

Retention, Promotion and Tenure Guidelines
Department of Pharmaceutics and Pharmaceutical Chemistry
University of Utah

Approved by Department Tenure-Line Faculty: August 23, 2012
Approved by Dean, College of Pharmacy: August 30, 2012
Approved by office of the Vice President Health Sciences: August 30, 2012
Approved by University RPT Standards Committee: July 1, 2012 & September 14, 2012 for implementation as of July 1, 2012

Table of Contents

I. PREAMBLE: Mission of the Department of Department of Pharmaceutics and Pharmaceutical Chemistry.....	2
II. DEPARTMENT RETENTION, PROMOTION & TENURE ADVISORY COMMITTEE (DRPTAC)	3
A. Committee Membership (U-Policy 6-303- III-A-3).....	3
B. Quorum.....	3
C. Absentee Voting.....	3
D. Limitations	3
III. ACTIONS BY THE DRPTAC.....	3
A. Informal or Formal Reviews (U-Policy 6-303-III-B.).....	3
B. Notice to Candidate	5
C. Notice to Department Faculty.....	5
D. Materials to Committee (file closing date)	5
E. Letters of Evaluation (U-Policy 6-303- III-D-9)	5
F. Student Advisory Committee (SAC) Reports (U-Policy 6-303-III-C-3)	7
G. DRPTAC Secretary	7
H. DRPTAC Committee Report (for both formal and informal reviews)	7
I. Department Chair Report.....	7
J. Candidate’s Right to Respond (U-Policy 6-303-III-F-3).....	7
K. The Completed File and Subsequent Procedures Beyond the Department Level.....	8
IV. CRITERIA AND EXPECTATIONS FOR RETENTION, PROMOTION AND TENURE	8
A. General Principles and Objectives.....	8
B. Retention as Assistant Professor	9
C. Promotion to Associate Professor and Award of Tenure	10
D. Promotion to Professor	12
V. APPENDICES	14
Appendix A. List of required contents for the candidate's completed file.....	5
Appendix B. Notice of Final URPTSC Approval of RPT Statement. . ..	6
I. PREAMBLE: Mission of the Department of Pharmaceutics and Pharmaceutical Chemistry	
A. The Department of Pharmaceutics and Pharmaceutical Chemistry seeks to create highly	

trained, versatile experts in the diverse sets of scientific and engineering disciplines that together represent the modern field of pharmaceutics. These experts will serve to lead the world's industries and academic institutions to forward the field, foster innovation and progress, and endeavor to improve human therapies to benefit patient quality of life. The Department strives to be internationally recognized as a top-tier education and research program in pharmaceutics through innovative teaching and training, and creative research approaches that provide effective solutions to challenging clinical therapeutic problems. The Department's faculty is centric to achieving these academic performance goals and in fully supporting the mission of the College of Pharmacy and the broader University's academic mission and function as mandated by the State of Utah. Excellence can only be achieved through consistent participation of outstanding students and faculty. The Department seeks to attract the best and brightest students and faculty by creating a welcoming environment to foster success and creativity, and encourage enduring leadership using skills crucial for current global pharmaceutical employment. To capture the unique values and richness that arise from differences of culture and circumstance, as well as contrasting worldviews, we are committed to consistent and dedicated efforts to attract and retain diverse faculty and student populations.

All decisions by the Department of Pharmaceutics and Pharmaceutical Chemistry on retention, promotion and tenure for faculty members are consistent with the commitment of the University of Utah to the achievement and maintenance of academic excellence as stated in U-Policy 6-303.

B. This document provides guidelines for the Department of Pharmaceutics and Pharmaceutical Chemistry of the College of Pharmacy regarding retention, promotion and tenure decisions for its faculty. It serves as the departmental Statement of RPT Criteria, Standards and Procedures for tenure-line faculty required by University Policy 6-303-III-A-2-a. Nothing in this document shall be interpreted to conflict with University Regulations. The most important University Policies regarding RPT are 6-303 (Retention, Promotion, and Tenure), and 6-311 (Faculty Retention and Tenure), available at the University Regulations Website <http://www.regulations.utah.edu/>.

C. Implementation Date and Application to Existing Faculty. The revised RPT standards, criteria, and procedures contained in this Statement come into effect as of July 1, 2012. All faculty member RPT candidates appointed on or after this date will be considered under the new RPT standards and procedures. Candidates whose appointments began prior to that date who are reviewed for promotion with granting of tenure (assistant to associate level) will have the option of choosing the old RPT requirements or the new RPT requirements. Previously appointed candidates to be reviewed for promotion to the rank of Professor may choose the old requirements for reviews completed in or before the 2014-15 academic year. In each case, the new requirements will apply unless the candidate's choice of the old requirements is communicated to the department chairperson by signed letter before evaluation materials are sent to evaluators for external evaluations (See III-E below).

II. DEPARTMENT RETENTION, PROMOTION & TENURE ADVISORY COMMITTEE (DRPTAC)

A. Committee Membership (U-Policy 6-303-III-A-3)

1. **For Retention.** “All tenured faculty members regardless of rank are eligible to participate in the consideration of and to vote on recommendations in individual cases on matters of retention.”
2. **For Promotion.** “All regular faculty members of equal or higher rank than that proposed for the candidate for promotion are eligible to participate in the consideration of and to vote on recommendations in individual cases on matters of promotion.”
3. **For Tenure.** “All tenured faculty members regardless of rank are eligible to participate in the consideration of and to vote on recommendations in individual cases on matters of tenure.”
4. **Chairperson.** The chair of the Department Retention, Promotion and Tenure Advisory Committee (DRPTAC) shall be a tenured faculty member elected annually, early in the Fall semester, ordinarily before the end of the fifth week, from the tenured members of the Department faculty. The Department tradition is that the DRPTAC chair hold the rank of professor. All tenure-line faculty have the right to vote. The Department Chair is not eligible to chair this committee. The DRPTAC Chair shall establish the date and time of the DRPTAC meeting in approximately the 8th/9th week of the semester, and inform the chairperson of the College RPT Advisory Committee (Associate Dean for Faculty).

B. Quorum

“A quorum of [the DRPTAC] for any given case shall consist of two-thirds of its members, except that any member unable to attend the meeting because of formal leave of absence or physical disability shall not be counted in determining the number required for a quorum.” (Policy 6-303-III-E-3). A minimum of three individuals is required for a quorum.

C. Absentee Voting

“Whenever practicable, the Department Chairperson shall advise all members on leave or otherwise absent of the proposed action and shall request their written opinions and votes[, to be received approximately one week prior to the DRPTAC meeting]. Absent members’ written opinions shall be disclosed at the meeting and their votes will be counted the same as other votes[, either open or secret as defined in Part III.H].” (Policy 6-303-III-E-4). It is expected that absent members who cast a vote will be familiar with the candidate’s completed file.

D. Limitations

The Department Chair and College Dean, “who are required by the regulations to make their own recommendations in an administrative capacity, may attend, and upon invitation by majority vote of the committee, may submit evidence, judgments and opinions, or participate in discussion. By majority vote, the committee may move to executive session, from which nonvoting participants may be excluded. [The Department Chair and Dean], and other administrative officials who cast RPT votes in their administrative capacity, shall not vote at the departmental level.” (Policy 6-303-III-E-5). The ordinary practice of the department is, by majority approval, to first invite the Department Chair to submit evidence and participate in the discussion up to the point of voting, and then to move to executive session during voting on recommendations on each candidate, excusing the Department Chair and other nonvoters from the voting portion of the meeting.

III. ACTIONS BY THE DRPTAC

A. Informal or Formal Reviews (U-Policy 6-303-III-B-1.)

All tenure-eligible faculty members shall be reviewed annually to assess their achievement in teaching, research/scholarship, faculty responsibility, and service. The DRPTAC Chair shall call a meeting of the DRPTAC once each academic year in the Fall Semester to consider the retention of, promotion of, and/or award of tenure to, tenure-eligible faculty members and the promotion of tenured faculty, as appropriate.

1. A Retention Review, either Informal or Formal, will be given each year to tenure-eligible faculty members.
2. A Mid-term Formal Review for Retention will be conducted for all tenure-eligible faculty members appointed at the assistant professor level in ***their fourth probationary year***, and in the third year for tenure-eligible faculty members appointed at the associate professor or professor rank. An Informal Review will be conducted in each year in which a Formal Review is not held.
3. A Formal Review for Tenure and consideration for promotion to associate professor is required in the ***seventh probationary year*** for all tenure-eligible faculty members appointed at the assistant professor rank. A Formal Review and consideration for tenure is required in the fifth probationary year for all tenure-eligible faculty members appointed at the rank of associate professor or professor.
4. A Formal Review, either as required (see III.A.2) or requested (III.A.7), is required for a recommendation of termination.
5. Formal Reviews for retention, promotion or tenure require thorough examination and documentation of the candidate's academic performance in accordance with the pertinent criteria and in conformance with the procedures prescribed below.
6. *RPT file contents* (U-Policy 6-303-III-D). For both Informal and Formal Reviews, the candidate and department will develop a file that documents achievements and objectives in the areas of teaching, research and service. At a minimum, the file will include a personal statement and a curriculum vitae (in the format specified by the Faculty Affairs Office of the Health Sciences Center (HSC)), prepared by the candidate; and the following materials prepared or collected by the department -- professional and/or graduate student teaching evaluations and peer teaching observations for at least two consecutive immediately prior years, and the reports from the Department and College of Pharmacy Student Advisory Committees (see III.F). The candidate should also include details on teaching responsibilities (including course-mastership), and course description(s) and syllabi may be included if informative. For Formal Reviews, letters of evaluation will be requested by the Chair and DRPTAC from qualified individuals internal to and external to the University of Utah (see III.E). Informal Reviews do not require such letters. The file will also contain copies of past RPT reviews and recommendations at all levels, and any additional materials relevant to the issue under consideration.
7. *Shortening or extending probationary period (extraordinary progress)*. As indicated in U-Policy 6-303-III-B-2-c-ii, tenure-eligible faculty may request a Formal Review for Tenure earlier than the year of the mandatory review. Such early reviews require the approval of the Department Chair and DRPTAC Chair, and in instances specified in Policy 6-311 also require the approval of the Dean and Senior Vice President Health Sciences. For such an early review, "evidence in the file should demonstrate that the candidate *unequivocally* meets the tenure standard." Policy 6-311. [Per current Health Sciences Center policy, such requests must be submitted to the Faculty Affairs Office of

the Health Sciences Center by May 15 of the year preceding the year of the review.] Additional University Regulations regarding early review for tenure are contained in U-Policy 6-311-Sec. 4-C-1. The probationary period may be extended in conformity with relevant University Regulations (See U-Policies 6-311, 6-314, 6-315, and contact the Office of the Vice President for complete information).

8. *Triggered review.* Per U-Policy 6-303-III-B-1-c, if a tenure-eligible faculty member does not demonstrate clearly adequate progress to the reviewers in an informal review, the department chair or department RPT advisory committee may trigger a formal RPT review after giving the candidate written notice of such a review and its timing. The formal RPT review may proceed either in the following year or as soon as the file is completed (including the solicitation and receipt of external evaluator letters if applicable) but no sooner than 30 days after written notice of the review is provided to the candidate.

B. Notice to Candidate

At least three weeks prior to the beginning of the Fall Semester, the Department Chair will inform the candidate of pending retention, promotion or tenure action, and if a Formal Review is required, will request the names of qualified evaluators internal and external to the University for consideration by the Department and DRPTAC Chairs (see below). The Department Chair will also obtain a completed waiver/non waiver form (see below).

By the first Department faculty meeting of the Fall Semester, the candidate will submit to the Department Chair any information the candidate desires the College SAC and the DRPTAC (and evaluators if Formal Review) to consider. The minimum information requirements to be supplied are stated in Part III.A.6 above.

C. Notice to Department Faculty

Early in the Fall semester (typically the first week), the Department Chair shall inform faculty of upcoming RPT actions. If one or more Formal Reviews are scheduled, a notice will be disseminated that informs interested faculty and staff in the Department of their right to submit signed, written recommendations. (U-Policy 6-303-III-C-2)

D. Materials to Committee (file closing date)

Prior to the DRPTAC meeting (ordinarily held in approximately the 8th/9th week of the Fall semester), the Department Chairperson and the DRPTAC Chair shall jointly ensure that the candidate's RPT file is complete as described in III.A.6, and include any other statements and materials submitted by the candidate, and for Formal Reviews, all other signed recommendations submitted by individual faculty and staff, and all solicited letters received from internal and external evaluators. Per U-Policy 6-303-III-D-10, candidates are entitled to see their RPT file upon request at any time during the review process, *except for confidential letters of evaluation if the candidate has waived the right to see them.* If a candidate wishes to comment upon items in the initial RPT file, the candidate's written comment must be added to the file before the DRPTAC meeting is held. The DRPTAC Chair is responsible for making the file available to DRPTAC members.

E. Letters of Evaluation (U-Policy 6-303-III-D-9)

The purpose of letters of evaluation is to provide an objective assessment of the quality of the candidate's work and its impact on the academic and/or professional community at large. The requirements for letters of evaluation from internal and external (defined as external to the University of Utah) evaluators are given below:

- Mid-Term Formal Review for Retention: at least two internal and at least three external letters
- Formal Review for Tenure (all ranks): at least two internal and at least six external letters
- Formal Review for Promotion (all ranks): at least two internal and at least six external letters

The selection of external evaluators will be made jointly by the Department Chair and the DRPTAC Chair from lists of possible evaluators suggested by 1) the candidate; 2) the Department Chair; 3) DRPTAC Chair and members. Letters should be solicited from recognized experts in the same or similar field of scholarly endeavor who are familiar with the traditional rigor, criteria and expectations for and understanding of the promotion and tenure process in a research-intensive college at a major research university. External academic evaluators must have recognized professional standing at the same rank (or higher) that the candidate seeks. Letters from current collaborators and former mentors are acceptable for justified reasons but must be minimized (represent less than 20% of the total letter pool). We define “current collaborator” according to the NIH conflict of interest statement for reviewers (<http://grants.nih.gov/grants/policy/coi/index.html>), as any colleague with whom the candidate is currently conducting research or with whom the candidate has conducted research within the past three years. Along with the review, the external evaluators will be asked to describe any relationship to the candidate, and will be asked to provide their full CV or an abbreviated CV such as an NIH-style biosketch. Copies of solicitation letters sent to evaluators will also be included in the file, and these will document that the primary focus of enquiry is on the candidate’s research and scholarly activity and on the candidate’s national or emerging national reputation. Invited evaluators will be provided with the file as prepared by the candidate, as well as the Department RPT guidelines, with the request to evaluate the file along specific criteria. Evaluators will also be requested to comment on teaching and service activities if they have direct knowledge or other information pertaining to the candidate in these areas.

Once internal and external evaluators are chosen, the Department Chair shall solicit the letters and shall ensure that sufficient requests are made and received in a timely manner so that the required number of eligible letters as indicated above is included in the file before the DRPTAC meeting. Before external letters of evaluation are requested, the candidate shall be presented with a departmentally prepared form containing the following statements and signature lines:

I waive my right to read the external letters of evaluation obtained from outside the department for my [retention/promotion/tenure] review. Signature/date

I retain my right to read the external evaluations obtained from outside the department for my [retention/promotion/tenure] review. Signature/date

That form, with the candidate’s signature below the preferred statement, shall be included in the candidate’s file. When the candidate retains the right to read the external

letters of evaluation, the external evaluators shall be informed by writing that their letters may be seen by the faculty member being reviewed.

F. Student Advisory Committee (SAC) Reports (U-Policy 6-303-III-C-3)

SAC reports will be obtained for formal and for informal reviews. In this department (unlike others in the College of Pharmacy) reports are obtained from both our Department SAC and the College of Pharmacy SAC. The Department SAC and College SAC will each receive a file submitted by the candidate in approximately the 5th week of the Fall semester and should each complete their review and written recommendations, as a written report that includes votes and signatures, before the DRPTAC meeting (by approximately the end of the 8th week of the semester). “The SAC shall be given at least three weeks to prepare its report....” Policy 6-303. The reports from each SAC should be based on guiding principles approved by the University RPT Standards Committee, available through the office of the Vice President (<http://www.admin.utah.edu/facdev/forms/studentadv.pdf>), and provided by the Associate Dean For Faculty of the College. The file submitted to each SAC shall contain the candidate’s CV, personal statement, and teaching evaluations from students and peers as specified in III.A.6 above, but not internal or external letters of evaluation. If either or both of the two SACs fails to prepare a signed report within the prescribed time frame and with proper content abiding by University standards, the missing SAC’s recommendations “shall be deemed conclusively waived, and [the] absence shall not thereafter be cause for complaint by faculty members appealing an adverse decision.” Policy 6-303-III-C-3.

G. DRPTAC Secretary

A secretary of each meeting shall be designated by the Chair of the DRPTAC and shall take notes of the discussion to provide the basis for developing a summary.

H. DRPTAC Committee Report (for both formal and informal reviews)

After due consideration, voting on all appropriate actions regarding the candidate shall then proceed. Voting is ordinarily conducted in executive session, excluding the Department Chair and others ineligible to vote (see II-D above), and is either by open or secret ballot, per committee preference (as is allowed under university policy). A separate vote shall be taken on each action proposed for each candidate under consideration for retention, promotion, or tenure.

The secretary shall make a record of the vote (including absentee votes as noted above), and shall prepare a separate summary report of the meeting for each candidate. Each report shall include the substance of the discussion, including the explicit rationale for negative votes, if any, and also the findings and recommendations of the committee for either an Informal or Formal Review. DRPTAC members will have the opportunity to review and approve the report during a 2-to-5 day inspection period (U-Policy 6-303-III-E-7). By approximately the end of the 9th week of the semester, the DRPTAC summary report of the review, bearing the written approvals of the committee chair and secretary, along with a list of all faculty members present or voting in absentia at the meeting, shall be forwarded to both the Department Chairperson, and the candidate for an opportunity for response or comment (see below).

I. Department Chair Report

By approximately the end of the 11th week of the semester, the Department Chair will prepare an independent report, addressed to the Dean of the College of Pharmacy, to

be submitted to both the candidate and College Retention, Promotion and Tenure Advisory Committee (CRPTAC). The Chair's report will summarize the Chair's evaluation of the candidate and recommendation regarding retention, promotion and/or tenure. The Chair's report may quote from the letters submitted by evaluators, but will not identify any evaluators.

J. Candidate's Right to Respond (U-Policy 6-303-III-F-3)

For both Formal and Informal Reviews, the candidate shall have the opportunity at this time, but not the obligation, to add a written statement to his/her RPT file in response to the summary report of the DRPTAC and/or the report of the Department Chair. Written notice of this option shall be included with the copy of the Department Chair's report that is sent to the candidate. If the candidate chooses to add such a statement to the file, that statement must be submitted to the Department Chair within seven business days, except in extenuating circumstances, of the date upon which the Chair's report is delivered to the candidate. If such a response is submitted, the Department Chair will add the candidate's statement to the file without comment.

K. The Completed File and Subsequent Procedures Beyond the Department Level

By approximately the middle of the 13th week of the semester, the Department Chair will then forward the completed file, including the DRPTAC report, the Department Chair's report, and any responses by the candidate, to the Associate Dean for Faculty of the College of Pharmacy (see below) for subsequent review by the CRPTAC. CRPTAC reviews both Formal and Informal Reviews. Per current policy (2010-2011) of the Senior Vice President Health Sciences, the completed file will contain (from the rear forward) the sections detailed in Appendix A (and this list may be updated from time to time by the department without a formal re-approval of the entire department RPT Statement):

Procedures subsequent to the department level are described in University Policy 6-303-III-G,H,J (action by dean and college advisory committee, action by cognizant vice president and University Promotion and Tenure Advisory Committee, final action by president).

After all formal and informal reviews prior to the tenure review, the Department Chair shall meet with the candidate to discuss the report and his/her progress. (Policy 6-303-III-B-1).

IV. CRITERIA AND EXPECTATIONS FOR RETENTION, PROMOTION AND TENURE

A. General Principles and Objectives

1. Decisions by the Department of Pharmaceutics and Pharmaceutical Chemistry on retention, promotion and tenure for faculty members are consistent with the commitment of the University of Utah to the achievement and maintenance of academic excellence. As stated in U-Policy 6-303-III-A-2-c-i, *“For granting of tenure, it is indispensable that there be a cumulative record demonstrating sustained effectiveness in each of the two areas of teaching and research/other creative activity, and additionally, excellence in a combination of those areas.”*

For the award of tenure, the Department of Pharmaceutics and Pharmaceutical Chemistry requires excellence in both teaching and research/creative activity appropriate to the characteristics of our discipline. In addition, faculty are expected to provide effective service to the University

- and to the profession, broadly defined.** For candidates whose initial appointment is made at the assistant professor rank, tenure will not be awarded unless accompanied by promotion to associate professor.
2. Research or scholarship includes discovery, development and dissemination of new knowledge, and is universally accepted as a critical core mission of universities. The ability to conduct research of high quality is required for appointment to the tenure-eligible faculty in the Department of Pharmaceutics and Pharmaceutical Chemistry, for advancement in rank, and for award of tenure. The most quantifiable endpoint of research and scholarly activity is the publication of its results. **The Department defines excellence in research/creative activity as achievement in the conduct of research that makes significant contributions to new knowledge in a sustained fashion, and that is of such quality as to gain favorable recognition within the discipline at the national level.**
 3. Teaching also has an obvious central role within the university. All tenure-track faculty are expected to participate in teaching and demonstrate a high level of effectiveness in this activity, which can involve presentation of lectures, direction of smaller discussion groups, student mentoring and laboratory training, and which can be directed to undergraduate students, professional students in the College of Pharmacy and School of Medicine, or graduate students and post-doctoral trainees. **The Department defines excellence in teaching as a high level of achievement in presenting and explaining concepts, approaches and other principles that are generally accepted as important learning objectives in our discipline to students and/or trainees, and in creating a positive learning environment for students and trainees, in one or more of the various forms of teaching conducted by the Department.**
 4. Consistent with U-Policy 6-303-III-A-2-c-i, *“For retention during the probationary period, the record for the two areas must demonstrate reasonable potential for meeting the standards established for tenure. For promotion in rank, the record for the two areas must demonstrate continuing professional growth at a level appropriate to the particular rank.”* In addition, in carrying out their academic duties, *“faculty members are expected to demonstrate the ability and willingness to perform as responsible members of the faculty, as defined in the Code of Faculty Rights and Responsibilities (U-Policy 6-316).”* Policy 6-303-III-A-2-b. Faculty of this and all health sciences departments are expected to comply with requirements of the Faculty Code and to conduct their interactions with other members of the University community in a professional, collegial, and constructive manner.

B. Retention as Assistant Professor

1. Criteria and expectations

Teaching: It is expected that the individual will show a commitment to teaching and will demonstrate an ability to develop and present well-organized lectures in professional and/or graduate courses. Furthermore, it is expected that the individual will demonstrate the desire to develop as an educator. Finally, it is expected that the individual will interact with their graduate and/or post-doctoral trainees in a manner conducive to their education and advancement.

Research: The Department expects that the individual will be able to establish, budget,

and supervise a research laboratory, direct specific research projects and/or programs, and prepare grant applications seeking research funding from intramural and/or extramural sources. During the probationary period, the Department expects that the individual will publish the results of hypothesis-driven research in well-regarded, peer-reviewed journals.

Service: It is expected that the individual will show willingness to serve on Department, College and University committees as appropriate for years of service, and will initiate involvement in national service activities through discipline-appropriate, professional societies or similar organizations.

2. Evidence for effectiveness in teaching CAN be documented by:

- Participation in professional and/or graduate courses as instructor or course director
- Receipt of positive evaluations by students and faculty peers
- Demonstrated record of responding to student and peer reviews of teaching in a constructive and improving manner
- Development and effective implementation of new courses or teaching materials
- Nomination/recommendation and/or receipt of a teaching award
- Successful mentoring of pre- and postdoctoral trainees

3. Evidence for effectiveness in research CAN be documented by:

- A publication record in peer-reviewed journals demonstrating continuity of an independent research program
- A record of applying for and success in obtaining intramural and/or extramural grant support, including funding support for graduate students
- Invitations to present research findings at scientific meetings or other universities/research institutions
- Successful outcomes (e.g., dissertations, publications) of doctoral dissertation and post-doctoral research projects

4. Evidence for effectiveness in service CAN be documented by:

- A record of participation in Department, College and/or University committees
- Assignment to administrative duties within the Department, College or University
- A record of participation in peer review for scientific journals
- A record of participation on scientific grant review panels
- A record of participation in service to national professional societies

C. Promotion to associate professor and the award of tenure

1. Criteria and expectations

Teaching: The teaching criterion for promotion to associate professor and award of tenure is demonstrated excellence in teaching as defined in Part IV-A above. The candidate is expected to participate in the teaching programs of the Department as assigned, with the number and type of contact hours reflecting an effort appropriate to the Department's teaching mission.

Research: The research criterion for promotion to associate professor and award of tenure is demonstrated excellence in research as defined in Part IV-

A above. The Department expects the candidate to establish, conduct, and publish results from a sustained, productive research program that is recognized nationally for its high quality. The candidate is expected to obtain research funding, which is clearly necessary to support a high quality research program, to demonstrate the potential for continued success in obtaining and sustaining such funding, and to consistently disseminate the results of the research through high quality scientific scholarly publications recognized by the field.

Service: The candidate is expected to provide service to the University and to the profession as broadly defined, by serving on Department and/or College and/or University committees, and by contributing in a substantive manner to their mission. The candidate is also expected to participate in visible, impacting service at the national or international level.

2. To document excellence in teaching, the following items of evidence ARE required:

- Positive student evaluations, when considered overall, regarding the candidate's achievement as an instructor and/or course master, and regarding the candidate's creation of a positive learning environment (including numerical scores and written comments)
- Peer faculty observation reports that indicate a high level of achievement and professionalism and creation of a positive learning environment
- Consistent improvement in teaching performance, as reflected by improved numerical scores and increasingly positive written comments on student and peer evaluations, or maintenance of teaching performance once excellence has been achieved.
- The Department and College SAC reports both indicating a majority positive vote for promotion and award of tenure, and written comments that reflect the positive learning environment created by the candidate and/or the candidate's record of responsiveness to student concerns.

Additional evidence of excellence in teaching CAN include:

- Nomination for or receipt of a teaching award
- Guest lectureships at other institutions
- Development and implementation of a new course or novel teaching methods
- Successful mentoring of graduate students and postdoctoral trainees

3. To document excellence in research, the following items of evidence ARE required:

- A record of consistent publication of original research as senior (primary/corresponding) author in peer-reviewed scientific journals describing work conducted in the candidate's laboratory, or where appropriate, the laboratories of a center or program.
- Research funding awarded through competitive peer review from extramural agencies that is sufficient to sustain investigator-initiated research projects and/or graduate student dissertation projects and to permit consistent scientific productivity as defined above.

- Positive letters of evaluation from evaluators within and external to the University of Utah indicating that the quality and quantity of the candidate's scientific work demonstrates an excellent or emerging excellent national reputation in research/creative activity, and stating a recommendation in favor of promotion and tenure.

Additional evidence for excellence in research CAN include:

- Scientific publications as a significant contributor to collaborative research in which the candidate is not the senior author
- Authorship of review articles and/or book chapters
- Invitations to present research findings at national/international scientific meetings and/or at other universities/research institutions
- Recognition through scientific awards and nominated professional fellow inductions.
- Inventorship and co-authorship on patent applications
- Consistent participation in commercially sponsored research
- Successful translation of new technologies into commercial products

4. Evidence for effectiveness in service CAN be documented by:

- A record of active participation and leadership in Department, College and/or University committees
- Demonstrated leadership in administrative duties within the Department, College or University
- A record of promoting increased public understanding of science and technology in non-academic settings
- A record of leadership in service to national professional societies
- A record of participation in peer review for scientific journals
- A record of participation on scientific grant review panels
- A record of involvement in planning/organizing scientific sessions or scientific meetings
- A record of active participation in department, College, and/or University outreach activities

5. Special note:

In the case of a faculty member hired at the rank of associate professor, but without tenure, the candidate subsequently reviewed for tenure must have demonstrated a sustained level of excellence in teaching and research during the pre-tenure probationary period at the University of Utah.

D. Promotion to professor

1. Criteria and expectations

Associate professors may request promotion to the rank of professor at any time at which they have met the Department's requirements. The Department does not require any minimum number of years subsequent to granting of tenure or promotion to associate professor before a candidate may be considered eligible for promotion to Professor.

Teaching: The teaching criterion for promotion to professor is continued participation in the teaching mission of the Department and continued demonstration of excellence in teaching as described above for award of tenure.

Research: The research criterion for promotion to professor is sustained conduct of an active research program as described for the award of tenure, and demonstrated national and international reputation for excellence in research. The candidate is expected to maintain a level of scientific productivity consistent with a national and international reputation.

Service: The candidate is expected to continue to provide effective service to the University, College and Department, and to also show significant service at the national level, particularly as it relates to research and/or the profession.

2. To document continued excellence in teaching, the following items of evidence ARE required:

- Consistent positive student evaluations, when considered overall, regarding the candidate's achievement as an instructor and/or course master, and regarding the candidate's creation of a positive learning environment (including numerical scores and written comments).
- Consistent peer faculty observation reports that indicate a high level of achievement and professionalism and creation of a positive learning environment.
- The Department and College SAC reports both indicating a majority positive vote for promotion, and written comments that reflect the positive learning environment created by the candidate and/or the candidate's record of responsiveness to student concerns.

Additional evidence for continued excellence in teaching CAN include:

- Nomination for or receipt of a teaching award
- Guest lectureships at other institutions
- Development and implementation of a new course or novel teaching methods
- Successful mentoring of graduate students and postdoctoral trainees

3. To document continued excellence in research, the following items of evidence ARE required:

- A record, on average, of multiple publications per year of original research as senior (primary/corresponding) author in well-regarded, peer-reviewed scientific journals evidencing on-going achievements, leadership and consistent scholarship.
- A record of sustained research funding from extramural funding agencies sufficient to support the research program and to sustain continued scientific productivity
- Positive evaluations of the quality of the candidate's research program and indication of both national and international reputation of excellence in research by well-respected evaluators from within and external to the University of Utah, and their overall recommendation in favor of promotion.

Additional evidence for continued excellence in research CAN include:

- Multiple scientific publications as a significant contributor to collaborative research in which the candidate is not the senior author, but significant contributor
- Authorship of multiple review articles and/or book chapters
- Multiple invitations to present research findings at national/international scientific meetings and/or at other universities/research institutions
- Documented recognition through national scientific awards and nominated professional fellow inductions.
- A record of inventorship and co-authorship on patent applications
- A record of consistent participation in commercially sponsored research
- Evidence for successful translation of new technologies into commercial products

4. Evidence for continued effectiveness in service CAN be documented by:

- A record of active participation and leadership in Department, College and/or University committees
- Demonstrated leadership in administrative duties within the Department, College or University
- A record of promoting increased public understanding of science and technology in non-academic settings
- A record of leadership in service to national professional societies
- A record of participation in peer review for scientific journals
- A record of participation on scientific grant review panels
- A record of involvement in planning/organizing scientific sessions or scientific meetings
- A record of active participation in Department, College, and/or University outreach activities
- A record of contributions to local and national science and/or health care policy

V. APPENDICES.

Appendix A: List of required contents for the candidate's completed file.

Per current policy (2010-2011) of the Senior Vice President Health Sciences, the completed file submitted to the Dean will contain (from the rear forward) these sections (and this list may be updated from time to time by the department without a formal re-approval of the entire department RPT Statement):

If promotion to professor:

- a CV as submitted at the time of appointment or promotion to associate professor
- Past reviews in descending order
- Department RPT Criteria used for review

If Formal Review:

- Evaluators' letters of evaluation, signed waiver form, evaluators' name/address, qualifications and relationship to candidate, and table of source of evaluator selection (candidate, chair, etc).
- Internal recommendations, and posted memo for department faculty/staff recommendations
- Sample letter sent to external evaluators that includes list of enclosures, dates sent to evaluators, and actions being considered
- Candidate's current CV in College-approved format and bibliography, noting last revised date
- Updated Personal Statement
- SAC report and Teaching reports/evaluations from students and faculty peers
- DRPTAC Report
- Department Chair report and 7-day response notice
- Any Candidate Response

Appendix B: Notice of final URPTSC approval.



395 SOUTH 1300 EAST, ROOM 101 • SALT LAKE CITY, UTAH 84142-0101 • (801) 581-6191 • FAX (801) 585-3210 • WWW.CSOW.UTAH.EDU

Memorandum

To: David Grainger, Chair, Department of Pharmaceutics and Pharmaceutical Chemistry

Cc: Amy Wildermuth, Associate V.P. Academic Affairs
Liz Winter, Chief of Staff, Sr. V.P Health Sciences

From: Hank Liese, College of Social Work *Hank Liese*
Chairperson, University RPT Standards Committee 2011-2012, 2012-2013

Subject: Final Approval of RPT Statement

Date: September 14, 2012

This is to confirm that the attached version of the Department of Pharmaceutics and Pharmaceutical Chemistry's RPT Statement, dated as approved for implementation as of July 1, 2012 by the University Retention, Promotion, and Tenure Standards Committee, has been reviewed and approved by the Committee pursuant to University Policy 6-303. The Committee approved this Statement in substance as of July 1, and has now reapproved the Statement with certain technical revisions. The Statement may be implemented for RPT Proceedings in your department for the academic year 2012-2013 (as of July 1, 2012).

Congratulations on completing the approval process, and revising your Statement to comply with University Policies and to serve well the missions of your Department, College, and the University.

Please ensure that a copy of this approval notice is attached to all copies of the final approved version of the RPT Statement.

Two further steps should be taken to ensure an orderly transition from using the version of your department Statement in effect until now, to using this newly approved Statement. First, all current faculty members who will in the future undergo formal reviews for retention, promotion, or tenure should have their attention directed to the passage within the new Statement which describes the "Implementation Date and Application to Existing Faculty," and provides for certain procedures in making the transition from old to new. Second, those existing faculty members who are currently still in their pre-tenure RPT probationary period are requested to complete the "RPT Transition Choice Form" prior to the start of their next formal review, indicating their choice of having the remaining reviews conducted under the terms of the old or new Statement. That form is available from the office of the Vice President.