

COLLEGE OF PHARMACY, NURSING, AND HEALTH SCIENCES PROMOTION PROCEDURES

General Procedures

In order to provide faculty feedback as to their progression towards promotion, each Department/School shall establish a mechanism to review eligible faculty by members of the Primary Committee at least every other year. Probationary tenure-track faculty should be reviewed by the Primary Committee annually. The unit Head shall notify the Primary Committee and advise the Dean in writing of all individuals, including those in their penultimate probationary year, who are to be considered for promotion by June 1 preceding the academic year during which they will be evaluated. Working with the Head, each nominee will prepare a packet that will include the following components:

1. A 2-3 page executive summary that highlights, in narrative form, the major contributions of the candidate in the learning, discovery, and engagement missions of the University. This summary should emphasize the impact of the nominee's contributions consistent with the basis for which promotion is sought (scholarship of learning, discovery and/or engagement). The candidate's role in interdisciplinary and multidisciplinary activities should also be highlighted.
2. Materials in support of the nomination, as outlined in President's Form 36 instructions. These materials should provide a concise description of the activities of the nominee in the area of learning, discovery and engagement.
3. Copies of the three to five most significant publications of the nominee.

These materials should be submitted to the unit Head no later than August 15th.

Nominee Materials for Review

Materials provided in support of the nomination should clearly identify the major contributions of the nominee and avoid an exhaustive cataloging of activities. Elements to consider in the preparation of these materials include:

Teaching

- 1) Each candidate for promotion should have the opportunity to document in writing his/her contributions to student learning. This can include (but not necessarily be limited to) new courses developed, innovative approaches to teaching, and contributions to teaching scholarship. Where appropriate, contributions to teaching scholarship should be evaluated by outside referees in the same manner described for Scholarship in the next section. "Teaching" includes both graduate and undergraduate teaching and teaching in the broadest sense, which includes mentoring of graduate students, postdoctoral fellows and residents, academic advising, clinical teaching, etc.
- 2) Each candidate should provide a listing of courses taught by semester that includes course number, course name, number of contact hours provided

by the candidate, coordinator responsibilities, and number of students enrolled.

- 3) Each candidate should provide tables of student evaluations of each course for each semester taught. The table for each course should list the questions asked and the score (mean and SD) obtained for each question for each semester (standard questions to be determined by each unit). The number of respondents should also be provided for each semester. Candidates should not include redacted comments from student evaluations.
- 4) Where direct comparative data are available (i.e., average instructor ratings for the course in team taught courses), they should also be provided. A summary of average teaching scores for each year for the Department/School should also be provided by the unit Head.
- 5) Each candidate should include summaries of peer-reviews of teaching that have been conducted.
- 6) Each candidate should submit *representative* course materials, such as syllabi, examinations, problem sets, and assignments to the Primary Committee (or to a subcommittee thereof, which will report on these) well in advance of the Primary Committee meeting.

Scholarship

- 1) Each candidate for promotion should have the opportunity to document his/her contributions as a scholar. This should include peer-reviewed and non-peer reviewed publications, scholarly presentations, and intellectual property development. Candidates should provide some measure of journal ranking or impact for each publication published during the period in rank.
- 2) Each candidate should submit a listing of extramural funding obtained in support of their scholarly endeavors (using the format outlined in Form 36). This listing should include agency, title of project, years funded, dollars per year, percent of candidate's salary provided by grant, and role of the candidate (principal investigator, co-investigators, etc).
- 3) Where the candidate for promotion is not the corresponding author, the contribution of the candidate to the work should be briefly described.
- 4) Where the candidate for promotion is not the principal investigator on a sponsored research project, a letter should be solicited (see template letter in Appendix B) from the principal investigator seeking specific information regarding the candidate's specific contribution to the work (generally no more than three such projects will be assessed in this fashion).

Engagement

- 1) Each candidate for promotion should have the opportunity to document his/her contributions as defined in the Strategic Plans of the Schools and/or academic unit promotion documents. Where such activities have had an impact beyond the University, it is appropriate to solicit the comments of outside evaluators.
- 2) For faculty with significant clinical service responsibilities, the nature and extent of those services should be described. In addition to the external letters described below, letters may be solicited from individuals able to evaluate the quality and impact of the clinical services provided by the candidate (see template letter in Appendix C).

Once submitted to the Primary Committee, the packet in support of the nomination should not be altered except to correct errors of fact or typographical errors. If relevant new information becomes available after the materials have been reviewed by the Primary Committee (e.g., acquisition of extramural funding, significant scholarly award), this information should be noted in the Head's evaluation of the nominee. Similarly, if such material becomes available after review by the Area Committee, it should be noted in the Dean's evaluation of the nomination.

Solicitation of External Review Letters

As the intent of external reviews is to assess the national reputation of the nominee and to provide an external quality control to the evaluation process, it is important to avoid reviewers with significant personal or professional relationships with the nominee. Therefore, external letters from mentors and current or former collaborators should be avoided. In addition, external reviewers should generally reside at peer institutions with a mission similar to that of Purdue University. In the case of faculty for whom engagement is a significant basis for their promotion, inclusion of letters from local individuals who can attest to the quality of their engagement activity is appropriate. This should not, however, be to the exclusion of letters from individuals from peer institutions.

By August 1st, the nominee should provide a list of 5-10 potential external reviewers to the unit Head. The nominee may also provide a list of up to 5 individuals who should be excluded as potential external reviewers. In consultation with the Dean, the Head will develop a final list of reviewers by selecting up to 5 names from the nominee's list and adding up to an additional 5 names, from whom letters of evaluation of the nominee will be solicited. School/Department Heads should solicit agreement to conduct the evaluation prior to sending reviewers the nominee's packet. External reviewers will be provided the candidate's three to five most significant publications, the packet in support of the nomination, and the unit promotion and tenure guidelines. Letters to external reviewers should be sent no later than August 21st with a requested due date of October 1st.

When the packet is distributed to the Primary and Area Committees, the Head shall include a listing of all individuals from whom letters were solicited, a brief (one paragraph) biographical description of the reviewer, and all letters received in their entirety. If an external reviewer does not reside in a peer institution, the rationale for

their selection as an external reviewer should be described. Completed packets, including the external review letters, should be distributed to members of the Primary Committee no later than October 15th.

Notification of Progress of Application to Nominee

After the Primary Committee evaluates the nominee, the unit Head shall communicate to the nominee whether or not the nomination for promotion and/or tenure will move forward to the Area Committee. While the discussion during the Committee deliberations and actual vote results are to remain confidential, the Head may communicate to the nominee if there are significant concerns regarding the prospects of the nomination at subsequent levels of review. If desired, the nominee may request, in writing, that the nomination not be submitted for consideration by the Area Committee. After evaluation by the Area Committee, the Dean shall communicate to the nominee whether or not the nomination for promotion and/or tenure will move forward to the University Committee. If appropriate, the Dean may communicate to the nominee if there are significant concerns regarding the prospects of the nomination at University Committee. If desired, the nominee may request, in writing, that the nomination not be submitted for consideration by the University Committee. After evaluation by the University Committee, the Dean shall communicate whether or not the nomination for promotion and/or tenure will move forward to the President and Board of Trustees.

Timetable of Procedures for Promotion and Tenure

June 1	Unit Head notifies Primary Committee and Dean of individuals to be considered for promotion and/or tenure in next academic year
August 1	Nominee submits list of 5-10 names of potential external reviewers
August 15	Nominee submits material for packet in support of nomination
August 21	Letters sent soliciting external reviews
October 1	External letters due
October 15	Packets, including external letters, submitted to members of Primary Committee
November 15	Primary Committee Review Completed
November 21	Materials for Area Committee due in Dean's Office
November 23	Materials Distributed to members of Area Committee
December 15	Area Committee Review completed
February	University Promotion Committee Review
April	Board of Trustees Action on Promotion Recommendations

Appendix A

Conflict of Interest Policy for Primary and Area Committees

Any member of a unit Primary Committee or the College Area Committee whose present or past relationship with a candidate for promotion and/or tenure may compromise the ability to make an objective assessment of the candidate's credentials, or appear to compromise that ability, shall identify their conflict of interest to the Committee Chair prior to initiation of the meeting and recuse themselves from all discussions and voting involving such candidates. Relationships which would create such a conflict of interest include, but are not limited to,:

- Marital, romantic, life partner or family relationship
- Serving as faculty advisor for candidate's dissertation, residency, or postdoctoral fellowship
- Financial partnership

A faculty member who is recused from the discussion of a candidate with whom they possess a conflict of interest will be expected to fully participate in the deliberations of all other candidates under consideration.

In the event that the Chair of the Primary or Area Committee possesses a conflict of interest with a candidate under consideration, the relevant Committee will elect by majority vote a member of the Committee to serve as Chair for the consideration of any and all candidates for which the normal Chair possesses a conflict of interest. This individual will also write the assessment in place of the Head or Dean (whichever holds the conflict of interest) on Form 36. In the event the Dean has a conflict of interest with any candidate being considered, presentation of the candidate to the University Promotions Committee will be determined by the Provost.

Resolution of disputes as to whether or not a conflict of interest exists for a given individual will be determined by the Committee Chair, unless the disputed conflict of interest involves the Chair. In this circumstance, resolution will be determined by the Chair of the next highest review committee.

Appendix B
Template for letter to principal investigators

Dear [insert name]:

Professor [insert name] is being considered for promotion at Purdue University. He/she has indicated that they are a collaborator on a funded project for which you are the principal investigator. It is most helpful in the review process for us to know more specifically the contribution that Professor [insert name] has made to this endeavor. We would be most appreciative if you could provide a letter outlining the role of Professor [insert name], specifically addressing the following:

1. What fraction or specific sections of the grant was/were written by the candidate?
2. What fraction of the work is carried out by personnel directly supervised by the candidate?
3. What fraction (if any) of the direct cost budget is controlled exclusively by the candidate?
4. Please list the percent effort for all investigators on the project.
5. Please provide the expiration date for the extramural funding and the plans for renewal, if any.
6. Please comment on the quality of the candidate's contribution to the project and their importance to the overall success of the project.

Your provision of this information is most appreciated, as it will be extremely valuable as we move forward in the review process. In order to appropriately assemble all materials needed for review of the candidate; we would appreciate receiving your response prior to October 1st.

Sincerely,

Appendix C
Template for letter evaluating clinical service

Dear [insert name]:

Professor [insert name] is being considered for promotion in our clinical track. As a part of our assessment, we would appreciate your evaluation of this candidate's clinical service. In particular, we would value your perspective on the quality of clinical care provided, significant initiatives by the candidate that have improved the delivery of patient care, and any observations you may have related to the candidate's effectiveness as an educator in the clinical setting. Your comments on the candidate's interaction with other health professionals would also be helpful.

[Insert appropriate wording describing the access of the candidate to the letter]

In order to meet the time frame necessary for our internal review process, we would appreciate receiving your letter prior to October 1st. Thank you in advance for assisting us in this very important matter.

Sincerely,