College of Pharmacy

BY-LAWS

Approved by the Board of Trustees November 2023

PREAMBLE

These Bylaws articulate the structure and activities of the College of Pharmacy to supplement the Howard University Faculty Handbook. In the event that there is a conflict between these Bylaws and the Howard University Faculty Handbook, the provisions of the Howard University Faculty Handbook shall govern and control.

Table of Contents

ARTICLE I: VISION, MISSION, VALUES AND GOALS

Howard University College of Pharmacy is a premier educational institution developing students of high academic standing and high academic potential into becoming future leaders in the field of pharmacy. The College of Pharmacy strives to cultivate current and future scholars addressing pertinent healthcare needs throughout the domestic and international community through their service, leadership, and cutting-edge research discovery.

SECTION 1: VISION

Howard University College of Pharmacy excels in teaching and learning, practice, research, service, and leadership locally, nationally, and globally.

SECTION 2: MISSION

The mission of Howard University College of Pharmacy is to provide pharmacy education of excellent quality to students possessing high academic, scholarship, and leadership potential, with particular emphasis upon the recruitment, retention, and graduation of promising African American and other ethnically diverse minority students.

The college fosters the creation of new knowledge through innovative research and scholarship, commitment to community service, continuous professional development, and dedication to superior pharmacy practice locally and globally.

SECTION 3: VALUES

The college holds the following values:

C.A.R.E.

Collaboration| Accountability| Respect| Excellence|

SECTION 4: GOALS

The primary goals of the College of Pharmacy are:

1. To provide excellent pharmaceutical education and training experiences that develop competent pharmacists and pharmaceutical scientists, who can engage in a variety of contemporary professional practice settings and in community service nationally and globally;
2. To promote scholarly research that contributes to the growth and development of the basic and clinical pharmaceutical sciences;
3. To recruit and retain a cadre of faculty dedicated to the tasks of innovative teaching and mentoring students, conducting research, and providing exemplary clinical practice; and
4. To provide postgraduate and continuing professional education through traditional and nontraditional pathways.

ARTICLE II: THE ADMINISTRATION

SECTION 1: ORGANIZATIONAL STRUCTURE

The College of Pharmacy is an independent academic unit that reports directly to the Provost and Chief Academic Officer of Howard University.

SECTION 2: THE DEAN

The Dean serves as chief administrator of the College of Pharmacy and is directly responsible to the President of the University through the Provost and Chief Academic Officer. The Dean is assisted by the Associate Dean(s) and Assistant Dean(s) in discharging his/her responsibilities for the College of Pharmacy professional programs.

SECTION 2.1: QUALIFICATIONS AND EVALUATION OF THE DEAN

According to the Howard University Faculty Handbook (hereinafter referred to as the Faculty Handbook), the Dean is appointed by the Board of Trustees upon the nomination of the President and recommendations by the Provost and Chief Academic Officer from a list of qualified candidates selected by a search committee. When appointing a new Dean, the Provost shall name the chair of the search committee and appoint or arrange for the election of a search committee in accordance with the Faculty Handbook. The majority of the search committee members shall be from the college, and two members will be selected by the Faculty Senate. The Provost's recommendation, together with that of the college search committee, shall be forwarded to the President for final decision. If the Dean holds a faculty rank with indefinite tenure, he/she retains the right to return to the department of his/her academic discipline after stepping down from his/her position. Due to the varied disciplines in the College of Pharmacy, the qualifications that should be considered in the selection for the position of the Dean are as follows:

1. Earned doctorate from an accredited pharmaceutical education institution or a related health science discipline;
2. Proven record of teaching, research, service, and other scholarly activity appropriate for a faculty appointment, at the rank of full Professor with tenure;
3. Proven record of significant administrative experience in higher education, pharmaceutical sciences, pharmacy practice, and/or industry-related association;
4. Demonstrated abilities for grantsmanship and fundraising;
5. Commitment to building a cohesive and culturally diverse faculty, staff, and student body,
6. Ability to articulate a strong vision to promote the development of the college;
7. Outstanding interpersonal communication skills; and
8. Demonstrated ability to develop collaborative relationships with other University administrators and with the community at large.

SECTION 2.2: EVALUATION OF THE DEAN

Deans shall be evaluated by the faculty of the College of Pharmacy, in writing, at least once every two years. The evaluation shall be developed and coordinated by collaboration between the Office of the Provost and Chief Academic Officer and the Executive Committee of the college. Evaluation rubrics will be distributed to faculty within the college to provide them the opportunity to give feedback on their decanal leadership. The evaluation rubric will consist of a series of questions in which participating faculty will assign a score and will be given an opportunity for discursive comments. The discursive comments allow faculty to state any reasons they have for believing that the decanal leadership has or has not helped the college make progress in meeting its mission and goals. The Executive Committee will tabulate the results of the evaluation and submit a summary report and all completed evaluation rubrics to the Provost. The rubric responses and comments will be anonymous and will not be edited. The Provost will communicate the results of the evaluation to the full-time faculty of the college within sixty days of the completion of the evaluation. The results shall be used by the Provost to improve the effectiveness of the Dean and to make recommendations to the President regarding continuation or replacement.

SECTION 2.3: RESPONSIBILITIES OF THE DEAN

The Dean is responsible for the administration of the College of Pharmacy. In general, the Dean's responsibilities encompass instruction; research and professional services; faculty recruitment, development, and evaluation; student affairs; and budget management. As appropriate, the Dean shall consult with the Associate Dean(s), Assistant Dean(s), Department Chairs, Directors, faculty, staff, and students in performing these responsibilities. At the start of the academic year, the Dean informs the faculty of decanal priorities, goals, and objectives, along with budget summaries and resource allocations to the faculty.

At the conclusion of each academic year, the Dean provides the faculty with a written report of activities, accomplishments and impediments related to the original proposed goals and objectives outlined at the beginning of the academic year.

The specific responsibilities of the Dean shall include, but are not limited to:

1. Developing and monitoring the implementation of the college's mission and strategic plan;
2. Course schedule planning;
3. General supervision of college outreach activities;
4. General supervision of college service activities;
5. General supervision of college teaching and student advising;
6. Serving as chair of the college-wide Executive Committee for all matters except for decanal evaluations;
7. Appointing Program Directors and Program Coordinators;
8. Holding regularly scheduled meetings with Associate Dean(s), Assistant Dean(s), Department Chairs, and Directors;
9. Developing and implementing fund-raising activities for the college's academic programs, research infrastructure, and student scholarships, endowments, and stipends;

10. Supervising the administration of the college;
11. Monitoring the development, implementation, and evaluation of the college's programs;
12. Overseeing faculty appointment, reappointment, promotion, and tenure;
13. Appointing staff;
14. Appointing chairs of standing committees if needed;
15. Developing and procuring the college's budget;
16. Supervising the college's annual report, and accreditation self-studies and progress reports to the President, Board of Trustees, and/or designated authorities;
17. Representing the college in its official relations with the public, agencies, and professional organizations; and
18. The Dean must call "Town Hall" assemblies as needed, at a minimum one (1) per semester, which may include the "State of the College" addresses.

SECTION 3: ASSOCIATE AND ASSISTANT DEANS

1. **Appointment**. Consistent with this document, upon the approval of the Provost, the Dean shall appoint Associate and Assistant Deans of the college as necessary to facilitate administration of college activities and programs.
2. **Term of Appointment**. Associate and Assistant Deans serve at the pleasure of the Dean. Term limits for these positions are determined by the Dean.
3. **Duties**. The Dean shall develop the description of the duties of Associate and Assistant Deans and shall inform the faculty as to the assignment of duties and responsibilities, including any significant change of assignments of Associate and Assistant Deans. The Dean may establish a search committee that will be responsible for identifying candidates who may be considered for Associate and Assistant Dean appointments. Associate and Assistant Deans shall report to the Dean.
4. **Evaluation**. Associate and Assistant Dean performance review and continuation is based on successful fulfillment of documented roles and responsibilities. Because of the significant administrative roles that Associate and Assistant Deans have, a separate process to evaluate them was created for them to submit their activities and achievements annually for evaluation by the Dean. The process entails the following: The Associate/Assistant Dean submits the self-evaluation report and any attachments to the Dean. The Dean reviews, prepares an evaluation and meets with the Associate/Assistant Dean. The Dean sends the final evaluation to the Associate/Assistant Dean to respond to and return to the Dean. The Dean submits the evaluation to the Office of the Provost. Each step, except for the meeting, is facilitated within the University's faculty evaluation management system. This process is for those administrators who also have faculty status. If the Associate/Assistant Dean is an administrator without faculty status, their annual evaluation is through the Office of Human Resources.

SECTION 4: DEPARTMENT CHAIRPERSONS

There shall be a chairperson for each established department in the college. The Department Chairperson is the administrator of the department, reports to the Dean of the college, and serves as the chairperson of the department's Executive Committee. He/she represents the faculty and

staff of his/her department and is responsible for faculty recruitment, development and evaluation; program development and assessment; budget development and implementation; course schedule planning; and overseeing the instructional, research and service activities of the department.

SECTION 4.1: APPOINTMENT, EVALUATION AND REMOVAL OF THE DEPARTMENT CHAIRPERSON

1. **Appointment**. Department Chairpersons shall be appointed by the President upon recommendation of the Dean and the Provost and Chief Academic Officer.
2. **Search**. When a new Department Chairperson is appointed, a search committee shall be established, the size and composition of which shall be determined by the faculty of the department, but at least one-half the members of the search committee shall be from the full-time tenured faculty of the department and other half can be from probationary tenure-track and CET faculty. Tenured faculty in other department(s) within and outside the college and the University may also be included. The Dean shall appoint the search committee's chair. The search committee shall make recommendations to the Dean, who forwards those along with his/her own recommendation to the Provost and Chief Academic Officer and President for decision.
3. **Term of Appointment**. The Department Chairperson is appointed for a three (3) year renewable term, subject to satisfactory evaluation by the Dean, who will solicit the input of the departmental faculty, staff, and students.
4. **Interim Appointments**. The Dean shall appoint an interim chairperson from the full-time faculty upon the approval of the Provost, pending the appointment of the Department Chairperson.
5. **Evaluation**. The Department Chair submits a self-evaluation report and any attachments to the Dean. The Dean reviews, prepares an evaluation and meets with the Department Chair. The Dean sends the final evaluation to the Department Chair to respond to and return to the Dean. The Dean submits the evaluation to the Office of the Provost. Each step, except for the meeting, is facilitated within the University's faculty evaluation management system.
6. **Removal of Chair**. The Department Chairperson may be removed, at any time, prior to the expiration of his/her term. The department, upon the vote of two-thirds of the full-time faculty of the department, may initiate removal of a Department Chairperson. Also, the Dean or the Provost and Chief Academic Officer may initiate removal of a Department Chairperson. The Department Chairperson will be allowed to present his/her rebuttal to the next level authority (i.e., the Dean, in cases where removal has been initiated by faculty vote; the Provost, in cases where removal has been initiated by the Dean; the President, in cases where removal has been initiated by the Provost) prior to the final decision.

SECTION 4.2: THE RESPONSIBILITIES OF THE DEPARTMENT CHAIRPERSON

In consultation with departmental faculty, the Department Chairperson's responsibilities shall include, but are not limited to:

1. Developing and implementing the department's mission and strategic plan;

2. Planning and ensuring the continued growth and development of the department and its faculty;
3. Faculty recruitment, development, and evaluation;
4. Serving as custodian of equipment and facilities of the department in accordance with University safety guidelines;
5. Preparing the department's Annual Report, Accreditation Self-Study, and Progress Reports;
6. Assuming an advocacy role for his/her department at the Executive Committee meetings and in other college/University forums, as appropriate;
7. Development, review, and evaluation of departmental courses and programs;
8. Recommending the appointment of and conducting evaluations of support personnel;
9. Student advising;
10. Making teaching assignments;
11. Recommending and implementing departmental budget;
12. Planning the research and outreach activities of the department;
13. Implementing the University's and college's strategic plan as they pertain to the department; and
14. Performing other duties as may be assigned by the Dean.

SECTION 5: PROGRAM DIRECTORS AND COORDINATORS

1. **Appointment**. Program Directors and Program Coordinators shall be appointed to administer such programs in the college as stipulated by an accrediting agency or as may be determined by the Dean. Program Directors and Program Coordinators are appointed by the Dean, upon approval of the Provost.
2. **Term of Appointment**. The appointment is for a renewable term subject to satisfactory evaluation by the Dean, who will solicit the input from the Associate Dean(s), the Assistant Dean(s), Department Chairs, faculty, and students.
3. **Duties**. Program Directors and Program Coordinators are responsible for the administration of the academic programs they lead. They shall consult with the faculty who are part of the program in matters relevant to the academic program and administration of the program and be guided by the principle of shared governance.
4. **Evaluation**. Because of the significant administrative roles that Program Directors and Coordinators have, a separate process to evaluate them was created. The Program Director/Coordinator submits the self-evaluation report and any attachments to the supervisor (i.e., the Dean, Assistant Dean, or Department Chair to whom the Program Director or Coordinator directly reports). The supervisor reviews, prepares an evaluation and meets with the Program Director/Coordinator. The supervisor sends the final evaluation to the Program Director/Coordinator to respond to and return back to them. The reviews finally go to the Dean for any final comments/reviews, and then the Dean submits the evaluation to the Office of the Provost. Each step, except for the meeting, is facilitated within the University's faculty evaluation management system.
5. **Criteria for Annual Evaluation**. Among the indices of positive and constructive leadership of the appointee are various administrative achievements, knowledge of professional and/or health care system, familiarity with contemporary education, understanding of the college's mission, goals and objectives, and ability to interact with

other units within the College of Pharmacy and the University, and professional organizations.

SECTION 6: THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

The Executive Committee consists of the Dean, who shall serve as chair, the officers (Associate and Assistant Deans), the Department Chairs and Program Directors, along with other administrators, as deemed necessary by the Dean. The committee shall meet monthly to discuss matters related to day-to-day management of the college's instructional, scholarly, and service activities. The Department Chairs and Program Directors will report regularly to their units regarding issues discussed in these meetings.

ARTICLE III: THE FACULTY

SECTION 1: FACULTY COMPOSITION

The College of Pharmacy faculty shall comprise all those holding full-time or part-time (or, adjunct) faculty appointments as defined by the Faculty Handbook. The President and Provost of the University are members of the faculty of each school and college. Faculty appointments in the College of Pharmacy may be of the following types: tenured, clinical educator track, career-status, probationary tenure-track, and temporary. Faculty may be appointed to any of the following ranks: professor, associate professor, assistant professor, instructor, and lecturer. Please refer to Appendix A, which contains the Board-approved criteria for guidance in administering the appointments, reappointments, promotions, and tenure (APT) process for tenure-track and tenured faculty appointments; and to Appendix B, which contains the separate Board-approved appointment, reappointment, and promotion criteria for clinical educator track (CET) faculty appointments.

SECTION 2: FACULTY INITIAL APPOINTMENTS, REAPPOINTMENTS, PROMOTIONS, AND TENURE

1. Tenured and tenure-track faculty members shall be appointed, reappointed, promoted, and tenured in accordance with the current Faculty Handbook and the college's Board-approved Criteria for Appointment, Reappointment, Promotion and Tenure (see Appendix A) pertaining to their ranks or the rank of their promotion. Clinical educator track faculty members shall be appointed, reappointed, and promoted in accordance with the current Faculty Handbook and the college's Board-approved Criteria for Appointment, Reappointment and Promotion of Clinical Educator Faculty (see Appendix B).
2. In case of a new appointment, at the conclusion of a search conducted as provided in the Faculty Handbook, the Department Chairperson shall forward his or her APT recommendation for the candidate, attaching the recommendation of the Search Committee, and the departmental APT Committee to the Dean and the college's APT Committee for their consideration. The college's and the Dean's APT recommendations, together with all prior recommendations and the applicant's dossier (i.e., documents that support the application), are forwarded to the Provost and Chief Academic Officer, who shall add his/her recommendation and forward the entire package to the President for final

action and ratification by the Board of Trustees, if the appointment is for a tenured, tenure-track or non-tenured renewable term track position. For temporary faculty, both full-time and part-time (i.e., adjunct faculty), the Provost is the final decisional authority.

3. For faculty reappointment, tenure, and promotion, the faculty member shall initiate the process by submitting an application supported by documentation (henceforth referred to as the 'dossier') as described in the APT Criteria (see Appendix A and Appendix B) to the Department Chairperson. The Department Chairperson shall solicit the recommendation of the departmental APT Committee and forward it together with the dossier and his/her own recommendation to the Dean. The Dean shall seek the recommendation of the college's APT Committee. The Dean's recommendation, together with all prior recommendations and the applicant's dossier are forwarded to the Provost and Chief Academic Officer, who shall add his/her recommendation and forward the entire package to the President for final action and ratification by the Board of Trustees for tenured, tenure-track and non-tenured renewable term track faculty. Final approval of temporary faculty is a decision of the Provost and Chief Academic Officer.
4. For faculty reappointments, there are deadlines in the Faculty Handbook to notify faculty that they are not going to be reappointed. See the section that provides standards for notice of non-reappointment.
5. When a situation arises in which the college's APT Committee membership composition is not sufficient to evaluate a candidate's initial appointment, reappointment, tenure, or promotion at the requested rank, the Dean shall convene an ad hoc college APT Committee, as provided in the Faculty Handbook, to evaluate the applicant's dossier according to the college's APT Criteria.

SECTION 3: FACULTY RESPONSIBILITIES

As indicated in the Faculty Handbook, an appointment to the faculty carries the responsibilities for excellence in teaching, the intellectual growth of students, high scholarship, and the improvement of society. In addition, faculty members have the responsibility to participate in the life and operation of their department, the college, and the University. Although the final authority for the conduct of University affairs is vested in the Board of Trustees, the academic judgments, recommendations, and policies of the faculty are central to the University's general educational policy in determining the shape and character of the University as an educational institution. The purpose of the following sections is to describe the minimum obligations of a faculty member in carrying out the aforementioned faculty responsibilities. If a faculty member fails to carry out these responsibilities, then the conduct will be reflected in the faculty member's annual evaluation and, where appropriate, disciplinary sanctions could be enacted in accordance with the chapter on discipline in the Faculty Handbook.

SECTION 3.1: ACADEMIC AFFAIRS

The faculty's responsibilities in this section include, but are not limited to:

1. Deliberating and making recommendations on all policies relating to the quality of instruction within the college;

2. Establishing and maintaining standards of academic excellence for faculty and students;
3. Developing, evaluating, and revising departmental and college curricula;
4. Approving standards for admission to the college as recommended by the professional disciplines;
5. Participating in the admissions process in the selection of prospective candidates; and
6. Approving standards for advancement and matriculation of each professional discipline to meet graduation and accreditation requirements.

SECTION 3.2: TEACHING

The faculty member's pursuit of teaching excellence is a life-long commitment and includes the following responsibilities:

1. Meeting all classes regularly and promptly;
2. Holding standing office hours and being available for consultation with students;
3. Conducting assessments of student performance in courses and making necessary changes in response to student evaluations (which occur at the completion of the course, once per semester) and peer feedback on evaluations;
4. Developing an objective and fair grading system and explaining the system to students,
5. Maintaining appropriate records of grades and meeting all deadline dates; and
6. Selecting teaching strategies that facilitate the learning process and communicate subjects effectively.

SECTION 3.3: SCHOLARLY ACTIVITIES

All tenured, tenure-track and clinical educator track faculty members are required to engage in research, scholarly writing, and advanced study, and to continue their professional development in these areas. Such scholarly activities are consistent with the college's goals to produce skilled pharmaceutical care practitioners and contribute to the growth and development of basic and clinical pharmaceutical sciences.

SECTION 3.4: UNIVERSITY AND COMMUNITY SERVICE

Faculty members shall engage in service to the University and community that is health or education related, and shall assume a prominent role (e.g., facilitator, evaluator, consultant) and engage in other activities that will contribute to enhancing the education, health, or general well-being of the community. The faculty member may also hold national or local offices in health-related professional organizations, and/or serve on community task forces, committees, or commissions.

SECTION 3.5: PROFESSIONAL ETHICS AND GOOD CITIZENSHIP

As members of a learned profession, the position of faculty in this college carries the following responsibilities: (1) attending departmental and faculty meetings regularly; (2) striving for professional growth through membership in professional organizations; (3) planning and engaging

in continued education in pharmacy, pharmaceutics and/or clinical pharmacy patient care services; (4) engaging in research, both academic and/or professional; (5) maintaining an active interest in and serving on departmental, college and/or University committees; (6) securing prior approval for planned absences (e.g., conferences) from the appropriate administrative officer; (7) attending official University ceremonies, which include Opening Convocation, Charter Day Convocation, and Commencement Convocation; and (8) supporting, encouraging, and protecting the academic quality of the programs.

SECTION 3.6: FACULTY SECRETARY

A Secretary shall be nominated and elected by the faculty at the first faculty meeting of each academic year and shall serve in this capacity for the faculty. The Secretary may succeed himself/herself in subsequent academic year elections for 2 terms renewable. The Secretary shall:

1. Notify all faculty of regular and special meetings;
2. Distribute the agenda, which has been prepared by the Dean, at least one week prior to regular meetings;
3. Record the minutes of meetings and distribute them to all faculty members, at least 7 days prior to regular scheduled meetings;
4. Maintain an official file of the minutes electronically; and
5. Maintain a record of all action formally enacted.

SECTION 3.7: FACULTY MEETINGS

The college's faculty shall each meet at least once every month when classes are in session at a time determined by the Dean. The Dean shall preside over these meetings. In the Dean's absence, an Associate Dean shall serve in this capacity. Special meetings may be called by the Dean, the Provost and Chief Academic Officer, or the President of the University, at any time, on their own initiative; or upon written request or petition signed by fifty-one percent (51%) of the voting members of the faculty. A quorum of any meeting shall consist of the majority of the faculty. After they are approved by the faculty, the minutes of all faculty meetings shall be kept on file and be available to the faculty and Office of the Dean for review for a period of four years.

SECTION 3.8: PARLIAMENTARY RULES

The business of the faculty shall be conducted in accordance with *Robert's Rules of Order*.

SECTION 3.9: AGENDA

The Secretary shall distribute the agenda prepared by the Dean. The agenda of all regular meetings shall include, but not be limited to:

1. Certification of graduates;
2. Reports from the college, departments, the college's Executive Committee, and/or other committees on matters of interest to members of the faculty;

3. Matters introduced by members of the faculty; and
4. Any other matter related to the mission or goals of the faculty, college, or University.
5. Faculty/staff retreats may be called as needed and appropriate.

SECTION 3.10: VOTING RIGHTS AND PROCEDURES

All full-time faculty members have the right to vote during faculty meetings. The Dean or Associate Dean (when serving as the chair) shall vote only in the event of a tie. All full-time faculty members are eligible to vote on the promotion and graduation of students in accordance with University policies and regulations. Only full-time faculty shall vote on matters relating to certification of graduates, senior awards, curricular matters and election of faculty delegates or representatives on the Faculty Senate, professional organizations and standing committees. When a faculty member is elected as a departmental delegate or representative, or when a senior graduate is nominated for an award for which the sole criterion for selection is performance in a specific course, the faculty shall elect the delegate, representative or nominee by acclamation. Voting shall be done by voice, written ballot, or electronic capture at all meetings, except when otherwise approved by the faculty.

ARTICLE IV: DEPARTMENTAL ORGANIZATION AND FUNCTION

SECTION 1: DEPARTMENTS

Within the college, there are the following departments:

1. Pharmaceutical Sciences
2. Clinical and Administrative Pharmacy Sciences

SECTION 2: STRUCTURE AND FUNCTION

A department consists of a chairperson and those faculty members of the established disciplines of the department. The administrative responsibilities of the Department Chairperson are addressed in Article II, Section 4.2. All departmental faculty members should possess the necessary credentials and certification pertaining to their rank, discipline, and/or specialty. The department has the fullest measure of autonomy consistent with the policies of the college and University. All full-time departmental faculty members have the right to vote on departmental matters in accordance with the University's policies. Each department, through the Department Chairperson:

1. Is responsible for formulating, developing, and implementing the mission, goals, and objectives of the department;
2. Is responsible for teaching, research, and service programs of the college in conformity with college and University guidelines;

3. Collaborates with other departments in the college and with other colleges and schools within the University, as may be deemed necessary, for effectively implementing programs of the department, college, and the University; and
4. Develops, proposes, and manages its budget.

The department shall meet no less than three times during a regular semester to conduct its affairs. The Department Chairperson shall call the meetings and shall preside. Special meetings can be called by the Dean or upon the written request of one-fourth (25%) of the department faculty members. A department shall set its own quorum. The agenda and proceedings shall provide opportunity for the active participation, by all faculty members, in the affairs of the department and decision-making relative to all facets of the program. The minutes of the meeting are to be promptly prepared by an elected Secretary who will distribute to the members of the department. The departments shall keep copies of all minutes of their meetings on file.

SECTION 3: DEPARTMENT COMMITTEES

Each department shall have the following: a committee on appointments, reappointments, promotions, and tenure (i.e., an APT Committee); a Curriculum Committee; an Executive Committee; and other ad hoc committees, as may be determined by the Department Chairperson and/or by faculty vote. The composition of each committee shall be established in conformity with college and University policies. Conduct in departmental committees will be according to the Department Chairperson's written recommendation and in accordance with the Bylaws of the College of Pharmacy and *Robert's Rules of Order*.

SECTION 3.1: DEPARTMENT CURRICULUM COMMITTEE

Each department's Curriculum Committee shall consist of no less than three full-time faculty members from the respective department as voted on by faculty in the college. The committee chairperson shall be selected based upon committee vote. The departmental Curriculum Committee shall review issues related to curriculum design which are of a discipline specific nature and referred to it from the college-wide Curriculum Committee. The committee shall conduct meetings in accordance with *Robert's Rules of Order*. All full-time faculty members who serve on the committee will have voting privileges, and, in the case of a tie, the committee chairperson shall break the tie.

SECTION 3.2: DEPARTMENT EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

Each department shall have an Executive Committee, which shall be composed of no less than three tenured faculty members from the respective department. The faculty members serving on this committee shall be elected through faculty vote at the college level. All meetings held by the committee shall be conducted in accordance with *Robert's Rules of Order*. This committee shall assume responsibility at the department level for duties delegated to it, which include but are not limited to reviewing requests for sabbatical leave, reviewing written reprimands at the request of departmental faculty, and serving as a consultant body prior to issuance of major disciplinary sanctions for faculty within the department:

1. **Reviewing requests for sabbatical leave**: Upon submission of a request for a departmental faculty member to take sabbatical leave, the Department Chairperson shall consult with the committee to provide the Dean with a recommendation regarding how to allocate the teaching responsibilities of the faculty member requesting leave.
2. **Written reprimands**: Prior to issuing a written reprimand to a faculty member, an administrator must provide the faculty member with a notification of the pending reprimand. During this time, if the faculty member elects to do so, a request may be made for the department's Executive Committee to review the situation and put forth a recommendation to the administrator. If the faculty member has already received a written reprimand and did not take the privilege of having the department's Executive Committee to review the situation prior to the issuance of the written reprimand, then the faculty member may at this time issue a request for the department's Executive Committee to review the matter and provide a recommendation to the administrator.
3. **Issuance of major disciplinary sanctions**: Before initiating a major disciplinary sanction regarding a faculty member, the Dean must consult with the faculty member's Department Chairperson and departmental Executive Committee.
4. The departmental Executive Committee may be assigned other duties delegated to it by the faculty of the department.

SECTION 3.3: DEPARTMENT APPOINTMENT, PROMOTION, AND TENURE COMMITTEE

The departmental Appointment, Promotion and Tenure (APT) Committee shall consist of all tenured members of the department. When a department does not have at least three tenured members eligible to vote on an application, the Faculty Handbook permits the Dean in consultation with the tenured faculty to constitute an ad hoc committee, all of whose members must be tenured.

The APT Committee shall be responsible for making recommendations with regard to the appointment, reappointment, promotion, and tenure of faculty members in accordance with the college's Board of Trustees approved criteria (see Appendix A and Appendix B) and the Faculty Handbook. Recommendations are to be sent in a timely manner and in accordance with University guidelines, to the Department Chairperson, with supportive documentary evidence through the University's APT management system. The Department Chairperson shall submit his/her recommendation, along with the recommendation of the department's Appointment, Promotion, and Tenure Committee, to the Dean utilizing the University's APT management system (Article III, section 2).

ARTICLE V: COLLEGE STANDING COMMITTEES

SECTION 1: ORGANIZATION

In addition to the college's Executive Committee described in Article II Section 6, the college's standing committees include the following:

1. Appointment, Promotion, and Tenure (APT) Committee

2. Curriculum and Instructional Resources Committee
3. Faculty Grievance Committee
4. Faculty Nominations, Awards, Development, Evaluation, Welfare and Amenities Committee
5. Judiciary Committee
6. Outcomes Assessment Committee
7. Professional Identity Formation and Cultivation Committee
8. Research and Graduate Programs Committee
9. Student Financial Aid and Awards Committee
10. Student Grievance Committee
11. Student Progression and Retention Committee
12. Student Recruitment and Admissions Committee

These committees are organized around the following core areas or domains: Academic Affairs; Faculty Affairs; Student Affairs; and Appointment, Promotion, and Tenure. In addition, the Dean may appoint ad hoc committees for tasks that may not fit within the functions of the standing committees and sub-committees in the college.

SECTION 2: STRUCTURE AND FUNCTION

Each standing committee consists of faculty and, where appropriate, students. Except where expressly provided in these articles, each standing committee shall be composed of at least three full-time faculty members (one or two from each department and one at-large) elected by the faculty with staff representation, as specified in these Bylaws, and one student representative elected/appointed from the student body, as specified in these Bylaws. Student representatives shall be notified in advance of meetings and receive minutes of meetings, excluding minutes relating to finance, tenure, promotions, and appointments, personnel, and student records. Likewise, student representatives may not participate in faculty meetings or faculty deliberation related to finance, tenure, promotions, and appointments, personnel, and student records.

In general, faculty are elected to serve on a given committee during elections, which take placed during a faculty meeting presided over by the Faculty Nominations, Awards, Development, Evaluation, Welfare and Amenities Committee. At this meeting, if faculty members are not already serving on a committee, they may be nominated to do so. If the faculty member accepts the nomination, then they can be elected to serve on the committee in accordance with *Robert's Rules of Order*. Staff are appointed to serve on committees by the Dean.

The chairperson of a committee shall be selected by the committee and shall serve for 2 years. Individuals selected as committee chairperson must work collaboratively with the committee and should have at least one year experience on the committee, if possible, for continuity purposes, and be willing and able to conduct the business of the committee for favorable results and accomplishment of assigned charges. In the event that a chairperson was not selected by the members of the committee, the Dean will have the authority to select the chairperson for the continuity of the functions of the committee.

The secretary of each committee shall be elected by the committee and serve for a one-year term, with eligibility to be elected for a new term. The secretary is entrusted with maintaining the minutes of each meeting.

Each committee chairperson shall have the power to appoint sub-committees necessary to enable the committee to carry out its functions. Unless otherwise stated, the term of office for each member shall be two years. In order to promote continuity of committee function, only one-half of the membership should be replaced each academic year. Each member shall be eligible for one additional term, after which the member must sit out at least a term before he/she can serve again.

To the extent possible, a faculty member should not serve on more than three standing committees in a given academic year. If a committee member cannot complete his/her term, the Dean shall appoint another faculty member to serve on the committee until the next election cycle.

At the beginning of each academic year, the Dean in collaboration with members of the Executive Committee shall issue specific charges for each of the standing committees. The standing committees shall conduct their businesses in accordance with *Robert's Rules of Order*. Decisions shall include input from the membership, and, where consensus is not reached, a vote is conducted according to *Robert's Rules of Order*. The standing committees established after ratification of this document may be modified only by action of the full faculty. Any committee recommendation that requires action by the faculty shall be placed on the faculty meeting agenda, at least one week prior to the regularly scheduled faculty meetings. Recommendations and reports that do not require action by the faculty shall be forwarded to the faculty for information through the Office of the Dean of the college. The reports may be also presented to the faculty as deemed necessary or upon request of the faculty or the Dean of the college at the faculty meeting.

SECTION 3: COMMITTEE CHARGES

The charges for each standing committee below will be authored by the Dean.

SECTION 4: THE COMMITTEES IN THE ACADEMIC AFFAIRS DOMAIN

The committees serving under this domain are responsible for all the college's academic affairs, including curricula, policies and procedures, and assessment. The committees that address matters related to academic affairs include:

1. Curriculum and Instructional Resources Committee
2. Outcomes Assessment Committee
3. Research and Graduate Programs Committee
4. Student Progression and Retention Committee

SECTION 4.1: THE CURRICULUM AND INSTRUCTIONAL RESOURCES COMMITTEE

The committee shall periodically review the college's curricula and make recommendations to the Dean regarding required enhancements. The committee shall review and evaluate all issues related

to curriculum design and teaching effectiveness of the professional programs. Specific responsibilities include but are not limited to:

1. Evaluation of the curriculum for relevance of courses and course content to its mission, and recommending appropriate changes;
2. Reviewing all proposed changes in all course content, and recommending approval or disapproval;
3. Developing and proposing standards and criteria for the promotion/graduation of students;
4. Assessment of teaching and delivery methodology and recommending appropriate measures for improvement;
5. Establishing standards for grading, syllabi format and assessment;
6. Implementing outcomes assessment instruments for the curriculum; and
7. Recommending standards and procedures for the provision of library facilities and information systems to faculty and students.
8. Copies of the most recent syllabi should be requested and posted on Canvas for all courses and housed on the College of Pharmacy's Academic Affairs office/portal.

The committee shall be composed of faculty representatives from each department; at least one student representative from each professional year (appointed by the College of Pharmacy Student Council); the Academic Dean (ex-officio); and a Library System liaison shall serve (ex-officio). The committee shall meet regularly throughout the academic year, and as deemed necessary by the administration.

SECTION 4.2: THE OUTCOMES ASSESSMENT COMMITTEE

This committee shall establish instruments to evaluate faculty teaching and curriculum effectiveness, student learning and development outcomes, and program/institutional effectiveness. The committee shall coordinate these activities with the University's Office of Institutional Assessment and evaluation.

SECTION 4.3: THE RESEARCH AND GRADUATE PROGRAMS COMMITTEE

This committee is responsible for the research and grantsmanship efforts of the college and will conduct research seminars and presentations regularly to foster interactions and exchange of ideas. The committee is also responsible for enhancing funding for students and for research by fostering appropriate grant applications. The committee facilitates and stimulates research publications and, in collaboration with the Director of Graduate Studies, oversees the recruitment and retention of graduate students.

SECTION 4.4: THE STUDENT PROGRESSION AND RETENTION COMMITTEE

This committee shall review policies concerning student advancement, promotions, suspensions, dismissals, and graduation. The committee shall evaluate the progress of all students and recommend retention, suspension, and/or readmission of students in accordance with the University's academic policies, including the Academic Code of Student Conduct, and the College

of Pharmacy's academic policies. The committee shall comply fully with the laws and University policies limiting or protecting student confidentiality regarding student academic performance and records and shall inform the Dean of specific actions taken by the committee. The Dean's Office shall officially notify the student of the committee's action within the limits required to preserve confidentiality.

The specific functions of the committee shall include, but are not limited to:

1. Reviewing the academic performance of students and, where appropriate, recommending action to the Dean;
2. Establishing programs and procedures for student counseling/advising, tutoring and remedial assistance; and
3. Recommending changes in academic policies.
4. Specific cases may be referred by the Dean for review.

The committee shall comprise two elected faculty members from each department, with at least one member holding a rank of associate professor or professor. The committee shall meet at least once monthly during an academic year.

SECTION 5: THE COMMITTEES IN THE FACULTY AFFAIRS DOMAIN

The committees serving under this domain shall propose programs, policies, and procedures on all matters regarding faculty affairs of the college. The committees that address matters related to faculty affairs include:

1. Faculty Grievance Committee
2. Faculty Nominations, Awards, Development, Evaluation, Welfare and Amenities Committee

SECTION 5.1: FACULTY GRIEVANCE COMMITTEE

Complaints regarding discrimination, harassment, or retaliation must be addressed to the Office of Equal Employment Opportunity and Diversity in the Office of Human Resources (EEO). Such matters are not the jurisdiction of this committee. The Title IX Office responds to all reports of sexual assault, sexual harassment, gender-based discrimination and harassment, sexual exploitation, dating and domestic violence, stalking, retaliation, and complicity (the act of encouraging another person to commit any of the above); and, therefore, these matters are not the jurisdiction of this committee. Alleged violations of academic freedom are the jurisdiction of the Howard University Faculty Grievance Commission (HU-FGC), and not the jurisdiction of this committee. This committee shall be responsible for reviewing those faculty grievance matters that have been referred to the committee by the Dean and are related to alleged violations of established rules and procedures that are not the responsibility of the EEO, Title IX, the HU-FGC, the Department Chairperson, the Dean, the Executive Committee, or any other responsible office at the University. This committee must conduct its reviews in accordance with guidelines provided in the Faculty Handbook and shall inform the Dean of its specific recommendations. The members

of this committee shall be tenured faculty members who do not hold an administrative appointment. Only faculty members who are not from the department of the faculty member submitting a grievance are allowed to review and provide a recommendation.

SECTION 5.2: THE FACULTY NOMINATIONS, AWARDS, DEVELOPMENT, EVALUATION, WELFARE AND AMENITIES COMMITTEE

The responsibility of this committee is to develop a slate of faculty candidates for the Standing Committees' membership and awards, and to collect and evaluate data which allows for analyses of faculty in relation to production and potential resources to improve and promote teaching, scholarly activities, and service. This Committee shall recommend to the Dean short, medium, and long- range plans for these resources for the college. The members of the Committee shall have faculty representatives from each department.

SECTION 6: THE COMMITTEES IN THE STUDENT AFFAIRS DOMAIN

The committees serving under this domain shall tend to matters that affect students, such as finance, admission, and grievance. The committees that address matters related to student affairs include:

1. Student Financial Aid and Awards Committee
2. Student Recruitment and Admissions Committee
3. Student Grievance Committee
4. Judiciary Committee
5. Professional Identity Formation and Cultivation Committee

SECTION 6.1: THE STUDENT FINANCIAL AID AND AWARDS COMMITTEE

This committee shall review applications of nominees for awards specific to the College of Pharmacy that require the input of the faculty and select recipients in accordance with policy and established criteria. The membership shall include at least four full-time faculty representatives and a support staff member from the College of Pharmacy's Office of Recruitment and Admissions. Financial aid policy and the decisions around financial aid awards for students are the exclusive purview of the University's Office of Financial Aid and are not subject to the jurisdiction of this committee.

SECTION 6.2: THE STUDENT RECRUITMENT AND ADMISSIONS COMMITTEE

This committee shall recommend policies, standards and procedures related to recruitment and admission of students into the college; review applications and interview students for admissions to the college, recommending approval or disapproval of their application; and generally, advise the Dean and the faculty on matters related to recruitment and admission. See Article V Section 2 for committee and chair selection and service requirements. The membership shall also include a staff member from the college's Office of Recruitment and Admissions.

SECTION 6.3: THE STUDENT GRIEVANCE COMMITTEE

This committee reviews formal student grievances (e.g., grade disputes between a student and an instructor), which are consigned to it in cases where informal mediation at the Dean's level has failed. Hearings are to be conducted in accordance with the Formal Grievance Process of the Howard University Student Academic Grievance Procedure. Committee members who review the individual cases shall not have any previous involvement in the situation under consideration. The committee membership shall include one faculty representative from each department, one faculty representative elected at large, and two student representatives.

SECTION 6.4: THE JUDICIARY COMMITTEE

This faculty committee is responsible for conducting hearings of academic infractions (e.g., academic cheating, plagiarism, and copy infringement) that a faculty member has accused a student of having committed. Hearings are to be conducted in accordance with the Howard University Academic Code of Student Conduct. Of note, students may not serve on in the Judiciary Committee. See Article V Section 2 for committee and chair selection process.

Student Code of Conduct violations (e.g., incidents of student misconduct, on-campus, and off-campus), on the other hand, are the purview of the Office of Student Conduct and Community Standards (OSC). Such matters are not subject to the jurisdiction of the College of Pharmacy Judiciary Committee.

SECTION 6.5: THE PROFESSIONAL IDENTITY FORMATION AND CULTIVATION COMMITTEE

The committee shall develop outcomes and activities to facilitate the professional identity formation of pharmacy students throughout their matriculation at the college. See Article V Section 2 for committee and chair selection process. The committee shall provide or facilitate training for faculty and preceptors on professional identity formation. Professional infractions not covered by the Academic Code of Student Conduct and not subject to the Student Code of Conduct that students allegedly commit shall be adjudicated by this committee. The committee's recommendation shall be forwarded confidentially to the Dean for final decision. The membership shall include faculty representatives from each department.

SECTION 7: THE APPOINTMENT, PROMOTION, AND TENURE (APT) COMMITTEE

The committee reviews and evaluates faculty initial appointments, reappointments, promotions, and tenure applications. In addition, the committee reviews and recommends faculty for sabbatical leave and faculty merit pay. A recommendation shall be forwarded to the Dean. The membership is established in accordance with the Faculty Handbook. Tenured faculty from each department comprise the membership. The college APT Committee will not include Department Chairs, Program Directors, Deans (assistant, associate and full), or any faculty member from the

applicant's home department. Please refer to Appendix A for the Board-approved criteria for administering the APT process for tenure-track and tenured faculty appointments and to Appendix B for the separate Board-approved document regarding clinical educator track faculty appointments.

ARTICLE VI: COLLEGE AD-HOC COMMITTEES

The Dean may constitute ad-hoc committees to address specific matters. The Dean will appoint the chair of the committee and may appoint the faculty to these committees. The Dean will also provide the charges of the committee.

ARTICLE VII: AUTHORIZATION AND AMENDMENTS

SECTION 1: AUTHORIZATION

These Bylaws shall become effective upon a majority vote of the faculty and the approval of the Provost and Chief Academic Officer, the President of the University, and the Board of Trustees of the University.

SECTION 2: AMENDMENTS

These Bylaws may be amended by a majority vote of the faculty, at a regularly scheduled or special meeting called for this purpose, if copies of the proposed amendments shall have been distributed to the faculty, at least 10 working days prior to the meeting. Before becoming effective, such amendments must be approved by the Provost and Chief Academic Officer, and the President of the University, and approved and ratified by the Board of Trustees of the University.

APPENDIX A: HOWARD UNIVERSITY COLLEGE OF PHARMACY CRITERIA FOR APPOINTMENT, REAPPOINTMENT, PROMOTION AND TENURE

This document refers to tenured and probationary tenure-track faculty in the College of Pharmacy. The candidate must also fulfill the criteria set forth in the Faculty Handbook and must comply with the terms and conditions of employment. In any instance of inconsistency between this document and the Faculty Handbook, the provisions of the Faculty Handbook will govern. These criteria supersede all other criteria previously employed for the evaluation of College of Pharmacy faculty candidates for appointment, reappointment, promotion, and tenure.

I. AREAS OF PROFICIENCY

Areas of proficiency include **Teaching, Scholarship, Clinical Practice** and **Service** which are described in sections V, VI, VII and VIII, respectively. The mission of the College of Pharmacy requires that clinical faculty have competency and excellence in providing patient centered health care services. In that regard, an independent area of "Proficiency in Clinical Practice" was formed and was delineated as a separate area of proficiency. The area of "Proficiency in Service" is evaluated based upon non-clinical areas of contribution made to the College of Pharmacy, Howard University, and society. The area of proficiency, creativity, and innovation in development of pharmacy practice, its successful implementation, and the candidate's performance will be measured.

II. RATING

Candidates are assigned one of the following ratings based on their performance in each of the above areas of proficiency: For the ranks of Professor, Associate Professor and Assistant Professor (reappointments), ***Outstanding***, ***Excellent*** and ***Good***; for initial appointment at the rank of Assistant Professor; ***Good***, ***Satisfactory*** and ***Less than Satisfactory***. The criteria provided in each of the proficiency areas are guidelines only. Quality and significance of contribution shall be determined by the department's and college's Appointment, Promotion and Tenure (APT) Committees, Department Chair and Dean, and shall be based on the evidence provided by the candidate in the evaluation file for the relevant time period (i.e., since the candidate was last reappointed; or, if this is the candidate's first reappointment application, since the candidate's initial appointment). It is incumbent upon the candidate to prepare the dossier accurately and provide a detailed narrative with proper evidence to make the case that the criteria claimed should be accepted.

III. TYPES OF APPOINTMENT

Upon acceptance of employment, a candidate may be appointed initially to a tenure track. Within the first two years, but not later than the first reappointment following the initial appointment, a faculty member appointed to the tenure track has the option of a one-time resignation from the tenure track and application to the clinical educator track. After two years or first reappointment, whichever occurs first, a faculty member no longer has the option to resign from the tenure-track and apply to the clinical educator track. Resignation from the tenure track precludes later reapplication to the tenure track.

IV. QUALIFICATIONS AND RATINGS

The following are the qualifications and ratings required for initial appointment, reappointment, promotion and/or tenure of candidates in the tenure track. The APT criteria set forth the minimum requirements for tenure or promotion. The candidate and evaluators should not assume that compliance with minimum requirements will satisfy or guarantee promotion/tenure. A floor is necessary so that candidates and evaluators have some understanding of where to start their assessment. Candidates should seek to exceed the expectations written in this document rather than merely meet the minimum requirements for their contributions to their field of expertise, and performance in critical areas of evaluation to satisfy teaching, scholarship/research, and service commitments.

A. Qualifications and Ratings as a Function of Rank

1. Professor

For initial appointment, or promotion to this rank, the candidate must hold a doctoral degree. The candidate shall also have a minimum of four years of experience as an Associate Professor. For evaluation of a candidate for promotion and/or tenure in pharmacy practice at this rank, he/she must receive an ***Outstanding*** rating in clinical practice and an ***Excellent*** rating in teaching, scholarship, and service. For evaluation of a candidate for promotion and/or tenure at this rank, the pharmaceutical science and pharmacy administration faculty must receive a minimum of an ***Outstanding*** rating in scholarship and an ***Excellent*** rating in teaching and service. No rating less than excellent may be received in all applicable categories.

2. Associate Professor

For initial appointment or promotion to this rank, the candidate must hold a doctoral degree. The candidate shall also have a minimum of four years of experience as an Assistant Professor. For evaluation of a candidate for promotion and/or tenure in pharmacy practice at this rank, he/she must receive a minimum of an ***Excellent*** rating in teaching and clinical practice and a ***Good*** rating in scholarship and service. For evaluation of a candidate for promotion and/or tenure in pharmaceutical science and pharmacy administration faculty must receive a minimum of an ***Excellent*** rating in teaching and scholarship and ***Good*** rating in service. No rating less than good may be received in all possible categories.

3. Probationary Assistant Professor

For initial appointment or reappointment to this rank, the candidate must hold a doctoral degree. For initial appointment at this rank, the applicant must receive a minimum of a ***Satisfactory*** rating in all of the areas of proficiency. For reappointment of a candidate in pharmacy practice at this rank, he/she must receive a minimum of a ***Good*** rating in teaching, clinical practice, scholarship, and service. For reappointment of pharmaceutical science and pharmacy administration faculty he/she must receive a minimum of a ***Good*** rating in teaching, scholarship, and service.

B. Faculty Workload Policy

Evaluations will be performed based on percent effort dedicated to each proficiency area. Extenuating circumstances leading to the change of percent effort from original expectations will be taken into consideration by committee chair or designee if chair is unavailable (for example, Teaching – 40%, Service – 10% and Scholarship – 50%). Please refer to the Howard University

Faculty Workload Policy for detailed instructions, as the distribution can be vary depending on the individual faculty member.

C. External Reviews

In accordance with the description of the application for tenure in the Faculty Handbook, external reviews of applications for tenure **are required.** The guidelines for selecting external reviewers are as follows: Upon receipt of the application for tenure, the chair of the department will contact four (4) external reviewers (two recommended by the candidate and two by the department) to determine their ability to participate in the evaluation process on the prescribed timeline. The reviewers must be persons external to Howard University, who are experts in the applicant's discipline and who are affiliated with research universities or comparable institutions (e.g., federal agencies, such as NIH, NSF, NEA, HRSA; national laboratories, such as Brookhaven National Laboratory, FermiLab; policy institutes, such as Brookings Institution, Rand Corporation, the Wilson Center; national professional organizations, such as American Psychological Association, American Medical Association, American Historical Association). Each external reviewer should hold the academic rank of Associate Professor (or its equivalent) or higher. The chief purpose of the external review letters is to obtain an objective evaluation of the applicant's scholarship, which includes research publications or evidence of creative work appropriate to the applicant's field or discipline.

V. TEACHING CRITERIA AND SUPPORTING DOCUMENTS

Teaching refers to instruction of undergraduate, professional and/or graduate students, residents, fellows, postdoctoral associates, and visiting professors in classroom or non-classroom (clinical or laboratory) settings. Assessment is based on (1) pursuing activities to improve teaching skills; (2) advising and supervising undergraduate, professional, and graduate students, residents, and fellows in research; (3) providing continuing education lectures; and (4) publication on development of instructional methodologies or curriculum design. Supporting documentation of teaching skills includes (1) pedagogical contributions, (2) peer evaluations, (3) student evaluations, and (4) Department Chair evaluations.

A. Evidence of the Teaching Principal Criteria

	Criteria	Evidence*
1	Fulfillment of didactic, clinical, professional, and graduate teaching responsibilities.	Peer evaluation data, assessment of Department Chair, and student evaluation data from previous 3 years.
2	Provide instructional activities for educational programs including precepting students, residents/fellows, staff development lectures, and research/elective courses.	Evidence of lectures developed, courses developed, and materials provided to students/residents/fellows. Course syllabi.
3	Demonstrate mastery of subject matter.	Peer evaluation data, assessment of Department Chair, and student evaluation data from previous 3 years.
4	Utilize effective communications skills in the application of teaching methods.	Peer evaluation data, assessment of Department Chair, and student evaluation data from previous 3 years.
5	Development of teaching methods and/or techniques.	Evidence of innovation of teaching methods and innovative activities.

6	Demonstrate effective student mentoring and advising that stimulates and motivates students toward higher educational/professional goals.	Evidence of mentoring activities, and student advisement, provision of supporting materials indicating student progression to higher educational/ professional goals.

A brief narrative describing the supporting evidence with specific page numbers to achieve this area of proficiency is recommended.

B. Evaluation

Faculty performance shall be assigned one of the following ratings: ***Outstanding***, ***Excellent***, ***Good***, ***Satisfactory*** and ***Less than Satisfactory***. It is also recognized that occasionally an individual may make extraordinary contributions to teaching in a manner not specifically characterized in these criteria including, but not limited to, serving as a course coordinator or a faculty mentor, motivating students toward higher educational/professional goals, and peer recognition for superior performance in teaching as recognized by national awards. In such rare cases, "Additional Contribution" considerations of achievements shall be made, and assessment of the evidence overwhelmingly may suggest an ***Outstanding*** or ***Excellent*** rating. The department APT, Department Chair, COP APT Committee and Dean shall assess and determine the depth and significance of these contributions. In such cases, they shall detail specific documentation of these contributions in the justification of this assessment. The candidate seeking reappointment or promotion has the burden of putting forth evidence of extraordinary contributions to the college or profession. The evidence should be well organized and easy to follow.

1. Student Evaluations

Student evaluations shall be used in the assessment of the teaching criteria. Students' course and instructor evaluations shall be based upon the scale as indicated in the evaluation form. A favorable evaluation must have a majority (see Ratings below) of *Strongly Agree* and *Agree* responses from students (generally, 3.5-5 on a scale of 1 to 5). Evaluations of the previous three years prior to application must be considered.

2. Peer Evaluations

Peer evaluations shall be conducted by the College Peer Review committee on a yearly basis in an effort to improve faculty teaching. Evaluations shall be made in the areas of preparation, delivery, and interactions with students as well as an overall rating. The emphasis shall be placed upon the improvement of teaching skills ideally over a three-year period. The results of a summative evaluation shall be provided to the candidate and shall be forwarded to the Chair of his/her department and to the department APT Committee as part of the reappointment and promotion evaluation. Tenured associate professors and full professors still receive internal feedback on their teaching efforts, as stipulated by peer-evaluation document. If peer evaluations are missing from the submission packet, the packet will be considered incomplete.

C. Ratings

1. Outstanding

In order to achieve this rating, the candidate's portfolio must demonstrate performance in each of the criteria at the levels described below:

a. There is evidence of fulfilling professional and/or graduate teaching responsibilities (didactic and/or clinical).

b. There is substantiated evidence of instructional activities for educational programs including precepting residents/fellows, staff development lectures and research/elective courses.
c. There is evidence of demonstration of mastery of subject matter with 80% of ratings from peer evaluations are strongly agree or agree. (Generally, an average of 4.0 on a scale of 1 to 5).
d. There is substantive evidence of effective communication skills in teaching with 80% of ratings from student evaluations in the previous three years are strongly agree or agree. (Generally, an average of 4.0 on a scale of 1 to 5).
e. There is substantiated evidence of the development of unique and innovative teaching methodologies and/or techniques.
f. There is substantiated evidence of effective student mentoring and advising that stimulates and motivates students toward higher educational/professional goals.

2. Excellent

In order to achieve this rating, the candidate's portfolio must demonstrate performance in each of the criteria at the levels described below:

a. There is evidence of fulfilling professional and/or graduate teaching responsibilities (didactic and/or clinical).
b. There is substantiated evidence of instructional activities for educational programs including precepting residents/fellows or staff development lectures or research/elective courses.
c. There is evidence of demonstration of mastery of subject matter with 75% of ratings from peer evaluations are strongly agree or agree. (Generally, an average of 3.75 on a scale of 1 to 5).
d. There is substantiated evidence of effective communications skills in teaching with 75% of ratings from student evaluations in the previous three years are strongly agree or agree. (Generally, an average of 3.75 on a scale of 1 to 5).
e. There is substantiated evidence of effective student mentoring and advising that stimulates and motivates students toward higher educational/professional goals.

3. Good

In order to achieve this rating, the candidate's portfolio must demonstrate performance in each of the criteria at the level described below:

a. There is evidence of fulfilling professional and/or graduate teaching responsibilities (didactic and/or clinical).
b. There is substantiated evidence of instructional activities for educational and clinical programs including precepting residents/fellows or staff development lectures or research/elective courses.
c. There is evidence of demonstration of mastery of subject matter with 70% of ratings from peer evaluations are strongly agree or agree. (Generally, an average of 3.5 on a scale of 1 to 5).
d. There is substantiated evidence of effective communication skills in teaching with 70% of ratings from student evaluations in the previous three years are strongly agree or agree. (Generally, an average of 3.5 on a scale of 1 to 5).

4. Satisfactory

In order to achieve this rating for Teaching, the candidate portfolio must demonstrate performance in each of the criteria at the level described below:

a. There is evidence of fulfilling professional and/or graduate teaching responsibilities (didactic and/or clinical).
b. There is substantiated evidence of instructional activities for educational and clinical programs including precepting residents/fellows or staff development lectures or research/elective courses.
c. There is evidence of demonstration of mastery of subject matter with 65% of ratings from peer evaluations are strongly agree or agree. (Generally, an average of 3.25 on a scale of 1 to 5).
d. There is evidence of effective communication skills in teaching with 65% of ratings from student evaluations in the previous three years are strongly agree or agree. (Generally, an average of 3.25 on a scale of 1 to 5).

5. Less than Satisfactory

If a candidate does not meet the minimal criteria for ***Satisfactory***, then that candidate would be considered ***Less than Satisfactory***, such as less than 3 out of 4 criteria.

VI. SCHOLARSHIP CRITERIA AND SUPPORTING DOCUMENTS

Scholarship is the advancement of knowledge through the conduct of research and/or development and publication of innovative teaching methods or professional practice. Research is comprised of systematic collection and analysis of information that generates new knowledge. Evaluative research is the application of appropriate research methodologies to study the effectiveness, efficiency, efficacy and usefulness of a procedure, therapeutic intervention, or service. Proficiency in scholarship is primarily documented by the submission and acquisition of grants/contracts, conduct/supervision of research, development and publication of innovative health care practices, contributions to peer-reviewed publications and recognition by peers and professional/scientific organizations, and the submission and acquisition of external awards.

A. Evidence of the Scholarship Principal Criteria

	Criteria	Evidence*
1.	Evidence of initiation/conduct/ supervision of research/scholarly activities or development of innovative professional practice.	Documentation of IRB/IACUC approved initiated protocols where applicable or evidence of scholarly activity with students/residents/fellows if applicable.
2.	Evidence of publication of articles in refereed professional/scientific journals[1] and the role of both primary[2] and secondary authors.	A copy of each of the publications or documented evidence of acceptance of manuscript(s) for publication.
3.	Evidence of peer-reviewed publication of either book chapters, book reviews, review articles, editorials, monographs, responses to letters, or continuing education (CE) articles and the role of both primary[2] and secondary authors.	A copy of each of the publications or documented evidence of acceptance of manuscript(s) for publication.
4.	Evidence of service as editor, reviewer, or member of editorial boards/advisory committees of professional/scientific publications and/or on grant/contract evaluation committees.	Documented evidence of the service and a statement of the depth of activities provided.
5.	Evidence of submission of extramural[3], non-limited[4] research grants/contracts[5] which are approved and funded. Other grant types in addition to federal	List of grant applications including author(s), grant number, funding agency, project title, date of approval, dollar amount approved and duration of

	agencies are comparable in supporting of research, thus are encouraged to apply for.	the grant or contract. Submit a copy of the approval letter.
6.	Evidence of scholarly contribution that provides a breakthrough in professional/ scientific fields or stimulates/impacts these fields.	Documented evidence of the scholarly contributions. A statement to include how this contribution provided a breakthrough in the field must be provided.
7.	Evidence of presentation at professional/scientific meetings or conferences or symposia of abstracts and innovative/provocative thoughts.	Documented evidence of presentations and abstracts/posters.

[*] ***A brief narrative describing the supporting evidence to achieve this area of proficiency including the role of applicant in each publication and the role in each of the grants funded or submitted should be provided.***

B. Evaluation

The purpose of this evaluation is to assess the quality and quantity of the candidate's activity in scholarly areas. Faculty performance shall be assigned one of the following ratings: ***Outstanding***, ***Excellent, Good***, ***Satisfactory*** and ***Less than Satisfactory.*** It is also recognized that occasionally an individual may make extraordinary contributions to the scholarship in a manner not specifically characterized in these criteria including, but not limited to, securing patent rights and national awards of recognition by peers for outstanding scholarship achievements. In such rare cases, "Additional Contribution" considerations of achievements shall be made, and assessment of the evidence overwhelmingly may suggest an ***Outstanding*** or ***Excellent*** rating. The department APT, Department Chair, COP APT Committee and Dean shall assess and determine the depth and significance of these contributions. In such cases, they shall detail specific documentation of these contributions in the justification of this assessment. The candidate seeking reappointment or

[1] It is recommended that the publishing journals should be indexed by major indexing service such as MEDLINE/PubMed/Index Medicus, Scopus and Journal Citation Reports, and having an Impact Factor (IF) greater than 1.0 if it is a pharmaceutical sciences journal. For the pharmacy practice/pharmacy administration faculty, it is highly recommended that they publish in reputable journals that are associated with professional organizations or widely recognized by other pharmacy professionals and avoid publishing in some of the open access predatory journals and with publishers listed on https://beallslist.weebly.com/standalone-journals.html.

[2] Primary author is the person designated in the article as the "corresponding author". For most journals, the first author shall also be considered the primary author. All other authors are considered secondary authors. A copy of the article should be included in the application dossier.

[3] "Extramural" means existing or functioning outside or beyond the boundaries, or precincts of Howard University. This term includes as it is applied to grant types: Federal Agencies, Foundations, Industry and International. For example, there is distinction between two types of grants issued by the District of Columbia Center for AIDS Research (DC CFAR), the Georgetown-Howard Universities Center for Clinical and Translational Science (GHUCCTS) as well as the Research Centers in Minority Institutions (RCMI) at HU. The ones issued by those consortiums on their own and who conduct the review process by themselves should be considered as local and limited. Those grants include but not limited to the DC CFAR Pilot Awards Program, Microgrant Program, etc. However, if the RFAs are from the level above the consortiums such as NIH CFAR Administrative Supplements by which the peer review process is carried out by the NIH Center for Scientific Review (CSR), they should be regarded as truly "extramural" and "non-limited." The latter type of grants can also be evidenced by managing at the NIH eRA Commons system.

[4] "non-limited" submission means the funding opportunities are not limited to just applications from Howard and are more competitive and/or specific eligibility requirement(s) towards the PI.

[5] The minimum size limit of $50,000 is recommended for research grants, which provide the same amount **per year** in direct cost for faculty with appointment in Pharmacy administration and Pharmaceutical Sciences.

promotion has the burden of putting forth evidence of extraordinary contributions to the college or profession. The evidence should be well organized and easy to follow.

C. Ratings

1. Outstanding

To receive this rating for Scholarship, the applicant must fulfill all of the following:

a. During the period between last appointment and prior to the application, the applicant has received funding on two or more grants/contracts at least one of which was extramural, non-limited submission and he/she was the PI.

b. During the period between last appointment and prior to the application, the applicant has either**:**
   (i) Submitted three (3) extramural grants/contracts as a PI or Co-I; or
   (ii) Initiated, conducted, or supervised at least three (3) research projects; or
   (iii) Developed at least three (3) professional/scientific projects which provided breakthrough information that impacted the field.

c. During the period between last appointment and prior to the application, the candidate has published on average at least item (i) below or one of the items (ii)-(iv) prior to his/her application:
   (i) Two (2) peer-reviewed research/review articles per year, at least one of which as the primary author; or
   (ii) Three (3) peer-reviewed and published monographs per year; or
   (iii) One (1) book chapter every two years; or
   (iv) One (1) book every 4 years.

   All publications must be in refereed journals or books.

d. During the period between last appointment and prior to the application, the candidate fulfilled the following criteria:
   (i) During each year prior to the application, the applicant has presented at least two (2) abstracts/posters at professional/scientific meetings/conferences/symposia.
   (ii) The candidate's scholarly contribution provided new information in professional/scientific fields or stimulated/impacted these fields such as patents.

2. Excellent

To receive this rating for Scholarship, the candidate must fulfill all of the following:

a. During the period between last appointment and prior to the application, the candidate has received last appointment funding on one extramural non-limited grant/contract in which he/she was the PI.

b. During the period between last appointment and prior to the application, the applicant has either:
   (i) Submitted two (2) extramural grants/contracts as a PI or Co-I; or
   (ii) Initiated, conducted, or supervised at least two (2) research projects; or
   (iii) Developed at least two (2) professional/scientific projects which provided new information that stimulated the field.

c. During the period between last appointment and prior to the application, the candidate has published on average at least item (i) below or one of the items (ii)-(iv) prior to his/her application:
   (i) One research/review article per year or
   (ii) Two peer-reviewed and published monographs/letters/responses to letter(s) per year; or
   (iii) One book chapter every three years or

(iv) One book every five years

All publications must be in refereed journals or books.

d. During the period between last appointment and prior to the application, the candidate fulfilled any one (1) of the following criteria:
   (i) During each year prior to the application, the applicant has presented at least one abstract/poster at professional/scientific meetings/conferences/symposia.
   (ii) The candidate's scholarly contribution provided new information in professional/scientific fields or stimulated/impacted these fields such as patents.

3. Good

To receive this rating for Scholarship, the candidate must fulfill all of the following:

a. During the period between last appointment and prior to the application, the candidate has either:
   (i) Submitted one (1) extramural grant/contract as a PI; or
   (ii) Initiated, conducted, or supervised at least one (1) research project.
b. During the period between last appointment and prior to the application, the candidate has published on average at least item (i) below or one of the items (ii)-(iv) prior to his/her application:
   (i) One research/review article per year; or
   (ii) Two peer-reviewed and published monographs/letters/responses to letters per year; or
   (iii) One book chapter every three years or
   (iv) One book every five years

All publications must be in a refereed journal or book.

c. During the period between last appointment and prior to the application, the candidate has fulfilled the criterion below:
   (i) During each year prior to the application, the candidate has presented at least one abstract/poster at professional/scientific meetings/conferences/symposia.

4. Satisfactory

To receive this rating the candidate must fulfill at least two of the three principal criteria listed below.

a. During the period between last appointment and prior to the application, the candidate has either:
   (i) Submitted one (1) extramural grant/contract as a PI; or
   (ii) Initiated, conducted, or supervised at least one (1) research project.
b. During the period between last appointment and prior to the application, the candidate has published on an average at least one of the following every other year prior to his/her application:
   (i) One research/review article per year; or
   (ii) Two peer-reviewed and published monographs/letters/responses to letters per year; or
   (iii) One book chapter every three years or
   (iv) One book every five years

All publications must be in a refereed journal or book.

c. During the period between last appointment and prior to the application, the candidate has fulfilled the criterion below:

(i) During each year prior to the application, the candidate has presented at least one abstract/poster at professional/scientific meetings/conferences/symposia.

5. Less than Satisfactory

To receive this rating, the candidate must fulfill at least one of the three principal criteria listed below:

a. During the period between last appointment and prior to the application, the candidate has either:
   (i) Submitted one (1) extramural grant/contract as a PI; or
   (ii) Initiated, conducted, or supervised at least one (1) research project.

b. During the period between last appointment and prior to the application, the candidate has published on an average at least one of the following every other year prior to his/her application:
   (i) One research/review article per year; or
   (ii) Two peer-reviewed and published monographs/letters/responses to letters per year; or
   (iii) One book chapter every three years or
   (iv) One book every five years

   All publications must be in a refereed journal or book.

c. During the period between last appointment and prior to the application, the candidate has fulfilled the criterion below:
   (i) During each year prior to the application, the candidate has presented at least one abstract/poster at professional/scientific meetings/conferences/symposia.

VII. CLINICAL PRACTICE CRITERIA AND SUPPORTING DOCUMENTS

Clinical practice includes engaging in exemplary management of progressive/contemporary pharmaceutical health care services. The candidate shall be creative and innovative in the development of improved modes of clinical practice. Principal criteria of evaluation of the candidate's performance in a clinical practice setting are listed below.

A. Evidence of the Clinical Practice Principal Criteria

	Criteria	Evidence*
1	Provision of health care services, which includes but is not limited to monitoring of patient therapeutic intervention; decision-making processes in acute care, and advisement and counseling of patients on proper use of medications in ambulatory, and/or community-based environments; and performing pharmaceutical health care services.	a. Documentation of Services b. Clear and adequate evidence of activities
2	There is evidence of professional competence, locally, regionally, and national recognition for clinical expertise through invitations from other institutions or organizations to plan, organize, or review professional-related activities	a. Documentation of Services b. Clear and adequate evidence of activities
3	Participation in practice-site quality assessment and improvement activities.	a. Documentation of Services b. Clear and adequate evidence of activities

4	Provision of drug information and/or pharmaceutical health education services for patients and health professionals.	a. Documentation of Services b. Clear and adequate evidence of activities
5	Publication of peer-reviewed research/editorial/review journal articles.	a. Documentation of journal articles b. Copy of journal article(s)
6	Development of health care services of a standard that allows the service to serve as training sites for faculty, students, and other health care providers.	a Documentation of health care services b. Provide list of students/residents and fellows for each year during the period between last appointment and prior to the application.
7	Experiential evaluations from students	a. Documentation of services b. Evaluations from RxPreceptor

**** A brief narrative describing the supporting evidence with specific page numbers to achieve this area of proficiency is recommended.***

B. Evaluation

Faculty candidates shall be assessed based upon the following categories of accomplishment: ***Outstanding***, ***Excellent***, ***Good***, ***Satisfactory*** and ***Less than Satisfactory***. It is also recognized that occasionally an individual may make extraordinary contributions to the college or profession in a manner not specifically characterized in this criterion, including (but not limited to) service as a consultant to a health-related program at the local, state, national, or international level, national distinctions, peer recognition for superior performance in professional practice. In such rare cases, "Additional Contribution" considerations of achievements shall be made, and assessment of the evidence overwhelmingly may suggest an *Outstanding* or Excellent evaluation. The department APT, Department Chair, COP APT Committee and Dean shall assess and determine the depth and significance of these contributions. In such cases, they shall detail specific documentation of these contributions in the justification of this assessment. The candidate seeking reappointment or promotion has the burden of putting forth evidence of extraordinary contributions to the college or profession. The evidence should be well organized and easy to follow.

C. Ratings

In order to achieve the ***Outstanding***, ***Excellent***, ***Good***, ***Satisfactory*** and ***Less than Satisfactory*** rating, faculty in the College of Pharmacy, must demonstrate accomplishment in all areas of clinical practice. The quality of the accomplishment shall be judged by the depth of participation and evidence of significant activity during the stated period. The candidate must provide documentation in each category as follows:

1. Outstanding

To receive this rating for Clinical Practice a candidate must accomplish all criteria listed below:

a. Documentation of de-identified health care activities related to patient centered care rated as outstanding and outstanding performance evaluations, reports, or general communication methods from directors, healthcare administrators, and/or health care providers.
b. There is substantiated and consistent evidence of professional competence, national recognition for clinical expertise through invitations from other institutions or organizations to plan, organize, or review professional-related activities.
c. There is substantiated and consistent evidence of participation in practice-site quality assessment and improvement activities.

d. There is substantiated and consistent evidence for participation in practice-site committees or in-service/ or community presentations.
e. There is substantiated evidence for practice/service-related honors, certification, and awards.
f. Publication of two peer reviewed research/editorial/review articles per year.
g. Experiential evaluations from student rotations with a rating of 4.25 - 5 out of 5.

2. Excellent

To receive this rating for Clinical Practice, a candidate must accomplish all criteria listed below:

a. Documentation of healthcare activities related to patient centered care rated as excellent and excellent performance evaluations, reports, or general communication methods from directors, healthcare administrators, and/or health care providers.
b. There is substantiated evidence of professional competence, local/regional recognition for clinical expertise through invitations from other institutions or organizations to plan, organize, or review professional-related activities.
c. There is substantiated evidence for participation in practice-site quality assessment and improvement activities.
d. There is substantiated evidence for participation in practice site committees or in-service or community presentations.
e. There is substantiated evidence for practice/service-related honors, certification, or awards.
f. Publication of one peer reviewed research/editorial/review article per year
g. Experiential evaluations from student rotations with a rating of 3.75-4.25 out of 5

3. Good

To receive this rating for Clinical Practice a candidate must accomplish all criteria listed below:

a. Documentation of health care activities related to patient-centered care rated as good and good performance evaluations, reports, or general communication methods from directors, healthcare administrators, and/or healthcare providers.
b. There is evidence for participation in practice-site quality assessment and improvement activities.
c. There is evidence for participation in practice-site committees or in-service/ or community presentations.
d. There is evidence for practice/service-related honors, certification, or awards.
e. Publication of one peer reviewed research/editorial/review article every year
f. Experiential evaluations from student rotations with a rating of 3-3.75 out of 5

4. Satisfactory

To receive this rating for Clinical Practice a candidate must accomplish all criteria listed below:

a. Documentation of health care activities related to patient-centered care and performance evaluations are rated as satisfactory, reports, or general communication methods from directors, healthcare administrators, and/or healthcare providers.
b. There is substantiated evidence for participation in practice-site quality assessment and improvement activities.
c. There is substantiated evidence for participation in practice-site committees or in-service/ or community presentations.
d. Publication of one peer reviewed research/editorial/review article every other year

e. Experiential teaching evaluations from student rotations with a rating of 2.5-3 out of 5

5. Less than Satisfactory

If a candidate does not meet the minimal criteria for ***Satisfactory***, then that candidate would be considered ***Less than Satisfactory***, such as less than 4 out of 5 criteria.

VIII. SERVICE CRITERIA AND SUPPORTING DOCUMENTS

Service includes engaging in community services that function as models of global interests and promote collegiality. Service may include administration and/or participation/contribution to service activities locally, regionally, nationally, and internationally. The candidate shall provide evidence of sustained and substantive contribution to the college and/or University and also to his/her profession or discipline external to Howard University. Emphasis shall be given to both quality and quantity of the candidate's activity in service areas. Participation and contribution documentation are in two distinct areas: department/college/University and the professional/scientific fields.

A. Evidence of the Service Criteria

	Criteria	Evidence
	Department/College/University	
1	Service in the development of workshops, seminars and continuing education programs in the departmental, college or University	a. Documentation of Services. b. Clear and adequate evidence of outcomes of activities.
2	Service as a mentor of junior faculty.	a. Documentation of faculty mentee correspondence. b. Clear and adequate evidence of outcomes of activities.
3	Service as director or co-director of department, college, or University programs (e.g., drug information, poison center, graduate program, post graduate training program, professional development, experiential program, distance learning or discipline specific program etc.).	a. Documentation of Services. b. Clear and adequate evidence of outcomes of activities.
4	Service as an officer of committee(s), secretary, student chapter advisor, coordinator.	a. Documentation of Services. b. Clear and adequate evidence of outcomes of activities.
5	Service as official/administrative head of department/college/University unit.	a. Documentation of Services. b. Clear and adequate evidence of outcomes of activities.
6	Participation in departmental, college and University committees.	a. Documentation of Services. b. Clear and adequate evidence of outcomes of activities.
	Professional/Scientific	
1	Participation in professional/scientific meetings and/or continuing professional education as invited speaker or coordinator, moderator, facilitator.	a. Documentation of Services. b. Clear and adequate evidence of outcomes of activities.

2	Participation in professional/scientific meetings and/or continuing professional education as contributor of papers, and/or program participant.	a. Documentation of Services. b. Clear and adequate evidence of outcomes of activities.
3	Participation in editorial and/or review publication process of a professional/scientific/community organization.	a. Documentation of Services. b. Clear and adequate evidence of outcomes of activities.
4	Service as member of special task force of professional, academic, or community organization with significant contributions.	a. Documentation of Services. b. Clear and adequate evidence of outcomes of activities.
5	Service as officer or special designated position of committees for professional/scientific/health-related community organization.	a. Documentation of Services. b. Clear and adequate evidence of outcomes of activities.
6	Service as official/administrative head of professional/scientific society or community organization.	a. Documentation of Services. b. Clear and adequate evidence of outcomes of activities.
7	Provision of invited lectures/seminars to professional, societal and/or public groups.	a. Documentation of Services. b. Clear and adequate evidence of outcomes of activities.
8	Evidence of election or appointment to state, national or international professional/ scientific organizations in recognition of outstanding scholarship.	a. Documentation of Services. b. Clear and adequate evidence of outcomes of activities.

**** A brief narrative describing the supporting evidence with specific page numbers to achieve this area of proficiency is recommended.***

B. Evaluation

Faculty candidates shall be assessed based upon the following categories of accomplishment: ***Outstanding***, ***Excellent***, ***Good***, ***Satisfactory*** and ***Less than Satisfactory***. It is also recognized that occasionally an individual may make extraordinary contributions to the college or profession in a manner not specifically characterized in these criteria, including (but not limited to) service at the local, state, national, or international level, national distinctions, peer recognition for superior performance in public service. In such rare cases, "Additional Contribution" considerations of achievements shall be made, and assessment of the evidence overwhelmingly may suggest an ***Outstanding*** or ***Excellent*** evaluation. The department APT, Department Chair, COP APT Committee and Dean shall assess and determine the depth and significance of these contributions. In such cases, they shall detail specific documentation of these contributions in the justification of this assessment. The candidate seeking reappointment or promotion has the burden of putting forth evidence of extraordinary contributions to the college or profession. The evidence should be well organized and easy to follow.

C. Ratings

In order to achieve the ***Outstanding***, ***Excellent***, ***Good***, ***Satisfactory*** and ***Less than Satisfactory*** rating, faculty in the College of Pharmacy must demonstrate accomplishment in all of the criteria listed for department/college/University, and Professional/Scientific. The quality of the accomplishment shall be judged by the depth of participation and evidence of significant activity during the stated period. The candidate must provide documentation in each category as follows:

1. Outstanding

To receive this rating, a candidate must accomplish all criteria in both categories (i.e., Department/College/University and Professional/Scientific) listed below:

Department/College/University

a. There is substantiated evidence of development of workshops, seminars or continuing education programs in the department, college, or University level.
b. There is substantiated evidence of serving as mentor for junior faculty if needed and if a mentoring program is available.
c. There is substantiated and consistent evidence in the participation as program director or co-director (i.e., drug information, poison center, graduate program, post graduate training program, professional development, experiential program, distance learning or other discipline-specific programs).
d. There is substantiated and consistent evidence for participation in departmental, college and University committees or student organizations as a chair, coordinator, secretary, class advisor, student chapter organization advisor etc.
e. There is substantiated evidence for participation in departmental, college and University committees.

Professional/Scientific

a. There is substantiated evidence in the participation in professional/scientific meetings and/or continuing professional education as invited speaker, coordinator, moderator, or facilitator.
b. The substantiated evidence in professional/scientific meetings and/or continuing professional education as contributor of papers and/or program participant.
c. There is substantiated evidence of participation in editorial and/or review publication process of a professional/scientific/community organization.
d. There is substantiated evidence of service as a member of a special task force of a professional, academic or community organization with significant contributions.
e. There is substantiated and consistent evidence of service as an officer or special designated position of committees for professional/scientific/health-related community organization.
f. There is substantiated evidence invited lectures/seminars to professional, societal and/or public groups.

2. Excellent

Department/College/University

a. There is substantiated evidence in the development of workshops, seminars and continuing education programs in the department, college, or University level.
b. There is substantiated and consistent evidence in the participation as program director or co-director (i.e., drug information, poison center, graduate program, post graduate training program, professional development, experiential program, distance learning or other discipline-specific program).
c. There is substantiated and consistent evidence for participation in departmental, college and University committees or student organizations as a chair, coordinator, secretary, class advisor, student chapter organization advisor etc.

d. There is substantiated evidence for participation in departmental, college and University committees.

Professional/Scientific

a. There is substantiated evidence in professional/scientific meetings and/or continuing professional education as invited speaker, coordinator, moderator, or facilitator.
b. There is substantiated evidence of participation in professional/scientific meetings and/or continuing professional education as a contributor of papers and/or program participant.
c. There is substantiated evidence of participation in editorial and/or review publication process of a professional/scientific/community organization.
d. There is substantiated and consistent evidence of service as an officer or special designated position of committees for professional/scientific/health-related community organization.
e. There is substantiated evidence invited lectures/seminars to professional, societal and/or public groups.

3. Good

Department/College/University

a. There is substantiated evidence in the development of workshops, seminars and continuing education programs in the department, college, or University level.
b. There is substantiated evidence of participation in graduate program, post-graduate training program, experiential or discipline-specific program.
c. There is substantiated evidence for participation in departmental, college and University committees.

Professional/Scientific

a. There is substantiated evidence in professional/scientific meetings and/or continuing professional education as invited speaker, coordinator, moderator, or facilitator.
b. There is substantiated evidence of participation in professional/scientific meetings and/or continuing professional education as a contributor of papers and/or program participant.
c. There is substantiated evidence of participation in editorial and/or review publication process of a professional/scientific/community organization.
d. There is substantiated evidence invited lectures/seminars to professional, societal and/or public groups.

4. Satisfactory

The candidate must demonstrate evidence of performance in one of the following categories (i.e., Department/College/University **or** Professional/Scientific):

Department/College/University

a. There is substantiated and consistent evidence for participation in departmental, college and University committees or student organizations.
b. There is substantiated evidence of participation in graduate program, post-graduate training program, experiential or discipline-specific program.

-Or-

Professional/Scientific

a. There is substantiated evidence in professional/scientific meetings and/or continuing professional education as invited speaker, coordinator, moderator, or facilitator.
b. There is substantiated evidence of participation in professional/scientific meetings and/or continuing professional education as a contributor of papers and/or program participant.
c. There is substantiated evidence invited lectures/seminars to professional, societal and/or public groups.

5. Less than Satisfactory

If a candidate does not meet the minimal criteria for ***Satisfactory***, then that candidate would be considered ***Less than Satisfactory***.

APPENDIX B: COLLEGE OF PHARMACY CRITERIA FOR APPOINTMENT, REAPPOINTMENT AND PROMOTION OF CLINICAL EDUCATOR FACULTY

This document refers to faculty in the College of Pharmacy (COP) who receive a clinical educator track appointment from the college. The candidate must also meet the criteria set forth in the Faculty Handbook and with the terms and conditions of employment.

Individuals appointed to the clinical faculty in the college must have at least a Doctorate degree in Pharmacy, postgraduate training in a residency or fellowship program or commensurate experience and a current licensure as a registered pharmacist or with eligibility for licensure in DC. Clinical faculty appointments are typically made for a three- year term for Instructors and Assistant Professors and five-year term for Associate Professors and Full Professors. Clinical Educator Track faculty are non-tenured renewable term faculty.

I. AREAS OF PROFICIENCY

These include **Teaching, Practice, Service and Scholarship** which are described in sections V, VI, VII and VIII, respectively.

II. RATING

Candidates are assigned one of the following ratings based on their performance in each of the above areas of proficiency: ***Outstanding***, ***Excellent***, ***Good, Satisfactory*** and ***Less than Satisfactory.*** The criteria provided in each of the proficiency areas are guidelines only. Quality and significance of contribution shall be determined by the departmental Appointment, Promotion and Tenure (APT) Committee, Department Chair, college APT Committee and Dean and shall be based on the evidence provided by the applicant. It is incumbent upon the applicant to prepare the dossier accurately and provide detailed a narrative with proper evidence to make the case that the criteria claimed should be accepted.

III. TYPES OF APPOINTMENT

Upon acceptance of employment, a candidate is appointed to the clinical educator track. Within the first three years following this initial appointment, a Clinical Instructor/Clinical Assistant Professor faculty member may apply for reappointment every three years based on performance and should apply no earlier than 1 year prior to the end of their term. A Clinical Associate Professor and Clinical Professor may apply for reappointment every five years based on performance and should apply no earlier than 1 year prior to the end of their term.

IV. QUALIFICATIONS AND RATINGS

The provision of health care is a major activity of clinical faculty and requirement for the clinical educator track at all levels. A high level of competency is expected at all ranks. Evaluation will be emphasized on teaching, scholarship, service, clinical practice, and administration. Only faculty who hold administrative positions will be evaluated on administration[1]. The following are the

[1] Evaluations will be performed based on percent effort dedicated to each proficiency area. Extenuating circumstances leading to the change of percent effort from original expectations will be taken into consideration by committee chair or designee if chair is unavailable.

qualifications and ratings required for initial appointment, reappointment, and promotion of candidates to each rank.

A. Clinical Professor

For initial appointment, reappointment or promotion to this rank, the candidate must hold a doctorate degree and be licensed to practice pharmacy in a US state or territory. The candidate shall also have a minimum of four years of experience as an Associate Professor. For promotion from Clinical Associate Professor and initial and reappointment at the Clinical Professor level, the candidate must receive ***Outstanding*** in practice plus ***Excellent*** rating in teaching, service, and scholarship. For faculty with primarily administrative functions, the candidate must achieve ***Outstanding*** in either practice or administration (through their annual administrative performance review process), plus ***Excellent*** in teaching, service, and scholarship for initial, reappointment and promotion to Clinical Professor. No rating less than excellent is received on all possible categories.

B. Clinical Associate Professor

For an initial appointment, reappointment or promotion to this rank, the candidate must hold a doctorate degree and be licensed to practice pharmacy in a US state or territory. The candidate shall also have a minimum of four years of experience as an Assistant Professor. For initial appointment, reappointment, and promotion from Clinical Assistant Professor to Clinical Associate Professor level, the candidate must receive an ***Excellent*** rating in teaching and practice plus a ***Good*** rating in the areas of scholarship and service. For faculty with primarily administrative functions, the candidate must achieve ***Excellent*** in teaching and either practice or administration (through their annual administrative performance review process) plus ***Good*** in service and scholarship for initial, reappointment and promotion to Clinical Associate Professor. No rating less than good is received on all possible categories.

C. Clinical Assistant Professor

For an initial appointment, reappointment or promotion to this rank, the candidate must hold a Doctor of Pharmacy Degree and be licensed to practice pharmacy in a US state or territory. For initial appointment and reappointment at the Clinical Assistant Professor level, the applicant must receive a minimum of ***Good*** in teaching and practice plus ***Satisfactory*** in scholarship and service. For initial and reappointment of faculty with primarily administrative functions, the candidate must achieve ***Good*** in teaching and, either practice or administration (through their annual administrative performance review process) plus ***Satisfactory*** in service and scholarship. No rating less than satisfactory is received on all possible categories.

D. Clinical Instructor

For an initial appointment at this rank the candidate must hold a doctorate degree and be licensed or eligible to practice in pharmacy in the US. For initial and reappointment, he/she must receive a ***Good*** rating in teaching and ***Satisfactory*** in practice, scholarship, and service.

V. TEACHING CRITERIA AND SUPPORTING DOCUMENTS

Teaching refers to instruction of undergraduate, professional and/or graduate students, residents, fellows, postdoctoral associates, and visiting professors in classroom or non- classroom (clinical or laboratory) settings. Assessment is based on 1) pursuing activities to improve teaching skills; 2)

advising and supervising undergraduate, professional, and graduate students, residents, and fellows in research; 3) providing continuing education lectures; and 4) publication on development of instructional methodologies or curriculum design. Supporting documentation of teaching skills includes: 1) pedagogical contributions, 2) peer evaluations, and 3) student evaluations.

A. Evaluation for Teaching

Faculty performance shall be assigned one of the following ratings: ***Outstanding*, *Excellent, Good, Satisfactory* and *Less than Satisfactory***. It is also recognized that occasionally an individual may make extraordinary contributions to teaching in a manner not specifically characterized in these criteria including, but not limited to, serving as a course coordinator or a faculty mentor, motivating students toward higher educational/professional goals, and peer recognition for superior performance in teaching as recognized by national awards. In such rare cases, "Additional Contribution" considerations of achievements shall be made, and assessment of the evidence overwhelmingly may suggest an ***Outstanding*** or ***Excellent*** rating. The department APT, Department Chair, COP APT Committee and Dean shall assess and determine the depth and significance of these contributions. In such cases, they shall detail specific documentation of these contributions in the justification of this assessment. The candidate seeking reappointment or promotion has the burden of putting forth evidence of extraordinary contributions to the college or profession. The evidence should be well organized and easy to follow.

1. Student Evaluations

Student evaluations shall be used in the assessment of the teaching criteria. Students' course and instructor evaluations shall be based upon the scale as indicated in the evaluation form. A favorable evaluation must have a majority (see Ratings below) of *Strongly Agree* and *Agree* responses from students (Generally 4 or 5 on a scale of 1 to 5). Evaluations of all years prior to application must be considered.

2. Peer evaluations

Peer evaluations shall be conducted by the College Peer Review committee on a yearly basis in an effort to improve faculty teaching. The evaluation shall be made in the areas of preparation, delivery, and interactions with students as well as an overall rating. The emphasis shall be placed on the improvement of teaching skills ideally over the period since the last appointment. The results of a summative evaluation shall be provided to the candidate and shall be forwarded to the Chair of his/her department and to the department APT Committee as part of the Reappointment and Promotion evaluation. If peer evaluations are missing from the submission packet, the packet will be considered incomplete.

B. Ratings

1. Outstanding

In order to achieve this rating, the candidate's portfolio must demonstrate performance in each of the criteria at the levels described below:

a. There is evidence of fulfilling professional and/or graduate teaching responsibilities (didactic and/or clinical).
b. There is substantiated evidence of instructional activities for educational programs including precepting residents/fellows, staff development lectures and research/elective courses.

c. There is evidence of demonstration of mastery of subject matter with 75% of ratings from peer evaluations in all years are strongly agree or agree.
d. There is substantive evidence of effective communication skills in teaching with 75% of ratings from student evaluations in all years are strongly agree or agree. (Generally, an average of 3.75 on a scale of 1 to 5)
e. There is substantiated evidence of the development of unique and innovative teaching methodologies and/or techniques.
f. There is substantiated evidence of effective student mentoring and advising that stimulates and motivates students toward higher educational/professional goals.
g. Experiential teaching evaluations from students with a rating of 4.25 - 5 out of 5

2. Excellent

In order to achieve this rating, the candidate's portfolio must demonstrate performance in each of the criteria at the levels described below:

a. There is evidence of fulfilling professional and/or graduate teaching responsibilities (didactic and/or clinical).
b. There is substantiated evidence of instructional activities for educational programs including precepting residents/fellows or staff development lectures or research/elective courses.
c. There is evidence of demonstration of mastery of subject matter with 70% of ratings from peer evaluations in all years are strongly agree or agree.
d. There is substantiated evidence of effective communication skills in teaching with 70% of ratings from student evaluations in all years are strongly agree or agree. (Generally, an average of 3.5 on a scale of 1 to 5).
e. There is substantiated evidence of effective student mentoring and advising that stimulates and motivates students toward higher educational/professional goals.
f. Experiential teaching evaluations from students with a rating of 3.75-4.25 out of 5.

3. Good

In order to achieve this rating, the candidate's portfolio must demonstrate performance in each of the criteria at the level described below:

a. There is evidence of fulfilling professional and/or graduate teaching responsibilities (didactic and/or clinical).
b. There is substantiated evidence of instructional activities for educational and clinical programs including precepting residents/fellows or staff development lectures or research/elective courses.
c. There is evidence of demonstration of mastery of subject matter with 65% of ratings from peer evaluations in all years are strongly agree or agree.
d. There is substantiated evidence of effective communication skills in teaching with 65% of ratings from student evaluations in all years are strongly agree or agree. (Generally, an average of 3.25 on a scale of 1 to 5).
e. Experiential teaching evaluations from students with a rating of 3-3.75 out of 5.

4. Satisfactory

In order to achieve this rating for Teaching, the candidate portfolio must demonstrate performance in each of the criteria at the level described below:

a. There is evidence of fulfilling professional and/or graduate teaching responsibilities (didactic

and/or clinical).

b. There is substantiated evidence of instructional activities for educational and clinical programs including precepting residents/fellows or staff development lectures or research/elective courses.
c. There is evidence of demonstration of mastery of subject matter with 60% of ratings from peer evaluations in all years are strongly agree or agree. There is evidence of effective communication skills in teaching with 60% of ratings from student evaluations in all years are strongly agree or agree. (Generally, an average of 3 on a scale of 1 to 5).
d. Experiential teaching evaluations from students with a rating of 2.5-3 out of 5.

5. Less than Satisfactory

If a candidate does not meet the minimal criteria for ***Satisfactory***, then that candidate would be considered ***Less than Satisfactory***, such as less than 3 out of 4 criteria.

C. Supportive Evidence

	Criteria	**Evidence***
1	Fulfillment of didactic, clinical, professional, and graduate teaching responsibilities.	Peer evaluation data, assessment of Department Chair, and student evaluation data from all years from last candidate's most recent appointment.
2	Provide instructional activities for educational programs including precepting students, residents/fellows, staff development lectures, and research/elective courses.	Evidence of lectures developed, courses developed, and materials provided to students/residents/fellows. Course syllabi, evidence of newly developed instructional techniques.
3	Demonstrate mastery of subject matter.	Peer evaluation data, assessment of Department Chair, and student evaluation data from all years from last candidate's most recent appointment.
4	Utilize effective communications skills in the application of teaching methods.	Peer evaluation data, assessment of Department Chair, and student evaluation data from all years from last candidate's most recent appointment.
5	Development of innovative teaching methods and/or techniques.	Evidence of innovation of teaching methods and innovative activities.
6	Demonstrate effective student mentoring and advising that stimulates and motivates students toward higher educational/professional goals.	Evidence of mentoring activities, and student advisement, provision of supporting materials indicating student progression to higher educational/ professional goals.
7	Experiential evaluations from students	a. Documentation of services. b. Evaluations from RxPreceptor.

A brief narrative describing the supporting evidence with specific page numbers to achieve this area of proficiency is recommended.

VI. CLINICAL PRACTICE CRITERIA AND SUPPORTING DOCUMENTS

Clinical practice includes engaging in exemplary management of clinical services that are based on updated treatment guidelines. The candidate shall be able to demonstrate best clinical practices in their field. Individuals with significant administrative duties may co-precept at a practice site and are evaluated based on their percent effort allocation. Principal criteria of evaluation of the

candidate's performance in a clinical practice setting are listed below.

A. Evaluation

Faculty candidates shall be assessed based upon the following categories of accomplishment: ***Outstanding***, ***Excellent, Good, Satisfactory*** and ***Less than Satisfactory***. It is also recognized that occasionally an individual may make extraordinary contributions to the college or profession in a manner not specifically characterized in these criteria, including (but not limited to) service as a consultant to a health-related program at the local, state, national, or international level, national distinctions, peer recognition for superior performance in professional practice. In such rare cases, "Additional Contribution" considerations of achievements shall be made, and assessment of the evidence overwhelmingly may suggest an *Outstanding* or Excellent evaluation. The department APT, Department Chair, COP APT Committee and Dean shall assess and determine the depth and significance of these contributions in such cases, they shall detail specific documentation of these contributions in the justification of this assessment. The candidate seeking reappointment or promotion has the burden of putting forth evidence of extraordinary contributions to the college or profession. The evidence should be well organized and easy to follow.

B. Ratings

In order to achieve the ***Outstanding***, ***Excellent***, ***Good***, ***Satisfactory*** and ***Less than Satisfactory*** rating, faculty in the College of Pharmacy, must demonstrate accomplishment in all areas of clinical practice. The quality of the accomplishment shall be judged by the depth of participation and evidence of significant activity during the stated period. The candidate must provide documentation in each category as follows:

1. **Outstanding**

   To receive this rating for Clinical Practice a candidate must accomplish all criteria listed below:

   a. Documentation of de-identified health care activities related to patient centered care exemplified as outstanding and performance evaluations, reports, or general communication methods from directors, healthcare administrators, and/or health care providers.
   b. Documentation of advisement and counseling of de-identified patient data on the proper use of medications and therapeutic interventions pertinent to patient care management in ambulatory care and/or community-based environments)
   c. Documentation of evaluations and recommendations on drug and other therapies that promote the appropriate use in the treatment of diseases in acute care, long term care, ambulatory care and/or community-based environments.
   d. There is substantiated and consistent evidence for participation in practice site quality assessment and improvement activities including but not limited to practice site committees and in-service presentations.
   e. There is substantiated evidence for practice/service-related honors and certification; or appointment to administrative and special duties at practice/service site.
   f. Documentation of the development of health care services that may serve

as training sites for faculty, residents/fellows, students, and other health care providers with a minimum of:

- 14 learners OR 100% of assigned learners per year (single preceptors)
- 8 learners OR 100% of assigned learners per year (team preceptors) precepted consistently for the past four years in a full-time capacity (student clinical exposure of no less than 160 hours per block per ACPE standards)

g. Recognition in area of clinical specialty by peers nationally or internationally through awards etc.

2. **Excellent**

To receive this rating for Clinical Practice a candidate must accomplish all criteria listed below:

a. Documentation of de-identified healthcare activities related to patient centered care and performance evaluations, reports, or general communication methods from directors, healthcare administrators, and/or health care providers.
b. Documentation of advisement and counseling of de-identified patient data on the proper use of medications and therapeutic interventions pertinent to patient care management in ambulatory and community-based environments
c. Documentation of evaluations and recommendations on drug and other therapies that promote the appropriate use in the treatment of diseases.
d. There is substantiated evidence for participation in practice-site quality assessment and improvement activities including but not limited to practice site committees and in-service/presentations.
e. There is substantiated evidence for practice/service-related honors and certification.
f. Documentation of the development of health care services that may serve as training sites for faculty, residents/fellows, students, and other health care providers with an average of:
   - 12 learners OR 100% of assigned learners per year (single preceptors)
   - 8 learners OR 100% of assigned learners per year (team preceptors)

   precepted consistently for the past four years in a full-time capacity (student clinical exposure of no less than 160 hours per block per ACPE standards)

3. **Good**

To receive this rating for Clinical Practice a candidate must accomplish all criteria listed below:

a. Documentation of de-identified health care activities related to patient-centered care and performance evaluations, reports, or general communication methods from directors, healthcare administrators, and/or healthcare providers.
b. Documentation of advisement and counseling of de-identified patient data on the proper use of medications and therapeutic interventions pertinent to

patient care management in ambulatory and community-based environments

c. Documentation of evaluations and recommendations on drug and other therapies that promote appropriate use in the treatment of diseases.
d. There is substantiated evidence for participation in practice-site quality assessment and improvement activities including but not limited to practice site committees or in-service/presentations.
e. Documentation of the development of health care services that may serve as training sites for faculty, residents/fellows, students, and other health care providers with an average of:
   - 10 learners OR 100% of assigned learners per year (single preceptors)
   - 6 learners OR 100 of assigned learners per year (team preceptors)

   precepted consistently for the past four years in a full-time capacity (student clinical exposure of no less than 160 hours per block per ACPE standards)

4. **Satisfactory**
   To receive this rating for Clinical Practice a candidate must accomplish all of the criteria listed below:

   a. Documentation of health care activities related to patient-centered care and performance evaluations, reports, or general communication methods from directors, healthcare administrators, and/or healthcare providers.
   b. Documentation of advisement and counseling of patients on the proper use of medications and therapeutic interventions pertinent to patient care management in ambulatory and community-based environments
   c. Documentation of evaluations and recommendations on drug and other therapies that promote rationale use in the treatment of diseases.
   d. There is substantiated evidence for participation in practice-site quality assessment and improvement activities including but not limited to practice site committees or in-service/presentations.

5. **Less than Satisfactory**
   If a candidate does not meet the minimal criteria for Satisfactory, then that candidate would be considered *Less than Satisfactory*, such as less than 3 out of 4 criteria.

C. Evidence of the Clinical Practice Principal Criteria

	Principal Criteria	Evidence*
1	Provision of drug information and health care services, which includes but is not limited to monitoring of patient therapeutic intervention; decision-making processes in acute care, ambulatory, and/or community- based environments; and performing pharmaceutical health care services.	a. Documentation of Services. b. Letter from provider.

2	Advisement and counseling of patients on the proper use of medications and pertinent patient care management in ambulatory and/or community-based environments	a. Documentation of Services. b. Letter from nursing staff.
3	Evaluation and recommendations on therapeutic intervention that promote rational use in the treatment of diseases in acute care, ambulatory and/or community-based environments	a. Documentation of Services. b. Letter from provider and nursing staff.
4	Participation in practice-site quality assessment and improvement activities.	a. Documentation of Services. b. Summary DUE, Spreadsheet showing outcome data and next steps. Letter form provider.
5	Recipient of practice/service-related honors, certifications, or awards	a. Documentation of Services. b. Copy of certificate, email notification showing dates awarded.
6	Development of health care services that may serve as training sites for faculty, students, and other health care providers.	a. Documentation of Services. b. Letters from providers.
7	Recognition in area of clinical specialty by peers locally, regionally, nationally, or internationally	a. Documentation of Services. b. Copy of certificate, email notification showing dates awarded.

*A brief narrative describing the supporting evidence to achieve this area of proficiency including the role of the applicant in each publication should be provided

VII. SERVICE CRITERIA AND SUPPORTING DOCUMENTS

Service includes exemplary practice and management of progressive/contemporary healthcare services that function as models for global interests and promotes collegiality. Service may include administration and/or participation/contribution to service activities locally, nationally, and internationally. Emphasis shall be given to both quality and quantity of the candidate's activity in service areas. The candidate shall provide evidence of sustained and substantive contribution to the department, college and/or University and also to his/her Profession or Discipline external to Howard University. Participation and contribution documentation are in two distinct areas: the departmental/college/University and the Professional/Scientific fields.

A. Evaluation for Service

Faculty candidates shall be assessed based upon the following categories of accomplishment: ***Outstanding***, ***Excellent***, ***Good***, ***Satisfactory*** and ***Less than Satisfactory***. It is also recognized that occasionally an individual may make extraordinary contributions to the college or profession in a manner not specifically characterized in these criteria including (but not limited to) service as a consultant to health-related programs at local, state, national, or international level, national distinctions, peer recognition for superior performance. In such rare cases, "Additional Contribution" considerations of achievements shall be made, and assessment of the evidence overwhelmingly may suggest an *Outstanding* or Excellent evaluation. The department APT, Department Chair, COP APT Committee and Dean shall assess and determine the depth and significance of these contributions in such cases, they shall detail specific documentation of these contributions in the justification of this assessment. The candidate seeking reappointment or promotion has the burden of putting forth evidence of extraordinary contributions to the college or profession. The evidence should be well organized and easy to follow.

B. Ratings

In order to achieve the ***Outstanding***, ***Excellent***, ***Good***, ***Satisfactory*** or ***Less than Satisfactory*** rating, College of Pharmacy, must demonstrate accomplishment in either the area of department, college, University or in Professional/Scientific area. The quality of the accomplishment shall be judged by the depth of participation and evidence of significant activity during the stated period. The candidate must provide documentation in each category as follows:

1. **Outstanding**

(achieve 9 out of 11 of the following combined criteria in both categories)

Department/College/University

a. There is substantiated evidence of the serving as a mentor for junior faculty on a consistent basis.
b. There is substantiated evidence for participation in departmental, college and University committees.
c. There is substantiated and consistent evidence for participation in departmental, college and University committees or student organizations as a chair, coordinator, secretary, class advisor, student chapter organization advisor etc.
d. There is substantiated evidence of serving as a faculty advisor for assigned PharmD students.
e. There is substantiated evidence of development of workshops, seminars or continuing education programs in the department, college, or University level.
f. There is substantiated evidence of attendance in HUCOP sponsored professional development workshop and/or CETLA workshop (once a year during the most recent application review period).

Professional/Scientific

a. There is substantiated evidence of participation in professional/scientific meetings and/or continuing professional education as invited speaker, panelist, coordinator, moderator, or facilitator nationally or internationally.
b. There is substantiated evidence of service as either:
   (i) Special task force member OR,
   (ii) Officer/administrative head OR,
   (iii) Special designated position of committees for professional, academic, or community organization with significant contributions nationally or internationally
c. There is substantiated evidence for provision of invited lectures/seminars to professional, societal and/or public groups nationally or internationally.
d. There is substantiated evidence of membership in 2 professional organizations.
e. There is substantiated service of participation in traineeship/national certification program once every three years.

2. **Excellent**

(achieve 8 out of 11 of the following combined criteria in both categories)

Department/College/University

a. There is substantiated evidence of the serving as a mentor for junior faculty on a consistent basis.
b. There is substantiated evidence for participation in departmental, college and University committees.
c. There is substantiated and consistent evidence for participation in departmental, college and University committees or student organizations as a chair, coordinator, secretary, class advisor, student chapter organization advisor etc.
d. There is substantiated evidence of serving as a faculty advisor for assigned PharmD students.
e. There is substantiated evidence of development of workshops, seminars or continuing education programs in the department, college, or University level.
f. There is substantiated evidence of attendance in HUCOP sponsored professional development workshop and/or CETLA workshop (once a year during the most recent application review period)

Professional/Scientific

a. There is substantiated evidence of participation in professional/scientific meetings and/or continuing professional education as a speaker, panelist, coordinator, moderator, or facilitator regionally, nationally, or internationally.
b. There is substantiated evidence of service as either:
   (i) Special task force member OR,
   (ii) Officer/administrative head OR,
   (iii) Special designated position of committees for professional, academic, or community organization with significant contributions regionally, nationally, or internationally.
c. There is substantiated evidence of provision of lectures/seminars to professional, societal and/or public groups regionally, nationally, or internationally.
d. There is substantiated evidence of membership in 1 professional organization.
e. There is substantiated evidence of participation in traineeship/national certification program once every three years.

3. **Good**

(achieve 7 out of 10 of the following combined criteria in both categories)

Department/College/University

a. There is substantiated evidence for participation in departmental, college and University committees.
b. There is substantiated and consistent evidence for participation in departmental, college and University committees or student organizations as a chair, coordinator, secretary, class advisor, student chapter organization

advisor etc.

c. There is substantiated evidence of serving as a faculty advisor for assigned PharmD students.
d. There is substantiated evidence of development of workshops, seminars or continuing education programs in the department, college, or University level.
e. There is substantiated evidence of attendance in HUCOP sponsored professional development workshop and/or CETLA workshop (once a year during the most recent application review period).

Professional/Scientific

a. There is substantiated evidence of participation in professional/scientific meetings and/or continuing professional education as a speaker, panelist, coordinator, moderator, or facilitator locally, regionally, nationally, or internationally.
b. There is substantiated evidence of service as either:
   (i) Special task force member OR,
   (ii) Officer/administrative head OR,
   (iii)Special designated position of committees for professional, academic, or community organization with significant contributions nationally or internationally.
c. There is substantiated evidence of provision of lectures/seminars to professional, societal and/or public groups locally, regionally, nationally, or internationally.
d. There is substantiated evidence of membership in 1 professional organization.
e. There is substantiated evidence of participation in traineeship/national certification program every 6 years.

4. **Satisfactory**

(achieve 6 out of 9 of the following combined criteria in both categories)

Department/College/University

a. There is substantiated evidence for participation in departmental, college and University committees.
b. There is substantiated and consistent evidence for participation in departmental, college and University committees or student organizations as a chair, coordinator, secretary, class advisor, student chapter organization advisor, etc.
c. There is substantiated evidence of serving as a faculty advisor for assigned PharmD students.
d. There is substantiated evidence of development of workshops, seminars or continuing education programs in the department, college, or University level.
e. There is substantiated evidence of attendance in HUCOP sponsored professional development workshop and/or CETLA workshop (once a year during the most recent application review period).

Professional/Scientific

a. There is substantiated evidence of participation in professional/scientific meetings and/or continuing professional education as a speaker, panelist, coordinator, moderator, or facilitator locally, regionally, nationally, or internationally.

b. There is substantiated evidence of service as either:
   (i) Special task force member OR,
   (ii) Officer/administrative head OR,
   (iii) Special designated position of committees for professional, academic, or community organization with significant contributions nationally or internationally.

c. There is substantiated evidence of provision of lectures/seminars to professional, societal and/or public groups locally, regionally, nationally, or internationally.

d. There is substantiated evidence of membership in 1 professional organization.

5. **Less than Satisfactory**

If a candidate does not meet the minimal criteria for Satisfactory by achieving less than 5 out of 9 criteria, then that candidate would be considered *Less than Satisfactory*.

C. **Evidence of the Service Criteria**

Principal Criteria		Evidence
Department/College/University		
1	Service in the development of workshops, seminars, and continuing education programs in the departmental, college or University level.	a. Documentation of Services b. Clear and adequate evidence of outcome of activities
2	Service as a mentor of junior faculty.	a. Documentation of Services b. Letter from faculty mentee
3	Service as an officer of committees	a. Documentation of Services b. Final nomination list of chairs of committees
4	Service as a faculty mentor for PharmD students	a. Documentation of Services. b. Final list of student advisees
5	Participation in departmental, college and University committees	a. Documentation of Services b. Final nomination list of committees
6	Attendance in HUCOP sponsored professional development workshop and/or CETLA workshop (once a year during the most recent application review period	Documented evidence of attendance at HUCOP sponsored and approved workshop or CETLA workshop
Professional/Scientific		
1	Participation in professional/scientific meetings and/or continuing professional education as a speaker, panelist, coordinator, moderator, or facilitator	a. Documentation of Services b. Evidence of participation as a speaker, panelist, coordinator, moderator, or facilitator
2	Service as either: a. Special task force member OR,	a. Documentation of Services b. Evidence of participation as a special taskforce

	b. Officer/administrative head OR, c. Special designated position of committees	member or administrative head or special designated position
3	Provision of lectures/seminars to professional, societal and/or public groups locally, regionally, nationally, or internationally	a. Documentation of Services b. Posters, copy of program booklet or website page showing candidate's name
4	Membership in professional organizations	Documented evidence of paid membership
5	Participation in traineeship/national certification program	Documented evidence of attendance at traineeship/national certification program

A brief narrative describing the supporting evidence to achieve this area of proficiency

VIII. SCHOLARSHIP CRITERIA AND SUPPORTING DOCUMENTS

Scholarship is the advancement of knowledge through the conduct of research and/or development of innovative teaching methods and/or professional practice. Research is comprised of systematic collection and analysis of information that generates new knowledge. Evaluative research is the application of appropriate research methodologies to study the effectiveness, efficiency, efficacy and usefulness of a procedure, drug regimen or service. An innovative professional practice method such as a case report or discovery involves the application or relevancy of clinical, pharmacoeconomic and/or organizational mechanisms to impact or solve health care problems. Proficiency in scholarship is primarily documented by the submission and acquisition of grants/contracts, conduct/supervision of research, development of innovative health care practices, contributions to peer-reviewed publications, recognition by peers and professional/scientific organizations, and the submission and acquisition of an academic excellence award.

A. Evaluation for Scholarship

The purpose of this evaluation is to assess the quality and quantity of the candidate's activity in scholarly areas. Faculty performance shall be assigned one of the following ratings: ***Outstanding, Excellent, Good, Satisfactory*** and ***Less than Satisfactory***. It is also recognized that occasionally an individual may make extraordinary contributions to the Scholarship in a manner not specifically characterized in these criteria including, but not limited to, securing patent rights and national awards of recognition by peers for outstanding scholarship achievements. In such rare cases, "Additional Contribution" considerations of achievements shall be made, and assessment of the evidence overwhelmingly may suggest an ***Outstanding*** or ***Excellent*** rating. In such cases, the department APT, Department Chair, COP APT and Dean shall detail specific documentation of these contributions in the justification of this assessment. The candidate seeking reappointment or promotion has the burden of putting forth evidence of extraordinary contributions to the college or profession. The evidence should be well organized and easy to follow.

B. Ratings

1. **Outstanding**

(must achieve all 5)

a. Receive funding on one extramural grant/contract in which he/she was the PI (1).
b. Submit at least two (2) extramural grants/contracts as PI or Co-I.
c. Initiated, conducted, or supervised at least two (2) research projects.
d. One peer-reviewed research/review/editorial article per year AND Completed at least one of the following:

(i) One additional research/review/editorial article per year OR
(ii) Book or book chapter every three years OR
(iii)Two monographs/letters/responses to letters per year.

e. Present at least two (2) research projects (poster or platform) at professional/scientific meetings/conferences/symposia nationally or internationally during each appointment term.

2. **Excellent**

A peer-reviewed research/review/editorial article per year is required) and (must achieve 3 out of 4 listed below)

a. Submit at least two (2) extramural grants/contracts as PI or Co-I.
b. Initiated, conducted, or supervised at least two (2) research projects.
c. Completed at least one of the following:
(i) One additional research/review/editorial article per year OR
(ii) Book or book chapter every three years OR
(iii)Two monographs/letters/responses to letters per year.
d. Present at least one (1) research project (poster or platform) at professional/scientific meetings/conferences/symposia nationally or internationally during each appointment term.

3. **Good**

A peer-reviewed research/review/editorial article per year is required) and (must achieve 3 out of 4 listed below)

a. Submit at least one (1) extramural grants/contracts as PI or Co-I.
b. Initiated, conducted, or supervised at least one (1) research project.
c. Completed at least one of the following:
(i) One additional research/review/editorial article per year OR
(ii) Book or book chapter every three years OR
(iii)One monographs/letters/responses to letters per year.
d. Present at least one (1) research project (poster or platform) at professional/scientific meetings/conferences/symposia nationally or internationally during each appointment term.

4. **Satisfactory**

(Must achieve 2 out of 4)

a. Submit at least one (1) extramural grants/contracts as PI or Co-I.
b. Initiated, conducted, or supervised at least one (1) research project.
c. One research/review/editorial article per year **OR** Completed at least one of the following:
(i) One research/review/editorial article per year
(ii) Book or book chapter every three years
(iii) One monographs/letters/responses to letters per year.
d. Present at least one (1) research project (poster or platform) at professional/scientific meetings/conferences/symposia nationally or internationally during each appointment term.

5. **Less than Satisfactory**

If a candidate does not meet the minimal criteria for Satisfactory, then that candidate would be considered ***Less than Satisfactory*** such as having less than 2 criteria satisfied.

C. Evidence of the Scholarship Criteria

	Principal Criteria	Evidence
1	Initiation/conduct/supervision of research/scholarly activities	Statement of the goals and objectives or abstract of the research/scholarly activities
2	Publication of articles in peer-reviewed professional/scientific journals as a primary or secondary author.	Submit a copy of each of the publications or documented evidence of acceptance of manuscript(s) for publication.
3	Publication of books, chapters, book reviews, review articles, editorials, monographs, letters, responses to letters, continuing education (CE) articles and newsletters.	Submit a copy of each of the publications or documented evidence of acceptance of manuscript(s) for publication.
4	Submission of research grants/contracts.	List of grant applications including author(s), grant number, funding agency, project title, date of submission and if approved, approval letter.
5	Presentation at professional/scientific meetings/conferences/symposia of abstracts, research, and innovative/provocative thoughts.	Documented evidence of presentation, such as program with name and title of presentation listed.

****A brief narrative describing the supporting evidence to achieve this area of proficiency including the role of applicant in each publication and the role in each of the grants funded or submitted should be provided.***

Definitions:

- "Extramural" means existing or functioning outside or beyond the boundaries, or precincts of Howard University.