

Criteria for Promotion and Tenure
Division of Toxicology
College of Pharmacy

Philosophy

Promotion and tenure of faculty within the Division of Toxicology will be based on evidence of quality in teaching, research and service. Teaching without research/scholarly activity or inversely, research without involvement of students has no place in the Division of Toxicology. Thus, the Division faculty member must strive to join effectively these two elements of academia. Issues of chemical contamination are commonly of public concern. The Division faculty member has to both participate in the public debate regarding chemical contamination episodes and public health by membership in local, state, and/or national committees, and act as an information resource to citizens regarding public health concerns of environmental, pharmaceutical and household chemicals. Tenure and promotion requires evidence of quality in all three areas.

Core/Criteria for Tenure and Promotion

- ◆ Appropriate credentials and experience
- ◆ Demonstrated quality in teaching
- ◆ Continuing scholarship and professional growth
- ◆ Performance of service responsibilities to the university, school, department, profession, and broader community

I. Teaching

Student (Purdue Cafeteria System) evaluations should not be considered as the sole criteria in assessing teaching evaluation.

The Evaluation process should include student, administrator, and self evaluation.

In addition, the faculty candidate should have the right to an optional peer evaluation. In such cases, the candidate should have the right to identify the faculty within the same area to serve as the Peer.

The peer and administrator evaluations should include more than one lecture.

All faculty (tenured and nontenured) must undergo an annual evaluation by the

administrator(s). While this process would obviously not contribute to tenure and promotion activities for full professors, the annual evaluation should serve as a quality control check within the Division for all faculty.

After the evaluation process, the candidate and administrator(s) should sit face-to-face and discuss the evaluation. Specific written suggestions for improvement, if any should be provided at that time. Such evaluations should be promptly available to the faculty and copies should be kept on files in the Director as well as the Dean's office.

Prior notification of such evaluations should be provided to the candidate.

II. Research/professional development

Research and scholarly activities are an important part of promotion and tenure evaluations. Faculty are expected to show evidence of continuing research and professional development. Under research and professional development, the following items are considered:

1. Publications
2. Scholarly activity
3. Grantsmanship
4. Graduate research/training

1. Publications

What is the minimum number (or range) to be considered?

At associate level:

- Ideally, 1 to 2 refereed research publications per year
- Cohesive contribution to a body of knowledge within the candidate's discipline
- Evidence of continuing professional growth in the candidate's speciality area

At professor level:

- Ideally, at least 20 refereed publications
- Significant contributions of original quality research

- Consistency in research activity
- Maintain an active interest in the specific field of interest
- Subjective but not objective evaluation

2. Scholarly activity

What should we consider as scholarly activity?

The following are considered as evidence of scholarly activity:

books--writing, editing
 chapters--single or multiple authors
 monographs, bulletins
 review articles--invited, uninvited
 CE articles in trade journals
 editorial board publications
 editorial commentary
 technical reports
 invited lectures
 invited symposia
 presentation at local, regional, national and international meetings
 presentations in short courses
 presentations in workshops
 organizing symposia, conferences, discussion groups
 organizing workshops, non-credit and extension courses
 reviewing research articles
 reviewing grant proposals
 participating in national/regional discussion groups
 involving students in state, regional, national and international meetings
 chairing sessions
 moderating sessions
 scientific society offices held
 planning committees of scientific organizations
 consultation (industry, education, government)

Honors and awards received for research achievement/distinctions should be included in this category under a subhead, *Special Recognition*.

What should be our benchmark of scholarly activity?

At the associate professor level:

- Consistent evidence of contribution in some of the above mentioned areas

At the professor level:

- Demonstrated scholarly achievement
- Significant contributions in many of the areas listed above

3. Grantsmanship

At the associate professor level:

- Evidence of grantsmanship is essential (at least one proposal per year)
- Consistency in efforts to get grants
- Funding source considerations should not be taken into account, i.e., there should be no distinction between the sources of funding.

At professorial level:

- Success in obtaining extramural funding is essential
- Consistency in efforts to get grants
- Funding source considerations may be considered

Should there be a distinction between principle investigator and co-investigator(s)?

If the applicant is a co-investigator or collaborator, specific role of the applicant must be documented.

4. Graduate training/research

What should we consider as evidence in graduate training?

- Major Advisor to graduate students (Ph.D. and masters)
- Supervisor for directed study

- Advisory committee member for graduate students (Ph.D. and masters)
- Supervisor for undergraduate laboratory training

In the categories mentioned above, should we recommend only evidence or require numbers?

- Numbers should not be considered at either level
- Productivity, contribution, and the value of the candidate to the program may be considered

III. Service

The Division of Toxicology should consider teaching, research/scholarly activity, and service to be equally important criteria in assessing the promotion and tenure of faculty. Performance of exemplary service is not a substitute for meeting the institutional requirements for teaching and research.

At the associate professor level, the candidate is expected to show evidence of service to the University, School, Department, Profession and broader community. Service may also include advising students and student activities. Service to the profession may include membership and election to offices of state, regional, national and international professional associations.

At the professorial level, the candidate is expected to perform exemplary service in the area of his/her academic responsibilities to the University, School, Department, Profession and broader community. Service may also include advising students and student activities. Service to the profession may include membership and election to offices of state, regional, national and international professional associations, editorial work for professional journals, and utilization as an expert consultant to professional groups.

Letters of evaluation

Letters of evaluation, from persons both outside and within the University, are essential to provide an informed assessment of an applicant's scholarly activity and contributions. The specific recommendations are as follows:

At the associate level:

External letters

Candidate should request no less than 2 and no more than three external letters of evaluation.

In addition, Director or Dean should request for no less than 2 and no more than three external letters of evaluation. Candidate should provide a list of at least 4 names to the Director/Dean.

The persons suggested by the candidate must be experts in candidate's area of research. Persons asked to write letters should be advised that their letters must be analytical, carefully weighing the strengths and weaknesses in the case, and evaluating the significance of the candidate's work with emphasis on originality and contributions to the knowledge base in the field.

Internal letters

Candidate should request two letters.

Contents may or may not be specified.

At the professor level:

External letters

Candidate should request no less than three and no more than four external letters of evaluation.

In addition, Director or Dean should request no less than three and no more than four external letters of evaluation. Candidate provides a list of at least 6 names to the Director/Dean.

The persons suggested by the candidate must be experts in candidate's area of research.

Persons asked to write letters should be advised that their letters must be analytical, carefully weighing the strengths and weaknesses in the case, and evaluating the significance of the candidate's work with emphasis on originality and contributions to the knowledge base in the field. Further, persons should also be advised to comment in some detail on the significance of the overall research program as well as on individual papers, including the scientific merit of the work, its originality, and its impact on the field of study.

Internal letters

Candidate should request three letters.

Contents may or may not be specified.

Process

The Committee recognizes the following procedures in place in the School of Pharmacy:

Procedures

1. Director of Toxicology discusses promotion and tenure with the prospective candidate, provides the general guidelines
2. Candidate collects all the pertinent information, submits his/her dossier to the Director
3. Director makes the recommendation for the formation of the Departmental Tenure Committee (DTC) to the Dean
4. Dean formalizes the DTC (The committee elects a Chair and Secretary)
5. DTC reviews the dossier, submits the committee's recommendations to the Director
6. Director forwards the recommendations of DTC to the Dean with his own recommendation
7. Dean convenes a College Tenure Committee (CTC), forwards the documentation to CTC
8. CTC reviews the documentation, adds their recommendation and forwards to the Dean
9. Dean reviews all the documentation, makes his own recommendation, forwards All documents to the Provost
10. Provost reviews all documentation, makes a recommendation to the President

Recommendations:

A standing committee on tenure and promotion for the Division of

Toxicology should be appointed with a specific charge, i.e., to formulate and review guidelines periodically and provide advisement as appropriate to the Administrative Unit(s).

The criteria for assessment at both Department and College level should be consistent.

Timeliness/deadlines for each step must be specified.

Tenure and Promotion Committees shall be composed of only Division of Toxicology faculty. If insufficient numbers are available, additional members may be requested from the Division of Basic Pharmaceutical Sciences.