

**DEPARTMENT OF PHARMACY PRACTICE  
COLLEGE OF HEALTH PROFESSIONS AND BIOMEDICAL SCIENCES**

**STANDARDS AND PROCEDURES FOR FACULTY TENURE,  
PROMOTION, AND SALARY ADVANCEMENT**

*January 31, 2020*

*Based on 2017-21 Collective Bargaining Agreement*

**Table of Contents**

I. INTRODUCTION .....	2
II. EVALUATION STANDARDS .....	3
III. UNIT STANDARDS FOR FACULTY EVALUATION .....	3
A. SALARY DETERMINATION (CBA 10.110.3) .....	4
1. Definitions of Normal, Above Normal, and Outstanding Performance .....	4
2. Normal.....	7
3. Merit.....	7
4. Less-Than-Normal .....	7
5. Retention / Non-renewal .....	7
B. PROMOTION REQUIREMENTS (CBA 10.110.1) .....	7
1. Possession of terminal degree .....	8
2. Rank-specific criteria for promotion: .....	8
C. TENURE .....	9
1. Eligibility for tenure application (CBA 9.310) .....	9
2. Tenure application (CBA 9.310) .....	9
3. Award of tenure (CBA 10.110-2) .....	10
D. FACULTY IN NON-TENURABLE APPOINTMENTS.....	10
IV. PERFORMANCE MEASURES & EVIDENCE FOR PERFORMANCE .....	10
A. TEACHING .....	11
B. SCHOLARLY ACHIEVEMENT & CREATIVE ACTIVITY.....	12
C. SERVICE .....	13
1. University Service.....	14
2. Professional Service .....	14
3. Clinical Service.....	15
4. Community Service .....	16

D. PROFESSIONALISM .....	16
V. EVALUATION PROCESS (CBA 10.200) .....	17
A. INDIVIDUAL PERFORMANCE RECORD (IPR) – October 15 .....	17
VI. ANNUAL EVALUATION STEPS AND TIMELINES.....	17
A. STUDENT EVALUATION COMMITTEE (SEC) – October 15 .....	18
B. FACULTY EVALUATION COMMITTEE (FEC) – November 15 .....	18
C. DEPARTMENT CHAIR RECOMMENDATION - December 15.....	19
D. DEAN RECOMMENDATION – February 15 .....	19
E. EVALUATION OF FACULTY MEMBER SERVING AS DEPARTMENT CHAIR.....	20

**I. INTRODUCTION**

Individuals holding academic appointments are members of the faculty of The University of Montana. In that capacity, each is expected to carry out the principal assignments and responsibilities of the position and to work professionally to support the overall mission and programs of the University, the College of Health and the Skaggs School of Pharmacy in teaching, scholarly achievements, and service. It is emphasized that the proportion of work in each area will, of necessity, vary with the individual faculty member and may vary per year, but all faculty members including those in non-tenure track positions are expected to perform in each category unless otherwise directed.

The evaluation process is used to assist with decisions for salary advancement, retention, promotion, and tenure. General guidance for evaluations is found in the Collective Bargaining Agreement (CBA) Articles 9 and 10. In addition, Articles 4 and 6 address the rights and responsibilities of faculty including professional behavioral expectations and academic responsibilities, respectively. Article 6 also addresses instructional workload as assigned by the Dean, subject to Provost approval, giving consideration to the Department Chair recommendations.

This document contains unit-specific standards designed to provide additional clarity for the evaluations for faculty in this department. In evaluating the performance of a faculty member, the criteria set forth herein represent the evaluating standards. As a professional program with faculty members who also provide direct patient care, the unit must take a comprehensive view of academic performance, contributions to the unit, school, and college, and service to the profession.

All faculty covered by the CBA, including those in non-tenure track appointments who hold greater than 0.5FTE positions, are expected to submit Individual Performance Record (IPR) data for evaluation each year with some exceptions. The exceptions to the annual evaluation requirement are for tenured associate professors who must submit every other year and full professors who must submit every three years according to a schedule set by the University or as otherwise exempted (CBA 10.210).

For annual evaluations, the submitted IPR data should document performance from the first day of the previous academic year, which includes the previous fall semester, spring semester and applicable summer terms. Requests for merit salary increase, promotion or tenure may require data from multiple years. Specific data requirements are addressed in subsequent relevant sections. Other part-time and temporary faculty are encouraged, but not required, to submit data for annual review.

The faculty member serving as the Department's chair will be evaluated in two separate processes – one for faculty duties and one for administrative duties. The Chair's faculty duties will be evaluated on teaching, scholarly activities, and service by the FEC in accordance with these unit standards and the CBA in the same manner as other faculty (CBA 10.00) The administrative performance of the Department Chair is subject to review at any time by the Dean. The results of said review will be included in the next normal faculty evaluation according to the procedures of CBA Section 10.00. Further, said evaluation will focus on the Chairperson's leadership in meeting the goals of the unit and fulfilling the duties outlined in CBA 16.22. In addition to the Dean's review, the faculty and staff in the department will be given an opportunity to provide performance evaluations. Each fall, the immediate past chair of the FEC will gather feedback from faculty and staff, and then summarize the rating scores and collate verbatim comments into a single document. The process will result in a written evaluation report that will be made available to the Department Chair for review and clarification at least 10 days prior to forwarding it to the Dean. The Department Chair shall sign the evaluation report to acknowledge that it has been read without implication about the evaluation's validity.

These unit standards and procedures are intended to be in addition to and consistent with those provided in the current CBA and in the event of any omissions or inconsistencies, the terms of the CBA shall be applicable and prevail. A faculty member should consult the CBA 10.200 for additional details about the evaluation process including procedural requirements for appeals.

## **II. EVALUATION STANDARDS**

Any evaluation of faculty members for purposes of promotion, tenure, salary determination, or recommendation for retention shall be commensurate with appropriate UNIVERSITY STANDARDS (CBA 10.110) as well as the UNIT STANDARDS that are specific to the Department of Pharmacy Practice. CBA available at: ([http://www.umt.edu/provost/faculty/CBAs/UFA\\_2017-2021\\_fall19.pdf](http://www.umt.edu/provost/faculty/CBAs/UFA_2017-2021_fall19.pdf)) . The Pharmacy Practice Department's Unit Standards are posted on the Provost's webpage (<https://www.umt.edu/provost/faculty/deptreports/default.php>) under the College. Faculty are expected to review these documents prior to initiating the evaluation process.

## **III. UNIT STANDARDS (US) FOR FACULTY EVALUATION**

All faculty members undergoing evaluation will be evaluated using the current US with one exception. If the US have been revised during an evaluation period for any faculty member, then said faculty will have the choice of using either the US effective at the time of hire, or those currently in effect, when applying for tenure and/or promotion to Associate Professor. However, after faculty members are tenured, only the US in effect at the time of evaluation will be used. (CBA 10.200). Faculty on split assignment will submit their evaluation documentation to the unit in which the greatest portion of the FTE

is assigned; If it is and equal split, then it is submitted to the unit first hired or in which best qualified for full-time service (CBA 10.220).

There are four levels of performance that are used in the evaluation process. These terms are used to describe overall performance as well as performance within each area of teaching, scholarly activity, and service. Expectations for performance will vary with rank, appointment type, and job description.

**Normal:** faculty member has expected level of professional growth and satisfactory performance for the period of time under review.

**Above Normal:** Faculty member exceeds expectations for professional growth and performance within the time under review.

**Outstanding:** Faculty member far exceeds expectations through above normal performances during the time period under review or exceptional performances within the time under review.

**Below Normal:** faculty member fails to meet expected professional growth or satisfactory performance for the time under review.

## **A. COMPENSATION (CBA 13.00)**

Performance activities & evidence related to the following section are qualified in more detail in Section IV.

### **1. Definitions of Normal, Above Normal, and Outstanding Performance**

For any given time period under review, performance for a faculty member is defined by:

#### **TEACHING:**

Teaching is a major responsibility of any faculty member, but this is especially true for Pharmacy Practice faculty, many of whom have a substantial component of teaching based in the team-oriented (off-campus) clinical setting with other health professionals and providers. The faculty member must be, above all, an effective teacher and role model in contemporary pharmacy practice for students. In order to achieve this goal, most faculty members also must be accomplished, and in some areas, expert practitioners in their practice setting. Thus, evaluation of teaching for the practice faculty member will typically include evaluation of his/her teaching ability in the (clinical) practice setting, as well as in the didactic classroom. It must be considered that Pharmacy Practice clinical faculty members typically spend greater than 50% of their time involved with clinical practice site teaching and service activities (both on campus and at their practice site).

Teaching is the interaction between the faculty member and the student or other learner. Teaching performance should be evaluated on the effectiveness of the instructional methods, content knowledge, professional behavior, and assessment of student learning across all didactic and experiential courses. Demonstrations of leadership in teaching such as course development and coordination, redesigning or innovative change to an

existing course, or leading curriculum decision-making or paradigm change should also be assessed. Each faculty member is expected to provide classroom instruction in his/her area(s) of expertise, advise students, and, train students in the clinical practice setting, if required by their position. Course materials must be well organized and regularly updated to reflect current practice.

“Normal” teaching is considered to be a composite of peer assessments, colleague assessments, and student teaching evaluations from both the classroom and clinical setting (if relevant) that indicate average to above average instructional effectiveness, acceptable (or innovative) teaching methods and materials, and an ability to communicate.

“Above normal” teaching is further defined by exceeding the “Normal” standard. Examples include consistent and predominantly above average to excellent teaching evaluations, the development of innovative courses, enhanced teaching methodologies, or programs that enhance student learning. It could also include a faculty member’s willingness to assume extra teaching-related duties above those typical for a member of the department.

“Outstanding” teaching occurs when the teaching contributions clearly exceed the “Normal” standard in a consistent basis by all measures. Peer evaluations should recognize obvious excellence and teaching load. Student evaluations will reflect consistent excellence for effectiveness and materials. Teaching may also be recognized as outstanding due to the development of new courses or course content that represent clear benefits to the program, or the assumption of teaching loads and duties far above those typically expected.

#### SCHOLARLY ACHIEVEMENT & CREATIVE ACTIVITY:

Most faculty and all those who have tenure track appointments in the Department of Pharmacy Practice are expected to engage in scholarly or creative activity (scholarship) that is relevant to the focus of their expertise as it relates to pharmacy education and practice. The expectation is that the results and outcomes of scholarship will be communicated, disseminated, or published to the pharmacy and/or other medical or health professions. Further, the expectation is that these activities will bring recognition to the Department, School, and the University; and will foster enhanced learning opportunities for students.

“Normal” scholarship in the Department encompasses developing and conducting activities related to advanced learning, clinical research, sharing of knowledge including providing Continuing Education presentations to peers, colleagues or other healthcare professionals at State, Regional or National symposia, publishing manuscripts through peer-reviewed processes, obtaining extra mural funding or competitive grants, and developing (then disseminating) information about innovative and paradigm-changing learning methods. The faculty member maintains appropriate credentials and certifications and seeks training to increase expertise. All faculty members are expected to have documented activity in at least one area of scholarship each year.

“Above Normal” scholarship exceeds “Normal” scholarship by increased quantity of scholarship activity or scholarship that has a greater impact than is considered ‘standard’

for the Department. Publications in peer-reviewed professional journals, receiving or being awarded a competitive grant, or national/international recognition and/or presentations will typically be required. Taking the leadership role in grants and publications also indicates above normal scholarship. The faculty member gains recognition of expertise through external peer-review processes and increases expertise through successful completion of credentialed training programs and exams.

“Outstanding” scholarship will be considered when scholarship activities reflect a high level of work that far exceeds standard performance in the area, such as a greater than expected number of publications in the time period, a major publication such as a book, or the attainment of a substantial competitive grant award that brings value and recognition to the Department, School, and the University. Faculty member initiates and provides leadership for grants and publications. Expertise is widely recognized and acknowledged both within and outside the profession based on key contributions to the science of pharmacy practice and healthcare.

#### SERVICE:

Each Department faculty member is expected to provide service to students directly or indirectly through service to the Department, Skaggs School of Pharmacy, College of Health and University of Montana. Because pharmacy is a patient-care profession, service to professional organizations, health care groups and organizations, practice sites and patients is expected. Most often, the Department faculty member fulfills patient-based service obligations at the clinical site where they develop and provide services to enhance experiential student instruction. In many instances, the significant provision of service activities in the instructional or clinical settings is provided for in the expected workload of a pharmacy practice faculty member.

“Normal” service is the provision of service in at least two areas, including at least one benefitting the pharmacy program, College, University, or community, and at least one that benefits the profession of pharmacy and/or health care in general. It also includes the expected level of service associated with a given faculty position.

“Above normal” service includes performance above the expected Normal standard, such as a greater number of service activities, the development of innovative pharmacy services to the public or a clinical site, increased leadership roles, or an amount of service rendered that exceeds typical service demands.

“Outstanding” service includes involvement in the number or degree of professional performance activities that far exceeds that of a typical faculty member. It can include a significant and recognized service contribution to the profession, such as serving as an officer of a state or national professional organization. It may also be defined by services that are recognized with an award that indicates esteemed regard by a service group or organization.

## **2. Normal**

A “normal” performance for the period under review includes “normal” or expected evaluations in the three categories of teaching, scholarship, and service. A normal level of performance should indicate consistent professional growth. Normal faculty performance in the Department also includes the absence of evidence of unprofessional behavior patterns as defined in Section IV.D.

It is understood that the absence of performance in any one or two of the areas of teaching, research or creative activity, or public/professional service does not justify a less-than-normal increment if the quantity of performance in the remaining area or areas is proportional to the FTE of the appointment, if the quality of performance in the remaining area or areas is at least normal, and if the individual has been assigned duties solely in the remaining area or areas. (CBA 10.110.3.C Less-than-Normal)

## **3. Merit**

In merit consideration, the same evidence for performance listed above applies. Merit considerations will be based on one of two scenarios listed below. (CBA 10.110.3.A)

**Scenario 1:** “above normal” performance in at least two of the three areas of teaching, scholarship, and service.

**Scenario 2:** at least “normal” performance in two areas of teaching, scholarship, and service with an “outstanding” performance recognition in the third area.

Recommendations for merit consideration may be initiated by the FEC, the individual, another faculty member, Department Chair, or Dean. If this occurs, the faculty member may need to submit data for additional years to meet the merit request requirements.

## **4. Less-Than-Normal**

Either the absence of any performance or performance evaluated as “poor” regarding assigned responsibilities in teaching, scholarship, and service within the scope of employment may constitute grounds for a less-than-normal increment. A recommendation for a less-than-normal increment must be accompanied by written justification from the Faculty Evaluation Committee (FEC).

## **5. Retention / Non-renewal**

For information about non-renewal of Contract, see CBA 9.230 probationary and CBA 9.110 non-tenurable faculty. Employment may be discontinued in the event the employer elects not to renew a probationary appointment for an additional term consistent with the provisions of this agreement.

## **B. PROMOTION REQUIREMENTS (CBA 10.110.1)**

There are three ranks a faculty member may achieve: assistant professor, associate professor, and professor. Promotion to the next higher rank requires evidence that the performance of said faculty is commensurate with the standards associated with that rank. For purposes of determining years in rank, pro rata credit shall be given all full-

time service for any semester except summer session. Promotion is not the same thing as tenure, which is described in Section C.

Evaluation for promotion is based on performance since the last promotion or date of hire. A faculty member may request promotion any year as long as the requirements listed in the current CBA are met. Promotion requirements apply to all faculty members including those in non-tenure track appointments. Recommendations for promotion consideration may be initiated by the FEC, the individual, another faculty member, Department Chair, or Dean.

## **1. Possession of terminal degree**

The faculty member must possess a terminal degree for promotion. In the Department, the terminal degree shall be defined as either a doctorate (e.g., Pharm.D., J.D., M.D., Ph.D., Sc.D.) or a graduate degree combined with a BS Pharm degree (e.g., M.S., M.B.A., M.P.H.).

## **2. Rank-specific criteria for promotion:**

**To Assistant Professor:** possession of the appropriate terminal degree or its equivalent as defined by the unit standard and indication of potential for performance and growth in each of the areas of teaching, scholarship, and service.

**To Associate Professor:** possession of the terminal degree, four (4) or more completed years in rank as assistant professor, clear evidence of professional growth and an increasingly valuable contribution to the University, and no evidence of unprofessional/ behavior patterns as defined in Section IV.D.

Satisfactory performance in teaching, service and scholarship is also considered and may be defined as:

- a. Teaching: Evidence of instructional effectiveness and dedication to student learning in teaching activities arising from the FEC's assessment of teaching performance using criteria listed in Section IV.A.
- b. Scholarship: Evidence of activity using criteria listed in Section IV.
- b. Scholarship must be consistent with the primary responsibilities of the faculty member. A record of regular scholarly work should be established. The record is expected to include evidence of significant scholarship activity in the form of publications, curricular research, and/or grant activity. Evidence of dissemination of scholarship to the profession at a state and/or national level will be required.
- c. Service: Evidence of service using criteria listed in Section IV.C.

**To Professor:** possession of the terminal degree, five (5) or more years in rank as associate professor (application may be made during the fifth year), a clear demonstration of professional growth, increasingly valuable contributions to the University, no evidence of unprofessional/ behavior patterns (see Section IV.D), and



achievement of the following performance levels in teaching, scholarly activity, and service.

Satisfactory performance in teaching, service and scholarship is also considered and may be defined as:

- a. Teaching: Evidence of ongoing effectiveness in teaching activities and a record of contribution to methods consistent with student learning arising from the FEC's assessment of teaching performance using criteria listed in Section IV.A.
- b. Scholarship: Evidence of ongoing activity, using criteria listed in Section IV.B. A record of scholarly publication, research, or curricular research, development, and application should be well established. It is expected that the faculty member has evidence of national/international recognition in their area of expertise, as a result of their scholarship.
- c. Service: Evidence of ongoing service and leadership in the profession, clinical practice site, professional/public organizations, and School or University, using criteria listed in Section IV.C.

No faculty member may be promoted to associate professor or full professor on the basis of teaching and service alone (CBA 10.110-1.d.), and scholarship must be demonstrated by scholarly publication or national recognition of creative activity in the area of pharmacy practice, pharmacy education, and healthcare.

## **C. TENURE**

### **1. Eligibility for tenure application (CBA 9.310)**

Tenure is a right to annual renewal of each academic year appointment. A probationary appointee shall be eligible to apply for tenure after the appointee has completed five (5) years of credited service toward tenure (i.e., during the sixth [6<sup>th</sup>]) year of credited employment, at least three (3) of which have been completed at The University of Montana. The applicant must have the appropriate terminal degree for the discipline and unit in which the tenure is to be awarded (B1 of this document). The applicant should hold the minimum academic rank of associate professor, although faculty may apply for tenure and promotion to associate professor simultaneously. If a faculty member seeking promotion to associate professor and tenure simultaneously is not promoted, tenure will be denied as well.

A probationary faculty member who has not attained tenure by the end of his/her seventh year of credited service will be given notice and placed on a one-year nonrenewable contract. No probationary faculty may apply for tenure more than twice and may not work for more than 8 years in a probationary appointment. See CBA Articles 9.000 and 10.000 for additional information on tenure eligibility and process.

### **2. Tenure application (CBA 9.310)**

Tenure shall not be awarded in the absence of application by the eligible faculty member and approval of tenure by the employer. Application for tenure must be in accordance with unit standards.

Procedures for the evaluation of tenure applications shall be conducted according to the section "Unit Standards and Faculty Evaluation Procedures" in the current CBA Section 10.000. It shall be the responsibility of the eligible faculty member to initiate the application for tenure which shall include at least the following:

- a. A letter at the front of the FEC packet explicitly requesting tenure;
- b. A statement of the teaching, research and/or creative activity, and service performed by the applicant during the probationary period;
- c. A list of the applicant's publications and/or creative works;
- d. Evidence that the applicant has achieved or is in the process of achieving recognition in his/her field of competence beyond The University of Montana;
- e. Any additional information the applicant deems relevant to his/her professional development, competence, or performance.

It is noted that performance in the areas of teaching, scholarship, and service are all important and expected for tenure-track faculty. Evidence of unprofessional behavior patterns will also be considered in the review process.

### **3. Award of tenure (CBA 10.110-2)**

The evaluation of the tenure application and limitations on tenure award shall be in accordance with procedures outlined in the CBA. An individual's progress toward the award of continuous tenure shall be evaluated each year. Documentation for the entire probationary period will be submitted for tenure application.

## **D. FACULTY IN NON-TENURABLE APPOINTMENTS**

While the same evidence for performance will be used for evaluation of non-tenurable faculty, expectations across the three areas of performance are dependent on the appointment type and assigned duties based on department needs, and may include minimal or even the absence of activity in one or two areas.

Evaluation of the non-tenurable faculty member will be based on assigned duties for salary determination, promotion, and retention. Evidence of unprofessional behavior patterns will also be considered in the review process.

## **IV. PERFORMANCE MEASURES & EVIDENCE FOR PERFORMANCE**

As indicated in CBA section 6.20 (Academic Responsibility), all faculty members are considered members of the University who are expected to relate to others in a professional, nondiscriminatory manner and participate in the work of the unit and institution. The Department expects its faculty to demonstrate this behavior across teaching, research, and service activities. A lack of professionalism or collegiality is best determined by considering patterns of behavior over time and not isolated events. (See Section IV.D)

The departmental evidence (activities are not listed in order of significance) for faculty performance cited for tenure, promotion, or merit award evaluations are as follows:

## **A. TEACHING**

The following are examples of evidence that can be used to demonstrate teaching performance. Professionalism will be presumed when there is a lack of evidence to show unprofessional/non-collegial behavior patterns.

1. Formal student evaluations. Aspects evaluated may include content knowledge and the ability to effectively interact with students, provide intellectual stimulation, accomplish course objectives, and maintain continuity during teaching. Faculty members must submit student evaluations for classroom performance for at least one course for each semester they teach (CBA 10.220).
2. Formal and informal written evaluation by colleagues. Aspects evaluated may include command of subject material, growth of topic areas according to area developments, ability to communicate subject material to the students, syllabus and course content, educational materials, and coordination of courses. This optional evaluation will be set up by the faculty member who wants additional feedback.
3. Course coordination and instructional assigned duties in the didactic portion of the curriculum.
4. Direction of an experiential educational program, including Introductory (IPPE) and Advanced (APPE) Pharmacy Practice Experiences and service-learning projects.
5. Establishment and maintenance of an appropriate teaching environment for student education (e.g. clinical site or skills laboratory).
6. Participation in and direction of undergraduate and graduate students' theses committees or research.
7. Direction of or participation in pharmacy or medical resident education or inter-professional education.
8. Student advising.
9. Use of innovative teaching methods such as distance learning, active learning, service learning, and technology that enhances student learning.
10. Formal written alumni feedback.
11. Provide lectures or courses for students in other health professions programs on campus or within the MUS system, including general education courses on campus.
12. Recognition of teaching excellence (e.g., awards, titles).

13. Evidence of credentialed training to enhance teaching and student learning assessment skills.
14. Other evidence deemed relevant by the faculty member submitting the IPR or the evaluation committee.

## **B. SCHOLARLY ACHIEVEMENT & CREATIVE ACTIVITY**

Every faculty member is expected to engage in scholarly activity. In a professional program such as pharmacy, these activities may be traditional research or innovative clinical practices. Both can directly help to increase knowledge and improve patient care. For faculty in this unit, scholarly activity may occur primarily within the practice setting. As such, initial development and communication to the profession of innovative pharmacy practice services may be considered scholarly activity.

Overall performance in the area will be judged on merit in terms of the significance of the work, as well as quantity of activity. Professionalism will be presumed when there is a lack of evidence to show unprofessional/non-collegial behavior patterns.

The following evidence will be considered in evaluating scholarly achievement:

- Publication of research and professional articles and reviews in scientific and professional journals. Publications may be descriptive reports of professional services or patient case reports. Publications in refereed journals are accepted as works of scholarly achievement. Other publications are judged on their merit.
- Publication of books, book chapters, monographs, book reviews, technical reports, and continuing education articles.
- Success in obtaining grants, including competitive grants internal and external to The University of Montana, and external industry research contracts. Unsuccessful attempts to obtain grants will not receive adverse evaluations and may be considered for the involved effort.
- Presentation of refereed papers/posters describing research or innovative programs at professional meetings.
- Invited presentations at state, regional or national meetings.
- Presentation of professional continuing education sessions and workshops.
- Research, development and communication of innovative academic and/or practice programs within the university, school, state, or local health care units.
- Receipt of awards, honors, and fellowships for scholarly activities and subject matter expertise. This includes recognition of specialty certification by national organizations such as the Board of Pharmacy Specialties (BPS).

- Participation in multi-disciplinary or multi-center research projects which enhance the role of pharmacy in health care. The faculty member's role should be clearly described.
- Invited participation in a peer-review process to create new or evaluate existing national practice guidelines that will impact professional practice. This is not literature/manuscript review, rather, an editorial function that involves a significant rendering of scholarly assessment of the literature in pharmacotherapy and pharmacy practice resulting in an "expert" opinion and can have a major impact on the profession. Such invitations recognize the faculty member's clinical expertise.
- Invited participation in a peer-review process for nationally competitive grant proposals that will impact scientific inquiry in health fields. This type of activity involves significant effort to evaluate the proposed project or program and recognizes the scientific and programmatic expertise of the faculty member. As with the activity above, this activity can have a major impact on the direction of the profession.
- Invited participation in other national peer-review activities that promote quality in pharmacy practice and patient care such as item-writing for board-certification exams. This activity involves the production of original scholarly work versus a review of existing material.
- Development of inter-professional programs, research projects or services that involve collaborators from other disciplines or health care fields.
- Recognition of research or professional expertise by groups or organizations outside of the Department (e.g., fellow status, awards, titles)
- Other evidence deemed relevant by the evaluation committee, including ongoing research and creative innovative practice activities.

### **C. SERVICE**

Service to the university, to the school and to the profession is also the obligation of a faculty member. Each is expected to make a commitment of time and effort to serving the institution and the profession. Service can be measured across four areas: university, professional, clinical, and public. Professionalism will be presumed when there is a lack of evidence to show unprofessional/non-collegial behavior patterns.

The following are examples of the type of evidence that will be considered in evaluating service activities:

## **1. University Service**

1. Participation on committees, task forces, working groups, and other organized groups within the University, CHPBS, Skaggs School of Pharmacy, and the Department.
2. Serve as faculty advisor to student groups and organizations.
3. Serve as a mentor, either formally or informally, for junior faculty members.
4. Administer or direct programs for the University, School, or Department.
5. Serve school, students, or alumni through activities not related to teaching or scholarly activity (e.g., letters of reference, recruitment, admissions interviews, and APPE exit interviews).
6. Leadership positions within the Department, School or University (e.g., Department Chair, committee chair).
7. Awards or recognition of service for the campus.

## **2. Professional Service**

1. Development and maintenance of supportive relationships with agencies, organizations, or persons whose cooperation is important to the enhancement of the school's academic programs. This would include affiliations with pharmacies, hospitals, clinics, and other institutions. Also included would be service on committees and boards of such organizations.
2. Administration/Direction of healthcare-related programs that serve practitioners or the general public in the community and around the state (e.g., continuing education, drug information service, IPHARM, asthma camp, MTGEC).
3. Participation on editorial boards of professional journals.
4. Review of manuscripts or other documents for national professional publications and review of competitive abstracts for podium or poster presentations.
5. Review of grant or project proposals that does not meet the standard for scholarship, delineated in B-10 above.
6. Leadership positions within professional organizations or groups.

7. Recognition of service to professional organizations or practitioner groups (e.g., awards, titles).
8. Membership and active participation on committees and boards of professional organizations.
9. Informal professional service and consultation with other professionals. This includes any teaching activities for health care groups.
10. Professional service and consultation to the lay public, including any teaching activities for patient groups.

### **3. Clinical Service**

For pharmacy practice faculty whose job description includes the provision of patient care services in the clinical practice setting, this can represent a major service commitment in addition to teaching responsibilities and, thus, it must be considered that a service commitment in the form of patient-care services, or clinical – site services may represent a major component of the daily activity for clinical faculty. The commitment is comprised of important activities which establish the faculty member as a role model for students in demonstrating contemporary pharmacy practice and as a clinical instructor for the experiential portion of the program. Moreover, clinical services represent a major contribution by the Department to the quality of health care for the citizens of Montana. Professionalism/collegiality will be presumed when there is a lack of evidence to show unprofessional/non-collegial behavior patterns.

Such clinical services include, but are not limited to:

1. Optimization of patient drug therapy through medication management activities including patient monitoring, participation on patient care teams, counseling, and education.
2. Patient drug regimen review, as required for various facilities such as extended care facilities (e.g. nursing homes).
3. Drug information provision or other written communication to healthcare practitioners or the public.
4. Formulary drug reviews and adverse drug reaction program reporting.
5. Design and implementation of collaborative drug therapy agreements.
6. Leadership positions within the clinical site, organization, or system.
7. Management of or service to specialty clinics focused on drug therapy.
8. Quality improvement activities including drug utilization reviews.

9. Recognition of service within the clinical site, organization, or system (e.g., awards, titles, employee-of the-month).
10. Other care site activities that directly or indirectly impact quality of patient care and outcomes.

#### **4. Community Service**

1. Administration of programs not affiliated with the University of Montana.
2. Membership and participation in civic organizations and activities.
3. Leadership positions within the service organizations.
4. Recognition of service from the community group (e.g., awards, honorary titles).

#### **D. PROFESSIONALISM**

Collegiality and professionalism can positively impact every faculty member's ability to achieve optimal success in teaching, scholarship, and service, and this can ultimately impact the Department's ability to achieve its goals. As such, collegial/professional behavior by faculty is an expected behavior that does not need to be documented in the IPR, and professionalism/collegiality will be presumed when there is a lack of evidence to show unprofessional/non-collegial behavior patterns.

The FEC should note in its report summary whether a faculty member has demonstrated a pattern of professional behavior during the period of time under review.

Examples of behavior patterns that indicate UNPROFESSIONAL behavior because they occur consistently are:

- Fails to volunteer when help is needed or requested.
- Refuses to participate in assigned task or workgroup.
- Disrespects the time of colleagues, staff and students.
- Refuses to provide advice or informal consultations to colleagues to promote collegial support at all levels.
- Refuses to serve as a peer evaluator for teaching or clinical activities.
- Fails to constructively participate in department discussions to ensure an issue is fully explored and the best options are identified.
- Interferes with other faculty members' work.
- Fails to support student-oriented School functions and student organization activities.
- Fails to respond in a timely manner to requests for information or input for department, school or college matters.



## V. EVALUATION PROCESS (CBA 10.100-.340)

### A. INDIVIDUAL PERFORMANCE RECORD- (IPR) – October 15

Documentation or evidence for an individual's performance will be provided by each faculty according to guidelines in the current CBA (CBA 10.210). The time period covered in the IPR will vary based on the evaluation need (e.g., normal versus merit versus promotion). The IPR and cover sheet for the evaluation packet should be submitted to the FEC via the Department administrative assistant no later than October 15.

**Normal (and Less-Than-Normal):** Submit one year of data for the previous academic year (Sept 1 through Aug 31) for assistant professors and non-tenure track faculty. Associate professors submit data for two years and full professors submit data for three years.

**Merit:** Submit data for all years since last merit award or promotion, i.e., submit data for the performance years that are being evaluated, or the most recent seven (7) sequential years. For the first merit request from an assistant professor, include all data since time hired. Include all previous recommendations from the SEC, FEC, Chair, Dean and Provost for the performance period under review prior to transmittal of the packet to the Dean.

**Promotion:** Submit data since date of hire for promotion from assistant to associate; otherwise, submit all data since last promotion or the most recent seven (7) sequential years. Include all previous recommendations from the SEC, FEC, Department Chair, Dean and Provost for the performance period under review prior to transmittal of the promotion packet to the Dean.

**Tenure:** Submit all data from the entire probationary period including credited prior service earned prior to appointment to a tenure-track position at UM. Include all previous recommendations from the SEC, FEC, Department Chair, Dean and Provost for the performance period under review prior to transmittal of the tenure packet to the Dean.

In addition to the IPR submitted by the faculty member, the FEC may receive solicited and unsolicited data relevant to an evaluation. The CBA (Articles 10.220 and 10.230) describes who may submit what, who may do so anonymously, and when the faculty member under review can see the additional information. The faculty member under review must be allowed to see the added information and be given appropriate time and opportunity to respond.

## VI. ANNUAL EVALUATION STEPS AND TIMELINES

The CBA Articles 10.200-10.240 outline the timelines and processes for the evaluation process. At each step in the process within the school, faculty being reviewed will be asked to read recommendations and sign that they have read them. The signature does not indicate agreement, rather, acknowledges that they have read and understand the recommendations. There is a brief, usually 10-day period, in which the faculty member may submit an appeal. These processes are described in the CBA for each of the following steps. Likewise, the CBA outlines when additional information may be solicited

and when a source is deemed confidential and what solicited or unsolicited documentation must be signed. The faculty member under review must be notified if additional information is added to their evaluation packet and given ample time to respond.

**A. STUDENT EVALUATION COMMITTEE (SEC) – October 15**

The role of the Student Evaluation Committee (SEC) is to summarize student feedback on teaching and advising. It does not consider unit standards or other faculty performance. The Department Chairperson shall approve the list of student volunteers who have agreed to serve on the SEC by September 15. The SEC shall perform its tasks according to guidelines in the current CBA (CBA 10.220). The SEC will include one faculty (tenured or tenurable) observer who shall enjoy all rights of full participation and access to information, except for voting privileges.

Each year, all faculty members in the unit should submit teaching evaluations for at least one course for each semester they teach regardless of whether they will be submitting an IPR for evaluation. Faculty shall submit their evaluations to the SEC by September 20.

Copies of the SEC reports will be made available before October 15 for faculty to read and then sign the SEC form to indicate they have read it. If a faculty member disagrees with the SEC report, they should follow the steps outlined in the CBA section 10.230 for response.

**B. FACULTY EVALUATION COMMITTEE (FEC) – November 15**

The role of the Faculty Evaluation Committee (FEC) is to compare submitted IPRs with the unit standards to provide peer evaluation of faculty performance. Evaluations are based on submitted IPRs, and if relevant, additional solicited/unsolicited information (see CBA 10.200-.240 for guidance).

The FEC shall consist of all Department faculty members (except the Chair and the Director of Student Services) and one pharmacy student observer. The FEC shall elect a new chair annually from among its members. The FEC meetings will be open to all faculty in the Department except for the person that is being evaluated. The FEC member being evaluated shall be excused from the meeting during his/her own evaluation unless that individual so chooses to be present. During the FEC meetings, anonymous ballots will be used to document decisions and to capture vote counts needed for merit decisions.

Per the current CBA Article 10.230, only tenured or tenure-track faculty are eligible to vote on tenure and promotion decisions. Senior faculty members should serve as primary reviewers for tenure and promotion packets. All members of the FEC will vote on all other decisions including merits.

One student observer shall be appointed by the chair of the FEC. The student observer shall be a pharmacy major in the professional curriculum. The student observer shall have full right of participation and access to information, except for the right to vote.

The committee shall:

1. Apply the unit standards to review the performance of faculty members in the Department and make a written recommendation with justification signed by the

FEC chairperson which shall, where appropriate, specifically address: 1) retention 2) salary increment 3) promotion, and 4) tenure but without priority ranking for merit decisions. This document will be forwarded to the Department Chair by November 15<sup>th</sup>. Prior to forwarding the Department chairperson, the FEC will provide each evaluated individual with a written copy of the FEC evaluation report. The faculty member will sign it to indicate that he/she read it. The faculty member may request to meet with the committee for further discussion of the recommendations.

2. Provide written justification for any recommendation for "less-than-normal."

The overall results of the FEC vote on a recommendation may be revealed to the faculty member concerned upon request to the FEC chair; however, no record or other information relative to an individual committee member's vote shall be provided.

All documentation related to each faculty member's evaluation must be relevant to the approved unit standards and shall be available for his or her review; the faculty member shall have the right to challenge any of the documented evidence. See CBA Section 10.230 for data and sources deemed relevant.

Evaluation of the Department Chair (CBA 16.240): The immediate past chair of the FEC will be responsible for conducting a separate evaluation of the Department Chair's administrative role. (See Section VI.E.)

### **C. DEPARTMENT CHAIR RECOMMENDATION - December 15**

The Department Chair will conduct a separate faculty member evaluation applying guidelines, standards and principles of the IPR, unit standards, SEC, and FEC recommendations. The performance evaluation of faculty members in the Department will result in the Chairperson making a written recommendation with justification signed by the Department Chair which shall, where appropriate, specifically address: 1) retention 2) salary increment 3) promotion, and 4) tenure. Further, the Chair recommendations will be presented to the faculty member such that they will read and sign that they have read it. (CBA Article 10.240) The Chair will also prepare and submit a list of all evaluation recommendations including a prioritized merit list that will be submitted to the Dean by December 15.

### **D. DEAN RECOMMENDATION – February 15**

Based on the CBA, unit standards, and the evaluation record, the Dean shall prepare an individual written evaluation and recommendation for each faculty member regarding 1) retention 2) salary increment 3) promotion, and 4) tenure where appropriate for the individual being considered. The Dean shall also prepare and forward a summary list of those he/she has recommended for promotion, merit, or tenure, respectively. The names of those recommended for merit increase shall be listed in order of priority by the Dean. On or before February 15, deans shall inform the faculty that merit rankings are available and shall provide individual rankings to specific faculty members at the request of the faculty member. Faculty who do not ultimately receive merit awards may appeal the dean's ranking if it can be demonstrated to have been in error based upon the criteria listed in CBA10.270, 10.280.

The Dean shall assure that the entire evaluation record, including the Dean's evidence, evaluation, recommendation, professional opinion, and priority ranking shall be forwarded to the Provost and each respective member by February 15. A copy of the Dean's evaluation shall be sent to the respective Department Chairpersons. Appeals to the Dean about any aspect of the evaluation record may be submitted in writing within 10 days of receiving the entire evaluation record. See CBA 10.270, 10-280 for details. Appeals occur between February 25 and March 12. By March 12, the Dean will grant or deny requested remedial action. The appeal process is described in CBA Article 10.280 Appeals Committee. For additional information about restraints on evaluation and appeals, please see the relevant article in the current CBA (Article 10.300).

#### **E. EVALUATION OF FACULTY MEMBER SERVING AS DEPARTMENT CHAIR**

The faculty member serving as the Department Chair will be evaluated in two separate processes – one for the faculty role and one for the administrative role. The faculty role related to teaching, service, scholarship will be evaluated according to these unit standards and as per CBA 10.00. The University Service section of the IPR should indicate the Department Chair appointment. See details in CBA Article 16.240. The administrative role of the Department Chair is subject to review at any time by the dean and will be evaluated in a separate process focusing on leadership and management in meeting the goals of the unit and fulfilling the duties as outlined in the CBA Article 16.220.

In addition to the Dean's review, the faculty and staff in the department will be given an opportunity to provide performance evaluations. Each fall, the immediate past chair of the FEC will gather feedback from faculty and staff, and then summarize the rating scores and collate verbatim comments into a single document. The process will result in a written evaluation report that will be made available to the Department Chair for review and clarification at least 10 days prior to forwarding it to the Dean. The Department Chair shall sign the evaluation report to acknowledge that it has been read without implication about the evaluation's validity.

Department faculty approval (by vote): 4/13/2020, final revision April 2020  
Effective Date: TBA

Unit Standards Approved:

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Dean, College of Health Professions and Biomedical Sciences      6/15/2020      date

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Chair, UM Unit Standards Committee      6/15/20      date

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Provost      5/25/2022      date

