

BINGHAMTON UNIVERSITY
STATE UNIVERSITY OF NEW YORK

**SCHOOL OF PHARMACY AND
PHARMACEUTICAL SCIENCES**

Bylaws

(draft)

Version Date: October 3, 2018

School of Pharmacy and Pharmaceutical Sciences

Bylaws

PREAMBLE

In accordance with the State University of New York Board of Trustees Policies: "Bylaws shall be consistent with and subject to the Policies of the Board of Trustees of State University of New York, the laws of the State of New York, and the provisions of agreements between the State of New York and the certified employee organization established pursuant to Article 14 of the Civil Service Law. Provisions of bylaws concerning consultation with the faculty shall be subject to the approval of the chief administrative officer of the school. All actions under bylaws shall be advisory upon the Chancellor and chief administrative officer of the school."

These bylaws are prepared for the internal governance of the Binghamton University School of Pharmacy and Pharmaceutical Sciences (SOPPS). No portion or provisions of these bylaws are intended to be superior to, or in conflict with, other binding governance documents including, but not limited to, the current Faculty Senate Bylaws of Binghamton University or the current Faculty-Staff Handbook of Binghamton University.

ARTICLE I.

DEFINITIONS

As used in the bylaws, the following means:

- A. Accreditation Council for Pharmacy Education (ACPE): The non-profit accreditation organization recognized by the Council on Higher Education Accreditation and the US Department of Education responsible for accrediting schools and programs offering the Doctor of Pharmacy (Pharm.D.) degree.
- B. Pharmacy Leadership Team: The committee provides overall direction for the School of Pharmacy and Pharmaceutical Sciences. The team consists of the Dean, all Associate and Assistant Deans, all Department Chairs, a student representative (the Student Dean), and the Speaker of the Faculty Council.
- C. Dean: Refers to the person or persons designated by the President of Binghamton University to administer the School of Pharmacy and Pharmaceutical Sciences.
- D. Departments: The academic units of the School of Pharmacy and Pharmaceutical Sciences, including the respective programs, faculty, and professional and classified staff members.
- E. Department Chair or Director: The person who exercises general administrative responsibilities for a department or specific functional group. The Chair or Director serves as the chief administrator of that academic department or functional group. The appointment of Chair or Director is made in accordance with Binghamton University Faculty Bylaws IV.A.3.a.:

“Department Chairpersons and Program Directors shall be appointed by the President in accordance with the Policies of the Board of Trustees. To assist the President in selecting such officers, the department or program shall institute appropriate consultative procedures. The term of office shall be three years and renewable. Whenever such an officer is not in residence or cannot serve for any reason, an acting Chairperson or Director shall be appointed in accordance with the above procedures.”

- F. Student Advisory Committee: As described in the Faculty Bylaws, this committee shall consist of no more than eight students from the declared majors and/or graduate students within the SOPPS. The membership and method of election will be determined by the student government. This charge of this committee includes, but is not limited to, preparing reports on the teaching effectiveness and student-teacher relations when requested by the chairperson of an Initiating Personnel Committee (IPC).
- G. Voting Faculty: Voting faculty shall include the following: members of the academic staff with an administrative home in the School of Pharmacy and Pharmaceutical Sciences, who provide at least fifty percent (50%) of their activities to the School of Pharmacy and Pharmaceutical Sciences, have academic or qualified academic rank, and have either a continuing or term appointment as defined in the Policies of the Board of Trustees. School of Pharmacy and Pharmaceutical Sciences-appointed Bartle faculty and Professors of Practice shall have voting privileges as described in Article III Section II of these bylaws.
- H. Voting Staff: Voting staff are professional and classified staff, who provide full-time service to the School of Pharmacy and Pharmaceutical Sciences.
- I. Voting Members: Voting members shall include Voting Faculty, and Voting Staff.
- J. Quorum. Unless defined specifically elsewhere in these by-laws, a quorum for any faculty or committee meetings requires a simple majority of the voting membership. Member attendance by phone or video conference is allowable, except for instances where the committee chair determines, in advance, that confidential discussions should preclude phone or video conferencing. The chair makes this determination when the meeting agenda is disseminated, and no less than forty-eight (48) hours prior to the start of the meeting. A voting member on leave or otherwise unavailable to vote shall be excluded from the calculation of quorum. Voting members who abstain are treated (for purposes of decision making) as not voting.
- K. In residence. Members *in residence* refers to School of Pharmacy and Pharmaceutical Sciences faculty and staff whose duty assignments require their presence on campus, primarily within the School of Pharmacy and Pharmaceutical Sciences physical facilities. (e.g. Pharmacy experiential preceptors, while they may be considered faculty, are not considered to be *in residence* but Clinical faculty with a clinical site are considered *in residence*).
- L. Department Bylaws: Academic departments may establish bylaws that govern departmental decision-making not covered in these bylaws.

- M. Presiding Officer: The Dean or his/her designated representatives shall preside over all official meetings of the Pharmacy Leadership Team.
- N. Academic Year: The academic year is set by the Office of the Provost and Executive Vice President for Academic Affairs.
- O. Faculty Council: Consists of all members in residence, voting and non-voting, of the SOPPS faculty.

ARTICLE II.

STAFFING

I. Leadership and Membership

- A. Leadership: A Dean leads the School of Pharmacy and Pharmaceutical Sciences. When there is a vacancy in the position of the Dean, the Provost initiates procedures with a Search Committee to select a new Dean.
- B. Departmental and Program Leadership: The appointment of Chair or Director is made in accordance with Binghamton University Faculty Bylaws IV.A.3.a.:

“Department Chairpersons and Program Directors shall be appointed by the President in accordance with the Policies of the Board of Trustees. To assist the President in selecting such officers, the department or program shall institute appropriate consultative procedures. The term of office shall be three years and renewable. Whenever such an officer is not in residence or cannot serve for any reason, an acting Chairperson or Director shall be appointed in accordance with the above procedures.”

- C. Faculty Recruitment: The Dean instructs each department to develop a process for faculty recruitment. When faculty vacancies occur, the Dean defines positions with faculty consultation, provides approval to hire a faculty member with the designated qualifications, and enables the department chair to form a search committee. Department chairs and directors make faculty hiring recommendations to the Dean or his or her designee.

Faculty appointments are made in accordance with Binghamton University Faculty Bylaws (Article VII; Title E; Section 1.b.)

*“In cases of initial appointments to the rank of associate professor or full professor, or any changes from a qualified to an unqualified title at these ranks (**Approved by faculty in mail ballot in May 2005**), and any appointments with tenure, recommendations will be submitted to the President by the IPC, the Chairperson, and the Dean or Director. In cases of non-concurrence between any of these parties, or requests for consultation by any of these parties, the appropriate UPC shall review the case and submit a formal report and recommendation to the President.”*

ARTICLE III.

DUTIES AND RESPONSIBILITIES OF VOTING MEMBERS

I. Legislative Powers

The *voting faculty* of the School of Pharmacy and Pharmaceutical Sciences, operating through the *Faculty Council*, has the power to legislate as necessary to meet its responsibilities to initiate, develop, and implement the curriculum and educational policies of the School in accordance with the policies of the Board of Trustees. This responsibility is met largely through the election of members to faculty committees.

The *voting members* of the Faculty Council have the power to legislate as necessary to meet its responsibilities to initiate, develop, and implement all *other* activities of the School in accordance with the policies of the Board of Trustees.

II. Responsibilities

The *voting faculty* is responsible, individually and collectively, for the initiation, development and implementation of the curriculum and educational policies of the School of Pharmacy and Pharmaceutical Sciences. These responsibilities, in accordance with the policies of the Board of Trustees, include:

- Maintenance of academic requirements, including requirements for admission subject to Binghamton University's obligation to SUNY and the accreditation requirements of the ACPE
- Recommendations for granting degrees
- Development and implementation of the educational programs of the School
- Conduct of the instructional, research, and service programs of the School of Pharmacy and Pharmaceutical Sciences.

The *voting members* of the Faculty Council, individually and collectively, participate significantly in the initiation, development and implementation of all other activities of the School in accordance with the policies of the Board of Trustees, including:

- Activities related to the recruitment and retention of students
- Establishment and maintenance of strong relationships with the community
- Recommendations regarding the governing structure of the School

ARTICLE IV.

ORGANIZATION AND OPERATING PROCEDURES

I. Organization

A. Organizational Structure: The School of Pharmacy and Pharmaceutical Sciences is organized into departments, and stand-alone organizational units reporting to the Office of the Dean.

B. Component Descriptions:

Office of the Dean: The Office of the Dean is comprised of the Dean, the Associate Dean for Academic Affairs and Assessment, the Assistant Dean for Operations and Finance, the Assistant Dean for Student Affairs, and the Director of Assessment. The Dean represents the School to the Provost and the University Administration. The Dean is responsible for establishing the vision for the School, recommending hires to the Provost and President, and for the School's administration, including all budget planning. The Dean coordinates the administration of the School with input from the Pharmacy Leadership Team and ensures that all accreditation requirements are met.

Pharmacy Leadership Team: The committee provides overall direction for the School of Pharmacy and Pharmaceutical Sciences. The team consists of the Dean, all Associate and Assistant Deans, all Department Chairs, a student representative (the Student Dean), and the Speaker of the Faculty Council.

II. Faculty Council

A. Meetings: The Speaker of the Council is elected by secret ballot for a term of no less than two years. The Speaker calls a meeting of the members on at least a semester basis.

B. Agenda: The agenda for regular or special meetings is announced, and distributed to the members at least forty-eight (48) hours in advance of the meeting. Any waiver of the forty-eight (48) hour rule requires the affirmative vote of at least two-thirds (2/3) of the voting members in residence.

C. Quorum: See the definition of a quorum in Article I.i above.

D. Voting and Decision Making: Decision-making responsibilities of voting members are defined in Article III (above). Decisions are based on the choice of the majority of those voting provided that a quorum is present. Voting members who abstain are treated (for purposes of decision making) as not voting.

E. Meeting Secretary: The Secretary of the Council is elected by secret ballot for a term of no less than two years. The secretary distributes meeting agendas, attends regular and special meetings, drafts and publishes approved minutes.

F. School Minutes: Minutes of each meeting are presented, edited, amended from the floor at the next meeting, and if approved by the voting members, signed by the Meeting Secretary and distributed to the members. The Meeting Secretary maintains permanent files of these minutes.

- G. Meeting Procedures: Meetings are conducted using Robert’s Rules of Order. The Dean reports to each session of the Faculty Council in order to keep the faculty informed of matters that affect the school both from within and without.

ARTICLE V.

FACULTY COMMITTEES

Faculty members exercise their governance responsibilities through the Faculty Council and the work of committees. Committees may be standing (permanent) or ad hoc (temporary). Standing committees primarily address matters related to academic affairs, faculty governance, and accreditation standards. Except where otherwise noted, committees make recommendations related to their charge to the Faculty Council and the Pharmacy Leadership Team. All faculty committees are chaired by a voting-eligible faculty member. Committee Chairs are elected by voting members of the committee prior to the beginning of the academic year. All full-time faculty with voting privileges are eligible to serve on faculty committees, except where otherwise noted. Faculty representation on faculty committees is determined by election with final appointment by the Dean. Ad hoc committees shall prescribe their functions within the motions creating them, and within the limitations of the policies of the Board of Trustees and these bylaws.

Appointment periods on the committees are for three (3) years, and staggered to ensure both continuity and turnover of committee membership. To the extent possible, membership on a committee should not exceed six (6) years, but a longer service period is not precluded by this guideline. *Ex officio* members of committees serve without voting.

During the initial start-up years, some faculty committees may be temporarily combined (e.g. the Curriculum and Assessment Committees) in order to facilitate continuous communication relating to all areas of faculty governance supporting accreditation standards.

I. Standing Committees

- A. Pharmacy Leadership Team: Defined in Article I.B. above.
- B. Admissions Committee:
1. Charge: This committee is responsible for the acceptance of students into the School of Pharmacy and Pharmaceutical Sciences. Further, this committee oversees the recruitment and admissions process of the School and makes recommendations on the policies and procedures for admissions - in accordance with current ACPE standards. The committee ensures that the credentials of the candidates for admission are reviewed appropriately, that candidates are interviewed in a timely fashion, and that admissions policies are followed. The committee works closely with the Office of Student Affairs and Admissions of the School and the Graduate Admissions Office of the University.

2. Staffing: The committee is chaired by a member of the faculty and membership will include a minimum of five (5) faculty members (including the Chair), two (2) student representatives (voting) from any of the pharmacy classes P1 through P3, the Assistant Dean for Student Affairs or a designated representative from the Office of Student Affairs and Admissions (*ex officio*), and one (1) preceptor (*ex officio*). In addition, an alternate faculty member may be named to the committee to serve in the case that a regular faculty member is unable to attend a meeting.
3. Processes: When the screening/interviewing process has been completed, the committee votes on the acceptance of each candidate. Committee decisions and recommendations are reported to the Faculty Council, Pharmacy Leadership Team, and the Dean.

C. Curriculum Committee (CC):

1. Charge: This committee is charged with developing educational objectives and policies as well as acting on curricular review performed by the Assessment and Evaluation Committee, and also provides advice to the Dean on accreditation issues. The CC is responsible for curricular development, implementation, and the continuous quality improvement of the curriculum. The CC bases the curriculum and educational policies on current accreditation standards and on School of Pharmacy and Pharmaceutical Sciences/Binghamton University policies.

The CC and consequently the PharmD curriculum is under full faculty governance. Specifically, CC membership is decided by the Faculty Council via faculty vote. Membership is then forwarded to the Dean for review and dissemination.

A large portion of the courses in our curriculum are integrated across at least two of three departments and thus is interdisciplinary or transdisciplinary in nature. Therefore, courses needed to fulfill the accreditor mandated curriculum are developed by all three departments at a school-level and voted on for approval by the CC. Electives are designed to augment the accreditor-required curricular content and are based on contemporary and specialty pharmacy practice, topical areas in health-related research and professional development are designed at both a department and a school level; they are voted on first at the department level and finally by the CC.

2. Specific responsibilities of the CC include, but are not limited to:
 - a. Reviewing course content and optimizing course sequencing and integration over the entire curriculum.
 - b. Mapping curricular content to School intermediate (ACPE pre-APPE competencies) and terminal outcomes (CAPE educational outcomes) as well as ACPE standards, NAPLEX, and MPJE content outlines and outcomes in collaboration with the Assessment and Evaluation Committee.
 - c. Establishing and verifying the use of a uniform course syllabus across the Pharmacy program curriculum.

- d. Using data from the Assessment Committee, course review processes, and other means such as OSCEs to guide curricular modifications.
 - e. Reviewing and approving elective and new course proposals and new curricular initiatives.
 - f. Addressing student and faculty complaints or concerns regarding the curriculum.
 - g. Ensuring student course load is reasonable and balanced across the curriculum.
 - h. Ensuring proven teaching and learning methods are used within courses; including an appropriate level of active learning within each course.
 - i. Initiating trial and evaluation of innovative teaching and learning methods to encourage continuous quality improvement of curricular delivery and optimal learning.
3. Staffing: The committee is chaired by a member of the faculty and membership includes a minimum of five (5) faculty members (including the Chair), one or more of which is also a member of the Assessment Committee and two (2) student representatives (voting) from any of the pharmacy classes P1 through P3. In addition, an alternate faculty member may be named to the committee to serve in the case that a regular faculty member is unable to attend a meeting. Faculty representation comes from all three departments: Pharmacy Practice, Pharmaceutical Sciences, and Health Outcomes and Administrative Sciences. To ensure that the didactic curriculum prepares students for the experiential curriculum, one (1) faculty member from the Office of Experiential Education is a voting member of the CC. The Associate Dean for Academic Affairs and Assessment serves *ex officio*.
 4. Processes: The Chair of the CC is responsible for the preparation of minutes, actions of various decisions, and action items taken by the CC. This information is disseminated to the Faculty Council, Department Chairs, and the Pharmacy Leadership Team. Opportunities for continuous curricular quality improvement is an agenda item at CC meetings.
- D. Assessment and Evaluation Committee (AEC):
1. Charge: The committee is charged with the design, management, and oversight of the programmatic, student, and curricular assessment and evaluation processes, in accordance with all applicable accreditation standards. To ensure continuous quality improvement, the AEC will carry out the responsibilities below on a continuous basis.

The AEC and consequently the assessment and evaluation of the PharmD program is under full faculty governance. Assessment and evaluation plans (curricular, learning outcomes and programmatic) are shared with the entire faculty and their input is sought. Assessment and evaluation updates are periodically presented to the full faculty. Specifically, AEC membership is decided by the Faculty Council via faculty vote. Membership is then forwarded to the Dean for review and dissemination.

As mentioned under the section on the Curriculum Committee (CC), courses are developed at both a school and department level. Within the course syllabi, assessments are described in detail.

Specific responsibilities of the AEC include, but are not limited to:

- a. Reviewing course assessment data to ensure student achievement of learning outcomes in collaboration with the Curriculum Committee.
 - b. Mapping curricular content to School intermediate (ACPE pre-APPE competencies) and terminal outcomes (CAPE educational outcomes) as well as ACPE standards, NAPLEX, and MPJE content outlines and outcomes in collaboration with the Curriculum Committee.
 - c. Reviewing resource allocation across content based on the entire curriculum and recommending modifications as needed.
 - d. Reviewing established courses and curricular tracks on a regular basis to ensure appropriate content delivery and to provide an opportunity for continuous quality improvement. This process includes, but is not limited to: review of syllabus, learning objectives, course outline, course content, teaching methods and assessment measures, course materials provided by course coordinators, and appropriateness of credit hours.
 - e. Implementing an assessment plan that measures curricular delivery and providing this input to individual course faculty and the curriculum committee to act upon for continuous quality improvement of curricular delivery.
 - f. Implementing an assessment plan that measures student academic achievement of learning outcomes throughout the curriculum using both direct and indirect measures.
 - g. Implementing an assessment plan to review faculty, staff and administration performance in relation to student achievement of learning outcomes and programmatic goals.
 - h. Implementing an assessment plan to review preceptor and experiential site quality and effectiveness in collaboration with the Office of Experiential Education.
 - i. Administering, collecting, analyzing and acting upon key stakeholder feedback. Examples include: student satisfaction surveys, employer surveys, AACP surveys (graduating student, preceptor, faculty and alumni) and input from the Dean's Advisory Council.
 - j. Providing feedback about curricular and programmatic assessment to key stakeholders on a regular basis.
2. Staffing: The committee is chaired by a member of the faculty and membership includes a minimum of five (5) faculty members (including the Chair) and two (2) student representatives (voting) from any of the pharmacy classes P1 through P4. In addition, an alternate faculty member may be named to the committee to serve in the case that a regular faculty member is unable to attend a meeting. A quorum is defined as per Article I.I above. Member attendance by phone/video conference is allowable, and described in Article I.I above. The Associate Dean for Academic Affairs and Assessment as well as the Director of Assessment serve *ex officio*.
3. Processes: The Chair of the AEC is responsible for the preparation of minutes, actions of various decisions, and action items taken by the committee. Committee decisions and recommendations are reported to the Faculty Council, Pharmacy Leadership Team, and the Dean.

E. Committee on Awards and Progression (CAP):

1. Charge: The Committee is charged with assessing student academic progress, scholarship, professionalism, recommendations for academic and/or disciplinary sanctions, student recognition and awards. The Committee also conducts student hearings of academic and/or disciplinary sanctions as specified in the approved SOPPS Academic Integrity, Professionalism Policy or Student Handbook. The Committee evaluates information from all appropriate sources concerning each student's progress and makes recommendations for appropriate action and dispositions to the Associate Dean for Academic Affairs and Assessment. The committee, in conjunction with the Office of Student Affairs (OSA), makes recommendations for student honors, awards and all other monetary or other forms of recognition based on qualifications. CAP will be informed of mid-semester grades by OSA and the Associate Dean for Academic Affairs and Assessment, and will convene at the end of each semester, at the end of summer Pharmacy Practice Experiences, and as needed.
2. Staffing: The Committee is chaired by a member of the faculty and membership includes a minimum of five (5) faculty members (including the Chair) and two (2) student representatives (voting) from any of the pharmacy classes P1 through P3. In addition, an alternate faculty member may be named to the committee to serve in the case that a regular faculty member is unable to attend a meeting. Faculty from each of the three Departments will serve on the Committee at one time. Member attendance by phone/video conference is allowable when discussing policy, awards and student conduct (academic and/or professional), and all members of the Committee can vote on these actions, unless there is a conflict of interest. Access to any action affecting a student's academic standing and progression shall be limited to only faculty members of the committee. This includes, the discussion prior to a vote, the actual voting and the result of the vote. Minutes of meetings where these actions are taken shall be available only to faculty members. The Assistant Dean for Student Affairs or a designated representative from OSA serves *ex officio*. The Associate Dean for Academic Affairs and Assessment also serves *ex officio*.
3. Processes: The Chair of CAP is responsible for the preparation of minutes, actions of various decisions, and action items taken by the Committee. Committee decisions and recommendations are reported to the Associate Dean for Academic Affairs and Assessment, OSA, Pharmacy Leadership Team and the Dean of SOPPS. Awards and scholarship decisions are also reported to the Faculty Council.

F. Student Grievance Committee:

1. Charge: The committee is charged with hearing student grievances or complaints related to: academics or policies as described in the approved SOPPS Student Handbook, or matters pertaining to ACPE standards or ACPE policies and procedures. The Committee also evaluates academic appeals of grades which are made in accordance with the procedures described in the approved SOPPS Student Handbook. Students may make a formal written appeal or complaint to the Grievance Committee following the procedures outlined in the SOPPS Student Handbook. The

committee evaluates information from all appropriate sources concerning student grievances or complaints and makes recommendations for appropriate action.

2. Staffing: The committee is chaired by a member of the faculty and membership includes a minimum of five (5) faculty members (including the Chair) and two (2) student representatives (voting) from any of the pharmacy classes P1 through P3. In addition, an alternate faculty member may be named to the committee to serve in the case that a regular faculty member is unable to attend a meeting, or in the case of a conflict of interest. The Associate Dean for Academic Affairs and Assessment also serves *ex officio*.
3. Processes: The Chair of the Grievance Committee is responsible for the preparation of minutes, actions of various decisions, and action items taken by the committee. Recommendations by this committee are reported to the Pharmacy Leadership Team, Associate Dean for Academic Affairs and Assessment, Assistant Dean for Student Affairs, and the Dean. The Student Handbook also includes information and directions for students to be able to convey concerns related to the standards or the policies and procedures of ACPE at the School directly to the ACPE.

II. Ad Hoc Committees

The Faculty Council or the Pharmacy Leadership team may create ad hoc committees, within the limitations of the Board of Trustees and these bylaws. The charge, function, and duration of these committee activities are described in the motion that creates them. The chair of an ad hoc committee presents a written report by the last day of obligation of each academic year (as established by the Provost), or if the ad hoc committee is dissolved within the academic year, a final report is presented to the Dean not later than thirty (30) working days following its dissolution.

ARTICLE VI.

APPOINTMENTS, PROMOTION, AND TENURE

The School of Pharmacy and Pharmaceutical Sciences maintains both tenure/tenure-track positions (also referred to as “unqualified” or “academic rank” appointments) and non-tenure-track appointments (also referred to as “qualified academic rank” appointments). Academic rank appointments include titles with the rank of Instructor, Assistant Professor, Associate Professor, or Full Professor. Qualified faculty appointments use the same titles but are preceded by the words “Clinical” or “Research” (e.g. - Clinical Assistant Professor, Research Associate Professor, etc.) or lecturer.

While it is expected that promotion in the qualified ranks follows the same process as tenure track appointments, criteria for promotion may differ. To minimize ambiguity, all appointees are provided with either a written copy of these by-laws and promotion guidelines, or with the appropriate URL where such information is located. Thereafter, all appointees are informed of any changes in the promotion process in the same manner.

The procedures pertaining to faculty personnel actions including recruitment, appointments, and evaluations are described in detail in the Binghamton University Faculty-Staff Handbook and can be accessed below:

<https://www.binghamton.edu/academics/provost/faculty-staff-handbook/index.html>

The policies described below support the standards and values of the School of Pharmacy and Pharmaceutical Sciences, augmenting those contained in the Faculty-Staff Handbook and in the review timetable generated by the Provost's office. In cases of conflict, the policies of Binghamton University and the State University of New York take precedence. Faculty Members are encouraged to review the current Faculty Personnel Policies and Procedures (Section IV) of the Faculty-Staff Handbook available at:

<https://www.binghamton.edu/academics/provost/faculty-staff-handbook/handbook-iv.html#A5>

Further, the procedures described in these by-laws address the following requirements as stated in the current Binghamton University Faculty-Staff Handbook:

“Article VII. Title E.1.a of the Faculty Bylaws requires that the manner in which each academic subdivision handles appointments below the rank of associate professor, all visiting appointments, and changes from a qualified (non-tenure/tenure-track position such as a clinical or research appointment) to an academic rank (tenure/tenure-track) title, shall be specified in its Bylaws. Recommendations from academic subdivisions shall be submitted to the president through the dean or director.”

I. The Initiating Personnel Committee (IPC) for the School of Pharmacy and Pharmaceutical Sciences Personnel Reviews

A. Overview:

Every mandated personnel review and those non-mandated cases advanced by a faculty member are considered by the IPC. The SOPPS utilizes school-wide IPCs rather than academic department based IPCs.

B. Composition of the SOPPS Initiating Personnel Committee (IPC):

1. Membership of Senior Personnel Committees

All full professors who are voting faculty shall serve on the Senior Personnel Committee to consider cases of professors and associate professors, except when their own case is being considered. Bartle Professors holding the title of full professor, who agree to serve on this committee during a given academic year, and within a five-year limit from the date of appointment as Bartle Professor, shall do so. *(Approved by faculty in mail ballot in April 1997)* In instances where five *(Approved by faculty in mail ballot in October 2008)* members of the Senior Personnel Committee cannot be drawn from within the academic subdivision, the committee shall be constituted to provide a majority of *(Approved by faculty in mail ballot in October 2008)* a combination of full and associate professors from within that academic subdivision who are voting faculty with at least two semesters of academic service at this University; the associate professors to be elected by the faculty of the academic subdivision; the remaining seats to be filled by full professors from other academic subdivisions at this University appointed by the Provost after

consultation with the faculty of the academic subdivision in which the case is being heard and the appropriate UPC* (see Title D). The Committee shall be formed by the Provost after consultation with the faculty of the academic subdivision in which the case is being heard when the inclusion of the sum of full and associate professors eligible to serve is fewer (*Approved by faculty in mail ballot in October 2008*) than three.

* University Personnel Committee

<https://www.binghamton.edu/academics/provost/faculty-staff-handbook/handbook-iv.html>

2. Membership of Junior Personnel Committees:

All full professors and associate professors who are voting faculty shall serve on the Junior Personnel Committee to consider cases of those below the rank of associate professor. Bartle Professors holding the title of full professor or associate professor who agree to serve on the Committee during a given academic year, and within a 5-year limit from the date of appointment as Bartle Professor, shall do so. (*Approved by faculty in mail ballot in April 1997*) An academic subdivision which has fewer than five qualified members available shall notify the Provost, who shall then appoint (*in consultation with the Dean per an agreement dated February 17, 2014*), after consultation with the faculty, the number necessary to make up the minimum complement of five voting members. In cases where no member of an academic subdivision is eligible for service on a Junior Personnel Committee, the members of that subdivision shall elect from among themselves a person who shall serve as the chairperson-without-vote of the Junior Personnel Committee in question.

Department Chairs are members of the IPC and are able to serve as IPC Chair, but do not vote on personnel cases originating in their respective departments.

C. Officers:

The Office of the Dean schedules the first meeting of the IPC for the purpose of having the IPC elect a member of the committee to act as Chair and a member to act as faculty Secretary for each candidate case.

1. IPC Secretary:

The IPC elects a Secretary to keep such records as the committee designates and prepares the committee's final report.

2. IPC Chair:

The chairperson is elected by secret ballot from the committee's membership and presides, with vote, at committee meetings. The chairperson of a departmentalized academic subdivision may be elected to chair an IPC, but serves without vote. The chairperson of an IPC is not present when his or her own case is being considered. The IPC Chair is responsible for scheduling subsequent meetings, and ensuring that deadlines are met for completion of tasks. The IPC Chair presides, with vote, at committee meetings except in cases where the chair of the candidate's department is selected to serve as IPC Chair, in which case that person serves without vote. The IPC Chair serves

as a liaison between the IPC and the candidate. Duties include advising the candidate on processes and procedures involved in the preparation and organization of folder materials, the timeline for review, and the options for response to reports submitted at different stages in the review process. For each personnel case, the IPC Chair appoints a sub-committee of IPC members with familiarity of the candidate's research, teaching, and service records to assist the IPC in evaluating the candidate's record and in preparing the Secretary's report. The IPC chair may serve on this sub-committee.

D. Guidelines for Review and Recommendations:

1. Overview:

The School of Pharmacy and Pharmaceutical Sciences is a departmentalized school composed of units that are closely aligned with a similar commitment to the Doctor of Pharmacy degree and related doctoral programs. In respect to the variety of standards, the Department Chair, the IPC, and the Dean refer to the definitions and demonstration criteria of scholarship, teaching, and service as determined by the School of Pharmacy and Pharmaceutical Sciences and Binghamton University, unless these conflict with University standards. All reviewers are expected to evaluate the quality, significance, and process of scholarship, teaching, service and overall continuing growth based on the evidence presented. Departmental criteria and an explanation of the unique mission of the school are provided to all external reviewers.

2. Integration of research, teaching, and service:

Nationally recognized colleges and universities increasingly acknowledge that faculty research should not be evaluated in isolation. As a School committed to research, faculty-scholarship, teaching, and service are expected to be often (although not always) interwoven. Teaching and rigorous scholarship are essential. Service and research should be shared and integrated into one's teaching. Service activities and innovative teaching practices should generate research questions, grant activity, publications and presentations. In all cases, University Personnel Committee guidelines are followed.

II. **Promotion and Tenure Guidelines**

Promotion and tenure decisions for Academic Rank and Qualified Academic Rank include evidence of scholarship, teaching and service. In addition, promotion and continuation decisions include evidence of clinical service. More detailed guidance for promotion, tenure, and continuation decisions accompany these bylaws as appendices. These general guidelines are developed and adhere to university guidelines, and include the following for consideration:

A. Scholarship:

Scholarship is assessed by considering a number of different sources of evidence. Primary among them are an active research agenda that must include evidence of extramural and/or other grant funding, and publications in inter/national, peer-reviewed journals. Secondary evidence includes

paper presentations, panel/symposium participation, invitations to speak, etc. at inter/national, or state conferences/meetings, authoring/editing scholarly books and chapters, and other scholarly documents/materials/contributions pertinent to practice and/or research program. The scholarship of teaching is considered as an active research agenda, providing it meets the same criteria of publication and grant funding as other types of research agendas.

Candidates are expected to demonstrate ongoing participation in an active research program that follows a cohesive agenda. Evidence of the quality and significance of grant funding and scholarship includes publication in scholarly books and highly regarded journals, creation/design and application of innovative conceptual/methodological approaches, and extension of the knowledge base in the candidate's field or specialty.

B. Teaching:

High quality teaching is expected of candidates with teaching obligations for contract renewal and tenure and promotion in the School of Pharmacy and Pharmaceutical Sciences. Teaching is broadly defined, going beyond actual classroom instruction, to include experiential supervision and instruction, advising, supervision of student projects/research, and other activities. Faculty with teaching obligations are expected to demonstrate a commitment to continual improvement of teaching. Evidence to support the quality, significance, and process of teaching includes peer observations, student surveys, mid- and end- of course student evaluations, self-assessments, and other forms of assessment documentation. Evidence of student learning outcome achievement should be gathered by the candidate and are systematically evaluated.

C. Service:

As a School committed to the profession of Pharmacy, it is expected that faculty engage in service to the community, the university, and the profession. Each department defines community engagement broadly. While it is expected that faculty engage in community service locally, evidence of engagement also includes service in other parts of the state, country and world. In addition to a broad definition of the location for service, faculty engage in a breadth of service activities. Appropriate departmental, college, and university service includes serving on/or chairing committees, serving on boards, consulting with community organizations or for governmental agencies, program development and/or evaluation, providing direct services, participating or leading community-based research or service efforts, and other related activities. Appropriate professional service could also include review of papers for journals, abstracts or content for professional conferences, and/or leadership in professional organizations.

Evidence to support the quality, significance, and processes for service might include, but are not limited to, letters from groups relevant to the candidate's scholarly focus, demonstrated impact on populations of interest, and the value of service activities as measured by changes at an individual, organizational, or community level.

Service may take many forms and may support a faculty member's scholarship and be integrated into research and teaching. In documenting a record of service, School faculty members should be able to

articulate the relevance of service contributions to their own scholarly focus, in addition to contributions to the SOPPS governance.

D. Clinical Practice: (Qualified Academic Rank only)

Development and maintenance of a state of the art clinical practice for both educating students and contributing to the care of patients is a hallmark responsibility of clinical pharmacy faculty. In addition, as a member of Binghamton University SOPPS faculty, promotion and continuation criteria will include evidence of strides towards achieving our mission “to transform human health locally and globally.” This may include evidence of program or service improvements within institutions where faculty practice such as the development of new pharmaceutical care clinics/activities (e.g. implementation of MTM services or improvements in antimicrobial stewardship programs) or improvements in patient health outcomes such as decreasing length of stay, preventing readmissions, and improving rates of attainment of patient health goals such as blood pressure, lipid levels, or hemoglobin A1C levels.

III. The Process for consideration for promotion and/or tenure

A. Overview:

The process for review consists of a series of semi-independent, cumulative reviews of the candidate record.

B. Submission of Candidate Materials:

The candidate makes the materials available to the IPC Chair. Materials are submitted according to dates set in the Provost’s Guidelines. The following materials are required for submission:

- a vita (following the Faculty Senate Bylaws IPC Vita Guidelines)
- syllabi and evaluations for all courses (Student evaluations and/or department-developed course evaluations are strongly recommended as part of course evaluations.)
- statement on teaching philosophy including a self-assessment of teaching in relation to teaching philosophy and goals. Documentation of peer-teaching evaluations are also included and should inform the candidate’s reflection in their teaching philosophy. Information also includes how feedback from students (performance on tests, student evaluations of the course, etc.) has been used to improve teaching and/or student learning.
- statement on service including a description of the ways in which service contributes or has contributed to teaching and research endeavors
- full copies of all publications
- research agenda describing background and trajectory, and including details of peer-reviewed publications, Hirsch or h-index, and grant activity
- other supporting materials (e.g. letters or evaluations from clinical site directors)

Candidate statements explicitly address how the research, teaching, and service activities support the mission of the department, the School, and Binghamton University. These statements provide evidence of the quality and significance of professional activities performed.

Candidates are encouraged to consult with a mentor, department chair, and/or current IPC Chair and to review the following:

- Procedures for Personnel Cases available on the Provost's website at:
<http://www2.binghamton.edu/academics/provost/faculty/index.html>
- The Faculty ByLaws available online at:
<http://www2.binghamton.edu/faculty-senate/faculty-bylaws.html>
- Criteria established by SOPPS for more information on the types of materials to submit
See Appendices

C. Student Input:

In the semester before a formal review, the student advisory committee is notified of all faculty under consideration for contract renewal, promotion, and/or tenure. The student advisory committee solicits input from students and alumni who are familiar with the faculty member and prepares a report summarizing the received student and alumni input. This process may be assisted and supported by the Office of the Dean, and/or the Office of Student Affairs and Admissions, and may be conducted through an electronic survey process. -The summary report of input is provided to the faculty member who then has five (5) business days to prepare a written response. The student report and, if applicable, the faculty member's response, is forwarded to the department chair and the chair of the IPC, and is also appended to the IPC report.

D. External Reviews:

External reviews apply only for Tenure and Promotion reviews; they are not required for contract renewal cases.

1. Selection of External Reviewers:

In the semester before a formal review, candidates submit the names of four (4) or more individuals who could function as external reviewers. The IPC selects one (1) person from the candidate's list of external reviewers. The remaining external reviewers are selected from a list prepared by the IPC. Neutrality of these reviewers is assured. The reviewers may not be co-authors, dissertation committee chairs, or dissertation committee members. The department chair requests external review letters from a sufficient number of individuals to ensure that a minimum of four (4) external reviews are received by the IPC. In selecting external reviewers, the IPC identifies individuals who are "noted scholars" from "comparable institutions," usually based on Carnegie rankings and similar commitment to applied or community-based research.

2. External Review Materials:

In the semester before a candidate's formal review for tenure and promotion, the candidate submits a packet of materials to the department chair that is shared with external reviewers. This packet includes: a CV, a statement of philosophy on the intersection of the research, teaching and service activities, an explanation of the background and intended research trajectory, and copies of three (3) scholarly works.

3. Confidentiality:

The IPC adheres to University requirements regarding the confidentiality of external reviews as specified in the faculty by-laws and the Provost's procedures

E. Initiating Personnel Committee (IPC) Review and Report.

The IPC reviews candidate materials, student advisory committee reports, and, where applicable, external reviews. The IPC is also guided by the faculty by-laws and Provost's procedures with respect to additional materials submitted for review. The IPC discusses each case, votes on it, and prepares a report. In promotion and tenure cases, separate votes are taken on promotion and tenure. IPC votes are taken by secret ballot. If a qualified faculty member does not attend any meeting of the IPC or SPC, does not review records and does not vote, in transmitting the vote, that action is recorded by the chair as a non-participatory abstention. The results of the vote are a part of the Committee's report and recommendation.

The IPC Secretary prepares a written report for each candidate including the recommendation of the committee, the final vote, and all supporting documentation. The IPC report is drafted by the IPC Secretary and reviewed by the committee members. In promotion and tenure cases, where the report may be considerably more detailed than those prepared for contract renewal, the IPC may decide to have separate members of the committee draft sections of the report. In such cases, the IPC Secretary is responsible for compiling the sections into a single cohesive document. When the report reflects the assessment of the IPC, a hard copy and an electronic copy are provided by the IPC Chair to the Office of the Dean, who arranges for all members of the IPC to sign the document.

The IPC report for each candidate is sent by the Office of the Dean to the candidate first, who has five (5) business days to respond, if desired. The IPC report, the candidate's materials and response (if there is one) are then forwarded directly to the Dean.

F. Department Chair Review and Report.

The materials for each candidate (and in promotion and tenure cases, external reviewer letters) are used in the review by the department chair. For each candidate, the department chair submits a report with his/her recommendation to the Dean that is made available to the IPC, subsequent to the committee's decision, and to the individual candidate.

G. Dean Review:

For each candidate, the Chair’s Report and IPC Report are submitted concurrently to the Dean for review. The Dean reviews the candidate’s materials, the Chair’s Report, and the IPC Report, and where applicable, external reviewer letters. The Dean prepares a report including recommendations.

H. Reviews beyond the School.

Following the Dean’s Review, candidate materials progress through appropriate University channels – including reviews by the UPC, the Provost, the President, and in the case of tenure, the Chancellor – according to University policies in place at the time of the candidate review.

ARTICLE VII.

AMENDMENTS

Amendments to these bylaws shall be adopted if all of the following are satisfied:

1. A proposed amendment, signed by five or more SOPPS voting members, is distributed to all voting members ten or more working days prior to an open school-wide meeting at which the proposed amendment is scheduled to be discussed.
2. The school-wide meeting approves the submitted or an amended version of the proposed amendment by secret ballot.
3. The approved amendment is distributed to all voting members of SOPPS ten or more working days prior to the call for a vote, which may be accomplished electronically.
4. The approved amendment receives the approval of a majority of the eligible SOPPS voting members.

ARTICLE VIII.

SEPARABILITY

Should any provision or section of these Bylaws be found by qualified authority to be invalid or in conflict with superior articles of governance of the University, that judgment applies only to the provision or section concerned, and does not invalidate or otherwise affect the remaining sections of this document.

APPENDICES

- A. Appendix A: Guidance on Promotion and Tenure
(Academic Rank Appointments)
- B. Appendix B: Guidance on Promotion from Clinical Assistant Professor to Clinical Associate Professor
(Qualified Academic Rank Appointments)
- C. Appendix C: Guidance on Promotion from Associate Professor to Professor
(Academic Rank Appointments)
- D. Appendix D: Guidance on Promotion from Clinical Associate Professor to Clinical Professor
(Qualified Academic Rank Appointments)
- E. Appendix E: Guidance on Promotion from Clinical Instructor to Clinical Assistant Professor
(Qualified Academic Rank Appointments)

Review and Endorsements:

Ratified by the faculty: 09/18/2018

Revisions based on comments from FSEC Bylaws Committee: 10/03/2018

Revisions based on comments from the Dean: 10/03/2018

Ratified by the Faculty Senate: _____

Revisions based on comments from the Provost on: _____

Revisions based on comments from the President on: _____

Guidance on Promotion and Tenure
Appendix A

The purpose of this document is to provide general guidelines regarding likely expectations for transition from the tenure-track Assistant Professor appointment to the tenured Associate Professor appointment.

At Binghamton University, each school defines its own expectations for achieving tenure. The Initiating Personnel Committee (IPC) in the school reviews the candidate and makes a recommendation to the department chair. The chair evaluates the recommendation and creates a report that is provided to the dean, along with the IPC recommendation. The dean reviews the evaluation report, creates an additional report, and forwards all previous reports to the University Personnel Committee (UPC) for review. This package is then forwarded to the provost for review, and finally sent to the president of the University. Award of tenure is made by the chancellor of the State University of New York.

Tenure implies an active pursuit of scholarship, where there are significant additions to the base of intellectual knowledge and theory at a national or international level, both through research and the education of the next generation of scholars. The candidate shall also show a *Mastery of their Subject Matter*: <https://www.binghamton.edu/academics/provost/faculty-staff-handbook/handbook-iv.html>.

Tenure is meant to give freedom to pursue this scholarship in directions that are at the discretion of the tenured scholar, both in terms of research and teaching. Tenure is an evaluation of previous scholarship of the faculty member, and a determination of whether or not the contributions are highly likely to continue.

There are some requirements for review that are imposed on the schools regarding their evaluation. Specifically:

- **Review of teaching.** Teaching including precepting, is broadly defined, and for SOPPS would include didactic classroom teaching of PharmD students, small group sessions, leading active learning exercises and PhD student education. Mentorship of students through independent and group research and/or capstone projects is also considered. The school considers the key components of this review to include class evaluations, a self-assessment and an anonymous report from a SOPPS student committee. The candidate should have coordinated/directed at least one course (the syllabus has therefore been peer-reviewed). Other reviews as pertinent and prescribed by University guidelines should be included. Both quality and quantity are important metrics.
- **Review of research.** Research is also broadly defined, and may include community research, policy research, basic research and most any other type of scholarly pursuit. Key to evaluation of research is the concept of *'impact'* – impact is also broadly defined and has many possible metrics. The number of scholarly papers and presentations in international meetings is a measure of impact. The citations of individual papers, as well as the impact factor of the journals in which papers are published are both measures of impact. Impact is also measured in terms of relative responsibility for the reported research – e.g. a lead author (communicating author) indicates primary responsibility for the reported research, whereas a minor author may have had a minor contribution. Acquisition of funding (grants, contracts, and/or donations) is a required metric when evaluating research programs of the faculty member being considered for

Guidance on Promotion and Tenure
Appendix A

tenure. Successful extramural financial support for the faculty's research program indicates that the research is respected by scholarly peers, and anticipated to have a significant impact. As with teaching, both quality and quantity of publications and grants are the most important metrics.

- **Review of service.** Tenure-track faculty are part of multiple communities, and each faculty member is expected to show active rather than passive involvement in these communities. These communities include, but are not limited to, their department and school, their university, their geographical community, national and international academic and professional societies, networks and working groups. Again, **impact** is an important concept in demonstration of service activities. Passive membership in a number of geographic community activities has far less impact on scholarship than leading an international consensus panel on pharmacy policy. For service, quality (measured in terms of active involvement and impact) is more important as a metric than quantity.

Given these general guidelines, there is often a strong desire for junior tenure-track faculty to know more precise targets/thresholds for metrics of teaching, research and service.

Specific thresholds are difficult to define, in part due to the variable mix/balance of the three areas: education, research and service. Also, any specific metric within any single area must also be considered in terms of mix/balance.

With these caveats in mind, general guidelines are:

- **Teaching.** Since the curriculum is integrated and team taught, the candidate must count teaching in terms of contact hours rather than "courses taught." The candidate should be responsible for at least 100 contact hours per year.
- **Research.** Three or more lead author publications over the preceding five years, with a cumulative journal impact factor of ≥ 10 , and/or cumulative citations by ≥ 40 other publications. Research funding is quantifiable and regardless of the source, should be an acceptable figure for the field of endeavor.
- **Service.** Evidence of active, not passive, participation in a healthy mix of departmental, school, national and international committees, networks and working groups.

Guidance on Promotion and Tenure
Appendix A

Effective Date	Brief Summary of Change
07-11-2017	Approved by Pharmacy Leadership Team
10-19-2017	Updated - correction of typographical error
04-17-2018	Updated - added page with summary of changes

Guidance on Promotion for Clinical Assistant Professor to Clinical Associate Professor
Appendix B

The purpose of this document is to provide some general guidelines regarding likely expectations for transition from the Clinical Assistant Professor to the Clinical Associate Professor appointment.

At Binghamton University, each school defines its own expectations for achieving promotion. The Initiating Personnel Committee (IPC) in the school reviews the candidate, and then follows the University procedure, following which the package is forwarded to the provost.

In the School of Pharmacy and Pharmaceutical Sciences (SOPPS), promotion of clinical faculty relies on evidence of growth in teaching, both didactic and experiential, research/scholarship and evidence of excellent clinical service, both to the community and patients, as well as service to the pharmacy profession and SOPPS. The candidate shall also show a *Mastery of their Subject Matter*:
<https://www.binghamton.edu/academics/provost/faculty-staff-handbook/handbook-iv.html>.

The promotion process involves an evaluation of previous scholarship, teaching, clinical practice, and service of the faculty member, and a determination of whether or not the contributions are highly likely to continue.

There are some requirements for review that are imposed on the schools regarding their evaluation. Specifically:

- **Review of teaching.** Teaching including precepting, is broadly defined, and for SOPPS would include didactic classroom teaching of PharmD students, small group sessions, leading active learning exercises, participation in simulations, including those that are interprofessional, as well as experiential teaching at a clinical practice site. Mentorship of students through independent and group research and/or capstone projects is also considered. Key components of this review include student and peer-review class evaluations, annual self-assessment and an anonymous report from a SOPPS student committee. Candidates for promotion beyond clinical assistant professor should have coordinated/directed at least one course (the syllabus has therefore been peer-reviewed) each year. Other reviews as pertinent and prescribed by University guidelines should be included. Both quality and quantity are important metrics.
- **Review of Clinical Practice.** Development and maintenance of a state-of-the-art clinical practice for both educating students and contributing to the care of patients is a hallmark responsibility of clinical pharmacy faculty. In addition, as a Binghamton University SOPPS faculty, promotion criteria will include evidence of strides towards achieving our mission “to transform human health locally and globally.” This may include evidence of program or service improvements for the institutions we work with, such as the development of new pharmaceutical care clinics/activities (e.g. implementation of medication therapy management (MTM) services or improvements in antimicrobial stewardship programs) or improvements in patient health outcomes such as decreasing length of stay, preventing readmissions, and improving rates of attainment of patient health goals such as blood pressure, lipid levels or hemoglobin A1C levels.



**Guidance on Promotion for Clinical Assistant Professor to Clinical Associate Professor
Appendix B**

- **Review of research.** Research is also broadly defined, and may include community research, policy research, basic research and most any other type of scholarly pursuit. Key to evaluation of research is the concept of '**impact**' – impact is also broadly defined and has many possible metrics. The number of scholarly papers and presentations at regional, national and international meetings is a measure of impact. The citations of individual papers, as well as the impact factor of the journals in which papers are published are both measures of impact. Impact is also measured in terms of relative responsibility for the reported research – e.g. a lead author (communicating author) indicates primary responsibility for the reported research, whereas a minor author may have had a minor contribution. Acquisition of funding (grants, contracts and/or donations) is a desired metric when evaluating research programs of the faculty member being considered for promotion beyond clinical assistant professor. Successful extramural financial support for the faculty's research program indicates that the research is respected by scholarly peers, and anticipated to have a significant impact. In addition, platform presentations at national and international meetings is another metric that demonstrates impact in the field of scholarship.
- **Review of service.** Clinical faculty are part of multiple communities, and each faculty member is expected to show active rather than passive involvement in these communities. These communities include, but are not limited to, their department and school, their university, their geographical community, national and international academic and professional societies, networks and working groups. Again, **impact** is an important concept in demonstration of service activities. Active membership includes but is not limited to service such as holding a significant leadership position, leading a working group and leading advocacy activities. For service, quality (measured in terms of active involvement and impact) is more important as a metric than quantity.

Given these general guidelines, there is often a strong desire for junior clinical faculty to know more precise targets/thresholds for metrics of teaching, research and service.

Specific thresholds are difficult to define, in part due to the variable mix/balance of the four areas: teaching, clinical practice, research and service. Also, any specific metric within any single area must also be considered in terms of mix/balance.

With these caveats in mind, general guidelines are:

The process of review for promotion follows the tenure review calendar for tenure-track faculty which includes a substantive review in year three. If promotion is not awarded by year seven, the candidate may request another review no earlier than one year later, although it is highly recommended that the candidate work closely with the department chair to determine the next review for optimal achievement of promotion. The successful candidate for promotion from clinical assistant to clinical associate professor will have:



***Guidance on Promotion for Clinical Assistant Professor to Clinical Associate Professor
Appendix B***

- **Teaching.** Since the curriculum is integrated and team taught, the candidate must count teaching in terms of contact hours rather than “courses taught.” The candidate should be responsible for at least 100 contact hours per year.
- **Clinical Practice.** Developed and maintained a highly functional clinical practice which advances the practice of pharmacy and care to patients and shows evidence of contributions to the mission of the SOPPS, “to transform human health locally and globally.” Peer and/or chair evaluations of clinical practice along with evaluation by the institution’s lead pharmacist, pharmacy director and/or other partner healthcare professionals (physicians, nurses, social workers, etc.) are favorable and mutually beneficial to the site and SOPPS.
- **Research/Scholarship.** Three or more major scholarly works over the preceding five years including peer-reviewed publications of research or reviews, books and book chapters where the candidate had a significant role such as lead or second author. A cumulative journal impact factor of ≥ 4 , and/or cumulative citations ≥ 20 . Also, other publications are desired. Productivity with minor scholarly work such as letters to the editor, published abstracts, and non-peer-reviewed publications as well as national and international platform presentations will also be considered (e.g. high productivity in national/international platform presentations and/or abundance of minor scholarly work that positively impacts pharmacy practice may count towards one major scholarly work). Evidence of collaborative scholarly efforts including quantifiable research funding regardless of the source; it should be an acceptable figure for the field of endeavor.
- **Service.** Evidence of active, not passive, participation in a healthy mix of departmental, school, national and international committees, networks and working groups.

Guidance on Promotion for Clinical Assistant Professor to Clinical Associate Professor
Appendix B

Effective Date	Brief Summary of Change
07-11-2017	Approved by Pharmacy Leadership Team
10-19-2017	Updated - correction of typographical errors
04-17-2018	Updated - correction of typographical errors, added page with summary of changes

Guidance on Promotion for Clinical Associate Professor to Clinical Professor

The purpose of this document is to provide some general guidelines regarding likely expectations for transition from the Clinical Associate Professor to Clinical Professor appointment. At Binghamton University, each school defines its own expectations for achieving promotion. The Initiating Personnel Committee (IPC) in the school reviews the candidate, and then follows the University procedure, following which the package is forwarded to the provost.

In the School of Pharmacy and Pharmaceutical Sciences (SOPPS), promotion of clinical faculty relies on evidence of growth in teaching, both didactic and experiential, research/scholarship, and evidence of excellent clinical service, if applicable, both to the community and patients, as well as service to the pharmacy profession and SOPPS. The candidate shall also show a *Mastery of their Subject Matter*: <https://www.binghamton.edu/academics/provost/faculty-staff-handbook/handbook-iv.html>.

The promotion process involves an evaluation of previous scholarship, teaching, clinical practice, and service of the faculty member, and a determination of whether or not the contributions are highly likely to continue.

There are some requirements for review that are imposed on the schools regarding their evaluation. Specifically:

- **Review of teaching.** Teaching including precepting, is broadly defined, and for the SOPPS would include didactic classroom teaching of PharmD students, small group sessions, leading active learning exercises, participation in simulations, including those that are interprofessional, as well as experiential teaching at a clinical practice site. Mentorship of students through independent and group research and/or capstone projects is also considered. Key components of this review include student and peer-review class evaluations, annual self-assessment and an anonymous report from a SOPPS student committee. Candidates for promotion to clinical professor should have coordinated/directed at least one course each year. Other reviews as pertinent and prescribed by University guidelines should be included. Both quality and quantity are important metrics.
- **Review of Clinical Practice,** if applicable. The candidate should be board-certified in their area of specialty. They should have maintained a state-of-the-art clinical practice both for educating students and contributing to the care of patients, which is a hallmark responsibility of clinical pharmacy faculty. In addition, as a Binghamton University SOPPS faculty, promotion criteria will include evidence of strides towards achieving our mission “to transform human health locally and globally.” This may include evidence of program or service improvements for the institutions we work with, such as the development of new pharmaceutical care clinics/activities (e.g. implementation of medication therapy management (MTM) services or improvements in antimicrobial stewardship programs) or improvements in patient health outcomes such as decreasing length of stay, preventing readmissions, and improving rates of attainment of patient health goals such as blood pressure, lipid levels or hemoglobin A1C levels.
- **Review of research.** Research is also broadly defined, and may include community research, policy research, basic research, and most any other type of scholarly pursuit. Key to evaluation

Guidance on Promotion for Clinical Associate Professor to Clinical Professor

of research is the concept of '**impact**' – impact is also broadly defined and has many possible metrics. The number of scholarly papers and presentations in international meetings is a measure of impact. The citations of individual papers, as well as the impact factor of the journals in which papers are published are both measures of impact. Impact is also measured in terms of relative responsibility for the reported research – e.g. a lead author (communicating author) indicates primary responsibility for the reported research, whereas a minor author may have had a minor contribution. Acquisition of funding (grants, contracts, and/or donations) is a required metric when evaluating research programs of the faculty member being considered for clinical professor. Successful financial support for the faculty's research program indicates that the research is respected by scholarly peers, and anticipated to have a significant impact. As with teaching, both quality and quantity of publications and grants are the most important metrics. In addition, platform presentations, especially invited ones, at national and international meetings is another metric that demonstrates impact in the field of scholarship.

- **Review of service.** Clinical faculty are part of multiple communities, and each faculty member is expected to show active rather than passive involvement in these communities. These communities include, but are not limited to, their department and school, their university, their geographical community, national and international academic and professional societies, networks and working groups. Again, **impact** is an important concept in demonstration of service activities. Active membership includes but is not limited to service such as holding a significant leadership position, leading a working group, and leading advocacy activities. For service, quality (measured in terms of active involvement and impact) is more important as a metric than quantity.

Given these general guidelines, there is a desire for clinical faculty to know more about precise targets/thresholds for metrics of teaching, research and service.

Specific thresholds are difficult to define, in part due to the variable mix/balance of the four areas: teaching, clinical practice, research and service. Also, any specific metric within any single area must also be considered in terms of mix/balance. Candidates must meet the guidelines of the University in terms of letters of recommendation and peer evaluations of teaching.

With these caveats in mind, general guidelines are:

The process of review for promotion follows the tenure review calendar for all faculty, which includes a substantive review every three years. It is highly recommended that the candidate work closely with the department chair to determine the next review for optimal achievement of promotion. The successful candidate for promotion from clinical associate professor to clinical professor will have:

- **Teaching.** Academic excellence in didactic teaching of PharmD students through student and peer evaluations ranking the candidate in the top 20th percentile and/or evidence of high quality clinical teaching. The candidate should be responsible for at least 100 contact hours per year

Guidance on Promotion for Clinical Associate Professor to Clinical Professor

and have a continuous record of course coordination. Evidence of mentoring other faculty will also be considered.

- **Clinical Practice**, if applicable. Candidates should provide evidence that they have maintained a highly functional clinical practice which advances the practice of pharmacy and care to patients and shows evidence of contributions to the mission of the SOPPS, “to transform human health locally and globally.” Peer and/or chair evaluations of clinical practice along with evaluation by the institution’s lead pharmacist, pharmacy director, and/or other partner healthcare professionals (physicians, nurses, social workers, etc.) are expected and mutually beneficial to the site and SOPPS.
- **Research**. There should be evidence of the faculty member having gained a national or international reputation in their field of endeavor. Publications should be peer-reviewed and the faculty member should show a sustained record of peer-reviewed publications from clinical assistant professor until this application. Research funding is quantifiable and regardless of the source; the faculty member should demonstrate a record of funding in their field of endeavor. Participation in peer review of journal articles is required and should be documented.
- **Service**. Evidence of active, not passive, participation in a healthy mix of departmental, school, national and international committees, networks and working groups. National or state/regional service at the officer level in a professional organization is required as is service on federal or national panels, either as a regular member or ad hoc.

Guidance on Promotion for Clinical Associate Professor to Clinical Professor

Effective Date	Brief Summary of Change
04-26-2018	Approved by Pharmacy Leadership Team



Guidance on Promotion from Associate Professor to Professor

The purpose of this document is to provide general guidelines regarding likely expectations for transition from the tenured Associate Professor appointment to the tenured Professor appointment.

At Binghamton University, each school defines its own expectations for promotion. The Initiating Personnel Committee (IPC) in the school reviews the candidate and then follows the University procedure, including review by the UPC, following which the package is then forwarded to the provost for review, and finally sent to the president of the University.

Promotion to professor requires that the individual has been an associate professor for at least three years and that the faculty member has developed a reputation for advanced scholarship. Advanced scholarship is defined as a body of published work that provides significant additions to the base of intellectual knowledge and theory at a national or international level, as well as excellence in mentorship and teaching of the next generation of scholars. The candidate shall also show a *Mastery of their Subject Matter*: <https://www.binghamton.edu/academics/provost/faculty-staff-handbook/handbook-iv.html>.

This promotion is an evaluation of all previous scholarship of the faculty member, and a determination that scholarly contributions have continued unabated or increased since obtaining tenure.

There are some requirements for review that are imposed on the schools regarding their evaluation. Specifically:

- **Review of teaching.** Teaching including precepting, is broadly defined, and for the SOPPS would include didactic classroom teaching of PharmD students, small group sessions, leading active learning exercises, and PhD student education, if involved in that program. Mentorship of students through independent and group research and/or capstone projects is also important. The school considers the key components of this review to include class evaluations, a self-assessment and an anonymous report from a SOPPS student committee. The candidate should have coordinated/directed at least one course each year in the PharmD curriculum and at least one course in the PhD curriculum, if involved in that curriculum. The candidate should provide evidence of mentoring other faculty in line with our educational mission. Other reviews as pertinent and prescribed by University guidelines should be included. Both quality and quantity are important metrics.
- **Review of research.** Research is also broadly defined, and may include community research, policy research, basic research and most any other type of scholarly pursuit. Key to evaluation of research is the concept of '*impact*' – impact is also broadly defined and has many possible metrics. There should be evidence of the faculty member having gained a national/international reputation in their research field. The number of scholarly papers and presentations in international meetings is a measure of impact. The citations of individual papers, as well as the impact factor of the journals in which papers are published are both measures of impact. Impact is also measured in terms of relative responsibility for the reported research – e.g. a lead author (communicating author) indicates primary responsibility for the reported research, whereas a minor author may have had a minor contribution. Acquisition of funding (grants, contracts, and/or donations) is a required metric when evaluating research programs of the faculty member being considered for promotion to professor. Successful extramural financial support



Guidance on Promotion from Associate Professor to Professor

for the faculty's research program indicates that the research is respected by scholarly peers, and anticipated to have a significant impact. Both quality and quantity of publications and grants are the most important metrics.

- **Review of service.** Tenured faculty members are part of multiple communities, and each faculty member is expected to show active rather than passive involvement in these communities. These communities include, but are not limited to, their department and school, their university, their geographical community, national and international academic and professional societies, networks and working groups. Again, **impact** is an important concept in demonstration of service activities. Passive membership in a number of geographic community activities has far less impact on one's service commitment than leading international panels on research or contemporary topics. For service, quality (measured in terms of active involvement and impact) is more important as a metric than quantity.

Given these general guidelines, there is often a strong desire for senior faculty to know more precise targets/thresholds for metrics of teaching, research and service.

Specific thresholds are difficult to define, in part due to the variable mix/balance of the three areas: education, research and service. Also, any specific metric within any single area must also be considered in terms of mix/balance. Candidates must meet the guidelines of the University in terms of letters of recommendation and peer evaluations of teaching.

With these caveats in mind, general guidelines are:

- **Teaching.** Academic excellence in didactic teaching of PharmD students through student and peer evaluations ranking the candidate in the top 20th percentile and/or evidence of high quality clinical teaching. The candidate should be responsible for at least 100 contact hours per year and have a continuous record of course coordination. Evidence of mentoring other faculty will also be considered.
- **Research.** There should be evidence of the faculty member having gained a national or international reputation in their field of endeavor. Publications should be peer-reviewed and the faculty member should have an H-index that exceeds the median of their field of endeavor. The median indices are published. Research funding is quantifiable and regardless of the source, the faculty member should demonstrate a sustained record of funding in their field of endeavor. Participation in peer review of grants and journal articles is required and should be documented.
- **Service.** Evidence of active, not passive, participation in a healthy mix of departmental, school, national and international committees, networks and working groups. National service in a professional organization or a high quality journal editorial board is advantageous as is service on federal or national panels, either as a regular member or ad hoc.



Guidance on Promotion from Associate Professor to Professor

Effective Date	Brief Summary of Change
12-14-2017	Approved by Pharmacy Leadership Team
04-17-2018	Updated - added page with summary of changes

Guidance on Promotion for Clinical Instructor to Clinical Assistant Professor

The purpose of this document is to provide some general guidelines regarding likely expectations for transition from the Clinical Instructor to Clinical Assistant Professor appointment.

At Binghamton University, each school defines its own expectations for achieving promotion. The Initiating Personnel Committee (IPC) in the school reviews the candidate, and then follows the University procedure, following which the package is forwarded to the provost.

In the School of Pharmacy and Pharmaceutical Sciences (SOPPS), promotion of clinical faculty relies on evidence of growth in teaching, both didactic and experiential, research/scholarship and evidence of excellent clinical service, both to the community and patients, as well as service to the pharmacy profession and SOPPS. The candidate shall also show a *Mastery of their Subject Matter*:
<https://www.binghamton.edu/academics/provost/faculty-staff-handbook/handbook-iv.html>.

The promotion process involves an evaluation of previous scholarship, teaching, clinical practice, and service of the faculty member, and a determination of whether or not the contributions are highly likely to continue.

There are some requirements for review that are imposed on the schools regarding their evaluation. Specifically:

- **Review of teaching.** Teaching including precepting, is broadly defined, and for SOPPS would include didactic classroom teaching of PharmD students, small group sessions, leading active learning exercises, participation in simulations, including those that are interprofessional, as well as experiential teaching at a clinical practice site. Mentorship of students through independent and group research and/or capstone projects is also considered. Key components of this review include student and peer-review class evaluations, annual self-assessment and an anonymous report from a SOPPS student committee. Other reviews as pertinent and prescribed by University guidelines should be included. Both quality and quantity are important metrics.
- **Review of Clinical Practice.** If appropriate, development and maintenance of a state-of-the-art clinical practice for both educating students and contributing to the care of patients which is a hallmark responsibility of clinical pharmacy faculty. In addition, as a Binghamton University SOPPS faculty, promotion criteria will include evidence of strides towards achieving our mission “to transform human health locally and globally.” This may include evidence of program or service improvements for the institutions we work with, such as the development of new pharmaceutical care clinics/activities (e.g. implementation of medication therapy management (MTM) services or improvements in antimicrobial stewardship programs) or improvements in patient health outcomes such as decreasing length of stay, preventing readmissions, and improving rates of attainment of patient health goals such as blood pressure, lipid levels or hemoglobin A1C levels.
- **Review of research.** Research is also broadly defined, and may include community research, policy research, basic research and most any other type of scholarly pursuit. Key to evaluation of research is the concept of ‘*impact*’ – impact is also broadly defined and has many possible

Guidance on Promotion for Clinical Instructor to Clinical Assistant Professor

metrics. The number of scholarly papers and presentations at regional, national and international meetings is a measure of impact. The citations of individual papers, as well as the impact factor of the journals in which papers are published are both measures of impact. Impact is also measured in terms of relative responsibility for the reported research – e.g. a lead author (communicating author) indicates primary responsibility for the reported research, whereas a minor author may have had a minor contribution. Successful extramural financial support for the faculty's research program indicates that the research is respected by scholarly peers, and anticipated to have a significant impact. In addition, platform presentations at national and international meetings is another metric that demonstrates impact in the field of scholarship.

- **Review of service.** Clinical faculty are part of multiple communities, and each faculty member is expected to show active rather than passive involvement in these communities. These communities include, but are not limited to, their department and school, their university, their geographical community, national and international academic and professional societies, networks and working groups. Again, **impact** is an important concept in demonstration of service activities. Active membership includes but is not limited to service such as holding a significant leadership position, leading a working group and leading advocacy activities. For service, quality (measured in terms of active involvement and impact) is more important as a metric than quantity.

Given these general guidelines, there is often a strong desire for junior clinical faculty to know more precise targets/thresholds for metrics of teaching, research and service.

Specific thresholds are difficult to define, in part due to the variable mix/balance of the four areas: teaching, clinical practice, research and service. Also, any specific metric within any single area must also be considered in terms of mix/balance.

With these caveats in mind, general guidelines are:

- **Teaching.** At least one year of experience teaching and demonstrated promise in teaching ability as evidenced by increasing independence in development of curriculum, upward trending student review ratings and favorable peer evaluations of teaching.
- **Clinical Practice.** For clinical faculty, these criteria will be broadly applied as appropriate. Shown growth and progress in the development and maintenance of a clinical practice which will advance the practice of pharmacy and care to patients. Peer and/or chair evaluations of clinical practice along with evaluation by the institution's lead pharmacist, pharmacy director and/or other partner healthcare professionals (physicians, nurses, social workers, etc.) are favorable and mutually beneficial to the site and SOPPS.
- **Research/Scholarship.** At least one peer-reviewed publication, and at least two of the following: a platform or poster presentation at a national meeting, published abstract or accredited CE presentation.

Guidance on Promotion for Clinical Instructor to Clinical Assistant Professor

- **Service.** Evidence of active, not passive, participation in at least one of the following: departmental and/or SOPPS committees, local, regional, or national professional pharmacy associations, or other networks or working groups as appropriate to the field of endeavor.

Guidance on Promotion for Clinical Instructor to Clinical Assistant Professor

Effective Date	Brief Summary of Change
09-12-2017	Approved by Pharmacy Leadership Team
04-17-2018	Updated – corrected typographical error, added page with summary of changes