

Promotion and Tenure Guidelines

College of Veterinary Medicine

April 26, 2011

Table of Contents

CVM Guidelines.....	1
Department of Anatomy, Physiology, and Pharmacology.....	16
Department of Clinical Sciences.....	26
Department of Pathobiology.....	36
Appendix.....	45

External Evaluator Selection Guidelines

List of Peer Institutions

College of Veterinary Medicine

Guidelines for Promotion and Tenure

Introduction

The College of Veterinary Medicine (CVM) strives to reward excellent scholarship in all components of its land grant mission—teaching, research/creative work, outreach, and service. The college recognizes the need to identify guidelines and expectations for faculty activity in each of these components that will serve as general criteria for promotion and/or tenure. The CVM Guidelines described herein are supplemental to the *Auburn University Faculty Handbook* (hereafter, Handbook), and the guidelines for promotion in clinical track or research track positions. The CVM Guidelines may be revised in response to changes in the Handbook or to other relevant Auburn University or CVM policies. These guidelines will be used to inform the University Promotion and Tenure Committee of general performance expectations of faculty within the CVM. Appendices to this document contain specific guidelines from each of the three departments in the CVM: the Department of Anatomy, Physiology and Pharmacology, the Department of Clinical Sciences, and the Department of Pathobiology. The Handbook, Chap. 3, section 11.A defines the process for promotion and tenure at Auburn University.

The Handbook is located at: <http://www.auburn.edu/academic/provost/Handbook.html>

Guidelines for promotion in clinical track and research track positions are located at: <http://www.auburn.edu/academic/provost/>

Faculty assignments in the CVM are unique in several respects from those of faculty in other colleges and schools across the Auburn University campus:

Teaching:

1. Teaching includes didactic lectures, applied and basic laboratory instruction, and clinical instruction.
2. Most courses incorporate a team-approach, resulting in relatively few courses in which a single lecturer delivers the entire course content.
3. Clinical instruction occurs in Teaching Hospital rotations, where a single faculty member may spend up to 10 hours/day for 1-2 week or longer intervals while instructing a group of 4-8 students.
4. Clinical instruction occurs simultaneously with clinical activities in the Teaching Hospital or the Diagnostic Laboratories.
5. Advanced clinical instruction of residents and interns (graduate veterinarians) is conducted without designated course credit while a faculty member works as a clinician or diagnostician.
6. Training of graduate students and post-doctoral associates is heavily integrated into research activities.

Time spent on assignment to clinical activities in the Teaching Hospital or Diagnostic Laboratories is included on a faculty member's time allocation under teaching or teaching/outreach, respectively. When supervising a clinical rotation, the faculty member is continuously teaching both professional veterinary students, interns and residents in a setting that may be considered service learning. It should be recognized, however, that clinical activities involve integration of teaching, research and outreach. Clinical research often involves a series of carefully documented clinical cases in the assessment of new diagnostic methods or treatments. Each animal presented to the teaching hospital, and each diagnostic specimen submitted to a diagnostic service laboratory potentially represents an opportunity to advance clinical knowledge. Cases presented to the teaching hospital are privately owned animals either brought to the

hospital by clients in the local area or referred by veterinarians throughout the state and region. Outreach is inherent to the education of clients and referring veterinarians.

Research/Creative Activities:

Research and creative activities within the CVM include basic research, clinical research, and translational research. Clinical research is often incorporated into clinical and diagnostic activities to advance the current state of knowledge or standard of care, and often incorporates residency-style training. Basic research is usually based in laboratories and incorporates opportunities for graduate and post-graduate education. Translational research applies basic research methods toward the aim of achieving a clinical application.

Outreach:

Clinical or diagnostic services provided directly to animal owners and veterinarians in the form of patient care, clinical or diagnostic reports, continuing education presentations, professional activities, or case consultations are a prevalent outreach activity within the CVM. Other outreach activities may involve education or other involvement with animal organizations such as food animal producer associations, horse owner associations and pet owner breed associations or kennel clubs. Faculty may also be called on to inform the general public regarding important veterinary issues. Scientific outreach includes activities in which scientists engage the public to disseminate and apply research findings as a method to tangibly improve the welfare of society.

Service:

Service activities may include committee work in the department, college, or university and contributions to the missions of national organizations, professional societies or professional veterinary specialty colleges (American College of Veterinary Internal Medicine, American College of Veterinary Pathologists, etc.) including serving as officers, examining board members, committee members or leadership associated with scientific meetings. Membership on our consultation with regulatory or government agencies may also represent an important service of faculty in the CVM.

The purpose of this document is to establish guidelines specific to the CVM to be used in the assessment of CVM faculty activities across a spectrum of disciplines. Examples of scholarly activities recognized by specific departments and their relative significance are included in the Appendix.

Scholarship

Scholarship is simply defined as a peer-reviewed contribution to the advancement of knowledge in a particular field, which is published or presented for public use. According to the Handbook, faculty scholarship is evaluated in the areas of (A) teaching; (B) research/creative work; (C) outreach; and (D) service. Distinctive performance in each area can be demonstrated through scholarship. In this document, Section IV explains some general criteria for understanding scholarship at CVM in relation to the areas defined in the Handbook. Faculty who come to Auburn from another university may have prior faculty service, peer reviewed scholarship, and creative activity count toward promotion and tenure (see Handbook, Chap. 3.4. “prior service”).

General Criteria for Promotion and/or Tenure

A faculty member (tenured, tenure-track, research-title series, or clinician-title series) is expected to develop a body of peer-reviewed work, reflecting an appropriate level of scholarly distinction in their assigned activities, to become eligible for promotion. Candidates for promotion in tenured or tenure-track appointments are expected to have meritorious performance in at least two major areas of professional faculty service, *i.e.* teaching and research, teaching and outreach, or research and outreach. Candidates for promotion in the research-title series are non-tenurable, and expected to demonstrate scholarship in research. Candidates for promotion in clinician-title series are non-tenurable and expected to demonstrate scholarship in clinical practice or diagnostics (depending on the position) and clinical teaching. Service to the department, college, and university is considered in the evaluation of collegiality. A faculty member's professional stature can be generally classified by his/her level of scholarship as follows:

- Highest Distinction in scholarship indicates the attainment or maintenance of a national and international reputation. This is required for promotion from Associate Professor to Full Professor.
- Distinction in scholarship demonstrates the faculty member's attainment of a regional and/or national reputation. This is used as a criterion for promotion from Assistant Professor to Associate Professor.
- Expected scholarship indicates the minimum level of performance expected of all faculty members. Achievement of expected scholarship without achievement of distinction in at least two major faculty assignment areas is not sufficient for promotion to Associate Professor.

Levels of scholarship are achieved principally through external peer review and peer recognition of published journal articles and other works. Performance criteria are additive as scholarship level moves from Expected to Distinction to Highest Distinction. Some examples of scholarship in each category are listed below:



This document describes some general qualitative indicators of scholarship that apply to research, teaching, and outreach. Achievement in the areas indicated on the left is expected of all faculty members as appropriate to their faculty assignment. As peer review and regional and/or national recognition are attained, distinction in scholarship is supportive of promotion. Indicators listed on the right are graduated from distinction to

highest distinction because productivity in these areas is by definition a distinctive professional achievement.

A comprehensive evaluation of the significance of the quality and quantity of scholarship with respect to the candidate's workload is derived from letters from the department head, dean, and outside reviewers that accompany the promotion dossier. Department heads will assess scholarship during annual faculty reviews using the same criteria and standard university terminology (i.e. exemplary, exceeds expectations, meets expectations, marginal, unacceptable).

1. Promotion

Promotion is based on meritorious performance and scholarly activity in the areas of teaching, research/creative work, outreach, and/or service.

Candidates for promotion from **assistant professor to associate professor** at CVM are expected to develop a body of work that demonstrates consistent growth and progress toward achievement of distinction in scholarship related to one or more areas of a candidate's appointment (teaching, research/creative work, or outreach) along with responsible contributions to the mission of the department, college, and/or the university (i.e. collegiality—see below). Candidates in the research track or clinical track must demonstrate distinction principally in the major category of their appointment (i.e. distinction in research for research-track and distinction in clinical work for clinical track). The candidate must also demonstrate evidence of an emerging national reputation in his/her discipline and of the potential to ultimately advance to the rank of professor. Evidence of accomplishment must be substantiated through internal and external peer review.

Candidates for promotion from **associate professor to professor** at the CVM (whether tenured, clinical track, or research track, must demonstrate a respected national/international reputation in their discipline as evidenced by a sustained body of scholarly activities of distinction and highest distinction in that discipline. Evidence of such accomplishment must be substantiated through internal and external peer review.

Academic ranks and promotion are addressed in the Handbook, Chap. 3.6.

2. Tenure

Academic tenure is a principle that affords the individual faculty member academic freedom in the university environment. The Handbook explains that tenure exists to ensure academic freedom by protecting "the faculty member's ability to criticize and advocate changes in existing theories, beliefs, programs, policies and institutions" (Chap. 3.9). The criteria for tenure are more exacting than for promotion—in addition to demonstrating a level of distinctive scholarship appropriate for promotion, the candidate for tenure must also demonstrate professional collegiality.

Collegiality is best defined as the commitment of an individual to the shared mission of the institution. According to the Handbook, "Collegiality should not be confused with sociability..." and is, "a professional, not personal, criterion relating to the performance of a faculty member's duties within a department." (Chap. 3.9).

Examples of collegiality include but are not limited to: responsible discharge of assignments (including clinical assignments), responsible participation in

committee work, regular and constructive participation in faculty meetings, participation in activities related to peer review and faculty recruitment, participation in departmental seminars and journal clubs, adherence to institutional policies, and professional interaction with external constituents.

Review Processes

In addition to the annual assessment process as described in the Handbook, Chap. 3.7, candidates on tenure track appointments must be reviewed by their tenured faculty peers in the third year of their full-time appointment and again when the candidate initiates the process of application for tenure and promotion.

An assistant professor must have at least 4 years full-time experience in rank before going up for promotion and tenure (Handbook, Chap. 3.10). Faculty on tenure track appointments may initiate the process for tenure and promotion in the fifth year of their full-time appointment (Handbook, Chap. 3.10). A candidate may request that tenure consideration be deferred from the fifth to the sixth year; however, a candidate must be considered during his/her sixth year if he/she has not been considered earlier and has not waived consideration.

1. Third Year Review

The focus of the third year review is to assess the candidate's progress towards tenure. The review must be completed no later than 32 months after the initial appointment (Handbook, Chap. 3.7). The candidate's department head is responsible for scheduling the candidate's third year review at the appropriate time.

Prior to the third year review, the candidate should turn in a current dossier following the provisions (outlined below under "Dossier Format") for review and discussion by the tenured faculty in the department. Each department may establish additional guidelines for the third year review, such as a research presentation by the candidate to the faculty.

The third year review must result in a vote by the faculty of greater rank. The voting options are:

- Present and voting
- Present and abstaining
- Absent but submitting a written vote prior to the meeting, or
- Absent and not voting (this response does not count in the total vote)

Vote for promotion: The faculty of greater rank (including clinical and research-track) vote by ballot. Ballot choices are either:

- Yes, the candidate is progressing appropriately towards achieving promotion, or
- No, the candidate is not progressing appropriately towards achieving promotion
- Abstain

Vote for tenure: The tenured faculty vote by ballot. Ballot choices are either:

- Yes, the candidate is progressing appropriately towards achieving tenure or

- No, the candidate is not progressing appropriately towards achieving tenure
- Abstain

If a faculty member who is eligible to vote cannot attend the third year review meeting and would like to vote on the candidate's progress, the vote should be sent in writing or by e-mail in advance of the meeting to the department head. Vote counting should not begin until all ballots of those in attendance are turned in to the meeting chair. The result of the vote must be announced at the meeting. Third year review voting records will be retained by the department and reported to the Office of the Provost upon request.

After the faculty vote is complete, the department head prepares a written report summarizing the results of the review for the candidate. This written report is confidential to the candidate, department head, and dean, and "may only be consulted by the tenured faculty when the faculty member is a candidate for tenure" (Handbook, Chap. 3.7).

Faculty receiving a majority of negative votes during the probationary period may be given notice of non-continuation of appointment (Handbook, Chap. 3.15).

2. Review for Tenure and Promotion, and for Promotion

The CVM requires both an internal peer review at the departmental level and an external peer review for all candidates petitioning for tenure and/or promotion.

a. Promotion and Tenure Dossier and Supporting Materials

After initiating the process, the candidate prepares the dossier for promotion and tenure following the format described below under "Dossier Format." The candidate may also prepare supplemental materials designed to illustrate her/his accomplishments in greater depth for use in the internal and external peer reviews (examples of reports, submitted manuscripts, etc). Supplemental materials are not submitted to the University Promotion and Tenure Committee.

All materials prepared for the promotion and tenure process are confidential and should only be used by CVM administrators, the faculty eligible to vote in the department, and external peer reviewers. Dossier materials should not be copied and/or distributed to anyone beyond the faculty who are eligible to vote on the candidate. However, the candidate may independently choose to make the materials available to other colleagues.

b. External Peer Review

External peer review of accomplishments and scholarship is an integral part of the method for assessing a CVM candidate's achievements. External peer review provides validation of the faculty member's scholarly contributions by a discipline-specific audience outside of Auburn University. The department head will direct the external peer evaluator to focus the evaluation on the quality and significance of the faculty member's scholarship (in teaching, research, outreach, or service, as appropriate based on assignment) as defined by the criteria described in this document and illustrated in the appendix.

The CVM requires external peer review by three evaluators for promotion. According to the Handbook (Chap. 3.11.3.D):

“In consultation with the candidate and the faculty voting on the candidate the head (or dean) shall compile a list of potential evaluators. He or she shall then seek responses from at least three of the potential evaluators. These evaluators shall be people outside of Auburn University who are nationally acknowledged experts in the candidate’s field and can comment on the quality and reputation of the candidate’s work. If the evaluator is from an academic institution, he or she shall be of higher academic rank than the candidate. Evaluators may be associated with industry, government agencies, foundations, etc.”

The procedure for external peer review is as follows:

1. Selection of Evaluators (see appended templates)

- 1.1. The candidate will prepare a list of 4-6 suggested evaluators, which will include name, title, rank, address, phone number, and a short description of the applicability of suggested evaluator’s credentials or attach his/her vita. This information should be submitted to the department head
- 1.2. The department head will review the list and, if deemed necessary, prepare an additional list of potential evaluators, providing the same information as above (1.1). The candidate and department head will discuss the list to identify any potential conflicts of interest
- 1.3. Drawing from the names provided by the candidate and the department head, the department head will prepare a final list of 4-6 potential evaluators. The department head will select 3 peer evaluators from the list and will contact them using a standard approved letter
- 1.4. Peer evaluators affiliated with an academic institution should be from an institution considered to be a peer of Auburn University in the candidate’s discipline (a list of peer institutions is appended).
- 1.5. Potential peer evaluators will be contacted by the department head by telephone or e-mail to insure their willingness to participate, prior to the forwarding of the dossier and any supporting materials
- 1.6. The identity of the final three evaluators will not be shared with the candidate
- 1.7. In cases where the candidate has had significant experience at another university an additional evaluation may be solicited from an individual who has first-hand knowledge of the candidate from a supervisory perspective

2. External Review Materials

The external review package sent to all external evaluators will include the following:

- 2.1 A standard approved cover letter prepared by the department head outlining the procedure for external review and providing additional information relative to workload and other relevant conditions of the faculty member’s appointment
- 2.2 The candidate’s dossier in the format outlined by the Handbook
- 2.3 Supplemental materials as determined by the candidate. Supplemental materials may contain portfolio of creative work, samples of research papers and other research/creative work/outreach scholarship, teaching portfolio including students’ work and syllabi from courses taught, support letters from outreach stakeholders and collaborators, etc
- 2.4 Copy of *CVM and Departmental Guidelines for Promotion and Tenure*

3. Format for Evaluator's Response

The external peer evaluators should review the candidate's materials and write a letter of evaluation addressing the candidate's scholarly activities. As noted above, the evaluators will be advised to use the CVM Guidelines in framing the evaluations.

The external evaluators' letters will be made available to faculty members who are eligible to vote on the candidate's application for tenure and/or promotion.

The department head is authorized to provide a summary to the candidate of the comments made in the evaluation letter only if the confidentiality of the evaluator's identity is maintained.

4. Due Date for Response

The external review package should be mailed to allow for a six week period for review letters to be mailed back to the CVM.

c. Internal Peer Review by Departmental Faculty (Handbook, Chap. 3.11.D)

The internal departmental peer review process will begin according to the timeline established by the Office of Provost. The department head will work with the candidate to establish deadlines for the submission of required materials, to schedule the candidate's presentation to the departmental/school faculty when applicable, and to schedule a meeting of the voting faculty.

The procedure for internal review is as follows:

1. Explanation of Candidate Internal Review Information

The candidate will provide the department head with a copy of the dossier in the required format and with any supplemental materials. Typically, this package contains the same material that is provided to external evaluators. The department head will make this material available to the eligible voting faculty prior to the internal review, if applicable, and for the meeting of voting faculty. The supplemental materials will not be included in the package that is forwarded to the University Promotion and Tenure Committee. The Handbook and the CVM and Departmental Guidelines for Promotion and Tenure should be the point of reference for the process of internal review. Materials may be distributed through an electronic or printed format.

2. Internal Review Presentation

The candidate may make an oral presentation (research seminar, case report, etc.) to the departmental faculty prior to the discussion.

3. Faculty Vote (Handbook, Chap. 3.11.E)

The faculty eligible to vote should conduct a closed meeting to discuss the candidate's qualifications for tenure and/or promotion. These deliberations are confidential. After discussion, the department faculty may elect to table the discussion prior to the vote and recommend that the candidate defer his/her application. However, if the candidate elects to proceed with the application, a vote

will be conducted. A secret ballot vote on the candidate's application will be taken at the meeting to determine the faculty's final recommendation to the AU Promotion and Tenure Committee.

4. The voting options are:

- Present and voting
- Present and abstaining
- Absent but submitting a written vote prior to the meeting, or
- Absent and not voting (this response does not count as part of the total vote)

5. Ballot choices are either:

- Yes, the candidate is deserving of tenure
- No, the candidate is not deserving of tenure
- Abstain

and/or:

- Yes, the candidate is deserving of promotion
- No, the candidate is not deserving of promotion
- Abstain

If a candidate is under consideration for tenure and promotion, then separate votes for each issue must be taken and recorded.

If an eligible voting faculty member cannot attend the meeting, but intends to vote on the candidate's application, that faculty member is responsible for sending the vote in writing or by e-mail in advance of the meeting to the department head or to the unit-level promotion and tenure committee chair. Vote counting should not begin until the ballots of all faculty in attendance and all votes from absent and voting faculty are submitted to the meeting chair.

If holding the appropriate rank, then the department head should vote by secret ballot at the meeting. According to the Handbook, "Any other faculty member serving as an administrator who has an official vote on the candidate at a higher administrative level shall excuse himself or herself at the departmental level."

The result of the vote must be announced at the meeting.

Faculty receiving a majority of negative votes during the probationary period may be given notice of non-continuation of appointment (Handbook, Chap. 3.15).

d. Department Head's Recommendation

The department head will review all available materials after the faculty deliberation and the external peer review are completed. The head will provide a letter with a written evaluation of the candidate's qualifications for tenure and/or promotion to the Dean of the CVM. The letter should provide additional information relative to workload and other relevant conditions of the faculty member's appointment. Most importantly, the letter should clearly indicate the department head's recommendation with regard to the candidate's tenure and/or promotion.

e. Dean's Recommendation

The dean will review all available materials after the process of faculty deliberation, the external peer review, and the department head's recommendation. The dean will provide a letter with a written evaluation of the candidate's qualifications for tenure and/or promotion to the University Promotion and Tenure Committee. The letter should indicate clearly a recommendation for or against tenure and/or promotion.

f. Communication to Candidate

The department head and the dean will communicate the recommendations of the department and college to the candidate. At this point the candidate can choose not to continue the process of pursuing promotion and/or tenure (according to Handbook policies).

Faculty receiving a majority of negative votes may be given notice of non-continuation of appointment (Handbook, Chap. 3.15).

g. Faculty Support Letters

Comments from faculty may be summarized by a committee (a departmental promotion and tenure committee) of voting faculty members in lieu of sending individual letters. The summary letter should be signed by all members of the committee. Faculty who are eligible to vote may write letters to the University Promotion and Tenure Committee explaining their position regarding the candidate's application for tenure and/or promotion. These letters should be addressed and sent to the department head or dean for inclusion in the candidate's package. The package is then sent from the CVM Dean's Office to the Office of the Provost.

h. Submission to the Office of the Provost

The CVM Dean's Office will collect all materials including the information to be submitted by the candidate, the information submitted by the department head, and all relevant letters. The full dossier will be submitted to the Office of the Provost by the indicated date.

Dossier Format

The dossier must follow the format detailed in the Handbook, Chap. 3.11.C.1-2.

1. Information Supplied by the Candidate

The information should exactly follow the Handbook format. The format without detailed descriptions is as follows in italics:

1. *Standard Biographical Data sheet*
2. *Appointment percentages for the last three years*
3. *Honors and Awards list*
4. *Scholarly Contributions as:*
 - A. *Teaching*
 1. *Courses, past 3 years*
 2. *Graduate students supervised*
 3. *Current graduate student committees*
 4. *Courses and curricula developed*
 5. *Grants received related to teaching*
 6. *Publications pertaining to teaching*

7. *Other contributions to teaching*
8. *Statement of teaching philosophy, self-evaluation*

B. Research/Creative Work

1. *Books*
2. *Article length publications*
3. *Papers or lectures*
4. *Exhibitions*
5. *Performances*
6. *Patents and inventions*
7. *Other research/creative contributions*
8. *Grants and contracts*
9. *Description of scholarly program, work in progress, work anticipated*

C. Outreach

1. *Commentary*
 - a. *Description*
 - b. *Mission*
 - c. *Scholarship*
 - d. *Impact*
2. *Activities and Products*
 - a. *Instructional activities*
 - b. *Technical assistance*
 - c. *Outreach publications*
 - d. *Electronic products*
 - e. *Other outreach products*
 - f. *Copyrights, patents and inventions*
 - g. *Contracts, grants, and gifts*

D. Service

1. *Institutional Service (university, college, or department)*
2. *Professional Service*

2. Information Supplied by the Department Head (Chap. 3.11.C.3)

The department head will provide the following supplemental information for the candidate's package:

A. Teaching

1. A summary of student teaching evaluations as specified in the Handbook
2. Peer teaching evaluations
3. Letters from former students (may be solicited by candidate)
4. Letter from service chief or laboratory director evaluating clinical activities and instruction.

B. Research/Creative Work

1. Statement indicating level of support for achieving assigned activities
2. Assessment of scholarly contributions

C. Outreach

1. Statement indicating how outreach serves the mission of the unit

2. Assessment of level of scholarship in outreach activities
3. Participant, client, or peer evaluations of outreach activities

D. Service: Confidential letters addressing service performance (solicited by candidate from committee chair, professional officer, foundation officer, etc.)

Deadlines: Refer to Annually Published Schedule from the Office of Provost

CVM Scholarship

This section explains the CVM criteria for understanding scholarship relative to areas defined in the Handbook as teaching, research, outreach and service. Scholarship is defined as peer-reviewed, scholarly activities yielding a measurable impact through publication, public presentation, an award, or other recognition. The Appendix provides examples and assessment criteria for scholarly activity in the areas of teaching, research/creative work, and outreach.

1. Teaching Scholarship

Candidates for promotion and/or tenure are expected to demonstrate strength in teaching. Teaching can take many forms in the CVM: didactic, group facilitation, laboratory, clinical, graduate, resident, or intern.

General teaching activity is assessed annually by the Associate Dean for Academic Affairs through student evaluations. Faculty members may request peer evaluations through the department head or from a departmental mentoring committee. Teaching scholarship is different than general teaching activity. Information on teaching activity is included in the P&T dossier in order to provide a context for the varied teaching environments within the CVM.

Daily teaching activities, curriculum development, and integrated activities in teaching, research, outreach may be developed into teaching scholarship if there is related meritorious performance as evidenced by some form of peer review or other measurable impacts. In particular, some faculty members in the CVM are able to demonstrate significant and frequent meritorious performance in the area of teaching as evidenced by the receipt of college and national awards, the acceptance of peer-reviewed journal articles on teaching, and contributions to national conference proceedings on instruction. Faculty are encouraged to apply for regional, national and international teaching awards and grant opportunities in order to advance the strong educational mission of the CVM and to demonstrate exceptional faculty performance in teaching. Departmental criteria for assessment of teaching scholarship are appended.

2. Scholarship in Research / Creative Work

A strong culture of faculty scholarship in research is essential to the CVM faculty's continued success. Productivity in research is important evidence of CVM faculty scholarship because it demonstrates the contributions of the faculty to the advancement of their disciplines, it documents the significance of these contributions to external audiences, and it enhances educational opportunities for CVM students. Each faculty must describe an individual research/creative work agenda in section B.9 of the

dossier. An initial review of each junior faculty's developing research work agenda should be a vital component in the third year review.

For the tenure and/or promotion process, peer-reviewed or refereed work is valued more highly than non-peer-reviewed endeavors, but all responsible dissemination of knowledge is valuable and should be considered in the evaluation of a candidate. Research valued by the CVM includes traditional peer-reviewed publications and other forms of scholarship. Laboratory research and clinical research such as prospective studies, retrospective studies and case reports are considered meritorious. In the current environment of research teams, collaborative and multi-institutional studies and publications are also considered meritorious. The individual departments and disciplines in the CVM are actively engaged in defining and determining the standards for each discipline within the larger context of the CVM and Auburn University requirements. In all CVM disciplines it is imperative for faculty to develop a sustained body of high quality peer-reviewed work.

3. Outreach Scholarship

The CVM has a strong history of outreach to practicing veterinarians, producers, pet owners, and other public groups. As identified in the Handbook, Chap. 3.8.C., "outreach refers to the function of applying academic expertise to the direct benefit of external audiences in support of university and unit mission." When considered for the purposes of tenure and promotion, the faculty activity should address the six criteria detailed in the Handbook, Chap. 3.8.C. However, the CVM recognizes that some distinctive scholarly outreach activities may not directly address all six criteria; in those activities, the candidate and department head should justify the scholarly nature of the activity.

Outreach activities, outreach program development and/or implementation, and combined teaching/research/outreach activities may contribute to outreach scholarship if there is related meritorious performance as evidenced by some form of peer review or other measurable impacts.

All outreach activities must be documented with regard to significance and contribution. The Handbook describes the documentation requirements which are mentioned in an abbreviated form in the current document. The Handbook also includes a detailed example of the outreach section of a dossier (Chap. 3. Appendix A).

4. Service Scholarship

Faculty members may demonstrate scholarship in service to their profession through service on advisory panels or review committees. Departmental Criteria for assessment of these activities are found in the Appendix.

Evaluating Teaching, Research/Creative Work, Outreach Scholarship

CVM disciplines are varied and encompass different types of scholarship in the areas of teaching, research, outreach, and service. A detailed list with examples and assessment criteria is found in each department's appendix to this document. These represent an overview of scholarship and award venues and levels of achievement that are generally valued by each department in the CVM. Candidates are expected to have meritorious performance in at least two major areas. Clinical and diagnostic are unique opportunities for scholarship in the CVM. Excellent contributions to the mission of the Teaching Hospital can be used to generate scholarship in teaching, research, and

outreach. Meritorious performance in committee service is generally valued in the evaluation of collegiality and in the annual review process.

1. Categories of Scholarly Activities

Research publications and/or presentations

Acknowledgement of Reputation, Expertise, and Peer Recognition

Funded Activities

Outreach Scholarship

Teaching Scholarship

Scholarship in Clinical or Diagnostic Activities

2. Evaluation Levels

Within the six categories, the significance of an endeavor and/or award is evaluated as Highest Distinction, Distinction, or Expected.

Highest Distinction in scholarship demonstrates a national/ international reputation. A candidate progressing from associate professor to full professor must have Highest Distinction and Distinction in scholarship.

Distinction in scholarship demonstrates the faculty member's potential for building a national reputation. A candidate for tenure and for promotion from assistant professor to associate professor should have Distinction in scholarship and/or awards.

Expected scholarship indicates a valuable contribution to the activities of the college or to the advancement of the candidate's discipline. All faculty members are expected to perform at least at the expected level of scholarship whether or not they are candidates for promotion or tenure.

Service

At the CVM service can be divided into two broad categories: faculty governance of the academic mission (i.e. committee work) and service to the profession. All faculty members are expected to contribute some service to the department, college, and university.

Examples of service activities include but are not limited to the following:

1. participation in departmental/college/university committees,
2. graduate program officer or residency coordinator,
3. development of new academic programs,
4. work on accreditation documentation,
5. revision of curricula,
6. recruitment of new faculty,
7. holding office in a professional organization,
8. committee work for professional associations,
9. supervision of a service laboratory,
10. service as a chief of a clinical service, or
11. service on an advisory committee for a corporation or government agency.

For the annual assessment process, documentation of contributions in the area of service may consist of:

1. Description of the service activity
2. Letters from colleagues documenting excellent service

3. Explanation of how the activity contributes to the university, college, or departmental mission
4. Significant contributions of the faculty member to a committee's activities
5. Impact of the activity (was it evaluated or recognized as significant?)
6. Description of activities and products
7. Letters of appreciation from panel chairpersons

Guidelines for Post-Tenure Review

Faculty members are expected to be productive throughout their tenure at Auburn. Two successive unsatisfactory ratings during annual evaluations will trigger a post-tenure review under current University guidelines.

Appendix

Scholarly Activities and Evaluation of Significance:

1. Department of Anatomy, Physiology, and Pharmacology
2. Department of Clinical Sciences
3. Department of Pathobiology

Submitted December 1, 2010. Revised April 26, 2011.

Promotion and Tenure Guidelines

Department of Anatomy, Physiology,
and Pharmacology

April 26, 2011

Department of Anatomy, Physiology, and Pharmacology

Table of Contents

PEER REVIEWED PUBLICATION

1. Journal Article.....	18
2. Book.....	18
3. Book Chapter	19
4. Conference Proceedings.....	19

OTHER PUBLICATIONS

1. Abstracts	20
2. Web and Electronic Resources	21
3. Advisory Report.....	21

PATENTS	21
---------------	----

PEER RECOGNITION OF EXPERTISE

1. Teaching.....	22
2. Competitive Awards and Honors.....	22
3. Grant Reviewer	22
4. Invited Lectures	23
5. Journal Reviewer	23
6. Platform Presentations	23
7. Poster Presentations	24
8. Professional Service and Leadership Activities.....	24
9. Expert Testimony.....	24
10. Specialty Board Certification.....	24

FUNDED ACTIVITIES

1. Extramurally Funded Grants and Contracts.....	25
2. Intramurally Funded Grants and Contracts.....	25

Candidates for tenure and promotion are expected to develop independently funded research programs, participate in the graduate and professional instruction and be an active member of the academic community. To accomplish these commitments the Department shall actively mentor new hires.

For new hires of tenure track assistant/associate level:

- A mentoring committee of three faculty, including at least two members working in the same general areas as mentee, shall be constituted for each new hire on assumption of duty;
- A mentoring committee shall provide guidance and information regarding activities with potential to facilitate achievement of tenure and/or promotion;
- Activities requiring mentorship shall include, albeit not limited to, scientific writing (grants), presentations at academic/scientific forums, mentoring of professional and undergraduate students, and development of long-term collaborations within or outside Auburn for professional development;
- A mentoring committee shall meet at least once every six months with mentee to review progress and identify problems;
- A mentoring committee shall provide a report to the Head of the Department regarding their activities for each year.

A faculty member's professional stature can be generally classified by his/her level of scholarship as follows:

- Highest Distinction in scholarship indicates the attainment or maintenance of a national and international reputation. This is required for promotion from Associate Professor to Full Professor.
- Distinction in scholarship demonstrates the faculty member's attainment of a regional and/or national reputation. This is used as a criterion for promotion from Assistant Professor to Associate Professor.
- Expected scholarship indicates the productivity expected of all faculty members.

Levels of scholarship are achieved principally through published journal articles, peer reviewed activities, and measures of peer recognition through activities such as:

- Highest Distinction: Books, book chapters, invited lectures, professional leadership, PI/Co-PI on extramural grants and contracts, conference proceedings, board certification, grant reviewer, journal editor, and patents, in addition to those indicators of Distinction and Expected scholarship, in addition to:
- Distinction: Publication of journal articles, Co-I/collaborator/consultant on extramural grants, PI/Co-PI on intramural grants, and other forms of peer review and recognition, in addition to the indicators of Expected scholarship:

- Expected: Participation, effective teaching, contributions to publications, presentations at meetings, contribution to intramural grants, and professional service (this is expected of all faculty members in order to achieve satisfactory performance ratings).

PEER REVIEWED PUBLICATION

1. Journal Article - Authorship of peer-reviewed journal articles is a core indicator of scholarship. In some cases, significance can be determined statistically (journal impact factor or citation index, i.e., Cell, Endocrine, Nature, Neuroscience) or by an assessment of appropriateness of the journal's target audience relative to article's subject matter (i.e., JAVMA). It is important to recognize that some publications are intended for focused readership; therefore, impact factors or citation indices might be poor indicators of actual impact on the intended audience. Such situations should be explained by the candidate and/or department head. Full research articles often represent the product of a sustained research effort, and may represent a more extensive scope than a brief report. Case reports and case-series reports are often the foundation of clinical or diagnostic scholarship. First authorship, senior authorship, and corresponding authorship carry equal significance. The significance of co-authorship should be defined in the dossier by the candidate.

Expected	Distinction	Highest Distinction
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Co-authorship on a brief report or single case study (or other comparable format). 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Primary, senior, or corresponding authorship on a brief report or single case study. • Co-authorship on a full length manuscript or case series. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Primary, senior, or co-authorship on a full length manuscript or case series.

2. Book - Authorship or editorship of a published book or textbook is generally recognized as an indication of distinction or highest distinction in scholarship. Shared authorship can carry equal significance if roles are evenly distributed. Significance can be gauged by the type of book (an authoritative professional resource vs. a review of the current state of knowledge), the scope of distribution or adoption (regional vs. national/international), the intended audience (public vs. professional), and the extent of professional acceptance (numbers of peer citations or published copies). A signed contract with the publisher, accompanied by a complete draft of the book, is acceptable for consideration.

Expected	Distinction	Highest Distinction
Not applicable	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A book serving as a review of other authoritative works. • Intended for distribution to public readership, regional distribution and adoption. • Narrow impact on a field. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • An authoritative work and comprehensive review. • Intended for professional or professional student audiences. • National/international distribution and adoption. • Many citations or adoptions. • Broad impact on a field

3. Book Chapter - Authorship of a book chapter is usually an invited professional contribution which reflects national or international recognition; therefore, it is a good indication of distinction or highest distinction in scholarship. Significance can be gauged by the same criteria as those specified above for book authorship. A signed contract with the publisher, accompanied by a complete draft of the book, is acceptable for consideration.

Expected	Distinction	Highest Distinction
Not applicable	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A chapter serving as a review of other authoritative works. • Intended for distribution to public readership. • Regional distribution and adoption. • Relatively few citations. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • An authoritative work and comprehensive review. • Intended for professional or professional student readership. • National/international distribution and adoption. • Extensive citations

4. Conference Proceedings - Authorship of a manuscript-length contribution (not an abstract) to conference proceedings is often an invited activity that indicates a degree of professional recognition associated with distinction or highest distinction in scholarship. Significance is validated by the inclusion of peer review (e.g. by a session chair or moderator), the scope of attendance at the conference (regional, national, or international), and the extent of circulation of the proceedings.

Expected	Distinction	Highest Distinction
Not applicable	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Authorship of a peer-reviewed contribution with regional distribution. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Primary authorship on a peer-reviewed contribution with national or international distribution.

OTHER PUBLICATIONS

1. Abstracts - Authorship of an abstract indicates a transition between discovery and peer-reviewed publication. Abstracts are an appropriate method to deliver new information to peers, but they are usually published in conference proceedings with limited peer review. Thus, abstracts alone are indicators of expected scholarship while abstracts that precede published articles are indicators of distinction in scholarship. Service as first or senior author carries the most significance. The significance of co-authorship needs to be defined in the dossier by the candidate.

Expected	Distinction	Highest Distinction
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Authorship or co-authorship on an abstract published the proceedings of a local or regional meeting. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Authorship or co-authorship of an abstract published in the proceedings of a national or international meeting. • Significance is increased when similar data are published in a refereed journal article. 	Same criteria as listed under Distinction

- 2. Web and Electronic Resources** - Web and electronic resources can be developed into a form of outreach scholarship with a potential for rapid national and international impact. The scholarly significance should be determined through post-hoc peer review and by documenting the extent of resource integration into classes and training programs through user surveys and quantification of usage (number of website visits). Adherence to institutional policies related to Web usage (e.g. Blackboard posting of course materials) is expected. The range of significance can vary from expected scholarship to scholarship with highest distinction.

Expected	Distinction	Highest Distinction
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Adherence to departmental, college, or university policies related to Web and other electronic resources (e.g., Blackboard posting of course materials). 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> A completed resource that has been implemented as a component of a course or outreach program, receiving favorable user-review, positive post hoc peer-review, and documented usage 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> A resource that has been nationally or internationally recognized as a unique contribution based on post hoc peer-review and documentation of broad usage.

- 3. Advisory Report** - An advisory report is a summary of a body of work presented to an authoritative audience (e.g. a committee's recommendation to a governing body, a scientific advisory document written to brief a board of directors, etc.). The significance of authorship of published reports is usually indicated by the scope and nature of the intended audience (i.e., regional, national, or international; the broader the audience the greater the impact). Some reports are intended for smaller audiences, but they exert a major impact on the advancement of a scientific discipline (e.g. published report of a corporate advisory panel). Published reports are indicative of expected scholarship, scholarship with distinction, or scholarship with highest distinction, subject to assessment and validation by an external reviewer of the dossier.

Expected	Distinction	Highest Distinction
Not applicable	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Authorship on a report with focused readership or narrow impact at a local, state, regional, or national level. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Authorship of a report with disseminated readership or wide impact at national or international levels.

PATENTS

The scholarship of invention reflects distinction or highest distinction. Significance is assessed by the scope of the patent, likelihood for national or international impact, role as a team member (principal inventor and co-inventor can carry similar weight with justification by the candidate) and the status of the application (along the spectrum from disclosure of intellectual property to issuance of a patent).

Expected	Distinction	Highest Distinction
Not applicable	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Inventor or key co-inventor of a disclosed technology or issued patent. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Inventor or key co-inventor of a licensed patent or a patent that has led to an extramurally funded project or commercial product.

PEER RECOGNITION OF EXPERTISE

- 1. Teaching** - Peer-review of teaching is the core method to assess scholarship in instruction. Student reviews of teaching are also considered in the assessment of teaching effectiveness. Distinction is usually reserved for teaching that incorporates scholarly approaches while highest distinction denotes the development and implementation of novel approaches and the demonstration of their effectiveness through publication.

Expected	Distinction	Highest Distinction
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> An organized delivery of accurate information with responsive participation (e.g., timely submission of course notes, grades, etc.) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> An organized delivery of information that reflects the most current state of knowledge. A scholarly approach to teaching that incorporates reported effective techniques. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> An organized delivery of information that reflects the most current state of knowledge. Development and implementation of novel scholarly approaches that are subject to publication.

- 2. Competitive Awards and Honors** - The scholarly significance of competitive awards and Honors is assessed through the prestige of the award (indicated by the stringency of the selection process, level of competition, etc.), extent of recognition (regional, national, international), and placement (first place, second place, honorable mention, etc.). They usually reflect distinction or highest distinction in scholarship.

Expected	Distinction	Highest Distinction
Not applicable	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Recipient of a prestigious college, university, or regional award. Finalist for a prestigious national or international award. Recurring nominee/finalist for a college award. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Recipient of a prestigious national or international award.

- 3. Grant Reviewer** - Selection to serve on a grant review panel is evidence of professional recognition within the scope of the granting institution. Thus, national or international panels acknowledge scholarship with distinction or with highest distinction, while local or regional panels acknowledge scholarship at the level of distinction. Quality of participation can be documented by the panel coordinator. Impact can be assessed by the stature of the funding agency and the association between the reviewer's expertise and the agency's goals.

Expected	Distinction	Highest Distinction
Not applicable	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Reviewer for funding opportunities coordinated within Auburn University or the State. Ad hoc member of a review panel for national/international funding opportunities. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Full member of a review panel (e.g. study section member or scientific panel) for funding opportunities at the national or international levels.

4. Invited Lectures - The impact of invited lectures is largely determined by the venue (e.g., a peer institution, a technical school, etc.). Lectures that reflect unique expertise in a topic are generally valued over those that are based on general knowledge. The quality of lectures may be assessed through traditional measures (student evaluations, peer evaluations, etc.).

Expected	Distinction	Highest Distinction
Not applicable	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> An invited lecture delivered to another department or peer institution based on unique expertise in a field; should receive favorable student and peer review. An invited outreach lecture to the public on a general interest topic at the state, regional, or national level. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> An invited lecture delivered at a peer institution as a part of a special lecture series or conference focusing on the presenter's area of expertise.

5. Journal Reviewer - Selection to serve on an editorial board of a journal or to serve as an ad hoc reviewer is evidence of professional recognition. The scope of such recognition is generally reflected by the breadth and extent of the journal's circulation or its impact factor. Such recognition is indicative of scholarship at the levels of expected, distinction, or highest distinction. Determinants of impact would include number of reviews, extent of journal circulation (national or international) and the stature of the journal relative to the candidate's professional interests.

Expected	Distinction	Highest Distinction
Not applicable	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Ad hoc reviewer of manuscripts in a professional journal with national/international circulation. Member of an editorial board for a national/ international professional journal. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Service as primary editor for a national/international professional journal.

6. Platform Presentations - Platform presentations are those that deliver new findings to an audience of peers, usually after abstract submission. These indicate scholarship with distinction or scholarship with highest distinction. Criteria include scope of the audience (i.e., regional, national, or international), nature of the presentation (invited vs. self-submission of abstract) and duration/extent of the presentation. Faculty members are expected to regularly present platform presentations at departmental or college venues appropriate to their assignments.

Expected	Distinction	Highest Distinction
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> A platform presentation at a departmental or college seminar series (depending on assignment; e.g. dept. research seminar series, Phi Zeta Day, etc.) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> A platform presentation at a meeting based on an abstract submission. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> A platform presentation of special significance at a national or international meeting based on an invitation.

7. Poster Presentations - Poster presentations at professional meetings are usually an indicator of expected scholarship, or in well documented cases, scholarship with distinction or highest distinction. When abstracts are voluntarily submitted for presentation at a professional meeting, peer selection for a poster presentation generally carries lower impact than a platform presentation; some exceptions are listed below. Criteria include scope of the meeting attendance (i.e., local, regional, national, or international), the degree of stringency for selection of poster presentations (usually indicated by the session chair in the notice of poster assignment).

Expected	Distinction	Highest Distinction
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> A poster presentation at a local, regional, national or international meeting. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> A poster presentation at a national or international meeting with an invitation to appear in a special program (e.g., a featured poster session) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> An invited poster presentation at a prestigious national or international meeting (e.g., Gordon Conference, NIH workshop, USDA special session, etc.)

8. Professional Service and Leadership Activities - Selection to serve in professional leadership roles is usually an indication of a record of scholarship ranging from distinction to highest distinction. Criteria include the scope of the professional body (local, regional, national, or international), the nature of the leadership role (e.g. president vs. program chair) and selection method (volunteer vs. appointment vs. election).

Expected	Distinction	Highest Distinction
Not applicable	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Moderator or officer of a local or regional meeting (as a volunteer approved or elected by a larger body). 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Moderator of a session of a national or international meeting (by appointment or invitation). Professional service as an elected national officer in a national or international organization.

9. Expert Testimony - This is evidence of esteemed professional reputation and indicates scholarship with highest distinction.

Expected	Distinction	Highest Distinction
Not applicable	Not applicable	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Invited expert testimony

10. Specialty Board Certification – Certification by a nationally or internationally recognized professional college is indicative of scholarship with highest distinction and national/international peer recognition of expertise

Expected	Distinction	Highest Distinction
Not applicable	Not applicable	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Board certification by a clinical or diagnostic specialty organization (ACVP, ACT, ACVPM, ACVM, ACVIM, ACVS, etc.)

FUNDED ACTIVITIES

1. Extramurally Funded Grants and Contracts - Service as a principal investigator (PI), co-principal investigator (Co-PI), co-investigator (Co-I), collaborator, or consultant indicate scholarly contributions to a project (generally listed in decreasing order of distinction). The roles of PI or Co-PI carry the greatest scholarly impact. A major factor in determining scholarly impact is the scope of the funding entity (federal department, nationally recognized foundation, global corporation, state agency, etc.). Funding agencies with a broad scope reflect a more significant the scholarly contribution. However, certain disciplines rely on state or local funding sources to target the appropriate audiences in their outreach efforts. Some projects are appropriately targeted to large funding sources (NIH, NSF, USDA, corporations, etc.). Other projects are appropriately targeted to smaller funding sources (Morris Animal Foundation, Grayson Jockey Club, Winn Feline Foundation, etc.). While large grants and contracts are usually indicators of highest distinction in scholarship, smaller grants may carry equivalent distinction when targeted to the appropriate funding source. In such cases, justification for the selection of a funding source should be provided by the candidate.

Expected	Distinction	Highest Distinction
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> General contributions to extramurally funded projects when relevant to assignment and area of expertise. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Co-investigator, collaborator, or consultant on an extramurally funded project. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> PI or Co-PI on an extramurally funded project. PI or Co-PI on multiple extramural projects (depending on extent of research assignment)

2. Intramurally Funded Grants and Contracts - Intramural support is defined as a source of funding that is awarded from within Auburn University (this includes Animal Health and Disease Research, the Alabama Agricultural Experiment Station, the Scott-Ritchey Research Center, AU Intramural Grants Program, Breeden Awards, etc.). Roles on projects are the same as those described above under Extramural Grants and Contracts. Intramural funding is often used as a source of support for experiments that generate preliminary data in justification of a later extramural proposal. Thus, intramural funding for a project that precedes an extramurally funded project is evidence of scholarship with highest distinction. Intramural projects that lead to peer-reviewed publications are indicators of distinction or highest distinction in scholarship.

Expected	Distinction	Highest Distinction
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Co-investigator, collaborator, or consultant on an intramural project. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> PI or Co-PI on an intramural project. Distinction is further demonstrated by peer-reviewed publication of results from the project. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> PI or Co-PI on an intramural project that leads to extramural funding.

Promotion and Tenure Guidelines

Department of Clinical Sciences

April 26, 2011

Department of Clinical Sciences

Table of Contents

PEER REVIEWED PUBLICATION	28
1. Journal Article	28
2. Book	28
3. Book Chapter	29
4. Conference Proceedings	29
OTHER PUBLICATIONS.....	29
1. Diagnostic Reports.....	29
2. Abstracts.....	30
3. Web and Electronic Resources.....	30
4. Advisory Report	30
PATENTS.....	31
PEER RECOGNITION OF EXPERTISE.....	31
1. Teaching	31
2. Competitive Awards and Honors	31
3. Grant Reviewer	32
4. Invited Lectures	32
5. Journal Reviewer	32
6. Platform Presentations	33
7. Poster Presentations	33
8. Professional Service and Leadership Activities	33
9. Expert Testimony	34
10. Specialty Board Certification	34
FUNDED ACTIVITIES	34
1. Extramurally Funded Grants and Contracts -.....	34
2. Intramurally Funded Grants and Contracts	35

PEER REVIEWED PUBLICATION

1. Journal Article - Authorship of peer-reviewed journal articles is a core indicator of scholarship. In some cases, significance can be determined statistically (journal impact factor or citation index) or by an assessment of appropriateness of the journal's target audience relative to article's subject matter. It is important to recognize that some publications are intended for focused readership; therefore, impact factors or citation indices might be poor indicators of actual impact on the intended audience. Such situations should be explained by the candidate and/or department head. Full research articles often represent the product of a sustained research effort, and may represent a more extensive scope than a brief report. Case reports and case-series reports are often the foundation of clinical or diagnostic scholarship. First authorship, senior authorship, and corresponding authorship carry equal significance. The significance of co-authorship, particularly where faculty mentor graduate students, residents, or house officers, should be defined in the dossier by the candidate. Peer-evaluated review articles are valued contributions, especially when invited as a result of the faculty member's clinical or investigative reputation and experience.

Expected	Distinction	Highest Distinction
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Co-authorship on a brief report or single case study (or other comparable format). 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Primary, senior, or collaborative authorship on a brief report or single case study. Co-authorship on a full length manuscript or case series. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Primary, senior, or co-authorship on a full length manuscript or case series. Essential contributor to publication of collaborative or multi-institutional research.

2. Book - Authorship or editorship of a published book or textbook is generally recognized as an indication of distinction or highest distinction in scholarship. Shared authorship can carry equal significance if roles are evenly distributed. Significance can be gauged by the type of book, the scope of distribution or adoption (regional vs. national/international), the intended audience (public vs. professional), and the extent of professional acceptance (numbers of peer citations or published copies). A signed contract with the publisher, accompanied by a complete draft of the book, is acceptable for consideration.

Expected	Distinction	Highest Distinction
Not applicable	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> A book serving as a review of other authoritative works. Intended for distribution to public readership, regional distribution and adoption. Narrow impact on a field. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> An authoritative work and comprehensive review. Intended for professional or professional student audiences. National/international distribution and adoption. Many citations or adoptions. Broad impact on a field of faculty expertise.

3. Book Chapter - Authorship of a book chapter is usually an invited professional contribution which reflects national or international recognition; therefore, it is an indication of distinction or highest distinction in scholarship. Significance can be gauged by the same criteria as those specified above for book authorship. A signed contract with the publisher, accompanied by a complete draft of the book, is acceptable for consideration.

Expected	Distinction	Highest Distinction
Not applicable	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> A chapter serving as a review of other authoritative works. Intended for distribution to public readership. Regional distribution and adoption. Relatively few citations. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> An authoritative work and comprehensive review. Intended for professional or professional student readership. National/international distribution and adoption. Extensive citations

4. Conference Proceedings - Authorship of a manuscript-length contribution (not an abstract) to conference proceedings is often an invited activity that indicates a degree of professional recognition associated with distinction or highest distinction in scholarship. Significance is validated by the inclusion of peer review (e.g. by a session chair or moderator), the scope of attendance at the conference (regional, national, or international), and the extent of circulation of the proceedings.

Expected	Distinction	Highest Distinction
Not applicable	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Authorship of a peer-reviewed contribution with regional distribution. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Primary authorship on a peer-reviewed contribution with national or international distribution.

OTHER PUBLICATIONS

1. Clinical and Diagnostic Reports - A clinical or diagnostic report is a confidential document that exerts a major impact on a clinician's management of a patient. Such reports provide documentation of clinical activities in imaging, medicine, surgery and other clinical and diagnostic disciplines. Final reports, although not peer-reviewed documents, are regularly distributed to veterinarians in the Teaching Hospital and to referring veterinarians as informational and advisory documents for the diagnosis and treatment of patients. The scholarly value of these reports in the management of a case can be confirmed by peer diagnosticians and clinical veterinarians who receive the reports. A faculty member may elect to submit a collection of reports for external peer review to establish distinction in scholarship. Impact and responsiveness in clinical and diagnostic activities can be documented in a promotion dossier by inclusion of selected diagnostic reports.

Expected	Distinction	Highest Distinction
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Timely, accurate, and responsive clinical and/or diagnostic reporting. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Timely and accurate reporting with the highest standards of responsiveness and interpretation Incorporation of state-of-the-art research technology into a clinical or diagnostic service. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Service as a clinical or diagnostic specialist on a peer-reviewed publication of a case report that reflects the highest national/international standards in diagnostics, interpretation, and advancement of the field. Board certification by a national organization in a clinical or diagnostic discipline (ACVA, ACVIM, ACVS, ACVR, ACVD, ACT, ACVECCS, ABVP, etc.).

2. Abstracts - Authorship of an abstract indicates a transition between discovery or application and peer-reviewed publication. Abstracts are an appropriate method to deliver new information to peers, but are sometimes published in conference proceedings with limited peer review. Thus, abstracts alone are indicators of expected scholarship while abstracts that precede published articles are indicators of distinction in scholarship. Abstracts published as first or senior author are more significant. Peer-reviewed abstracts published in refereed journals have greatest significance. The significance of co-authorship should be defined in the dossier by the candidate

Expected	Distinction	Highest Distinction
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Authorship or co-authorship on an abstract published in the proceedings of a local or regional meeting. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Authorship or co-authorship of an abstract published in the proceedings of a national or international meeting. Significance is increased when similar data are published in a refereed journal article. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Same as listed under Distinction

3. Web and Electronic Resources - Web and electronic resources can be developed into a form of outreach scholarship with a potential for rapid national and international impact. The scholarly significance should be determined through post-hoc peer review and by documenting the extent of resource integration into classes and training programs through user surveys and quantification of usage (number of website visits). Adherence to institutional policies related to Web usage (e.g. Blackboard posting of course materials) is expected. The range of significance can vary from expected scholarship to scholarship with highest distinction

Expected	Distinction	Highest Distinction
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Adherence to departmental, college, or university policies related to Web and other electronic resources (e.g., Blackboard posting of course materials). 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> A completed resource that has been implemented as a component of a course or outreach program, receiving favorable user-review, positive post hoc peer-review, and documented usage 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> A resource that has been nationally or internationally recognized as a unique contribution based on post hoc peer-review and documentation of broad usage. (i.e., Veterinary Information Network).

4. Advisory Report - An advisory report is a summary of a body of work presented to an authoritative audience (e.g. a committee's recommendation to a governing body, a scientific advisory document written to brief a board of directors, etc.). The significance of authorship of published reports is usually indicated by the scope and nature of the intended audience (i.e., regional, national, or international; the broader the audience the greater the impact). Some reports are intended for smaller audiences, but they exert a major impact on the advancement of a scientific discipline (e.g. published report of a corporate advisory panel or report of Standards set by national clinical specialty colleges). Published reports are indicative of expected scholarship, scholarship with distinction, or scholarship with highest distinction, subject to assessment and validation by an external reviewer of the dossier.

Expected	Distinction	Highest Distinction
Not applicable	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Authorship on a report with focused readership or narrow impact at a local, state, regional, or national level. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Authorship of a report with disseminated readership or wide impact at national or international levels.

PATENTS

The scholarship of invention reflects distinction or highest distinction. Significance is assessed by the scope of the patent, likelihood for national or international impact, role as a team member (principal inventor and co-inventor can carry similar weight with justification by the candidate) and the status of the application (along the spectrum from disclosure of intellectual property to issuance of a patent).

Expected	Distinction	Highest Distinction
Not applicable	<ul style="list-style-type: none">Inventor or key co-inventor of a disclosed technology or issued patent.	<ul style="list-style-type: none">Inventor or key co-inventor of a licensed patent or a patent that has led to an extramurally funded project or commercial product.

PEER RECOGNITION OF EXPERTISE

1. Teaching - Peer-review of teaching is the core method to assess scholarship in clinical, didactic and laboratory instruction. Student reviews of teaching are also considered in the assessment of teaching effectiveness. Distinction is usually reserved for teaching that is of consistently high quality (as indicated by student and peer evaluations) and that incorporates scholarly approaches, while highest distinction denotes the development and implementation of novel approaches while maintaining exemplary evaluations. Peer-reviewed publication of teaching methods and outcomes is considered most significant.

Expected	Distinction	Highest Distinction
<ul style="list-style-type: none">An organized delivery of accurate information with responsive participation (e.g., timely submission of course notes, grades, etc.)	<ul style="list-style-type: none">An organized delivery of information that reflects the most current state of knowledge.A scholarly approach to teaching that incorporates reported effective techniques.	<ul style="list-style-type: none">An organized delivery of information that reflects the most current state of knowledge.Development and implementation of novel scholarly approachesPeer-reviewed publication of teaching methods and outcomes.

2. Competitive Awards and Honors - The scholarly significance of competitive awards and Honors is assessed through the prestige of the award (indicated by the stringency of the selection process, level of competition, etc.), extent of recognition (regional, national, international), and placement (first place, second place, honorable mention, etc.). Such awards usually reflect distinction or highest distinction in scholarship.

Expected	Distinction	Highest Distinction
Not applicable	<ul style="list-style-type: none">Recipient of a prestigious college, university, or regional award.Finalist for a prestigious national or international award.Recurring nominee/finalist for a college award.	<ul style="list-style-type: none">Recipient of a prestigious national or international award.

3. Grant Reviewer - Selection to serve on a grant review panel is evidence of professional recognition within the scope of the granting institution. Thus, national or international panels acknowledge scholarship with distinction or with highest distinction, while local or regional panels acknowledge scholarship at the level of distinction. Impact can be assessed by the stature of the funding agency and the association between the reviewer's expertise and the agency's goals.

Expected	Distinction	Highest Distinction
Not applicable	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Reviewer for funding opportunities coordinated within Auburn University or the State. Ad hoc member of a review panel for national/international funding opportunities. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Full member of a review panel (e.g. study section member or scientific panel) for funding opportunities at the national or international levels. Grant review committee member for national specialty college

4. Invited Lectures - The impact of invited lectures is largely determined by the venue (e.g., a peer institution, a technical school, etc.). Lectures that reflect unique expertise in a topic are considered to be most significant. The quality of lectures may be assessed through traditional measures (student evaluations, peer evaluations, venue, etc.).

Expected	Distinction	Highest Distinction
Not applicable	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> An invited lecture delivered to another department or peer institution based on unique expertise in a field; should receive favorable student and peer review. An invited outreach lecture to the public on a general interest topic at the state, regional, or national level. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> An invited lecture delivered at a peer institution or national/international meeting as a part of a special lecture series or conference focusing on the presenter's area of expertise.

5. Journal Reviewer - Selection to serve on an editorial board of a journal or to serve as an ad hoc reviewer is evidence of professional recognition. The scope of such recognition is generally reflected by the breadth and extent of the journal's circulation or its impact factor. Such recognition is indicative of scholarship at the levels of distinction or highest distinction. Determinants of impact would include number of reviews, extent of journal circulation (national or international) and the stature of the journal relative to the candidate's professional interests.

Expected	Distinction	Highest Distinction
Not applicable	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Ad hoc reviewer of manuscripts in a professional journal with national/international circulation. Member of an editorial board for a national/international professional journal. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Service as primary editor or associate editor for a national/international professional journal.

6. Platform Presentations - Platform presentations are those that deliver new findings to an audience of peers, usually after abstract submission. These indicate scholarship with distinction or scholarship with highest distinction. Criteria include scope of the audience (i.e., regional, national, or international), nature of the presentation (invited vs. self-submission of abstract) and duration/extent of the presentation. Faculty members are expected to regularly present platform presentations at departmental or college venues appropriate to their assignments.

Expected	Distinction	Highest Distinction
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> A platform presentation at a departmental or college seminar series (depending on assignment; e.g. dept. research seminar series, Phi Zeta Day, etc.) Mentor for graduate student, intern or resident seminars 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> A platform presentation at a meeting based on an abstract submission. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> A platform presentation of special significance at a national or international meeting based on an invitation.

7. Poster Presentations - Poster presentations at professional meetings are usually an indicator of expected scholarship, or in well documented cases, scholarship with distinction or highest distinction. When abstracts are voluntarily submitted for presentation at a professional meeting, peer selection for a poster presentation generally carries lower impact than a platform presentation; some exceptions are listed below. Criteria include scope of the meeting attendance (i.e., local, regional, national, or international), the degree of stringency for selection of poster presentations (usually indicated by the session chair in the notice of poster assignment).

Expected	Distinction	Highest Distinction
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> A poster presentation at a local, regional, national or international meeting. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> A poster presentation at a national or international meeting selected by abstract submission 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> An invited poster presentation at a prestigious national or international meeting (e.g., clinical specialty college scientific meeting , AVMA)

8. Professional Service and Leadership Activities - Selection to serve in professional leadership roles is usually an indication of a record of scholarship ranging from distinction to highest distinction. Criteria include the scope of the professional body (local, regional, national, or international), the nature of the leadership role (e.g. president program chair, or committee member) and selection method (e.g. volunteer, appointment or election).

Expected	Distinction	Highest Distinction
Not applicable	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Moderator or officer of a local or regional meeting (as a volunteer approved or elected by a larger body). Service on committee of national/international organization committee 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Moderator of a session of a national or international meeting (by appointment or invitation). Professional service as an elected national officer in a national or international organization. Chair of national/international organization committee Service on National Examination Committee of Clinical Specialty College

9. Expert Testimony - This is evidence of esteemed professional reputation and indicates scholarship with highest distinction.

Expected	Distinction	Highest Distinction
Not applicable	Not applicable	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Invited expert testimony

10. Specialty Board Certification – Certification by a nationally or internationally recognized clinical specialty college is indicative of scholarship with highest distinction and national/international peer recognition of expertise

Expected	Distinction	Highest Distinction
Not applicable	Not applicable	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Board certification by a clinical or diagnostic specialty organization (ACVA, ACVD, ACVIM, ACVECC, ACVS, ACT, ACVR, ACVPM, etc.)

FUNDED ACTIVITIES

1. Extramurally Funded Grants and Contracts – Particularly for faculty with a research assignment, service as a principal investigator (PI), co-principal investigator (Co-PI), co-investigator (Co-I), collaborator, or consultant indicates scholarly contributions to a project (generally listed in decreasing order of distinction). The roles of PI or Co-PI carry the greatest scholarly impact. A major factor in determining scholarly impact is the scope of the funding entity (federal department, nationally recognized foundation, global corporation, state agency, etc.). Funding agencies with a broad scope reflect a more significant the scholarly contribution. However, certain disciplines rely on state or local funding sources to target the appropriate audiences in their outreach efforts. While some projects can be targeted to large funding sources (NIH, NSF, USDA, corporations, etc.) most projects in veterinary clinical sciences often are appropriately targeted to smaller funding sources (Morris Animal Foundation, Grayson Jockey Club, Winn Feline Foundation, etc.). While large grants and contracts are usually indicators of highest distinction in scholarship, smaller grants may carry equivalent distinction when targeted to the appropriate funding source. In such cases, justification for the selection of a funding source should be provided by the candidate.

Expected	Distinction	Highest Distinction
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> General contributions to extramurally funded projects when relevant to the assignment and area of expertise. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Co-investigator, collaborator, or consultant on an extramurally funded project. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> PI or Co-PI on an extramurally funded project. Essential contributor on an extramurally funded collaborative or multi-institutional project

2. Intramurally Funded Grants and Contracts - Intramural support is defined as a source of funding that is awarded from within Auburn University (this includes Animal Health and Disease Research, the Alabama Agricultural Experiment Station, the Scott-Ritchey Research Center, Interdisciplinary Grants Program, Breeden Awards, etc.). Roles on projects are the same as those described above under Extramural Grants and Contracts. Intramural funding is often used as a source of support for experiments that generate preliminary data in justification of a later extramural proposal. Thus, intramural funding for a project that precedes an extramurally funded project is evidence of scholarship with highest distinction. Intramural projects that lead to peer-reviewed publications are indicators of distinction or highest distinction in scholarship.

Expected	Distinction	Highest Distinction
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Co-investigator, collaborator, or consultant on an intramural project. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • PI or Co-PI on an intramural project. • 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • PI or Co-PI on an intramural project that leads to extramural funding or peer-reviewed publication.

Promotion and Tenure Guidelines

Department of Pathobiology

April 26, 2011

Department of Pathobiology

Table of Contents

PEER REVIEWED PUBLICATION	38
1. Journal Article	38
2. Conference Proceedings	38
3. Book	38
4. Book Chapter	39
OTHER PUBLICATIONS.....	39
1. Diagnostic Reports	39
2. Abstracts	39
3. Web and Electronic Resources.....	40
4. Advisory Report.....	40
PATENTS	40
PEER RECOGNITION OF EXPERTISE	41
1. Teaching.....	41
2. Professional Service and Leadership Activities	41
3. Platform Presentations	41
4. Competitive Awards and Honors	42
5. Grant Reviewer	42
6. Invited Lectures.....	42
7. Journal Reviewer	43
8. Poster Presentations	43
9. Expert Testimony	43
10. Specialty Board Certification.....	43
FUNDED ACTIVITIES.....	44
1. Intramurally Funded Grants and Contracts	44
2. Extramurally Funded Grants and Contracts	44

PEER REVIEWED PUBLICATION

1. Journal Article - Authorship of peer-reviewed journal articles is a core indicator of scholarship. In some cases, significance can be determined statistically (journal impact factor or citation index) or by an assessment of appropriateness of the journal's target audience relative to article's subject matter. It is important to recognize that some publications are intended for focused readership; therefore, impact factors or citation indices might be poor indicators of actual impact on the intended audience. Such situations should be explained by the candidate and/or department head. Full research articles often represent the product of a sustained research effort, and may represent a more extensive scope than a brief report. Case reports and case-series reports are often the foundation of clinical or diagnostic scholarship. First authorship, senior authorship, and corresponding authorship carry equal significance. The significance of co-authorship should be defined in the dossier by the candidate.

Expected	Distinction	Highest Distinction
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Co-authorship on a peer-reviewed publication of any type. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Primary, senior, or corresponding authorship on a brief report or single case study. Co-authorship on a full length manuscript or case series. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Primary or senior authorship on a full length manuscript or case series.

2. Conference Proceedings - Authorship of contributions to conference proceedings can be voluntary or an invited activity that indicates a degree of professional recognition associated with distinction or highest distinction in scholarship. Significance is validated by the inclusion of peer review (e.g. by a session chair or moderator), the scope of attendance at the conference (regional, national, or international), and the extent of circulation of the proceedings.

Expected	Distinction	Highest Distinction
Not applicable	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Primary authorship of a peer-reviewed contribution with regional distribution. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Primary authorship on an invited peer-reviewed contribution with national or international distribution.

3. Book - Authorship or editorship of a published book or textbook is generally recognized as an indication of distinction or highest distinction in scholarship. Shared authorship can carry equal significance if roles are evenly distributed. Significance can be gauged by the type of book (an authoritative professional resource vs. a review of the current state of knowledge), the scope of distribution or adoption (regional vs. national/international), the intended audience (public vs. professional), and the extent of professional acceptance (numbers of peer citations or published copies). For books in press, a contract with the publisher, accompanied by a complete draft of the book, is acceptable for consideration.

Expected	Distinction	Highest Distinction
Not applicable	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> A book serving as a review of other authoritative works. Intended for distribution to public readership, regional distribution and adoption. Narrow impact on a field. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> An authoritative work and comprehensive review. Intended for professional or professional student audiences. National/international distribution and adoption. Many citations or adoptions. Broad impact on a field.

4. Book Chapter - Authorship of a book chapter is usually an invited professional contribution which reflects national or international recognition; therefore, it is a good indication of distinction or highest distinction in scholarship. Significance can be gauged by the same criteria as those specified above for book authorship. For book chapters in press, a contract with the publisher, accompanied by a complete draft of the chapter, is acceptable for consideration.

Expected	Distinction	Highest Distinction
Not applicable	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A chapter serving as a review of other authoritative works. • Intended for distribution to public readership. • Regional distribution and adoption. • Relatively few citations. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • An authoritative work and comprehensive review. • Intended for professional or professional student readership. • National/international distribution and adoption. • Extensive citations.

OTHER PUBLICATIONS

1. Diagnostic Reports - A diagnostic report is a confidential document that exerts a major impact on a clinician's management of a patient. Diagnostic reports are the final product of clinical diagnostic activities in anatomic pathology, clinical pathology, microbiology, molecular diagnostics, and other diagnostic disciplines. Final reports, although not peer-reviewed documents, are regularly distributed to clinical veterinarians as an informational and advisory document for the treatment of patients. The scholarly value of these reports in the management of a case can be confirmed by peer diagnosticians and clinical veterinarians who receive the reports. A faculty member may elect to submit a collection of redacted reports for external peer review to establish distinction in scholarship. Impact and responsiveness in diagnostic activities can be documented in a promotion dossier by inclusion of selected diagnostic reports with a statement by the candidate on the importance of the selected report and letters from clinical veterinarians validating the report's impact on case management. All faculty who participate in diagnostic outreach are expected to provide timely, accurate, and responsive reporting.

Expected	Distinction	Highest Distinction
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Timely, accurate, and responsive diagnostic reporting. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Timely and accurate reporting with the highest standards of responsiveness and interpretation based on knowledge of the current literature. • Incorporation of state-of-the-art research technology into a diagnostic service. • Board certification by a national organization in a clinical or diagnostic discipline relevant to faculty activities. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Authorship of a peer-reviewed publication of case-based material that reflects the highest national/ international standards in diagnostics, interpretation, and advancement of the field. • Participation on a national/international panel tasked with establishing universal standards for test performance/assessment of diagnostic samples.

2. Abstracts - Authorship of an abstract indicates a transition between discovery and peer-reviewed publication. Abstracts are an appropriate method to deliver new information to peers, but they are usually published in conference proceedings with limited peer review. Thus, abstracts alone are indicators of expected scholarship while abstracts that precede published articles are indicators of distinction in scholarship. Service as first or senior author carries the most significance. The significance of co-authorship needs to be defined in the dossier by the candidate. Authorship or co-authorship of abstracts is expected of all faculty regardless of rank.

Expected	Distinction	Highest Distinction
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Authorship or co-authorship on an abstract published the proceedings of a local or regional meeting. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Authorship or co-authorship of an abstract published in the proceedings of a national or international meeting. Significance is increased when similar data are published in a refereed journal article. 	Not applicable

3. Web and Electronic Resources - Web and electronic resources can be developed into a form of outreach scholarship with a potential for rapid national and international impact. The scholarly significance should be determined through *post-hoc* peer review and by documenting the extent of resource integration into classes and training programs through user surveys and quantification of usage (number of website visits). Adherence to institutional policies related to Web usage (e.g. Blackboard posting of course materials) is expected. The range of significance can vary from expected scholarship to scholarship with highest distinction.

Expected	Distinction	Highest Distinction
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Adherence to departmental, college, or university policies related to Web and other electronic resources (e.g., Blackboard posting of course materials). 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> A resource that has been implemented as a component of a course or outreach program, receiving favorable user-review, positive <i>post hoc</i> peer-review, or documented usage (e.g., UGA's reports from the Clinical Pathology Clerkship) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> A resource that has been nationally or internationally recognized as a unique contribution based on <i>post hoc</i> peer-review or documentation of broad usage (e.g., UGA's Noah's Arkive).

4. Advisory Report - An advisory report is a summary of a body of work presented to an authoritative audience (e.g. a committee's recommendation to a governing body, a scientific advisory document written to brief a board of directors, etc.). The significance of authorship of published reports is usually indicated by the scope and nature of the intended audience (*i.e.*, regional, national, or international; the broader the audience the greater the impact). Some reports are intended for smaller audiences, but they exert a major impact on the advancement of a scientific discipline (e.g. published report of a corporate advisory panel). Published reports are indicative of expected scholarship, scholarship with distinction, or scholarship with highest distinction, subject to assessment and validation by an external reviewer of the dossier.

Expected	Distinction	Highest Distinction
Not applicable	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Authorship on a report with focused readership or narrow impact at a local, state, regional, or national level. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Authorship of a report with disseminated readership or wide impact at national or international levels.

PATENTS

The scholarship of invention reflects distinction or highest distinction. Significance is assessed by the scope of the patent, likelihood for national or international impact, role as a team member (principal inventor and co-inventor can carry similar weight with justification by the candidate) and

the status of the application (along the spectrum from disclosure of intellectual property to issuance of a patent).

Expected	Distinction	Highest Distinction
Not applicable	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Inventor or key co-inventor of a disclosed technology or issued patent. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Inventor or key co-inventor of a licensed patent or a patent that has led to an extramurally funded project or commercial product.

PEER RECOGNITION OF EXPERTISE

1. Teaching - Peer-review of teaching is the core method to assess scholarship in instruction. Student reviews of teaching are also considered in the assessment of teaching effectiveness. Distinction is usually reserved for teaching that incorporates scholarly approaches while highest distinction denotes the development and implementation of novel approaches and the demonstration of their effectiveness through publication. Effective teaching is required of all faculty members regardless of rank.

Expected	Distinction	Highest Distinction
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> An organized delivery of accurate information with responsive participation (e.g., timely submission of course notes, grades, etc.). 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> An organized delivery of information that reflects the most current state of knowledge. A scholarly approach to teaching that incorporates reported effective techniques. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> An organized delivery of information that reflects the most current state of knowledge. Development, implementation, and publication of novel scholarly approaches.

2. Professional Service and Leadership Activities - Selection to serve in professional leadership roles is usually an indication of a record of scholarship ranging from distinction to highest distinction. Criteria include the scope of the professional body (local, regional, national, or international), the nature of the leadership role (e.g. president vs. program chair) and selection method (volunteer vs. appointment vs. election). A high level of professional service and leadership is expected of all faculty regardless of rank.

Expected	Distinction	Highest Distinction
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Contributor to the leadership of the department and college by actively serving on committees, attending meetings, engaging in discussion, and voting. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Moderator or officer of a local or regional meeting (as a volunteer approved or elected by a larger body). 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Moderator of a session of a national or international meeting (by appointment or invitation). Professional service as an elected national officer in a national or international organization.

3. Platform Presentations - Platform presentations are those that deliver new findings to an audience of peers, usually after abstract submission. These indicate scholarship with distinction or scholarship with highest distinction. Criteria include scope of the audience (i.e., regional, national, or international), nature of the presentation (invited vs. self-submission of abstract) and duration/extent of the presentation. Faculty members are expected to regularly present platform presentations at departmental or college venues appropriate to their assignments.

Expected	Distinction	Highest Distinction
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> A platform presentation at a departmental or college meeting (depending on assignment; e.g. dept. research seminar series, Phi Zeta Day, etc.). 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> A platform presentation at a meeting based on an abstract submission. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> A platform presentation of special significance at a national or international meeting based on an invitation.

4. Competitive Awards and Honors - The scholarly significance of competitive awards and Honors is assessed through the prestige of the award (indicated by the stringency of the selection process, level of competition, etc.), extent of recognition (regional, national, international), and placement (first place, second place, honorable mention, etc.). They usually reflect distinction or highest distinction in scholarship.

Expected	Distinction	Highest Distinction
Not applicable	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Recipient of a prestigious college, university, or regional award. Finalist for a prestigious national or international award. Recurring nominee/finalist for a college award. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Recipient of a prestigious national or international award.

5. Grant Reviewer - Selection to serve on a grant review panel is evidence of professional recognition within the scope of the granting institution. Thus, national or international panels acknowledge scholarship with distinction or with highest distinction, while local or regional panels acknowledge scholarship at the level of distinction. Quality of participation can be documented by the panel coordinator. Impact can be assessed by the stature of the funding agency and the association between the reviewer's expertise and the agency's goals.

Expected	Distinction	Highest Distinction
Not applicable	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Reviewer for funding opportunities coordinated within Auburn University or the State. <i>Ad hoc</i> member of a review panel for national/international funding opportunities. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Full member of a review panel (e.g. study section member or scientific panel) for funding opportunities at the national or international levels.

6. Invited Lectures - The impact of invited lectures is largely determined by the venue (e.g., a peer institution, a technical school, etc.). Lectures that reflect unique expertise in a topic are generally valued over those that are based on general knowledge. The quality of lectures may be assessed through traditional measures (student evaluations, peer evaluations, etc.).

Expected	Distinction	Highest Distinction
Not applicable	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> An invited lecture delivered to another department or peer institution based on unique expertise in a field; should receive favorable student and peer review. An invited outreach lecture to the public or sector group on a general or special interest topic at the state or regional level. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> An invited lecture delivered at a peer institution as a part of a special lecture series or conference focusing on the presenter's area of expertise. An invited outreach lecture to the public or sector group on a general or special interest topic at the national or international level.

7. Journal Reviewer - Selection to serve on an editorial board of a journal or to serve as an *ad hoc* reviewer is evidence of professional recognition. The scope of such recognition is generally reflected by the breadth and extent of the journal's circulation or its impact factor. Such recognition is indicative of scholarship at the levels of expected, distinction, or highest distinction. Determinants of impact would include number of reviews, extent of journal circulation (national or international) and the stature of the journal relative to the candidate's professional interests.

Expected	Distinction	Highest Distinction
Not applicable	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>Ad hoc</i> reviewer of manuscripts in a professional journal with national/international circulation. Member of an editorial board for a national/ international professional journal. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Service as primary editor for a national/international professional journal.

8. Poster Presentations - Poster presentations at professional meetings are usually an indicator of expected scholarship, or in well documented cases, scholarship with distinction or highest distinction. When abstracts are voluntarily submitted for presentation at a professional meeting, peer selection for a poster presentation generally carries lower impact than a platform presentation; some exceptions are listed below. Criteria include scope of the meeting attendance (*i.e.*, local, regional, national, or international), the degree of stringency for selection of poster presentations (usually indicated by the session chair in the notice of poster assignment). All faculty are expected to contribute to presentations (poster or platform) at venues appropriate to their assignments.

Expected	Distinction	Highest Distinction
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Contribution to a poster (or platform) presentation at a local, regional, national or international meeting. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> A poster presentation at a national or international meeting. The presenter is in attendance to discuss the contents of the poster. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> An invited poster presentation at a prestigious national or international meeting (<i>e.g.</i>, Gordon Conference, NIH workshop, USDA special session, etc.).

9. Expert Testimony - This is evidence of esteemed professional reputation and indicates scholarship with highest distinction.

Expected	Distinction	Highest Distinction
Not applicable	Not applicable	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Invited expert testimony.

10. Specialty Board Certification - Certification by a nationally or internationally recognized professional college is indicative of attainment of a national standard, thus scholarship with distinction and national/international peer recognition of expertise.

Expected	Distinction	Highest Distinction
Not applicable	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Board certification by a nationally or internationally recognized clinical or diagnostic specialty organization. 	Not applicable

FUNDED ACTIVITIES

1. Intramurally Funded Grants and Contracts - Intramural support is defined as a source of funding that is awarded from within Auburn University (this includes Animal Health and Disease Research, the Alabama Agricultural Experiment Station, the Scott-Ritchey Research Center, Interdisciplinary Grants Program, Breeden Awards, etc.). Roles on projects are the same as those described above under Extramural Grants and Contracts. Intramural funding is often used as a source of support for experiments that generate preliminary data in justification of a later extramural proposal. Thus, intramural funding for a project that precedes an extramurally funded project is evidence of scholarship with highest distinction. Intramural projects that lead to peer-reviewed publications are indicators of distinction or highest distinction in scholarship.

Expected	Distinction	Highest Distinction
<ul style="list-style-type: none">Co-investigator, collaborator, or consultant on an intramural project or departmental research.	<ul style="list-style-type: none">PI or Co-PI on an intramural project.Distinction is further demonstrated by peer-reviewed publication of results from the project.	<ul style="list-style-type: none">PI or Co-PI on an intramural project that leads to extramural funding.

2. Extramurally Funded Grants and Contracts - Service as a principal investigator (PI), co-principal investigator (Co-PI), co-investigator (Co-I), collaborator, or consultant indicate scholarly contributions to a project (generally listed in decreasing order of distinction). The roles of PI or Co-PI carry the greatest scholarly impact. A major factor in determining scholarly impact is the scope of the funding entity (federal department, nationally recognized foundation, global corporation, state agency, etc.). Funding agencies with a broad scope reflect a more significant the scholarly contribution. However, certain disciplines rely on state or local funding sources to target the appropriate audiences in their outreach efforts. Some projects are appropriately targeted to large funding sources (NIH, NSF, USDA, corporations, etc.). Other projects are appropriately targeted to smaller funding sources (Morris Animal Foundation, Grayson Jockey Club, Winn Feline Foundation, etc.). While large grants and contracts are usually indicators of highest distinction in scholarship, smaller grants may carry equivalent distinction when targeted to the appropriate funding source. In such cases, justification for the selection of a funding source should be provided by the candidate.

Expected	Distinction	Highest Distinction
<ul style="list-style-type: none">General contributions to extramurally funded projects when relevant to assignment and area of expertise.	<ul style="list-style-type: none">Co-investigator, collaborator, or consultant on an extramurally funded project.	<ul style="list-style-type: none">PI or Co-PI on an extramurally funded project.

Submitted by the Department of Pathobiology on April 1, 2010. Revised April 26, 2011.

EXTERNAL EVALUATOR SELECTION FOR FACULTY EVALUATION

Candidate Name: _____

Department: _____

From the Auburn University Faculty Handbook (Section 3.11.C.3.D.1): "In consultation with the candidate and the faculty voting on the candidate the head (or dean) shall compile a list of potential evaluators. He or she shall then seek responses from at least three of the potential evaluators. These evaluators shall be people outside of Auburn University who are nationally acknowledged experts in the candidate's field and can comment on the quality and reputation of the candidate's work. If the evaluator is from an academic institution, he or she shall be of higher academic rank than the candidate. Letters from the candidate's major professor for a graduate degree, from former graduate students, and from ongoing research partners are unacceptable. Evaluators may be associated with industry, government agencies, foundations, etc."

- I. Candidate's List of 4-6 Suggested Evaluators: (Please provide complete name, title (include faculty rank), address, phone number and a short description of the applicability of suggested evaluator's credentials or attach his/her vita. Any professional or personal relationship between the faculty member and the evaluator should be identified.) **Due to the Department [Head/Chair] by [Date].**

- II. Department Committee/Chair/Head's List of Evaluators: (Please provide complete name, title, address, phone number, and a short description of the applicability of suggested evaluator's credentials or attach his/her vita. Any professional or personal relationship between the faculty member and the evaluator should be identified.) **Due to the Department [Head/Chair] by [Date].**

- III. Final List of 4-6 External Evaluators--to be contacted using an approved letter (attach copy of letter). Please indicate alternate evaluators in case any evaluators initially identified are found to be unavailable. **List due to the [Head/Chair/Dean] for approval on or before [Date]. Evaluations must be solicited no later than [Date].**

• NOT TO BE SHARED WITH CANDIDATE •

Head/Chair's Signature

Date

Dean's Signature

Date

Example Letter

Dr. XXXX, an (Assistant/Associate) Professor of XXXX at Auburn University, is being considered for [tenure and] promotion to the rank of [Associate] Professor. As part of our procedure for assessing the quality of Dr. XXXX's scholarly activity, we seek the judgment of scholars [individuals] like you in [his/her] area of specialization. Thus, we ask that you help us by providing comment on the quality and reputation of the candidate's work.

Auburn University's Faculty Handbook (Section 3.8) states: "Promotion is based on merit. A candidate for promotion should have acceptable achievements in the areas of 1) teaching and/or outreach and 2) research/creative work. He or she is further expected to demonstrate over a sustained period distinctive achievement in one of these areas or achievement in both areas comparable to that of successful candidates in the discipline in the past five years. In addition, he or she is **expected** to have contributed some service to the University." To help assess the **quality and reputation** of the candidate's research/creative work, confidential external letters are requested from outside evaluators. The Auburn University's Faculty Handbook (Section 3.11.C.3.D.1) states: "These evaluators shall be people outside of Auburn University who are nationally acknowledged experts in the candidate's field and can comment on the quality and reputation of the candidate's work. If the **evaluator** is from an academic institution, he or she shall be of higher academic **rank** than **the** candidate. Letters from the candidate's major professor for a graduate degree, from former graduate students, and from ongoing research partners are **unacceptable**. Evaluators may be associated with industry, government agencies, foundations, etc."

Enclosed is a sample of Dr. XXXX's research/creative work and [his/her] curriculum vitae. Please forward your evaluation to XXXX [Name], XXXX, [Address], no later than [Date]. If you are unable to provide an evaluation of Dr. XXXX's work, please contact me immediately at 334-844-XXXX or by e-mail at XXXX.XXXX.

We recognize that writing recommendations of this type is time consuming and, therefore, are most **grateful** for your assistance. Your comments will be an important component of our evaluation process.

Sincerely,

XXXXXXXXXX
Chair

cc: XXXX, Dean

Enclosures

Peer Institutions

Arizona State University Tempe
University of Arizona
University of Arkansas Main Campus
Auburn University
Auburn University Main Campus
University of Alabama
University of Alabama Birmingham
University of Alabama Huntsville
University of Alabama Tuscaloosa
Brigham Young University
Boston College
Boston University
Brandeis University
Brown University
California Institute of Technology
University of California Berkeley
University of California Davis
University of California Irvine
University of California Los Angeles
University of California Riverside
University of California San Diego
University of California Santa Barbara
University of California Santa Cruz
University of Southern California
University of Chicago
University of Colorado Boulder
University of Colorado Denver & HSC
University of Connecticut
University of Connecticut-Storrs
Carnegie Mellon University
Case Western Reserve University
Catholic University of America
Claremont Graduate University
Clemson University
Colorado State University
Columbia University
Cornell University
Dartmouth College
University of Delaware
University of Denver
Duke University
Emory University
Florida International University
Florida State University
University of Florida
University of South Florida
University of Georgia
George Washington University

Georgetown University
Georgia Institute of Technology
Georgia State University
Harvard University
University of Hawaii Manoa
University of Houston
Howard University
University of Idaho
University of Illinois Chicago
University of Illinois Urbana-Champaign
Iowa State University
University of Iowa
Indiana University Bloomington
Johns Hopkins University
University of Kansas Main Campus
University of Kentucky
Kansas State University
Kent State University Main Campus
Lehigh University
Louisiana State University-Baton Rouge
University of Louisville
Loyola University of Chicago
University of Maine
University of Maine at Orono
Marquette University
University of Maryland Baltimore County
University of Maryland-College Park
University of Massachusetts Amherst
Massachusetts Institute of Technology
University of Memphis
University of Miami
University of Michigan
University of Minnesota Twin Cities
University of Mississippi Main
University of Missouri Columbia
University of Missouri-Rolla
Michigan State University
Mississippi State University
University of Southern Mississippi
Montana State University-Bozeman
University of Nebraska at Lincoln
University of Nebraska Lincoln
University of Nevada Reno
University of New Hampshire Main
University of New Hampshire-Main Campus
University of New Mexico Main Campus
University of North Carolina - Chapel Hill
University of North Carolina Chapel Hill

University of North Texas
University of Notre Dame
New Mexico State University Main Campus
New York University
City University of New York Graduate Center
State University of New York Albany
North Carolina State University
North Carolina State University at Raleigh
North Dakota State University-Main Campus
Northeastern University
Northern Illinois University
Northwestern University
Ohio State University Main Campus
Oklahoma State University-Main Campus
University of Oklahoma
University of Oklahoma Norman Campus
University of Oregon
Oregon State University
Pennsylvania State University-University Park
Pennsylvania State University-Main Campus
University of Pennsylvania
University of Pittsburgh Main Campus
Princeton University
Purdue University-Main Campus
Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute
Rice University
University of Rhode Island
Rutgers University New Brunswick Campus
Saint Louis University
University of South Carolina
University of South Carolina Columbia
Southern Illinois University Carbondale
Stanford University
Temple University

University of Tennessee
University of Tennessee Knoxville
University of Texas - Austin
University of Texas Arlington
University of Texas Austin
Texas A & M University
Texas Tech University
Tufts University
Tulane University
University of Utah
University of Vermont
University of Virginia
University of Virginia Main
University of Washington
University of Wisconsin Madison
University of Wisconsin Milwaukee
University of Wyoming
University of Wyoming
Rutgers University-New Brunswick
Utah State University
Vanderbilt University
Virginia Commonwealth University
Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State
University
Virginia Tech
Washington
Washington State University
Washington University
Wayne State University
West Virginia University
Yale University