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Charge

The 2011-2012 Academic Affairs Standing Committee described the six standards of scholarly teaching and provided resources to assist schools and colleges in both improving and evaluation faculty teaching in light of these standards. Recommendation #1 of the committee suggested establishing "a fellow of AACP (fellowship) designation that would recognize excellence in scholarly teachers and in the scholarship of teaching and learning."

For the 2013-2014 academic year, the Council of Faculties is charged with addressing this recommendation and has been asked to develop a process to identify, evaluate, and award the designation of scholarly teacher, suggest a name for this designation and to recommend one or more sustainable roles that this group of scholarly teachers could assume within the academy.
AACP Fellow Designation Criteria Checklist and Evaluation Process Timeline

Purpose of this document

The purpose of this checklist and timeline is to provide prospective fellow applicants with an overview of the fellow’s program criteria and timeline to aide in the decision to apply. Review of the following should help applicants determine if they have;

- Met minimum expectations related to years of experience and membership in AACP
- Engaged in the activities consistent with fellow’s recognition
- Evidence of accomplishments for each of the criteria that can be evaluated
- Time to complete the application

Further detail on the application process and how the criteria are evaluated is summarized in the documentation and evaluation of criteria outline.

Vision for the AACP Fellow’s Program

The AACP Fellow’s designation will be a recognition for our academic pharmacy heroes engaged in and/or supporting scholarly teaching and the scholarship of teaching and learning. In recognizing service and outstanding contributions to our academy, pharmacy education and schools, the AACP Fellow’s will raise the bar for scholarly teaching and the scholarship of teaching and learning. Members of AACP will look to our Fellow’s as models for advancing the profession of pharmacy through education by enhancing student learning and the knowledge base of teaching and learning in professional and/or graduate pharmacy education. Collectively, this group will guide the Academy in furthering scholarly teaching and the scholarship of teaching and learning. The results of their example and efforts will challenge our academic pharmacy institutions to foster cultures that support and advance scholarly teaching and the scholarship of teaching and learning.

A Description of Scholarly Teaching and Scholarship of Teaching and Learning

Scholarly teaching is a process to advance student learning where a faculty member identifies learning problems, investigates what has been done in the past to address this, and chooses a teaching method to address the problem. Scholarly teaching includes systematic observation that is documented, analyzed and reviewed by peers. At this point, the experience may be reflected on for further use where it is implemented. It may also be considered for scholarship of teaching and learning.

The scholarship of teaching and learning involves taking scholarly teaching, identifying key issues and synthesizing results so that it can be placed in the context of existing knowledge via a manuscript. The manuscript is then peer reviewed and disseminated to contribute to the existing knowledge base.

Adapted from Richlin, Laurie. Scholarly Teaching and the Scholarship of Teaching. New Directions for Teaching and Learning, no. 86, Summer 2001 © Jossey-Bass
**Fellow’s Criteria Checklist**

- Full membership status in AACP for at least 5 years
- At least 10 years of experience in pharmacy education
  - Experience may be as faculty, staff or administration with schools of pharmacy or organizations that directly deliver or support pharmacy education.
- Proof of efforts in scholarly teaching in professional and/or graduate pharmacy education that are;
  - Sustained and consistent
    - Evidence of efforts is over a significant period of time with regular, consistent contribution.
  - Based on evidence
    - Literature, best practices and resources support the efforts.
  - Put into action
    - Course or activity design is a product of scholarly teaching.
  - Documented using a systematic approach
    - A systematic approach includes;
      - Observation of a problem or opportunity
      - A literature review
      - An intervention
      - Observation
      - Documentation of observation
      - Analysis of results
      - Peer review
      - Definition of roles of participants
  - Demonstrating impact and influence
    - Efforts are shown to;
      - Improve teaching and learning
      - Be utilized/adapted by others
      - Be sustainable
- Demonstrating continuous professional development
  - Individuals can articulate actions and process that stimulated their growth in scholarly teaching.
- Innovative
  - Products and processes that are new and showcase creativity.

- Proof of efforts in the scholarship of teaching and learning available to pharmacy that are;
  - Sustained and consistent
    - Applicants should show evidence that their efforts (publications, presentations, posters, and citations) span their career and are a part of their reputation in pharmacy education.
  - Meaningful
    - Questions addressed are important and/or connected to previous research.
  - Strong in design/evaluation
    - Methods are appropriate to produce important results.
  - Strong analysis and usable results
    - Results are gathered carefully, defensible and used by the academy.
  - Demonstrating impact and influence
    - Efforts are shown to be;
• Disseminated to a broad audience
• Transformative
• Transferrable
  o Demonstrating continuous professional development
    ▪ Individuals can articulate actions and process that stimulated their growth in the scholarship of teaching and learning.
  o Innovative
    ▪ Products and processes that are new and showcase creativity.

□ Proof of efforts related to institutional and profession-wide advancement of scholarly teaching and the scholarship of teaching and learning and service related to both that;
  o Creates a culture for scholarly teaching and the scholarship of teaching and learning
  o Emphasizes learning outcomes and relevant teaching practices
  o Develops discipline and pedagogical knowledge and innovation
  o Includes service to professional pharmacy associations that focuses on the advancement of scholarly teaching and the scholarship of teaching and learning

□ Proof of excellence in teaching and learning
  o Excellence in teaching and learning can be demonstrated by evidence of any of the following attributes;
    ▪ positive student-faculty contact
    ▪ effective active learning
    ▪ achievable, yet high expectations
    ▪ respecting diverse talents and ways of learning
    ▪ effective communication skills
    ▪ commitment to teaching well

Evaluation and Award Process
Fellow status will be awarded annually at the AACP Annual Meeting to all qualified applicants for the status. A scoring rubric (to be developed) will be utilized by the selection committee to determine each year’s fellows. Scoring of each application will be broken down as follows;

• Scholarly Teaching (ST) (35 points)
• Scholarship of Teaching and Learning (SOTL) (35 points)
• Institutional Advancement of ST/SOTL and ST/SOTL Service (25 points)
• Excellence in Teaching (5 points)

The following timeline will guide the selection process.

September
□ Letter of intent and CV is due to AACP;
□ AACP staff reviews letter and CV to ensure year’s experience and membership in AACP and confirms with applicant their minimum eligibility.

Early December
□ Applications due

January
□ Selection Committee reviews applications

February - March
Selection committee meets to select and finalize recipients.
April
Fellows are notified
July
Fellows are awarded at the AACP annual meeting.
AACP Fellow Application Documentation and Evaluation of Criteria Outline

The following lists and describes the criteria utilized to determine AACP Fellows and includes definitions, principles for the evaluation of the criteria with a connection to literature where appropriate and required documentation to be evaluated. This document does not detail the evaluation rubric or scoring of applications. Upon approval of these criteria, principles of evaluation and award logistics, evaluation rubrics/scoring guides and a cut point will be developed. The document provides guidance to AACP and the fellow awards committee in determining evaluation processes and metrics. Prospective applicants may utilize this document to evaluate their own potential to receive fellow status.

**Letter of Intent - Reviewed by AACP Staff**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Documentation Required</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. At least 10 years of experience in pharmacy education with sustained, consistent contributions.</td>
<td>Letter including a brief description of ST/SOTL initiatives over years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Curriculum Vitae</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. A current full member of AACP (including adjunct, part-time, full-time or emeriti faculty, administration or staff) with cumulative membership of at least 5 years prior to the nomination.</td>
<td>Dues paid for at least five years</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Definitions

Scholarly Teaching (ST)

Scholarly Teaching promotes student engagement and learning using the educational literature and systematically assesses learning outcomes (Medina 2011). Scholarly Teaching involves: Observing a teaching-learning problem or opportunity, consulting literature, selecting and applying an educational intervention, conducting systematic observation, documenting observations, analyzing results and obtaining peer evaluation (Richlin 2001). The purpose of ST is to affect the activity of teaching and the resulting learning. (Richlin and Cox 2001).

Scholarship of Teaching and Learning (SOTL)

The Scholarship of Teaching builds on the end product of Scholarly Teaching. It involves identifying key issues from the scholarly teaching, analyzing results and putting them into the context of the existing knowledge base. Once a venue for dissemination is chosen (i.e. presentation and/or publication), peer review is conducted on the manuscript or proposal (Richlin 2001). Therefore, SOTL results in formal, peer-reviewed products, which then become part of the knowledge base of teaching and learning. (Richlin and Cox 2001). In short, the scholarship of teaching communicates the goals, preparation, methods, results, presentation and reflection of teaching in the literature (Medina 2011).

Innovation

Innovation is a multi-stage process (e.g. generation, development, adaptation) where ideas are transformed into new policies, structures, methods, processes, products or opportunities to advance education. Innovation involves intentional activity and structured creativity that is aimed at making education better. Innovation involves the application of an idea that is different, cutting edge or novel to the environment or organization. Innovation is not to be confused with invention, which is the creation of ideas.

Educational Research

The use of experimental design to systematically study educational questions (Medina 2011).

Teaching Excellence

Common characteristics of good teachers include: positive student-faculty contact, effective active learning, achievable yet high expectations, respects diverse talents and ways of learning, effective communication skills, commitment to teaching well (Hammer, 2010 ).
Application Summary

Each applicant will demonstrate:

- Scholarly Teaching (ST) (35 points)**
- Scholarship of Teaching and Learning (SOTL) (35 points)**
- Departmental/Institutional Advancement of ST/SOTL and ST/SOTL Service (25 points)**
- Excellence in Teaching (5 points)

**In describing contributions, applicants will include information on Impact & Influence, Innovation and Continuing Professional Development.

The application includes:

- 4 required narratives of three pages each (i.e. ST, SOTL, Institutional Advancement of ST/SOTL) (Total: 12 pages)
- An updated curriculum vitae
- up to 15 pages plus 1-2 SOTL publications of optional appendices
- Within required documentation and optional appendices, applicants may include links to ePortfolios, publications, website and any other electronically available media.
# Scholarly Teaching (ST)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criterion</th>
<th>Required Documentation</th>
<th>Examples of Optional Appendices</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **1. Excellence and sustained contributions in scholarly teaching**  
*Proof* of efforts (direct or indirect) that impact the activity of teaching, and resulting learning, in a scholarly fashion | Narrative/Reflection (max. 3 pages) commenting on ST themes and initiatives over the years, including one or more examples of ST with description/evidence of:  
- Observing a teaching-learning problem or opportunity  
- Consulting literature  
- Selecting and applying an educational intervention  
- Conducting systematic observation  
- Documenting observations  
- Analyzing results  
- Obtaining peer evaluation (Richlin 2001)  
- Your role and roles of others involved  

*Please include information on impact/influence, innovation and continuing professional development (see criteria below)* | One or more additional narratives with additional examples of STs.  
Listing/description collaborations resulting from work or invitations to consult in a teaching area (e.g. teaching cardiovascular pharmacotherapy) or on teaching strategies (e.g. Team Based Learning)  
Example of the process of designing a course or lesson plan demonstrating a scholarly approach (e.g. including literature foundation, including peer review) (Simpson 2007)  
Analysis of teaching related artifacts (e.g. assignment) with description of scholarly approach to development, implementation and evaluation (e.g. baseline measures, pre-post results). |

## Elements of Evaluation/Connections to Literature

Initiatives must be rooted *primarily* in pharmacy education (i.e. professional or graduate education). Evidence that the educators’ work is informed by what is known in the field (e.g. existing literature, best practices, resources in the field, local, regional, national and international colleagues) (Simpson 2007). Evidence that the candidate has engaged in course redesign and, in the process, has engaged with the literature in the discipline and put that literature into action (Walker 2008). Documentation of a systematic approach to ST (Simpson 2007).

## Scaling Ideas/Weighting/Levels

### Scholarship of Teaching and Learning (SOTL)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criterion</th>
<th>Required Documentation</th>
<th>Examples of Optional Appendices</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>2. Excellence and sustained contributions</strong> in the scholarship of teaching and learning that are disseminated and embody expertise and focus.</td>
<td>Narrative/reflection (max. 3 pages) commenting on SOTL themes and initiatives over the years, including one or more examples of SOTL with description/evidence of: -Identifying key issues from ST -analyzing results -placing into context of existing knowledge -preparing a manuscript or proposal for presentation -submitting for peer review -disseminating and adding to existing knowledge base (Richlin 2001) -Your role and roles of others involved <strong>If it covers these bullets, it may be possible to substitute a publication for the narrative.</strong></td>
<td>One or more additional narratives with additional examples of SOTL 1-2 SOTL publications.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In addition, CV should include listing/description of poster presentations, special sessions, publications.

*Please include information on impact/influence, innovation and continuing professional development (see criteria below)*

### Elements of Evaluation/Connections to Literature

Clear goals, adequate preparation, appropriate methods, significant results, effective presentation, reflective critique (Glassick 2000). Has progressed in continuum of growth from development of personal knowledge about teaching and learning to dialogue and exchange with colleagues to the development of scholarly knowledge that has impact and significance to the field (Weston 2001).

### Scaling Ideas/Weighting/Levels

## Departmental/Institutional Advancement of ST/SOTL and Other ST/SOTL Service

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criterion</th>
<th>Required Documentation</th>
<th>Examples of Optional Appendices</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Institutional Advancement** of the scholarship of teaching and learning through departmental or institutional efforts related to: (1) creating a culture for ST/SOTL, (2) emphasis on learning outcomes and relevant teaching practices, and (3) development of discipline and pedagogical knowledge and innovation (Theall and Centra 2001). | Narrative (max. 3 pages) describing at least one program/initiative including:  
- rationale and goals for program/initiative  
- your role and roles of others involved  
- duration of the project  
- data demonstrating achievement of goals  
- connection to literature and/or best practices  
- resources garnered to support the initiative (grants, internal funds allocated) (Simpson 2007) | Letters of support providing descriptions and verification of roles in ST/SOTL support. It may also be helpful to have letters provide information on impact (see impact/influence criterion below).  
Strategic plan supporting ST/SOTL initiatives and description of results  
Documents describing/reporting on development of ST or SOTL related faculty learning communities, faculty development programs and/or mentoring programs and results  
Development of policies for teaching portfolios, funding for ST/SOTL development and/or annual reporting, peer review or evaluation of ST or SOTL initiatives.  
Demonstration of recognition/award for non-traditional approaches to teaching and/or teaching related scholarship (e.g. promotion and tenure policies) |

Support Examples:  
i. Initiating a ST and/or SOTL faculty development program.  
ii. Developing a ST and/or SOTL mentoring program.  
iii. Design of peer review processes to support ST and/or SOTL  
iv. Creation of awards or recognition systems for ST and/or SOTL
### Departmental/Institutional Advancement of ST/SOTL and Other ST/SOTL Service

(continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criterion</th>
<th>Required Documentation</th>
<th>Examples of Optional Appendices</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Record of **sustained service to the American Association of Colleges of Pharmacy, pharmacy education **AND/OR one or more schools/colleges of pharmacy** related to scholarly teaching and the scholarship of teaching and learning.** | Also, in the same narrative, any service contributions, including ST/SOTL work on/as:  - AACP committees,  - local/national task forces,  - college or university committees (e.g. curriculum, assessment, faculty development)  - officer roles,  - abstract reviewer,  - AJPE reviewer (and other ST/SOTL related journals)  - grant or awards reviewer  - ST/SOTL trainer or mentor  Please include the goals and outcomes of your service.  
*Please include information on impact/influence, innovation and continuing professional development (see criteria below)* | Annual reports of committee work or white papers with an introduction describing your role and providing context for the work |

### Elements of Evaluation/Connections to Literature

Departmental or institutional efforts related to: (1) creating a culture for a shared public account of teaching, (2) emphasis on learning outcomes and relevant teaching practices, and (3) development of discipline and pedagogical knowledge and innovation (Theall and Centra 2001)

### Scaling Ideas/Weighting/Levels

Alignment with organizational needs. Level of initiative required (e.g. planning, generating resources, generating buy-in). Creating an initiative/program vs. adopting/modifying. Endurance/persistence. Scope of the initiative (although impact is assessed below).

Diversity and/or focus of service contributions. Level of responsibility e.g. member vs. chair. Scope of work e.g. local vs. national. Type of work and/or promise/potential (e.g. advancing field or maintaining operations). Reviewing grants or manuscripts v.s. abstracts. (Note: Impact and duration assessed under separate criteria)

### Impact and Influence

**Note:** The criterion is documented and evaluated as part of the existing narratives.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criterion</th>
<th>Required Documentation</th>
<th>Examples of Optional Appendices</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Demonstrated **impact and influence**, as evidenced by improvements in teaching and learning, engagement in the educational community and transferability to other courses/schools | Contained in narratives. In compiling the narratives, please include information on how others have:  
  ● benefited from your work (e.g. colleagues, graduate students)  
  ● incorporated your work (e.g. other college courses, other universities), and/or  
  ● built upon your work. Please also comment on your involvement with the educational community. | Evidence of student learning (e.g. pre-post performance data, test statistics [difficulty, discrimination, reliability], assessments of student work from panels of faculty experts).  
Evidence of dissemination of educational products (e.g. instructional video, learner assessment instrument), programs or scholarship through established venues (e.g. local curriculum committee, presentations to other educators, posting to Pharmacy Education Assessment and Accreditation System [PEAAS]) (Simpson 2007)  
Descriptions/evidence of educational transformations, sustainability of changes and/or transferability  
Evidence of positive faculty/administrative response |

**Elements of Evaluation/Connections to Literature**
Level and extent of engagement with the education community (i.e. higher education educators inside of pharmacy and outside) (Simpson 2007) (e.g. co-PIs, multi-institutional work, development of networks and collaboratives). Visibility of peer-reviewed work through dissemination practices. Degree of use of that work. Frequency of citation. Level and extent of learning improvements. Level and extent of educational changes. Degree of sustainability, adoption and adaptation.

**Scaling Ideas/Weighting/Levels**
ST Uptake: Use of teaching expertise in own courses, other college courses, within university, within pharmacy education, within higher education. SOTL Uptake: Development and leadership of SOTL teams. Subsequent SOTL initiatives. New lines of inquiry. Advancement Uptake: Adoption and/or adaptation of SOTL support programs in other departments, units or universities.
Innovation
Note: The criterion is documented and evaluated as part of the existing narratives.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criterion</th>
<th>Required Documentation</th>
<th>Examples of Optional Appendices</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Innovation</strong> in scholarly teaching, the scholarship of teaching and learning and/or support of ST/SOTL.</td>
<td>A narrative (max two pages) describing an example of innovation (not already described in other sections of the application) including • the rationale/goals, • your role and the roles of others involved • the connection to previous work • efforts and investments made in bringing the innovation to fruition • information on results. Note: This information may be included in another narrative.</td>
<td>Products of the innovation (e.g. new instruments, policies) Evidence related to the successfulness of the innovation (e.g. publications, excerpts from curriculum, collegiate or accreditation reports)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Elements of Evaluation/Connections to Literature
Inputs to the innovation (e.g. acquisitions of new technology, training, systematic investigations). Process elements of the innovation (e.g collaboration, connection to previous work). Outputs of the innovation (e.g. number or percent of students achieving a competency measure, changes in other courses, adoption by other schools, ongoing collaborations).

Scaling Ideas/Weighting/Levels
Intentionality in understanding the problem and deriving a solution. Scope of effort (e.g. numbers of students or faculty, numbers of courses, years in curriculum, number of schools). Challenge. Novelty or creativity.
## Continuing Professional Development

**Note:** The criterion is documented and evaluated as part of the existing narratives.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criterion</th>
<th>Required Documentation</th>
<th>Examples of Optional Appendices</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Demonstration of <strong>excellence in continuing professional development (CPD)</strong></td>
<td>Contained in narratives. In compiling the narratives, please describe any development, including the rationale and intended outcomes of the development undertaken. Development may include <em>acquisition of technical skills</em> in teaching (e.g. syllabus preparation, lecturing) and/or SOTL (e.g. study design, data collection and/or data analysis). Development may also include <em>mastery of techniques to facilitate quality improvement</em> of teaching (e.g. adult learning principles) and/or SOTL (e.g. reliability, validity and generalizability). Development may be targeted at <em>broadening of approaches</em> to teaching (e.g. problem based learning) and/or for addressing scholarly questions (e.g. qualitative methods, narrative inquiry). Development may include <em>collaboration and/or mentorship</em> that includes review of teaching (e.g. conversation, observation) and/or SOTL (e.g. faculty learning community) (Smith 2001)</td>
<td>Description of coursework completed, conferences/workshops attended and use of competencies attained Evidence of regular participation in ST and/or SOTL related book or journal clubs. Descriptions of articles/books read and use of information Evidence of collaboration and/or mentorship directed at professional development of ST or SOTL skills and effects</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Elements of Evaluation/Connections to Literature

Invests in one’s own learning (Smith 2001). Building the technical skills (used in ST or SOTL) (Smith 2001).

### Scaling Ideas/Weighting/Levels

Strength of purpose and direction behind development efforts. Duration (# of years) and breadth of commitment. Application and impact of training completed.
# Teaching and Learning Excellence

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criterion</th>
<th>Required Documentation</th>
<th>Examples of Optional Appendices</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Evidence of teaching and learning excellence | A narrative (max. 2 pages) describing evidence related to excellence in two or more of the following areas:  
- positive student-faculty contact  
- effective active learning  
- achievable, yet high expectations  
- respecting diverse talents and ways of learning  
- effective communication skills  
- commitment to teaching well (Hammer 2010)  

Multiple sources of evidence is encouraged. (Hammer 2010, Piascik 2011) | Norm-referenced summary data from learner evaluations (e.g. end-of-course or rotation evaluations) (Simpson 2007)  
Norm-referenced summary data from alumni evaluations  
Documentation/summaries from peer reviews of teaching (peer reviews of lectures, internal education committee ratings of course reviews) (Simpson 2007)  
A self-assessment and reflection on teaching, including: 1) a description of development over time, including failures, 2) with evidence of student and/or faculty discussion and input (Hammer 2010)  
Student and/or school awards for excellence in teaching |

## Elements of Evaluation/Connections to Literature
Evidence should be triangulated from multiple sources for a cohesive and convincing argument for excellence in particular areas (Hammer 2010, Piascik 2011)

## Scaling Ideas/Weighting/Levels
Quantity and quality of evidence. Evidence over time with evidence of improvements.
References


Logistics for Fellow Designation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of Award</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Individuals who meet the criteria would be deemed a fellow of the American Association of Colleges of Pharmacy and would earn the credential FAACP. If the term fellow is not preferred, an alternative was Teaching Scholar, which could include the designation TS-AACP.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Length of Membership in AACP and Experience in Pharmacy Education</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>In order to be eligible, applicants would be required to have been a member of AACP for a minimum of five years. In addition, they must have at least ten years of experience in pharmacy education (PharmD and/or PhD) with sustained contributions in scholarly teaching and the scholarship of teaching and learning.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nomination Process</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Individuals will self-nominate. In order to assist individuals with determining whether they meet the criteria for the award, a checklist will be available via the AACP website to assist potential candidates. A letter of intent and CV will be preliminarily submitted by the applicant to AACP for review by staff to ensure that the applicant meets the minimum eligibility of at least 5 years of membership in AACP and at least 10 year experience in pharmacy education. Staff will notify applicants that they meet minimum qualifications and are eligible to apply. In addition, the letter of intent can assist with determining the size of the committee that would be needed to review all the applicants. Individuals who do not submit a letter of intent and CV will not be eligible to later submit a full online dossier during the current review period.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Selection Process</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Members of a new committee, the Fellows Award Committee, would evaluate the credentials of each nominee. The committee would be made up of approximately 8-10 members, including one AACP staff member. Membership on the committee would be for a period of 2-3 years. Each nominee would be reviewed by three members of the committee and scored individually using the developed rubric. Suggestions to standardize scoring include:  
  - Pairing new and returning committee members for reviews  
  - Staff to provide orientation to criteria and evaluation rubric  
  - Creation of a sample dossier(s) and corresponding scored rubric(s)  
| From the rubric, a score would be determined from each evaluator. To the extent possible, one reviewer would be in the same field as the nominee. Following individual reviews, the committee would meet via conference call to discuss scoring of all candidates and make final decisions. |

| Membership on the committee would be comprised of previous award recipients. For the first few years where there may not be a significant number of awardees to comprise the Awards Committee, a combination of recipients of Innovations in Teaching award, Chalmers award, winners of the Excellence in Assessment awards and this year’s Faculty Affairs Committee could serve as membership of the Awards Committee. All would need to be current members of AACP. Applicants cannot serve on the Awards Committee. Membership to the committee could be sought during AACP’s annual solicitation for committee members. For the first several years when the number of nominees may be high, a reviewer pool could be created to assist in reviews. One review would be required to be completed by a committee member. |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>When Would the Award Be Given</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The award would be presented annually at the AACP Annual Meeting in July. The fellow designation should appear on their name badge. It is recommended that fellows should receive their award near the beginning of the meeting. This could be part of either the opening general session or during a special session. If a separate session is created, it could form the basis of a teaching and learning plenary, with awardees sharing their expertise in some format. In addition, the recipients could receive recognition at the closing banquet.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of awardees</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No minimum or maximum number was set. Rather, all qualified candidates who meet the criteria and receive a score above the cut-off would be deemed a fellow.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reapplication Process</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>An applicant who does not receive the fellow designation in a given year can re-apply in two years from</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
the time of the first application. Some feedback would be provided to nominees who are not successful.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Timeline</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>September</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Letter of intent and CV is due to AACP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• AACP staff reviews letter and CV to ensure eligibility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>First Week of December</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Applications due (similar to other AACP awards)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>December – January</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Awards Committee reviews applications; outside reviews from the reviewer pool are sought</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>February</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Committee meets to select recipients</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>February – March</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Finalization by Awards Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>April</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Applicants notified of status of application</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>July</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Fellows are recognized at the Annual meeting</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| **Award** |
| Awardees would receive a certificate signifying the honor, as well as an award that could be prominently displayed on a desk or bookshelf. An award with both the mortar and pestle and an apple could capture the honor of scholarly teaching/scholarship of teaching and learning in pharmacy. |

| **Role of the Fellows** |
| Fellows could serve as a body of AACP that specifically focuses on programming and efforts related to scholarly teaching and the scholarship of teaching and learning, including the development of strategic initiatives to support these facets (like the Argus Commission, but with a more specific focus). Fellows could also serve as members of the Awards Committee as described above. |

| **Budget** |
| A small budget that would support the cost of the awards would be required. Approximately $100 per awardee x 10-20 awardees = $1000-$2000 annually. A nominal application fee could be included ($75) if funds are not available elsewhere. |