

Tenure-line FARA Criteria 2015

Table of Contents

I. Preamble	3
II. RPT Pre-Tenure Probationary Period And Schedule of Reviews	5
A. University Policy Parameters For Normal, Shortened or Extended Probationary Period	5
B. School of Medicine Policy on Probationary Period and Schedule	5
C. Changes of Faculty Category ('Track Switch'), And Effect on Probationary Period	6
III. RPT Informal Review Procedures	8
A. 6-303-III-B Informal and Triggered Reviews	8
IV. RPT Formal Review Procedures	9
A. Introduction	9
B. Processes for Formal Reviews	9
C. Notice to Candidate	10
D. Notice to Department Faculty	10
E. Completion of File, Candidate's Right to Examine and Comment on Contents	10
F. Letters of Evaluation	11
G. Student and Resident Advisory Committee (SAC) Report (U-Policy 6-303-III-C-3)	12
H. Department Advisory Committee For Faculty Review and Advancement ("RPT") (DAC-FRA):	
Membership and Actions	13
I. DAC-FRA Chair and Secretary	13
J. DAC-FRA Secretary	13
K. Quorum	13
L. Absentee Voting	14
M. Limitations	14
N. DAC-FRA Committee Report	14
O. Department Chair Report	15
P. Candidate's Right to Respond	15
Q. The Completed File and Review Beyond the Department Level	15
V. Appointments of Tenure-line Faculty	15
A. Procedures for Appointments	15
B. Actions by the DAC-A	16
C. For Appointment	16
D. Action by Department Chair	16
E. Actions Subsequent to the Department	17
F. Criteria and Standards for Appointments	17
VI. Criteria, Standards, and Evidence for Retention, Promotion and Tenure (Expectations for Tenure-line Faculty Review and Advancement)	17
A. General Principles and Objectives	18
B. Responsibilities in the Faculty Review Process	20
C. Areas of Accomplishment Definitions	20
D. Definition of Scholarship	20
E. Standards Definitions	20
1. Excellence	20
2. Effectiveness	20
F. Area of Accomplishment – INVESTIGATION	21
G. Area of Accomplishment – EDUCATION	22
H. Area of Accomplishment – CLINICAL PRACTICE ADVANCEMENT	22
I. Area of Accomplishment – ADMINISTRATION / SERVICE IN SUPPORT OF MISSIONS	23
J. Evidence of Excellence and Effectiveness	24

K. Appointments	25
1. Appointment to the Rank of Instructor	25
2. Appointment to the Rank of Assistant Professor	25
3. Appointment to the Rank of Associate Professor <i>without</i> Award of Tenure	25
4. Appointment to the Rank of Associate Professor <i>with</i> Award of Tenure	26
5. Appointment to the Rank of Professor <i>without</i> Award of Tenure	26
6. Appointment to the Rank of Professor <i>with</i> Award of Tenure	27
L. Retention in the probationary period (prior to award of tenure)	28
1. Instructor	28
2. Assistant Professor	28
3. Associate Professor	28
4. Professor	28
M. Promotion	28
1. Promotion to Assistant Professor	28
2. Award of Tenure with simultaneous Promotion to Associate Professor	28
3. Promotion to Associate professor without Award of Tenure	29
4. Stand Alone Award of Tenure (Associate Professor)	29
5. Promotion to Professor	30
6. Stand Alone Award of Tenure (Professor)	30
References	31
VII. Appendices	32
Appendix A: List of required contents for the candidate's completed file	32
Appendix B: Notice of final UFRSC approval	33
Appendix C: Departmental Supplemental Rules	34
History	35

I. PREAMBLE:

A. The quality and impact of the University of Utah School of Medicine depends on the quality of our faculty members and their contributions. Criteria for formal and informal review of faculty members are established to allow the School of Medicine to recognize the accomplishments and impact of individual faculty members. In the context of the faculty review processes, criteria and standards for appointment, retention, promotion, and award of tenure (which are described fully in Part V below) are grounded in the mission of the University of Utah School of Medicine: to advance health. The University of Utah School of Medicine serves the people of Utah and beyond by continually improving individual and community health and quality of life. This is achieved through excellence in patient care, education, and research; each is vital to our mission and each makes the others stronger.

1. We provide compassionate care without compromise.
2. We educate scientists and health care professionals for the future.
3. We engage in research to advance knowledge and well-being.
(<http://medicine.utah.edu/mission.php>)

B. “College-wide RPT Statement.” This document provides guidelines and criteria for all School of Medicine departments regarding faculty review decisions for tenure-line faculty members. For the purpose of this document, the term “faculty review” encompasses reviews for the purpose of initial appointment, and subsequent retention and advancement (including promotion and tenure) of tenure-line faculty members.

This document serves as the “Statement of Criteria, Standards, Evidence and Procedures” for Retention, Promotion, and Tenure reviews of tenure-line faculty required by University Policy 6-303, and having been approved by a majority of the tenure-line faculty of each adopting department, it constitutes a “college-wide RPT Statement” as described in 6-303-III-A-2-a, governing for all departments of the college. Within the parameters established by University Regulations and this college-wide RPT Statement, any department may adopt further specific details regarding the criteria, standards and evidence and procedures for RPT decisions by describing them in a department-specific Supplemental Rule (a supplemental RPT document) which, upon approval by the tenure-line faculty of the department, the dean of the college, the cognizant senior vice president, and the Senate Faculty Review Standards Committee, shall be appended to this document.

This document (particularly Part V), also serves as a description of School of Medicine policy on *appointments* of tenure-line faculty, and within the parameters established by University Regulations (particularly Policy 6-302—Appointments of Faculty) and this college Statement, a department may adopt further specific details regarding appointments by describing them in a Supplemental Rule approved and appended to this document.

Nothing in this document (including any appended Supplemental Rule of a department) shall be interpreted to conflict with University Regulations. The most important University Policies regarding tenure-line faculty review are 6-303 (Reviews of Tenure-

Line Faculty Members--RPT and TFR Criteria, Standards and Procedures), 6-311 (Faculty Retention and Tenure), and 6-302 (Faculty Appointments). The full policy for each is available at the University Regulations Website <http://www.regulations.utah.edu/>.

This document is not intended to directly govern post-tenure reviews of tenured faculty not being considered for promotion, which are instead addressed in a separate "Tenured Faculty Review (TFR) Statement" in accord with Policy 6-303-III-L. And this document is not intended to directly govern appointments or reviews of faculty in the career-line, adjunct, or visiting categories, or reviews of non-faculty instructional personnel, which matters are addressed in a separate Statement in accord with Policy 6-310.

C. Implementation Date and Application to Existing Faculty. The revised faculty review criteria, standards and procedures contained in this RPT Statement take effect January 1, 2015. All faculty members appointed on or after this date will be considered under the new faculty review standards and procedures. Candidates whose appointments began prior to that date who are reviewed for granting of tenure, or promotion to Associate rank with or without granting of tenure will have the option of choosing between the previous and the new faculty review requirements for faculty review actions that begin after January 1, 2015. Previously appointed candidates to be reviewed for promotion to the rank of Professor may choose the old requirements for reviews completed in or before the 2016-2017 academic year. In each case, the new requirements will apply unless the candidate's choice of the previous requirements is communicated to the department chair by signed letter before evaluation materials are sent to evaluators for external evaluations (See Part IV below).

II. RPT PRE-TENURE PROBATIONARY PERIOD AND SCHEDULE OF REVIEWS

A. University Policy Parameters For Normal, Shortened or Extended Probationary Periods.

University Policy 6-303-III-A-3 provides that

*“a. The **normal** pre-tenure probationary period, (i) for candidates initially appointed at the rank of **Assistant Professor** or **Instructor** is **seven years** (unless the department within the approved RPT Statement has adopted the alternative of six years), and (ii) for candidates initially appointed at the rank of **Professor** or **Associate Professor** is **five years**. (Policy 6-311-III-Section 4-B)*

*b. There shall be (i) a final formal review for tenure during the final year of the probationary period, (ii) normally **either one or two mid-probationary-period formal reviews for retention** (with the number and normal scheduling to be specified in the approved RPT Statement), and (iii) **informal reviews in all other years**.*

*c. The probationary period length (and accordingly the schedule of formal reviews) **for a particular candidate** may be varied on the grounds and through the procedures prescribed regarding (i) **shortening based on "credit for prior service" or "extraordinary progress toward tenure"** (Policy 6-311-III-Section 4-C-1), or (ii) **extending**, based on "leave of absence," "effect of administrative assignments," or "extraordinary circumstances" (Policy 6-311-III-Section 4-C-2), or under the terms of other relevant Regulations, including those regarding Faculty Parental Benefits (Policy 6-315, Policy 8-002) or Part Time Status (Policy 6-320).”*

B. School of Medicine Policy on Probationary Period and Schedule.

1. Normal period and reviews schedule

For School of Medicine candidates initially appointed at the rank of Assistant Professor (or the rank of Instructor), the normal pre-tenure probationary period is *seven years*, and there shall be *one* mid-probationary formal retention review, which normally will occur in the *fourth* year. However, by so specifying in the department’s approved Supplemental Rule (Appendix C) a department may instead choose for all such candidates to have that single formal retention review occur in the third year, or may choose to have *two* such formal retention reviews, occurring in the third and fifth years. (For candidates initially appointed to a limited term at the rank of Instructor and then promoted to Assistant Professor, see Policy 6-300-III-B-3-c [Special provisions for the limited-term rank of Instructor], regarding a candidate’s option to count or not count the limited term as part of the pre-tenure probationary period.)

For candidates appointed at the rank of Professor or Associate Professor, the normal pre-tenure probationary period is five years and there shall be one mid-probationary formal retention review, in the third year.

For all candidates, there shall be an informal review in each probationary year in which there is not a formal review, and there shall be a formal review for tenure in the final probationary year. The review for award of tenure and a review for promotion in rank will ordinarily occur in the same year.

2. Varying of period and schedule of formal reviews

The School of Medicine recruits candidates of exceptional quality, and there are frequently cases in which circumstances make it appropriate to shorten a particular candidate's probationary period, in accord with the provisions of University Policies 6-303 and 6-311 (based on adjustment of the tenure clock for prior service ["credit for prior service"] or "extraordinary progress toward tenure").

Candidates and department administrators preliminarily considering making a request for an early formal review should review Policy 6-311 and consult with the SOM Academic Affairs office for guidance regarding the procedures and criteria for early review. Early formal reviews must be approved in the manner prescribed in Policy 6-311. As a matter of college policy, formal requests for early review must be submitted to the SOM Academic Affairs Office by May 15 of the year preceding the year of the review (e.g., by May 15, 2015 for a review during the 2015-16 academic year). Candidates and department administrators should also consult with the SOM Academic Affairs Office for guidance in any case in which a candidate's probationary period might appropriately be extended on any grounds, as referred to in Policy 6-303 (see above). The Office of Academic Affairs will work with faculty members who wish to extend the probationary period to ensure compliance with all policies.

C. Changes of Faculty Category ('Track Switch'), And Effect on Probationary Period

1. Within the School of Medicine it is an accepted practice that faculty members being initially appointed at the entry level ranks of Instructor or Assistant Professor might be appointed in either a tenure-line category position or a career-line category position. This possibility is explained more fully in the separate document: SOM Statement on Career-line Appointment, Review, and Advancement Guidelines. In general, initial appointment to a tenure-line position at the rank of Instructor or Assistant Professor is appropriate when recommended by the department chair for a candidate with at least 2 years of additional training with a substantial focus on scholarly training after completion of a terminal degree and clear potential for success in the tenure-line.

In general, initial appointment to a career-line position is appropriate for a candidate with less preparation and experience who wishes to begin in a career-line position and yet be eligible to be subsequently considered for a tenure-line position. For such situations, it is an accepted practice in the SOM that in the fourth year

after initial appointment to a career-line position, a career-line faculty member who has shown potential for success in the tenure-line may request to be considered for appointment into a tenure-line position typically at the rank of Assistant Professor. Candidates and department chairs considering such an arrangement should consult with the SOM Office of Academic Affairs for more complete guidance on criteria and procedures for such a change of faculty category

2. Further information regarding changes of faculty category (track switches).

a. Types of category changes. Faculty members may change from one faculty category to another (i.e., “switch tracks”, either (i) from the tenure-line category to a career-line category, or (ii) from a career-line category to the tenure-line category, or (iii) between the Clinical / Lecturer / Research subcategories within the career-line category) at any time after initial appointment, so long as they properly initiate the process, and meet relevant appointment criteria for the new category.

Procedurally, any change of category is managed as a new appointment, and requires pre-approval by their Department Chair, the Dean, and the Senior Vice President for Health Sciences. In general, faculty members should only change categories once within a career at the SOM. If a faculty member changes from a tenure-track position (prior to award of tenure) to a career-line position and then wishes to change back to the tenure-line, the probationary period (tenure clock) will start again at the point it was stopped for the earlier change to the career-line position. The total probationary period for a faculty member in a tenure-line position status will not exceed 7 years unless an extension of the period is granted as described above in accord with University Policies.

b. Overview of Process for Changes of Category:

1. The faculty member must write a letter of request addressed to the Associate Dean for Academic Affairs. The letter must include justification for changing categories and qualifications for the proposed new category and position.

2. The faculty member’s department chair must write a letter of support for the category change, including qualifications for the proposed new category and position. The chair’s letter must be included with the faculty member’s letter when it is submitted to the Office of Academic Affairs.

3. The letters must be approved by the Dean of the School of Medicine and Senior Vice President for Health Sciences.

4. Any change of category is processed as a new appointment. Candidates must meet requirements outlined in the recruitment, selection, and appointment guidelines and be formally appointed into the new category and position.

5. For appointments into the tenure-line category, a national search is normally required. However, if there was a national search for the original career-line appointment, the Senior Vice President may approve making the appointment without a new national search. Information related to the earlier national search should be included with the chair’s letter in this case. If there was no national search

for the original appointment, there should be a national search for the position as part of the appointment process.

III. RPT ANNUAL (“INFORMAL”) AND TRIGGERED REVIEW PROCEDURES

A. “6-303-III-B Informal or Formal Reviews

All tenure-track faculty members shall be reviewed annually to assess their achievement in teaching, research/other creative activity, responsibility, and service. Informal annual reviews are required in each year in which a formal review is not held. More extensive, formal reviews are required for mid-probationary retention reviews; final probationary year reviews (consideration for tenure); consideration for termination at any point in the probationary period (such as triggered reviews); and promotion decisions.”

1. Annual “Informal” Reviews

All tenure-line (tenure-eligible and tenured) faculty members shall have a review by the department chair annually. In all departments with formal divisions, this responsibility may be designated to the cognizant division chief. The annual review shall be accomplished in a face-to-face meeting and result in a written report. The written report of each annual review shall be shared with the faculty member and the Departmental Advisory Committee for Faculty Review and Advancement (DAC-FRA) Chair in a timely manner. All annual reviews shall be included in the review file for formal reviews. The annual (informal) review shall specifically include a discussion of: progress in achievements that will provide evidence for the next formal review, goals for the upcoming year, recommendations from the chair / division chief for making progress toward promotion, and changes in expectations and / or distribution of effort from the original offer letter / previous review.

2. Triggered reviews

Per University Policy 6-303-III-B-1-c, if, in an annual departmental review, a tenure-eligible faculty member does not demonstrate clearly adequate progress during the probationary period or continued contributions after award of tenure, the department chair or DAC-FRA Chair may trigger a formal faculty review. The faculty member must be given written notice of such a review and its timing. The formal faculty review may be undertaken either in the following review year or as soon as the file is completed (including the solicitation and receipt of external evaluator letters if applicable) but no sooner than 30 days after written notice of the review is provided to the candidate. A Formal Review is required for a recommendation of termination.

IV. RPT FORMAL REVIEW PROCEDURES

A. Introduction

Per University policy 6-302, the primary departmental review body for faculty appointments is the Departmental Faculty Appointment Advisory Committee (“DAC-A”), which consists of all tenure-line and all career-line faculty members. Only tenure-line faculty members are eligible to vote on tenure-line faculty appointments, but departments should record career-line faculty votes, which should be tallied separately. The DAC-A is chaired by the Department Chair.

Per University policy 6-303, the primary departmental review body for faculty review and advancement (retention, promotion, and tenure) actions is the Departmental Faculty Review and Advancement (“RPT”) Advisory Committee (DAC-FRA), which consists of all tenure-line and all career-line faculty members. Only tenure-line faculty members are eligible to vote on tenure-line faculty actions, but departments should record career-line faculty votes, which should be tallied separately. The Chair of the DAC-FRA is elected annually from the department’s tenured faculty members and long-serving career-line faculty members at the rank of Associate Professor or Professor, usually at the annual DAC-FRA meeting.

Larger departments may convene smaller ad-hoc DAC-A and DAC-FRA committees. The responsibilities of such committees may include preparation of formal faculty review files, review of formal faculty review files, and presentation of recommendations to the full DAC-FRA Committee. The composition and role of such committees in a given department must be described in the appended Supplemental Rule from that department.

B. Processes for Formal Reviews

Formal Reviews for retention, promotion or award of tenure require thorough documentation and examination of the candidate’s academic performance in accordance with the pertinent criteria and in conformance with the procedures prescribed below.

1. Faculty Review File Contents (U-Policy 6-303-III-D).

For formal reviews, the candidate and department will develop a file that documents achievements in each of the applicable areas of Investigation [Research / Creative Activity], Education [Teaching], Clinical Practice Advancement, and Administration / Service in Support of a Mission [Service].

At a minimum, the completed file submitted to the Office of Academic Affairs will include the following items, as submitted by the candidate, department administrative coordinator, and DAC-FRA Chair.

The candidate is responsible for submitting:

1. A curriculum vitae prepared by the candidate in the format specified by the Office of Academic Affairs
(<http://healthsciences.utah.edu/mbm/cvSystem/index.html>)
2. A signed attestation to the integrity of the CV
3. A self-assessment prepared by the candidate in the format specified by the Office of Academic Affairs
4. Waiver / non-waiver of confidentiality for evaluators

The department administrative coordinator and DAC-FRA are responsible for submitting:

1. Formal teaching evaluations and peer observations from the period since the candidate's previous appointment or promotion review, compiled by the department, and including reviews related to the education of professional students, graduate and undergraduate students, residents, fellows, attendees at continuing education conferences, patients, and the public. The candidate should also provide documentation, including evaluations and peer observations, to which the coordinator does not have access.
2. Internal and external letters of evaluation as defined in U-Policy 6-303-III-C-2
3. The report of the Student and Trainee Advisory Committee (STAC) [SAC]
4. A Master Summary Document that provides a brief summary of the complete file
5. The report of the DAC-FRA
6. Copies of past formal and departmental annual reviews
7. Other materials deemed pertinent to the review.

2. Notice to Candidate

At a date determined by the DAC-FRA Chair to be sufficient to allow completion of the candidate's file prior to the due date in the Academic Affairs Office, the Department Chair or DAC-FRA Chair will inform the candidate of pending formal faculty review action(s) and request the appropriate documents (CV, self-assessment, and attestation), the names of qualified internal and external evaluators, and the names of other evaluators (for example, collaborators or students) whose input the candidate or DAC-FRA Chair feels would be useful. The Department Chair or DAC-FRA Chair will also obtain a completed waiver/non waiver form (see section IV-B-5 below).

3. Notice to Department Faculty

Once candidates for formal faculty review have been identified and notified, the Department Chair or DAC-FRA Chair shall inform faculty of upcoming faculty review actions. A notice will be disseminated that informs interested faculty and staff in the Department of their right to submit signed written recommendations for each candidate. (U-Policy 6-303-III-C-2)

4. Completion of File, Candidate's Right to Examine and Comment on Contents

Prior to review by the SAC and the DAC-FRA, the Department Chair and the DAC-FRA Chair shall jointly ensure that the candidate's faculty review file is complete, including the CV, self-assessment, attestation, all other statements and materials submitted by the candidate, teaching evaluations, all other signed

Commented [HH1]: Verify appropriate reference

recommendations submitted by individual faculty and staff, and all solicited letters received from internal and external evaluators. Per University Policy 6-303-III-D-10, candidates are entitled to see their RPT file upon request at any time during the review process, *except for confidential letters of evaluation if the candidate has waived the right to see them*. If a candidate wishes to comment upon items in the initial faculty review file, the candidate's written comments must be added to the file before the DAC-FRA meeting is held. The DAC-FRA Chair is responsible for making the file available to DAC-FRA members.

5. Letters of Evaluation (University Policy 6-303-III-D-9)

The purpose of letters of evaluation is to provide an objective assessment of the scope, quality, and impact of the candidate's work. The requirements for letters of evaluation from internal and external evaluators are given below and detailed on the Office of Academic Affairs website

(<https://pulse.utah.edu/site/academicaffairs/Documents/2018-19%20FRA%20LOE%20Requirements.pdf>).

- a. Mid-Probationary Formal Review for Retention (usually in the fourth year): at least two letters internal to the department; and letters external to the department are optional
- b. Formal Review for Promotion to Assistant Professor or Associate Professor: at least two letters internal to the institution and at least two letters external to the institution
- c. Formal Review for Award of Tenure (all ranks): at least two letters internal to the institution and at least two letters external to the institution
- d. Formal Review for Promotion to Professor: at least two letters internal to the institution and at least three letters external to the institution

The selection of external evaluators will be made jointly by the Department Chair and the DAC-FRA Chair from lists of possible evaluators suggested by the candidate, the Department Chair, the DAC-FRA Chair, and the DAC-FRA Committee or ad hoc committee. Letters should be solicited from recognized experts familiar with the candidate's field who have recognized professional standing at the same, equivalent, or higher rank as the proposed rank of the candidate. Letters from current or recent (within 3 years) collaborators and current or recent (within 5 years) mentors can be included as required letters for mid-probationary retention reviews. After this point, letters from current or recent collaborators or mentors are encouraged, but will not count towards the required number of letters. Current collaboration includes joint funding, co-authorship on more than 3 publications in the past 5 years, or close collaboration in other endeavors related to the mission of the department and SOM.

Participation in multi-center clinical trials, guidelines development committees, and similar efforts will not be considered collaboration based on co-authorship for publications resulting from these efforts. Evaluators will be requested to comment on specific aspects of the candidate's record as defined by the individual department and the Office of Academic Affairs. Copies of solicitation letters sent to evaluators shall be included in the file. Invited evaluators will be

provided with the review file as prepared by the candidate, the pertinent School of Medicine guidelines, and any department-specific guidelines.

Once internal and external evaluators are chosen, the Department Chair shall solicit the letters and shall ensure that sufficient requests are made and received in a timely manner so that the required number of eligible letters as indicated above is included in the file before review by the SAC and DAC-FRA. Candidates will be required to indicate by signature whether they waive their right to see letters of evaluation as follows:

*I hereby elect to have all letters for my review solicited on a **confidential** basis. This option constitutes a waiver of any right I might have to see those letters. Signature/date*

*I hereby elect to have all letters for my review solicited on a **non-confidential** basis. I understand that people asked to write letters of recommendation will be informed of my right to see those letters. Signature/date*

That form, with the candidate's signature below the preferred statement, shall be included in the candidate's file. Internal and external evaluators shall be informed in writing whether the candidate has waived his/her right to review the letters of evaluation.

6. Student and Trainee Advisory Committee (STAC) [SAC] Report (U-Policy 6-303-III-C-3)

[The functions of the Student Advisory Committee (SAC) described in Policy 6-303 are in departments of this college performed by the "Student and Resident Advisory Committee (SAC)."]

The STAC will be convened by the Department Chair and DAC-FRA Chair and will include students who have some affiliation with the department and residents from within the department. Residents have an MD or DO degree and are completing required post-doctoral training in an Accreditation Council for Graduate Medical Education (ACGME)-accredited clinical residency program. As such, residents (interns, residents, and some clinical fellows) are not considered "students" but rather "trainees." In clinical departments, resident education is a major component of faculty teaching responsibilities. Therefore, both students and residents are included on the STAC, because both are considered essential for evaluating the teaching of candidates.

The students and residents need not have had direct contact with each candidate, although it is recommended that at least one SAC member have personal knowledge of each candidate. The STAC will meet at least 3 weeks prior to the DAC-FRA meeting in order to have sufficient time to prepare a report (University Policy 6-303). The STAC report should be based on the candidate's record and should focus specifically on educational efforts and accomplishments as defined by the faculty review criteria using a standard report form provided by the Office of Academic Affairs. The file submitted to each STAC shall contain

the candidate's CV, self-assessment, and teaching evaluations as specified in IV.B.1 above. Internal or external letters of evaluation shall not be provided for review. If the STAC fails to prepare a signed report within the prescribed time frame and with proper content abiding by University standards, the missing STAC's recommendations "shall be deemed conclusively waived, and [the] absence shall not thereafter be cause for complaint by faculty members appealing an adverse decision." Policy 6-303-III-C-3.

7. DEPARTMENT ADVISORY COMMITTEE FOR FACULTY REVIEW AND ADVANCEMENT ("RPT") (DAC-FRA): Membership and Actions. Committee Membership (University Policy 6-303-III-A-3)

The DAC-FRA consists of all tenure-line faculty members, and all career-line faculty members in the department. Only tenure-line faculty members are eligible to vote on actions for tenure-line faculty members (see details below) but departments should record career-line faculty votes for these actions, which should be tallied separately.

- a. **For Retention.** "All *tenured* faculty members *regardless of rank* are eligible to participate in the consideration of and to vote on recommendations in individual cases on matters of retention."
- b. **For Promotion.** "All *tenure-line* faculty members of *equal or higher rank* than that proposed for the candidate for promotion are eligible to participate in the consideration of and to vote on recommendations in individual cases on matters of promotion."
- c. **For Tenure.** "All *tenured* faculty members *regardless of rank* are eligible to participate in the consideration of and to vote on recommendations in individual cases on matters of tenure."
Policy 6-303-III.

8. DAC-FRA Chair

The chair of the DAC-FRA shall be a tenured faculty member or a career-line faculty member at the rank of Associate Professor or Professor. The DAC-FRA Chair shall be elected annually from the eligible members of the Department faculty. Usually, the election will occur at the end of the annual DAC meeting. All tenure-line faculty members at the rank of professor, associate professor, assistant professor, and instructor have the right to vote for DAC-FRA Chair. The Department Chair is not eligible to chair this committee. The DAC-FRA Chair shall be responsible for identifying faculty members due for formal review, setting deadlines for submission of file documents, and advising faculty members in the preparation of documents. The DAC-FRA Chair shall establish the date and time of the DAC-FRA meeting in a timely manner, such that completed faculty review files can be submitted to the Office of Academic Affairs by the last Monday in October.

9 DAC-FRA Secretary

A secretary of each meeting shall be designated by the Chair of the DAC-FRA and shall take notes of the discussion to provide the basis for developing a

summary. The DAC-FRA Secretary shall also keep track of the quorum and of the outcomes of votes.

10. Quorum

“A quorum of [the DAC-FRA] for any given case shall consist of two-thirds of [eligible faculty] members, except that any member unable to attend the meeting because of formal leave of absence or physical disability shall not be counted in determining the number required for a quorum.” (Policy 6-303-III-E-3). Faculty members who participate via video conference will count towards the quorum. A minimum of three individuals is required for a quorum. Absentee voters will not count toward the quorum.

11. Absentee Voting

“Whenever practicable, the Department Chair shall advise all members on leave or otherwise absent of the proposed action and shall request their written opinions and votes, to be received approximately one week prior to the DAC meeting. Absent members’ written opinions shall be disclosed at the meeting and their votes will be counted the same as other votes.” (Policy 6-303-III-E-4). It is expected that absent members who cast a vote will be familiar with the candidate’s completed file. Absentee voters will not count toward the quorum.

12. Limitations

The Department Chair and College Dean, “who are required by the regulations to make their own recommendations in an administrative capacity, may attend, and upon invitation by majority vote of the committee, may submit evidence, judgments and opinions, or participate in discussion. By majority vote, the committee may move to executive session, from which nonvoting participants may be excluded. [The Department Chair and Dean], and other administrative officials who cast [faculty review and advancement] votes in their administrative capacity, shall not vote at the departmental level.” (Policy 6-303-III-E-5).

The DAC-FRA will be convened by the DAC-FRA Chair at least 3 weeks after the STAC meeting and in time for completion of the department review file by the last Monday in October. DAC-FRA members will be provided each candidate’s file for review. After due consideration, voting on all appropriate actions regarding the candidate shall then proceed. Voting may be conducted by the committee as a whole, including the Department Chair and others ineligible to vote, or in executive session, excluding the Department Chair and others ineligible to vote (see II-D above). The vote may be by open or secret ballot. A request by any DAC-FRA member for a secret ballot requires a secret ballot. A separate vote shall be taken on each action proposed (e.g., retention, promotion, or Award of Tenure) for each candidate under consideration.

Commented [HH2]: Check this is correct reference3

13. DAC-FRA Committee Report

The Secretary shall make a record of the vote (including absentee votes as noted above) and shall prepare a separate summary report of the meeting for

each candidate. Each report shall include the substance of the discussion, including the explicit rationale for negative votes, if any, and also the findings and recommendations of the committee. DAC-FRA members will have the opportunity to review and approve the report during a 7-day inspection period (U-Policy 6-303-III-E-7). The DAC-FRA summary report, bearing the written approvals of the committee chair and secretary, along with a list of all faculty members present in person or by video or voting in absentia at the meeting, shall be forwarded to both the Department Chair and the candidate for an opportunity for response or comment (see below).

14. Department Chair Report

The Department Chair will prepare an independent report, addressed to the Dean of the School of Medicine, to be submitted to both the candidate and the Office of Academic Affairs. The Chair's report will summarize the Chair's evaluation of the candidate and recommendation regarding each action. The Chair's report may quote from the letters submitted by evaluators, *but shall not identify any evaluators*. (University Policy 6-303-III-F-3)

15. Candidate's Right to Respond

The candidate shall have the opportunity, but not the obligation, to add a written statement to his/her faculty review file in response to the summary report of the DAC-FRA and the report of the Department Chair. Written notice of this option shall be included with the copy of the Department Chair's report that is sent to the candidate. If the candidate chooses to add such a statement to the file, that statement must be submitted to the Department Chair within seven business days, except in extenuating circumstances. If such a response is submitted, the Department Chair will add the candidate's statement to the file without comment. (University Policy 6-303-III)

16. The Completed File and Review Beyond the Department Level

The Department Chair will forward the completed file, including the SAC report, the DAC-FRA report, the Department Chair's report, and any responses by the candidate, to the SOM Office of Academic Affairs for review, by the last Monday in October. Files for candidates for promotion and award of tenure, but not for retention, will be reviewed and assessed by the School of Medicine Faculty Appointment, Review, and Advancement Committee (FARA Committee; formerly ARPT Committee). All files will be reviewed and assessed by the Dean or Dean's designee and the Senior Vice President for Health Sciences:

Procedures subsequent to the department level are described in University Policy 6-303-III-G,H,J, including action by dean and college advisory committee, action by the cognizant vice president and University Promotion and Tenure Advisory Committee, and final action by the President.

V. APPOINTMENTS OF TENURE-LINE FACULTY

A. Procedures for Appointments

Appointments to the faculty of the SOM are governed by University Policy 6-302. SOM-specific procedures and criteria & standards for appointments of tenure-line faculty members are described below.

Faculty Review File Contents for Appointments are similar to those for review and advancement (RPT), excluding the personal statement, teaching evaluations, Master Summary Document, and STAC review. For appointments, the candidate and department will develop a file that documents achievements in each of the applicable areas of Investigation, Education, Clinical Practice Advancement, and Administration / Service in Support of the Mission. At a minimum, the completed file submitted to the Office of Academic Affairs will include 1) a curriculum vitae prepared by the candidate; 2) at least three external letters of evaluation; 3) the report of the Departmental Faculty Appointments Advisory Committee (DAC-A); and 4) other materials deemed pertinent to review.

B. Actions By The DAC-A

In its capacity as the “Departmental Faculty Appointments Advisory Committee” governed by University Policy 6-302, the DAC-A will consider the appointment of all faculty members appointed to the tenure-line, with or without the award of tenure. The DAC-A will be chaired by the Department Chair. A quorum consists of two-thirds of eligible faculty members. Appointments to the tenure-line may be voted on in person or electronically by the DAC-A. Appointments with award of tenure must be voted on at an in-person DAC-A meeting. Faculty members who participate via video conference will count towards the quorum.

C. For Appointment

“First, all *[tenure-line]* members of the committee shall vote on a recommendation as to the making of the appointment generally, with the appointment to be made carrying at least the lowest rank applicable for the type of position being filled. Second, if it is proposed that the appointment be made at any higher rank, then there shall be a separate vote taken among only those *[tenure-line faculty] members holding a rank equivalent to or higher* than the proposed appointment rank, and they shall vote on a recommendation as to that specified higher rank. For example, with an appointment to a tenure-line faculty position proposed at the rank of associate professor, the assistant professor members of the committee shall participate with other members in the first vote, producing a recommendation regarding appointment with at least the rank of assistant professor, and then only the associate and full professors shall participate in a second vote on recommending that the appointment carry the higher rank of associate professor.”

D. Action by Department Chair

As per University Policy 6-302, the Department Chair shall prepare a written recommendation to the Dean regarding the proposed appointment that includes a summary of the candidate's file and the DAC-A vote.

E. Actions subsequent to the Department

As per University Policy 6-302 and the SOM College Council Charter, the SOM has a standing college faculty appointments advisory committee, the Faculty Appointment, Review, and Advancement Committee (FARA, formerly ARPT Committee). The FARA Committee is an elected body whose composition is defined in the SOM College Council Charter. The completed file for each candidate for a tenure-line faculty appointment will be reviewed and assessed by the FARA Committee according to the criteria and standards in this document. An initial review will be completed electronically. For appointments without Award of Tenure, a unanimous electronic vote will be sufficient. If any FARA Committee member recommends the file be discussed, the file must be discussed in person at a monthly FARA Committee meeting. All appointments with Award of Tenure must be discussed and assessed in person by the FARA Committee. A written recommendation will be provided to the SOMEK.

As per University Policy 6-302 and the SOM College Council Charter, the completed file for each candidate for a tenure-line faculty appointment will be reviewed and assessed by the School of Medicine Executive Committee (SOMEK). Members of the SOMEK are either elected or appointed as defined the SOM College Council. For appointments without Award of Tenure, a unanimous electronic vote will be sufficient. If any SOMEK member recommends the file be discussed, the file must be discussed in person at a SOMEK meeting. All appointments with Award of Tenure must be discussed and assessed in person by the SOMEK.

As per University Policy 6-302 the Dean or Dean's designee shall review the complete file and provide a written recommendation to the Senior Vice President for Health Sciences. The Senior Vice President for Health Sciences *shall review the entire file and shall then forward the entire file with a recommendation, where appropriate, to the President (University Policy 6-302)*. The Vice President's recommendation shall be reviewed and assessed by the President, Academic Senate, and Board of Trustees as provided by University Policy 6-302.

F. Criteria and Standards for Appointments

Criteria and standards for appointments are governed by the criteria and standards defined for review and advancement (retention, promotion, and award of tenure) in Part VI (below). For clarity, the criteria and standards for appointments will be described in detail in Section VI.C, after detailed definitions are provided. Criteria and standards for appointment to a given rank are consonant with those required for promotion to that rank.

VI. CRITERIA, STANDARDS, AND EVIDENCE FOR RETENTION, PROMOTION, AND TENURE (EXPECTATIONS FOR TENURE-LINE FACULTY REVIEW AND ADVANCEMENT)

A. General Principles and Objectives

1. Decisions by the School of Medicine on initial appointment, and subsequent retention, promotion and tenure for tenure-line faculty members are consistent with the commitment of the University of Utah to the achievement and maintenance of academic excellence.

As stated in University Policy 6-303-III-A-2-c-i, *“For granting of tenure, it is indispensable that there be a cumulative record demonstrating sustained effectiveness in each of the two areas of teaching and research/other creative activity, and additionally, excellence in a combination of those areas.”*

In the SOM, tenure-line faculty members make critical contributions not just in the areas of teaching and research / other creative activity, but also to clinical care and administration / service in support of the missions of the SOM and SOM departments. Therefore, standards of evidence for faculty review and advancement (RPT) in the SOM have been modified to account for the variety of contributions of SOM faculty members, while remaining consistent with the expectations of University Policy.

The overall mission of the University of Utah School of Medicine is to advance health. For the purpose of faculty review, the School of Medicine’s missions are understood to encompass:

- Education in the myriad of domains that could improve patient care, individual and population health and well-being, and / or advancement of knowledge
- Investigation of important questions related to all three missions, including but not limited to development and dissemination of new knowledge
- Provision and advancement of clinical care across the spectrum of disciplines.

In order to incorporate these missions into the criteria, standards, and evidence expected, the SOM has adopted somewhat different titles for the areas of accomplishment, although the overall meaning and expectation of overall excellence in research / creative activity and teaching remain. Research / Creative Activity has been renamed “Investigation” to better capture the type of activities and evidence valued in the context of SOM reviews. Similarly, Teaching has been renamed “Education” to better capture the range of educational activities that contribute to SOM missions. Note that scholarship / dissemination consistent with Boyer’s Scholarship Reconsidered is required for evidence of excellence in all areas of accomplishment.

Administrative work and service are valued in faculty review criteria when they serve to advance one or more missions. Investigation and scholarship, which must include dissemination, may stem from any mission, as well as from administration / service.

Although there are four areas of accomplishment instead of two, excellence in Investigation (Research / Creative Activity) is required for Award of Tenure, as is effectiveness in Education, and overall excellence in the combination.

While Award of Tenure requires excellence in Investigation and one other area of accomplishment, promotion or appointment to Associate Professor without Award of Tenure requires only excellence in Investigation. Because promotion to Associate Professor almost always occurs simultaneously with Award of Tenure, most faculty candidates for promotion to Associate Professor will be expected to demonstrate excellence in both Investigation and a second area of accomplishment.

Award of Tenure at the time of appointment at the rank of Associate Professor or Professor is reserved for extraordinary circumstances, including appointment to a leadership position and / or extraordinary accomplishments and impact.

2. In order to recognize the breadth and depth of faculty accomplishment across a variety of disciplines and departmental missions, the criteria defined in this statement are intended to provide flexibility in evaluating contributions and impact. Criteria modified by “must” are absolute requirements that must be achieved by a faculty member for a specific action. Criteria modified by “should” are achievements that will usually be required, but can be superseded under special circumstances and with supportive evidence for other important contributions to that area of accomplishment. Criteria modified by “can” are intended to provide ideas and suggestions; absence of accomplishments that meet such a suggested criterion in a faculty file may not be the basis for a negative inference about the file. Formal faculty reviews will consider expected effort for each area of accomplishment as defined in an individual faculty member’s offer letter and annual departmental written faculty reviews in evaluating whether an individual’s accomplishments and impact meet criteria. *Outstanding achievements (well above expectation) in a single area may serve to modify the level of accomplishment required in other areas.*

The activities expected of an individual faculty member should be aligned closely with departmental missions as well as college and institutional missions. Thus, departments may choose to provide additional, mission-based criteria for faculty review, as long as these are in compliance with School of Medicine and University of Utah Policy (see department specific missions and criteria, Appendix C).

3. For the purpose of this document, the term “faculty review” encompasses reviews for the purpose of appointment, retention, and advancement (including promotion, and tenure) of tenure-line faculty members.

The unique missions of the School of Medicine include Investigation, Education, and Clinical Practice Advancement, which are supported by Administration / Service in support of SOM missions. These four areas are understood specifically in the context of faculty reviews as “areas of accomplishment” and are defined in Section IV.A.3-d-h. Tenure-line faculty members will be expected to demonstrate excellence in two areas

of accomplishment, one of which must be Investigation, and effectiveness in the other two (the other one in the case of faculty members with no clinical responsibilities). The differences between “excellent” and “effective” work lie in scale, outcome, and impact. In general, effectiveness represents work that has impact within the institution or within a faculty member’s division or department; excellence represents work that has impact outside of the division, department or institution, depending on rank and area of accomplishment. Excellence generally requires some level of dissemination and scholarship. Excellence in Investigation specifically requires scholarship and dissemination outside the institution. For both effectiveness and excellence, accomplishments are divided into required (must have all), recommended (should have some, but not necessarily all), and potential (a check list of possible accomplishments that may contribute to the assessment).

B. Responsibilities in the Faculty Review Process

- a. Faculty members are responsible for providing documentation of their contributions and impact in applicable areas of accomplishment. This documentation requires both a description of the importance and impact of the faculty member’s overall body of work and contributions to their field, and detailed description of specific products that demonstrate the faculty member’s impact in specific areas of accomplishment. The CV (<http://healthsciences.utah.edu/mbm/cvSystem/index.html>) and structured self-assessment template (<https://pulse.utah.edu/site/academicaffairs/Documents/Forms/Faculty%20Review%20%20Advancement%20FRA.aspx>) provide a structure in which the faculty member can document his or her impact, accomplishments, and body of work.
- b. The institutional responsibility begins at the time of appointment, when the department should provide clear expectations in the Offer Letter. These expectations may be modified in written annual faculty departmental reviews. The department and institution should provide faculty development programs and mentoring that will help a faculty member identify and pursue opportunities that will lead to a high impact body of work and on time promotion.

C. Areas of Accomplishment Definitions:

1. Areas of Accomplishment (“Criteria”)

As noted above, the criteria of Research / Creative Activity, Teaching, and Service, as described in University Policy 6-303, have been renamed to be better aligned with the SOM mission and SOM faculty contributions, while remaining consistent with Policy 6-303. Instead of the term “criteria”, the term “areas of accomplishment “ is used. Areas of accomplishment pertinent to review of SOM faculty members include:

- a. **Investigation (“Research / Creative Activity”)**
- b. **Education (“Teaching”)**
- c. **Clinical Practice Advancement**
- d. **Administration / Service in Support of the Missions (“Service”)**

D. Scholarship

Excellence in an area of accomplishment generally requires some form of scholarship; the degree of dissemination required and venue depend on rank and area of accomplishments. To be considered scholarship, faculty contributions must have demonstrable impact; that is the work must be:

- Made public
- Peer-reviewed based on the standard of the field at the time
- Built on by others¹

Scholarship may stem from any mission or from administration / service activities that support one or more of the missions. It should be aligned with departmental missions. The focus and requirements relating to scholarship should be defined at the time of appointment and during annual departmental review in consultation with a faculty member's mentors, chair, and division chief. Areas of focus may include discovery, application, integration, and educational scholarship². Departments may limit which areas of scholarship may be considered for faculty review in alignment with departmental mission (which shall be explained in the Supplemental Rule of the department, see [Appendix C]). Team science³, Clinical Practice Advancement and quality improvement, collaboration, technology commercialization, education, community engagement, advocacy, inclusion, sustainability, web-based dissemination, administration / service, and global health can all be areas for effective and excellent scholarship. Other areas that emerge as vital to academic health systems may also be appropriate areas for scholarship. The key metrics for evaluating scholarship are *dissemination* and *impact*.

Excellence requires durable dissemination and cumulative impact; excellence in Investigation specifically requires national dissemination

1. Based on: Glassick, CE. *Academic Medicine* 75:877-80, 2000.
2. Based on: Boyer, EL. *Scholarship Reconsidered*, 1990.
3. See, for example Sanberg, PR et al. *PNAS* 2014;111:6542-7.

E. Standards Definitions —“Excellence” and “Effectiveness”

1. Excellence

Excellence requires outward-facing (external to the division / department or institution, depending on rank and area of accomplishment) contributions and impact.

As examples, the following would be considered excellent contributions in the context of promotion to associate professor:

- a. Clinical Practice Advancement: service on a national guidelines committee; contributions to an interdisciplinary quality improvement initiative
- b. Education: service on the SOM Curriculum Committee; presentation of a workshop at a conference
- c. Investigation: publication of original research in a peer-reviewed journal; licensing of a patent

- d. Administration / Service: Residency Program Director;
Committee Chair for a national society

2. Effectiveness

Effectiveness requires inward-facing (within the division / department or institution, depending on rank and area of accomplishment) contributions and impact.

As examples, the following would be considered effective contributions in the context of promotion to associate professor:

- Clinical Practice Advancement: delivery of high quality patient care. **Note that delivery of high quality clinical service is an absolute requirement for faculty members with clinical appointments.**
- Education: high quality teaching
- Investigation: participation in planning and enrolling participants in published clinical trials
- Administration / Service: service on a committee

F. Area of Accomplishment - Investigation

Investigation involves efforts by the faculty member that generate or advance creation or development of new knowledge. These could include such activities as bench research, clinical trials, quality improvement, and evaluation of educational efforts. Team science, clinical care, collaboration, technology commercialization, education, community engagement, advocacy, inclusion, sustainability, web-based dissemination, administration / service, and global health can all be areas for effective and excellent Investigation.

Excellence in Investigation--requires scholarship, as defined by durable dissemination outside the institution and cumulative impact for promotion to Associate Professor and Award of Tenure. For promotion to Professor, the faculty member should have developed a body of work that has changed practice, understanding, process, or methods in the field. Scholarship, dissemination, and impact could include authorship on peer-reviewed original articles; peer-reviewed, durable workshops; dissemination of innovation through commercialization that leads to improvements in patient care or outcome¹; or other metrics that demonstrate durable dissemination and impact. Glassick's criteria for scholarship (see [IV.A.h.](#), below) must be met for work to be considered scholarship. External funding is evidence of impact, dissemination, and a national reputation, but it is not an absolute requirement for promotion or award of tenure. As a measure of the ability to sustain excellence, individual departments can define external funding as a required component of excellence (see Appendix C).

Investigation without participation in scholarship and external dissemination by the individual faculty member cannot qualify as excellent.

Commented [HH3]: Check section

G. Area of Accomplishment – Education

Education is defined broadly to include dissemination of knowledge, skills, and attitudes to trainees, faculty members, clinicians, staff, colleagues, patients, and the public within or external to the institution. Education includes teaching activities; learner assessment; curriculum development; mentoring, advising, and supervising; and educational leadership and administration. Curriculum development may be considered both scholarship and educational activity. Educational leadership may be considered both administration and educational activity. Patient education may be considered both Clinical Practice Advancement and educational activity.

Excellence in Education--requires participation in education at an administrative, development, scholarly, or Investigational level with involvement outside the division / department for promotion to Associate Professor and Award of Tenure, and outside the institution for promotion to Professor. Involvement could be evidenced by service on curriculum committees, dissemination of curricula or teaching methods, or presentations on educational topics, or curricular development.

Effectiveness in Education--requires active participation in at least one area of education, ongoing commitment to improving educational skills, and positive assessments.

H. Area of Accomplishment - Clinical Practice Advancement

Clinical Practice Advancement is defined broadly to include direct patient care; development of algorithms, care process models, protocols or templates; decision support tools to improve patient care; participation in quality improvement projects or programs; and oversight of patient care. Quality improvement projects and development of protocols may be considered both Clinical Practice Advancement and application scholarship. Oversight of patient care may be considered Clinical Practice Advancement, Administration / Service, and Education.

Excellence in Clinical Practice Advancement--requires participation in Clinical Practice Advancement at an administrative, development, scholarly, or Investigational level with involvement outside the division / department for promotion to Associate Professor and Award of Tenure, and outside the institution for promotion to Professor. Involvement could be evidenced by service on a clinical guidelines committee, service on a professional society committee, dissemination of quality improvement projects, or presentations on clinical topics. Excellence may include efforts to improve the quality of care or clinical education.

Effectiveness in Clinical Practice Advancement--includes provision of high quality care, participation in quality improvement projects, and ongoing commitment to maintaining and improving clinical skills. **Provision of high quality clinical service (effectiveness) is an absolute requirement for**

promotion for faculty members with a clinical service commitment, but does not rise to the level of excellence.

I. Area of Accomplishment - Administration / Service in Support of Missions

Administration includes leadership and work within and outside the institution on committees; participation in organizational efforts to meet strategic goals; and program or unit leadership. Service includes leadership and work within and outside the institution as part of inclusion, sustainability, outreach, and other service efforts. Administration / service will often overlap with Clinical Practice Advancement, Investigation, scholarship, and education.

Excellence in Administration/ Service--requires substantial administrative and / or service effort and impact, generally in a leadership role with involvement outside the division / department for promotion to Associate Professor and Award of Tenure, and outside the institution for promotion to Professor. Involvement could be evidenced by service on committees related to administration / service, presentations related to administration / service, or dissemination of administrative / service innovation. Developmental, scholarly, and / or investigational contributions are evidence of excellence.

Effectiveness in Administration/ Service--requires competent participation in administrative / service roles.

J. Evidence of Excellence and Effectiveness

1. Demonstration of *excellence* in a given area (Investigation, Education, Clinical Practice Advancement, or Administration / Service in Support of Missions) requires a synthesis of the body of work as evidenced by overall contributions reflected in the CV, and evidence of significant contributions of quality and impact reflected in the self-assessment. **Excellence** should be captured in the self-assessment for a given area based on three individual products or contributions of high external impact and quality. These could include, for example, a high impact original article with a major intellectual contribution by the candidate (Investigation), development of a curriculum that improved learner outcomes (Education), a quality improvement project that reduced morbidity or mortality in a targeted group of patients (Clinical Practice Advancement), or leadership of a committee that recommended and implemented valuable process changes in an administrative unit (Administration / Service).

2. Demonstration of *effectiveness* in a given category (Investigation, Education, Clinical Practice Advancement, or Administration / Service in Support of Missions) requires a synthesis of the body of work as evidenced by overall contributions reflected in the CV, and evidence of significant contributions of quality and impact as reflected in the self-assessment. **Effectiveness** should be captured in the self-assessment for a given area based on two individual products or contributions of internal impact and quality. These could include, for example, a quality improvement project within the institution (Investigation), high quality teaching in a required course (Education), provision of high quality patient care (Clinical Practice Advancement), or service on a departmental committee (Administration / Service).

3. [Responsible conduct] Consistent with U-Policy 6-303-III-A-2-c-i, *“For retention during the probationary period, the record ... must demonstrate reasonable potential for meeting the standards established for tenure. For promotion in rank, the record for the two areas must demonstrate continuing professional growth at a level appropriate to the particular rank.”* In addition, in carrying out their academic duties, *“faculty members are expected to demonstrate the ability and willingness to perform as responsible members of the faculty, as defined in the Code of Faculty Rights and Responsibilities (University Policy 6-316).”* Policy 6-303-III-A-2-b. Faculty members of all School of Medicine departments are expected to comply with requirements of the Faculty Code and to conduct their interactions with other members of the University community in a professional, collegial, and constructive manner.

K. Appointments

1. Appointment to the Rank of Instructor

This rank is intended for individuals who are completing training or acquiring essential experience while simultaneously serving a faculty role.

a. **Education:** A degree appropriate to expected academic and clinical roles from an accredited institution of higher education.

b. **Clinicians:** Faculty members who will provide clinical care should have completed the training normally required for board certification in their specialty and be board eligible. Expedited promotion to Assistant Professor is possible for faculty members appointed at the Instructor rank who meet all requirements for appointment as Assistant Professor except board certification and subsequently achieve board certification.

c. **Expectations:** Faculty members appointed at the rank of Instructor in the tenure-line should demonstrate the potential and commitment to develop and demonstrate excellence in Investigation, along with the potential to develop excellence in one of Education, Clinical Practice Advancement, or Administration / Service and effectiveness in the others.

2. Appointment to the Rank of Assistant Professor

This rank is intended for individuals who have completed training, who have demonstrated commitment and potential and are beginning to develop a record of excellence in and one other area, along with a record of effectiveness in the others.

a. **Education:** A degree appropriate to expected academic and clinical roles from an accredited institution of higher education. A record of post-doctoral or other training commensurate with expectations.

b. **Clinicians:** Faculty members who will provide clinical care should be board certified.

c. **Expectations:** Faculty members appointed at the rank of Assistant Professor in the tenure-line should demonstrate commitment and progress toward developing a record of excellence in Investigation, along with commitment and progress toward developing a record of excellence in one

of Education, Clinical Practice Advancement, or Administration / Service and effectiveness in the others.

3. Appointment to the Rank of Associate Professor *without* Award of Tenure

This rank is intended for individuals who have served at the rank of Assistant Professor or the equivalent for at least 5 years or at the rank of Associate Professor or the equivalent and who have a demonstrated record of excellence in with durable impact outside their institution and at least effectiveness in Education, Clinical Practice Advancement (if applicable), and Administration / Service. It is expected that the individual will develop and demonstrate excellence in one additional area of accomplishment from among Education, Clinical Practice Advancement, or Administration / Service and meet criteria for Award of Tenure by the 5th year review.

- a. **Education:** A degree appropriate to expected academic and clinical roles from an accredited institution of higher education.
- b. **Clinicians:** Faculty members who will provide clinical care should be board certified.
- c. **Expectations:** Faculty members appointed at the rank of Associate Professor in the tenure-line should demonstrate a cumulative record of excellence in with durable impact outside their institution; progress toward developing excellence in one area of Education, Clinical Practice Advancement (if applicable), or Administration / Service; and effectiveness in the others. There should be a strong expectation that the candidate will continue to demonstrate excellence and will meet the criteria for Award of Tenure by the end of the Tenure probationary period as defined in the offer letter.

4. Appointment to the Rank of Associate Professor *with* Award of Tenure

Appointment at the rank of Associate Professor with Award of Tenure is an unusual action, usually related to appointment to an institutional leadership position and / or exceptional accomplishments. Candidates will usually have already served at the rank of Associate Professor or the equivalent at another institution (or in the career-line) or have served at the rank of Assistant Professor or the equivalent for at least 5 years. Candidates must have a demonstrated record of excellence in of durable impact outside their institution; excellence in one area of Education, Clinical Practice Advancement (if applicable), and Administration / Service; and effectiveness in the others. **In this case, the requirements for Award of Tenure are primary, since the expectations are greater (excellence in two areas) than for appointment or promotion to Associate Professor (excellence in).**

- a. **Education:** A degree appropriate to expected academic and clinical roles from an accredited institution of higher education.
- b. **Clinicians:** Faculty members who will provide clinical care should be board certified.
- c. **Expectations:** Faculty members appointed at the rank of Associate Professor with Award of Tenure should have a demonstrated cumulative record of excellence in with durable impact outside their institution, along

with excellence in one of Education, Clinical Practice Advancement (if applicable), or Administration / Service and effectiveness in the others.

5. Appointment to the Rank of Professor *without* Award of Tenure

This rank is intended for individuals who have served at the rank of Associate Professor or the equivalent at another institution (or in the career-line) for at least 5 years or at the rank of Professor or the equivalent and who have a demonstrated record of excellence in with durable impact outside their institution, including a body of work that has changed practice, understanding, process, or methods in the field; excellence in one of Education, Clinical Practice Advancement (if applicable), or Administration / Service; and effectiveness in the other(s).

a. **Education:** A degree appropriate to expected academic and clinical roles from an accredited institution of higher education.

b. **Clinicians:** Faculty members who will provide clinical care should be board certified.

c. **Expectations:** Faculty members appointed at the rank of Professor in the tenure-line should have a cumulative record of excellence in Investigation with durable impact outside their institution, including a body of work that has changed practice, understanding, process, or methods in the field; excellence in one of Education, Clinical Practice Advancement (if applicable), or Administration / Service; and effectiveness in the others. It is expected that the individual will continue to demonstrate excellence in and in one additional area of Education, Clinical Practice Advancement (if applicable), or Administration / Service and effectiveness in the others in order to meet criteria for Award of Tenure by the 5th year review. There should be a strong expectation that the candidate will continue to demonstrate excellence and will meet the criteria for Award of Tenure by the end of the tenure probationary period as defined in the offer letter.

6. Appointment to the Rank of Professor *with* Award of Tenure

Appointment at the rank of Professor with Award of Tenure is an unusual action, usually related to appointment to an institutional leadership position and / or exceptional accomplishments. Candidates will usually have already served at the rank of Professor or the equivalent at another institution (or in the career-line) or have served at the rank of Associate Professor or the equivalent for at least 5 years. Candidates must have a demonstrated record of excellence in Investigation of durable impact outside their institution, including a body of work that has changed practice, understanding, process, or methods in the field; excellence in one area of Education, Clinical Practice Advancement (if applicable), and Administration / Service; and effectiveness in the others.

a. **Education:** A degree appropriate to expected academic and clinical roles from an accredited institution of higher education.

b. **Clinicians:** Faculty members who will provide clinical care should be board certified.

c. **Expectations:** Faculty members appointed at the rank of Professor with Award of Tenure should have a demonstrated cumulative record of excellence in Investigation with national impact, along with excellence in

one of Education, Clinical Practice Advancement (if applicable), or Administration / Service and effectiveness in the others. There should be a strong expectation that the candidate will continue to demonstrate excellence and will meet the criteria for Award of Tenure by the end of the tenure probationary period as defined in the offer letter.

L. Retention in the probationary period (prior to award of tenure)

1. Instructor: It is expected that the individual will show commitment to and progress in developing excellence in with durable impact outside the institution, along with the commitment to and progress in developing excellence in one of Education, Clinical Practice Advancement (if applicable), or Administration / Service and effectiveness in the others.

2. Assistant Professor: It is expected that the individual will show commitment to and progress in developing excellence in Investigation with durable impact outside the institution, along with commitment to and progress in developing excellence in one of Education, Clinical Practice Advancement (if applicable), or Administration / Service and effectiveness in the others, in order to achieve milestones and meet criteria for Award of Tenure by the 7th year review.

3. Associate Professor: It is expected that the individual will continue to demonstrate excellence in Investigation and in one additional area of Education, Clinical Practice Advancement (if applicable), or Administration / Service and effectiveness in the others in order to meet criteria for Award of Tenure by the 5th year review.

4. Professor It is expected that the individual will continue to demonstrate excellence in and in one additional area of Education, Clinical Practice Advancement (if applicable), or Administration / Service and effectiveness in the others in order to meet criteria for Award of Tenure by the 5th year review.

M. Promotion

1. Promotion to Assistant Professor

It is expected that the individual will demonstrate the potential and commitment to develop and demonstrate excellence in Investigation, along with the potential to develop excellence in one of Education, Clinical Practice Advancement (if applicable), or Administration / Service and effectiveness in the others. There should be a strong expectation that the candidate will continue to demonstrate excellence and will meet the criteria for Award of Tenure by the end of the tenure probationary period as defined in the offer letter.

2. Award of Tenure with simultaneous Promotion to Associate Professor

It is expected that the individual will demonstrate a cumulative record of excellence in Investigation, including:

- a. A sustained record of scholarship of high quality and impact. This may include individual excellence and unique contributions in collaborative work, based on evidence provided in the self-assessment, in external evaluations, and evaluations by collaborators.

- b. Highly collaborative faculty who are capable of forging new collaborations as specific programs evolve and are supplanted merit the award of tenure. Evidence of such success could include collaborations with multiple other investigators and expertise pertinent to multiple potential areas of Investigation.
 - c. Excellence in at least one focused area of Education, Clinical Practice Advancement (if applicable), or Administration / Service as defined above, and effectiveness in the other(s).
 - d. A cumulative body of work that demonstrates overall excellence with demonstrable impact in the combined record of Investigation, Education, Clinical Practice Advancement (if applicable), or Administration / Service.
 - e. An important criterion for the award of tenure is confidence that the faculty member will continue sustained excellence in Investigation leading to scholarship.
- Note that the requirements / evidence in support of Award of Tenure supersede those for Promotion to Associate Professor when the actions are simultaneous. See VI.E.3 and VI.E.4 below for special circumstances when Promotion to Associate Professor and Award of Tenure are not linked.

3. Promotion to Associate Professor without Award of Tenure

This is an unusual action that occurs when an individual who has served as an Assistant Professor at another institution or in the career-line is appointed to the tenure-line as an Assistant Professor; the individual may be eligible for promotion prior to the end of the 5-year probationary period for Award of Tenure. In this case, it is expected the faculty member will demonstrate a cumulative record of excellence in Investigation with durable impact outside the institution, and progress toward developing Education, Clinical Practice Advancement (if applicable), or Administration / Service and effectiveness in the others. There should be a strong expectation that the candidate will continue to demonstrate excellence in Investigation and will meet the criteria for Award of Tenure by the end of the tenure probationary period as defined in the offer letter.

4. Stand Alone Award of Tenure (Associate Professor)

It is expected that the individual will demonstrate a cumulative record of excellence in Investigation, including:

- a. A sustained record of scholarship of high quality and impact. This may include individual excellence and unique contributions in collaborative work, based on evidence provided in the self-assessment, in external evaluations, and evaluations by collaborators
- b. Highly collaborative faculty who are capable of forging new collaborations as specific programs evolve and are supplanted merit the award of tenure. Evidence of such success could include collaborations with multiple other investigators and expertise pertinent to multiple potential areas of Investigation.

- c. Excellence in at least one focused area of Education, Clinical Practice Advancement (if applicable), or Administration / Service as defined above, and effectiveness in the other(s).
- d. A cumulative body of work that demonstrates overall excellence with demonstrable impact in the combined record of Investigation, Education, Clinical Practice Advancement (if applicable), or Administration / Service.
- e. An important criterion for the award of tenure is confidence that the faculty member will continue sustained excellence in Investigation leading to scholarship.

5. Promotion to Professor

Promotion to Professor requires sustained overall excellence, development of a body of work that has changed practice, understanding, process, or methods in the field, and a strong expectation of continued demonstration of excellence. The candidate's combined record of Investigation, Education, Clinical Practice Advancement, and Administration / Service must demonstrate overall excellence in contributions to the missions of the department and institution.

Specifically, it is expected that the individual will demonstrate a cumulative record of excellence in Investigation as defined above, including:

- a. A sustained record of scholarship of high quality and impact. This may include individual excellence and unique contributions in collaborative work, based on evidence provided in the self-assessment, in external evaluations, and evaluations by collaborators.
- b. Highly collaborative faculty who are capable of forging new collaborations as specific programs evolve and are supplanted merit the award of tenure. Evidence of such success could include collaborations with multiple other investigators and expertise pertinent to multiple potential areas of Investigation.
- c. Excellence in at least one focused area of Education, Clinical Practice Advancement (if applicable), or Administration / Service as defined above and effectiveness in the other(s).
- d. A cumulative body of work that demonstrates overall excellence in the combined record of Investigation, Education, Clinical Practice Advancement (if applicable), or Administration / Service.

6. Stand Alone Award of Tenure (Professor)

It is expected that the individual will demonstrate a cumulative record of excellence in Investigation as defined above, including:

- a. A sustained record of scholarship of high quality and impact and development of a body of work that has changed practice, understanding, process, or methods in the field. This may include individual excellence and unique contributions in collaborative work, based on evidence provided in the self-assessment, in external evaluations, and evaluations by collaborators.
- b. Highly collaborative faculty who are capable of forging new collaborations as specific programs evolve and are supplanted merit the award of tenure.

Evidence of such success could include collaborations with multiple other investigators and expertise pertinent to multiple potential areas of Investigation.

c. Excellence in at least one focused area of Education, Clinical Practice Advancement (if applicable), or Administration / Service as defined above and effectiveness in the other(s).

d. A cumulative body of work that demonstrates overall excellence in the combined record of Investigation, education, Clinical Practice Advancement (when applicable), and administration / service.

An important criterion for the award of tenure is confidence that the faculty member will continue sustained excellence in Investigation leading to scholarship

VII. APPENDICES

Appendix A: List of required contents for the candidate's completed file.

The completed file submitted to the Dean will contain the following sections. This list may be updated from time to time by the college without a formal re-approval of the entire faculty review statement:

If promotion to professor:

- A CV as submitted at the time of appointment or promotion to associate professor
- Past reviews in descending order
- Criteria used for review
- All materials required for formal review as outlined below

If Formal Review:

- Evaluators' letters of evaluation, signed waiver form, evaluators' name, qualifications and relationship to candidate.
- Internal evaluations, and the posted memo for department faculty/staff letters of evaluation
- Sample letter sent to external and internal evaluators that includes list of enclosures, dates sent to evaluators, and actions being considered
- Candidate's current CV in College-approved format and bibliography, noting last revised date
- A signed attestation to the integrity of the CV
- Self-Assessment Statement, formatted according to the Office of Academic Affairs template
- Attestation
- STAC report and Teaching reports/evaluations from students and faculty peers
- DAC Report
- Department Chair report and 7-day response notice
- Any Candidate Response

Appendix B: Senate Faculty Review Standards Committee, Notice of Final Approval.

Appendix C.

Departmental Supplemental Rules (Mission statements and department-specific criteria, and procedures for FRA RPT and / or Appointments)

Each department may, within the parameters established by University Policies and the college-wide Statement of the School of Medicine, adopt additional specific criteria, standards and evidence, and procedures, for FRA (RPT) and / or for appointments of tenure-line faculty. These shall be articulated in a Supplemental Rule, which shall be approved by the tenure-line faculty of the department, the dean of the college and finally approved by the senior vice president, and the Senate Faculty Review Standards Committee. Upon approval, such Supplemental Rule is appended to and becomes part of this Statement.

**Appointment, Review and Advancement Policy
for Tenure-Line Faculty Members
University of Utah School of Medicine
(College-wide “RPT Statement” for all departments)**

Approved by School of Medicine Tenure-Line Faculty: (date)

Approved by School of Medicine Career-Line Faculty (date)

Approved by Tenure-line faculty of each adopting department (Departmental DAC):

Anesthesiology (date)

Biochemistry (date)

Biomedical Informatics (date)

Dermatology

Family and Preventive Medicine (date)

Human Genetics (date)

Internal Medicine (date)

Neurobiology and Anatomy (date)

Neurology (date)

Neurosurgery (date)

Obstetrics and Gynecology

Oncological Sciences (date)

Ophthalmology and Visual Sciences (date)

Orthopaedics (date)

Pathology (date)

Pediatrics (date)

Physical Medicine and Rehabilitation

Population Health Sciences (date)

Psychiatry (date)

Radiation Oncology (date)

Radiology (date)

Surgery (date)

Approved by Senate Faculty Review Standards Committee (contingent): 8 October 2014

Approved by Senior Vice President for Health Sciences: (date) for implementation as of
January 1, 2015

Career-line FARA Criteria 2015

Table of Contents

I. Preamble	3
II. Schedule of Formal and Annual (“Informal”) Reviews	5
A. Annual (“Informal”) Reviews	5
B. Formal Reappointment Reviews	5
C. Formal Review for Reappointment at Higher Rank (Promotion)	5
D. Adjustment of the Appointment Review Clock for Prior Service	5
E. Early Promotion	5
F. Extending the Formal Reappointment Review Period	6
G. Changes of Faculty Category (“Track Switch”) and Effect on Probationary Period	6
III. FARA Formal Review Procedures	7
A. Introduction	7
B. Processes for Formal Reviews	8
1. Faculty Review File Contents	8
2. Notice to the Candidate	9
3. Notice to Department Faculty	9
4. Completion of File, Candidate’s Right to Examine and Comment on Contents	9
5. Letters of Evaluation	9
6. Student and Resident Advisory Committee (SAC) Report	11
7. Department Advisory Committee for Faculty Review and Advancement	12
a. For Annual Contract Renewal	12
b. For Formal Reappointment Review	12
c. For Reappointment at Higher Rank (Promotion)	12
d. DAC-FRA Chair	12
e. DAC-FRA Secretary	13
f. Quorum	13
g. Absentee Voting	13
h. Limitations	13
i. DAC-FRA Committee Report	13
8. Department Chair Report	14
9. Candidate’s Right to Respond	14
10. The Completed File and Review Beyond the Department Level	14
IV. Appointments of Career-line Faculty	14
A. Procedures for Appointments	14
B. Actions by the DAC-A	15
C. For Appointment	15
D. Action by the Department Chair	16
E. Actions Subsequent to the Department	16
F. Criteria and Standards for Appointments	16
V. Criteria and Expectations for Faculty Review and Advancement	17
A. General Principles and Objectives	17
B. Responsibilities in the Faculty Review Process	18
C. Areas of Accomplishment Definitions	19
D. Scholarship	19
E. Standards Definitions	20
1. Excellence	20
2. Effectiveness	20
F. Area of Accomplishment – INVESTIGATION	20
G. Area of Accomplishment – EDUCATION	21
H. Area of Accomplishment – CLINICAL PRACTICE ADVANCEMENT	22
I. Area of Accomplishment – ADMINISTRATION / SERVICE IN SUPPORT OF MISSIONS	22
J. Evidence of Excellence and Effectiveness	23

K. Appointments for Clinical Track	23
1. Appointment to Instructor (Clinical)	24
2. Appointment to Assistant Professor (Clinical)	24
3. Appointment to Associate Professor (Clinical)	24
4. Appointment to Professor (Clinical)	24
L. Formal Reappointment Reviews for Clinical Track	25
1. Formal Reappointment Review for Instructor (Clinical)	25
2. Formal Reappointment Review for Assistant Professor (Clinical)	25
3. Formal Reappointment Review for Associate Professor (Clinical)	25
4. Formal Reappointment Review for Professor (Clinical)	25
M. Promotion in the Clinical Track	25
1. Promotion to Assistant Professor (Clinical)	25
2. Promotion to Associate Professor (Clinical)	25
3. Promotion to Professor (Clinical)	26
N. Appointments for Research Track	26
1. Appointment to Research Instructor	27
2. Appointment to Research Assistant Professor	27
3. Appointment to Research Associate Professor	27
4. Appointment to Research Professor	28
O. Formal Reappointment Review for Research Track	28
1. Formal Reappointment Review for Research Instructor	28
2. Formal Reappointment Review for Research Assistant Professor	28
3. Formal Reappointment Review for Research Associate Professor	28
4. Formal Reappointment Review for Research Professor	28
P. Promotion in the Research Track	28
1. Promotion to Research Assistant Professor	28
2. Promotion to Research Associate Professor	28
3. Promotion to Research Professor	28
Q. Appointments for Lecturer Track	29
1. Appointment as Instructor (Lecturer)	29
2. Appointment as Assistant Professor (Lecturer)	29
3. Appointment as Associate Professor (Lecturer)	30
4. Appointment as Professor (Lecturer)	30
R. Formal Reappointment Review Lecturer Track	30
1. Formal Reappointment Review for Instructor (Lecturer)	30
2. Formal Reappointment Review for Assistant Professor (Lecturer)	30
3. Formal Reappointment Review for Associate Professor (Lecturer)	30
4. Formal Reappointment Review for Professor (Lecturer)	31
S. Promotion in the Lecturer Track	31
1. Promotion to Assistant Professor (Lecturer)	31
2. Promotion to Associate Professor (Lecturer)	31
3. Promotion to Professor (Lecturer)	31
References	31
V. Appendices	32
Appendix A: List of required contents for the candidate's completed file	32
Appendix B: Notice of final UFRSC approval	33
Appendix C: Departmental Mission Statements and Department-specific criteria	34
History	35

I. PREAMBLE:

A. The quality and impact of the University of Utah School of Medicine depends on the quality of our faculty members and their contributions. Criteria for formal and informal review of faculty members are established to allow the School of Medicine to recognize the accomplishments and impact of individual faculty members. In the context of the faculty review processes, criteria and standards for appointment, retention, promotion, and award of tenure (which are described fully in Part V below) are grounded in the mission of the University of Utah School of Medicine: to advance health. The University of Utah School of Medicine serves the people of Utah and beyond by continually improving individual and community health and quality of life. This is achieved through excellence in patient care, education, and research; each is vital to our mission and each makes the others stronger.

1. We provide compassionate care without compromise.
2. We educate scientists and health care professionals for the future.
3. We engage in research to advance knowledge and well-being.
(<http://medicine.utah.edu/mission.php>)

B. College-wide career-line Faculty Appointment Review and Advancement (FARA) Statement. This document provides guidelines for all School of Medicine departments regarding faculty review decisions for career-line faculty members. For the purpose of this document, the term “faculty review” encompasses reviews for the purpose of initial appointment, and subsequent formal reappointment and advancement (including formal reappointment at higher rank / promotion) of career-line faculty members.

This document serves as the basis for “Evaluation and Reappointment of members of the Career-line” (University Policy 6-310-III-A-2). Having been approved by a majority of the tenure-line and career-line faculty of each adopting department, it constitutes a “*Statement of academic unit rules that provide for criteria, standards, evidence and, procedures for the initial appointment and subsequent review processes for evaluation and reappointment of each category of career-line ... faculty appointed in the unit*” as described in University Policy 6-310-III-A-2, governing for all departments of the college. Within the parameters established by University Regulations and this college-wide FARA Statement, any department may adopt further specific details regarding the criteria, standards and evidence and procedures for FARA decisions by describing them in a department-specific Supplemental Rule (see appendix) which, upon approval by the tenure-line and career-line faculty of the department, the dean of the college, the cognizant senior vice president, and the Senate Faculty Review Standards Committee, shall be appended to this document.

This document (particularly Part IV), also serves as a description of School of Medicine policy on *appointments* of career-line faculty, and within the parameters established by University Regulations (particularly Policy 6-302—Appointments of Faculty) and this college Statement, a department may adopt further specific details regarding appointments by describing them in a Supplemental Rule approved and appended to this document.

Nothing in this document (including any appended Supplemental Rule of a department) shall be interpreted to conflict with University Regulations. The most important University Policies regarding career-line faculty review are 6-310 (Reviews of Career-line, Adjunct, and Visiting Faculty Members, and Other Instructional Personnel) and 6-302 (Faculty Appointments). The full policy for each is available at the University Regulations Website <http://www.regulations.utah.edu/>.

This document is not intended to directly govern formal reviews of career-line faculty (CFR) that occur every 5 years after the 4th year formal reappointment review after initial appointment. It governs only the initial 4th year formal reappointment review and all promotion reviews. CFR are governed by a separate SOM “Career-line Faculty Review (CFR) Statement” in accord with Policy 6-310. This document is not intended to directly govern appointments or reviews of faculty in the tenure-line, adjunct, or visiting categories, or reviews of non-faculty instructional personnel, which matters are addressed in a separate Statement in accord with Policy 6-310, 6-302, 6-303, and 6-311.

C. Implementation Date and Application to Existing Faculty. The revised faculty review criteria, standards and procedures contained in this FARA Statement take effect January 1, 2015. All faculty members appointed on or after this date will be considered under the new faculty review standards and procedures. Candidates whose appointments began prior to that date who are reviewed for promotion to Assistant Professor, Associate Professor, or Professor rank may choose the old requirements for reviews completed in or before the 2016-2017 academic year. In each case, the new requirements will apply unless the candidate’s choice of the previous requirements is communicated to the department chair by signed letter before evaluation materials are sent to evaluators for external evaluations (See Part IV below).

II. SCHEDULE OF FORMAL AND ANNUAL (“INFORMAL”) REVIEWS

- A. Annual (“Informal”) Reviews:** All career-line faculty members shall have an annual, written review by the department chair or division chief. A written report of each annual review shall be included in the review file for formal reviews.
- B. Formal reappointment reviews:** All career-line faculty members appointed at any rank (Instructor, Assistant Professor, Associate Professor, and Professor) shall have a formal reappointment review in their fourth year; thereafter they shall have a formal reappointment review every 5 years. A written review will be conducted by the Department Chair or designee in each year in which a formal review is not completed.
- C. Formal Review for Reappointment at Higher Rank (Promotion):** Career-line faculty members appointed at the rank of Instructor are eligible for promotion to Assistant Professor after the 1st year through the formal review process. Faculty members who provide clinical care and who are board-eligible but not board-certified at the time of appointment are eligible for an expedited promotion to Assistant Professor at any time within one year of becoming board certified. Beyond one year after board certification, faculty members are required to go through the formal review process for promotion. Career-line faculty members appointed at the rank of Assistant Professor, Associate Professor, or Professor are eligible for consideration for promotion at the fifth year. Although there is no formal clock, it is recommended that faculty members expect to be reviewed for promotion by the seventh year after appointment or promotion. The Departmental Advisory Committee for Faculty Review and Advancement (DAC-FRA) Chair and Department Chair will determine whether an individual faculty member’s accomplishments are sufficient to warrant formal review for promotion.
- D. Adjustment of the Appointment Review Clock for Prior Service:** Faculty members who have served at the same or equivalent rank at another institution or in another track at the University of Utah may request an adjustment of the appointment clock for prior service. Faculty members who have served at the Instructor rank may request adjustment of the appointment clock for prior service at the Assistant Professor level. Such an adjustment requires only a request by the faculty member, approval by the department chair, and communication of the approval to the Office of Academic Affairs. **Note that there is no formal review clock for career-line faculty members, so that there is no required formal review for promotion.**
- E. Early Promotion (Extraordinary Progress):** Career-line faculty may request a Formal Review for Promotion earlier than in the fifth year. Such early reviews require the approval of the Department Chair, DAC-FRA, and Associate Dean for Academic Affairs. For such an early review, evidence in the file should demonstrate that the candidate *unequivocally* meets criteria for promotion. Such

requests must be submitted to the SOM Academic Affairs Office by May 15 of the year preceding the year of the review (e.g., by May 15, 2015 for a review during the 2015-16 academic year).

F. Extending the formal reappointment review period: Formal reappointment review (4th year after initial appointment and every 5th year after that) may be postponed for parental or other leave or other circumstances deemed appropriate. Such postponement must be formally requested by the faculty member and approved by the Department Chair and the Associate Dean for Academic Affairs. The Office Academic Affairs will work with faculty members who wish to extend the formal review period to ensure compliance with all policies.

G. Changes of Faculty Category (“Track Switch”) And Effect on Probationary Period

1. Within the School of Medicine it is an accepted practice that faculty members being initially appointed at the entry level ranks of Instructor or Assistant Professor might be appointed in either a tenure-line category position or a career-line category position. In general, initial appointment to a tenure-line position at the rank of Instructor or Assistant Professor is appropriate when recommended by the department chair for a candidate with at least 2 years of additional training with a substantial focus on scholarly training after completion of a terminal degree and clear potential for success in the tenure-line. In general, initial appointment to a career-line position is appropriate for a candidate with less preparation and experience who wishes to begin in a career-line position and yet be eligible to be subsequently considered for a tenure-line position. For such situations, it is an accepted practice in the SOM that in the fourth year after initial appointment to a career-line position, a career-line faculty member who has shown potential for success in the tenure-line may request to be considered for appointment into a tenure-line position typically at the rank of Assistant Professor. Candidates and department chairs considering such an arrangement should consult with the SOM Office of Academic Affairs for more complete guidance on criteria and procedures for such a change of faculty category

2. Further information regarding changes of faculty category (track switches).

a. Types of category changes. Faculty members may change from one faculty category to another (i.e., “switch tracks”) at any time after initial appointment, so long as they properly initiate the process and meet relevant appointment criteria for the new category. Such changes include: (i) from the tenure-line category to a career-line category, or (ii) from a career-line category to the tenure-line category, or (iii) between the Clinical / Lecturer / Research subcategories within the career-line category.

Procedurally, any change of category is managed as a new appointment, and requires pre-approval by their Department Chair, the Dean,

and the Senior Vice President for Health Sciences. In general, faculty members should only change categories once within a career at the SOM. If a faculty member changes from a tenure-track position (prior to award of tenure) to a career-line position and then wishes to change back to the tenure-line, the probationary period (tenure clock) will start again at the point it was stopped for the earlier change to the career-line position. The total probationary period for a faculty member in a tenure-line position status will not exceed 7 years unless an extension of the period is granted as described above in accord with University Policies (see SOM Tenure-Line Faculty Review and Advancement Policy, Section II-C).

b. Overview of Process for Changes of Category:

1. The faculty member must write a letter of request addressed to the Associate Dean for Academic Affairs. The letter must include justification for changing categories and qualifications for the proposed new category and position.
2. The faculty member's department chair must write a letter of support for the category change, including qualifications for the proposed new category and position. The chair's letter must be included with the faculty member's letter when it is submitted to the Office of Academic Affairs.
3. The letters must be approved by the Dean of the School of Medicine and Senior Vice President for Health Sciences.
4. Any change of category is processed as a new appointment. Candidates must meet requirements outlined in the recruitment, selection, and appointment guidelines and be formally appointed into the new category and position.
5. For appointments into the tenure-line category, a national search is normally required. However, if there was a national search for the original career-line appointment, the Senior Vice President may approve making the appointment without a new national search. Information related to the earlier national search should be included with the chair's letter in this case. If there was no national search for the original appointment, there should be a national search for the position as part of the appointment process.

III. FARA FORMAL REVIEW PROCEDURES

A. Introduction:

Per University policy 6-302, the primary departmental review body for faculty appointments is the Departmental Faculty Appointment Advisory Committee ("DAC-A"), which consists of all tenure-line and all career-line faculty members. Only tenure-line faculty members are eligible to vote on tenure-line faculty appointments, but departments should record career-line faculty votes, which should be tallied separately. The DAC-A is chaired by the Department Chair.

The primary departmental review body for faculty review and advancement actions is the Departmental Faculty Review and Advancement Advisory Committee (DAC-FRA), which consists of all tenure-line and all career-line faculty members. Tenure-line and career-line faculty members are eligible to vote on career-line faculty actions, as long as they are at or above the proposed rank for the candidate. The Chair of the DAC-FRA is elected annually from the department's tenured faculty members and long-serving career-line faculty members at the rank of Associate Professor or Professor, usually at the annual DAC-FRA meeting.

Larger departments may convene smaller ad-hoc DAC-A and DAC-FRA committees. The responsibilities of such committees may include preparation of formal faculty review files, review of formal faculty review files, and presentation of recommendations to the full DAC-FRA Committee. The composition and role of such committees in a given department must be described in the appended Supplemental Rule from that department.

B. Processes for Formal Reviews

Formal Reviews for reappointment and promotion require thorough documentation and examination of the candidate's academic performance in accordance with the pertinent criteria and in conformance with the procedures prescribed below.

1. Faculty Review File Contents.

For formal reviews, the candidate and department will develop a file that documents achievements in each of the applicable areas of Investigation, Education, Clinical Practice Advancement, and Administration / Service.

At a minimum, the completed file submitted to the Office of Academic Affairs will include the following items, as submitted by the candidate, department administrative coordinator, and DAC-FRA Chair.

The candidate is responsible for submitting:

1. A curriculum vitae prepared by the candidate in the format specified by the Office of Academic Affairs
(<http://healthsciences.utah.edu/mbm/cvSystem/index.html>)
2. A signed attestation to the integrity of the CV
3. A self-assessment prepared by the candidate in the format specified by the Office of Academic Affairs
4. Waiver / non-waiver of confidentiality for evaluators\

The department administrative coordinator and DAC-FRA are responsible for submitting:

1. Formal teaching evaluations and peer observations from the period since the candidate's previous appointment or promotion review, compiled by the department, and including reviews related to the education of professional students, graduate and undergraduate students, residents, fellows, attendees at continuing education conferences, patients, and the public. The candidate should also provide documentation, including evaluations and peer observations, to which the coordinator does not have access.

2. Internal and external letters of evaluation as defined in this document, Section III-B-5.
3. The report of the Student and Trainee Advisory Committee (STAC)
4. A Master Summary Document that provides a brief summary of the complete file
5. The report of the DAC-FRA
6. Copies of past formal and written annual reviews
7. Other materials deemed pertinent to the review.

2. Notice to Candidate

At a date determined by the DAC-FRA Chair to be sufficient to allow completion of the candidate's file prior to the due date in the Academic Affairs Office, the Department Chair or DAC-FRA Chair will inform the candidate of pending formal faculty review action(s) and request the appropriate documents (CV, self-assessment, and attestation), the names of qualified internal and external evaluators, and the names of other evaluators (for example, collaborators or students) whose input the candidate or DAC-FRA Chair feels would be useful. The Department Chair or DAC-FRA Chair will also obtain a completed waiver/non waiver form (see section III-B-5 below).

3. Notice to Department Faculty

Once candidates for formal faculty review have been identified and notified, the Department Chair or DAC-FRA Chair shall inform faculty of upcoming faculty review actions. A notice will be disseminated that informs interested faculty and staff in the Department of their right to submit signed, written recommendations for each candidate.

4. Completion of File, Candidate's Right to Examine and Comment on Contents

Prior to review by the STAC and the DAC-FRA, the Department Chair and the DAC-FRA Chair shall jointly ensure that the candidate's faculty review file is complete, including the CV, self-assessment, attestation, all other statements and materials submitted by the candidate, teaching evaluations, all other signed recommendations submitted by individual faculty and staff, and all solicited letters received from internal and external evaluators. Candidates are entitled to see their FARA file upon request at any time during the review process, *except for confidential letters of evaluation if the candidate has waived the right to see them*. If a candidate wishes to comment upon items in the initial faculty review file, the candidate's written comments must be added to the file before the DAC-FRA meeting is held. The DAC-FRA Chair is responsible for making the file available to DAC-FRA members.

5. Letters of Evaluation

The purpose of letters of evaluation is to provide an objective assessment of the scope, quality, and impact of the candidate's work. The requirements for letters of evaluation from internal and external evaluators are given below and detailed

on the Office of Academic Affairs website

(<https://pulse.utah.edu/site/academicaffairs/Documents/2018-19%20FRA%20LOE%20Requirements.pdf>).

- a. Appointment: at least three external letters.
- b. After initial appointment, for fourth year Formal Reappointment Review (all tracks): at least two letters internal to the department.
- c. Letters of evaluation are not required for 5th year formal reviews after completion of the fourth year review or after promotion.
- d. Formal Review for Promotion to Assistant Professor.
 - i. All tracks: at least two internal letters and at least two external letters.
- e. Formal Review for Promotion to Associate Professor:
 - i. Research track: at least two letters internal to the institution and at least two letters external to the institution
 - ii. Clinical and Lecturer tracks: at least two letters internal to the department and at least two letters external to the department.
 - iii. While letters from individuals external to the institution are not required for promotion in the Clinical and Lecturer tracks, they are encouraged, because they help to establish regional and national involvement and provide stronger support for the action.
- f. Formal Review for Promotion to Professor:
 - i. Research track: at least two letters internal to the institution and at least three letters external to the institution
 - ii. Clinical and Lecturer tracks: at least two letters internal to the department and at least three letters external to the department.
 - iii. While letters from individuals external to the institution are not required for promotion in the Clinical and Lecturer tracks, they are encouraged, because they help to establish regional and national involvement and provide stronger support for the action.

The selection of external evaluators will be made jointly by the Department Chair and the DAC-FRA Chair from lists of possible evaluators suggested by the candidate, the Department Chair, the DAC-FRA Chair, and the DAC-FRA Committee or ad hoc committee. Letters should be solicited from recognized experts familiar with the candidate's field who have recognized professional standing at the same, equivalent, or higher rank as the proposed rank of the candidate. *For Research Track faculty* members, letters from current or recent (within 3 years) collaborators and current or recent (within 5 years) mentors can be included as required letters at the 4th year formal reappointment review. After this point, letters from current or recent collaborators or mentors are encouraged, but will not count towards the required number of letters. Current collaboration includes joint funding, co-authorship on more than 3 publications in the past 5 years, or close collaboration in other endeavors related to the mission of the department and SOM. Participation in multi-center clinical trials, guidelines development committees, and similar efforts will not be considered collaboration based on co-authorship for publications resulting from these

efforts. *For Clinical and Lecturer track* faculty members, letters from current or recent collaborators and current or recent mentors are acceptable as required letters, although careful consideration should be given to providing the strongest possible review file. Evaluators will be requested to comment on specific aspects of the candidate's record as defined by the individual department and the Office of Academic Affairs. Copies of solicitation letters sent to evaluators shall be included in the file. Invited evaluators will be provided with the review file as prepared by the candidate, the pertinent School of Medicine guidelines, and any department-specific guidelines.

Once internal and external evaluators are chosen, the Department Chair shall solicit the letters and shall ensure that sufficient requests are made and received in a timely manner so that the required number of eligible letters as indicated above is included in the file before review by the STAC and DAC-FRA. Candidates will be required to indicate by signature whether they waive their right to see letters of evaluation as follows:

*I hereby elect to have all letters for my review solicited on a **confidential** basis. This option constitutes a waiver of any right I might have to see those letters. Signature/date*

*I hereby elect to have all letters for my review solicited on a **non-confidential** basis. I understand that people asked to write letters of recommendation will be informed of my right to see those letters. Signature/date*

That form, with the candidate's signature below the preferred statement, shall be included in the candidate's file. Internal and external evaluators shall be informed in writing whether the candidate has waived his/her right to review the letters of evaluation.

6. Student and Trainee Advisory Committee (STAC) Report

The STAC will be convened by the Department Chair and DAC-FRA Chair and will include students who have some affiliation with the department and residents from within the department. Residents have an MD or DO degree and are completing required post-doctoral training in an Accreditation Council for Graduate Medical Education (ACGME)-accredited clinical residency program. As such, residents (interns, residents, and some clinical fellows) are not considered "students" but rather "trainees." In clinical departments, resident education is a major component of faculty teaching responsibilities. Therefore, both students and residents are included on the STAC, because both are considered essential for evaluating the teaching of candidates. The students and residents need not have had direct contact with each candidate, although it is recommended that at least one STAC member have personal knowledge of each candidate. The STAC will meet at least 3 weeks prior to the DAC-FRA meeting in order to have sufficient time to prepare a report. The STAC report should be based on the candidate's record and should

focus specifically on educational efforts and accomplishments as defined by the faculty review criteria using a standard report form provided by the Office of Academic Affairs. The file submitted to each STAC shall contain the candidate's CV, self-assessment, and teaching evaluations as specified in III.B.1 above. Internal or external letters of evaluation shall not be provided for review. If the STAC fails to prepare a signed report within the prescribed time frame and with proper content abiding by University standards, the missing STAC's recommendations "shall be deemed conclusively waived, and [the] absence shall not thereafter be cause for complaint by faculty members appealing an adverse decision." Policy 6-303-III-C-3.

7. Department Advisory Committee For Faculty Review And Advancement (DAC-FRA): Membership and Actions.

Committee Membership (U-Policy 6-303-III-A-3, 6-310)

The DAC-FRA consists of all tenure-line and career-line faculty members in the department. Tenure-line *and* career-line faculty members are eligible to vote on actions for career-line faculty members as described in detail below. A simple majority or a tie of tenure-line faculty members (as long as there is a quorum) and of career-line faculty members (no quorum required) is considered a positive vote. A smaller ad hoc committee may be convened in larger departments.

a. For Annual Contract Renewal. All tenure-line faculty members regardless of rank are eligible to vote on annual contract renewal.

b. For Formal Reappointment Review. All *tenure-line* faculty members and all career-line faculty members *at or above rank* are eligible to participate in the consideration of and to vote on recommendations in individual cases on matters of formal reappointment.

c. For Reappointment at Higher Rank (Promotion). All *career-line and tenure-line* faculty members of *equal or higher rank* than that proposed for the candidate for promotion are eligible to participate in the consideration of and to vote on recommendations in individual cases on matters of reappointment at higher rank (promotion).

d. DAC-FRA Chair. The chair of the DAC-FRA shall be a tenured faculty member or a career-line faculty member at the rank of Associate Professor or Professor. The DAC-FRA Chair shall be elected annually from the eligible members of the Department faculty. Usually, the election will occur at the end of the annual DAC meeting. All tenure-line faculty members at the rank of professor, associate professor, assistant professor, and instructor have the right to vote for DAC-FRA Chair. The Department Chair is not eligible to chair this committee. The DAC-FRA Chair shall be responsible for identifying faculty members due for formal review, setting deadlines for submission of file documents, and advising faculty members in the preparation of documents. The DAC-FRA Chair shall establish the date and time of the DAC-FRA meeting in a timely manner, such that completed faculty review files can be submitted to the Office of Academic Affairs by the last Monday in October.



e. DAC-FRA Secretary

A secretary of each meeting shall be designated by the Chair of the DAC-FRA and shall take notes of the discussion to provide the basis for developing a summary. The DAC-FRA Secretary shall also keep track of the quorum and of the outcomes of votes.

f. Quorum

A quorum of the DAC-FRA for any given case shall consist of two-thirds of eligible tenure-line faculty members, except that any member unable to attend the meeting because of formal leave of absence or physical disability shall not be counted in determining the number required for a quorum. (Policy 6-303-III-E-3). Tenure-line faculty members who participate via video conference, phone conference, as absentee voters, or by electronic vote will count towards the quorum. A minimum of three individuals is required for a quorum. Career-line faculty members may vote as outlined above, but there is no required quorum of career-line faculty members.

g. Absentee Voting

Whenever practicable, the Department Chair shall advise all members on leave or otherwise absent of the proposed action and shall request their written opinions and votes, to be received approximately one week prior to the DAC meeting. Absent members' written opinions shall be disclosed at the meeting and their votes will be counted the same as other votes. It is expected that absent members who cast a vote will be familiar with the candidate's completed file.

h. Limitations.

The Department Chair and College Dean, "who are required by the regulations to make their own recommendations in an administrative capacity, may attend, and upon invitation by majority vote of the committee, may submit evidence, judgments and opinions, or participate in discussion. By majority vote, the committee may move to executive session, from which nonvoting participants may be excluded. [The Department Chair and Dean], and other administrative officials who cast [faculty review and advancement] votes in their administrative capacity, shall not vote at the departmental level." (Policy 6-303-III-E-5).

The DAC-FRA will be convened by the DAC-FRA Chair at least 3 weeks after the STAC meeting and in time for completion of the department review file by the last Monday in October. DAC-FRA members will be provided each candidate's file for review. After due consideration, voting on all appropriate actions regarding the candidate shall then proceed. Voting may be conducted by the committee as a whole, including the Department Chair and others ineligible to vote, or in executive session, excluding the Department Chair and others ineligible to vote. The vote may be by open or secret ballot. A request by any DAC-FRA member for a secret ballot requires a secret ballot. A separate vote shall be taken on each action proposed (e.g., formal reappointment or promotion) for each candidate under consideration.

i. DAC-FRA Committee Report

The secretary shall make a record of the vote (including absentee votes as noted above) and shall prepare a separate summary report of the meeting for each candidate. Each report shall include the substance of the discussion, including the



explicit rationale for negative votes, if any, and also the findings and recommendations of the committee. DAC-FRA members will have the opportunity to review and approve the report during a 7-day inspection period. The DAC-FRA summary report, bearing the written approvals of the committee chair and secretary, along with a list of all faculty members present in person or by video or voting in absentia at the meeting, shall be forwarded to both the Department Chair and the candidate for an opportunity for response or comment (see below).

8. Department Chair Report

The Department Chair will prepare an independent report, addressed to the Dean of the School of Medicine, to be submitted to both the candidate and the Office of Academic Affairs. The Chair's report will summarize the Chair's evaluation of the candidate and recommendation regarding each action. The Chair's report may quote from the letters submitted by evaluators, *but shall not identify any evaluators.*

9. Candidate's Right to Respond

The candidate shall have the opportunity, but not the obligation, to add a written statement to his/her faculty review file in response to the summary report of the DAC-FRA and the report of the Department Chair. Written notice of this option shall be included with the copy of the Department Chair's report that is sent to the candidate. If the candidate chooses to add such a statement to the file, that statement must be submitted to the Department Chair within seven business days, except in extenuating circumstances. If such a response is submitted, the Department Chair will add the candidate's statement to the file without comment.

10. The Completed File and Review Beyond the Department Level

The Department Chair will forward the completed file, including the STAC report, the DAC-FRA report, the Department Chair's report, and any responses by the candidate, to the Office of Academic Affairs for review by the last Monday in October. Files for candidates for promotion, but not for formal reappointment, will be reviewed and assessed by the School of Medicine Faculty Appointment, Review, and Advancement Committee (FARA Committee, formerly ARPT Committee). All files will be reviewed and assessed by the Dean or Dean's designee and the Senior Vice President for Health Sciences:

Procedures subsequent to the department level are described in University Policy 6-310, including action by dean and college advisory committee, action by the University Career-line Reappointment Committee (UCLRC), action by cognizant vice president, and final action by President.

IV. APPOINTMENTS OF CAREER-LINE FACULTY

A. Procedures for Appointments (U-Policy 6-302 and 6-310)

Appointments to the faculty of the SOM are governed by University Policy 6-302. SOM-specific procedures and criteria & standards for appointments of career-line faculty members are described below.



Faculty Review File Contents for Appointments are similar to those for review and advancement, excluding the personal statement, teaching evaluations, Master Summary Document, and SAC review. For appointments, the candidate and department will develop a file that documents achievements in each of the applicable areas of Investigation, Education, Clinical Practice Advancement, and Administration / Service in Support of the Mission. At a minimum, the completed file submitted to the Office of Academic Affairs will include 1) a curriculum vitae prepared by the candidate; 2) at least three external letters of evaluation; 3) the report of the Departmental Faculty Appointments Advisory Committee (DAC-A); and 4) other materials deemed pertinent to review.

B. Actions by the DAC-A

In its capacity as the “Departmental Faculty Appointments Advisory Committee” governed by University Policy 6-302, the DAC-A will consider the appointment of all faculty members appointed to the career-line. The DAC-A will be chaired by the Department Chair. A quorum of the DAC-A shall consist of two-thirds of eligible tenure-line faculty members, except that any member unable to attend the meeting because of formal leave of absence or physical disability shall not be counted in determining the number required for a quorum. Tenure-line faculty members who participate via video conference, phone conference, as absentee voters, or by electronic vote will count towards the quorum. A minimum of three individuals is required for a quorum. Career-line faculty members may vote as outlined above, but there is no required quorum of career-line faculty members.

C. For Appointment

First, *all tenure-line and career-line members* of the committee shall vote on a recommendation as to the making of the appointment generally, with the appointment to be made carrying at least the lowest rank applicable for the type of position being filled. Second, if it is proposed that the appointment be made at any higher rank, then there shall be a separate vote taken among *all tenure-line faculty members and only among career-line faculty members holding a rank equivalent to or higher* than the proposed appointment rank, and they shall vote on a recommendation as to that specified higher rank. For example, with an appointment to a career-line faculty position proposed at the rank of associate professor, the career-line assistant professor members of the committee shall participate with other members in the first vote, producing a recommendation regarding appointment with at least the rank of instructor and assistant professor, and then only the career-line associate and full professors shall participate in a second vote on recommending that the appointment carry the higher rank of associate professor.



D. Action by Department Chair

As per University Policy 6-302, the Department Chair shall prepare a written recommendation to the Dean regarding the proposed appointment that includes a summary of the candidate's file and the DAC-A vote.

E. Actions subsequent to the Department

As per University Policy 6-302 and the SOM College Council Charter, the SOM has a standing college faculty appointments advisory committee, the Faculty Appointment, Review, and Advancement Committee (FARA, formerly ARPT Committee). The FARA Committee is an elected body whose composition is defined in the SOM College Council Charter. The completed file for each candidate for a career-line faculty appointment will be reviewed and assessed by the FARA Committee according to the criteria and standards in this document. An initial review will be completed electronically and a unanimous electronic vote will be sufficient. If any FARA Committee member recommends the file be discussed, the file must be discussed in person at a monthly FARA Committee meeting. A written recommendation will be provided to the SOMEK.

As per University Policy 6-302 and the SOM College Council Charter, the completed file for each candidate for a career-line faculty appointment will be reviewed and assessed by the School of Medicine Executive Committee (SOMEK). Members of the SOMEK are either elected or appointed as defined the SOM College Council Charter. For appointments, a unanimous electronic vote will be sufficient. If any SOMEK member recommends the file be discussed, the file must be discussed in person at a SOMEK meeting.

As per University Policy 6-302 the Dean or Dean's designee shall review the complete file and provide a written recommendation to the Senior Vice President for Health Sciences. The Senior Vice President for Health Sciences *shall review the entire file and shall then forward the entire file with a recommendation, where appropriate, to the President. (University Policy 6-302)*. The Vice President's recommendation shall be reviewed and assessed by the President, Academic Senate, and Board of Trustees as provided by University Policy 6-302.

F. Criteria and Standards for Appointments

Criteria and standards for appointments are governed by the criteria and standards defined for review and advancement (formal reappointment review and promotion) in Part V (below). For clarity, the criteria and standards for appointments will be described in detail in Section V.C, after detailed definitions are provided. Criteria and standards for appointment to a given rank are consonant with those required for promotion to that rank.

V. CRITERIA AND EXPECTATIONS FOR FACULTY REVIEW AND ADVANCEMENT

A. General Principles and Objectives

1. Decisions by the School of Medicine on appointment, formal reappointment, and promotion of career-line faculty members are consistent with the commitment of the University of Utah to the achievement and maintenance of academic excellence.

The overall mission of the University of Utah School of Medicine is to advance health. For the purpose of faculty review, the School of Medicine's missions are understood to encompass:

- Education in the myriad of domains that could improve patient care, individual and population health and well-being, and / or advancement of knowledge
- Investigation of important questions related to all three missions, including but not limited to development and dissemination of new knowledge
- Provision and advancement of clinical care across the spectrum of disciplines.

In order to incorporate these missions into the criteria, standards, and evidence expected, the SOM has adopted somewhat different titles for the areas of accomplishment, although the overall meaning and expectation of overall excellence in research / creative activity and teaching remain. Research / Creative Activity has been renamed "Investigation" to better capture the type of activities and evidence valued in the context of SOM reviews. Similarly, Teaching has been renamed "Education" to better capture the range of educational activities that contribute to SOM missions. Note that scholarship / dissemination consistent with Boyer's Scholarship Reconsidered is required for evidence of excellence in all areas of accomplishment.

Administrative work and service are valued in faculty review criteria when they serve to advance one or more missions. Investigation and scholarship, which must include dissemination, may stem from any mission, as well as from administration / service.

2. In order to recognize the breadth and depth of faculty accomplishment across a variety of disciplines and departmental missions, the criteria defined in this statement are intended to provide flexibility in evaluating contributions and impact. Criteria modified by "must" are absolute requirements that must be achieved by a faculty member for a specific action. Criteria modified by "should" are achievements that will usually be required, but can be superseded under special circumstances and with supportive evidence for other important contributions to that area of accomplishment. Criteria modified by "can" are intended to provide ideas and suggestions; absence of accomplishments that meet such a suggested criterion in a faculty file may not be the basis for a negative inference about the file. Formal faculty reviews will consider expected effort for each area of accomplishment as defined in an individual faculty member's offer letter and annual departmental written faculty reviews in evaluating

whether an individual's accomplishments and impact meet criteria. *Outstanding achievements (well above expectation) in a single area may serve to modify the level of accomplishment required in other areas.*

The activities expected of an individual faculty member should be aligned closely with departmental missions as well as college and institutional missions. Thus, departments may choose to provide additional, mission-based criteria for faculty review, as long as these are in compliance with School of Medicine and University of Utah Policy (see department specific missions and criteria, Appendix C).

3. For the purpose of this document, the term "faculty review" encompasses reviews for the purpose of appointment, formal reappointment, and advancement (including formal reappointment at higher rank, or promotion) of career-line faculty members.

Investigation, Education, and Clinical Practice Advancement, supported by Administration / Service are defined specifically in the context of faculty reviews as "areas of accomplishment" and are defined in Section IV.E. Clinical track faculty members will be expected to demonstrate excellence in two areas of accomplishment and effectiveness in the other two. Provision of high quality clinical service (effectiveness), as defined in the offer letter, is required for promotion in the clinical track. Research track faculty members are expected to demonstrate excellence in investigation. Lecturer track faculty members are expected to demonstrate excellence in Education. For Research and Lecturer track faculty, effectiveness or excellence in the other areas will strengthen the review file, as long as excellence is maintained in the required area. The differences between "excellent" and "effective" work lie in scale, outcome, and impact. In general, effectiveness represents work that has impact within the institution or within a faculty member's division or department; excellence represents work that has impact outside of the division, department, or institution, depending on rank and area of accomplishment. Excellence generally requires some level of dissemination and scholarship. Excellence in investigation specifically requires scholarship and dissemination outside the institution. For both excellence and effectiveness, accomplishments are divided into required (must have all), recommended (should have some, but not necessarily all), and potential (a check list of possible accomplishments that may contribute to the assessment).

B. Responsibilities in the Faculty Review Process

a. Faculty members are responsible for providing documentation of their contributions and impact in applicable areas of accomplishment. This documentation requires both a description of the importance and impact of the faculty member's overall body of work and contributions to their field, and detailed description of specific products that demonstrate the faculty member's impact in specific areas of accomplishment. The CV (<http://healthsciences.utah.edu/mbm/cvSystem/index.html>) and structured self-assessment template provide a structure in which the faculty member can document his or her impact, accomplishments, and body of work.

b. The institutional responsibility begins at the time of appointment, when the department should provide clear expectations in the Offer Letter. These expectations may be modified in written annual faculty departmental reviews. The department and institution should provide faculty development programs and mentoring that will help a faculty member identify and pursue opportunities that will lead to a high impact body of work and on time promotion.

C. Areas of Accomplishment:

a. Areas of Accomplishment (“Criteria”)

As noted above, the criteria for review for career-line faculty members have been renamed to be better aligned with the SOM mission and SOM faculty contributions, while remaining consistent with Policy 6-310. Instead of the term “criteria,” the term “areas of accomplishment “ is used. Areas of accomplishment pertinent to review of SOM faculty members include:

Areas of accomplishment pertinent to faculty review include:

- a. Investigation (“Research / Creative Activity”)**
- b. Education (“Teaching”)**
- c. Clinical Practice Advancement**
- d. Administration / Service in Support of the Missions (“Service”)**

D. Scholarship

Excellence in an area of accomplishment generally requires some form of scholarship; the degree of dissemination required and venue depend on rank and area of accomplishments. To be considered scholarship, faculty contributions must have demonstrable impact; that is the work must be:

- Made public
- Peer-reviewed based on the standard of the field at the time
- Built on by others¹

Scholarship may stem from any mission or from administration / service activities that support one or more of the missions. It should be aligned with departmental missions. The focus and requirements relating to scholarship should be defined at the time of appointment and during annual departmental review in consultation with a faculty member’s mentors, chair, and division chief. Areas of focus may include discovery, application, integration, and educational scholarship². Departments may limit which areas of scholarship may be considered for faculty review in alignment with departmental mission (which shall be explained in the Supplemental Rule of the department, see [Appendix C]). Team science³, Clinical Practice Advancement and quality improvement, collaboration, technology commercialization, education, community engagement, advocacy, inclusion, sustainability, web-based dissemination, administration / service, and global health can all be areas for effective and excellent scholarship. Other areas that emerge as vital to academic health systems may also be appropriate areas for scholarship. The key metrics for evaluating scholarship are *dissemination* and *impact*.

Excellence requires durable dissemination and cumulative impact; excellence in investigation specifically requires national dissemination

1. Based on: Glassick, CE. *Academic Medicine* 75:877-80, 2000.
2. Based on: Boyer, EL. *Scholarship Reconsidered*, 1990.
3. See, for example Sanberg, PR et al. *PNAS* 2014;111:6542-7.

E. Standards Definitions--- “Excellence” and “Effectiveness”

1. Excellence

Excellence requires outward-facing (external to the division / department or institution, depending on rank and area of accomplishment) contributions and impact.

As examples, the following would be considered excellent contributions in the context of promotion to associate professor:

- Clinical Practice Advancement: service on a national guidelines committee; contributions to an interdisciplinary quality improvement initiative
- Education: service on the SOM Curriculum Committee; presentation of a workshop at a conference
- Investigation: publication of original research in a peer-reviewed journal; licensing of a patent
- Administration / service: Residency Program Director; Committee Chair for a national society

2. Effectiveness

Effectiveness requires inward-facing (within the division / department or institution, depending on rank and area of accomplishment) contributions and impact.

As examples, the following would be considered effective contributions in the context of promotion to associate professor:

- Clinical Practice Advancement: delivery of high quality patient care; note that delivery of high quality clinical service is an absolute requirement for faculty members with clinical appointments.
- Education: high quality teaching
- Investigation: participation in planning and enrolling participants in published clinical trials
- Administration / Service: service on a committee

F. Area of Accomplishment - Investigation

Investigation involves efforts by the faculty member that generate or advance creation or development of new knowledge. These could include such activities as bench research, clinical trials, quality improvement, and evaluation of educational efforts. Team science, clinical care, collaboration, technology commercialization, education, community engagement, advocacy, inclusion, sustainability, web-based dissemination, administration / service, and global health can all be areas for effective and excellent investigation.

Excellence in Investigation: requires scholarship, as defined by durable dissemination outside the institution and cumulative impact for promotion to Associate Professor. For promotion to Professor, the faculty member should have developed a body of work that has changed practice, understanding, process, or methods in the field. Scholarship, dissemination, and impact could include authorship on peer-reviewed original articles; peer-reviewed, durable workshops; dissemination of innovation through commercialization that leads to improvements in patient care or outcome³; or other metrics that demonstrate durable dissemination and impact. Glassick's criteria for scholarship (see V.D) must be met for work to be considered scholarship. External funding is evidence of impact, dissemination, and a national reputation, but it is not an absolute requirement for promotion. As a measure of the ability to sustain excellence, individual departments can define external funding as a required component of excellence (see Appendix C).

Effectiveness in Investigation: requires participation in investigation projects that have impact. External dissemination by the individual faculty member is not required, although external dissemination of the work (scholarship) by others involved in the project is considered important evidence of impact. Substantial contributions to enrolling patients in published clinical trials for which the faculty member is not an author and completion of quality improvement projects are examples of effective investigation. Investigation without participation in scholarship and external dissemination by the individual faculty member cannot qualify as excellent.

G. Area of Accomplishment - Education

Education is defined broadly to include dissemination of knowledge, skills, and attitudes to trainees, faculty members, clinicians, staff, colleagues, patients, and the public within or external to the institution. Education includes teaching activities; learner assessment; curriculum development; mentoring, advising, and supervising; and educational leadership and administration. Curriculum development may be considered both scholarship and educational activity. Educational leadership may be considered both administration and educational activity. Patient education may be considered both Clinical Practice Advancement and educational activity.

Excellence in Education: requires participation in education at an administrative, development, scholarly, or investigational level with involvement outside the division / department for promotion to Associate Professor, and outside the institution for promotion to Professor. Involvement could be evidenced by service on curriculum committees, dissemination of curricula or teaching methods, or presentations on educational topics, or curricular development.

Effectiveness in Education: requires active participation in at least one area of education, ongoing commitment to improving educational skills, and positive assessments.

H. Area of Accomplishment - Clinical Practice Advancement

Clinical Practice Advancement is defined broadly to include direct patient care; development of algorithms, care process models, protocols or templates; decision support tools to improve patient care; participation in quality improvement projects or programs; and oversight of patient care. Quality improvement projects and development of protocols may be considered both Clinical Practice Advancement and application scholarship. Oversight of patient care may be considered Clinical Practice Advancement, administration / service, and education.

Excellence in Clinical Practice Advancement: requires participation in Clinical Practice Advancement at an administrative, development, scholarly, or investigational level with involvement outside the division / department for promotion to Associate Professor, and outside the institution for promotion to Professor. Involvement could be evidenced by service on a clinical guidelines committee, service on a professional society committee, dissemination of quality improvement projects, or presentations on clinical topics. Excellence may include efforts to improve the quality of care or clinical education.

Effectiveness in Clinical Practice Advancement: includes provision of high quality care, participation in quality improvement projects, and ongoing commitment to maintaining and improving clinical skills. **Provision of high quality clinical service (effectiveness) is an absolute requirement for promotion for faculty members with a clinical service commitment.**

I. Area of Accomplishment - Administration / Service in Support of Missions

Administration includes leadership and work within and outside the institution on committees; participation in organizational efforts to meet strategic goals; and program or unit leadership. Service includes leadership and work within and outside the institution as part of inclusion, sustainability, outreach, and other service efforts. Administration / Service will often overlap with Clinical Practice Advancement, Investigation, Scholarship, and Education.

Excellence in Administration / Service: requires substantial administrative and / or service effort and impact, generally in a leadership role with involvement outside the division / department for promotion to Associate Professor, and outside the institution for promotion to Professor. Involvement could be evidenced by service on committees related to administration / service, presentations related to administration / service, or dissemination of administrative / service innovation. Developmental, scholarly, and / or investigational contributions are evidence of excellence.

Effectiveness in Administration / Service: requires competent participation in administrative / service roles.

J. Evidence of Excellence and Effectiveness

1. Demonstration of *excellence* in a given category (Investigation, Education, Clinical Practice Advancement, or Administration / Service in Support of Missions) requires a synthesis of the body of work as evidenced by overall contributions reflected in the CV, and evidence of significant contributions of quality and impact as reflected in the self-assessment. **Excellence** should be captured in the self-assessment for a given area based on three individual products or contributions of high external impact and quality. These could include, for example, a high impact original article with a major intellectual contribution by the candidate (investigation), development of a curriculum that improved learner outcomes (education), a quality improvement project that reduced morbidity or mortality in a targeted group of patients (Clinical Practice Advancement), or leadership of a committee that recommended and implemented valuable process changes in an administrative unit (administration and service).

2. Demonstration of *effectiveness* in a given category (Investigation, Education, Clinical Practice Advancement, or Administration / Service in Support of Missions) requires a synthesis of the body of work as evidenced by overall contributions reflected in the CV, and evidence of significant contributions of quality and impact as reflected in the self-assessment. **Effectiveness** should be captured in the self-assessment for a given area based on two individual products or contributions of internal impact and quality. These could include, for example, a quality improvement project within the institution (investigation), high quality teaching in a required course (education), provision of high quality patient care (Clinical Practice Advancement), or service on a departmental committee (administration / service).

3. For formal reappointment, the record must demonstrate reasonable potential for meeting standards established for promotion in the future. Because there is no formal clock for promotion in the career-line, there is no stipulation as to the rate at which a career-line faculty member is making progress toward promotion. Faculty of all School of Medicine departments are expected to comply with requirements of the Faculty Code and to conduct their interactions with other members of the University community in a professional, collegial, and constructive manner.

K. Clinical Track

Appointments

1. Appointment to Instructor (Clinical)

This rank is intended for individuals who are completing training or acquiring essential experience while simultaneously serving a faculty role.

a. **Education:** A degree appropriate to expected academic and clinical roles from an accredited institution of higher education.

b. **Clinicians:** Faculty members who will provide clinical care should have completed the training normally required for board certification in their specialty and be board eligible. Expedited promotion to Assistant Professor is possible for faculty members appointed at the Instructor rank who meet all

requirements for appointment as Assistant Professor except board certification and subsequently achieve board certification.

c. **Expectations:** Faculty members appointed at the rank of Instructor in the Clinical track should demonstrate the potential and commitment to develop and demonstrate excellence in two areas of accomplishment, and effectiveness in the others.

2. Appointment to Assistant Professor (Clinical)

This rank is intended for individuals who have completed training, who have demonstrated commitment and potential and are beginning to develop a record of excellence in two areas accomplishment, and effectiveness in the others.

a. **Education:** A degree appropriate to expected academic and clinical roles from an accredited institution of higher education.

b. **Clinicians:** Faculty members who will provide clinical care should be board certified.

c. **Expectations:** Faculty members appointed at the rank of Assistant Professor in the Clinical track should demonstrate commitment and progress toward developing a record of excellence in two areas of accomplishment, and effectiveness in the others.

3. Appointment to Associate Professor (Clinical)

This rank is intended for individuals who have served at the rank of Assistant Professor or the equivalent for at least 5 years or at the rank of Associate Professor or the equivalent at another institution or in the tenure-line and who have a demonstrated record of excellence in one area of accomplishment, and at least effectiveness in the other three. It is expected that the individual will develop and demonstrate excellence in one additional area of accomplishment by the 5th year review.

a. **Education:** A degree appropriate to expected academic and clinical roles from an accredited institution of higher education.

b. **Clinicians:** Faculty members who will provide clinical care should be board certified.

c. **Expectations:** Faculty members appointed at the rank of Associate Professor in the Clinical track should demonstrate a cumulative record of excellence in one area of accomplishment, progress toward developing excellence in one additional area, and effectiveness in the others.

4. Appointment to Professor (Clinical)

This rank is intended for individuals who have served at the rank of Associate Professor or the equivalent for at least 5 years or at the rank of Professor or the equivalent at another institution or in the tenure-line and who have a demonstrated record of excellence in at least one area of accomplishment and effectiveness in the others. It is expected that the individual will have demonstrated durable impact in at least one area of accomplishment outside their institution, including a body of work that has changed practice, understanding, process, or methods in the field;

a. **Education:** A degree appropriate to expected academic and clinical roles from an accredited institution of higher education, or record of post-doctoral or other training commensurate with expectations.



- b. **Clinicians:** Faculty members who will provide clinical care should be board certified.
- c. **Expectations:** Faculty members appointed at the rank of Professor in the Clinical track should have a cumulative record of excellence in at least one or areas of accomplishment and effectiveness in the others. It is expected that the individual will develop and demonstrate excellence in a second area of accomplishment by the 5th year review.

L. Formal Reappointment Reviews

1. Formal Reappointment Review for Instructor (Clinical): It is expected that the individual will show commitment to and progress in developing excellence in two areas of accomplishment, along with commitment to and progress in developing effectiveness in the others.

2. Formal Reappointment Review for Assistant Professor (Clinical): It is expected that the individual will show commitment to and progress in developing excellence in two areas of accomplishment, along with commitment to and progress in developing effectiveness in the others. Although there is no required deadline for review for promotion, the evaluation will provide feedback on whether the candidate is meeting milestones to meet criteria for promotion by the 7th year.

3. Formal Reappointment Review for Associate Professor (Clinical): It is expected that the individual will continue to demonstrate excellence in two areas of accomplishment and effectiveness in the others. Although there is no required deadline for review for promotion, the evaluation will provide feedback on whether the candidate is meeting milestones to meet criteria for promotion.

4. Formal Reappointment Review for Professor (Clinical): It is expected that the individual will continue to demonstrate excellence in two areas of accomplishment and effectiveness in the others.

M. Promotion

1. Promotion to Assistant Professor (Clinical)

It is expected that the individual will demonstrate the potential and commitment to develop excellence in two areas of accomplishment, along with potential and commitment to develop effectiveness in the others.

2. Promotion to Associate Professor (Clinical)

It is expected that the candidate will demonstrate a cumulative record of excellence in at least two focused areas of accomplishment, with excellence defined as in section V-J, and effectiveness in the others. Excellence in Clinical Practice Advancement is not required as long as excellence in two other areas and effectiveness in Clinical Practice Advancement are demonstrated. Effective investigation does not require individual scholarship as described in V-F. The candidate's combined record of Investigation, Education, Clinical Practice Advancement, and Administration / Service must demonstrate overall excellence in contributions to the missions of the department and institution.

For excellence in Investigation, the candidate is expected to demonstrate a cumulative record of excellence in Investigation as defined in V-F, including:

- A sustained record of scholarship of high quality and impact. This may include individual excellence and unique contributions in collaborative work, based on evidence provided in the self-assessment, in external evaluations, and evaluations by collaborators.
- Highly collaborative faculty who are capable of forging new collaborations as specific programs evolve and are supplanted merit promotion. Evidence of such success could include collaborations with multiple other investigators and expertise pertinent to multiple potential areas of Investigation. Effective Investigation does not require scholarship of national impact

3. Promotion to Professor (Clinical)

It is expected that the candidate will demonstrate a cumulative record of sustained excellence, including development of a body of work that has changed practice, understanding, process, or methods in the field in at least two focused areas of accomplishment, with excellence defined as in section V-E, and effectiveness in the others. Excellence in Clinical Practice Advancement is not required as long as excellence in two other areas and effectiveness in Clinical Practice Advancement are demonstrated. Effective investigation does not require scholarship of national impact, as described in V-F. The candidate's combined record of Investigation, Education, Clinical Practice Advancement, and Administration / Service must demonstrate overall excellence in contributions to the missions of the department and institution.

N. Research Track

Appointments

1. Appointment to Research Instructor

This rank is intended for individuals who are completing training or acquiring essential experience while simultaneously serving a faculty role.

a. Education: A degree appropriate to expected academic and clinical roles from an accredited institution of higher education.

b. Clinicians: Faculty members who will provide clinical care should have completed the training normally required for board certification in their specialty and be board eligible. Expedited promotion to Assistant Professor is possible for faculty members appointed at the Instructor rank who meet all requirements for appointment as Assistant Professor except board certification and subsequently achieve board certification. Most faculty members appointed to the Research Track will not provide clinical care.

c. Expectations: Faculty members appointed at the rank of Research Instructor should demonstrate the potential and commitment to develop and demonstrate excellence in Investigation.

2. Appointment to Research Assistant Professor

This rank is intended for individuals who have completed training, who have demonstrated commitment and potential and are beginning to develop a record of excellence in Investigation.

- a. **Education:** A degree appropriate to expected academic and clinical roles from an accredited institution of higher education.
- b. **Clinicians:** Faculty members who will provide clinical care should be board certified. Most faculty members appointed to the Research Track will not provide clinical care.
- c. **Expectations:** Faculty members appointed at the rank of Research Assistant Professor should demonstrate commitment and progress toward developing a record of excellence in Investigation.

3. Appointment to Research Associate Professor

This rank is intended for individuals who have served at the rank of Assistant Professor or the equivalent for at least 5 years or at the rank of Associate Professor or the equivalent at another institution or in the tenure-line and who have a demonstrated record of excellence in investigation.

- a. **Education:** A degree appropriate to expected academic and clinical roles from an accredited institution of higher education or a record of post-doctoral or other training commensurate with expectations.
- b. **Clinicians:** Faculty members who will provide clinical care should be board certified. Most faculty members appointed to the Research Track will not provide clinical care.
- c. **Expectations:** Faculty members appointed at the rank of Research Associate Professor should demonstrate a cumulative record of excellence in Investigation.

4. Appointment to Research Professor

This rank is intended for individuals who have served at the rank of Associate Professor or the equivalent for at least 5 years or at the rank of Professor or the equivalent at another institution or in the tenure-line and who have a demonstrated record of excellence investigation.

- a. **Education:** A degree appropriate to expected academic and clinical roles from an accredited institution of higher education or a record of post-doctoral or other training commensurate with expectations.
- b. **Clinicians:** Faculty members who will provide clinical care should be board certified. Most faculty members appointed to the Research Track will not provide clinical care.
- c. **Expectations:** Faculty members appointed at the rank of Research Professor should have a cumulative record of excellence in Investigation with impact outside their institution, including a body of work that has changed practice, understanding, process, or methods in the field;

O. Formal Reappointment Reviews for Research Track

1. Formal Reappointment Review for Research Instructor: It is expected that the individual will show commitment to and progress in developing excellence in Investigation.

2. Formal Reappointment Review for Research Assistant Professor: It is expected that the individual will show commitment to and progress in developing



excellence in Investigation. Although there is no required deadline for review for promotion, the evaluation will provide feedback on whether the candidate is meeting milestones to meet criteria for promotion by the 7th year.

3. Formal Reappointment Review for Research Associate Professor: It is expected that the individual will continue to demonstrate excellence in Investigation. Although there is no required deadline for review for promotion, the evaluation will provide feedback on whether the candidate is meeting milestones to meet criteria for promotion.

4. Formal Reappointment Review for Research Professor: It is expected that the individual will continue to demonstrate a cumulative record of excellence in Investigation.

P. Promotion

1. Promotion to Research Assistant Professor

It is expected that the individual will demonstrate the potential and commitment to develop excellence in Investigation.

2. Promotion to Research Associate Professor

It is expected that the candidate will demonstrate a cumulative record of excellence in Investigation as defined in V-F. Effective contributions in the areas of education and administration are encouraged but not required and add strength to the faculty member's file. The candidate's combined record of Investigation, Education, Clinical Practice Advancement, and Administration / Service must demonstrate overall excellence in contributions to the missions of the department and institution.

For excellence in Investigation, the candidate is expected to demonstrate a cumulative record of excellence in Investigation as defined in V-F, including:

a. A sustained record of scholarship of high quality and impact. This may include individual excellence and unique contributions in collaborative work, based on evidence provided in the self-assessment, in external evaluations, and evaluations by collaborators.

b. Highly collaborative faculty who are capable of forging new collaborations as specific programs evolve and are supplanted merit promotion. Evidence of such success could include collaborations with multiple other investigators and expertise pertinent to multiple potential areas of investigation.

3. Promotion to Research Professor

It is expected that the candidate will demonstrate a cumulative record of excellence in Investigation with durable impact outside the institution,, including a body of work that has changed practice, understanding, process, or methods in the field. Effective contributions in the areas of Education, Clinical Practice Advancement, and Administration / Service are encouraged but not required and add strength to the faculty member's file. The candidate's combined record of Investigation, Education, Clinical Practice Advancement, and Administration / Service must demonstrate overall excellence in contributions to the missions of the department and institution.

For excellence in Investigation, the candidate is expected to demonstrate a cumulative record of excellence in Investigation as defined in V-F, including:

- a. A sustained record of scholarship of high quality and impact that has changed practice, understanding, process, or methods in the field. This may include individual excellence and unique contributions in collaborative work, based on evidence provided in the self-assessment, in external evaluations, and evaluations by collaborators.
- b. Highly collaborative faculty who are capable of forging new collaborations as specific programs evolve and are supplanted merit promotion. Evidence of such success could include collaborations with multiple other investigators and expertise pertinent to multiple potential areas of investigation.

Q. Lecturer Track

Appointments

1. Appointment as Instructor (Lecturer)

This rank is intended for individuals who are completing training or acquiring essential experience while simultaneously serving a faculty role.

a. Education: A degree appropriate to expected academic and clinical roles from an accredited institution of higher education.

b. Clinicians: Faculty members who will provide clinical care should have completed the training normally required for board certification in their specialty and be board eligible. Expedited promotion to Assistant Professor is possible for faculty members appointed at the Instructor rank who meet all requirements for appointment as Assistant Professor except board certification and subsequently achieve board certification. Most faculty members appointed to the Lecturer Track will not provide clinical care.

c. Expectations: Faculty members appointed at the rank of Instructor in the Lecturer track should demonstrate the potential and commitment to develop and demonstrate excellence in Education.

2. Appointment as Assistant Professor (Lecturer)

This rank is intended for individuals who have completed training, who have demonstrated commitment and potential and are beginning to develop a record of excellence in Education.

a. Education: A degree appropriate to expected academic and clinical roles from an accredited institution of higher education.

b. Clinicians: Faculty members who will provide clinical care should be board certified. Most faculty members appointed to the Lecturer Track will not provide clinical care.

c. Expectations: Faculty members appointed at the rank of Assistant Professor (Lecturer) should demonstrate commitment and progress toward developing a record of excellence in education.

3. Appointment as Associate Professor (Lecturer)

This rank is intended for individuals who have served at the rank of Assistant Professor or the equivalent for at least 5 years or at the rank of Associate Professor or the equivalent at another institution or in the tenure-line and who have a demonstrated record of excellence in Education.

- a. **Education:** A degree appropriate to expected academic and clinical roles from an accredited institution of higher education.
- b. **Clinicians:** Faculty members who will provide clinical care should be board certified. Most faculty members appointed to the Lecturer Track will not provide clinical care.
- c. **Expectations:** Faculty members appointed at the rank of Associate Professor (Lecturer) should demonstrate a cumulative record of excellence in Education with regional or national involvement.

4. Appointment as Professor (Lecturer)

This rank is intended for individuals who have served at the rank of Associate Professor or the equivalent at another institution (or in the tenure-line) for at least 5 years or at the rank of Professor or the equivalent and who have a demonstrated a sustained record of excellence in education that has changed practice, understanding, process, or methods in the field.

- a. **Education:** A degree appropriate to expected academic and clinical roles from an accredited institution of higher education.
- b. **Clinicians:** Faculty members who will provide clinical care should be board certified. Most faculty members appointed to the Lecturer Track will not provide clinical care.
- c. **Expectations:** Faculty members appointed at the rank of Professor in the career-line should have a cumulative record of excellence in Education that has changed practice, understanding, process, or methods in the field.

R. Formal Reappointment Review Lecturer Track

1. Formal Reappointment Review for Instructor (Lecturer): It is expected that the individual will show commitment to and progress in developing excellence in Education.

2. Formal Reappointment Review for Assistant Professor (Lecturer): It is expected that the individual will show commitment to and progress in developing excellence in Education. Although there is no required deadline for review for promotion, the evaluation will provide feedback on whether the candidate is meeting milestones to meet criteria for promotion by the 7th year.

3. Formal Reappointment Review for Associate Professor (Lecturer): It is expected that the individual will continue to demonstrate excellence in Education. Although there is no required deadline for review for promotion, the evaluation will provide feedback on whether the candidate is meeting milestones to meet criteria for promotion.

4. Formal Reappointment Review for Professor (Lecturer): It is expected that the individual will continue to demonstrate a cumulative record of excellence in Education.

S. Promotion in the (Lecturer) Track

1. Promotion to Assistant Professor (Lecturer)

It is expected that the individual will demonstrate the potential and commitment to develop excellence in Education.

2. Promotion to Associate Professor (Lecturer)

It is expected that the candidate will demonstrate a cumulative record of excellence in Education as defined in V-G. Effective contributions in the areas of investigation and administration are encouraged but not required and add strength to the faculty member's file. The candidate's combined record of Investigation, Education, Clinical Practice Advancement, and Administration / Service must demonstrate overall excellence in contributions to the missions of the department and institution.

3. Promotion to Professor (Lecturer)

It is expected that the candidate will demonstrate a cumulative record of excellence in Education with durable impact outside the institution, including a body of work that has changed practice, understanding, process, or methods in the field. Effective contributions in the areas of investigation and administration are encouraged but not required and add strength to the faculty member's file. The candidate's combined record of Investigation, Education, Clinical Practice Advancement, and Administration / Service must demonstrate overall excellence in contributions to the missions of the department and institution.

References:

1. Based on: Glassick, CE. *Academic Medicine* 75:877-80, 2000.
2. Based on: Boyer, EL. *Scholarship Reconsidered*, 1990.
3. See, for example Sanberg, PR et al. *PNAS* 2014;111:6542-7.

V. APPENDICES.

Appendix A: List of required contents for the candidate's completed file.

The completed file submitted to the Dean will contain the following sections. This list may be updated from time to time by the college without a formal re-approval of the entire faculty review statement:

If promotion to professor:

- A CV as submitted at the time of appointment or promotion to associate professor
- Past reviews in descending order
- Criteria used for review
- All materials required for formal review as outlined below

If Formal Review:

- Evaluators' letters of evaluation, signed waiver form, evaluators' name, qualifications and relationship to candidate.
- Internal evaluations, and the posted memo for department faculty/staff letters of evaluation
- Sample letter sent to external and internal evaluators that includes list of enclosures, dates sent to evaluators, and actions being considered
- Candidate's current CV in College-approved format and bibliography, noting last revised date
- A signed attestation to the integrity of the CV
- Self-Assessment Statement, formatted according to the Office of Academic Affairs template
- SAC report and Teaching reports/evaluations from students and faculty peers
- DAC Report
- Department Chair report and 7-day response notice
- Any Candidate Response

Appendix B: Senate Faculty Review Standards Committee, Notice of Final Approval.

Appendix C.

Departmental Mission Statements and Department-specific criteria

Each department may, within the parameters established by University Policies and the college-wide Statement of the School of Medicine, adopt additional specific criteria, standards and evidence, and procedures, for FRA (RPT) and / or for appointments of career-line faculty. These shall be articulated in a Supplemental Rule, which shall be approved by the tenure-line (quorum required) and career-line (no quorum) faculty of the department, the dean of the college and finally approved by the senior vice president, and the Senate Faculty Review Standards Committee. Upon approval, such Supplemental Rule is appended to and becomes part of this Statement.

HISTORY:

Appointment, Review and Advancement Policy for Career-Line Faculty Members University of Utah School of Medicine

Approved by School of Medicine Tenure-Line Faculty: (date)

Approved by School of Medicine Career-Line Faculty (date)

Approved by Departmental DAC:

Anesthesiology (date)

Biochemistry (date)

Biomedical Informatics (date)

Dermatology

Family and Preventive Medicine (date)

Human Genetics (date)

Internal Medicine (date)

Neurobiology and Anatomy (date)

Neurology (date)

Neurosurgery (date)

Obstetrics and Gynecology

Oncological Sciences (date)

Ophthalmology and Visual Sciences (date)

Orthopaedics (date)

Pathology (date)

Pediatrics (date)

Physical Medicine and Rehabilitation

Population Health Sciences (date)

Psychiatry (date)

Radiation Oncology (date)

Radiology (date)

Surgery (date)

Approved by Dean, School of Medicine: (date)

Approved by University Faculty Review Standards Committee (contingent; 8 October 2014)

Approved by Senior Vice President for Health Sciences: (date) for implementation as of January 1, 2015