

UNIVERSITY OF UTAH COLLEGE OF NURSING
Faculty Appointment, Retention, Promotion and Tenure
POLICIES AND PROCEDURES

Each department* shall formulate and distribute to all faculty members in the department, a statement of criteria to be used in retention, promotion, and tenure reviews. This statement shall include the rationale for the criteria, and must be approved by the department faculty.

University of Utah Policy Procedures Manual, Faculty Regulations,
Chapter V, Section 2, A-2

This statement of policies and procedures is coordinated with the College of Nursing Criteria for Appointment, Retention, Promotion, and Tenure. Copies of the Criteria and of the Policies and Procedures are provided to all faculty members. The Criteria address qualifications for appointment, retention, promotion or tenure with respect to the areas of (1) teaching, (2) research, scholarship, and other creative work, and (3) service.

Rationale for the Criteria

The College of Nursing faculty is committed to the discovery, organization, and transmission of knowledge which will benefit the health status of the people of our society (Mission Statement, College of Nursing).

It is the purpose of the College of Nursing to prepare qualified, broadly educated nurses to practice nursing, to conduct research, and to generate nursing knowledge. Students must be exposed to theoretical and technological advancements, and are entitled to qualified teachers, administrators, researchers and scholars in the field of nursing.

College of Nursing faculty have an obligation to the University, to the community, and to the nursing profession to contribute to scientific and scholarly advancements in the health field, and to publish their work. The development and implementation of progressive curricula in the College require that faculty engage in activities that expand their knowledge and experience and work collaboratively with students, faculty and other colleagues within and outside the University.

*Non-departmentalized colleges are regarded as administratively similar to departments in the ARPT review process; therefore, when the University regulations refer to "department," the term

"college" is used in this statement of College of Nursing Policies and Procedures.

Organization of Credentials Committees

The Credentials Committee members are the elected chairpersons and chairpersons-elect of the Retention, Promotions, and Tenure Advisory Committees, and the Dean, as Chairperson of the Appointments Committee. The responsibilities of the Credentials Committee include establishing and revising, as necessary and with the approval of the College Council, the Criteria and the procedures for review of faculty for appointment, retention, promotion, and tenure.

Confidentiality

All evaluative information on candidates for appointment, retention, promotion and tenure, presented in official ARPT review meetings, is strictly confidential. All policies concerning confidentiality of information are followed, as contained in University of Utah Policy and Procedures Manual, Faculty Regulations, Chapter V, Section 1.

APPOINTMENT OF REGULAR FACULTY

It is assumed that individuals who are appointed to regular faculty positions share the commitment of the College of Nursing faculty to the discovery, organization, and transmission of knowledge which will benefit the health status of people of our society.

All regular faculty appointments are regarded as pre-tenure in the university system, excepting appointment to the limited instructor rank. An individual may be appointed to the rank of instructor for a limited term not to exceed three years. Except for extraordinary circumstances, only regular faculty in the ranks of professor and associate professor are eligible for the granting of tenure; however, service in any regular faculty rank, including the rank of instructor, is counted as part of the pre-tenure probationary period. If the limited term appointment is renewed beyond a three year period in any rank, including the rank of instructor, the period served in the limited term appointment may, at the option of the faculty member, be counted as a part of the pre-tenure probationary period. At the time of appointment to a regular faculty position, the appointee shall exercise the option to count or not count the limited term appointment as part of his or her pre-tenure period.

The granting of tenure on appointment is recommended only in circumstances where the candidate is unquestionably qualified for the honor and the responsibility associated with tenure.

Appointments are made in accordance with University of Utah Policy and Procedures Manual, Faculty Regulations, Chapter V, Section 1.

Written recommendation for appointment to a regular faculty position may be initiated by faculty or other interested persons to the Dean through the appropriate coordinator/program director and the Associate Dean for Academic Affairs.

The complete dossier of transcripts, vita, letters of evaluation, and other data submitted by the prospective candidate, is reviewed by the appropriate coordinator/program director who makes a written recommendation. The file is then submitted to the Associate Dean for Academic Affairs and the Dean of the College who may summarize the data and present the applicant to regular faculty at a scheduled meeting of the Appointments Committee. The responsibility of the Appointments Committee is to discuss, recommend, and vote. The Dean may then recommend appointment of the candidate to the appropriate University committees and officials.

REVIEW SCHEDULES FOR REGULAR FACULTY

Please refer to University of Utah Policy and Procedures Manual, Faculty Regulations, Chapter V, Section 2. The Credentials Committee is responsible for scheduling the retention, promotion and tenure meetings each Fall Semester and for notifying candidates of the calendar of events. Retention and tenure reviews are scheduled in conformity with University and College policies as follows:

Review Schedule: Non-tenured Faculty

<u>Rank</u>	<u>Year of Informal Review</u>	<u>Year of Formal Review</u>	<u>Committee Composition</u>
Instructor	2nd, 4th, 6th	3rd, 5th, 7th	Assistant, associate and full professors, both tenured and non-tenured.
Assistant Professors	2nd, 4th, 6th	3rd, 5th, 7th	Tenured assistant professors and all associate and full full professors, both tenured and non-tenured.
Associate Professors	2nd, 4th	3rd, 5th	Tenured associate and all full professors.
Professors	2nd, 4th	3rd, 5th	All tenured full professors.

Review Schedule: Tenured Faculty

Formal review every five years following Committee of 3 peers, under the the granting of tenure, regardless of rank. supervision of the Credentials Committee.

INFORMAL RETENTION REVIEWS

The Informal Review for retention may be completed without special inquiry or documentation and is the procedure for each year when the formal review is not required. The procedure includes:

1. An up-dated curriculum vita.
2. Preparation of a brief self-evaluation by the individual, addressing goals, accomplishments and plans for the future.
3. Discussion and review of the self-evaluation involving the appropriate coordinator/program director, and the appropriate Associate Dean. In the event that termination is recommended, the faculty member will be given a formal review.
4. A written recommendation from the coordinator/program director to the Associate Dean, based on consultation with the faculty member. The recommendation will include evaluative comments and statements about retention for the succeeding year.

FORMAL REVIEWS

The criteria shall emphasize the University's commitment to superior intellectual attainment. Demonstration of achievement in the areas of both teaching and research and/or other creative activity, including the exercise of professional expertise, is an indispensable qualification for promotion and tenure. For the purpose of retention, a reasonable potential for achieving these criteria should be evident. In addition, recognition shall be accorded faculty members for the quality and extent of their public service and shall be taken into account in the evaluation made in the context of retention, promotion, and tenure. University of Utah Policy & Procedures Manual, Faculty Regulations. Chapter V, Section 2, A-2.

FORMAL RETENTION REVIEWS OR PROMOTION TO ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR WITHOUT TENURE

Committee Procedures for Formal Reviews

The chairpersons of the Retention, Promotion, and Tenure Committees are responsible for establishing the date of the review meetings and file closure date, convening and conducting the reviews, preparing for written balloting, appointing tellers, and other procedural affairs. The appropriate chairperson invites the candidate to select the committee member who will present his or her file to the committee. Minutes of the meetings are taken by a secretary and then approved by the members of the Credentials Committee for accuracy in reflecting the meeting.

The minutes of meetings, recommendations and vote results are sent to the Dean of the College and the candidate. The candidate has the opportunity but not the obligation to add a written statement in response to the minutes or the Dean's evaluation. The procedures and time limitations for continuation of the review process by the Dean and University committees and officials follow the University of Utah Policy and Procedures Manual, Faculty Regulations, Chapter V, Section 2.

The formal review consists of a detailed, documented presentation of the candidate's academic performance with respect to the areas of (1) teaching, (2) research, scholarship, and other creative work, and (3) university, professional, and public service. Each candidate will be given a minimum of six weeks notice of the meeting of the review committee, and will submit information which he or she wishes the committee to consider. Documentation for each criterion is essential to substantiate comments, recommendations, or suggestions for career development. The information considered in a formal review will include material from Student Advisory Committee, documentation by the candidate and letters of evaluation.

Student Advisory Committee

Prior to the convening of the Retention, Promotion or Tenure Committee, the chairperson of each committee will request the Student Advisory Committee to submit written recommendations on the proposed review of each candidate. Each recommendation should state, as specifically as possible, the reasons for the recommendation, following the College of Nursing criteria for the appropriate rank. The documentation considered by the Student Advisory Committee consists of the faculty member's vita and the numerical rankings for classroom and clinical evaluations. The numerical rankings for course evaluations will be made available to the SAC if the faculty member is the sole instructor (evaluations for courses that are team-taught are not representative of the individual faculty member but of the group effort). Student comments for specific courses may be added to this file at the faculty member's discretion. The SETE file (student evaluations) to be considered by the SAC will be for courses taught since the last formal review. For faculty being considered for promotion and tenure awards, the SETE file will be for a longer period to provide a historical perspective of teaching performance.

Documentation by the Candidate

It is the responsibility of the candidate for formal review to assemble his or her file and to check for accuracy and completeness prior to the closing date. The candidate is responsible for the following documentation:

1. An updated academic vita.
2. A written self-evaluation of how the criteria have been met.
3. Transcripts of university or other credits accrued during the period of review.

4. Copies of peer reviewed publications, abstracts, and approved applications with Summary Statements.
5. Copies of other publications, working documents, and in-progress works.
6. Evidence of membership and participation in committees or organizations established for public service, professional activities, nursing and/or health related programs, political programs, and projects for improvement of the welfare of citizens, in order to document contributions to University, local, regional, and national service.
7. Formal peer evaluation of teaching is required (see Peer Evaluation of Teaching Effectiveness, approved January 22, 1999).
8. Other evidence of teaching effectiveness. This evidence could include use of the SETEs, other evaluative documents which reflect faculty teaching ability, syllabi, outlines, bibliographies, video productions, etc. Documentation of teaching competence may include evaluation of course outlines and teaching methods by experts in the content area, written student evaluations, and written statements by peers and supervisors; documentation of the quantity and quality of research and generation of knowledge; as well as evidence of special awards, will be considered in the formal review.

Letters of Evaluation for Formal Retention Reviews

The guiding principle for obtaining letters of evaluation should be for the candidate to select people who have the expertise and knowledge for making informed and impartial judgments about the quality of his or her work. The emphasis should address professional qualifications. A few letters of evaluation from qualified unbiased people are worth far more than many letters from friends and acquaintances. The letters should address specific criteria (i.e. teaching, scholarship, service) with concrete documentation.

In early March, the candidate is to submit to the chairperson of the appropriate committee six (6) names and addresses for letters of evaluation: three (3) from within the College (including any agencies or institutions associated with the College for educational, clinical or research purposes), and three (3) from outside the College (local, regional, national, international). **NOTE: External letters for third-year retention reviews are optional. It will be up to the faculty member to indicate whether they would like external input. An exception to this change is if a faculty is hired at the Associate Professor rank and the third year review is a pre-tenure review; then external reviews will still be required (approved June 6, 2003).** Information that needs to be submitted for each individual who might write a letter regarding the candidate's application includes a brief rationale for identifying this individual, name, address, telephone number, (fax number, Email address, if available), academic ranks, and the capacities in which the

candidate has known each individual. A candidate elects to waive or retain the right to review external letters of evaluation and this written statement shall be included in the credential file. This statement is then included in the request for letters of evaluation.

By the first week in September, the candidate will submit to the appropriate chairperson copies of the self-evaluation and an updated vita. By mid-September, the chairperson will send a standard, formal request, along with the appropriate criteria, vita, and self-evaluation to each reviewer chosen to write a letter of evaluation. Any follow-up requests are to be written by the chairperson. The letters should be an independent and objective evaluation utilizing the criteria. Letters are not to be solicited by the candidate nor is the candidate to contact the individual or provide information about the nature of the content to be included in the letter. Every effort will be made by the Credentials Committee to secure the letters by the time the file closes. Unsolicited letters of evaluation will be accepted. Letters and other information (with the exception of updated vitas or publications of works which have been in progress) submitted after the date of the file closure will be discussed by the Faculty Advisory Committee and a vote will be taken to include or exclude from the credential file.

According to University policy, ". . . the candidate is entitled to see his/her review file upon request, except for confidential letters of evaluation solicited from outside the College. If a candidate wishes to comment on, or to take exception to, any item in his/her initial formal review file, the candidate's written comment or exception must be added to the file before the faculty advisory committee meeting is held." To facilitate committee review of the file, it is recommended that this written response be placed in the file several days prior to the review meeting. Faculty candidates have the opportunity (but not obligation) to attend a portion of the review committee to present information by sending a request to the Chairperson of the appropriate Committee a minimum of two weeks prior to the meeting. Faculty candidates may be invited by the appropriate Committee Chairperson to attend a portion of the review committee to clarify or present information in addition to the contents of the Credential file.

PROMOTION TO PROFESSOR OR AWARD OF TENURE REVIEWS

Granting tenure implies a commitment by the university to defend faculty members' academic freedom. Likewise, faculty members who are granted tenure make an equally strong commitment to serve their students, their colleagues, their discipline, and the university in a manner befitting an academic person. It also raises a strong presumption that those granted tenure are competent in their discipline and capable of scholarly contributions. Granting tenure is regarded as the University's most critical personnel decision. Except for extraordinary instances, when specific and persuasive justification is provided, tenure will not be awarded to faculty members prior to their advancement to the rank of associate professor. It is therefore imperative, before such commitments are made, that a responsible screening process be followed to ensure that the most highly qualified candidates available are granted tenure. University of Utah Policy & Procedures Manual, Faculty Regulations, Chapter V, Section 2

Promotion in rank is the acknowledgment by the university of excellence in performance in teaching, research and creative work, professional competence and activity, and university and public service. University of Utah Policy & Procedures Manual, Faculty Regulations, Chapter V, Section 2

Schedule

Reviews for promotions and/or granting tenure are scheduled Fall Semester in accord with the University program of review. Faculty are notified during Spring Semester prior to the review.

Review for Promotion and/or Award of Tenure

For assistant professors, a formal pre-tenure review is required at years 3 and 5; and 7th year is a formal review for the award of tenure. Faculty appointed as associate professors or professors have a 5 year probationary period, with required formal reviews at years 3 and 5. Information available for the formal review for tenure should include all of the 5 to 7 probationary years previous to the tenure review, and the proceedings and recommendations of the formal reviews should be available for evaluation by the tenure committee.

Review for tenure may occur at an earlier date or on appointment for associate professor and professors. See University Regulations, Chapter VI regarding credit for prior service and waiver of probationary service. Review for promotion may be scheduled to coincide with the formal pre-tenure or tenure reviews.

Documentation of teaching competence may include evaluation of course outlines and teaching methods by experts in the content area, written student evaluations, and written statements by peers and supervisors; documentation of the quantity and quality of research and generation of knowledge; as well as evidence of special awards, will be considered in the formal review.

The chairpersons of the Retention, Promotion, and Tenure Committees are responsible for establishing the date of the review meetings and file closure date, convening and conducting the reviews, preparing for written balloting, appointing tellers, and other procedural affairs. The appropriate chairperson invites the candidate to select the committee member who will present his or her file to the committee. Minutes of the meetings are taken by a secretary and then approved by the members of the Credentials Committee for accuracy in reflecting the meeting. The minutes of meetings, recommendations and vote results are sent to the Dean of the College and the candidate. The candidate has the opportunity but not the obligation to add a written statement in response to the minutes or the Dean's evaluation. The procedures and time limitations for continuation of the review process by the Dean and University committees and officials follow the University of Utah Policy and Procedures Manual, Faculty Regulations, Chapter V, Section 2.

The formal review consists of a detailed, documented presentation of the candidate's academic performance with respect to the areas of (1) teaching, (2) research, scholarship, and other creative work, and (3) university, professional, and public service. Each candidate will be given a minimum of six weeks notice of the meeting of the review committee, and will submit information which he or she wishes the committee to consider. Documentation for each criterion is essential to substantiate comments, recommendations, or suggestions for career development. The information considered in a formal review will include material from Student Advisory Committee, documentation by the candidate and letters of evaluation.

Student Advisory Committee

Prior to the convening of the Retention, Promotion or Tenure Committee, the chairperson of each committee will request the Student Advisory Committee to submit written recommendations on the proposed review of each candidate. Each recommendation should state, as specifically as possible, the reasons for the recommendation, following the College of Nursing criteria for the appropriate rank. The documentation considered by the Student Advisory Committee consists of the faculty member's vita and the numerical rankings for classroom and clinical evaluations. The numerical rankings for course evaluations will be made available to the SAC if the faculty member is the sole instructor (evaluations for courses that are team-taught are not representative of the individual faculty member but of the group effort). Student comments for specific courses may be added to this file at the faculty member's discretion. The SETE file (student evaluations) to be considered by the SAC will be for courses taught since the last formal review. For faculty being considered for promotion and tenure awards, the SETE file will be for a longer period to provide a historical perspective of teaching performance.

Documentation by the Candidate

It is the responsibility of the candidate for formal review to assemble his or her file and to check for accuracy and completeness prior to the closing date. The candidate is responsible for the following documentation:

1. An updated academic vita.
2. A written self-evaluation of how the criteria have been met.
3. Transcripts of university or other credits accrued during the period of review.
4. Copies of peer reviewed publications, abstracts, and approved applications with Summary Statements.
5. Copies of other publications, working documents, and in-progress works.

6. Evidence of membership and participation in committees or organizations established for public service, professional activities, nursing and/or health related programs, political programs, and projects for improvement of the welfare of citizens, in order to document contributions to University, local, regional, and national service.
7. Formal peer evaluation of teaching is required (see Peer Evaluation of Teaching Effectiveness, approved January 22, 1999).
8. Other evidence of teaching effectiveness. This evidence could include use of the SETEs, other evaluative documents which reflect faculty teaching ability, syllabi, outlines, bibliographies, video productions, etc. Documentation of teaching competence may include evaluation of course outlines and teaching methods by experts in the content area, written student evaluations, and written statements by peers and supervisors; documentation of the quantity and quality of research and generation of knowledge; as well as evidence of special awards, will be considered in the formal review.

Letters of Evaluation For Promotion to Professor or Award of Tenure Reviews

The guiding principle for obtaining letters of evaluation from outside the University is to obtain an informed and impartial review about the quality of the candidate's work and qualifications for promotion or tenure. Such individuals are recognized as experts consistent with the candidate's areas of inquiry or scholarship.

Internal Letters of Evaluation In early March, the candidate is to submit to the chairperson of the appropriate Promotion or Tenure Advisory Committee three (3) names and addresses for letters of evaluation from within the College (including any agencies or institutions associated with the College for educational, clinical or research purposes). After reviewing the information, the Credentials Committee (appropriate Chairperson of the Retention or Promotion Committees) will telephone the individuals on the final list to gain their concurrence to write letters of evaluation/recommendation.

Critique of Scholarly Work The potential list of individuals outside the University who might write letters regarding a candidate's application for promotion and tenure will be formulated by the candidate and submitted to the Credentials Committee for review in early March. Information that needs to be included for each individual who might write a letter regarding the candidate's application includes a brief rationale for identifying this individual, name, address, telephone number, (fax number, Email address, if available), academic ranks, and the capacities in which the candidate has known each individual. Guidelines for developing the list include: (1) some individuals who are content experts in the same field as the candidate; (2) some individuals at the same or higher rank and tenure status as that for which the candidate is being considered; (3) some out-of-state experts; (4) at least six names. A candidate elects to waive or retain the right to review the letters of evaluation and this written statement shall be included in the

credential file. This statement is then included in the request for letters of evaluation.

The list will then be reviewed by the Credentials Committee which has the responsibility for formulating the final list of names for solicitation of letters. In formulating the list, the Credentials Committee has the freedom to identify individuals outside the list submitted by the candidate. The final list of three names identified by the Credentials Committee will be shared with the candidate; if there is any conflict regarding the individuals on the list, a final list of names will be negotiated with the candidate. No more than one of the external reviewers may be non-academicians. The individuals selected from academic institutions must be at a rank and tenure status equivalent or higher than that for which the candidate is being considered.

After the list is complete, the Credentials Committee (appropriate Chairperson of the Promotion or Tenure Committees) will telephone the individuals on the final list to gain their concurrence to perform the critique of scholarly works that will be followed by a letter of confirmation. By the first week in September, the candidate will submit to the appropriate chairperson copies of all work they wish to be considered in the review, a self-evaluation, and an updated vita. By mid-September, the Credentials Committee (appropriate Chairperson of the Promotion or Tenure Committees) will correspond by letter to individuals on the final list and include with the correspondence the candidate's vita, publications, self-evaluation statement, and the College of Nursing criteria for evaluation according to the rank being sought for promotion and/or tenure.

Individuals will be asked to review the vita, evaluate scholarly works, and comment on the candidate's meeting of the criteria for promotion and/or tenure and to comment about whether the candidate meets the criteria at that institution. Individuals writing letters of evaluation will be asked to submit a copy of his/her vita to include with the candidate's credential file. The letters should be an independent and objective evaluation of the candidate's scholarly work utilizing the criteria. Letters are not to be solicited by the candidate nor is the candidate to contact the individual or provide information about the nature of the content to be included in the letter. Any follow-up requests are to be written by the Chairperson, not the candidate. Every effort will be made by the Credentials Committee to secure the letters by the time the file closes. Unsolicited letters of evaluation will be accepted. Letters and other information (with the exception of updated vitas or publications of works which have been in progress) submitted after the date of the file closure will be discussed by the Faculty Advisory Committee and a vote will be taken to include or exclude from the credential file.

If files are incomplete for candidates seeking elective review, these candidates will not be considered for review. If files are incomplete for candidates undergoing mandatory review, the faculty committee will proceed with the review of the incomplete file.

According to University policy, " . . . the candidate is entitled to see his/her review file upon request, except for confidential letters of evaluation solicited from outside the College. If a candidate wishes to comment on, or to take exception to, any item in his/her initial formal review file, the candidate's written comment or exception must be added to the file before the faculty

advisory committee meeting is held." To facilitate committee review of the file, it is recommended that this written response be placed in the file several days prior to the review meeting. Faculty candidates have the opportunity (but not obligation) to attend a portion of the review committee to present information by sending a request to the Chairperson of the appropriate Committee a minimum of two weeks prior to the meeting. Faculty candidates may be invited by the appropriate Committee Chairperson to attend a portion of the review committee to clarify or present information in addition to the contents of the Credential file.

With the caveat that University Faculty Regulations emphasize "achievement" in contradistinction to "potential" in the awarding of tenure, the statement of Criteria for the rank at which the candidate will be awarded tenure, and the statement of Policies and Procedures for Retention, Promotion and Tenure are followed in formal reviews for the granting of tenure.

REVIEW OF TENURED FACULTY

Schedule Reviews of tenured faculty are scheduled Spring Semester. Faculty are notified the preceding Fall Semester. The initial review of a tenured faculty member occurs at the fifth anniversary of the award of tenure and at subsequent five year intervals.

The review is conducted by a committee of three tenured peers, under the general supervision of the Credentials Committee.

Peer Review Committee The review committee is comprised of three eligible tenured faculty members. Eligibility is determined by rank according to University protocol for RPT affairs. It is recommended that the composition of the review committee include two College of Nursing faculty and one faculty member who may be from another academic unit at the University of Utah.

1. One member, who is tenure and of the appropriate rank, is selected by the RPT Committee. This person will serve as the convener/chair.
2. One member selected by the reviewee, who may be from another University department.
3. One member mutually agreed upon by the reviewee and the RPT Committee.

Documentation to be provided by the candidate

1. An updated academic vita.
2. A written self-evaluation of how the criteria have been met.
3. Copies of peer reviewed publications, abstracts, and approved applications with Summary Statements.
4. Copies of other publications, working documents, and in-progress works.
5. Evidence of membership and participation in committees or organizations established for public service, professional activities, nursing and/or health related programs, political programs, and projects for improvement of the welfare of citizens, in order to document contributions to University, local, regional, and national service.
8. Other evidence of teaching effectiveness. This evidence could include use of the SETEs, other evaluative documents which reflect faculty teaching ability, syllabi, outlines, bibliographies, video productions, etc. for the past five years or since the last review. Documentation of teaching competence may include evaluation of course outlines and teaching methods by experts in the content area, written student evaluations, and written statements by peers and

supervisors; documentation of the quantity and quality of research and generation of knowledge; as well as evidence of special awards, will be considered in the formal review.

Review Procedure The Chairperson of the Tenure Committee will initiate the review process: communication with the reviewee, selection and coordination of the review committee, assistance with file preparation, and establishing a schedule of meetings, etc.

1. The review committee will review and evaluate the file individually and will conduct the scheduled meeting(s) with the faculty candidate to review the record and discuss recommendations.
2. At the conclusion of the meeting, a written report of the recommendations will be forwarded within 30 days to the Credentials Committee. The Credentials Committee shall review the recommendation(s) and may provide additional comments, suggestions, clarifications, and/or recommendations prior to forwarding the report to the Dean, the candidate, and the appropriate coordinator/program director, and Associate Dean. A copy will be placed in the individual's personnel file.
3. Should the review process identify significant deficiencies, the review committee may:
 - a. Recommend actions by the reviewee and/or administration to address the area of the deficiency, or
 - b. Recommend a formal review after a one year or two year period.

Revisions to ARPT Procedures May 28, 1976; July 28, 1980; March 1, 1982; June 6, 1986; June 3, 1988, May 31, 1991; April 20, 1992; November 1992; November 18, 1994; January 10, 1997; editorial revision May 1998 to reflect semesters; editorial revision January 1999 to include peer teaching evaluation; June 6, 2003.

Revisions to Review of Tenured Faculty May 16, 1980; June 6, 1986; February 29, 1988; June 3, 1988; April 20, 1992; June 5, 1992; May 28, 1993; editorial revision May 1998 to change the academic terminology to semesters; editorial revision January 1999 to include peer teaching evaluation; editorial revision April 2002 to not include peer-evaluation and SAC reviews.

Request for Change of Faculty Status

On June 2, 1986, a policy change, recommended by the Credentials Committee, was approved by College Council. This policy dealt with changes in faculty status within the College of Nursing.

Change in faculty status within the College of Nursing, that is, a change from regular rank to auxiliary rank or from auxiliary to regular rank, will be considered by the Dean and the Appointments Committee under the following circumstances. It is assumed that each academic unit will have determined the balance of regular and auxiliary faculty.

1. The change must meet the educational objectives and requirements of the academic unit.

Process The change will only be considered if there is an open auxiliary rank position in the academic unit/program area for which the individual will make application and must qualify, in competition with other candidates. The individual will meet with the appropriate coordinator/program director, presenting a formal proposal and rationale for the change, and demonstrating his/her qualifications for the proposed auxiliary position. The coordinator/program director will make a recommendation to the Associate Dean for Academic Affairs and to the Dean, identifying the open position for which the application is being made, evaluating the applicant's qualifications in meeting the criteria for the proposed rank, and identifying possible recruitment problems for the position being vacated.

2. The individual requesting change to the auxiliary rank must meet the criteria for the proposed clinical, adjunct, or research rank.

Process Written documentation addressing the appropriate criteria will be presented for consideration to the coordinator/program director, Associate Dean, Dean, and the Appointments Committee. Equivalence of the ranks across regular and auxiliary categories has not been established, since areas of expertise differ according to the category, e.g., specific requirements for clinical practice in the clinical category and teaching/research requirements in the regular category.

3. Proposals for change in faculty category, e.g., regular to auxiliary rank, will be accepted ONLY during Fall Semester, to take effect January or September of the next year.

Process The individual will state his or her intent to apply for auxiliary rank a year prior to the anticipated move, allowing time for recruitment of faculty to fill the anticipated regular rank vacancy. If the appointment to the new rank is denied, the individual will have the option to remain in the regular rank position.

4. A proposal for change in faculty category from auxiliary to regular rank will follow the usual procedures for seeking such an appointment.