

COLLEGE OF ARCHITECTURE + PLANNING

Policy 2-05: Retention and Review Statement for Career-Line Faculty

Revision 1: Addition of Games Review Committee

Approved by the College Council of the College of Architecture + Planning: October 2024

Approved by Dean: October 2, 2024

Approved by Senate Faculty Review Standards Committee on December 13, 2024 and the Senior Vice President on January 14, 2025, for implementation on January 14, 2025.

Revision 0: Original Submission

Approved by the College Council of the College of Architecture + Planning: March 6, 2019

Approved by Dean: March 6, 2019

Approved by Senate Faculty Review Standards Committee on March 1, 2019 and the Senior Vice President on May 3, 2019, for implementation on May 6, 2019.

This document serves as the College of Architecture + Planning's Statement of retention and review criteria, standards, evidence, and procedures for Career-Line as required by University Policy. This statement along with relevant University Policies, 6-310, found at <http://regulations.utah.edu/academics/6-310.php>, 6-302, found at <http://regulations.utah.edu/academics/6-302.php>, and 6-300, found at <http://regulations.utah.edu/academics/6-300.php>, govern these processes.

The mission of the College of Architecture + Planning is to nurture a culture of discovery, design and innovation in our designed world rooted in an ethic of care, community and commitment. Our efforts will be the spark for positive transformation in our designed world to promote the health and well-being of our society and environment through research, community engagement and educational experiences shaped to nurture the agile, inventive minds necessary to address global challenges that are yet unknown.

Table of Contents

1. Effective Date and Application to Existing Faculty	3
2. Faculty Categories, Ranks, Responsibilities, and Rights	3
2.1. Faculty Categories.....	3
2.2. Responsibilities and Rights of Career-Line Faculty	3
2.2.1. Responsibilities and Rights of Clinical Faculty	4
2.2.2. Responsibilities and Rights of Lecturer Faculty	4
2.2.3. Responsibilities of Research Faculty	4
3. Initial Appointment, Term Length, and Mentors	5
3.1. Initial Appointments	5
3.2. Appointment Body.....	5
3.3. Appointment Duration	5
4. Procedures for Review	6
4.1. Informal Reviews.....	6
4.2. Formal Reviews	6
4.3. Review Committee.....	6
4.4. Report of Review Committee	7
4.5. Procedures for Career-Line Reviews	7
5. Review Guidelines	9
5.1. Review Standards and Criteria.....	9
5.1.1. Evaluation of Teaching	9
5.1.2. Evaluation of Service	10
5.1.3. Evaluation of Research/Creative Work.....	11
5.2. Review Standards for Career-Line Faculty.....	12
5.2.1. Review Standards for Clinical Faculty and Lecturers.....	13
5.2.2. Review Standards for Research Faculty	13
Appendix A: Notice of Senate Faculty Review Standards Committee and Vice Presidential Final Approval.	14

1. Effective Date and Application to Existing Faculty

The standards and procedures contained in this Statement are effective as of the date on page 1. All Career-Line faculty members appointed or reappointed on or after this date will be considered under this Statement with the exception that faculty members whose review for reappointment and/or promotion is within twelve months of the adoption of these standards shall have the option of selecting either (1) the prior review standards or (2) this new Statement. This Statement will apply unless the candidate's choice of the prior requirements is communicated to the Dean by signed letter before September 1 of the academic year in which the review will take place.

2. Faculty Categories, Ranks, Responsibilities, and Rights

2.1. Faculty Categories

In addition to Tenure-Line faculty, the departments of the College of Architecture + Planning appoint faculty members as (1) Career-Line Faculty, which includes Clinical Faculty, Lecturers, and Research Faculty; (2) Adjunct faculty; and (3) Visiting faculty. This statement applies only to Career-Line Faculty.

Career-Line faculty are formally appointed as members of the faculty of one or both of the departments in the College and of the University and serve for fixed durational terms.

Appointments may be renewed for additional terms through reappointment in accordance with University and College policy. Promotions to a higher rank are (but need not be) considered at the time of reappointment to a new term with the higher rank, and such promotions require a reappointment process. Career-Line faculty also are responsible, as designated in their contracts and expected by their home units, for service at the department, College, University, and community levels. Department, College, and University service includes a collective responsibility to help oversee and to participate in the administration and governance of those institutions.

In addition to formal appointment to the status of member of the faculty, Career-Line faculty members are frequently hired as an employee of the University, in a position designated as either full- or part-time, and for a designated time period which is customarily equal to the duration of the faculty appointment term. An individual contract for employment, including the full- or part-time position, the durational period of employment, salary and benefits, and specific individual duties, is administered by College and University administrative officers, with procedures separate from the faculty appointment processes described here.

2.2. Responsibilities and Rights of Career-Line Faculty

All Career-Line faculty members appointed at .5 FTE or above have the following rights and responsibilities. Career-Line faculty appointed by special arrangement at less than .5 FTE will have those rights and responsibilities articulated in their contract with the University.

2.2.1. Responsibilities and Rights of Clinical Faculty

Clinical faculty are primarily responsible for teaching clinical, skills, and other experiential learning courses. Clinical faculty members may also engage in scholarship.

Clinical faculty are entitled to participate fully on department, College, and University Committees (within limits prescribed by University regulations), in College Council, and at faculty meetings.

Clinical Professors are entitled to vote on all matters except hiring, retention, and promotion of Tenure-Line faculty. Clinical Assistant and Associate Professors are entitled to vote on all matters except appointment, retention, and promotion of Tenure-Line faculty and appointment, reappointment, and promotion of Career-Line Faculty above their rank.

2.2.2. Responsibilities and Rights of Lecturer Faculty

Lecturers are primarily responsible for teaching and for the development and implementation of special programs connected with their teaching and other areas of expertise. Lecturers may also engage in scholarship.

Lecturer faculty members are entitled to participate fully on department, College, and University Committees (within limits prescribed by University regulations), in College Council, and at faculty meetings.

Lecturers at the rank of Professor are entitled to vote on all matters except appointment, retention, and promotion of Tenure-Line faculty. Lecturers at the rank of Assistant Professor and Associate Professor are entitled to vote on all matters except appointment, retention, and promotion of Tenure-Line faculty and appointment, reappointment, and promotion of Career-Line faculty above their rank.

2.2.3. Responsibilities of Research Faculty

Research faculty are primarily responsible for research and publication, usually in conjunction with specially funded projects. Research faculty also may be responsible for the development and implementation of special programs connected with their research and other areas of expertise. Research faculty may work onsite at the University, or at other locations depending on the nature and funding of the research projects. Research faculty may also teach regular courses.

Research faculty may participate fully and vote in department, College, and University Committees (within limits prescribed by University regulations). Research faculty may attend College Council and appropriate faculty meetings.

Research faculty at the rank of Professor are entitled to vote on all matters except appointment, retention, and promotion of Tenure-Line faculty. Research faculty at the rank of Assistant Professor and Associate Professor are entitled to vote on all matters except appointment, retention, and promotion of Tenure-Line faculty and appointment, reappointment, and promotion of Career-Line faculty above their rank.

3. Initial Appointment, Term Length, and Mentors

3.1. Initial Appointments

Career-Line faculty members are appointed at one of four ranks: Instructor, Assistant Professor, Associate Professor, or Professor. Initial appointment is based on demonstrated achievement and the expectation of future contributions. Number of years in a relevant profession, length of prior teaching or research experience, and other significant achievements, service, awards, and contributions to their profession or field shall be considered when determining the initial term and faculty rank.

3.2. Appointment Body

Initial appointments of Career-Line faculty require a vote of the department Faculty Appointments Advisory Committee, as required by University Policy 6-302. The department Faculty Appointments Advisory Committee shall consist of all faculty members eligible to vote on an appointment or reappointment matter. The department Faculty Appointments Advisory Committee shall only vote when a two-thirds or greater quorum exists, including any proxy votes provided in advance in writing. A majority vote by the quorum is required for a positive recommendation on the appointment from the committee. Votes by the Faculty Appointments Advisory Committee shall proceed by secret ballot, unless the committee votes pursuant to Policy 6-302 to proceed with open balloting.

3.3 Appointment Duration

- (a) Career-Line faculty members appointed at the rank of Assistant Professor ordinarily serve for a one- or two-year term. Career-Line faculty members appointed at the rank of Associate Professor ordinarily serve up to a three-year term. Career-Line faculty members appointed at the rank of Professor ordinarily serve up to a five-year term.
- (b) Once appointed at the rank of Professor, Career-Line faculty members at that rank hold a five-year term with a presumption of renewal to subsequent five-year terms.
- (c) Notwithstanding the above, the appointment of Career-Line faculty members may be ended in conjunction with formal reviews, under University policy, or if there is financial exigency or discontinuation of a program or department of instruction. The affected faculty member will be given notice as soon as possible consistent with their contract terms. Unless the contract specifies otherwise, notice must be provided at least three months in advance of the ending of the appointment if the faculty member has served at least three years continuously.
- (d) The appointment of Career-Line faculty also may be ended if there is no longer a need for the faculty member's expertise or relevant teaching or research services in light of the teaching portfolios or expertise of other members of the faculty, or for lack of funding where such appointments are contingent on funding. The affected faculty member will be given notice as soon as possible.

- (e) The appointment of any Career-Line faculty member may be terminated for cause under University Policy related directly and substantially to the fitness of the faculty member in their professional capacity. Termination for cause shall not infringe on their right to exercise academic freedom or their rights as a citizen of the United States.

4. Procedures for Review

Once appointed, all Career-Line faculty will be regularly reviewed by their appointing department(s). This section describes the procedures for such reviews.

4.1. Informal Reviews

Each year, the department chair shall review teaching or research/scholarship/creative activity for all members of the Career-Line faculty who are not scheduled for a formal review. . If the Career-Line faculty member has teaching responsibilities, the chair will ensure peer-review of the individual's teaching and will solicit input and feedback from the Center for Teaching and Learning Excellence where appropriate. Any issues or problems are discussed and addressed individually, as needed. All informal reviews are included in a candidate's formal review file. If, in an informal review, a Career-Line faculty member does not demonstrate clearly adequate progress toward reappointment, the chair may "trigger" an early formal review.

Such "triggered" formal reviews shall occur the following fall. Such reviews, however, must not be conducted sooner than 30 days after written notice of the review is provided to the candidate.

4.2. Formal Reviews

To ensure the continued quality performance of faculty members and make decisions about their continuation in a position or promotion to a different rank, each department will conduct formal reviews of its Career-Line faculty as dictated by the length and terms of the contract provided to the faculty member.

4.3. Review Committee

Each department (other than Games) shall formulate a Career-Line Faculty Review Committee (Review Committee). The Review Committee shall be comprised of at least two members of the tenured faculty and one member of the Career-Line faculty who holds the rank of Associate Professor or Professor.

These appointments are made by the department chair. In addition, a member of the tenured faculty shall be elected as Chair of the Review Committee by majority vote of the Tenure-Line and Career-Line faculty in the department.

Games Committee Description: The Division of Games shall form a Career-Line Faculty Review Committee. The review committee shall be comprised of all Tenure-Line faculty holding appointments in Games, all Tenure-Line faculty holding shared appointments in Games, and Games Career-Line faculty eligible by rank. For reappointment without promotion in rank, rank eligible Career-Line faculty are those holding the same or higher rank as candidates being reviewed. For reappointment with promotion in rank, rank eligible Career-Line faculty are those

holding a higher rank than candidates being reviewed. In addition, a member of the Tenure-Line faculty shall be elected as Chair of the Review Committee by majority vote of the Tenure-Line and Career-Line faculty in the department.

4.4. Report of Review Committee

The Review Committee is responsible for conducting formal reviews of Career-Line faculty and completing a report describing the findings of its review. Based on this report, the Review Committee shall recommend either (1) that the candidate be reappointed and, where appropriate, promoted, (2) that the candidate be denied reappointment or, where appropriate, promotion, or (3), where there are issues that require attention, that the candidate be reappointed for a one-year contract with the opportunity to be considered for reappointment in the following year. The report of the Review Committee shall: (1) summarize the evidence considered; (2) state how the evidence considered satisfies or fails to satisfy the applicable standard(s); (3) make recommendations for rating the candidate in all applicable areas of evaluation (e.g., Excellent, Meritorious, or Satisfactory, or Not Satisfactory in Teaching); and (4) give the reasons for its recommendations.

4.5. Procedures for Career-Line Reviews

The Review Committee shall conduct its review of Career-Line faculty members using the following timeline and procedures:

1. By September 1 of the fall semester of the academic year for review, the Chair of the Review Committee shall solicit a Student Advisory Committee report on the candidate. Such report shall be submitted to the Chair by December 1.
2. By October 1, the Chair of the Review Committee shall designate one or more members of the Career-Line faculty (of a higher rank than the candidate) and one or more members of the Tenure-Line faculty to conduct at least two peer teaching reviews of any candidate who has teaching responsibilities. The reviewing faculty members may include members of the Review Committee. These peer teaching evaluations of the candidate shall be submitted to the candidate's file by December 1.
3. By October 1, the Chair of the Review Committee shall request a dossier from the candidate. The candidate shall submit that dossier by December 1 of that year. The dossier shall include:
 - (a) A curriculum vitae;
 - (b) A personal statement, including the following as appropriate: (1) a list of courses taught; (2) a description of course load and administrative responsibilities, which includes types of courses taught, student enrollment, student contact hours, and the types of student assessment for the courses; (3) a statement of teaching objectives and philosophy; (4) a description of research accomplishments, including any grant submissions and funding as well as publications; and (5) clinical practice and opportunities summary;

- (c) All publications generated during the review period;
 - (d) Any prior written evaluations or reports from the Review Committee;
 - (e) Any other materials the candidate deems relevant, such as course materials, simulations, presentations, evidence of pro bono or other work or activities that serve to enhance the College's local, regional, national, or international reputation.
4. By October 1, the Chair shall ensure that all teaching evaluations and recent syllabi for the candidate are placed in the candidate's file. By December 1, the Chair shall solicit comments about the candidate from other members of the department.
 5. The Chair shall circulate the candidate's file to other Review Committee members, who shall read the complete file.
 6. The Chair shall assign a Review Committee member to prepare a draft of the Review Committee Report. The draft report shall be completed by February 1, and the Review Committee shall confer about the report and vote on its approval by February 10.
 7. The Chair shall expeditiously transmit the report to the candidate following its approval by the Review Committee. Upon receipt of the report, the candidate shall have five business days to make a written comment on any item in her file, or to indicate the candidate is waiving such right. The candidate has the right to review all contents in her file, except for any confidential letters of evaluation solicited from outside the department.
 8. By March 1, the Review Committee Chair shall circulate a copy of the report to the Faculty Appointments Advisory Committee and make the candidate's file available for review. Thereafter, but no later than March 15, the Faculty Appointments Advisory Committee shall meet and discuss the recommendations and by a majority vote make a final recommendation to the department chair on the candidate's reappointment and, if applicable, promotion. The Chair of the Faculty Appointments Advisory Committee will appoint a secretary at the meeting to keep minutes, which will be made a part of the candidate's file.
 9. The candidate shall receive a copy of the vote and minutes at the time they are forwarded to the department chair.
 10. The department chair shall receive the entire file and make an independent recommendation and forward the file to the dean of the College for review. Before forwarding the file, the department chair shall give the candidate a copy of the recommendation. The candidate has the right to make a written response to the department chair's letter and/or the faculty vote and minutes within five business days of receiving the department chair's letter. The dean will make an independent recommendation and then forward the entire file to the appropriate University official for approval.

11. The dean shall notify the candidate of the decision no later than April 1 of the academic year for review.

5. Review Guidelines

A faculty member's stature is based on an assessment of achievements in the area of faculty responsibility and the three functions of faculty members, as those functions are relevant to that faculty member's appointment: (1) teaching, (2) service, and (3) research/creative activity.

Summary ratings of performance in these three areas as relevant to the faculty member's appointment serve as the standards for review, reappointment, and promotion. University Policy identifies a three-level scale of standards: excellent, effective, and not satisfactory. As permitted by Policy, this unit will use a four-level scale for evaluating performance: excellent, meritorious, satisfactory, and not satisfactory. These terms are intended to be interpreted similarly to their use in the College's RPT Statement, dated [date]. The same criteria and standards apply to both formal and informal reviews. Evaluations of candidates are based on the evidence provided regarding a candidate's research/creative activity, teaching, and service and are described in subsequent sections.

University Policy allows a candidate's conduct as a responsible member of the faculty to be taken into consideration during a review. As a result, one's failure to abide by the Faculty Code or any other rules or policies of the University may be considered in determining whether one will be retained, reappointed, or promoted.

5.1. Review Standards and Criteria

5.1.1. Evaluation of Teaching

Within the University system, the term teaching refers to regularly scheduled instruction, curriculum and program development, directing undergraduate and/or graduate student work, and counseling and advising of students in general. There are therefore three components of teaching: (1) course instruction, (2) curriculum and program development, and (3) student advising and mentoring.

(1) Course instruction

Course instruction encompasses (a) didactic classroom instruction; (b) online and distance education teaching; (c) the organization and facilitation of seminars and workshops that are related to curriculum needs; and (d) independent instruction involving one or more students on special topics. Specific sources of information to evaluate the candidate's course instruction shall include: (a) the candidate's statement of teaching philosophy as found in their personal statement; (b) peer review of the candidate's syllabi, assignments, and other teaching materials; (c) peer observation of the candidate's course instruction, seminars, workshops, and other public presentations; and (d) information from student course evaluations. Other information about teaching, including, for example, a teaching portfolio, teaching awards, or any evaluation of the

candidate's teaching done by personnel from the University's Center for Teaching and Learning Excellence (CTLE) or by the Student Advisory Committee (SAC) may also be included.

(2) Curriculum and program development

Academic programs require significant investments of faculty time in ongoing curriculum/program development and maintenance. The contributions of a candidate to such efforts, beyond regular teaching assignments, may therefore be considered as part of contributions in the area of teaching. Examples of these kinds of contributions include the development and teaching of new and novel courses and the publication of textbooks or other teaching materials.

(3) Student advising and mentoring

Work with undergraduate and graduate students outside of the classroom is also an important component of teaching. Activities of primary importance in this area include (1) general student advising and mentoring; (2) chairing and serving on graduate student committees; and (3) including students in research and as co-authors in scholarly work. Contributions in this area are evaluated with respect to both quantity and quality.

(4) Summary Rating Scale for Teaching

Ratings on the four-point scale below reflect the joint consideration of the three components of teaching described above.

Excellent: The candidate has made substantial, sustained contributions in areas of course instruction, curriculum/program development, and student advising and mentoring; and has demonstrated leadership and creativity in development of his or her teaching.

Meritorious: The candidate has made significant, sustained contributions in areas of course instruction, curriculum/program development, and student advising and mentoring; is an effective teacher with good reviews and performance; and aspires to continuing personal development in teaching.

Satisfactory: The candidate has made acceptable, sustained contributions in teaching. The candidate shows sufficient progress in the areas of course instruction, curriculum/program development, and student advising and mentoring to suggest that the eventual contributions in these areas will be significant.

Not Satisfactory: The candidate has made insufficient contributions in teaching.

5.1.2. Evaluation of Service

Evaluations are made with respect to three areas of service: (1) professional service, (2) University service, and (3) public service. It is not necessary for a candidate to participate equally in all three service areas. Differing participation in the three service areas typically reflects the strengths and interests of individual faculty members.

(1) Professional Service

This refers primarily to professional participation at a national or international level. Service in this category can be oriented toward national professional organizations and include such activities as holding offices; participating in the organization or operation of conferences; attending professional meetings; serving as chair, discussant, or reviewer for presentations at professional meetings; serving on various professional committees, panels, or boards (e.g., accreditation boards); and presenting professional workshops. Significant professional service contributions can also include serving as editor, associate editor, editorial review board member, or regular reviewer for scholarly or professional journals.

(2) University Service

This category refers to service within the University, including at the levels of the department, College, and overall institution. A candidate's shared-governance activities, including chairing and/or serving on standing and ad hoc committees, councils, and task forces, or serving in administrative positions, at any of these levels, represent valuable University service contributions.

(3) Public Service

This category includes service related to the candidate's area of expertise in various local, regional, national, and international public settings and can take many forms, e.g., serving on boards and committees for governmental and/or non-profit organizations, consulting with and/or providing direct service to community agencies as appropriate within University guidelines.

(4) Summary Rating Scale for Service

Ratings on the four-point scale below reflect the joint consideration of service contributions in the three areas described above.

Excellent: The candidate has made substantial, sustained contributions to the profession, the University, and/or the public. These contributions have distinguished the candidate as a recognized leader in the profession, University, or community.

Meritorious: The candidate has made significant, sustained contributions to the profession, the University, and/or the public.

Satisfactory: The candidate has made acceptable, sustained contributions in service. The candidate shows sufficient commitment to service in at least one area, suggesting that the eventual contributions of the candidate will be significant.

Not Satisfactory: The candidate has made insufficient contributions in service.

5.1.3. Evaluation of Research/Creative Work

Judgments about a candidate's research are based on both the quality and quantity of research and its relevance to the academic community and the College's needs. The characteristics of productive research, however, differ depending on the candidate's area(s) of specialization and professional goals and the College's needs for research in a given area.

(1) Description of Research/Creative Activity

Judgments about a faculty member's scholarship and creative work are based on both the quality and quantity of scholarly and creative products. The characteristics of productive scholarship and creative work can differ as a function of the faculty member's program, special interests and capabilities, areas of research or creative work, and professional goals. Consequently, there are no strict quantitative criteria for amount and type of scholarly and creative work at the various faculty ranks. Rather, assessments of faculty scholarship and creative work in the review process reflect professional judgments that balance the quality and quantity of contributions and take into account the overall professional output and productivity of the faculty member.

(2) Research Funding

Acquiring funding to support research is valued by the University and this College and is necessary to sustain the research mission of the university. All successful as well as unsuccessful efforts to obtain such funding will be considered as appropriate to contributing positively toward one's research.

(3) Summary Rating Scale for Research/Creative Activity

Ratings on the four-point scale below reflect the joint consideration of quantity and quality of research/creative activity as described above.

Excellent: The candidate has made substantial, sustained contributions in one or more topic areas of research/creative activity. The quality and quantity of research reflect a coherent agenda in at least one topic area.

Meritorious: The candidate has made significant, sustained contributions in one or more topic areas of research or creative work. The quality and quantity of research or creative work reflect a coherent agenda in at least one topic area.

Satisfactory: The candidate has made acceptable, sustained contributions in one or more topic areas of research/creative activity. The quality and quantity of research reflect a coherent agenda of work and suggest that significant contributions will be made over time.

Not Satisfactory: The candidate has made insufficient contributions in research/creative activity.

5.2. Review Standards for Career-Line Faculty

Two different sets of standards apply to the review of Career-Line faculty, depending on the faculty member's appointment category. One set of standards applies to Clinical faculty and Lecturers, whose primary responsibilities are teaching and service. The other set of standards applies to Research faculty, whose primary responsibilities are research and service.

5.2.1. Review Standards for Clinical Faculty and Lecturers

- (a) To be reappointed, a Clinical faculty member or Lecturer must demonstrate that they are (1) at least Satisfactory in teaching and (2) at least Satisfactory in service.
- (b) To be promoted from the rank of Assistant to Associate Professor, a Clinical faculty member or Lecturer must demonstrate that they are (1) Meritorious in teaching and (2) at least Satisfactory in service.
- (c) To be promoted to the rank of Professor, a Clinical faculty member or Lecturer must demonstrate that they are (1) they are Excellent in teaching and (2) at least Satisfactory in service.
- (d) Clinical faculty members and Lecturers are not expected to engage in research, published scholarship, and creative work. However, the College encourages and supports Clinical faculty and Lecturers who wish to engage in such endeavors.


5.2.2. Review Standards for Research Faculty

- (a) To be reappointed, a Research faculty member must demonstrate that they are (1) at least Satisfactory in research/creative work; (2) if the faculty member teaches, at least Satisfactory in teaching; and (3) at least Satisfactory in service.
- (b) To be promoted from the rank of Assistant to Associate Professor, a Research faculty member must demonstrate that they are (1) Meritorious in research/creative work; (2) if the faculty member teaches, at least Satisfactory in teaching; and (3) at least Satisfactory in service.
- (c) To be promoted to the rank of Professor, a Research faculty member must demonstrate that they are (1) they are Excellent in research/creative work; (2) if the faculty member teaches, at least Satisfactory in teaching; and (3) at least Satisfactory in service.

Appendix A: Notice of Senate Faculty Review Standards Committee and Vice Presidential Final Approval.

Revision 1 Approvals:

Review Committee Approval:

 _____ Trina Rich, SFRSC Committee Secretary	<u>December 13, 2024</u> Date
--	----------------------------------

Senior Vice President Approval:

 _____ Sarah Projansky, Designee	<u>January 14, 2025</u> Date
---	---------------------------------

Revision 0 Approvals.

Review Committee Approval:

 _____ Lincoln Davies, Chair	<u>3/1/2019</u> Date
---	-------------------------

Senior Vice President Approval:

 _____ Harriet W. Hopf, Designee	<u>5/3/2019</u> Date
---	-------------------------