COLLEGE OF NURSING

Faculty Appointment, Review, and
Advancement Statement for Tenure-Line Faculty

Approved by [Unit] Tenure-line Faculty:

Approved by Dean:

Approved by Senate Faculty Review Standards Committee on [date] and the Senior Vice President on [date], for implementation on [date]. *ML Hood, MD*

8/22/19

This document serves as the College of Nursing's Faculty Appointment, Review, and Advancement (FARA) Statement for Tenure-Line Faculty required by University Policy.[1] This statement along with relevant University Policies, Policy 6-303, found at http://regulations.utah.edu/academics/6-303.php, and Policy 6-311, found at http://regulations.utah.edu/academics/6-311.php, govern the retention, promotion, and tenure process.

The College of Nursing's mission is to advance health through excellence in nursing and interdisciplinary teaching, research, practice and service.

---

[1] In other units on campus, this Statement would be referred to as the College of Nursing's Retention, Promotion, and Tenure (RPT) Statement; we retain the FARA nomenclature to remain consistent with the College of Nursing charter and Health Sciences terminology.

Table of Contents

1. Effective Date and Application to Existing Faculty

The revised FARA criteria, standards, evidence, and procedures contained in this Statement are effective as of [date]. All FARA faculty members appointed on or after this date will be considered under this Statement.

With the exception of those faculty members seeking promotion to Professor (see below), faculty members whose appointments began prior to that date who are reviewed for retention, promotion, or tenure will have the option of choosing to be reviewed under either (1) the prior FARA requirements that were in place at the time of their appointment or (2) this new Statement. This Statement will apply unless the faculty member's choice of the prior requirements is communicated to the Division Chair and Dean by signed letter before review materials are sent to evaluators for external evaluations.

Faculty members who will be reviewed for promotion to the rank of Professor after the effective date of this Statement will be reviewed according to the statement and requirements in effect at the time review materials are sent to external evaluators.

2. Informal and Formal Reviews

2.1 Timing of Reviews and Length of Probationary Period

a. Timing. To ensure the continued quality performance of faculty members and make decisions about retention, promotion, and tenure, the College of Nursing will conduct either informal or formal reviews of its tenure-track faculty members in each year of their probationary period as indicated in Table 1 below.

b. Normal probationary period. The normal probationary period for a faculty member appointed at the rank of assistant professor is seven years. The normal probationary period for a faculty member appointed without tenure at the rank of Associate Professor or Professor is five years. Faculty members with a seven-year probationary period undergo one formal mid-probationary retention review, in the fourth year. Faculty members with a five-year probationary period undergo one formal mid-probationary retention review, in the third year.

Table 1: Normal Review Schedule

Rank at Appointment	Year of Informal Review	Year of Formal Review
Assistant Professor	1st, 2nd, 3rd, 5th, 6th	4th, 7th

Associate Professor and Professor (appointed without tenure)	1st, 2nd, 4th	3rd, 5th

If a tenure-track faculty member does not demonstrate clearly adequate progress to the reviewers in an informal review, an early formal review may be "triggered" by the TL-FRA Committee or the Dean, according to University Policy.

c. <u>Shortening or extending the probationary period</u>. Faculty members may request early tenure reviews (i.e., *shortening* the otherwise applicable probationary period) on the grounds described in and by following the procedures provided for in University Policy. Because early review cases require a faculty member either to have qualifying prior service or to have made truly extraordinary progress, few requests are made and few are granted. Faculty members are therefore encouraged to consult with the Division Chair and Dean and senior colleagues before requesting an early tenure review.

If the faculty member has had an authorized *extension* of the probationary period (e.g., for medical or parental leave), the years of the formal retention review and the mandatory review for tenure shall be adjusted accordingly. Extensions of the probationary period authorized by University Policies may postpone formal reviews, but informal reviews will occur in any year in which a formal review is not held.

Outside those instances in which a faculty member has a right to an extension of the probationary period under University policy, the procedure for requesting an extension of the probationary period is as follows: the faculty member must submit a letter to the Dean explaining the justification for the proposed extension and the timeline of the extension. The Dean will solicit input from Retention and Advancement Oversight Committee (RAO), which will endorse or oppose the request and provide rationale for their recommendation to the Dean. The Dean forwards the request for extension to the Senior Vice President, who is authorized by University Policy (6-303) to grant extensions to the mandatory tenure review period.

2.2 Informal Review

Informal reviews provide constructive feedback on progress and guidance on FARA expectations to faculty members. A primary function of the informal review is to provide advice in developing the file that will be made available for the formal review process, with due

attention to the materials appropriate to each of the three areas of evaluation: research and scholarship; teaching; and service to the profession, university, and public.

2.3 Triggering Formal Retention Reviews

If in the context of an informal review in which the faculty member does not demonstrate clearly adequate progress, the Dean or a majority of the Tenure-line Faculty Review and Advancement Committee Advisory Committee members may vote to conduct a formal "triggered" review. The formal review shall occur the following fall unless a majority of the Committee votes to proceed with the review in the current academic year. Such a review, however, must not be conducted sooner than 30 days after written notice of the review is provided to the faculty member. A triggered formal review shall include external evaluator letters unless a majority of the Committee votes that quality of research/Scholarship is not at issue in the review. The faculty member will be given written notice of the triggered formal FARA review and its timing.

2.4 Faculty Members Hired at the Rank of Associate Professor or Professor without Tenure

The College of Nursing typically does not appoint new tenure-line faculty members at or promote current tenure-line faculty to the Associate Professor or Professor rank without the concurrent granting of tenure. Under appropriate exceptional circumstances, however, a new faculty member may be appointed at the rank of Associate Professor or Professor or a current tenure-track faculty member may be promoted to Associate Professor without the immediate granting of tenure. In such cases, the appointee will be required to undergo formal tenure review within a timeline commensurate with rank currently approved College of Nursing and University policies.

2.5 Request for Promotion to Rank of Professor

A tenured faculty member at the rank of Associate Professor may request a review for promotion to the rank of Professor at any time when he or she has met the requirements for that rank. The College of Nursing does not require any minimum number of years subsequent to granting of tenure or promotion to Associate Professor before a faculty member may be considered eligible for promotion to Professor. In general, however, such requests are not made until the time of one's first tenured faculty review, which occurs five years after one is tenured. All activities at the University of Utah since the initial granting of promotion and tenure shall be counted towards promotion to the rank of Professor.

3. FARA 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, which are referred to as criteria in University Policy: (1) research/Scholarship, (2) teaching, and (3) service. Summary ratings of performance in each of these three areas serve as the standards for retention, promotion, and tenure. University Policy identifies a three-level scale of standards: *excellent*, *effective*, and *not satisfactory*.

The criteria and standards for retention during the probationary period; tenure; promotion to the rank of Associate Professor; and promotion to the rank of Professor are listed here. Implicit in the criteria and standards for each stage of advancement is the concept that accomplishments in one area do not compensate for substandard performance in another area. The same criteria and standards apply to both formal and informal reviews. Evaluations of faculty members are based on the evidence provided regarding a faculty member's research/Scholarship, teaching, and service and are described in subsequent sections.

University Policy allows a faculty member'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 may be considered in determining whether one will be retained, promoted, or tenured.

3.1 Summary of FARA Standards

Retention: A faculty member who is a candidate for retention must demonstrate that he or she has *reasonable potential* for meeting the standards established for tenure.

Tenure: A faculty member who is a candidate for tenure must achieve ratings of *excellent* in either research or teaching, at least sustained *effectiveness* in the other, and at least sustained *effectiveness* in service. The evidence presented must also demonstrate the potential to achieve the requirements for the rank of Professor in due course.

Associate Professor: A faculty member who is a candidate for promotion to this rank requires that one has developed a broad reputation for *high quality* research; demonstrated *sustained effectiveness* in teaching; and performed *effective* service in some combination of university, public, and professional settings. The evidence presented must also demonstrate that the faculty member has the ability to achieve the requirements for the rank of Professor in due course.

Professor: A faculty member who is a candidate for promotion to this rank must achieve ratings of *sustained excellence* in either research/Scholarship or teaching, at least *sustained effectiveness* in the other, and at least *sustained effectiveness* in service. The

evidence must demonstrate continuing professional growth at a level appropriate to the rank of Professor.

3.2 Evaluation of Research/Scholarship

Judgments about a faculty member's research are based on both the quality and quantity of research and their relevance to the academic community. The characteristics of productive research, however, differ depending on the faculty member's area(s) of specialization and professional goals. Assessments of faculty research in the FARA process reflect professional judgments that take into account the quality and quantity of contributions, and the professional context of the faculty member.

<u>a. Description of research/scholarship.</u>

The College of Nursing expects faculty to establish, conduct, and disseminate results from a sustained research program. A primary responsibility of tenure-line faculty members is to advance the sciences of their fields through research. Research is defined as the discovery and creation of new knowledge; reorganization and synthesis of existing knowledge into products that are accessible and applicable by academicians, clinicians, clients, and/or public audiences; and includes the dissemination of peer-reviewed research products. Research spans the entire spectrum of basic to applied knowledge, and can establish evidence to address health from the molecular to the systems levels. This definition is inclusive of, but not limited to, theoretical, conceptual, and philosophical inquiry, as well as clinical, education, evaluation, and policy research.

The following dimensions of evidence will be considered in evaluating a faculty member's research and scholarship according to accepted publishing patterns in the faculty member's own research area:

Funding

Research grants, either intramural or extramural, are valued as a means for accomplishing research and scholarship. Funding support from any peer-reviewed, competitive research grant process through an organization outside the University, such as a professional organization, private foundation, corporation, or state or governmental entity is considered extramural in nature. For the duration of their faculty appointment, a member is expected to demonstrate sustained submission of high quality applications to secure extramural funding as PI or as key personnel (e.g., Co-PI, Co-I, and/or Project Leader) regardless of funding status. Key personnel are defined as individuals who contribute to the scientific development or execution of a project in a substantive measureable way. An individual's role in team science efforts is recognized and valued by the College.

Publications

Written works in the form publications are evidence of scholarly and Scholarship. A record of consistent publications in reputable, peer-reviewed professional journals that reflects a primary role or responsibility by the faculty is valued more than a record that reflects a secondary or tertiary role by the faculty. A series of publications that represents sustained research in one or more topic areas is valued highly. In addition, the College values team science that involves publications resulting from multiple authors and publications that are co-authored with students. Examples of this category also include authored scholarly books by respected publishers, editor of a book, a chapter in an edited book, widely adopted general textbooks, or high quality advanced textbooks. Other examples of this category include peer-reviewed abstracts and presentations at national/international professional conferences.

Impact of Research and Scholarship

Evaluative attention is given to the actual or potential impact of the work to exert influence on the research or clinical field. The degree to which contributions are judged to advance science and impact health care is the degree to which research and scholarship is considered excellent or effective.

b. 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. A faculty member must therefore demonstrate that he or she has either acquired funding that will help sustain his or her research program or that he or she has made significant efforts to obtain such funding and will continue to do so.

c. Summary Rating Scale for Research/Scholarship

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

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

Example indicators of excellence in research include:

- The faculty member leads an established program of research with at least one focal area, and consistently disseminates scholarly work in well-regarded, peer reviewed journals and scientific meetings.

- Some level of independent or team research is sustained through a role in extramurally funded research.

- Indicators of excellence and impact that specifically demonstrate national/international recognition as a leader in the field.

- Continued and sustained dissemination of scholarly work.

- Leadership roles in research, including serving as principal investigator, co-investigator, consultant, or other key personnel on interdisciplinary research teams.

- Editorial advisory board membership.

- Selection for scientific grant review panels or advisory groups.

- Selection in international academic or practice settings to train, host, mentor or function as an ambassador of research-based programs

- Use of practice-based research to lead state or national health policy change.

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

Example indicators of effectiveness in research include:

- Publication in well-regarded peer reviewed journals evidencing a program of research.

- Invited or peer-reviewed presentation at scientific meetings.

- A record of scientific peer review activity.

- Service as a principal investigator or collaborator in extramurally funded study.

- Contributions to the design, conduct, or evaluation of a research project conducted in the faculty practice clinical setting.

- Use of practice-based research to influence or change health policy.

Not Satisfactory: The faculty member has made insufficient contributions in research/Scholarship.

3.3 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.

a. 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 faculty member's course instruction shall include: (a) the faculty member's statement of teaching philosophy as found in his or her personal statement; (b) peer review of the faculty member's syllabi, assignments, and other teaching materials; (c) peer observation of the faculty member's course instruction, seminars, workshops, and other public presentations; (d) information from student course evaluations; and (e) Student Advisory Committee (SAC) reports. Other information about teaching, including, for example, a teaching portfolio, teaching awards, or any evaluation of the faculty member's teaching done by personnel from the University's Center for Teaching and Learning Excellence (CTLE) may also be included if the faculty member so chooses.

b. Curriculum and program development

Academic programs require significant investments of faculty time in ongoing curriculum/program development and maintenance. The contributions of a faculty member 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.

c. 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.

d. Advancement of Teaching Methods

Presenting, publishing, or otherwise advancing methods and approaches for pedagogical undertakings in the classroom and practice environments, and other teaching-related topics that

advance the teaching mission of the College and the University may be considered a contribution to the mission of teaching. Examples include the publication of journal articles relevant to teaching, publication of textbooks, textbook chapters, or other teaching materials, and presenting workshops on teaching methodologies.

e. Summary Rating Scale for Teaching.

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

Excellent: The faculty member has made substantial, sustained contributions in areas of course instruction, curriculum/program development, and student advising and mentoring. Example indicators of excellence in teaching include:

- Peer review of teaching/peer observation of teaching suggest excellent teaching skills.

- As a clinical preceptor of students, consistently receives high scores on preceptor evaluations.

- Student course evaluation scores that demonstrate excellence in teaching.

- Substantial and/or significant contributions to curriculum or program development, or a record of leading curriculum or program development efforts over time.

- University-level, national or international teaching awards/honors.

- Development of educational materials that have an impact beyond the College of Nursing (e.g., textbooks, software, assessment measures, etc.), or substantial impact within the College of Nursing.

- Intellectually distinct contributions to scholarly publications on pedagogical practices, theory, or other teaching-related topics.

- Peer recognition of teaching excellence (e.g. awards or honors for teaching excellence from College of Nursing or local/regional organizations).

- A national award recognizing excellence in the role of clinical preceptor of students.

- Invited or keynote speaker for national/international academic conferences or colloquia.

- International recognition in the form of induction or fellowship into a practice-based teaching honor society recognizing excellence in the role of clinical preceptor.

- Selection to train, host, mentor, or function as an ambassador of practice-based education in international academic or practice settings.

- Notable innovation in teaching methods, measurement, or evaluation with national or international impact.

- A record of sustained funding related to teaching.

- Use of program evaluation data to develop a systematic curricular change or enhancement amendable to ongoing data-based monitoring and/or transferrable to other settings or programs.

- Publication of data-based scholarship to improve academic administrative processes and decisions.

Effective: The faculty member has made acceptable, sustained contributions in teaching. The faculty member 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. Example indicators of effectiveness in teaching include:

- Peer review of teaching/peer observation of teaching suggest effective teaching skills.

- As a clinical preceptor of students, consistently receives good scores on preceptor evaluations.

- Student course evaluation scores that demonstrate effectiveness in teaching.

- As a clinical preceptor of students, consistently receives good scores on preceptor evaluations.

- Contributions to curriculum or program development.

- Obtaining intramural or extramural funding for teaching, *e.g.*, for new course development, course modifications, or interdisciplinary teaching.

- Speaking at colloquia or academic conferences about teaching.

- Providing peer mentorship or consultation regarding teaching.

Not Satisfactory: The faculty member has made insufficient contributions in teaching.

3.4 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 faculty member 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.

a.   Professional Service

This refers primarily to professional participation at a regional, 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.

b.   University Service

This category refers to service within the University, including at the levels of the College and overall institution. A faculty member'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.

c.   Public Service

This category includes service related to the faculty member'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.

d.   Summary Rating Scale for Service. Ratings on the three-point scale below reflect the joint consideration of service contributions in the three areas described above.

Excellent: The faculty member has made substantial, sustained contributions to the profession, the University, and/or the public. Example indicators of excellence in service include:

- Progressive leadership in professional or community organizations/committees.

- Progressive leadership in College, Health Sciences, or university committees.

- National appointment to service posts with a high degree of influence (e.g. governmental advisory positions, think-tanks, policy boards).

Effective: The faculty member has made acceptable, sustained contributions in service. The faculty member shows sufficient commitment to service in at least one area, suggesting that the eventual contributions of the faculty member will be significant. Example indicators of effectiveness in service include:

- Record of engagement in professional or community organizations/committees.

- Consistent engagement in College, Health Sciences, or university committees.

- Record of engagement in local or regional community programs designed to impact health

- Fulfills administrative role in College or University.

Not Satisfactory: The faculty member has made insufficient contributions in service.

4. FARA Procedures

4.1 Participants
The following are the normal participants in FARA reviews:

a. Faculty member. The faculty member under review for retention, promotion, tenure, or tenure and promotion.

b. Retention, Advancement and Oversight (RAO) Committee. Formerly known as the RPT Oversight Committee, this committee monitors the review process for tenure-line faculty. The chair of RAO is typically the chair of TL-FRA Committee.

c. Department Tenure-Line Faculty Review and Advancement Committee (TL-FRA). As more fully described below, membership in and voting on the TL-FRA are determined by University Policy. Qualified members of the Committee may attend, participate in its meetings, and vote on its recommendations. The committee may agree to invite others to participate in the meeting as provided by University Policy. These other participants may not vote on recommendations. (This Committee is what other units on campus refer to as their Department RPT Advisory Committee.)

d. TL-FRA Committee Chairperson. The Chairperson of the TL-FRA Committee is a tenured member of the College of Nursing faculty, elected annually during the Spring Semester, with all tenure-line faculty eligible to participate in the election.

e. <u>Dean</u>. The administrative head of the College, who for a single-department college has the specific FARA responsibilities University Policy 6-303 prescribed for a department chairperson.

f. <u>Student Advisory Committee (SAC)</u>. A committee made up of students in the College of Nursing who provide evaluation of faculty members from a student perspective, as specified in the College Charter.

g. <u>Peer Teaching Reviewers</u>. Peer Teaching Reviewers are longstanding career-line (5 years or longer, as noted in CON Charter) or tenured faculty members who conduct peer reviews of teaching. They are selected by the Dean or her designee.

h. <u>External Evaluators</u>. These are scholars from outside the University of Utah selected by the RAO Committee Chairperson and RAO Committee in consultation with the faculty member to evaluate the faculty member's research and scholarship. All external evaluators must have a demonstrated record of scholarly excellence in the faculty member's scholarly field, and shall be at or above the academic rank for which the faculty member is being considered in this or the next promotion review. An external evaluator shall not be a family member, or the advisor or mentor of the faculty member. Faculty members will have the opportunity before evaluations are solicited to identify these relationships as well as any conflicts with any potential evaluators.

4.2 Informal Review Procedures
Informal reviews of tenure-track faculty shall take place in every year of the probationary period in which a formal review is not conducted. This process is typically delegated by the Dean of the College, to the College Division Chair(s).

a. <u>Informal Reviews after the First Year</u>. These procedures apply for all informal reviews except for the first year.

The file materials provided by the faculty member for an informal review shall normally consist of (i) an up-to-date curriculum vitae, (ii) a personal statement that includes a summary of the faculty member's progress to date, a description of teaching philosophy, and a description of current activities and future plans, in research/Scholarship, teaching, and service, and (iii) a FAR (faculty activity report) or other report of activity for the year. The faculty member may choose to submit relevant supplementary material. These materials should be submitted by the faculty member to the Dean's designee by the due date determined and announced annually by the Dean.

In the case of a faculty member having a "joint" appointment in another academic department or a "shared" appointment with an interdisciplinary academic program, the Dean's designee shall notify the appropriate administrator of the other unit in writing of the informal review by April 15 and invite the unit to submit a report with that unit's perspective on the faculty member's

progress toward tenure, which should be submitted to the College of Nursing prior to August 30. Any materials forthcoming from such a unit will be added to the FARA file and a copy provided to the faculty member.

Course evaluation results from the University of Utah are added to the file by the Faculty Affairs Office under the direction of the Dean. Evaluations from other institutions must be added by the faculty member.

The Student Advisory Committee is not asked to submit a report for informal reviews, and external evaluators are not required in informal reviews.

Division Chair will have a 3-month window to review the faculty member's file, meet with the faculty member as appropriate, and write an informal review report that evaluates progress toward tenure. A copy of this report will be provided to the faculty member and added to the FARA file at the conclusion of the 3-month window. The faculty member shall have the opportunity (but not an obligation) to provide a written response to the report within 1 month after receiving the division chair review.

The RAO Committee Chairperson will appoint an individual to review the faculty member's file, meet with the faculty member, and write an informal review report that evaluates progress toward tenure. A copy of this report will be provided to the faculty member and added to the RPT file. The faculty member shall have the opportunity (but not an obligation) to provide a written response to the report.

The RAO Committee will then meet to discuss the report and any response of the faculty member, and agree on feedback to be provided to the faculty member. The RPT Advisory Committee Chairperson shall prepare a summary report of the meeting, and shall then place in the faculty member's file: (i) the initial report, (ii) any response of the faculty member, and (iii) the summary report of the RAO Committee's meeting. After studying the faculty member's record, the Division Chair shall prepare his/her written recommendation to be included in the file. After all informal reviews, Division Chair the individual assigned to review the faculty member's file shall meet with the faculty member to discuss the report and his/her progress. The informal review normally concludes at this point. If Division Chair or members of the RAO Committee conclude that circumstances call for triggering a formal review, one shall begin in accord with University Policy.

b. First-Year Informal Review. The first-year informal review will be conducted during the Spring Semester to ensure no serious problems have arisen. The Division Chair will review the faculty member's research/Scholarship, teaching evaluations, and service, and will meet with the faculty member to discuss the review and any problems with research, teaching, or service. The

Division Chair will prepare a brief written report copied to the faculty member and placed in the RPT file. The faculty member has the opportunity to make a written response to the review, and any response shall be added to the RPT file.

4.3 Formal Review Procedures

A formal mid-probationary retention review, a formal tenure review, and a formal promotion (either to Associate Professor or to Professor) review follow the same format. However, faculty under formal mid-probationary retention review are reviewed by internal reviewers instead of external reviewers. A calendar of applicable dates is determined annually; the dates here represent typical dates.

a. Dean Responsibilities. The Dean may delegate some department chair responsibilities for the formal review procedures. The typical delegation of responsibility is as follows. The Division Chairs will determine the obligatory FARA reviews for the upcoming academic year and will notify, in writing, the faculty members required to be reviewed 5 months prior to the scheduled TL-FRA meeting convened to vote on the action; and will invite any other tenured and tenure-line faculty wishing formally to be reviewed for either promotion and/or tenure to so indicate in a letter. For each faculty member being reviewed, the RAO Chair will request nominations from the faculty member for internal evaluators and request that he or she sign the waiver/non-waiver form governing the confidentiality of evaluation letters.

At least three weeks prior to the convening of the TL-FRA Committee, interested faculty and staff members in the Department are invited to submit written statements for the file of each faculty to be considered.

In the case of a faculty member having a joint appointment in another academic department or a shared appointment with an interdisciplinary academic program, the appropriate administrator of the other unit may be invited to submit a report with that unit's perspective on the faculty member's progress, which should be submitted to the College of Nursing at least two weeks prior to the advisory meeting. Any materials forthcoming from such a unit will be added to the FARA file and a copy provided to the faculty member.

The RAO chair will notify the Student Advisory Committee of faculty undergoing formal 5 months prior to the TL-FRA meeting, ensure that they are informed of proper methods for conducting the SAC review, and that reports are due no later than 1 month prior to the TL- FRA meeting. The faculty member's relevant teaching and mentoring materials will be provided to the SAC no later than 1 week prior to the SAC meeting. The SAC is invited to provide written input related to teaching in accord with University Policy.

b. Tenure-line Faculty Review and Advancement (TL-FRA) Committee Chairperson. By April 30, the elected TL-FRA Committee Chairperson (normally the RAO chair) will, in consultation with the faculty member, assign an individual of the TL-FRA Committee to oversee the faculty member's file in the FARA process. Oversight of the file includes responsibilities such as meeting with the faculty member to assure the file is complete and materials can be presented clearly to the voting body, and then presenting the file at the TL-FRA meeting.

c. Peer Teaching Reviews. The Dean shall ensure that the Peer Teaching Reviewers conduct at least three peer teaching reviews and submit the resulting materials for the faculty member's file prior to any formal review.

d. External Evaluators. Faculty members must provide a list of five potential external evaluators and provide any information about potential conflicts the date specified by the TL-FRA Committee Chairperson. The TL-FRA Committee Chairperson, after consulting with the Dean, and considering the list of potential evaluators submitted by the faculty member as well as any information about any conflicts, will solicit no fewer than three external evaluations for each formal mid-probationary retention review, formal tenure review, and formal promotion (either to Associate Professor or to Professor) review. At least one external evaluator will be from the faculty member's list. The TL-FRA Committee Chairperson will send potential external evaluators a standard solicitation letter, including notification of whether the faculty member has or has not waived the right to see the evaluations, and will provide them with this document. External evaluators shall be asked to submit their evaluations no later than one month prior to the TL-FRA meeting.

e. FARA File Contents and File Closing Date. A faculty member's file will open no later than August 15 and close no later than September 15 (except for materials specified below as being added subsequent to the Advisory Committee meeting).

1) *Faculty Member Responsibilities for File Contents.* Prior to June 1, the faculty member is obligated to submit to the FARA file: (i) a current vita, (ii) copies of publications and other forms of scholarly/creative work, (iii) a personal statement that specifies progress to date and describes current activities and future plans, for the relevant criteria (research/other creative research, teaching, and service). The faculty member may similarly submit other relevant materials, including course evaluations from outside the University.

2) *Department Responsibilities for File Contents.* The Faculty Affairs Office, under the direction of the TL-FRA Chair, shall ensure that the file includes: (i) current University of Utah course evaluation results, (ii) available SAC reports, (iii) any written recommendations from department faculty and staff, (iv) any reports from

joint/shared appointment units, (v) external evaluator reports (treated as confidential as appropriate), (vi) peer teaching reviews, (vii) reports and recommendations from all past reviews, and (viii) all other required materials.

f. Faculty member's Rights to Comment on File. A faculty member has the right to submit a written response to any of their file contents no later than five business days after the file closing date.

g. Formal Review—TL-FRA Committee Meeting and Subsequent Steps.

1) *Department TL-FRA Committee Action.* The full TL-FRA Committee will meet in person after receiving any report from an interdisciplinary program but no later than October 15. Each Committee member is responsible for reviewing the file prior to the meeting. The Committee will discuss the record as it pertains to each of the relevant criteria (research/other creative research, teaching, and service). Unless the majority moves to an executive session to exclude non-voting participants per University Policy, the Dean may attend the meeting, and upon invitation by the majority of members, may participate in the discussion and submit evidence and opinions, but shall not vote on the Committee's recommendations. Committee members will vote by secret ballot separately on a recommendation as to each FARA action for each faculty member (e.g., a vote on recommendation for tenure is taken and recorded separately from a vote on recommendation for promotion of that faculty member). A quorum shall be considered present when two-thirds of the voting members of the committee are present.

Whenever possible, the TL-FRA Chair will advise all members on leave or otherwise absent of the proposed action and shall request their written opinions and votes in advance of the meeting. Absent members' written opinions shall be disclosed at the meeting and their votes will be counted and recorded the same as other votes.

The minutes of the meeting should reflect the nature of the discussion with major points on both sides revealed. Both affirmative and negative votes should be explained. From the minutes others should be able to get the sense of the discussion and not just a summary or the conclusions. The summary report of the meeting, including vote counts for each recommendation, should be signed by the person designated by the Committee Chairperson to serve as the Secretary, then signed and approved by the Committee Chairperson, and then made available for inspection by the Committee members. After allowing an inspection period of not less than two business days nor more than five business days, and after such modifications as the Committee approves, the Secretary shall forward the summary report to the Dean and the faculty member, along with a list of all faculty members present at the meeting.

The faculty member under review is to be informed of the Committee recommendation by the Committee Chairperson as soon as possible. All Committee votes and deliberations are personnel actions and must be treated with confidentiality in accordance with University Policy and state and federal law. Members of the Committee are enjoined not to convey the substance or outcomes of committee deliberations to faculty members undergoing FARA review. Such faculty members may not ask questions about the Committee's deliberations outside of the conversation the faculty member has with the Committee Chairperson about the Committee's meeting and recommendation.

2) *Dean's Action.* After studying the entire file relating to each faculty member, the Dean shall prepare his/her written recommendation with an exact copy to be provided to the faculty member and included in the file on the retention, promotion, and/or tenure of each faculty member, including specific reasons for the recommendation. The faculty member will then have the option to provide, within seven business days, a written statement in response to the report of the Committee or the recommendation of the Dean.

3) *Actions and Appeals Procedures Beyond the College of Nursing Level.* Subsequent procedures are described in University Policy.

5. Emeritus/Emerita Faculty Appointments

The category of this faculty appointment is for retired members of the College of Nursing. Emeritus/Emerita status is a recognized faculty category with established benefits (see U of U Policy 6-300, 5-112). Faculty are eligible for recommendation to this appointment at the faculty rank held upon retirement.

Faculty members must notify the Dean of retirement at least three months prior to the anticipated retirement date to be considered for recommendation for this status. Career-line and tenure-line faculty in the professorial ranks of Assistant, Associate, or Professor who wish to be considered for emeritus/emerita status prepare a file consisting of an academic vita and two letters of recommendation from University of Utah faculty at or above the faculty member's rank, at least one of those from a College of Nursing faculty member. Letters of recommendation are to address the faculty member's consistent and cumulative contributions to the College, University, and profession for appointment as emeritus/emerita.

The file is submitted for consideration to the Faculty Affairs Office and forwarded to the voting faculty as determined by the rules governing faculty appointments. Results of the vote are forwarded to the Dean who makes the decision regarding whether to recommend the faculty member for emeritus faculty appointment. Final appointments to emeritus status for retired

faculty members and certain administrative officers are made by the Board of Trustees on recommendation of the President and Vice President for Academic Affairs (University of Utah Regulations Library; policies 5-112, 6-300 and 6-301) and are typically in place at the start of each academic year.

Appendix A: FARA File Contents

In order for the FARA process to operate effectively, and to ensure that all faculty members receive the most accurate reviews possible, certain participants in the FARA process have responsibilities for placing certain materials in the file. All materials listed below are to be added by the file closing date, and are considered for the FARA Advisory Committee meeting. Additionally, the report of the TL-FRA Advisory Committee meeting, recommendation of the Dean, and any faculty member responses to either, are added subsequently.

Faculty member's Responsibility

It is the faculty member's responsibility to provide the following documentation to the Dean (or delegate) for inclusion in the FARA file.

1. Curriculum Vita (CV). This should be provided in the current, approved College of Nursing CV format and include at least the following:

    a. All research publications/creative works since the faculty member began his/her professional career. Please list inclusive page numbers and state if acceptance was based on blind review, or other selection method.

    b. All conference papers presented and presentations given.

    c. Grants and fellowships applied for and received.

    d. Honors received for research/creative work.

    e. All graduate student committees served on or chaired.

    f. Individual student research supervised.

    g. Teaching awards or teaching recognition received.

    h. Service activities for the University, profession, and public.

2. Personal Statement. This document should detail accomplishments as well as future plans in research/Scholarship, teaching, and service, and include a description of teaching philosophy.

3. Copies of recent publications, including title page of authored or edited books.

4. Course syllabi for all courses taught and such additional assignments, exams, and handouts the faculty member chooses to include. The faculty member should provide this information for the file early enough for Peer Teaching Reviewers and SAC.

5. Other relevant materials, such as a teaching portfolio, course evaluations from other institutions, or letters from faculty, staff, or interested individuals. If the faculty member has had personnel from the Center for Teaching and Learning Excellence or Academy of Health Science Educators observe teaching or review teaching materials, the faculty member may wish to include a resulting evaluation in the file. Where the faculty member's role in particular research is unclear, the faculty member may include letters from collaborators describing the faculty member's contribution to the work.

6. Faculty member response(s) to any other file contents, if desired.

College of Nursing's Responsibility

It is the Dean's responsibility to include the following documentation in the faculty member's FARA file, prior to the file closing date.

1. Reports of peer review of teaching materials and peer observations of teaching.

2. All student course evaluations, including both the numeric ratings and qualitative comments, at the University of Utah since the last formal review (with a maximum of five years required for post-tenure promotion to Professor). For formal reviews for tenure, all evaluations since appointment.

3. SAC report(s) (for the current formal review and all past formal reviews).

4. Any report received from a unit in which the faculty member holds a joint or shared appointment.

5. Copies of all prior years' FARA files.

6. Other relevant materials, such as signed letters from faculty, staff, or interested individuals.

7. Evidence of faculty responsibility. This may include letters describing the faculty member's service to the unit and commenting on professional conduct. If an administrative reprimand has been issued, that reprimand as well as the latest findings, decisions, or recommendations from University committees or officials arising from the concerns about the faculty member that led to the reprimand will be included in the faculty member's file.

8. External Evaluator Letters (for formal reviews; kept confidential if the faculty member has waived his or her right to read)

a. Signed form evidencing faculty member's waiver or retention of right to read
b. Qualifications of evaluators, normally a brief Curriculum Vitae
c. Indication of who nominated each evaluator.

Appendix B: Senate Faculty Review Standards Committee and Senior Vice President Notices of Final Approval

[to be inserted]

Glossary

FARA: Faculty Appointment Review and Advancement
FARAC: Faculty Appointment Review and Advancement Committee
RAO: Retention and Advancement Oversight
SAC: Student Advisory Committee
TL FRA: Tenure Line Faculty Reappointment and Advancement