

THE UNIVERSITY OF TEXAS AT EL PASO COLLEGE OF HEALTH SCIENCES

DOCTOR of PHYSICAL THERAPY PROGRAM POLICIES AND PROCEDURES MANUAL

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Section I: Program		3
Policy # Program 1: Policies and Procedures Review	w	3
Policy # Program 2: Accreditation Procedures and	Responsibilities	5
Policy # Program 3: Course Policies and Grading Sc	cales	6
Policy # Program 4: Consent		8
Policy # Program 5: UStore Financial Compliance P	olicy	11
Policy # Program 6: Honorarium and Speaker Fees		14
Policy # Program 7: Complaints that fall outside th	e realm of due process	16
Section II: Faculty		17
Policy # Faculty 1: Program Workload Standards		17
Policy # Faculty 2: Peer Review of Teaching		21
Policy # Faculty 3: Faculty Evaluation for Core Facu	ılty	27
Policy # Faculty 4: Annual Performance Evaluation Faculty		29
Policy # Faculty 5: Returning Documents to Studer	nts	38
Policy # Faculty 6: Professional Development Fund	ling for Core Faculty	39
Policy # Faculty 7: Funds Distribution from Research	ch Indirect Costs	40
Policy # Faculty 8: Student Advising		41
Section III: Students		42
Policy # Students 1: Scholastic Standards		42
Policy # Students 2: Student Complaints		43
Policy # Students 3: Student Safety, Privacy, and D	ignity	44
Policy # Students 4: Conduct and Safety in the Hur	man Anatomy Teaching Laboratory	46
Policy # Students 5: Full-time Enrollment		47
Section IV: Curriculum		48
Policy # Curriculum 1: Curriculum Assessment		48
Section V: Admissions		50
Policy # Admissions 1: Admissions		50
Policy # Admissions 2: Admissions Compliance		53
Section VI: Outcomes		55
Policy # Assessment 1: Assessment & Planning		55

Section I: Program

Policy # Program 1: Policies and Procedures Review

	Effective: 10/18/01
Revised: 11/30/11; 01/06/16; 04/21/21	Reviewed: 01/12/12; 01/10/18

Definition: This policy establishes the procedures by which the Doctor of Physical Therapy (DPT) Program's policies and procedures are reviewed and revised.

Purpose: To maintain order and provide governance, the DPT Program has developed this policies and procedures manual. This policy provides the procedures by which these policies and procedures can be revised, deleted, or expanded.

Standard: There is an ongoing process of assessment to determine the extent to which practices adhere to the program policies and procedures in accordance with institutional policies and procedures. (CAPTE Standards 3G, 3H)

Procedures:

University Policies and Procedures

- University policies and procedures are found in the Rules and Regulations of the Board
 of Regents of The University of Texas System (https://www.utsystem.edu/offices/board-of-regents/regents-rules-and-regulations) and the UTEP Handbook of Operating
 Procedures (https://www.utep.edu/hoop/).
- 2. Revision of University policies and procedures can be accomplished using the guidance found in the Handbook of Operating Procedures Section 1, Chapter 3, #2: Participation of Faculty in College and Department Affairs.
- 3. All core and associated faculty must complete the University compliance training annually.

Program Policies and Procedures

- All core faculty members will review the Program's policies and procedures on an annual basis. Core faculty members will verbally acknowledge that they have read the Program's policies and procedures during the January faculty retreat and it will be reflected in the retreat minutes.
- 2. All ongoing associated faculty members will review the Program's policies and procedures annually; new associated faculty members will review the Program's policies and procedures during the semester in which they are first appointed. Letters of appointment will include a statement of acknowledgement that they reviewed this Policies and Procedures manual. Letters will be signed by the new associated faculty before appointment.
- 3. The Program Director is responsible for ensuring that policies and procedures are understood and followed by all core and associated faculty members and that any changes in existing policies or new policies are added to this manual (and/or if relevant,

- to the DPT Student Handbook) in a timely manner.
- 4. The policies and procedures manual will be approved yearly at the January faculty retreat.
- 5. Changes to existing program policies and procedures.
 - a. A faculty member wishing to make changes in an existing policy will obtain the existing policy, make their suggested revisions in the document, request that the Program Director add the policy change be added as a faculty meeting agenda item, and present it at the next monthly faculty meeting.
 - b. Changes to an existing policy must be approved by a majority of the core faculty members.
 - c. If approved by a majority of the core faculty, the policy will be updated in the Program's policies and procedures manual (and/or if relevant, to the DPT Student Handbook) by the Program Director or their designee.
 - d. If the revised policy affects the DPT Student Handbook, necessary changes will be made to the DPT Student Handbook. The file name of the handbook will include the revision date, and the revised DPT Student Handbook will be uploaded to Blackboard. Students will be notified by email of any substantive changes.
- 6. New program policies and procedures.
 - a. A faculty member wishing to develop a new program policy must notify the
 - b. Program Director that discussion of a new policy needs to be placed on the next faculty meeting agenda, and submit the proposed policy to the faculty in draft form at or before the monthly faculty meeting.
 - c. The proposed policy will be discussed at the meeting but the faculty will have until the next faculty meeting to make comments/revisions to the proposed policy. These will be submitted to the original author of the proposed policy.
 - d. After completing any necessary revisions of the proposed policy, the policy's author must notify the Program Director that discussion of the revised proposed policy needs to be placed on the next faculty meeting agenda. The final draft of the proposed policy will be sent electronically to faculty at least 24 hours prior to the meeting. A discussion and vote will be held at the faculty meeting.
 - e. If approved by a majority of the core faculty, the policy will be added to the Program's policies and procedures manual (and/or if relevant, to the DPT Student Handbook) by the Program Director or their designee.
 - f. If the new policy is appropriate for the DPT Student Handbook, necessary changes will be made to the DPT Student Handbook. The file name of the handbook will include the revision date, and the revised DPT Student Handbook will be uploaded to Blackboard. Students will be notified by email of any substantive changes, and asked to sign documentation that they were notified of changes. The Program's Administrative Assistant will place this signed documentation in each student's permanent file.

Policy # Program 2: Accreditation Procedures and Responsibilities

	Effective: 10/18/01
Revised: 11/30/11; 01/06/16; 04/21/21	Reviewed: 01/12/12

Definition: The policy establishes the procedures by which the Doctor of Physical Therapy (DPT) Program will comply and maintain compliance with Commission on Accreditation in Physical Therapy Education (CAPTE) accreditation standards.

Purpose: This policy establishes accountability for all reports and documents that need to be accomplished to maintain accreditation with CAPTE.

Standard: Program policies and procedures provide compliance with accreditation policies and procedures. (CAPTE Standard 3H)

Submission of Reports and Fees:

- 1. All reports to CAPTE including reports of graduation rates, performance on state licensure examinations, employment rates, and Annual Accreditation Reports (AAR) are the responsibility of the Program Director with assistance from faculty as needed.
- 2. Copies of submitted reports will be maintained by the Program Director, and placed on the DPT Program's shared online site.
- 3. Fees to CAPTE will be paid in a timely manner. The Program Director will ensure that this is done.
- 4. The Program Director will report expected or unexpected substantive changes in the Program (including changes in leadership) in writing to CAPTE in a timely manner as defined by CAPTE.
- All reports needed to bring the Program into full compliance with CAPTE accreditation criteria are the responsibility of the Program Director with assistance from faculty as needed. All reports will be submitted in a timely manner as defined by CAPTE.
- 6. The Director of Clinical Education is responsible to submit information as requested to the Program Director within the stated timeline.
- 7. The individual faculty members are responsible to submit accurate information as requested to the Program Director within the stated timeline.
- 8. The Administrative Assistant is responsible to submit information as requested to the Program Director within the stated timeline.
- 9. If found out of compliance, the Program Director has the responsibility to ensure all issues are resolved and compliance is gained.

Policy # Program 3: Course Policies and Grading Scales

	Effective: 10/18/01
Revised: 11/30/11; 01/6/16; 11/16/16; 04/21/21	Reviewed: 01/12/12; 01/10/18

Definition: This policy delineates the location of course policies and grading criteria for the Doctor of Physical Therapy (DPT) Program.

Purpose: This policy ensures that rigor and academic integrity are maintained in all courses, and that course policies and grading scales are easily accessible for all students and faculty.

Standard: Students are provided with the current policies and procedures and information that may affect their matriculation. (CAPTE Standards 3D, 5B, 5D, 5E)

- Course Policies: The Program has adopted course policies that are valid in all PT and DRSC courses.
 - a. **Location of Course Policies**: Current course policies are found in the DPT Student Handbook, which is available to all students and faculty on Blackboard under "DPT Student Resources" in the "Handbooks" file folder.
 - b. **Content of Course Policies**: Please refer to the current UTEP DPT Program Student Handbook (Program Policies).
 - c. Revisions of Course Policies: If course policies are revised by the faculty, rationale for changes will be documented in the minutes of the meeting during which the decisions were made. Necessary changes will be made to the DPT Student Handbook. The file name of the handbook will include the revision date, and the revised DPT Student Handbook will be uploaded to Blackboard. Students will be notified by email of any substantive changes, and asked to sign documentation that they were notified of changes. The Program's Administrative Assistant will place this signed documentation in each student's permanent file.
- **2. Grading Criteria:** The Program has adopted grading procedures and grading scales for all PT and DRSC courses.
 - a. **Location of Grading Criteria:** Current grading criteria are found in the DPT Student Handbook, which is available to all students and faculty on Blackboard under "DPT Student Resources" in the "Handbooks" file folder.
 - b. **Content of Grading Criteria:** Please refer to the current UTEP DPT Student Handbook (Grading of Clinical Education Courses and Grading procedures).
 - C. Revisions of Grading Criteria: If grading criteria are revised by the faculty, rationale for changes will be documented in the minutes of the meeting during which the decisions were made. Necessary changes will be made to the DPT

UTEP DPT Faculty Copyright © 2024. For permission to use for educational purposes, contact UTEP DPT program at DPT@utep.edu



Policy # Program 4: Consent

	Effective: 10/05/99
Revised: 11/30/11; 04/21/21; 05/12/22	Reviewed: 1/12/12; 11/16/16

Definition: This policy establishes the Doctor of Physical Therapy (DPT) Program procedures for obtaining consent from clients or patients for learning activities in the classroom/laboratory and/or when students collect client/patient data/video in clinical settings for classroom/laboratory assignments.

Purpose: The attached document is a generic consent form to be used by the faculty and students. It will be used to obtain written permission from a client or patient for videotaping, photographs, still or motion pictures, patient screening, patient evaluation, and/or patient treatment.

Standard: The rights, safety, dignity, and privacy of all clients and patients will be protected.

Procedure:

- 1. All core and associated faculty will ensure that a consent form is obtained prior to the client or patient being presented in class. The faculty will submit signed form to the Program's Administrative Assistant who will keep the consent form on file for 4 years.
- 2. All students will obtain written consent from clients or patients outside of the classroom setting for academic assignments. (This does not apply to regular clinical education courses)
- 3. All current Texas Physical Therapy Rules (located at the Texas Board of Physical Therapy Examiners' Website http://www.ptot.texas.gov/page/home) will be followed with respect to any clients or patients participating in educational activities.
- 4. Consent form follows in English and Spanish.

The University of Texas at El Paso

College of Health Sciences
Doctor of Physical Therapy Program

PARTICIPANT CONSENT FORM , knowingly and voluntarily agree to be a participant in the following educational activity or activities associated with The University of Texas at El Paso Doctor of Physical Therapy Program. (Check all applicable boxes) Video taping П Patient evaluation **Photographs** Patient treatment П Still or motion pictures Case study Patient screening I understand that my participation is for educational purposes, and that all personally identifying information obtained will be kept confidential to the extent allowed by law. In addition, I understand that the information collected might be used for research purposes and might be presented or published in academic conferences or journals, respectively. If the information is used, my personal information will not be disclosed. I understand that if at any time I wish to withdraw my participation, I can do so without penalty. I understand that I will not receive compensation or benefit monetarily from my participation. I understand and acknowledge that health risks associated with the activities per this consent form have been explained to me, and I knowingly and voluntarily consent to participate. I understand that the UTEP Doctor of Physical Therapy Program, its faculty, staff, and student physical therapists, have no authority or mechanism for compensation of an injured volunteer participant, and agree that they are not financially responsible or liable in the event of injury. PARTICIPANT RELEASE & INDEMNIFICATION AGREEMENT , voluntarily consent to participate in the educational activities provided per this agreement. I acknowledge that the nature of the activities may expose me to hazards or risks that may result in illness, personal injury, or death, and I accept and understand the nature and possibility of such hazards and risks. In consideration of my participation in the activities provided per this agreement, I hereby accept all risk to my health and of my injury or death that may result from my participation, and I hereby release The University of Texas at El Paso (UTEP), its governing board, officers, employees and representatives from any liability to me, my personal representatives, estate, heirs, next of kin, and assigns for any and all claims and causes of action for property loss or damage, and for any illness or injury to my person, including my death, that may result from my participation, whether caused by negligence of UTEP, its governing board, officers, employees, representatives, or otherwise. I further agree to indemnify and hold harmless UTEP, its governing board, officers, employees, and representatives, from any liability for injury or death to any person(s) or property loss or damage that may result from my negligent or intentional act or omission while participating in the activities per this agreement. The indemnification related to property loss or damage also applies to storing my personal property while participating in activities per this agreement. I HAVE READ AND FULLY UNDERSTAND AND AGREE TO THE TERMS OF ALL RELEASES ON THIS FORM INCLUDING PARTICIPATION GUIDELINES AND RELEASE AND INDEMNIFICATION AGREEMENT. Participant Signature Date Parent or Legal Guardian of Participant (if applicable) Date

UTEP DPT Faculty Copyright © 2024. For permission to use for educational purposes, contact UTEP DPT program at DPT@utep.edu

Date

La Universidad de Texas en El Paso

Facultad de Ciencias de la Salud Programa de Doctorado en Fisioterapia

FORMA DE CONSENTIMIENTO PARA PARTICIPANTES

Yo,			orización para participar en esta(s) actividad(es)		
educacio	nal(es) asociada(s) con el Programa de Doctorado	o en Fisio	terapia en La Universidad de Texas en El Paso.		
(Marque todas las cajas que corresponda)					
	Toma de video		Evaluación del paciente		
	Fotografías		Tratamiento del paciente		
	Fotos estacionarias o en movimiento		Caso práctico		
	Examen del paciente				
Yo entier	ndo que esta actividad tiene propósitos educacion	ales y que	toda la información personalmente obtenida		
	endrá confidencial dentro de los marcos legales. A	-	•		
	a para investigación y presentada en conferencias				
	rmación es usada, mi información personal no ser				
	ndo que si en cualquier momento decido no seguir	participa	ndo en la(s) actividad(es), lo puedo hacer sin		
ser pena		normi n	articinación en esta(s) actividad(es)		
	ndo que no habrá compensación monetaria alguna nformado y entiendo en totalidad los riesgos e inc	-			
	s en este consentimiento y he aceptado entendien				
	ndo que el Programa de Doctorado en Fisioterapia	-	•		
	pia no tienen ninguna autoridad o mecanismo para				
-	ntes voluntarios y estoy de acuerdo que ellos no s	-	-		
el evento	de alguna lesión.				
	ACUERDO DE LIBERACIÓN DE RESPO	NSABILID	AD E INDEMNIFICACIÓN		
Yo,	consiento voluntariamen	te para pa	articipar en esta(s) actividad(es) educacional(es)		
	(s) con este acuerdo. Reconozco que la naturalez				
•	resultar en alguna enfermedad, lesión y hasta mue	-			
	deración de mi participación en la(s) actividad(es)				
	ara mi salud y de mi lesión o muerte que pueda r				
	dad de Texas en El Paso (UTEP), su junta de gobiern				
-	ibilidad hacia mí, mis representantes personale	-			
	ios por cualquier y todos los reclamos y causas de a dad o lesión a mi persona, incluida mi muerte, que	-			
	. su junta directiva, funcionarios, empleados, repr				
	onsabilidad a UTEP, su junta directiva, funci				
	ibilidad por lesiones o muerte de cualquier person				
-	ı omisión negligente o intencional. mientras partic	-			
relacionada con la pérdida o el daño de la propiedad también se aplica al almacenamiento de mi propiedad personal					
mientras participo en actividades según este acuerdo.					
HE LEIDO Y ENTIENDO PLENAMENTE Y ESTOY DE ACUERDO CON LOS TERMINOS DE ESTE ACUERDO DE LIBERACIÓN					
DE RESP	ONSABILIDAD E INDEMNIFICACIÓN				
Firma de	l Particpante	Fecha			
Padre M	ladre, o Representante Legal del Participante	Fecha			
raule, IV	iaure, o nepresentante Legal dei Farticipante	recild			
Testigo		Fecha			

Policy # Program 5: UStore Financial Compliance Policy

	Effective: 01/24/17
Revised: 04/21/21	Reviewed: 01/24/17, 01/10/18

Definition: This policy describes the Doctor of Physical Therapy (DPT) Program compliance procedures to be congruent with Payment Card Industry (PCI) security standards and UTEP's PCI policies found at http://admin.utep.edu/Default.aspx?tabid=73861

Purpose: This policy enforces compliance requirements to minimize liability to users of the DPT Program Touchnet UStore.

Standard: All faculty and staff users with DPT Program administrative-approved roles for Touchnet UStore management will follow these procedures:

- Each applicant who has been offered admission to the DPT Program will submit an admissions deposit to hold their place in the incoming cohort. The deposit will be submitted no earlier than January 15 and up to the date of matriculation only through the Touchnet UStore system. The approved faculty/staff will manage the deposits as follows:
 - a. Methods of accepted payment are by VISA, Mastercard, or electronic check through the Touchnet UStore system. Faculty/staff are not allowed to accept deposit payment in any other form.
 - b. Should an applicant send a credit card number or bank account number through any other means such as email, fax, or instant message, the following will be completed by the faculty/staff who received the personal information:
 - i. If received by email or instant message (IM): The receiver will reply to the applicant that the DPT Program does not accept payment in this manner and that the applicant has to submit through our secure system. The account numbers on the sender's message must be deleted before sending the reply. The DPT Program receiver will permanently delete the received email/IM from their computer immediately after the reply is sent.
 - ii. If received by fax: The receiver will phone the applicant and state that the DPT Program does not accept payment in this manner and that the applicant has to submit through our secure system. The fax sheet will be immediately shredded.
 - c. All deposits from eligible applicants are NONREFUNDABLE and this is stated on the UStore site.
 - d. Admission deposits are deposited into the UTEP DPT Program Gift Fund. The Admissions Chair and Administrative Assistant will reconcile the Gift Fund account to ensure accuracy of deposits.
 - e. The Admissions Chair will ensure that all applicants who have been accepted into

- the DPT Program have submitted the deposit.
- f. On the day that the applicant matriculates into the DPT Program, the deposit amount will be applied toward the summer tuition payment. The Program Director will complete this action in conjunction with the Student Business Services office.
- g. If an applicant withdraws from the DPT Program prior to matriculation, the deposit will remain in the DPT Program Gift Fund.
- 2. Participants in DPT Program sponsored Continuing Education courses will submit registration fees only through the Touchnet UStore system. The approved faculty/staff will manage the fees as follows:
 - a. Methods of accepted payment are by VISA, Mastercard, or electronic check through the Touchnet UStore system. Faculty/staff are not allowed to accept payment in any other form.
 - b. Payment is due no later than 48 hours prior to course date. Late registration will be accepted with a late fee incurred. Participants must use their own device to submit registration and payment.
 - c. Should a participant send a credit card number or bank account number through any other means such as email, fax, or instant message, the following will be completed by the faculty/staff who received the personal information:
 - i. If received by email or instant message: The receiver will reply to the participant that the DPT Program does not accept payment in this manner and that the participant has to submit through our secure system. The account numbers on the sender's message must be deleted before sending the reply. The DPT Program receiver will permanently delete the received email/IM from their computer immediately after the reply is sent.
 - ii. If received by fax: The receiver will phone the participant and state that the DPT Program does not accept payment in this manner and that the participant has to submit through our secure system. The fax sheet will be immediately shredded.
 - d. All registration fees are NONREFUNDABLE and this is stated on the UStore site. However, registration fees are transferable to another participant. It is preferred that the transfer occur no later than 48 hours prior to the continuing education course, however, this may be communicated to the DPT Program faculty/staff anytime prior to the beginning of the course.
 - e. Registration fees are deposited into the UTEP DPT Program Gift Fund. The Program Director and Administrative Assistant will reconcile the Gift Fund account to ensure accuracy of deposits.
 - f. The Program Director will ensure that all course participants have submitted the registration fee.
 - g. If a course participant does not attend the course or does not make arrangements for a transfer to another participant, the registration fee will remain in the DPT Program Gift Fund to be used at the DPT Program's discretion

for Program business.

- 3. DPT Program faculty/staff are not allowed to give applicants nor Continuing Education course participants access to a UTEP device to submit fees. Applicants and Continuing Education course participants must use their own device to submit their deposit or course registration.
- **4.** If an applicant or participant refuses to submit payment electronically, the DPT Program will accept cash in extreme cases. The cash will be locked in the Administrative Assistant's desk. Keys are only accessible to the Administrative Assistant and the DPT Program Director. Cash will be deposited no later than 1 week after receipt.
- **5.** In the event of suspected fraud or hacking, the DPT Program will follow the University's incident response plan.

Policy # Program 6: Honorarium and Speaker Fees

	Effective: 01/24/19
Revised: 05/06/21	Reviewed:

Definition: This policy describes compensation for services to the Doctor of Physical Therapy (DPT) Program at The University of Texas at El Paso (UTEP) by non-UTEP employees.

According to Federal Law (5 CFR 2634.105(i)) Honorarium is 'a payment of money or anything of value for an appearance, speech or article'. UTEP, as a Texas state institution, "may only pay an honorarium if it is given as compensation for services rendered. If an honorarium is an honorary gift or a gratuitous payment instead of being compensation for services rendered, a state agency may not constitutionally pay an honorarium."

(https://fmx.cpa.texas.gov/fm/pubs/purchase/misc/?section=grants&page=honoraria#honorarium)

Purpose: The DPT Program at UTEP relies on the contributions of individuals who are not employed by the UTEP DPT Program to fulfill the goals and objectives of the Program. These contributions may encompass guest lecture presentations related to the curriculum and laboratory assistance. The purpose of this policy is to standardize the compensation offered to these persons. This policy does not apply to adjunct faculty (University-paid teaching position) or guest speakers presenting continuing competency unit (CCU) courses.

Standard: The State of Texas allows the DPT Program, as a state agency, to compensate non-UTEP employees for their time and selected, reasonable expenses. However, and according to state law, a public servant of the State of Texas is ineligible for cash compensation. Under this definition, UTEP faculty members are not eligible for financial compensation. Rendering expertise is instead considered service to the University.

Procedure:

- 1. The DPT Program will offer compensation in one of two forms, depending on the type of assistance provided: financial compensation or CCU Coupon(s).
- CCU Coupon can be used to reduce the cost for registration in a UTEP DPT Programsponsored continuing competency course. A CCU Coupon has no expiration date, and it can be transferred to other persons. If lost, it will not be replaced. The Coupon holds no cash value.
- 3. Host faculty will offer financial compensation or CCU Coupon(s) to guest speakers who will communicate host faculty their choice.
- 4. Host faculty will communicate guest speaker choice to the DPT Administrative Assistant.

- 5. DPT Administrative Assistant will contact guest speaker to make financial compensation arrangements following UTEP policies and procedures or handle CCU Coupons to host faculty for their delivery.
- 6. The DPT Program Administrative Assistant is responsible for initiating payment. Fees will be paid from UTEP DPT Student Program Major Fees of Gift Fund, as appropriate and as determined by the DPT Program Director. Fees will be paid in a timely manner, no later than 60 days after the invoice is submitted.
- 7. The following are Honorarium and Guest Speaker Hourly Fees:
 - a. Curricular Presentation (invited lecture in DPT course): \$100 per hour that the speaker is presenting; no compensation is offered for preparation time.
 - b. Laboratory support: \$20 per hour of assistance in the laboratory
 - c. Practical Exam graders: \$20 per hour of assistance in the exam
 - d. Practical Exam subjects: \$15 per hour of assistance in the exam
 - e. Extracurricular/Mentor Presentations: \$15 per hour
 - f. Higher honorarium for speakers requires pre-approval of the UTEP DPT Program Director
- 8. If a guest speaker wants to voluntarily waive the fee, the Program Director will sign and send an Acknowledgment and Thank You letter for their service to the Program and for their time and expertise.

Policy # Program 7: Complaints that fall outside the realm of due process

	Effective: 08/01/2022
Revised:	Reviewed:

Definition: This policy describes the procedure that the general public will follow when filing a complaint in relation to the Doctor of Physical Therapy (DPT) Program at The University of Texas at El Paso (UTEP).

Purpose: To streamline any complaints in relation to the DPT Program at UTEP from the general public.

Standard: All complaints from the general public will be managed by UTEP's Office of Institutional Compliance (https://www.utep.edu/compliance/helpline/helpline-information.html).

Procedure:

- 1. If someone form the general public has any complaint in relation to the DPT program at UTEP, the person can file the complaint by
 - a. Calling UTEP's Compliance Helpline at 1-888-228-7713,
 - b. Emailing complianceoffice@utep.edu, or
 - c. Reporting online at www.lighthouse-services.com/utep
- 2. UTEP's Office of Institutional Compliance will follow up with the complainant within reasonable time.

Section II: Faculty

Policy # Faculty 1: Program Workload Standards

	Effective: 09/12/19
Revised: 02/10/22	Reviewed: 04/21/21

Definition: These standards outline the workload expectations for all faculty in the Department of Physical Therapy and Movement Sciences (DPT&MS) and are based on The University of Texas at El Paso's (UTEP) Handbook of Operating Procedures 4.3.3 Academic Workload Policy Requirement and UTEP College of Health Sciences (CHS) Faculty Workload Policy. These standards aim to reflect the Mission and Vision and the specific academic needs of the UTEP DPT&MS, as established on the UTEP Handbook of Operating Procedures 4.3.3.2.3.

Purpose: To be transparent about the roles and responsibilities of the DPT&MS faculty in terms of teaching, scholarship, and service.

Standard: Institutional policies related to academic standards and to faculty roles and workload are applied to the Department in a manner that recognizes and supports the academic and professional aspects of the DPT&MS, including providing for reduction in teaching load for administrative functions. In addition, Department and Program-specific policies and procedures are compatible with institutional policies and with applicable law. (CAPTE Standards 3C and 3G, respectively)

1. **DEFINITIONS**

- **a.** Faculty: The UTEP DPT&MS faculty can have any of the academic titles described in UTEP's Handbook of Operating Procedures 4.1.2. However, Tenured and Tenure-Track Faculty, Clinical Track Faculty (non-tenure track), and Adjunct Faculty are the most frequent.
- **b.** Workload: According to the UTEP Handbook of Operating Procedures 4.3.3.2.2, a full-time workload represents 15 semester credit hours (SCH) of organized undergraduate courses without significant service responsibilities during a regular long semester of the 9-month academic year.
- **c.** Summer Workload: for the DPT program, the summer semester is a 10-week long semester. Summer workload will be calculated based on a 10 SCH as full-time teaching workload.
- **d.** Workload Distribution: Represents the percentage of the time performing academic work such as teaching, scholarship, and service (including clinical practice in program's initiatives). It is represented with a 3-number series that reflects each academic work in the previously described order (e.g. 30-50-20 is 30% teaching, 50% scholarship, and 20% service).
- e. Typical Workload Distribution: Depends on the type of Faculty.

UTEP DPT Faculty Copyright © 2024. For permission to use for educational purposes, contact UTEP DPT program at DPT@utep.edu

- i. Tenured and Tenure-Track Faculty: 40-40-20
- ii. Clinical Track: 60-10-30 or 60-20-20
- iii. Adjunct/Associate: 100-0-0
- **f.** Deviation from typical workload distribution will address Department needs and will be applied as teaching releases (see 3.a and 3.b). These deviations must be approved by the CHS dean.
- **g.** Outside employment/activity is described in UTEP's Handbook of Operating Procedures 5.4 and 5.29. In summary, faculty may be permitted to engage in an average of 8 hours of outside activity each week during the term of an appointment, if this outside activity does not produce conflict of commitment and it has been approved in advance by the proper channels.

2. DPT PROGRAM WORKLOAD STANDARDS

a. Workload distribution

- i. Tenured and Tenure-Track Faculty:
 - 1. Teaching: 10-40% (Assistant/Associate); 20-70% (Full)
 - 2. Scholarship: 40-80% (Assistant/Associate); 20-70% (Full)
 - 3. Service: 10-40% (Assistant/Associate); 10-60% (Full)
- ii. Clinical Track:
 - 1. Teaching: 40-80% (Assistant/Associate); 20-80% (Full)
 - 2. Scholarship: 10-50% (Assistant/Associate); 10-60% (Full)
 - 3. Service: 10-50% (Assistant/Associate); 10-60% (Full)
- iii. Adjunct/Associate:
 - 1. Teaching: 100%
- iv. Others: Workload distribution will be determined according to the main purpose of the appointment (e.g. a Research Faculty will have more research time and a Faculty of Practice will have more teaching or service). In addition, DPT&MS faculty workload will align with CHS faculty categories based on scholarly activity and teaching load:
 - 1. High level of scholarly activity (1.5 6 SCH per semester)
 - 2. Moderate levels of scholarly activity (6 9 SCH per semester)
 - 3. Low levels of scholarly activity (9 15 SCH per semester)
 - 4. No Scholarship expectation (15 SCH per semester)

b. Appointments and Workload

- i. All Faculty will be appointed with the typical workload distribution.
- ii. A typical workload distribution can be modified according to the Department needs.
- iii. The new workload distribution will be assigned by the Department Chair, in consultation with the DPT&MS curriculum and research committees.

- iv. The Department Chair, after approval by the Dean, will communicate the new workload distribution in writing to the individual faculty and the Dean's office.
- v. Approved new workload distribution will apply until the Department needs change and a new workload distribution is discussed and approved.

c. Credit equivalences

- i. Lectures: 1 hour classroom= 1.5 SCH if class size is 65 students or more; if less than 65 students but more than 35, 1 hour classroom= 1.25 SCH; if 35 or less students, 1 hour classroom= 1.0 SCH. Any adjustments based on class size must not result in an unadjusted SCH that is below the range in #2-a-iv, except for circumstances that fall under #1-f (Deviation from Typical Workload distribution). These circumstances require prior approval from the Dean.
- ii. Labs: 1-hour lab= 1 SCH
- iii. Seminar: 1 group/semester=1 SCH (max 2 SCH per semester if 2 or more groups)
- iv. Clinical Education course credit is SCH*0.04*n of students

3. TEACHING RELEASES

- **a.** Academic release: According to accreditation standards, the DPT&MS has 2 types of academic release.
 - Department Chair: Will have 12 SCH of teaching release per year (4 SCH per semester or 30% of the annual workload), which will be considered as Administrative duties.
 - ii. Admissions Committee Chair: Will have 6 SCH of teaching release per year (2 SCH per semester or 15% of the annual workload), which will be considered as Service time.
- b. Ad-hoc releases: Special releases could be assigned to faculty considering the needs and budget of the DPT&MS. These teaching releases will have starting and ending dates, which will be agreed between the Department Chair and the individual faculty, and consultation with the research and/or curriculum committee. These releases may be taken from teaching or service workload with approval by the Dean. Some examples of ad-hoc releases are:
 - Scholarship: New Tenured and Tenure-Track faculty can have up to 12 SCH of teaching/service release during the first year (4 SCH per semester or 30% of the annual workload), which will be considered as Scholarship time.

- ii. Buy-out: If an awarded faculty's teaching/service time is bought out by a grant or contract, this time will be considered as scholarship time.
- iii. Administrative: Faculty could be assigned administrative duties (e.g. Associate Program Director, Residency Coordinator, etc.) with up to 6 SCH of teaching/service release per year (2 SCH per semester or 15% of the annual workload), which will be considered as Service time.
- iv. New programs: For the development and administration of new programs (e.g. clinical residencies), faculty will have up to 12 SCH of teaching/service release per year (4 SCH per semester or 30% of the annual workload), which will be considered as Service time.
- v. Others: For any other academic, administrative, or development needs, faculty could have up to 12 SCH of teaching/service release per year (4 SCH per semester or 30% of the annual workload), which will be considered as Service time.
- **c.** Outside employment/activity is not eligible for teaching, research, or service release. However, licensed DPT faculty are eligible for clinical practice in program's initiatives for up to 20% of their workload.

Policy # Faculty 2: Peer Review of Teaching

	Effective: 09/10/09
Revised: 11/30/11;01/06/16;11/16/16	Reviewed: 01/12/12; 04/21/21

Definition: Policy for peer review of core and associated faculty teaching for the Doctor of Physical Therapy (DPT) Program.

Purpose: To improve teaching abilities of faculty.

Standard: All core and associated faculty who teach 50% or more of a course will have at least 1 peer review of teaching per year. (CAPTE Standard 4E)

Procedure:

- Each faculty member is personally responsible to schedule the required peer review.
 Peer reviews may be completed by any academic faculty. However, regular reviews by faculty outside of the DPT Program and by senior faculty are encouraged to strengthen one's dossier, especially for tenure-track faculty.
- 2. Every faculty member is encouraged to vary the courses for which they receive a peer review.
- 3. Each DPT faculty member is responsible for maintaining a record of peer review. If they disagree with any elements of the peer review, they should attach a written statement and rationale for disagreement.
- 4. Peer review will be discussed with the Program Director at the annual performance evaluation meeting. If needed, a plan of action will be discussed and written on the Annual Performance Evaluation Program Director letter.
- It is strongly encouraged that faculty document peer reviews on their Annual Performance Evaluation to demonstrate ongoing professional development related to teaching.
- 6. It is strongly encouraged that faculty use the Peer Review of Teaching Form found below or a similarly comprehensive format.

UTEP Doctor of Physical Therapy Program Peer Review of Teaching

DEMOGRAPHIC DATA				
Instructor's Name:		Date:		
Instructor's Academic Rank:		Instructor's Program/Department:		
Observer's Name:		Time of Visit:	Start:	End:
Observer's Academic Rank:		Observer's Program/Department:		
Course/Section:		# of Student Enrolled:		
Room Location:		# of Students Present:		

Time Log Teaching Observation Notes

Enter the time at which specific actions are taken by the teacher and/or the students (eg, using lecture vs small group discussion). Feel free to expand the table or use separate pages. It is important to record actions/behavior by both the teacher and the students, especially how one influences the other.

Time:	What the teacher is doing:	What the students are doing:	
COMMEN	TS (eg, is there a balance between instructor ac	tivities and student activities?)	

CLASSROOM CLIMATE					
Characteristic	Always	Mostly	Sometimes	Never	N/A
Instructor addressed students by name.			٠,		
Instructor addressed and responded to students respectfully.					
Instructor looked at students in all parts of the room, turned in their direction and provided a sense of inclusion for all students.					
Instructor asked knowledge & comprehension questions.					
Instructor asked application, integration, &/or synthesis questions.					
Instructor kindly and constructively provided goal-related feedback students could use to improve their learning and performance.					
Instructor demonstrated enthusiasm while teaching.					
Instructor clearly communicates the purpose of class session and instructional activities.					
Instructor uses concrete examples and illustrations that clarify the material.					
Instructor uses a variety of activities to ensure all students are engaged.					
Instructor challenges students to think analytically.					
Instructor uses activities in class to determine whether students understand course material.					
Instructor fosters student-to-student interaction.					
Instructor links new material to previously learned concepts.					
Instructor uses visuals and handouts where appropriate to accompany verbal presentation.					
Instructor requires students to be active (eg, completing a task, applying concepts, or engaging in discussion instead of passively listening).					
Students appear comfortable asking questions.					
Students actively participate in class activities and discussion.					
Students are able to connect course material to other relevant topics.					
Student behavior suggested they were comfortable interacting with the instructor.					
If students disconnected from the learning process (side conversations, being disruptive, etc), the instructor appropriately redirected their attention to the topics/task at hand.					

LEARNING OBJECTIVES & ASSESSMENT OF LEARNING Do course objectives on syllabus appear congruent with the course description and a graduate level course? (eg, observable learning objectives reflecting higher levels of learning than just remembering) Does the instructor have explicit learning objectives for the class/lab/week that are congruent with the course objectives? Are teaching/learning activities congruent with learning objectives?	COMMENTS
Do course objectives on syllabus appear congruent with the course description and a graduate level course? (eg, observable learning objectives reflecting higher levels of learning than just remembering) Does the instructor have explicit learning objectives for the class/lab/week that are congruent with the course objectives? Are teaching/learning activities congruent with learning objectives? Did the instructor assess whether or not students understood the material and/or could demonstrate the skills being addressed during this class/lab session? Comment on how effective s/he did this, and/or recommendations for	COMMENTS:
Do course objectives on syllabus appear congruent with the course description and a graduate level course? (eg, observable learning objectives reflecting higher levels of learning than just remembering) Does the instructor have explicit learning objectives for the class/lab/week that are congruent with the course objectives? Are teaching/learning activities congruent with learning objectives? Did the instructor assess whether or not students understood the material and/or could demonstrate the skills being addressed during this class/lab session? Comment on how effective s/he did this, and/or recommendations for	
Do course objectives on syllabus appear congruent with the course description and a graduate level course? (eg, observable learning objectives reflecting higher levels of learning than just remembering) Does the instructor have explicit learning objectives for the class/lab/week that are congruent with the course objectives? Are teaching/learning activities congruent with learning objectives? Did the instructor assess whether or not students understood the material and/or could demonstrate the skills being addressed during this class/lab session? Comment on how effective s/he did this, and/or recommendations for	
Do course objectives on syllabus appear congruent with the course description and a graduate level course? (eg, observable learning objectives reflecting higher levels of learning than just remembering) Does the instructor have explicit learning objectives for the class/lab/week that are congruent with the course objectives? Are teaching/learning activities congruent with learning objectives? Did the instructor assess whether or not students understood the material and/or could demonstrate the skills being addressed during this class/lab session? Comment on how effective s/he did this, and/or recommendations for	
Do course objectives on syllabus appear congruent with the course description and a graduate level course? (eg, observable learning objectives reflecting higher levels of learning than just remembering) Does the instructor have explicit learning objectives for the class/lab/week that are congruent with the course objectives? Are teaching/learning activities congruent with learning objectives? Did the instructor assess whether or not students understood the material and/or could demonstrate the skills being addressed during this class/lab session? Comment on how effective s/he did this, and/or recommendations for	
Do course objectives on syllabus appear congruent with the course description and a graduate level course? (eg, observable learning objectives reflecting higher levels of learning than just remembering) Does the instructor have explicit learning objectives for the class/lab/week that are congruent with the course objectives? Are teaching/learning activities congruent with learning objectives? Did the instructor assess whether or not students understood the material and/or could demonstrate the skills being addressed during this class/lab session? Comment on how effective s/he did this, and/or recommendations for	
Do course objectives on syllabus appear congruent with the course description and a graduate level course? (eg, observable learning objectives reflecting higher levels of learning than just remembering) Does the instructor have explicit learning objectives for the class/lab/week that are congruent with the course objectives? Are teaching/learning activities congruent with learning objectives? Did the instructor assess whether or not students understood the material and/or could demonstrate the skills being addressed during this class/lab session? Comment on how effective s/he did this, and/or recommendations for	
Do course objectives on syllabus appear congruent with the course description and a graduate level course? (eg, observable learning objectives reflecting higher levels of learning than just remembering) Does the instructor have explicit learning objectives for the class/lab/week that are congruent with the course objectives? Are teaching/learning activities congruent with learning objectives? Did the instructor assess whether or not students understood the material and/or could demonstrate the skills being addressed during this class/lab session? Comment on how effective s/he did this, and/or recommendations for	
Do course objectives on syllabus appear congruent with the course description and a graduate level course? (eg, observable learning objectives reflecting higher levels of learning than just remembering) Does the instructor have explicit learning objectives for the class/lab/week that are congruent with the course objectives? Are teaching/learning activities congruent with learning objectives? Did the instructor assess whether or not students understood the material and/or could demonstrate the skills being addressed during this class/lab session? Comment on how effective s/he did this, and/or recommendations for	
Do course objectives on syllabus appear congruent with the course description and a graduate level course? (eg, observable learning objectives reflecting higher levels of learning than just remembering) Does the instructor have explicit learning objectives for the class/lab/week that are congruent with the course objectives? Are teaching/learning activities congruent with learning objectives? Did the instructor assess whether or not students understood the material and/or could demonstrate the skills being addressed during this class/lab session? Comment on how effective s/he did this, and/or recommendations for	
Do course objectives on syllabus appear congruent with the course description and a graduate level course? (eg, observable learning objectives reflecting higher levels of learning than just remembering) Does the instructor have explicit learning objectives for the class/lab/week that are congruent with the course objectives? Are teaching/learning activities congruent with learning objectives? Did the instructor assess whether or not students understood the material and/or could demonstrate the skills being addressed during this class/lab session? Comment on how effective s/he did this, and/or recommendations for	
Do course objectives on syllabus appear congruent with the course description and a graduate level course? (eg, observable learning objectives reflecting higher levels of learning than just remembering) Does the instructor have explicit learning objectives for the class/lab/week that are congruent with the course objectives? Are teaching/learning activities congruent with learning objectives? Did the instructor assess whether or not students understood the material and/or could demonstrate the skills being addressed during this class/lab session? Comment on how effective s/he did this, and/or recommendations for	
Do course objectives on syllabus appear congruent with the course description and a graduate level course? (eg, observable learning objectives reflecting higher levels of learning than just remembering) Does the instructor have explicit learning objectives for the class/lab/week that are congruent with the course objectives? Are teaching/learning activities congruent with learning objectives? Did the instructor assess whether or not students understood the material and/or could demonstrate the skills being addressed during this class/lab session? Comment on how effective s/he did this, and/or recommendations for	
Do course objectives on syllabus appear congruent with the course description and a graduate level course? (eg, observable learning objectives reflecting higher levels of learning than just remembering) Does the instructor have explicit learning objectives for the class/lab/week that are congruent with the course objectives? Are teaching/learning activities congruent with learning objectives? Did the instructor assess whether or not students understood the material and/or could demonstrate the skills being addressed during this class/lab session? Comment on how effective s/he did this, and/or recommendations for	
Do course objectives on syllabus appear congruent with the course description and a graduate level course? (eg, observable learning objectives reflecting higher levels of learning than just remembering) Does the instructor have explicit learning objectives for the class/lab/week that are congruent with the course objectives? Are teaching/learning activities congruent with learning objectives? Did the instructor assess whether or not students understood the material and/or could demonstrate the skills being addressed during this class/lab session? Comment on how effective s/he did this, and/or recommendations for	
Do course objectives on syllabus appear congruent with the course description and a graduate level course? (eg, observable learning objectives reflecting higher levels of learning than just remembering) Does the instructor have explicit learning objectives for the class/lab/week that are congruent with the course objectives? Are teaching/learning activities congruent with learning objectives? Did the instructor assess whether or not students understood the material and/or could demonstrate the skills being addressed during this class/lab session? Comment on how effective s/he did this, and/or recommendations for	LEADNING ORIECTIVES & ASSESSMENT OF LEADNING
Does the instructor have explicit learning objectives for the class/lab/week that are congruent with the course objectives? Are teaching/learning activities congruent with learning objectives? Did the instructor assess whether or not students understood the material and/or could demonstrate the skills being addressed during this class/lab session? Comment on how effective s/he did this, and/or recommendations for	LEARINING OBJECTIVES & ASSESSIVIENT OF LEARINING
Does the instructor have explicit learning objectives for the class/lab/week that are congruent with the course objectives? Are teaching/learning activities congruent with learning objectives? Did the instructor assess whether or not students understood the material and/or could demonstrate the skills being addressed during this class/lab session? Comment on how effective s/he did this, and/or recommendations for	Do course objectives on cullabus annear congruent with the course description and a graduate level course? (or observable
Does the instructor have explicit learning objectives for the class/lab/week that are congruent with the course objectives? Are teaching/learning activities congruent with learning objectives? Did the instructor assess whether or not students understood the material and/or could demonstrate the skills being addressed during this class/lab session? Comment on how effective s/he did this, and/or recommendations for	lography objectives on synabus appear congruent with the course description and a graduate level courser (eg, observable
Are teaching/learning activities congruent with learning objectives? Did the instructor assess whether or not students understood the material and/or could demonstrate the skills being addressed during this class/lab session? Comment on how effective s/he did this, and/or recommendations for	learning objectives renecting higher levels of learning than just remembering)
Are teaching/learning activities congruent with learning objectives? Did the instructor assess whether or not students understood the material and/or could demonstrate the skills being addressed during this class/lab session? Comment on how effective s/he did this, and/or recommendations for	
Are teaching/learning activities congruent with learning objectives? Did the instructor assess whether or not students understood the material and/or could demonstrate the skills being addressed during this class/lab session? Comment on how effective s/he did this, and/or recommendations for	
Are teaching/learning activities congruent with learning objectives? Did the instructor assess whether or not students understood the material and/or could demonstrate the skills being addressed during this class/lab session? Comment on how effective s/he did this, and/or recommendations for	
Are teaching/learning activities congruent with learning objectives? Did the instructor assess whether or not students understood the material and/or could demonstrate the skills being addressed during this class/lab session? Comment on how effective s/he did this, and/or recommendations for	
Are teaching/learning activities congruent with learning objectives? Did the instructor assess whether or not students understood the material and/or could demonstrate the skills being addressed during this class/lab session? Comment on how effective s/he did this, and/or recommendations for	
Are teaching/learning activities congruent with learning objectives? Did the instructor assess whether or not students understood the material and/or could demonstrate the skills being addressed during this class/lab session? Comment on how effective s/he did this, and/or recommendations for	Does the instructor have explicit learning objectives for the class/lab/week that are congruent with the course objectives?
Did the instructor assess whether or not students understood the material and/or could demonstrate the skills being addressed during this class/lab session? Comment on how effective s/he did this, and/or recommendations for	
Did the instructor assess whether or not students understood the material and/or could demonstrate the skills being addressed during this class/lab session? Comment on how effective s/he did this, and/or recommendations for	
Did the instructor assess whether or not students understood the material and/or could demonstrate the skills being addressed during this class/lab session? Comment on how effective s/he did this, and/or recommendations for	
Did the instructor assess whether or not students understood the material and/or could demonstrate the skills being addressed during this class/lab session? Comment on how effective s/he did this, and/or recommendations for	
Did the instructor assess whether or not students understood the material and/or could demonstrate the skills being addressed during this class/lab session? Comment on how effective s/he did this, and/or recommendations for	
Did the instructor assess whether or not students understood the material and/or could demonstrate the skills being addressed during this class/lab session? Comment on how effective s/he did this, and/or recommendations for	
Did the instructor assess whether or not students understood the material and/or could demonstrate the skills being addressed during this class/lab session? Comment on how effective s/he did this, and/or recommendations for	
Did the instructor assess whether or not students understood the material and/or could demonstrate the skills being addressed during this class/lab session? Comment on how effective s/he did this, and/or recommendations for	
Did the instructor assess whether or not students understood the material and/or could demonstrate the skills being addressed during this class/lab session? Comment on how effective s/he did this, and/or recommendations for	Are teaching/learning activities congruent with learning objectives?
addressed during this class/lab session? Comment on how effective s/he did this, and/or recommendations for	
addressed during this class/lab session? Comment on how effective s/he did this, and/or recommendations for	
addressed during this class/lab session? Comment on how effective s/he did this, and/or recommendations for	
addressed during this class/lab session? Comment on how effective s/he did this, and/or recommendations for	
addressed during this class/lab session? Comment on how effective s/he did this, and/or recommendations for	
addressed during this class/lab session? Comment on how effective s/he did this, and/or recommendations for	
addressed during this class/lab session? Comment on how effective s/he did this, and/or recommendations for	
	Did the instructor assess whether or not students understood the material and/or could demonstrate the skills being
improvement.	addressed during this class/lab session? Comment on how effective s/he did this, and/or recommendations for
	improvement.

omment on if formal and/or informal assessments are congruent with class/lab learning objectives:	
OVERALL ASSESSMENT	
OVERALL ASSESSIVIENT	
ghlights of most effective learning moments for students:	
gnights of most effective learning moments for students:	
ghlights of least effective learning moments for students:	
iefly summarize the instructor's strengths, and provide any specific recommendations for improvements; if the observ	/er
s previously observed instructor's teaching, please specify how/if the	
structor has improved.	
·	

Observer's Signature:
If instructor and observer met after the observation to discuss the critique & the observer's recommendations, please briefly note below:
If the instructor wishes to document anything related to the observer's assessment &/or recommendations, please do so below:
Instructor's Signature:

Policy # Faculty 3: Faculty Evaluation for Core Faculty

	Effective: 10/22/01
Revised:11/30/11; 01/06/16; 11/16/16; 01/10/18; 01/15/19; 04/21/21	Reviewed: 01/12/12

Definition: While students are primarily responsible for their learning, the Doctor of Physical Therapy (DPT) Program faculty believe this learning is facilitated by excellent teaching. Further, we recognize the importance of contributing to our profession through relevant scholarship, and to our profession and our community through meaningful service. To these ends, faculty are evaluated on their performance in teaching, scholarship, and service.

Purpose: The purpose of this document is to provide guidelines for use in the faculty evaluation at the DPT Program level. This document presents information that is in addition to guidelines related to faculty evaluation found in the UTEP Handbook of Operating Procedures https://www.utep.edu/hoop/. The functions of evaluation are to: 1) formally assess faculty performance annually in order to facilitate faculty development and continued performance improvement; 2) provide information for retention, promotion, and tenure; and 3) assist in determining if the collective faculty and program goals are being met.

Standard: There is an ongoing process of formal assessment to determine the effectiveness of core and associated faculty. (CAPTE Standard 4E)

Evaluation criteria: Teaching, Scholarship, and Service will be evaluated following the DPT Program Annual Performance Evaluation and Tenure & Promotion Standards (Policy # Faculty 5), the College of Health Sciences Annual Performance Evaluation Criteria, and the UTEP Handbook of Operating Procedures.

Evaluation of Teaching

Three sources of information are used to assess teaching:

<u>Student Didactic Course Feedback</u>: The University's standardized end-of-course evaluation is distributed electronically at the end of each semester to all enrolled students in each structured course. This accumulated information is available for the individual faculty and Program Director to view on Digital Measures, and a portion of these data are included in the College's Annual Performance Evaluation.

<u>Peer Review of Teaching</u>: A peer review of teaching will be completed for each core faculty and associated faculty who teach more than 50% of a course as described in DPT Program Policy Faculty 1.

<u>Teaching Evaluation by Program Director and/or Curriculum Committee Chair:</u> If a faculty member has unsatisfactory peer reviews of teaching, and/or unsatisfactory student

UTEP DPT Faculty Copyright © 2024. For permission to use for educational purposes, contact UTEP DPT program at DPT@utep.edu

evaluations, and/or if other faculty has alerted them of a problem, the Program Director and/or Curriculum Committee Chair will complete a teaching evaluation and if indicated, review course materials. Additionally, the Program Director and/or Curriculum Committee Chair will provide similar formative evaluation whenever requested by an individual faculty. Appropriate mentoring or counseling will be provided to the individual faculty member if needed.

Evaluation of Scholarship

The faculty member and the Program Director complete an evaluation of scholarship jointly during their annual performance evaluation meeting. They consider whether the individual faculty member is contributing towards the collective faculty and Program goals, and if the faculty member is meeting general expectations for tenure/clinical track as appropriate. The Program Director will provide mentoring or counseling as needed.

Evaluation of Service

The faculty member and the Program Director will complete evaluation of service jointly during their annual performance evaluation meeting. They consider whether the individual faculty member is contributing towards the collective faculty and Program goals, and if the faculty member is meeting general expectations for the Program and College. The Program Director will provide mentoring or counseling as needed.

Other Forms of Evaluation

Evaluation of the DCE: During each even-numbered calendar year, the Director for Clinical Education (DCE) distributes American Physical Therapy Association evaluation forms to the students, the Clinical Instructors, and the Site Coordinators for Clinical Education. These feedback forms are used by the DCE to assess and improve the ongoing process of clinical education, including DCE performance. The Program Director will review these data biennially (i.e., every other year) during the annual performance evaluation meeting with the DCE, and as needed in the case of any deficiencies brought to their attentions by students, academic faculty, clinical faculty, or others.

<u>Evaluation of the Program Director:</u> The Program Director is evaluated by the Dean of the College of Health Sciences. Faculty have the opportunity to evaluate the Program Director through the University's online evaluation of leadership, which are usually scheduled biennially (i.e., every other year) by the Provost Office. Additionally, data are collected regarding the Program Director in the Program's annual student surveys (First-Year, Second-Year, Third-Year), and the annual Faculty and Staff Survey.

Policy # Faculty 4: Annual Performance Evaluation and Tenure & Promotion Standards for Core Faculty

	Effective: 08/23/19
Revised: 04/21/21, 02/10/2022, 05/12/22, 05/12/2023	Reviewed:

Definition: These standards outline the performance expectations for all faculty in the DPT Program and are based on typical workload distributions for Tenured and Tenure-Track faculty (40% Teaching-40% Scholarship-20% Service or Moderate levels of scholarly activity). Any change in the typical workload distribution, approved by the Program Director, will produce corresponding changes to the performance expectations in scholarship and service. Standards for Clinical Track (non-tenure track) faculty will follow expectations for 'Low levels of scholarly activity', unless the faculty's workload had been modified and approved by the Program Director.

Purpose: To set up expectations and evaluation criteria in advance to help faculty to be successful within the DPT Program, the College of Health Sciences, and UTEP.

Standard: Institutional policies related to academic standards and to faculty roles and workload are applied to the program in a manner that recognizes and supports the academic and professional aspects of the physical therapy program, including providing for reduction in teaching load for administrative functions. (CAPTE Standards 3C)

Performance Evaluation Levels

Exceeds, meets, does not meet expectations, and unsatisfactory are 4 recognized performance evaluation levels for all faculty. A rating of meets expectations should not be understood as a standard that reflects mediocrity. Rather, a rating of meets expectations signifies that the faculty member's performance has met a high standard, as understood both in the faculty member's field of expertise and within the University community. To successfully progress toward tenure and promotion, faculty must obtain ratings of at least meets expectations in all 3 evaluation categories (i.e., Teaching, Scholarship, and Service) on a yearly basis and in the midtenure and tenure reviews.

Mid-tenure benchmarks should be evaluated during the 3rd year review of the 6-year tenure timeline (or equivalent).

Evaluation of teaching, scholarship, and service will be based mostly on the College of Health Sciences Annual Performance Evaluation criteria, the Department of Rehabilitation Sciences Annual Performance Evaluation Criteria, approved by the Rehabilitation Sciences Faculty on 12/13/2021, and general CAPTE standards.

Evaluation of Teaching

Teaching is an integral part of a faculty member's responsibilities. It is important for the faculty member to have a teaching philosophy, teaching goals, and reflection of their teaching experience over the probationary period. The faculty member should continually try to improve their teaching over time. Where appropriate, the faculty member should indicate how they has incorporated community engagement in teaching. It is expected that all teaching is congruent

with ethical guidelines (i.e., academic and professional). Faculty members will document their teaching activities annually according to College-wide Annual Performance Evaluation guidelines.

- **UNSATISFACTORY in Teaching:** Meets 0 or 1 of the following criteria for *MEETS EXPECTATIONS in Teaching*
- **DOES NOT MEET EXPECTATIONS in Teaching:** Meets 2 of the following criteria for *MEETS EXPECTATIONS in Teaching*
- **MEETS EXPECTATIONS in Teaching:** Meets 3 of the following criteria for *MEETS EXPECTATIONS in Teaching* per the College of Health Sciences Guidelines for Annual Performance Evaluations:

Faculty member wrote a self-reflection **narrative** (300-500 words) explaining the quality of teaching impacts, including course load, University course evaluation scores, peer teaching evaluation feedback, improvements made in the current year of evaluation, and strategies to improve teaching for the next calendar year of evaluation.

Faculty member taught a **course load** that fulfilled the minimum expectation for assigned teaching workload distribution (i.e., one organized/structured course (without a lab component) is approximately equivalent to 10% teaching distribution).

Faculty member earned **University course evaluation** responses for *Rating of Instructor* and *Rating of Course* \geq 3.0 on average for all organized/structured courses taught.

- EXCEEDS EXPECTATIONS in Teaching

- Faculty must show evidence of <u>at least 4 of the following examples</u> (#1-10) to earn EXCEEDS_EXPECTATIONS in Teaching (in addition to meeting above criteria for MEETS EXPECTATIONS) - <u>OR</u> - show evidence of at least one of the following:
 - o Earned a formal teaching award (at college, university, state, or national level)
 - Earned &/or appointed to an honorary position related to leadership in teaching and learning at the college or university level(s) (e.g., Provost fellow)
 - NOTE: If the appointment crosses 2 or more calendar years, this counts only towards first year of appointment
 - 1. Directly contributed to the instructional program development e.g., curriculum development, academic program development [does not refer to individual course development/revision of an individual course]
 - 2. Participated in formal professional development activities aimed at enhancing teaching effectiveness
 - 3. Implemented innovative teaching evidence-based practices (including innovative instructional technology) e.g., developed new teaching-learning activity, media production

- 4. Established new community program, new clinical site(s), and/or new service-learning partnership(s)
- 5. Served as Member or Chair of graduate student capstone, thesis, and/or dissertation committees
 - *Faculty member should indicate in APE narrative if they wish for this item to be considered under either Teaching OR Scholarship
- 6. Earned University course evaluation average responses for *Rating of Instructor* and *Rating of Course* ≥ 4.25 for each organized/structured course taught.
 - If the University does not provide a course evaluation (e.g., practicum courses), the instructor provides results of internal rating methods where results reflect excellence
- 7. Obtained a minimum of one peer teaching evaluation per year
- 8. Demonstrated outstanding scholarly mentoring with undergraduate &/or graduate students (e.g., co-authored paper(s) in peer-reviewed journal(s) or presentation(s) in peer-reviewed venue(s); students earn grants/awards related to their scholarly work)
 - *Faculty member should indicate in APE narrative if they wish for this item to be considered under either Teaching <u>OR</u> Scholarship
- 9. Developed and taught a new course that has been approved as a required or elective course for the degree program (NOTE: counts only in the calendar year in which it is first taught)
- 10. Published faculty-authored textbooks*, book chapters*, and software related to teaching and learning
 - Faculty should explain the impact of the product related to teaching and learning in the APE narrative
 - *Faculty member should indicate in APE narrative if they wish for book/book chapters to be considered under either Teaching **OR** Scholarship

Evaluation of Scholarship (based on Boyer's Model of Scholarship)

Scholarship may be defined as any peer-reviewed document or activity that contributes to the faculty member's field of expertise, including interdisciplinary research, or to the academy. In general, peer-reviewed documents or activities include research publications and presentations at professional conferences (which help disseminate new knowledge), grant applications, grant awards, and intellectual property (e.g., copyrights and patents). Basic, applied, and clinical research that is quantitative or qualitative in nature, with the integration of knowledge through interdisciplinary exploration is also included in this definition of scholarship. This recognizes the diversity of talents among Program faculty. It is expected that all scholarly activity is congruent with professional and scientific ethical guidelines.

The following are examples of scholarly products that faculty members must show evidence on their annual performance evaluation and tenure and promotion dossiers:

- Book published by a national or international publisher
- Book chapter published by a national or international publisher

- Publications in an indexed (e.g., PubMed, Medline, ERIC, Google Scholar, ISI) peer-reviewed journal.
- Invited conference presentation
- Conference presentation (e.g., peer-reviewed abstract)
- Research grants (internal and external)
- Clinical service contracts
- Intellectual property (e.g., Patent application)

Faculty members will document their scholarship activities annually according to College-wide Annual Performance Evaluation guidelines.

In the Doctor of Physical Program, impact of peer-reviewed products will be defined by 2 factors:

- 1. **Audience:** Any peer-reviewed product published in any American Physical Therapy Association (APTA)-sponsored peer-reviewed journal will be considered as a high impact product.
- 2. *Impact factor:* Faculty members are encouraged to publish their work in journals with high impact factor (IF). Scholarly work impact will be measured based on IF data (Journal Citation Reports published by Thomson Reuters) from 65 journals in the 'Rehabilitation' category. Any peer-reviewed product within these quartiles (Q) and IF ranges will be considered:
 - a. Q1 (top 25%): IF > 2.1
 - b. Q2 (25-50%): IF 2.0 1.5
 - c. Q3 (50-75%): IF 1.4 1.0
 - d. Q4 (lower 25%): IF < 1.0
- 3. *Interdisciplinary Research*: if a DPT faculty is a co-author (i.e., not first or senior author) of any interdisciplinary scholarly product as the only expert on his/her field, the faculty can claim that product as Category C below but need to be highlighted on the 300-500 words narrative.
- **UNSATISFACTORY in Scholarship/Research:** Meets 0 or 1 of the following criteria for *MEETS EXPECTATIONS in Scholarship/Research*
- **DOES NOT MEET EXPECTATIONS in Scholarship/Research:** Meets 2 or 3 of the following criteria for *MEETS EXPECTATIONS in Scholarship/Research*
- **MEETS EXPECTATIONS in Scholarship/Research:** Meets 4 of the following criteria for *MEETS EXPECTATIONS in Scholarship/Research* for faculty with ≥20% research distribution. Faculty with ≤20% research distribution should meet at least 2 of the following indicators to fulfill their research expectations.

Faculty member wrote a self-reflection narrative (300-500 words) explaining the quality of research impacts, including publications, intra or extramural funding, and research mentorship and/or collaboration as well as progress toward meeting CAPTE expectations in scholarship productivity.

With > 20% research distribution, faculty member published a minimum of one research

article in a moderate- to high-impact, peer-reviewed, scientific journal for every 20% research distribution. With ≤ 20% research distribution, faculty member presented a scholarly product in a peer-reviewed venue, professional association, and/or published a minimum of one research abstract in a peer-reviewed journal or substantively contributed/collaborated on one publication for every 10% research distribution.

With > 20% research distribution, faculty member sought or managed extramural funding as primary investigator or co-primary investigator/co-investigator that supports their program of research. With \leq 20% research distribution, faculty member contributed to collaborative research funding (i.e., intra/extramural funding) efforts as contributor, investigator, or primary investigator.

With > 20% research distribution, faculty member served as a research mentor for a minimum of one student as thesis/dissertation committee chair, capstone research project advisor, or honors thesis chair for every 20% research distribution. With \leq 20% research distribution, faculty member substantively contributed to one undergraduate or graduate student research development activity for every 10% research distribution (e.g., as member of thesis/dissertation committee).

EXCEEDS EXPECTATIONS in Scholarship/Research

- For >20% of scholarship/research distribution, faculty must show evidence of <u>at least 8</u> <u>points</u> from the following categories to earn EXCEEDS EXPECTATIONS in Scholarship/Research (in addition to meeting above criteria for MEETS EXPECTATIONS) <u>OR</u> show evidence of at least one of the following:
 - Earned a formal scholarship/research award (i.e., external funding at foundation or federal level)
 - Managed a \$500,000+ external award (e.g., R01, NSF, HRSA grant, etc.)
- For faculty with < 20% scholarship, faculty must show evidence of at least 4 points from the following categories to earn EXCEEDS EXPECTATIONS in Scholarship/Research (in addition to meeting above criteria for MEETS EXPECTATIONS) OR show evidence of at least one of the following:
 - Earned a formal scholarship/research award (at college, university, state, or national level)
 - Managed a \$500,000+ external award (e.g., R01, NSF, HRSA grant, etc.)

Category A - (Weighting = 0.5 point) (May earn a maximum of 2 points from this category)

- 1. Submitted one manuscript to an APTA-sponsored or Q1/Q2 peer-reviewed, scientific journal (any authorship level)
- 2. Submitted a second manuscript to an APTA-sponsored or Q1/Q2 peer-reviewed, scientific journal (any authorship level) (re-submission of same manuscript / same

- data from #1 does not count)
- 3. Published first-authored editorials on your area of academic expertise in national newspaper, or professional or academic publications
- 4. Provided an invited presentation at a conference/meeting/institution (e.g., keynote, panelist, etc.)
- 5. Published an abstract in conference proceedings [must be different than presentations listed in Category B #5 below]
- 6. Formally mentored an undergraduate student in research (e.g., student was registered in 4033 Undergraduate Research course but does not meet requirements of Category B #6)
- 7. Served as a committee member on a formal independent study research project, thesis, or dissertation committee
 - *Faculty member should indicate in APE narrative if they wish for this item to be considered under either Teaching <u>OR</u> Scholarship

Category B – (Weighting = 1 point)

- Submitted one competitive intramural grant/contract as PI/Co-PI/Co-I [limited to 1 time]
- 2. Managed one competitive intramural grant/contract as PI/Co-PI/Co-I [can be counted unlimited times] [The grant used for #1 cannot be re-used for credit here in the same calendar year]
- 3. Published a co-authored (neither first nor senior author) manuscript in an APTA-sponsored or Q1/Q2 peer-reviewed, scientific journal [limited to 2 times]
- 4. Published faculty-authored textbooks* and/or book chapters* [limited to 2 times]
 - Faculty should explain the impact of the product related to scholarship in the APE narrative
 - *Faculty member should indicate in APE narrative if they wish for book/book chapters to be considered under either Teaching OR Scholarship
- 5. Presented a poster/podium presentation/workshop at a peer-reviewed conference at university, regional, state, national, &/or international levels (i.e., competitive submission process) [limited to 2 times]
- 6. Formally mentored an undergraduate student research project (e.g., student is registered in an independent study course; COURI-funded research assistantship) [limited to 2 times]
 - *Faculty member should indicate in APE narrative if they wish for this item to be considered under either Teaching <u>OR</u> Scholarship
- 7. Served as a research mentor for a student as thesis/dissertation committee chair, capstone research project advisor, or honors thesis chair (Note: 1 project = 1 point, regardless of the numbers of students in the research group) [can be counted unlimited times]
 - *Faculty member should indicate in APE narrative if they wish for this item to be considered under either Teaching <u>OR</u> Scholarship

8. Served as the primary research mentor of a post-doctoral fellow [can be counted unlimited times]

Category C – (Weighting = 2 points)

- 1. Managed or submitted one additional extramural grant as PI/Co-PI [can be counted unlimited times]
- 2. Published a first or senior authored manuscript in an APTA-sponsored or Q1/Q2 peer-reviewed, scientific journal [can be counted unlimited times]
 - If the faculty member is a co-first author (i.e., contributing equally with listed first-author) or only field expert on an interdisciplinary publication, indicate in narrative.

Evaluation of Service

The Doctor of Physical Therapy Program expects all of its faculty members to document a pattern of significant, high-quality service related to the University (i.e., at the Program, College, and/or University level), profession, and/or community at large. It is expected that all service activity is congruent with professional and ethical guidelines (i.e., academic and professional).

Faculty members will document their service activities annually according to College-wide Annual Performance Evaluation guidelines.

- **UNSATISFACTORY in Service:** Meets 0 of the following criteria for *MEETS EXPECTATIONS in Service*
- DOES NOT MEET EXPECTATIONS in Service: Meets 1 of the following criteria for MEETS
 EXPECTATIONS in Service
- MEETS EXPECTATIONS in Service: Meets 2 or all 3 of the following criteria for MEETS
 EXPECTATIONS in Service per the College of Health Sciences Guidelines for Annual
 Performance Evaluations:

Faculty member wrote a self-reflection narrative (300-500 words) explaining the quality of service impacts, including service on organized institutional (Program, Department, College, and University), professional, and public service engagements. Administrative assignments are counted within the service distribution. If there is an administrative assignment, faculty must articulate the duties, outcomes, and deliverables of the assignment and explain how much service is attributed to the administrative role versus service attributed to the faculty role in the "Administrative Assignments" link within Digital Measures.

For service attributable to the faculty role, faculty member participated on a minimum of one organized institutional (Program, Department, College, or University), professional, or public service engagement (as appropriate for title/rank) for every 5% service distribution.

For faculty assigned with 10% for clinical services, a minimum of 4 hours a week in the clinic are expected.

- EXCEEDS EXPECTATIONS in Service

For every 10% service distribution, faculty must have evidence of <u>at least 8 additional</u> <u>points</u> of service to earn EXCEEDS EXPECTATIONS in Service (in addition to meeting above criteria for MEETS EXPECTATIONS) - <u>OR</u> - shows evidence of at least one of the following:

- Earned a formal service &/or leadership award (at college, university, community, state, national, or international level)
- Earned &/or appointed to an honorary position related to leadership at the college or university level (e.g., Provost fellow)
 - NOTE: If the appointment is a 1-year appointment and it crosses 2 calendar years, this counts only towards first year of appointment
- Served as President of the Faculty Senate
 - NOTE: This 2-year term counts only towards first 2 calendar years of appointment

Category A - (Weighting = 1 point) - Each item below counts as 1 point. You can count each item twice for a maximum of 2 points. (For example, you can use item 1 below twice to indicate that you mentored two different new or adjunct faculty members in teaching.)

- 1. Mentored new or adjunct faculty in teaching in a structured format (e.g., regular meetings)
 - 2. Mentored new or adjunct faculty in research in a structured format (e.g., regular meetings) [must be different faculty member(s) than for #1]
 - 3. Presented educational content at the college or university-level (e.g., faculty development workshops)
 - 4. Presented educational content to the community
 - 5. Served as a reviewer for a peer-reviewed journal(s) or book chapter(s)
 - 6. Served as a reviewer for a textbook
 - 7. Served as external reviewer for tenure and/or promotion candidate from other universities
 - 8. Served as faculty judge for Undergraduate Research Symposium or Graduate Expo
 - 9. Provided pro bono clinical services beyond clinical services assignment

Category B - (Weighting = 2 points) - Each item below counts as 2 points. You can count each item twice for a maximum of 4 points. (For example, you can use item 1 below twice to indicate that you served on 2 program committees.)

- 1. Served as a member on a program committee (e.g., search committee)
- 2. Served as a member on a department-level committee (e.g., APE Evaluation Committee)
- 3. Served as a member on a college-level committee or group (e.g., Faculty Development Committee)
- 4. Served as a member on a university-level committee or group (e.g., Faculty Senator, Faculty Senate Committee member, Graduate Council)
- 5. Served as a committee member in a community-based organization (e.g., review

UTEP DPT Faculty Copyright © 2024. For permission to use for educational purposes, contact UTEP DPT program at DPT@utep.edu

- committee in Paso del Norte Foundation)
- Served on a committee in a professional organization on the local, state, national, or international level (e.g., education committee; grant review committee; conference abstract review committee)
- 7. Served as proposal reviewer at the program, department, college, or university-level (e.g., internal grant proposal)
- 8. Served as faculty advisor to a Registered Student Organization (RSO)
- 9. Participated substantively in writing accreditation / re-accreditation self-study report
- 10. Led the planning for and implementation of local academic activities, such as workshops and colloquia

Category C - (Weighting = 3 points) – Each item below counts as 3 points. You can count each item twice for a maximum of 6 points. (For example, you can use item 1 twice to indicate that you served as a chair/co-chair on 2 different program committees.)

- 1. Served as a chair / co-chair on a program committee (e.g., search committee)
- 2. Served as a chair / co-chair on a department-level committee (e.g., APE Evaluation Committee)
- 3. Served as a chair / co-chair on a college-level committee or group (e.g., Faculty Development)
- 4. Served as a chair / co-chair on a university-level committee or group (e.g., Faculty Senate Committee, Graduate Council)
- 5. Served on a chair / co-chair on committee in a professional organization (e.g., Scholarship Committee in El Paso Speech and Language Hearing Association)
- 6. Served in a leadership role in accreditation self-study
- 7. Served on the board of a professional organization
- 8. Served on a national governmental commission, task force, or advisory board
- 9. Organized or co-organized a regional, state, national, or international conference
- 10. Served on an editorial board or as an editor / co-editor for a peer-reviewed journal
- 11. Served on accreditation reviews of other universities and professional/national/international boards

Policy # Faculty 5: Returning Documents to Students

	Effective: 10/12/01
Revised: 11/30/11; 01/06/16; 04/21/21	Reviewed: 01/12/12; 11/16/16

Definition: This policy outlines the expectations for grading assignments and assessments.

Purpose: To grade assignments and assessments in order to give timely feedback to enhance learning outcomes.

Standard: All core and associated faculty will return will grade assignments and assessments within 2 weeks of submission deadline. (CAPTE Standard 5E)

- 1. The faculty will post grades for assignments and assessments within 2 weeks of submission deadline.
- 2. One exception to this rule occurs when 2 or more documents (e.g., a project and an exam) are turned in to the instructor within the 2-week time period. The students should allow an additional week of the instructor's time for each additional group of documents turned in by the class.
- 3. A second exception to this rule will be final exams and final projects. These items will be graded prior to the University's deadline for course grade submission
- 4. Capstone advisors will follow the same 2-week rule in providing feedback to the student (assuming students submit documents by stated deadlines).

Policy # Faculty 6: Professional Development Funding for Core Faculty

	Effective: 08/28/18
Revised:	Reviewed: 04/21/21

Definition: This policy outlines professional developing funding for Core Faculty.

Purpose: According to the Doctor of Physical Therapy Program's Strategic Plan, core faculty members are required to attend at least one faculty development activity related to their teaching content, to general teaching/learning, and/or to clinical reasoning annually.

Standard: All core faculty will have the opportunity to attend professional development activities and/or to present their scholarship products partially supported by the DPT Program. Funding will be provided through the UTEP DPT Application Fee fund. (CAPTE Standard 4E, 4H)

- 1. Each DPT core faculty will have \$1,250 per Fiscal Year to spend on professional development.
- 2. These funds can be rolled-over for up to 3 years (total of \$3,750) if faculty is interested in attending more expensive activities.
- 3. Faculty desiring to roll-over funds (from one year to the next) need to formally notify the Program Director at least 90 days before the Fiscal Year ends (by May 30th).
- 4. Faculty presenting at a conference (e.g., first or last [senior] author of an abstract; invited lecture; accepted program presentation) may ask for another \$500 per conference toward travel costs. Official acceptance or invitation letter must be submitted to the Program Director at least 30 days before the conference.
- 5. All previously described amounts might change if the DPT Application Fee fund is no longer sustainable. Any change of the previously described amounts will be communicated to DPT Faculty by the Program Director at least 60 days before the Fiscal Year ends.

Policy # Faculty 7: Funds Distribution from Research Indirect Costs

	Effective: 09/01/23
Revised:	Reviewed:

Definition: This policy outlines the allocation of funds from research indirect costs that come back to the Department.

Purpose: To clarify and standardize the departmental use of funds received from awarded research grants that are eligible for indirect costs.

- 1. Research indirect costs range from 0% to 53.5%. In general, foundation grants (e.g., Texas PT Foundation, foundation for PT, American heart Association, Paso del Norte health Foundation, etc.) are eligible for 0 to 10% in indirect costs. Federal grants (e.g., NIH, NSF, DoD, etc.) are eligible for 30 to 53.5%, which are negotiated by the institution.
- 2. The principal investigator (PI) on the grant and the Department would receive up to ~1% of the indirect costs each.
- 3. The funds assigned to the PI will be added to the PI's professional development funds and need to be used within 3 years.
- 4. The funds assigned to the Department, which are at the discretion of the Department Chair, will be added to the Pl's professional development funds and need to be used within 3 years.
- 5. The funds can be used for professional development, membership fees, or research expenditures, including purchasing lab supplies, hiring staff, or compensating research participants.
- 6. The Department Chair can modify the distribution of the funds assigned to the Department based on the most current Strategic Plan.

Policy # Faculty 8: Student Advising

	Effective: 05/28/24
Revised:	Reviewed:

Definition: This policy outlines the Faculty responsibilities advising students.

Purpose: To clarify and standardize the academic advising that Faculty members must perform to enhance students success.

- 1. Advisees will be assigned to the academic advisor in the first semester in the program (Summer 1).
- 2. The number of advisees assigned in Summer 1 will depend on the number of upperclass advisees each faculty has and/or current faculty's research and service commitments.
- 3. During the first 2 semesters (Summer 1 and Fall 1), advisors will meet with each advisee once per month to enhance the student's success.
- 4. During the third semester (Spring 1), advisees will transition to their capstone/research advisors, who will become the student's academic advisors.
- 5. During the third semester (Spring 1), advisors will meet with each advisee once every other month or "as needed".
- 6. Advising meetings in Year 2 will evolve from once every other month to "as needed", depending on the academic progress of the advisee.
- 7. Faculty will document each advising meeting and save their advising form in the student's electronic folder. This is important as students might have more than one advisor during their tenure in the program and documentation helps new advisors to keep track of academic progress.

Section III: Students

Policy # Students 1: Scholastic Standards

	Effective: Spring semester 2019
Revised: 01/15/19; 04/21/21	Reviewed:

Definition: This policy establishes The University of Texas at El Paso (UTEP) Doctor of Physical Therapy (DPT) Program scholastic standards. Failure to meet the scholastic standards may result in academic probation and potential dismissal for a student.

Background: The DPT Program encourages and supports students in accomplishing high academic standards. It is recognized, however, that a student may encounter difficulty from time to time. In such cases a student's course instructor, advisor, Program Director, and/or the University Counseling Center stand ready to assist the student.

Purpose: In an effort to encourage high academic standards for DPT students, the DPT Program has established the following policy concerning academic probation, clinical experience expectations, and potential dismissal from the DPT Program. This policy supplements the UTEP academic regulations (as found in the UTEP Graduate Catalog).

Standard: All students acknowledge receipt of this policy in their DPT Student Handbook. (CAPTE Standard 5B, 5E)

General Procedures:

- Academic Probation and Dismissal: Please refer to the current UTEP Graduate Catalog for policies on academic probation and dismissal (http://catalog.utep.edu/grad/academic-regulations/curriculum-and-classroom-policies/).
- 2. Scholastic Standards: Please refer to the current UTEP DPT Program Student Handbook.

Policy # Students 2: Student Complaints

	Established: 10/22/01
Revised: 11/30/11; 01/06/16; 04/21/21	Reviewed: 01/12/12

Definition: This policy establishes the procedures through which the Doctor of Physical Therapy (DPT) Program will handle complaints from students concerning non-academic and academic issues.

Purpose: The faculty has an obligation to the students and the University to provide a supportive learning environment. If the student feels that this environment is not optimal for learning, they have a right to file a complaint. This policy outlines how those complaints will be handled.

Standard: The University and Program policies will protect the rights of the students in the DPT Program to file a complaint. (CAPTE Standard 5B)

General Procedures:

1. Student Complaints: Please refer to the current UTEP DPT Program Student Handbook (Other General Procedures).

Policy # Students 3: Student Safety, Privacy, and Dignity

	Established: 10/22/01
Revised: 11/30/11; 01/06/16; 11/16/16; 04/21/21	Reviewed: 01/12/12

Definition: This policy addresses all of the Doctor of Physical Therapy (DPT) Program's student safety policies, and how they affect the DPT students.

Purpose: The DPT Program has an obligation to ensure students are safe in their learning environment and understand that their privacy and dignity will be maintained.

Standards: Student safety is a priority in academic and clinical education. (CAPTE Standard 5D)

Policies:

- 1. Safety, Security and Emergency Procedures:
 - a. Students are provided Campbell Building emergency evacuation procedures in their DPT Student Handbook.
 - b. Students are provided the document "Safety and Security Information" which contains responsibilities, key phone numbers and links to key safety and security programs for the Program, the Campbell Building, and UTEP.
- 2. Laboratory Safety:
 - a. Each student must sign and comply with the "Statement of Responsibility for Physical Safety" found in their DPT Student Handbook
 - b. The Program's Administrative Assistant places the signed policy in each student's permanent record.
- 3. Hazardous Materials:
 - a. Students are exposed to potentially hazardous materials.
 - b. See Student Policy 4 of this document for more information.
 - c. Material Data Safety Sheets for chemicals students could be exposed to within the Campbell Building are located in the Program's Administrative Assistant's office, Anatomy Lab, and rooms 113 and 115.
- 4. Equipment: All electric equipment is calibrated and checked annually by an outside company.
- 5. Clinical Education:
 - a. Each student must sign the "Memorandum of Understanding Student Consent for Clinical Educational Experience", which describes their rights and risks of participating in clinical education.
 - b. The Program's Administrative Assistant places the signed memorandum in each student's permanent record.
 - c. A copy of the memorandum is found in the DPT Student Handbook.
- 6. Faculty, staff, and students will immediately report:
 - a. Any problems with equipment to the DPT Program's Administrative Assistant, who will initiate the process for repair.
 - b. Any problems with the building to the DPT Program's Administrative Assistant or

UTEP DPT Faculty Copyright © 2024. For permission to use for educational purposes, contact UTEP DPT program at DPT@utep.edu

- the Campbell Building's Building Manager.
- 7. In the event of an incident or injury, the individuals who are involved will complete what they can on the Supervisor's Incident and Injury Report (found at http://www.ehs.utep.edu/forms.html) and submit it to the Program Director within 24 hours. The Program Director will finalize and submit report.

Policy # Students 4: Conduct and Safety in the Human Anatomy Teaching Laboratory

/12

Definition: The rules are for student conduct and safety in the Human Anatomy Teaching Laboratory.

Purpose: The rules will inform Doctor of Physical Therapy (DPT) students how they are expected to act and will promote safety.

Standard: Respect for the cadavers and student safety are priorities in the Human Anatomy Teaching Laboratory. (CAPTE Standard 5D)

General Procedures:

- 1. Human Anatomy Teaching Laboratory policies and procedures: Please refer to the current DPT Student Handbook.
- 2. Material Data Safety Sheets for chemicals students could be exposed to within the Human Anatomy Teaching Laboratory are located inside the Human Anatomy Teaching Laboratory office.

Policy # Students 5: Full-time Enrollment

	Effective: 9/1/17
Revised:	Reviewed: 01/10/18; 04/21/21

Definition: This policy describes full-time enrollment status for Doctor of Physical Therapy (DPT) students which differs from the University definition of full-time enrollment. UTEP defines full-time enrollment for graduate students as 9 credit hours in the fall and spring semesters.

Purpose: The purpose of this policy is to inform the Graduate School and/or Office of Scholarships of the DPT Program's definition of full-time enrollment.

Standard: The DPT Program has one semester in which students are enrolled for 7 credit hours, but are in the clinic full-time. Thus, when a student is enrolled in a full-time clinical experience (8-12 weeks), it will meet the requirement for full-time enrollment in the DPT Program. (CAPTE Standard 3G)

Conditions:

- 1. The 9th semester in the curriculum includes PT 6606 which is a 12-week clinical internship. Students are enrolled for 7 credit hours. This will meet the requirement for full-time enrollment.
- 2. If a student has to repeat a full-time clinical experience in the fall or spring semester and is enrolled in fewer than 9 credit hours, this will also constitute full-time enrollment.
- 3. Students who meet the above conditions are eligible for scholarships in which full-time enrollment is a requirement.

Section IV: Curriculum

Policy # Curriculum 1: Curriculum Assessment

	Effective: 10/18/01
Revised: 11/30/11;01/06/16;11/16/16; 04/21/21	Reviewed: 01/12/12;01/10/18

Definition: The Doctor of Physical Therapy (DPT) Program curriculum plan is based on: (1) information about the contemporary practice of physical therapy; (2) standards of practice; and (3) current literature, documents, publications, and other resources related to the profession, to physical therapy professional education, and to educational theory.

Purpose: To ensure a current, responsive, and dynamic curriculum that will meet the needs of the students, Program, and profession.

Standard: There is an ongoing and formal assessment of the curriculum. (CAPTE Standard 2C)

Procedures:

Administration

- 1. The Curriculum Committee manages the Program curriculum.
- 2. The Curriculum Committee Chair and members are appointed prior to the beginning of the academic year by the Program Director.
- 3. The Curriculum Committee meets at least once a semester during the Fall and Spring semesters.
- 4. The Curriculum Committee Chair calls these meetings and appoints tasks to the members of the committee.
- The Curriculum Committee Chair in coordination with the Committee members and the Program Director ensures that assessment data are collected from various stakeholders through various mechanisms.

Evaluation:

- 1. Data from the curriculum assessment are provided to all core faculty members for their review.
- 2. The core faculty collectively consider the results of the curriculum evaluation at least annually to determine the need for any changes.
- 3. Changes to the curriculum are voted on, and decisions will be based on a present majority vote of the core faculty in person or electronically. If no majority vote is reached, the final decision rests with the Program Director. These decisions will reflect the guidelines set out in the guiding documents of the Program, profession, and governing bodies of the Program.
- 4. In response to immediate needs, the Curriculum Committee or individual faculty member can call for an as needed review of the curriculum item of concern. The concern will be presented to the faculty and voted on using prior procedures outlined.

UTEP DPT Faculty Copyright © 2024. For permission to use for educational purposes, contact UTEP DPT program at DPT@utep.edu

- Only in the most urgent situations will the curriculum be revised in this way as to avoid loss of plan and vision of the curriculum.
- 5. The Curriculum Committee Chair and Program Director are responsible for ensuring that appropriate approval is gained from authorities outside the DPT Program (eg, College of Health Sciences Academic Affairs Committee, UTEP Graduate Council) for any curricular changes requiring their approval prior to the implementation of these curricular changes.
- 6. The Curriculum Committee Chair is responsible for ensuring that curriculum assessment data are maintained on the DPT Program's shared online site for DPT faculty access.
- 7. The Curriculum Committee Chair is responsible for ensuring that relevant curriculum assessment data are maintained on the University's Compliance Assist site for University accreditation purposes.

Section V: Admissions

Policy # Admissions 1: Admissions

	Effective: 9/10/09
Revised: 11/30/11; 01/06/16; 11/16/16; 01/15/19;	Reviewed: 01/12/12
04/21/21; 05/12/2023	

Definition: This policy describes the procedures for student recruitment and admission into the Doctor of Physical Therapy (DPT) Program and evaluation of these procedures.

Purpose: The purpose is to make sure prospective students are made aware of procedures that affect the application process.

Standard: Prospective students are notified of relevant information, and admission policies are consistent with UTEP Graduate School policy and applicable laws and regulations. (CAPTE Standards 2B, 5A, 5B)

Recruitment:

- 1. Core faculty members participate in UTEP recruitment fairs/activities annually.
- 2. Core faculty members present to UTEP Bachelors in Rehabilitation Sciences students every Fall and Spring semesters.
- 3. An onsite and/or virtual visit for prospective students is held at least annually.
- 4. The DPT Program participates in the Physical Therapist Centralized Application Service (PTCAS).
- 5. The DPT Program maintains an updated DPT Program Web site with information under "Prospective Students" for the DPT Program (https://www.utep.edu/chs/pt/academic-programs/Prospective Students.html).

Requirements for admission:

- 1. Completion of a Bachelor degree
- 2. Completed Physical Therapy application available at http://www.ptcas.org/home.aspx by set deadline
- 3. Official transcripts from all universities or colleges attended must be received by PTCAS by the PTCAS deadline
- 4. Completion of 38 hours of required prerequisite courses prior to matriculation
- 5. A minimum overall GPA of 3.0 (on a 4.0 scale)
- 6. A minimum GPA of 3.0 (on a 4.0 scale) for prerequisite courses.
- 7. Fifty (50) clock hours of documented volunteer or paid work experience in a physical therapy setting under the supervision of a licensed physical therapist
- 8. One recommendation from a physical therapist who supervised your work or volunteer experience in a Physical Therapy clinical setting

UTEP DPT Faculty Copyright © 2024. For permission to use for educational purposes, contact UTEP DPT program at DPT@utep.edu

- 9. Two recommendations from individuals concerning the attributes which qualify you for this program. (See www.ptcas.org for qualifying recommenders)
- 10. Payment of a non-refundable application fee, paid through the program UStore
- 11. For foreign applicants, transcripts must be certified by World Education Services (as described on PTCAS website) and received by PTCAS by the PTCAS deadline
- 12. For foreign applicants educated in non-English speaking countries, completion of TOEFL is required and received by PTCAS deadline (minimum score: 79)

Current PTAs or SPTs enrolled or dismissed from other PT education programs:

Students who are either current physical therapist assistants (PTAs), enrolled in another PT program, or have been dismissed from another PT program must go through the same application process as any other student applicant. No prior PT or PTA course material will be transferred for credit toward the UTEP DPT degree.

Admission Decisions:

- 1. Applications are accepted from approximately July 1 to November 1 of each year (the exact dates are posted on PTCAS and the UTEP DPT Program Web site).
- 2. Applicants are scored based on:
 - a. Overall GPA
 - b. Last 60 hours GPA
 - c. Prerequisite GPA
 - d. Math and Science GPA
- 3. Based on these scores, a minimum of 50% of qualified applicants are holistically reviewed by the faculty using a pre-determined rubric approved by the Faculty, which includes but not limited to:
 - a. Work history
 - b. Community Service
 - c. Extracurricular activities (eg research, service, leadership, athletics)
 - d. Letters of recommendation
 - e. PTCAS essay question
- 4. The core faculty meet after review of all applications to determine status (Acceptance, Wait List, and Denial) for each applicant for the incoming cohort.
- 5. To fulfill the mission of our Program and the needs of our community, at least 40% of the initial offers will go to applicants from the region.
- 6. If an accepted student declines the offer, the Program selects an applicant from the alternate list.
- 7. Each accepted student is required to submit a non-refundable deposit within 5 business days of confirmation of acceptance to hold their position in the Program. Once the student matriculates into the Program (i.e., start classes in the DPT Program), the deposit will be applied towards their tuition. If the student does not submit their deposit by the stated date, then the offer will be rescinded.

Communication with Potential Applicants and Applicants:

1. Email is the primary mode of communication with all potential applicants in order to

UTEP DPT Faculty Copyright © 2024. For permission to use for educational purposes, contact UTEP DPT program at DPT@utep.edu

- standardize responses to questions and document communication.
- 2. Once the applicants have applied, all electronic communication is through PTCAS.
- 3. Notification of Acceptance/Wait List/Denial is made through PTCAS by January 31 of each year.

Evaluation of Recruitment and Admissions Process:

- 1. Core faculty will review admissions process at end of admissions cycle and at regular faculty meetings.
- 2. At least every 3 years, the Admission Committee will fully evaluate prerequisites and admission requirement and report to all core faculty at annual January retreat &/or faculty meetings.
- 3. If any changes are proposed, changes are voted on and decisions will be based on a majority vote of the core faculty in person or electronically.

Policy # Admissions 2: Admissions Compliance

	Effective: 9/1/17
Revised:	Reviewed: 01/10/18; 04/21/21

Definition: This policy describes the procedures for Doctor of Physical Therapy (DPT) student compliance information gathering. Compliance information required for admission includes a criminal background check (CBC) and drug screen.

Purpose: The purpose is to make sure prospective students are made aware of compliance requirements that affect the admissions process.

Standard: Students who have been offered admission to the DPT Program and accept the offer of admission understand admission and compliance policies consistent with the UTEP Graduate School policy and applicable laws and regulations. (CAPTE Standards 2B, 5A, 5B)

Compliance requirements:

- 1. Enrollment in the DPT Program requires each student to undergo and pass a CBC and drug screen prior to matriculation.
- 2. The student is responsible for paying for the cost of the CBC and drug screen.
- 3. The student is required to obtain all immunizations required by the State of Texas and clinical affiliates.

Compliance deadlines:

- 1. Applications are accepted from approximately July 1 to November 1 of each year (the exact dates are posted on PTCAS and the UTEP DPT Program Web site).
- 2. Notification of Acceptance/Wait List/Denial is made through PTCAS by January 31 of each year.
- 3. Upon receiving the DPT Program welcome letter, the student has 21 calendar days to complete the CBC and drug screen.
- 4. If the student fails to submit evidence of completion of the CBC and drug screen by the 22nd day, the offer of admission will be rescinded.
- 5. If the student is offered admission with less than 21 days before classes begin, s/he must show evidence of ordering the background check and drug screen within 72 hours of receiving the Graduate School official notification of admission. If the order has not been placed within the time frame, then the offer of admission will be rescinded. If there is not sufficient time to obtain results due to a late admission offer, the student cannot begin classes until the results have been obtained. In either case, offers of admission will be rescinded if the student does not pass the CBC or drug screen.

Communication with Admitted Students:

- 1. Each student will be given all information necessary to complete the CBC and drug screening in the offer of admission from the DPT Program.
- 2. Each student will receive their student identification number in the acceptance letter from the Graduate School.

Evaluation of Compliance Enforcement Process:

- 1. The DPT Program Admission Committee will review this process annually and make recommendations to the core faculty.
- 2. At least every 3 years, the Admission Committee will fully evaluate the compliance requirements and process. The Admission Committee will report to all core faculty at the annual January retreat &/or faculty meetings.
- 3. Proposed changes will be voted upon and decisions will be based on a majority vote of the core faculty in person or electronically.

Section VI: Outcomes

Policy # Assessment 1: Assessment & Planning

	Effective: 10/12/01
Revised: 11/30/11; 01/06/16; 04/21/21	Reviewed: 01/12/12

Definition: This policy describes the Doctor of Physical Therapy (DPT) Program Assessment and Planning procedures.

Purpose: The Program engages in ongoing, formal, and comprehensive self-assessment and planning for the purpose of Program improvement.

Standard: Outcomes of the Program are assessed on a regular basis as noted in procedures. (CAPTE Standards 1C, 2A, 2C, 2D)

- 1. Under the leadership of the Program Director, the core faculty participate in a formal strategic planning process (at least every 4 years) in which at least the following elements are examined, and revised if necessary, to reflect the University and College's mission and vision, and contemporary physical therapist practice:
 - a. Program Mission
 - b. Program Vision
 - c. Program Philosophy
 - d. Program goals and measurable outcomes
 - e. Program Assessment Plan
- 2. The Program Director is responsible for ensuring that the Program has an ongoing, formal, comprehensive Program Assessment Plan and processes that align with the DPT Program Strategic Plan and accreditation expectations.
- The Program Assessment Plan is designed to identify strengths and weaknesses of the Program and guide faculty to make appropriate changes based on numerous data sources.
- 4. The Program Director is responsible for ensuring that:
 - a. The DPT Program Assessment Plan is maintained on the DPT Program's shared online site for DPT faculty access.
 - b. Data are collected and analyzed annually according to the DPT Program Assessment Plan.
 - c. Data and results of annual assessment re maintained on the DPT Program's shared online site for DPT faculty access.
 - d. Results of annual assessment are maintained on the University's Compliance Assist site for University accreditation purposes.