

COLLEGE OF FINE ARTS SCHOOL OF DANCE

Retention, Promotion, and Tenure (RPT) Statement for Tenure-line Faculty

Approved by School Tenure-line Faculty: January 19, 2017

Approved by Dean: June 22, 2017

Approved by Senate Faculty Review Standards Committee on April 26, 2018, and the Senior Vice President on April 26, 2018, for implementation on July 1, 2017.

This document serves as the School's Statement of RPT criteria, standards, evidence and procedures required by University Policy. This Statement along with relevant University Policies—Policy 6-303, found at <http://regulations.utah.edu/academics/6-303.php>, and Policy 6-311, found at <http://regulations.utah.edu/academics/6-311.php>— govern the retention, promotion, and tenure process.

SCHOOL MISSION STATEMENT:

The mission of the University of Utah's School of Dance is to contribute to the growth of the discipline of dance through research, teaching, and service of the highest caliber. The School's dedication to promoting student and faculty growth as professional dance artists, critical thinkers, and community members propels the School towards excellence, creativity, collaboration, and innovation.

School of Dance Values:

- 1) Faculty and students are expected to maintain the highest standards of creative work, scholarship, pedagogic practice, and service.
- 2) Research is seen as fundamental to student learning and to the bridging of academia to the professional world.
- 3) The highest professional commitment is required from both faculty and students, with substantive School investment in recruitment, hiring, and retention.
- 4) Diversity is seen as integral to student learning, and therefore diversity is embraced and celebrated.
- 5) Creative and intellectual integrity is required; professional discipline is expected.
- 6) The School is committed to the profession through generating new knowledge; conducting, presenting, and documenting creative and scholarly research; and/or preserving historical traditions.

Expectations of Faculty:

Reflecting the School's mission, faculty members in the School of Dance are appointed on the basis of meritorious artistic and/or scholarly skills, with experience in and/or knowledge of dance as an art form. They are expected to possess exceptional teaching capabilities; to contribute through artistic and/or scholarly research and service to the university at large, community, and state; and to have an impact on dance at a national and/or international level. All faculty members in the School will hold a terminal degree or have commensurate

professional experience.¹ It is also of paramount importance that each faculty member's professional activities be compatible with the goals in this mission statement and enumerated in the criteria listed below under Research, Teaching, and Service. In addition, each faculty member will:

- 1) uphold School policies that have been accepted by a majority of the faculty
- 2) exhibit respect for opinions differing from her/his own position
- 3) continually work to develop and revise mutually acceptable goals for the School
- 4) support the work of colleagues
- 5) have a knowledge of the University milieu and an understanding of the role of the School of Dance in an institution of higher learning
- 6) understand the demands and opportunities of the profession, including national trends
- 7) exhibit support for the mission and values of the School of Dance, which places equal importance on the artistic, scholarly, and educational values of dance
- 8) demonstrate citizenship through a willingness and ability to engage in professional work in ways that are consistent with the advancement of the mission, vision, and values of the School, College, and University

The School recognizes that the fields known as "classical ballet, contemporary ballet, contemporary dance, and modern dance" are expanding and may include multiple and diverse movement forms and research interests. For the purposes of this Statement, the term "dance" refers to all dance genres taught and researched in the School of Dance.

¹ Experience commensurate with an MFA or other terminal degree in dance means that an external evaluator's or a candidate's professional experience be of the same extent, duration, measure, and standard as the criteria for earning the equivalent terminal degree. A tenure-line appointment would not be made unless the School faculty, Director, and Dean determine that prior experience is indeed commensurate with the requirement of a terminal degree, specifically the MFA or PhD. Similarly, an external evaluation would not be requested if the evaluator did not have appropriate commensurate experience. Commensurate Experience might include, but is not limited to, the following criteria:

- Directing and presenting a professional dance company over numerous years
- Having developed and maintained a professional reputation acknowledged by peer professionals as a performer and/or choreographer, dance media artist, or scholar
- Producing research projects continuously over time at a high level of acclaim from reviewers and critics
- Having a substantial record of master teaching nationally and/or internationally
- Receiving national grant support for the creation of new work and/or reconstruction of historical work
- Participating meritoriously in the milieu of the professional dance world through modeling best practices, mentorship, and other notable contributions such as authoring books, articles, and conference presentations
- Serving professionally in the dance field: locally, regionally, nationally and/or internationally.

Table of Contents

1.. Effective Date and Application to Existing Faculty	4
2. Informal and Formal Reviews	4
2.1. Timing of Reviews and Length of Probationary Period	4
2.2. Informal Reviews	5
2.3. Triggering Formal Retention Reviews	5
2.4. Candidates Hired at the Rank of Associate Professor or Professor without Tenure ..	5
2.5. Request for Promotion to Rank of Professor	6
3. RPT Guidelines	6
3.1. Summary of RPT Standards	6
3.2. Evaluation of Research	7
3.3. Evaluation of Teaching	9
3.4. Evaluation of Service	11
4.. RPT Procedures	12
4.1. Participants	12
4.2. Informal Review Procedures	13
4.3. Formal Review Procedures	15
Appendix A. RPT File Contents	18
Appendix B. Contents of the Curriculum Vitae	20
Appendix C. Senate Faculty Review Standards Committee and Senior Vice President Notices of Final Approval	22

1. Effective Date and Application to Existing Faculty

The revised RPT criteria, standards, evidence, and procedures contained in this Statement are effective as of July 1, 2017. All faculty member RPT candidates appointed on or after this date will be considered under this Statement of RPT criteria, standards, evidence and procedures.

With the exception of those candidates seeking promotion to Professor (see below), candidates whose appointments began prior to this date who are reviewed for retention, promotion, or tenure will have the option of choosing to be reviewed under either (1) the prior Modern Dance Department or Ballet Department RPT Statement that was in place at the time of their appointment or (2) this School of Dance RPT statement. This Statement will apply unless the candidate's choice of the prior requirements is communicated to the School Director and Dean by signed letter before review materials are sent to external evaluators.

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

2. Informal and Formal Reviews

2.1 Timing of Reviews and Length of Probationary Period

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

b. Normal probationary period. The normal probationary period for a candidate appointed at the rank of assistant professor is seven years. The normal probationary period for a candidate appointed without tenure at the rank of Associate Professor or Professor is five years.

Candidates with a seven-year probationary period undergo one formal mid-probationary retention review, in the fourth year.

Candidates with a five-year probationary period undergo one formal mid-probationary retention review, in the third year.

Table 1: Normal Review Schedule

Rank at Appointment	Years of Informal Reviews	Years of Formal Reviews
Assistant Professor	1 st , 2 nd , 3 rd , 5 th , 6 th	4 th , 7 th
Associate Professor or Professor (appointed without tenure)	1 st , 2 nd , 4 th	3 rd , 5 th

If a tenure-track faculty member does not clearly demonstrate adequate progress to the reviewers in an informal review, an early formal review may be “triggered” by the School RPT Advisory Committee or the School Director according to University Policy.

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

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

2.2 Informal Reviews

Informal reviews provide constructive feedback on progress and guidance on RPT expectations to candidates. A primary function of the informal review is to provide advice in developing the file that will be made available for the formal review process, with due attention to the materials appropriate to each of the three areas of evaluation: research as defined in 3.2 of this document; teaching; and service to the profession, university, and public.

2.3 Triggering Formal Retention Reviews

If, in the context of an informal review the candidate does not demonstrate clearly adequate progress, the School Director or a majority of the RPT Advisory Committee members may vote to conduct a formal review. A "triggered" formal review shall occur the following fall unless a majority of the Committee votes to proceed with the review in the current academic year. Such a review, however, must not be conducted sooner than 30 days after written notice of the review is provided to the candidate. A triggered formal review shall include external evaluator letters unless a majority of the Committee votes that quality and quantity of research are not at issue in the review.

2.4 Candidates Hired at the Rank of Associate Professor or Professor without Tenure

The School typically does not appoint new tenure-line faculty members at the Associate Professor or Professor rank without the concurrent granting of tenure. Under appropriate exceptional circumstances, however, a new faculty member may be appointed at the rank of Associate Professor or Professor without the immediate granting of tenure.

2.5 Request for Promotion to Rank of Professor

A tenured faculty member at the rank of Associate Professor may request a review for promotion to the rank of Professor at any time when she or he has met the requirements for that rank. The School does not require any minimum number of years subsequent to granting of tenure or promotion to Associate Professor before a candidate may be considered eligible for promotion to Professor. In general, however, such reviews do not occur until the beginning of the fifth year of service after one is tenured. All activities at the University of Utah after the initial granting of the rank of Associate Professor and tenure shall count towards promotion to the rank of Professor.

3. RPT Guidelines

A faculty member's stature is based on an assessment of achievements in the area of faculty responsibility and the three functions of faculty members, which are referred to as criteria in University Policy: (1) research, (2) teaching, and (3) service. Summary ratings of performance in each of these three areas serve as the standards for retention, promotion, and tenure. University Policy identifies a three-level scale of standards: *excellent*, *effective*, and *not satisfactory*.

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

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

<http://regulations.utah.edu/academics/6-316.php>.

3.1 Summary of RPT Standards

Retention: A candidate for retention must demonstrate that she or he has *reasonable potential* for meeting the standards established for tenure. It is unacceptable for a candidate to receive a ranking of "not satisfactory" in any area during the formal review for retention.

Tenure and Promotion to Associate Professor: A candidate for tenure and promotion to Associate Professor must achieve ratings of *excellent* in either research or teaching, at least sustained *effectiveness* in the other, and at least sustained *effectiveness* in service.

Professor: A candidate for promotion to this rank must achieve ratings of *sustained excellence* in research resulting in a national and international reputation in his or her field, *sustained excellence* in teaching, and at least *sustained effectiveness* in service.

3.2 Evaluation of Research

Research may include one or more of the below defined research areas: creative, scholarly, and/or community based participatory research (CBPR).

Judgments about a candidate's research are based on both the quality and quantity of research, as well as relevance to the academic community. The characteristics of productive research, however, may differ depending on the candidate's area(s) of specialization and professional goals. Therefore, assessments of research in the RPT process reflect professional judgments that take into account the quality and quantity of contributions, and the professional context of the candidate.

a. Description of research.

The School expects all faculty members to exhibit a well-founded and current knowledge of their particular area(s) of expertise, as well as knowledge and appreciation of broader dance in general.

Faculty members are evaluated differently in their respective areas: for example, professional performance experience is one indicator of performance ability; concert production of choreographic works is one indicator of capability and active involvement as a choreographer; historical research through restaging masterworks is one indicator of activity in bringing the traditions and creations of the past to life; screenings, exhibitions, and other public presentations of dance-related media and technology works are some indicators of active involvement in the broad field of dance media; and dissemination of scholarly work through peer-reviewed publications and presentations at professional meetings are some indicators of scholarly activity.

1) *Assessment factors.*

- a. *Quantity.* A minimum of one new project annually along with on-going productivity is expected, resulting in an average of one or more public presentations, performances, projects, or publications of work annually (exception to this expectation may be considered for research initiatives that require several years to complete).
- b. *Quality.* Quality of venue is highly variable in dance and is assessed in relation to the type of project being presented. Because dance often challenges how and where works are seen; innovative, non-traditional, and/or site-specific venues are accepted and encouraged. Geographic locations (University, community, national, and international) and prestige of the venues or presenting organizations are also relevant to quality. Research created with current students is highly valued in the School of Dance; this creative research serves as an incubator and complements additional required research off campus.
- c. *Impact.* It is expected that the candidate's research extends the understanding of dance and/or upholds standards as defined by the current field, and that the presentation of research goes beyond the university.

2) *Types of research.*

- a. *Creative research* includes, but is not limited to, choreography; performance; historical research, which can include the restaging and reconstruction of significant works; interdisciplinary projects; media/technology; and/or other generative or interpretive work. Creative research must be disseminated through production or presentation of the work in a credible venue that is appropriate to its genre, and/or through other equivalent contexts. Invitations and/or commissions to perform and/or create new work as well as the successful adjudication of a candidate's works are among the indicators of excellence in research. Creative research made in collaboration with other artists and scholars to support a singular work of art, so long as the candidate plays a unique and significant role in the research process, is viewed as equal to work made solely by one individual. Collaboration as a means to expand artistic vision and research possibilities is both valued and supported. All creative research must demonstrate appropriate attention given to the creation of new knowledge.
 - b. *Scholarly research* includes but is not limited to, design and implementation of research projects, theoretical investigation, and development of practical applications of those theories. Scholarly research must be disseminated through peer-reviewed publications (books, scholarly journals, or conference proceedings), and/or through other equivalent contexts. In addition, invited or peer-reviewed presentations at professional meetings are valid indicators of scholarly activity. Ideally, candidates would achieve a balance between impactful publications and impactful conference presentations.
 - c. *Community based participatory research (CBPR)* takes place in community settings and involves community members in the design and implementation of research projects. Such activities should demonstrate respect for the contributions made by community partners, as well as respect for the principle of "do no harm." CBPR research must be disseminated publicly and have an impact beyond those who participated in the research. Evidence may include: (i) publication of books, chapters, articles in peer-reviewed journals, and articles in highly-regarded non- peer-reviewed journals, (ii) presentation of research at professional meetings and/or invited lectures, and (iii) creative research disseminated in a credible venue that is appropriate to its genre, and/or through other equivalent contexts. It is the faculty member's responsibility to acquire Institutional Review Board (IRB) approval for projects that require such documentation according to University Policy.
- b. Research funding. Acquiring funding to support research is valued and strongly encouraged by the University and School, and is necessary to sustain the research mission of the University. All successful as well as unsuccessful efforts to obtain such funding will be considered as appropriate to contributing positively toward one's research. The School realizes, however, that funding for the arts is a challenge and that funding beyond the University is limited.

c. Summary rating scale for research. Ratings on the three-point scale below reflect the joint consideration of quantity, quality, and impact of research as described above.

Excellent: The candidate has made substantial, sustained contributions in one or more topic areas of research. The quality and quantity of research reflect a coherent agenda in at least one topic area. In addition, there is evidence that the candidate has made a significant impact on the profession at large.

Effective: The candidate has made acceptable, sustained contributions in one or more topic areas of research. The quality and quantity of research reflect a coherent agenda of work and suggest that significant contributions will be made over time. In addition, there is evidence that the candidate has made an impact on the profession at large.

Not Satisfactory: The candidate has made insufficient contributions in research. There is no particular impact beyond the University or immediate community.

3.3 Evaluation of Teaching

Within the University system, the term *teaching* refers to regularly scheduled instruction, curriculum and program development, directing undergraduate and/or graduate student work, counseling and advising of students in general, and other pedagogical activities. There are therefore four components of teaching: (1) course instruction, (2) curriculum and program developments, (3) student advising and mentoring, and (4) additional activities.

Through a combination of these activities, the School expects teachers to (1) promote students' learning; (2) continue to question, grow, and learn themselves; (3) serve as a model of curiosity and creativity for students and colleagues; (4) have a current understanding and knowledge of dance as a discipline; (5) demonstrate a connection between research and teaching;

(6) give clear, articulate, and verbal form to abstract and/or subtle ideas; (7) present materials in a well-organized manner both orally and in writing; (8) understand university students, respect their individuality, and work effectively with them, including as a mentor; and (9) stimulate students' desire to learn as evidenced by students' accomplishments.

Any candidate seeking promotion to Associate Professor must have teaching activity at the regional and/or national levels and must offer evidence of continual innovation and maturity as a teacher, and a Professor must possess a teaching expertise that contributes significantly to the School of Dance and may include teaching within the undergraduate as well as graduate curricula. Assistant Professors, Associate Professors, and Professors will contribute substantially to the graduate program and/or to graduate student committees.

a. Description of teaching.

- 1) *Course instruction*. Course instruction encompasses (a) classroom instruction, (b) online and distance education teaching, (c) the organization and facilitation of seminars and workshops that are related to curriculum needs, (d) studio teaching, (e) private instruction, and (f) independent instruction involving one or more students on special topics. Specific sources of information to evaluate the candidate's course instruction shall include: (a) the candidate's statement of teaching philosophy as

found in her/his personal statement; (b) the candidate's syllabi, assignments, and/or other teaching materials; (c) peer observation of the candidate's course instruction, seminars, workshops, and/or other public presentations (required in formal reviews only, but may be used in informal reviews, if available); (d) information from student course evaluations; and (e) Student Advisory Committee (SAC) reports (formal reviews only). Other information about teaching—including, for example, a teaching portfolio, teaching awards, or any evaluation of the candidate's teaching done by personnel from the University's Center for Teaching and Learning Excellence (CTLE)—may also be included if the candidate so chooses.

- 2) *Curriculum and program development.* Academic programs require significant investments of faculty time in ongoing curriculum/program development and maintenance. The contributions of a candidate to such efforts, beyond regular teaching assignments, may therefore be considered as part of contributions in the area of teaching. Examples of these kinds of contributions include the development and teaching of new courses and/or other teaching materials.
- 3) *Student advising and mentoring.* Work with undergraduate and graduate students outside of the classroom is also an important component of teaching. Activities of primary importance in this area include (a) general student advising and mentoring, (b) chairing and serving on graduate student committees, (c) supervising graduate teaching assistants, and (d) including students in research, as collaborators in creative work, and/or as co- authors in scholarly work. Contributions in this area are evaluated with respect to both quantity and quality.
- 4) *Additional activities.* Teaching may also include (a) invited teaching inside or outside the University; (b) teaching in the context of the choreographic process, such as directing students in rehearsals and mentoring and critiquing their choreographic investigations; and/or (c) other relevant activities.

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

Excellent: The candidate has made substantial, sustained contributions in areas of course instruction, curriculum/program development, and student advising and mentoring. An excellent teacher has an impact on the profession beyond the School. Further evidence of excellence in teaching may be shown by engaging in additional teaching activities.

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

Not Satisfactory: The candidate has made insufficient contributions in teaching. School and University duties are not fulfilled competently.

3.4 Evaluation of Service

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

The School encourages Assistant Professors to limit their service activity to the School during their first year on the tenure track, and this advice is taken into consideration when evaluating a candidate's service during the first two informal reviews. During other reviews within the probationary period, the candidate is expected to engage in service at the minimum at the School and/or College levels, but could also do so at the University, community, regional, or national levels. An Associate Professor is expected to exhibit a willingness to assume and fulfill more extensive service responsibilities than at the Assistant Professor level, not only within the School, but also at the College and/or University level, as well as at a regional, national, and/or international level. A Professor will be generally regarded as a leader locally and/or nationally. She or he is expected to serve as a mentor for the junior faculty and to exhibit a willingness to assume and fulfill more extensive service responsibilities than an Associate Professor, not only within the School and College, but also at a University, regional, national, and/or international level.

a. Description of service.

- 1) *Professional service.* This refers primarily to professional participation at a national and/or international level. Service in this category can be oriented toward professional organizations and include such activities as holding offices; participating in the organization or operation of conferences, competitions, or festivals; serving as chair, discussant, or reviewer for presentations at professional meetings; serving on various professional committees, panels, or boards (e.g., accreditation boards); presenting professional workshops; and serving as an artist or consultant (as appropriate within University guidelines) for other colleges, universities, or professional organizations. Significant professional service contributions can also include serving as editor, associate editor, editorial review board member, or regular reviewer for scholarly or professional journals or presses; and adjudication for professional organizations and competitions.
- 2) *University service.* This category refers to service within the University, including at the levels of the School, College, and overall institution. A candidate's shared-governance activities, including chairing and/or serving on standing and ad hoc committees, councils, and task forces; serving in administrative positions; or serving as a participant in official events at any of these levels, represent valuable University service contributions.
- 3) *Public service.* This category includes service related to the candidate's area of expertise in various local, regional, national, and/or international public settings and can take many forms, e.g., serving on boards and committees for governmental and/or non-profit organizations, consulting with and/or providing direct service to community agencies as appropriate within University guidelines, or presenting lectures, demonstrations, master classes, workshops, concerts, or choreography for state or community organizations.

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

Excellent: The candidate has made substantial, sustained contributions to the profession, the University, and/or the public. In addition, there is evidence that the candidate has made a significant impact on the profession at large.

Effective: The candidate has made acceptable, sustained contributions in service. The candidate shows sufficient commitment to service in at least one area, suggesting that the eventual contributions of the candidate will be significant. In addition, there is evidence that the candidate has made an impact on the profession at large.

Not Satisfactory: The candidate has made insufficient contributions in service. School and University duties are not fulfilled competently and there is no particular impact beyond the University or immediate community.

4. RPT Procedures

4.1 Participants

The following are the normal participants in RPT reviews:

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

b. School RPT Advisory Committee. As more fully described below, membership in and voting on the School RPT Advisory Committee are determined by University Policy. Qualified members of the RPT Advisory Committee may attend, participate in its meetings, and vote on its recommendations. The committee may agree to invite others to participate in the meeting as provided by University Policy. These other participants may not vote on recommendations.

c. RPT Advisory Committee Chair. The Chair of the RPT Advisory Committee is a tenured member of the School faculty, elected annually during the Spring Semester, with all tenure-line faculty members eligible to participate in the election.

d. RPT Advisory Committee Secretary. The RPT Advisory Committee Chair, in consultation with the RPT Advisory Committee, will appoint for each candidate under review a Secretary, who will prepare a summary report of the Committee's meeting, evaluation, and recommendations for that candidate.

e. School Director. The administrative head of the School.

f. Student Advisory Committee (SAC). A committee made up of undergraduate and graduate students in the School.

g. Peer Teaching Reviewers. Peer Teaching Reviewers are tenured faculty members who conduct peer reviews of teaching, selected by the RPT Advisory Committee Chair. Any RPT Advisory Committee member may serve as a peer teaching reviewer. All RPT Advisory Committee members, particularly those not writing a peer teaching review, are highly encouraged to observe the candidate teach in a variety of settings in order to provide the most comprehensive evaluation possible.

h. External Evaluators. These are creative artists and/or scholars from outside the University of Utah selected by the School Director—in consultation with the RPT Advisory Committee Chair, the RPT Advisory Committee, and the candidate—to evaluate the candidate's work. All external evaluators must have a demonstrated record of research excellence in the candidate's field and shall be at or above the academic rank for which the candidate is being considered in this promotion review, or they shall have commensurate professional experience equivalent to the rank for which the candidate is being considered.² An external evaluator shall not be a family member, advisor, or mentor of the candidate, and ordinarily shall not be a close collaborator with the candidate, although such a collaborator may be included along with a sufficient number of other evaluators. Candidates will have the opportunity before evaluations are solicited to identify these relationships as well as any conflicts with any potential evaluators. External evaluators will be provided with clearly presented and sufficient materials and guidelines for their review.

4.2 Informal Review Procedures

Informal reviews of tenure-track faculty shall take place in every year of the probationary period in which a formal review is not conducted.

a. Informal reviews after the first year.

These procedures apply for all informal reviews except for the first year.

The file materials provided by the candidate for an informal review shall normally consist of (1) an up-to-date CV; (2) a personal statement that includes a summary of the candidate's progress to date in the areas of research, teaching and service, a description of the research agenda, a description of teaching philosophy, and a description of current activities and future plans in research, teaching, and service; (3) evidence of research, and (4) syllabi. The candidate may choose to submit relevant supplementary material. These materials should be submitted by the candidate to the School Director by August 30 and may be updated until the close of files on September 15.

In the case of a candidate who has a portion of their full-time effort dedicated to a non-tenure-track appointment in another academic department or interdisciplinary academic program, the School Director shall notify the appropriate administrator of the other unit in writing of the informal review by April 15 and invite the unit to submit a report with that unit's perspective on the candidate's progress toward tenure, which should be submitted to the School prior to October 5. Any materials forthcoming from such a unit will be added to the RPT file and a copy provided to the candidate.

² See footnote 1 above for the definition of “commensurate experience.”

Course evaluation results from the University of Utah are added to the file by the School Director. Evaluations from other institutions may be added by the candidate.

If peer teaching reviews have been written in preparation to an upcoming formal review, these reviews may be referenced in a candidate's informal review, if they are available at the time of an informal review.

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

The School Director shall also invite (but not require) letters of appraisal from School peers.

The RPT Advisory Committee will meet to discuss the file and the RPT Advisory Committee Secretary (appointed by the Committee Chair) shall prepare a summary report of the meeting. After allowing an inspection period of not less than two business days nor more than five business days, and after such modifications as the Committee approves, the Secretary and Committee Chair shall sign the report, and then the Secretary shall forward the summary report to the School Director and the candidate, along with a list of all faculty members present at the meeting. After reviewing the candidate's file and the RPT Advisory Committee report, the School Director shall prepare her/his written recommendation to be included in the file. The candidate will then have the option to provide, within seven business days, a written statement in response to the report of the Committee and/or the recommendation of the School Director. After all informal reviews, the School Director shall meet with the candidate to discuss the report and her/his progress, and the School Director shall forward the file to the Dean. In addition, if during the informal review either the School Director or the RPT Advisory Committee give a ranking of "not satisfactory" in any area (research, teaching, or service), the School Director will set up a more formal mentoring structure to include the School Director, RPT Advisory Committee Chair, and any previously assigned faculty mentor. This structure will require more frequent contact, not only with the assigned mentor but also with the Director and RPT Advisory Committee Chair, to help the candidate improve in the specific area of concern. The informal review normally concludes at this point. If the School Director or a majority of the members of the RPT Advisory Committee conclude that circumstances call for triggering a formal review, one shall begin in accordance with University Policy.

b. First-Year Administrative Review. The first-year informal review will be conducted during the Spring Semester to ensure no serious problems have arisen. A part of the School mentoring program—which also includes providing a senior faculty member to serve as a mentor until tenure—this review is intended to encourage active, fruitful dialogue with new faculty. The School Director, the RPT Advisory Committee Chair, and a faculty mentor designated by the School Director will review the candidate's CV, research, teaching evaluations, and service, and will meet with the candidate to discuss the review and any problems with research, teaching, or service. The School Director and RPT Advisory Committee Chair will jointly author a summary of the discussion and recommendations, copied to the candidate and placed in the RPT file within ten days following the meeting. The candidate has the opportunity (but not the obligation) to make a written response to the review within seven business days following receipt of the summary, and any response shall be added to the RPT file.

4.3 Formal Review Procedures

A formal mid-probationary retention review, a formal tenure review, and a formal promotion (either to Associate Professor or to Professor) review all follow the same format, except that external evaluation letters are not solicited for a mid-probationary retention review.

a. School Director. By April 1, the School Director will determine the obligatory RPT reviews for the upcoming academic year, will notify in writing the faculty members required to be reviewed, and will invite any other tenured and tenure-track faculty members wishing to be reviewed formally for either promotion and/or tenure to so indicate in a letter to the School Director by April 15. For each candidate being reviewed for tenure and/or promotion, the School Director will request nominations from the candidate for external evaluators and request that she or he sign the waiver/non-waiver form governing the confidentiality of external evaluation letters.

At least three weeks prior to the convening of the RPT Advisory Committee, the School Director shall invite any interested faculty and staff members in the School to submit written statements for the file of each candidate to be considered.

In the case of a candidate who has a portion of their full-time effort dedicated to a non-tenure-track appointment in another academic department or interdisciplinary academic program, the School Director shall notify the administrator of the other unit in writing of the formal review by April 15 and invite the unit to submit a report with that unit's perspective on the question of retention, promotion, tenure, or promotion and tenure, which should be submitted to the School prior to October 5. Any materials forthcoming from the shared-appointment unit will be added to the RPT file and a copy provided to the candidate. The School Director will notify the Student Advisory Committee of candidates undergoing formal reviews by the first Friday of classes in the Fall semester, ensure that they are informed of proper methods for conducting the SAC evaluation, and inform them that reports shall be due to the School Director no later than September 15. The School Director must provide the candidate's relevant teaching and mentoring materials to the SAC no later than the first Friday of classes in the Fall semester. The SAC is to evaluate teaching and make RPT recommendations in accord with University Policy as appropriate with respect to each candidate to be considered, stating as specifically as possible the reasons for each recommendation. The SAC reports must be written, and the rationale for the distribution of votes should be noted in the report.

b. RPT Advisory Committee Chair. The elected RPT Advisory Committee Chair will convene the RPT Advisory Committee and assign a secretary for each candidate.

c. Peer Teaching Reviewers. The School RPT Advisory Committee Chair shall ensure that at least three Peer Teaching Reviewers conduct one peer teaching review each and submit the resulting materials for the candidate's file prior to any formal review. All members of the RPT Advisory Committee are strongly encouraged to observe the candidate teach in order to contribute substantially to the evaluation of the candidate's teaching in the RPT Advisory Committee meeting.

d. External Evaluators. For retention reviews, no external letters of evaluation are required. For tenure and/or promotion reviews, external letters of evaluation from outside of the University are required. By May 1, candidates must provide a list of five potential external evaluators and provide any information about potential conflicts. By June 1, the RPT Advisory Committee Chair, after consulting with the School Director and considering the list of potential evaluators submitted by the candidate as well as any information about any conflicts, will solicit no fewer than five external evaluations for each formal tenure review and formal promotion (either to Associate Professor or to Professor) review. At least one external evaluator will be from the candidate's list. The School Director will send potential external evaluators a standard solicitation letter, including notification of whether the candidate has or has not waived the right to see the evaluations, and will provide them with this RPT Statement. External evaluators shall be asked to submit their evaluations no later than September 15.

e. RPT file contents and file closing date. A candidate's file will open no later than August 15 and close no later than September 15 (except for any report from a shared-appointment unit [due October 5] and materials specified as being added subsequent to the Advisory Committee meeting).

- 1) *Candidate responsibilities for file contents*. Prior to June 1, the candidate is obligated to submit to the School Director to place in the candidate's file: (a) a current CV, (b) copies of publications and/or documentation of research, such as a digital copy of a performance or choreography, (c) a personal statement that includes a summary of the candidate's progress to date in the areas of research, teaching, and service; a description of the research agenda; a description of teaching philosophy; and a description of current activities and future plans in research, teaching, and service, and (d) course syllabi. The candidate may choose to submit other relevant materials, including course evaluations from outside the University.
- 2) *School responsibilities for file contents*. The School Director shall ensure that the file includes: (a) current University of Utah course evaluation results, (b) available SAC reports, (c) any written recommendations from School faculty and staff, (d) any reports from shared-appointment units, (e) external evaluator reports (treated as confidential as appropriate), (f) peer teaching reviews, (g) reports and recommendations from all past reviews, and (h) all other required materials.

f. Candidate's right to comment on file. A candidate has the right to submit a written response to any of her/his file contents no later than five business days after the file closing date.

g. School RPT Advisory Committee meeting and subsequent steps.

- 1) *School RPT Advisory Committee action*. The full RPT Advisory Committee will meet after receiving any required report for those with a non-tenure track appointment outside of the unit, but no later than October 15. Each Committee member is responsible for reviewing the file prior to the meeting. The Committee will discuss the record as it pertains to each of the relevant criteria (research, teaching, and service). Unless the majority moves to an executive session to exclude non-voting

participants per University Policy, the School Director may attend the meeting, and upon invitation by the majority of members may participate in the discussion and submit evidence and opinions, but shall not vote on the Committee's recommendations. Committee members will vote separately on a recommendation as to each RPT action for each candidate (e.g., a vote on recommendation for tenure is taken and recorded separately from a vote on recommendation for promotion of that candidate).

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

The report of the meeting should reflect the nature of the discussion with major points on both sides revealed. Both affirmative and negative votes should be explained. From the report, others should be able to get a sense of the discussion and not just a summary or the conclusions. The summary report of the meeting, including vote counts for each recommendation, must be signed by the person designated by the Committee Chair to serve as the Secretary, then approved by the Committee Chair, and then made available for inspection by the Committee members. After allowing an inspection period of not less than two business days nor more than five business days, and after such modifications as the Committee approves, the Secretary and Committee Chair shall sign the report, and then the Secretary shall forward the summary report to the School Director and the candidate, along with a list of all faculty members present at the meeting. The candidate is to be informed of the Committee's recommendations by the RPT Advisory Committee Chair as soon as possible. All Committee votes and deliberations are personnel actions and must be treated with confidentiality in accordance with University Policy and state and federal law. Members of the Committee are enjoined not to convey the substance or outcomes of committee deliberations to candidates. Candidates may not ask questions about the Committee's deliberations outside of the conversation the candidate has with the Committee Chair about the Committee's meeting and recommendation.

- 2) *School Director action.* After studying the entire file relating to each candidate, the School Director shall prepare her/his written recommendation with an exact copy to be provided to the candidate and included in the file on the retention, promotion, and/or tenure of each candidate, including specific reasons for the recommendation. The candidate will then have the option to provide, within seven business days, a written statement in response to the report of the Committee and/or the recommendation of the School Director.
- 3) *Actions and appeals procedures beyond the School level.* Subsequent procedures are described in University Policy.

Appendix A: RPT File Contents

In order for the RPT process to operate effectively, and to ensure that all candidates receive the most accurate reviews possible, certain participants in the RPT process have responsibilities for placing certain materials in the file. All materials listed below are to be added by the file closing date, and are considered for the RPT Advisory Committee meeting. Additionally, the report of the RPT Advisory Committee meeting, recommendation of the School Director, and any candidate responses to either are added subsequently.

Candidate's Responsibility

It is the candidate's responsibility to provide the following documentation to the School Director for inclusion in the RPT file.

1. Curriculum Vitae. See Appendix B for suggested format and information to be included.
2. Personal Statement. This document should detail accomplishments as well as future plans in research, teaching, and service, and should include descriptions of teaching philosophy and the research agenda.
3. Copies of recent publications, including title page of authored or edited books.
4. Documentation of creative works, such as still images, video, and/or sound files.
5. Course syllabi for all courses taught in the past year for informal reviews or for all courses taught since appointment for mid-probationary formal reviews; or the most recent syllabus for all courses taught since appointment for tenure and/or promotion to Associate Professor reviews or for all courses taught in the past five years for promotion to Professor reviews. In addition, the candidate may choose to include additional assignments, exams, and/or handouts. Candidates should provide this information for the file early enough for peer teaching reviewers and the SAC to use this material for their reports.
6. Other relevant materials may be included, such as a teaching portfolio, course evaluations from other institutions, or letters from faculty, staff, or interested individuals. If the candidate has had personnel from CTLE observe teaching or review teaching materials, the candidate may wish to include a resulting evaluation in the file. Where the candidate's role in particular research is unclear, the candidate may include letters from collaborators describing the candidate's contribution to the work.
7. Candidate response(s) to any other file contents, if desired.

School's Responsibility

It is the School Director's responsibility to include the following documentation in the candidate's RPT file, prior to the file closing date.

1. Reports of peer observations of teaching, required for formal reviews. If peer observations have been written in preparation for an upcoming formal review, these peer observations may be referenced in a candidate's informal review if available at the time of that review.
2. All student course evaluations at the University of Utah since the last formal review (with a maximum of five years required for post-tenure promotion to Professor). For formal reviews for tenure, all evaluations since appointment.
3. SAC report(s) (for the current formal review and all past formal reviews).
4. Any report received from a unit in which the candidate holds a shared appointment.
5. All previous reports submitted by all voting levels in formal and informal reviews: i.e., SAC; School and College RPT advisory committees; letters from chairs/directors, deans, vice presidents, and the president; and recommendation from UPTAC (if present).
6. For promotion to Professor, the candidate's CV at the time of the previous promotion (or at appointment if hired as Associate Professor).
7. Other relevant materials, such as signed letters from faculty, staff, or interested individuals.
8. Evidence of faculty responsibility, which may include letters from the School Director describing the candidate's service to the unit and commenting on professional conduct. If an administrative reprimand has been issued, that reprimand as well as the latest findings, decisions, or recommendations from University committees or officials arising from the concerns about the faculty member that led to the reprimand will be included in the candidate's file.
9. External Evaluator letters (for tenure and promotion reviews; kept confidential if the candidate has waived her/his right to read)
 - a. Signed form evidencing candidate's waiver or retention of right to read
 - b. Qualifications of evaluators, normally a brief CV or biography
 - c. Indication of who nominated each evaluator (candidate, School Director, RPT Advisory Committee, or RPT Advisory Committee Chair)

Appendix B: Contents of the Curriculum Vitae

While there is no required or standard vitae format for the University and School, below is a possible template. If using another format, all information listed below should be included.

1. Education
 - a. Institutions of higher education, degrees awarded, dates and any areas of specialization
 - b. Non-degree seeking study – nature and dates
 - c. Pertinent professional experiences – non-academic
2. Employment
 - a. Institutions of higher education – listing of positions held and dates
 - b. Other – listing of positions held and dates
3. Research
 - a. All publications (books, chapters, articles in peer-reviewed journals, articles in non-peer-reviewed journals, abstracts, reviews, etc.). Please state if acceptance was based on peer review or another selection method, and list inclusive page numbers.
 - b. All performances, shows or other artistic activities with dates and locations
 - c. All choreographic or other creative works completed, with dates and locations of performances included
 - d. All screenings, exhibitions and/or other public presentations of dance-related media and technology works with dates and screening locations
 - e. All community based participatory research with dates, locations, and communities served
 - f. Presentations at professional meetings
 - g. Invited lectures
 - h. All grants and fellowships applied for and/or awarded, including agency, amount, and purpose
 - i. Samples of clippings, reviews, or other evaluations
 - j. Artistic honors or awards
 - k. Honors or awards received for research
 - l. Other relevant activity
4. Teaching
 - a. All courses taught at the University of Utah
 - b. All new classes developed at the University of Utah
 - c. A "typical" teaching load
 - d. All graduate thesis or dissertation committees, with indication of role (i.e., chair or member of the committee)
 - e. Individual student research supervised
 - f. Teaching awards or teaching recognition received
 - g. Other relevant activity
5. Service (including dates)
 - a. All professional organization leadership positions
 - b. Editorial service
 - c. Judging or other forms of adjudication

- d. Other relevant professional service
- e. Listing of University committees
- f. Listing of College committees
- g. Listing of School committees
- h. Other relevant University/College/School service
- i. Listing of community involvement and service
- j. Other relevant service activity
- k. Listing of professional organizations membership

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

Review Committee Approval:



Lincoln L. Davies, Chair

04/26/18

Date

Senior Vice President Approval:



Amy J. Wildermuth, designee

04/26/18

Date