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I. PURPOSE

The purpose of this document is to guide the formal and informal review of tenure line faculty in the Division of Film Studies.

The Division of Film Studies provides a setting for scholarly and creative work, instruction, and service in the art of film and video. The Division sees the study of the history, theory, and criticism of film and video and their production as complementary activities, and is dedicated to excellence in all these areas. In order for this pedagogical perspective to succeed, faculty are expected to exhibit support for both enclaves of the curriculum.

Faculty in the Division of Film Studies, holding terminal degrees in the field except in rare circumstances, are appointed on the basis of their outstanding scholarly or artistic achievement or promise of such with creative experience in and/or knowledge of film and video as a communication medium and art form. Faculty are expected to possess exceptional teaching capabilities, and contribute artistically or in a scholarly way to the university and to the community and state, and to have an impact on film and video studies on a national level. It is also of paramount importance that each faculty member's professional activities be compatible with the accepted goals of the division. The division fosters a faculty member's professional growth and contribution to his or her respective specialization. The division expects that faculty members will perform their duties in a cooperative, collegial, and responsible manner and in accordance with the Faculty Regulations and the Code of Faculty Responsibilities as set forth in the University’s Policies and Procedures Manual (PPM; http://www.admin.utah.edu/ppmanual).

This criteria statement supplements the policies of the University of Utah as set forth in the University of Utah Policy and Procedures Manual (PPM 9-5.1). It conforms to the university’s affirmative action program, which takes a clear position against discrimination in any form in the recruitment, appointment, supervision, remuneration, and evaluation of university faculty members.

The specific criteria listed in this document are intended as guidelines for retention, promotion, and tenure, and the division faculty reserves the right to modify these standards when it is in the best interest of the division and the university to do so. However, approval from the division RPT advisory committee and a compelling rationale for the modification must appear in the division RPT minutes, and must be approved by the Dean of the College and by the University RPT Standards Committee. All faculty
affected by the changes will receive reasonable notice to enable them to comply successfully with the changes.

II. DEFINITIONS AND QUALIFICATIONS

Description of committee formation: as per PPM 9-5.1 and appendix C of this document.

For a description of formal and informal reviews, materials required, committee membership, years conducted, and timetable see appendix A of this document.

For a description of file requirements see appendices B, D and E of this document.

Formal evaluations of a candidate for promotion and/or tenure must include an updated Vita, a SAC report and on-line course evaluations since the candidate’s last review, and letters of evaluation from knowledgeable professors, scholars, and film/video artists, as appropriate. Evaluators will be selected from lists provided by the candidate and drawn up by the RPT committee. Three evaluators will be drawn from each list for the fourth year review, two external and one internal. For the seventh year review, six names each will be selected from the committee and candidate lists: three external and one internal on each list. It is expected that at least fifty percent of those from whom evaluations are requested will respond, allowing consideration of the candidate’s standing and achievement to be based on a minimum of three letters for the fourth year formal review and four letters for the seventh year evaluation.

In the event that the requested number of letters from each list does not result in three letters for the first formal review and the four for the second formal review, the candidate and the RPT committee will submit two additional names of evaluators each, who will be solicited for letters. This process will be continued until the necessary number of letters are received and placed in the file.

The candidate must provide copies of articles or books or films and videos authored and produced to the committee at its request. The candidate’s present and past experience as a film or video maker, teacher, author, or lecturer outside of the candidate’s present university appointment may also be considered. The time schedule for consideration of advancement of faculty rank and tenure shall conform to College of Fine Arts standards and the schedule specified in the University of Utah Policies and Procedures Manual.

Outside evaluators will be asked to assess the candidate’s record and achievement in either their scholarly or creative specialization, and their service to the discipline nationally, based on the candidate’s vita and copies of articles, books, or films made available to the evaluator.

Informal reviews for retention must include current Vita and SAC report with course evaluations since last review, and copies of scholarly/creative work as requested by the RPT committee. Letters of evaluation are not required although the candidate may have such letters submitted at his or her discretion. The committee will make a brief written
assessment of the candidate’s record and achievement in teaching, research/creative work, and service. Included in this assessment will be suggestions for further work or activities that seem likely to be necessary to achieve tenure and promotion in the division. In the event that serious deficiencies of performance are detected at the informal review, a formal review of the candidate may be initiated at the express request of a majority of faculty on the committee. Informal reviews will include the written report of evaluation and a face-to-face meeting with the candidate to discuss the results of the evaluation conducted the Division chair or representative appointed by the chair.
III. DESCRIPTION OF STANDARDS

A. Methods for Evaluating Teaching, Research and Service for Formal and Informal Reviews

1. Scholarly Research and/or Creative Work

All faculty are expected to exhibit a well-founded and current knowledge of their particular area(s) of expertise as well as a general knowledge of and appreciation for other areas of film and video. Faculty are evaluated according to either creative or scholarly standards, depending upon their particular job description and classroom responsibilities. A person hired in history and criticism is expected to be productive in scholarship while a faculty member hired in production is expected to emphasize creative works in his or her output. However, in the Division of Film Studies crossing over is appreciated and encouraged, and for all faculty members both creative and scholarly work will be counted as part of that faculty member's total dossier.

In the production area, faculty will produce or collaborate on the production of films and videos. These films and videos will then be exhibited both within the university, in the outside community, and nationally through film festivals, arranged screenings, television broadcast, and commercial distribution. Faculty under review should submit copies of reviews and documentation concerning all types of exhibition and awards received.

For history and criticism faculty, dissemination of scholarly work through publication, presentations at professional meetings, and other avenues of communication such as television or newspaper interviews and public lectures are indicators of scholarly activity.

In both venues, the standard of the division is excellence in both scholarly and artistic output, and evaluation of faculty work will be undertaken with this goal in mind.

**Indicators Used for Evaluation of Faculty engaged in Scholarly or Creative Work**

a. Qualifications: Academic degrees and/or professional experience
   Teaching experience

b. Research and Creative work Funding: University of Utah grants
   External grants

c. Dissemination of Information: through publication and exhibition

   Publication: Books and monographs
   Articles in juried journals or books
   Articles in non-juried articles
   (The above includes on-line publication)
   Presentation at international, national, regional and local meetings
   Awards and honors received for publications
Exhibition: Festival screenings  
National or local broadcast  
Commercial or non-commercial  
Public screenings  
Distribution

Note will be made of the prestige of the publication or festival where the work is published or exhibited.

Faculty colleagues will undertake evaluation or scholarly and creative output and, during promotion and/or tenure reviews, will seek the input of external evaluators with recognized expertise in the candidate’s specialties.

2. Teaching

Teachers in the Division of Film Studies are expected to understand and practice sound pedagogical principles. Teachers are therefore expected to 1. be effective in promoting growth in student learning, 2. continue to question, grow and learn, themselves, and 3. serve as a model of curiosity and creativity for students and colleagues.

Specific Criteria for Evaluation of Teaching

Teaching ability is, in part, demonstrated by:
   a. Enthusiasm for dedication to film as the subject matter of the profession
   b. A current understanding and knowledge of Film Studies as a discipline
   c. An ability to give clear, articulate, verbal form to abstract and/or subtle ideas.
   d. An ability to present materials in a well-organized manner both orally and in writing.
   e. The ability to work effectively with university students
   f. An ability to stimulate students’ desire to learn as evidenced by students’ accomplishments.
   g. Availability for student interaction and counseling.
   h. Participation in curriculum development, incorporation of current developments within the field, and a willingness to explore innovative teaching strategies.

Evaluation of teaching is done by the students (including SAC evaluations and verbal comments), and by colleagues through examination of course materials and by audit or participation in instructional sessions.
Basis for Evaluation of Teaching

a. Formal Classes
   1. Student evaluations
   2. Peer evaluations
   3. Examination of syllabi and other course materials

b. Informal Teaching Situations and/or Other Professional Contracts
   1. Student evaluations, generated, compiled and submitted by students
   2. Peer evaluations

3. Service

Service will be evaluated by a review of the candidate’s vitae in conjunction with those letters of recommendation which refer specifically to the candidate’s service to the profession. Members of the RPT committee who have observed the candidate’s professional service contributions directly may also contribute their observations.

Specific Criteria for Evaluation of Professional Service (3 categories)

a. Service to the university as demonstrated by:
   1. Department, college and university committee work.
   2. Active participation in department, interdepartmental or college events.
   3. Fulfillment of department student-faculty assignments such as student advising, service on MFA and MA thesis committees, and directing or advising student productions or company activities.

b. Service to the community or state as demonstrated by:
   1. Presentation of lectures, demonstrations, master classes, workshops, or screenings for state and community organizations.
   2. Presentation of scholarly lectures for state and community events; authorship of articles for state and local publications.
   3. Service locally as a consultant in areas of the candidate’s expertise, including radio and television appearances.
   4. Service on city, country, or state committees or boards.

c. Service nationally as demonstrated by:
   1. Service on national committees and boards
   2. Service as a consultant to colleges and universities in other states, within limitations of University policy.
   3. Service as consultant or reviewer for publishing houses in areas of the candidate’s expertise
B. Description of Standards for Faculty Rank

The following standards supplement the policies of the University of Utah as set forth in the University of Utah Policy and Procedures Manual (PPM 8-6).

1. Assistant Professor

Appointment to the rank of assistant professor normally requires an M.F.A. or Ph.D. degree or outstanding and extensive professional experience.

a. Artistry and/or Scholarship

To be retained in the rank of assistant professor a faculty member will be expected to have general competence in the artistic or scholarly aspects of film and video studies and must have demonstrated strengths in at least one area of specialization in the discipline. His/her work should reflect both quality and originality.

b. Teaching

Retention demands evidence of competence as a teacher of undergraduate students and where appropriate graduate students as shown in teaching evaluations, syllabi, and other course materials where requested. The ability to clearly and accurately communicate knowledge of the subject at the university level is essential.

c. Service

An assistant professor must show some evidence of the assumption of non-teaching responsibilities in the department, university, community, and nationally as previously listed. There must be evidence of service at the time of the fourth year formal review.

2. Associate Professor

To be promoted to the rank of associate professor or for appointment at that level, the candidate must demonstrate all the competencies required of an assistant professor, with the augmentations noted below.

a. Artistry and/or Scholarship

In addition to those qualifications listed previously for assistant professor, an associate professor must demonstrate the beginning of establishment of him or herself as an expert in his/her special area(s) of film and video studies through publication, exhibition, presentation, and citation in the works of others. In addition he or she must demonstrate comprehension of the discipline as a whole. Expertise should be evidenced by substantial creative work and/or scholarly research and publication beyond that demonstrated for the master of fine arts degree or doctorate. The associate professor’s professional
contributions should be recognized beyond the university.

b. **Teaching**

The associate professor must offer evidence of continual innovation, maturity, and effectiveness as a teacher. He or she should be contributing substantially to the graduate program and to graduate students’ thesis committees.

c. **Service**

Promotion to the rank of associate professor must show evidence of professional service through committee assignments and in participation in determination of policy relative to division and university affairs.

3. **Professor**

To be promoted to the rank of full professor or for appointment at that rank the candidate must meet the qualifications required for the associate rank with the augmentation listed below.

a. **Artistry and/or Scholarship**

The rank of full professor should be awarded only to those members of the faculty who give evidence of substantial command of the discipline as well as continued growth within his or her area(s) of specialization. The individual should be an acknowledged expert in his or her field demonstrated through publication and exhibition since promotion to associate professor. A full professor should continue to produce creative works of quality, or research that is published or otherwise disseminated.

b. **Teaching**

A full professor must be an authority in her/her areas of teaching and must possess the kind of teaching expertise and professional dedication that will serve as a model for both students and colleagues. The individual must possess sufficient versatility that his/her teaching assignments can be adapted to changes in the field that will occur over the years.

c. **Service**

Promotion to full professor requires evidence of contributions in service through membership on or service to university and/or local and national boards and committees. A professor is expected to actively serve as a mentor for the junior faculty.

C. **Tenure**
In keeping with the philosophy of the University of Utah, the Division of Film Studies considers tenure to be the single most important decision in the retention, promotion, and tenure process. The meaning of tenure is clarified in the University of Utah’s Policies and Procedures Manual and the Division of Film Studies endorses that definition.

In the event that a person is hired at or promoted to the rank of associate professor before achieving tenure, the subsequent conferral of tenure requires that the faculty member has provided convincing evidence that he or she will continue to achieve the standards expected of an associate professor and is likely to achieve the standards expected for promotion to the rank of professor.
APPENDICES

Appendix A: General Procedures and Timetable for Retention, Promotion, and Tenure

The Division of Film Studies is committed to the proposition that retention, promotion, and tenure actions be made with a serious purpose and in a stringent manner. All discussions of the faculty in retention, promotion, and tenure meetings are to be held in complete confidence.

The Division adheres to the University standards which call for both formal and informal reviews. Faculty are to be reviewed informally in their first, second, third, fifth and sixth years. Formal reviews, which are more intensive and comprehensive, are for retention in the fourth year and for promotion and tenure in the seventh year. Deviations from this time frame can only be done in accordance with the University’s policies and procedures regarding retention and tenure. (See PPM 8-6 for details.)

The RPT advisory committee must consist of at least three members of appropriate rank and tenure status, and all meetings of the committee must be attended by at least three members. The division RPT committee’s membership may be augmented by tenured faculty from other College of Fine Arts departments, in accordance with the University’s “Small Unit Rule” (PPM 9-5.1 Sect. B1d). The committee will not invite witnesses before the committee when it is considering a case, but rather makes all judgments from the “file.” This makes it essential for candidates under review to prepare thorough, well-documented, and complete files. This material is used at all subsequent levels of the review process.

The following procedures are to be followed each in accordance with the College of Fine Arts timetable:

ANNUAL CALENDAR AND RPT PROCESS

A. March

1. Department chair shall determine obligatory RPT reviews for the upcoming academic year and will notify, by letter, non-tenured and tenured faculty who are required to be reviewed. Consideration for early tenure shall be treated according to PPM 8-6 sec. 3 C.1.

2. Department chair notifies Associate Professors who are eligible for promotion, asking if they wish to request a formal review for consideration of promotion.

3. Department chair convenes a faculty meeting to elect an RPT Advisory Committee chair.

4. Department chair shall notify the faculty advisor to SAC and the SAC president which faculty evaluation reports for post-tenure reviews must be completed before the end of Spring Semester.
B. April

1. Department chair informs faculty and staff of upcoming formal reviews of candidates and solicits names of potential internal (University of Utah) and external reviewers (outside the University, preferably from out of state) from the candidate and the faculty. Potential reviewers must be professionals in the candidate’s field or allied fields or academic peers who can evaluate the scholarly/creative research and professional standing of the candidate according to the standards of the specific academic discipline. Qualifications of the potential reviewers must be clearly identified.
   a. Candidates for undergoing formal reviews will supply five names for external reviewers and two names for internal reviewers. The relationship between the candidate and the potential reviewer must be explained and contact information provided.
   b. The department chair and representative member(s) of the discipline area select three names of external reviewers and one internal reviewer for the formal review of each candidate. The final list of reviewers shall represent a balance among recommendations from all submissions.
   c. The list of reviewers’ names, their qualifications, their relationship to the candidate, and contact information are added to each candidate’s file. The list of names must be categorized according to the source of the nomination (candidate, RPT Advisory Committee, department chair, others).

2. Candidate signs a waiver-non-waiver form governing confidentiality of evaluation letters. A signed form accompanies each evaluation letter request.

C. May - August

1. Candidates for formal reviews in cooperation with the department chair assemble materials, before 30 May, to be sent to reviewers. The dossier reviewed by the evaluators must be the same as that submitted to the RPT Advisory Committee for the formal review, expecting materials documenting activity undertaken during summer months.
   a. Department chair contacts internal and external reviewers to ask about their willingness and availability to serve as reviewers.
   b. Department chair arranges for materials to be sent to reviewers for their evaluation and places the responses in the respective candidate’s file.

2. Faculty advisor to SAC ascertains that SAC will have appropriate membership for preparation of faculty evaluation reports during
Fall Semester.
3. Department chair prepares the cumulative file on each candidate for informal and formal reviews.

D. September
1. Department chair meets with department SAC president to initiate faculty evaluation report process for formal review files. Three weeks minimum notice is required before candidate's file is closed.
   a. SAC bases its report on compilations from previous years' course evaluations.
   b. SAC must use authorized report forms upon which to evaluate the candidate's teaching abilities.
2. Candidates undergoing informal reviews, in cooperation with the department chair, assemble dossier for RPT Advisory Committee evaluation.
3. Department faculty and staff are notified of their right to submit written recommendations.
4. All files are closed by 30 September but are available for examination by members of the RPT Advisory Committee prior to the meeting. Before the close date, candidates may submit a response to any of the file contents.

E. October
1. The RPT advisory committee chair schedules a meeting of the committee no later than 15 October and organizes the agenda of formal and informal files to be reviewed.
2. Guidelines for conducting the RPT meeting:
   a. Determine whether quorum is met. Quorum consists of two thirds of the members of the full RPT advisory committee, excluding those unable to attend the meeting. Record complete list of members present.
   b. Determine by vote of those present whether the department chair is invited to participate in the discussion. The chair may choose to decline the invitation.
   c. Divide the secretarial duties of the files to be reviewed among the members of the committee.
   d. Record absentee votes before discussion of individual files. Whenever practicable, the RPT Advisory Committee chair shall advise all members on leave or otherwise absent of the proposed action and shall request their written opinions and votes before the date of the RPT meeting. Absent members' written opinions shall be disclosed at the meeting and their votes shall be counted the same as other votes.
   e. Substantive discussion of the materials in comparison with department RPT criteria.
   f. Exact committee vote, including negative votes and
abstentions.

3. Actions subsequent to the RPT meeting.
The summary report of the meeting should be written such that valued activities performed by candidate are recognized at other voting levels of review. An electronic version of the summary report of the candidate’s file shall be sent to the committee members for their inspection. After allowing a period of not less than two days nor more than five days, and after such modification as the Committee approves, the final version of the summary report shall be signed by the RPT Advisory Committee chair and the committee secretary and added to the candidate’s file.

4. Action by the department chair:
   a. After studying the entire file of each candidate, the department chair shall prepare his/her written recommendation to be included in the file on the retention, promotion, or tenure of each candidate, including specific reasons for the recommendation.
   b. The department chair shall deliver an exact copy of the RPT advisory committee summary report and the chair’s evaluation of the file to the candidate. In years of informal review, the chair will schedule a face-to-face meeting with the candidate to discuss progress based on the candidate’s file.
   c. The candidate shall have the opportunity at this time, but not the obligation, to add a written statement to his/her formal review file in response to the summary report of the RPT advisory committee and/or the evaluation of the department chair. Written notice of this option shall be included with the copy of the chair’s evaluation sent to the candidate. If the candidate chooses to add such a statement to the file, that statement must be submitted to the department chair within seven days, except in extenuating circumstances such as health emergency, of the date upon which the chairperson’s evaluation is delivered to the candidate. If the candidate submits a written statement to the chair within this time limit, the candidate’s statement shall be added to the review file without comment by the chair.
   d. The department chair shall authorize delivery of the required number of copies of the complete files to the office of the dean of the College of Fine Arts no later than 15 November.
Appendix B: Overview of File

In the formal review process, whether it be for retention, promotion, and/or tenure, it is the candidate’s responsibility to build a comprehensive file of materials to support the case for retention, promotion, and/or awarding of tenure. Central to the file is the curriculum vitae. An accurate, current, and comprehensive vitae is essential to the review process at each level. A second component of a comprehensive file are internal and external letters of evaluation. A third component is a statement from the candidate. The candidate may add other materials to the file which serve to strengthen the case for the candidate. These additional materials are selected and included by the candidate.

CONTENTS OF THE CURRICULUM VITAE

1. Credentials
   A. Education- courses of study, degrees awarded and dates
   B. Non-degree seeking study- nature and dates
   C. Pertinent professional experiences- non-academic
   D. Academic honors or awards

2. Teaching
   A. Listing of positions held and dates
   B. Listing of classes taught at the University of Utah
   C. Listing of new classes developed at the University of Utah
   D. Listing of teaching load
   E. Listing of graduate thesis or dissertation committees, with indication of role (i.e., chair or member of committee)

3. Research, Scholarly and/or Creative Work
   A. Listing of publications (books, chapters, articles in jouried journals, articles in non-juried journals, abstracts, etc.)
   B. Listing of screenings and broadcasts with dates and locations
   C. Listing of grants including agency, amount, and purpose
   D. Artistic honors or awards
   E. Presentations at professional meetings
   F. Invited lectures

4. Service
   A. Listing of departmental committees
   B. Listing of college committees
   C. Listing of university committees
   D. Listing of community involvement and service
   E. Listing of professional organizations
-membership
-leadership
F. Editorial service
G. Judging or some other form of adjudication at film and video screenings
Appendix C: Composition of the Division RPT Committee

University of Utah
Policy and Procedures Manual
Number 9-5.1, Revision 15
Subject: Faculty Regulations: Appointments, Retention, Promotion, and Tenure

a. Retention. In each department all tenured faculty members of equal or higher rank and all non-tenured regular faculty members of higher rank than that held by the candidate for retention are eligible to participate in the consideration of and to vote on recommendations in individual cases on matters of retention.

b. Promotion. In each department all regular faculty members of equal or higher rank than that proposed for the candidate for promotion are eligible to participate in the consideration of and to vote on recommendations in individual cases on matters of promotion.

c. Tenure. In each department all tenured faculty members whose rank is equal to or higher than the rank currently held by the candidate for tenure are eligible to participate in the consideration of and to vote on recommendations in individual cases on matters of tenure.
Appendix D: Confidentiality Agreement

I waive my right to see the external letters of evaluation obtained from outside the department for my retention/promotion/tenure review.

________________________________________
signature

________________________________________
date

I retain my right to read the external evaluation obtained from outside the department for my retention/promotion/tenure review.

________________________________________
signature

________________________________________
date
Appendix E: Checklist of Supporting Documents for Submission to the College of Fine Arts RPT Advisory Committee

1. Formal Retention, Promotion, and Tenure Summary form (official form).

2. Department Chairperson’s letter of recommendation to the College Dean (Showing that a copy was sent to the faculty member with a provision for the candidate to respond). Include candidate’s letter of response, if submitted.

3. Minutes of the relevant discussions of the Departmental Faculty Advisory Committee on Retention, Promotion, and Tenure, signed by the Committee Chairperson, and listing names of faculty members present.

4. A copy of the departmental policy and procedures statement in matters of retention, promotion, and tenure.

5. Faculty Evaluation Report (official form) made out by the Department Student Advisory Committee, signed by SAC Chairperson.

6. Synopsis of specific course evaluations. (supplied by Division Office.)

7. Timely and relevant letters of evaluation.

8. A current curriculum vitae (to be supplied by the faculty member under review).