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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 Department of Modern Dance. 

Faculty in the Department of Modern 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, and contribute artistically and/or scholarly to the university at large, to the community and state, and to have an impact on dance at a national level. It is also of paramount importance that each faculty member’s professional activities be compatible with the accepted goals of the department. Each faculty member should: 1. uphold departmental policies which have been accepted by a majority of the faculty, 2. exhibit respect for opinions differing from his or her own position, 3. continually work to develop and revise mutually acceptable goals for the department, 4. support the work of colleagues, 5. have a knowledge of the university milieu and an understanding of the role of the Department of Modern Dance in an institution of higher learning, and 6. understand the demands and opportunities of the profession including national trends. Finally, because the philosophy of the Department of Modern Dance places equal value on artistic and educational value of dance, faculty of the department should exhibit support for both strands of the curriculum.

II. PROCEDURE  
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, www.admin.utah.edu/ppmanual/9/9-5.html). It conforms to the university’s affirmative action program, which takes a clear position against discrimination in the recruitment, appointment, supervision, remuneration, and evaluation of university faculty members.

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

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

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

For a description of RPT time line see appendix K of this document.

Evaluation of a candidate for retention, promotion, and/or tenure, must include a SAC report including a compilation of current course evaluations by students, a SAC summary report including a narrative summary of faculty teaching, and letters from other knowledgeable colleagues and dance artists in the professional world. Letters of appraisal from department peers are invited but not required. The candidate's present and
past experience as a professional dancer, choreographer, teacher, author, or lecturer outside of the candidate's present university appointment may also be considered when appropriate. The time schedule for consideration of advancement of faculty rank and tenure shall conform to the schedule as specified in the University of Utah Policies and Procedures Manual.

Also see:
Appendix A: General procedures for retention, promotion, and/or tenure
Appendix B: Overview of file contents submitted at the first level of review
Appendix C: Form for compilation of SAC evaluations
Appendix D: Procedures for formal and informal reviews
Appendix E: Composition of departmental RPT committee
Appendix F: Responsibilities of all personnel involved in the review
Appendix G: Sample of confidentiality designation statement regarding letters
Appendix H: Statement of Procedures; collection of outside RPT letters
Appendix I: Format for department RPT minutes
Appendix J: College of Fine Arts check-list for contents of file
Appendix K: Time line and deadlines for review process

III. DESCRIPTION OF STANDARDS

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

1. Scholarly and/or Creative Research

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 the other areas of dance. Faculty are evaluated differently for excellence in their respective areas: performance experience with professional companies is used as one indicator of performance ability; concert production of choreographic works is used as one indicator of capability and active involvement as a choreographer; and dissemination of scholarly work through publications and presentations at professional meetings are indicators of scholarly activity. *The evaluative criteria used to assess faculty research are 1.) quantity of research activity, and 2.) quality of research venue. In addition to all required materials, critical print reviews may be included in the materials each faculty submits to their RPT file to provide additional outside evaluation of a candidate’s research work.* Regional, national and/or internationally acknowledged research excellence is expected of all faculty for the award of tenure.

Scholarly research includes design and implementation of scholarly research projects, theoretical investigation, and development of practical applications of those theories. Written documentation and publication as well as presentations at professional meetings are considered to be valid indicators of scholarly activity.

Creative research includes choreography, performance, or other generative creative work. It is considered to be equivalent to scholarly research in value to the department and the university. Just as scholarly work must be disseminated through publication or presentations at professional meetings, creative research must be disseminated through production or presentation of the work in a credible venue that is appropriate to its genre.

The Department of Modern Dance subscribes to the definition of research as accepted by the College of Fine Arts. This position statement is as follows:
Research in the University of Utah's College of Fine Arts
Accepted as policy by the CFA Executive Committee, May 10, 2002

Goal of policy:
To provide a clear definition of research within the College of Fine Arts for the purpose of guiding evaluation.

Objectives of policy:

1. To create a concise definition which can be applied to all CFA faculty housed in multiple disciplines with multiple research traditions.

2. To create a definition which facilitates the development of specific evaluative criteria in the six CFA departments.

3. To create a definition of research in the College of Fine Arts which acts as a constructive and guiding tool in the development of faculty research agendas.

Research in the College of Fine Arts can be described as:

Creative Research
Interpretive creative work
   Performance processes:
      Recreating works of art and expanding knowledge about such works with reference to history, culture, theory, methods.

Generative creative work
   Creation processes:
      Creating works of art with innovative and original methods and/or content, with a commitment to research traditions in a discipline.

Scholarly Research
Correlate research traditions
Theoretical research methodologies; for example:
   History, humanities (cultural history, social history, semiotics, critical theory, etc.)
   Social and behavioral science (psychology, sociology, etc.)
   Science (biology, physiology, kinesiology, etc.)

Applied research methodologies; for example:
   Education
   Management/Administration
   Therapy
   Community/Action Research

Position:
The six disciplines which comprise the CFA are composed of artists and scholars who reference a variety of aesthetic and investigative traditions in their research endeavors. Each investigator develops a research agenda within the context of his/her department, disciplinary tradition and appropriate methodological orientation.

The two most recognizable research profiles in the CFA may be the interpretive artist (performer) and the generative artist (the composer, playwright, film maker, painter, choreographer, etc.). These creative artists are responsible to the interpretive or generative standards of each art making/producing discipline. The CFA is organized using these artistic disciplines.

Within each department there are also artists and scholars whose research endeavors are in correlate areas, outside of the discipline's generative or interpretive activities. Within the CFA there may be individuals whose theoretical or applied research orientations are similar (for example, historians or educators) yet they may reside in different disciplinary departments (theater historian, art educator). Additionally, the generative or interpretive artist may engage in art making which is grounded in a tradition or method outside of his/her home discipline (for example, the choreographer who chooses to generate dance for film; or the musician who investigates pedagogical theory).

Each CFA faculty member is responsible to his/her department and its disciplinary tradition and standards of rigor, but he/she is also responsible to the epistemological orientation and methodological integrity of any correlate research paradigm utilized in the service of his/her research.

For example, the historians of art, dance, film, music, and theater in the CFA are all responsible for upholding the contemporary standards for academic scholarship in the humanities found at the U of U. Similarly, educators in the CFA are held to research standards normally encountered in the field of educational study. Additionally, the artist who chooses to work in a correlate artistic method is held to the standards of generative or interpretive art making in the correlate discipline.

Faculty who choose to work in more than one discipline must not be penalized for doing so. The difficulty of this methodological breadth must be respected. Becoming cognizant and capable in a new research tradition is, in itself, a significant research endeavor. Research outcomes used in performance assessment must give substantive weight to gaining multiple methodological competencies.

It is critical that faculty members articulate the place of their research within an aesthetic, investigative, or intellectual tradition and context. Within the University of Utah, a Research-One Institution, it is essential that each researcher present his/her process and product in a manner that is clear and comprehensible to those outside the discipline.

2. Teaching

Teachers in the Department of Modern Dance are expected to understand and practice sound pedagogical principles. Teachers are therefore expected to 1. be effective in promoting growth, 2. continue to question, grow and learn, themselves, and 3. serve as a model of curiosity and creativity for students and colleagues. In the department, teaching goes on in many situations and in many locations. In-class teaching is only one component of the educational process.

Specific Criteria for Evaluation of Teaching
Teaching ability is, in part, demonstrated by:
a. Enthusiasm for and dedication to dance as the subject matter of the profession.
b. A current understanding and knowledge of dance as a discipline.
c. An ability to demonstrate scholarly and/or artistic research and production.
d. An ability to give clear, articulate, verbal form to abstract and/or subtle ideas.
e. An ability to present materials in a well-organized manner both orally and in writing.
f. The ability to understand university students and to work effectively with them.
g. An ability to stimulate students' desire to learn as evidenced by students' accomplishments.
h. Availability for student interaction and counseling according to departmental advising policies.

Evaluation of classroom teaching or studio teaching is done by the students (SAC evaluations of all classes), and by colleagues (after personal observation of the candidate's teaching in more than one class). An unacceptable form of evaluation of teaching ability is that which is based on second-hand information, or when the colleague has not actually seen the candidate teach, but rather is depending on word of mouth for the assessment of the candidate's ability.

It is the responsibility of the chair of the department to review all SAC evaluations of teaching each semester. Because the chair is the only person to review all teaching evaluations each term, it shall be the responsibility of the department chair to alert the chair of the RPT committee when questions arise regarding the candidate's teaching ability, or when the candidate's teaching may not be up to departmental standards. All members of the department RPT committee must personally observe the candidate's teaching in more than one class if they wish to contribute to the evaluation of the candidate's teaching in the RPT committee meeting.

Evaluation of out-of-class teaching is more difficult to conduct, but just as valuable an indicator of teaching ability. Activities which fall into this category of evaluation include advising of students (both curricular and personal), consultation with students related to independent study projects, consultation with graduate students regarding thesis projects, supervision of teaching assistants, choreographing works for performance, directing rehearsals, working with costumers and lighting designers regarding a particular choreographic work, and many others. If classroom or studio teaching is difficult to evaluate, out-of-class teaching is almost impossible to evaluate effectively. Nevertheless the department faculty believe that teaching is of sufficient importance that it should be noted and an attempt made to evaluate this aspect of teaching.

Basis for Evaluation of Teaching
1. Course (SAC) evaluations by students
2. Peer evaluations by other faculty
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
4. Outside evaluation letters

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.

b. Service to the community or state as demonstrated by:
   1. Presentation of lectures, demonstrations, master classes, workshops, or concerts, or creation and direction of choreography for state and community organizations.
   2. Presentation of scholarly lectures for state and community events; authorship of books or articles for state and local publications.
   3. Service as a consultant in areas of the candidate's expertise.
   4. Service on city, county, or state committees or boards.

c. Service to the nation as demonstrated by:
   1. Presentation of lectures, demonstrations, master classes, workshops, or concerts for national organizations of out-of-state communities, colleges, or universities.
   2. Presentation of scholarly lectures at the national level; publication of books and/or production of articles accepted by refereed journals and magazines.
   3. Service as a consultant to colleges and universities in other states.
   4. Service on national committees and boards.
   5. Participation as an artist with other professional dance artists or companies in or out of the academic area.

B. Methods for Soliciting Internal and External Evaluation Letters

Internal and external reviewers will be chosen as follows: the candidate will supply the departmental RPT chair with names of six potential reviewers, two internal nominees (outside the department but inside the University) and four external nominees (outside the University with national and/or international recognition in the field), with an indication of the professional relationship of each nominee to the candidate. The department RPT committee and the department chair will nominate additional internal and external reviewers. From these lists a total of three internal letters and three external letters will be solicited by the committee for retention reviews, and a total of three internal letters and five external letters will be solicited for tenure reviews. Every effort will be made to insure at least one of the internal and external reviewers were from the candidate’s list. The candidate will have the right to designate the confidentiality of the reviewers' letters.

C. 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). Adjunct or lecturer faculty are held to the standards below for retention or promotion.

1. **Assistant Professor**
   An M.A. or M.F.A. degree or extensive professional experience is normally expected.
   
   a. **Scholarly and/or Creative Research**

   An assistant professor will be expected to have command of creative and/or scholarly aspects of the modern dance discipline and must demonstrate comprehension of the discipline as a whole. His/her research should reflect departmental standards.
b. Teaching

Evidence of excellence as a teacher at the university level is essential. His/her teaching should reflect departmental standards.

c. Service

An assistant professor should show willingness to assume non-teaching responsibilities in the department, university, and/or community as previously listed.

An assistant professor is generally expected to be at least excellent (in a rating of superior, excellent, or good) in each of the three categories listed above. The evaluation of a candidate with this three point scale is to be done by referencing appropriate indicators from this document in research, teaching and service.

2. Associate Professor

Except for rare exceptions, an M.F.A., Ph.D., or Ed.D. degree is required.

a. Scholarly and/or Creative Research

In addition to those qualifications listed above for assistant professor, an associate professor should be an emerging expert in his/her special area(s) of the dance discipline. Expertise should be evidenced by substantial creative work and/or research and publication beyond that demonstrated at the Assistant Professor level. The associate professor's professional research contributions should be recognized beyond the university.

b. Teaching

The associate professor must offer evidence of continual innovation and maturity; he/she must be an outstanding teacher in his/her area(s) of expertise. The individual should be able to contribute substantially to the graduate program and to graduate students' thesis committees.

c. Service

An associate professor must have shown extensive evidence of professional service through active leadership on committees and in the determination of policy relative to department and university affairs.

An associate professor is generally expected to be superior (in a rating of superior, excellent, or good) in one category and excellent in the other two categories noted above. The evaluation of a candidate with this three
point scale is to be done by referencing appropriate indicators from this document in research, teaching or service.

3. **Professor**
   An M.F.A., Ph.D. or Ed.D. is required.
   
   a. **Scholarly and/or Creative Research**

      The rank of professor should be awarded only to those members of the faculty who give evidence of substantial command of the entire discipline as well as continued growth within his/her area(s) of specialization. A professor should also be cognizant of related art forms and/or related areas of research. The individual should be an acknowledged expert in his/her field and he/she should actively contribute in guiding the department toward long-range goals for the future. A full professor should continue to produce substantive interpretive and/or generative creative work or scholarly research.

   b. **Teaching**

      A professor must be an authority in his/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 multiplicity of teaching expertise within the undergraduate as well as graduate curricula.

   c. **Service**

      A professor must have made outstanding professional contributions in teaching, research and service and must be generally regarded as a leader in the profession locally and nationally. A professor is expected to actively serve as a mentor for the junior faculty.

      A professor is generally expected to be superior (in a rating of superior, excellent, or good) in two of the three categories listed above and excellent in the other one. The evaluation of a candidate with this three-point scale is to be done by referencing appropriate indicators from this document in research, teaching and service.

D. **Tenure**

In keeping with the philosophy of the University of Utah, the Department of Modern Dance considers tenure to be the single most important decision in the retention, promotion, and tenure process. For the awarding of tenure, the Departmental expectation is that the candidate meets the criteria for the level of Associate Professor, as stated in section III - C. The meaning of tenure is clarified in the University of Utah's Policies and
Procedures Manual (PPM 8-6, section 1 below) and the Department of Modern Dance accepts 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.

FACULTY RETENTION AND TENURE

SECTION 1. DEFINITIONS AND QUALIFICATIONS

To hold a position with tenure means that appointment to such a position is considered permanent and is not subject to termination or substantial reduction in status without adequate cause, provided that in all cases the services of the individual continue to be needed and that funds are available to pay for them. Only the regular faculty ranks of professor, associate professor, and assistant professor are tenure ranks. Service in any regular faculty rank, including the rank of instructor, except as otherwise provided in Faculty Regulations, Chapter II, Section 2, paragraph (D), shall be counted as part of the pretenure probationary period. Tenure, or the right to achieve tenure, cannot be waived. Appointments to all auxiliary faculty positions (research, clinical, lecturer, adjunct, and visiting positions), and to all administrative positions, including the offices of vice president, dean, director, chairperson of divisions, and chairperson of department, are without significance for the holding or achieving of tenure. Tenure is established only in an academic subdivision, such as a department or a school or college, if such school or college is not divided into departments. In other university subdivisions not designated as academic departments, schools, or colleges, appointments to regular faculty ranks are not made and tenure is not granted. Individuals in administrative positions may hold a faculty position with tenure in an academic subdivision. A faculty member who transfers from one academic subdivision to another loses tenure status in the former department. The academic subdivision to which the faculty member transfers may require service for the full probationary period appropriate to the person’s academic rank or may accept any or all of the years of satisfactory service completed in the former department toward tenure. An individual holding regular faculty appointments in two or more academic subdivisions must be considered separately for retention and tenure in each of them according to the criteria of each department.
APPENDICES

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

The Department of Modern Dance is extremely concerned that retention, promotion, and tenure actions are made with 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 following procedures are to be followed each year with great care:

1. All faculty who will be reviewed are to receive the department’s statement concerning the criteria used in retention reviews.

2. Faculty must be notified at least two months before the department retention committee meets. Each candidate submits all of the documents and materials he or she wishes to be considered by those involved in the review.

3. The department’s student advisory committee must have at least three weeks notification before submitting its recommendation for the committee’s action. The department chair will meet with the SAC chair each year and explain the procedure.

4. The department chair will remind faculty members that they may submit, in writing, recommendations with respect to any candidate, indicating that such letters should be as specific as possible.

5. If the RPT committee wishes input from non-committee faculty, staff or others, it may be requested. These evaluations must be presented in writing.

6. The department’s advisory committee elects a chair annually from tenured faculty of the department. A secretary (from the membership of the RPT committee, not a department secretary) is designated by the RPT chair. The secretary takes accurate and comprehensive minutes and prepares a "consensus summary".

7. The RPT advisory committee must consist of at least three members of appropriate rank and tenure status (see appendix E). The department RPT committee’s membership may be augmented by tenured faculty from other College of Fine Arts departments only in order to bring the number of committee members up to the minimum of three. 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 departments and candidates under review to prepare thorough, well-documented, and complete files. This material is used at all subsequent levels of the review process.

8. All votes on the retention, promotion or tenure of a faculty candidate shall be by secret ballot.

Appendix B: Overview of File Contents: First Level of Review

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 the 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 is internal and external letters of
evaluation. A third component is a statement from the candidate. In a formal review, a confidentiality designation agreement is included. 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. Research, Scholarly and/or Creative Work
   A. Listing of publications (books, chapters, articles in juried journals, articles in non-juried journals, abstracts, etc.)
   B. Listing of performances, shows or other artistic activities with dates and locations
   C. Listing of choreographic or written works completed, with dates and locations of performances included
   D. Listing of grants including agency, amount, and purpose
   E. Samples of clippings, reviews, or other evaluations
   F. Artistic honors or awards
   G. Presentations at professional meetings
   H. Invited lectures

3. 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 a "normal" teaching load
   E. Listing of graduate thesis or dissertation committees, with indication of role (i.e., chair or member of the committee)
   F. Listing of unpublished materials developed for class use

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 art gatherings

Appendix C: Form for Compilation of SAC Evaluations

University of Utah
Department of Modern Dance

Faculty Name: __________________________________________

Date of Compilation: ________________________________

Compilation Prepared by: ______________________________

Range: 1 = Lowest  6 = Highest
### Appendix D: Procedures for Formal and Informal Reviews

**Department of Modern Dance: RPT Responsibilities and Procedures**

**I. PROCEDURES FOR DIFFERENT TYPES OF REVIEWS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>REVIEW SITUATION</th>
<th>REQUIRED MATERIALS</th>
<th>WHEN</th>
<th>WHO SITS ON COMMITTEE</th>
<th>IS A VOTE TAKEN?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### A. Informal Reviews

<p>| | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Updated vitae</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAC evaluations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collegial evaluation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chair's letter</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **YEARS**: 1, 2, 4, AND 6
- **of appointment when original appointment was at Asst. Prof. level**

#### B. Formal Reviews

1. **RETENTION**

<p>| | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Updated vitae</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAC evaluations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAC report</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internal &amp;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>External letters</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peer evaluation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **YEARS**: 3, 5, AND 7
- **of appointment**

---

See below*** Yes
2. PROMOTION Same as B.1.  
No specific time is designated in U of U PPM  

3. TENURE Same as B.1.  
7th year of appt. for Asst. Prof. **  
5th year of appt. for Assoc. or Full Professor**  

See below*** Yes

C. Informal Reviews of Tenured Faculty  
Updated vitae SAC evaluations SAC report Collegial evaluations  
Once every 5 years  
Tenured fac. of equal or higher rank.

* Tenure for the Instructor rank automatically includes promotion to Assistant Professor.  
** Extension is possible as outlined in the U of U Policies and Procedures Manual.  
*** Committee Membership: To follow University policy as outlined in the U of U Policies and Procedures Manual.
Appendix E: Composition of the Departmental RPT Committee (from U of U PPM)

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, and all non-tenured regular faculty members of higher rank than that proposed for 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 F: Responsibilities

A. Department Chairperson
   1. Initiate review process.
      Letters to: RPT chair
      Candidate
   2. Meet with SAC chair and define SAC responsibilities.
   3. (Optional). Sit in on RPT Advisory Committee meeting (Ex officio - i.e. no vote).
   4. Review file.
   5. Write letter of personal recommendation noting rationale for position taken.
   6. Meet with a candidate:
      a. Share information from review.
      b. Copy of chair's letters and other materials to candidate (excluding confidential letters).
      c. Invite written response by candidate for addition to file.
   7. Submit file to college.

B. RPT Chairperson
   1. Notify candidate of candidate's responsibilities.
   2. Confirm with SAC chair RPT Advisory Committee meeting and SAC responsibilities.
   3. Contact RPT Advisory Committee members reminding them of responsibilities.
   4. Set date for RPT Advisory Committee meeting and inform all of meeting time.
   5. Make sure candidate has signed one of the confidentiality agreements regarding external letters if the review is formal.
   6. Solicit letters from outside references.
   7. Serve as collector of file materials.
   8. Chair RPT Advisory Committee meeting.
   9. Review, correct, and approve notes by secretary of RPT Advisory Committee.
  10. Sign RPT Advisory Committee minutes.
  11. Submit complete file to department chair.

C. RPT Advisory Committee Members
   1. Observe candidate teach.
   2. Review candidate's file before meeting.
   3. Attend committee meeting or submit absentee vote and comments in writing.

D. RPT Advisory Committee, Secretary
   1. Take notes at meeting.
   2. Complete notes in such a way that the notes represent majority and minority positions with rationales for each.
   3. Record those individuals attending the meeting as well as the votes. Absentee members and their votes are recorded separately.
   4. Submit notes to RPT chair.
   5. Approve any revisions in notes.
   6. Sign RPT Advisory Committee minutes.

E. SAC Chairperson
   1. Review SAC evaluations of candidate since the last formal review.
   2. Call SAC meeting to formulate SAC report.
   3. Chair SAC meeting.
   4. With consent of SAC members, compose written evaluation of the candidate which is included on the SAC Report. Rationale for the distribution of votes should be noted in this report.
5. Submit SAC Report to RPT Advisory Committee chair.
6. Attend first part of RPT Advisory Committee meeting to share SAC report.

F. Candidate
1. Submit updated vitae (see list of contents, below).
2. Submit a list of at least two internal and four external references to RPT chair.
3. If formal review, designate the confidentiality agreement and sign.
4. Submit additional materials which are thought to be pertinent to the review process.
5. With a formal review, submit a personal statement regarding teaching, research, and service.
Appendix G: Confidentiality Agreement

I waive my right to read the 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 H: Statement of Procedures; Collection of Outside RPT Letters of Recommendation

Name of Candidate: ___________________ Date: ______________

Outside reviewers, both internal and external, will be chosen as follows: the candidate will supply the departmental RPT chair with names of six potential reviewers (two internal (outside the department but inside the University) nominees and four external nominees of national and/or international recognition in the field), with an indication of the professional relationship of each nominee to the candidate. Ideally, these experts have:

- seen the candidate perform
- seen fully produced choreographic works
- observed the candidate's teaching
- reviewed the candidate’s scholarly work, and/or
- had contact with the candidate in professional meetings/organizations
- collaborated with the candidate on a project

In cases where experts might not have seen the candidate’s creative research directly, videotape will be provided to the reviewers.

Department RPT committee members and the department chair will nominate additional internal and external reviewers. From these lists a total of three internal letters and three external letters will be solicited by the committee for retention reviews, and a total of three internal letters and five external letters will be solicited for promotion and tenure reviews. Every effort will be made to include at least one internal and external reviewer from the candidate’s list. The candidate will have the right to designate the confidentiality of the reviewers' letters.

Letters from outside reviewers will be sent directly to the chair of the department RPT advisory committee, who will place them in the candidate's file.
Appendix I: Proposed Format for Department RPT Minutes

Minutes of the Department of Modern Dance
Retention, Promotion, and Tenure
Advisory Committee
November 5, 1995

Call to Order: 3:00 PM, November 5, 1995
Faculty Present: ________________________________

Absentee Members: ________________________________
(Absentee votes and written comments have been included)

Appointment of Secretary: ________________________________

EXAMPLE of INFORMAL REVIEW
Discussion was opened for the informal review of John Doe in the rank of Assistant Professor.
Teaching:
Service:
Research:
Other Issues:
The question was called and the vote was as follows:
Vote (this is new):

For Retention
Against Retention
Abstain

EXAMPLE of FORMAL REVIEW
It was moved and seconded that Jane Doe be retained in the position of Assistant Professor. Discussion followed.
Teaching:
Service:
Research:
Other Issues:
The question was called, and the vote was as follows:

For Retention (and Promotion)
Against Retention (and Promotion)
Abstentions

Respectfully submitted,

Committee Secretary ________________________________ Committee Chair ________________________________

Note: When more than one issue is considered, separate votes must be taken on each issue. For example, separate votes must be made for retention, promotion, and tenure. Additionally, separate reports must be made for each candidate in order to preserve the confidentiality of the RPT advisory committee.
Appendix J: 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).

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.

7. Outside letters of evaluation:
   A total of three internal letters and three external letters will be solicited by the
   committee for retention reviews, and a total of three internal letters and five
   external letters will be solicited for promotion and tenure reviews.

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

Appendix K: Time Line and Deadlines for Review Process

Time Line for Retention, Promotion, and Tenure Process
Dates indicate the deadline for submission of materials.

_________________________________________ Semester ______________

Autumn or Spring ________________________ Year ________________
RPT Chair sends letters to:
  Candidate
  SAC chair
  RPT committee
  Modern dance faculty not on the committee

SAC Review due to department administrative assistant

Internal and external letters due to RPT chair

File Closed (No materials added after this date)

File available for RPT committee review

Department chair adds his/her letter to file

Chair of the department meets with candidate to review
  SAC report
  Department minutes
  Chair's letter

Candidate has one week to respond

File is forwarded to the office of the dean of the college

Additionally, see RPT Procedures: Chronological Sequence in University of Utah RPT Workshop Manual for specific dates of review process in semester system.
6 April, 2010

Carl DeTar, Chair
University RPT Standards Committee
Campus

Dear Carlton DeTar and URPTSC members,

The Department of Art and Art History has recently revised our RPT standards. In our revision we have taken the opportunity to move our Third Year formal review to a Fourth Year formal review. We would propose the University RPT Standards Committee expedite approval of this discrete change in our RPT statement to take place this year Spring 2010.

1. Our proposed change is to move our mid-probationary, formal review to the candidates fourth year as opposed to their third year. We feel this places the review at a better time in the candidate’s tenure-track process. This option appears in the 2009 and 2010 RPT workshop manual Pp.15 2.a (Policy 6-303-III-D-9). “All tenure-eligible faculty members shall have at least one formal, mid-probationary review in their third or fourth year, as determined by departmental rule.”

2. The effective date for this change would take place this Spring 2010, to be in effect for this Fall 2010 in perpetuity or until the department deems necessary to revise in the future.

3. The current policy and practice to be changed is a formal review in the third year of a tenure-eligible faculty member’s tenure-track.

4. The department policy for handling transitional candidates who are subject to the old policy is:

   a. Allow all candidates subject to a third year formal review under the old policy the choice to move their review to fourth year.

   b. Allow those who have just completed a third year formal review to let that review stand. They will not be required to have another formal review until their promotion and tenure year.
c. All new tenure-track hires will be subject to the new policy.

d. The above changes do not alter any other policies including “Triggered” reviews.

5. The third to fourth year formal review policy was voted on by faculty March 10, 2010; the vote was 15 yes, 0 no, 0 abstentions.

_____________________________                      ________________
Chair, Department of Art And Art History          Date

_____________________________                      ________________
Dean, College of Fine Arts                        Date

_____________________________                      ________________
Chair, University RPT Standards Committee          Date

_____________________________                      ________________
Associate Vice President for Faculty                Date