

College of Fine Arts Promotion and Tenure Criteria Summary

Promotion and Tenure Committees

Each department or school will have a committee that consists of at least three tenured faculty within the respective department or school. (See the University of Arizona Handbook for Appointed Personnel, 3.11.01, Promotion and Tenure, Standing Committees, for detail information.)

Criteria for Appointment/Promotion to the Various Ranks of Tenure-Track Faculty

Assistant Professor – Appointment or promotion to this position is based on:

- Effective and promising teaching record.
OR, equivalent level of demonstrated professional competence and indication of potential to meet criteria for subsequent promotion and tenure.
- Evidence of promise in creative endeavors and/or research in primary area.
- Desire and ability to provide efficient service to the department, University and professional community.

Associate Professor – Appointment or promotion to this position is based on:

- Excellence in teaching.
- Growing reputation for creative endeavors and/or research in primary area.
- Significant service to department, University and professional community.
- Associate Professor with tenure will be based on strong evidence of continual promise and potential for growth in all areas above.

Professor – Appointment or promotion to this position is based on:

- Strong evidence of outstanding teaching ability.
- Sustained level of excellence in creative endeavors/research with a national or international reputation (verified by internal and external evaluations).
- Evidence of productive service to department, college, university and professional community activities.

Further definition of criteria for Promotion and Tenure in the College of Fine Arts

The following apply to all faculty in the College of Fine Arts and summarize and support the more specific criteria in each unit of Fine Arts.

College of Fine Arts time limits for promotion and tenure comply with those stated in the University of Arizona Handbook for Appointed Personnel.

Effective Teaching

- Essential requirement for promotion/tenure.
- Documented by objective means (student evaluations consistently recorded, peer reviews) accepted as standard in University.
- In some cases, exceptional and brilliant teaching, coupled with appropriate levels of creative/scholarly work may be most significant factor in decision to award tenure.

Creative Endeavors and/or Research

- Significant performances or exhibitions, properly evaluated, are fully equivalent to research and scholarly publication.
- Significant scholarly research and publication dealing with the history, criticism, aesthetic, theory and education in the arts.
- Sustained **quality** of creative and/or research is more important than **quantity**.

Service

- Service to University, department, college and professional community through committee membership or administrative assignment will be carefully documented.
- Service on University/College committees and to professional community and organization boards will be considered.
- Department head is responsible for describing service outside department in relation to the faculty member's principal assignment.

**The University of Arizona
School of Art**

Criteria for Promotion and Tenure by Rank

	ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR	PROFESSOR
Teaching/Advising	Contributes to School's teaching load. Receives positive student evaluations. Demonstrates effective teaching methods as evidenced by quality of students' work. Contributes to development of School's academic program evidenced by contributions to course syllabi. Receives favorable peer teaching evaluations from senior colleagues. Participation in student advising, including service on graduate student's thesis or dissertation committees.	Exercises leadership in School's teaching load. Receives recognition as a teacher through awards or other documentation. Exercises leadership in School's academic program development as evidenced by experience in originating or revising courses as documented in course syllabi. Received positive student and peer teaching evaluations. Outstanding record of student advising, including service as chair of graduate students' thesis or dissertation committees.
Research/Scholarly/ Creative Activity	Engages in quality artistic accomplishment and/or scholarly research as evidenced by exhibitions and/or publications. Establishes the promise of sustained creative research and scholarly activity. Provides evidence of recognition at regional and national levels.	Engages in quality artistic accomplishment and/or scholarly research which contributes significantly to the body of work in the field. Provides evidence of recognition at national and international levels. Demonstrates a commitment to sustained creative research and scholarly activity.
Service	Contributes to School committees. Contributes to profession through service to professional organizations and/or professional journals. Contributes to local or state community by sharing expertise.	Exercises leadership in School through service as committee chairperson and/or outstanding and continued service to School committees. Contributes to college and university committees. Contributes to profession through outstanding and continued service to professional organizations and/or professional journals, providing evidence of national and international impact.

The University of Arizona, College of Fine Arts
THE SCHOOL OF MUSIC
ANNUAL, PRE-TENURE, TENURE AND PROMOTION, AND POST-TENURE REVIEWS IN
THE SCHOOL OF MUSIC: PROCESS, CRITERIA AND MEASURES, AND OUTCOMES

(Approved by the faculty of the School of Music December 3, 1997)

(Amended May 6, 1998; April 4, 2007; March 4, 2009, affirmed 2011)

I. Introduction

II. Process

- A. Roles of the Peer Review Committee and Department Head
- B. Annual Performance Review
- C. Third Year Review for Tenure-Eligible Faculty
- D. Review for Tenure and/or Tenure and Promotion
- E. Post-Tenure Review

III. Criteria and Measures

- A. Faculty Ranks
- B. Teaching/Advising
- C. Research/Creative Activity
- D. Service

IV. Outcomes of the Review Process

- A. General Expectations
- B. Rewards
- C. Relationship to Tenure and Post-Tenure Processes
- D. Expectations for the Next Review Year

I. INTRODUCTION

Faculty members in the School of Music (SOM) of The University of Arizona are evaluated with respect to all personnel matters on the basis of their performance. The annual performance review is intended to support faculty members in achieving excellence in their duties and responsibilities. It serves as a basis for the assessment and enhancement of faculty performance and provides a measure of accountability to the people of Arizona.

The function of the review is both formative and summative: it involves faculty in the design of their own performance expectations within the context of the department's mission and budgetary constraints, and it provides a peer and administrative review process to evaluate the success of each year's work. More specifically, this formal review is intended to serve the following functions:

- i. To involve faculty members in the design and evaluation of objectives and goals of their academic programs and in the identification of the performance expectations central to their own personal and professional growth
- ii. To assess actual performance and accomplishment in the areas of teaching/advising, research/creative activity, and professional service/outreach through the use of peer and administrative review
- iii. To promote the effectiveness of faculty members through an articulation of the types of contributions they might make that enhance the university
- iv. To provide a written record of faculty performance to support personnel and merit salary decisions
- v. To recognize and maximize the special talents, capabilities and achievements of faculty members
- vi. To assist faculty members in improving their contributions in any areas where performance is considered by their peers and/or administrators to be below expectations
- vii. For tenured faculty members, to fulfill the ABOR policy 6-20I H: Post-tenure Review

The purpose of this document is two-fold:

- i. To specify the processes, criteria, and measures used in the SOM to achieve the goals of the annual performance review,
- ii. To clarify the relationship of this review to the tenure and post-tenure processes that apply to all tenure-eligible and tenured faculty.

This document is intended to be consistent with applicable portions of the Bylaws of the SOM; the University Guidelines, Criteria, and Evaluation Procedures for Promotion and Tenure (April 28, 1997); the Arizona Board of Regents (ABOR) Policy Manual; and the University of Arizona Handbook for Appointed Personnel (UHAP). In case of conflict, the provisions of UHAP and of ABOR shall prevail. In general, the annual performance review is covered by the ABOR Policy Manual Section 6-211 and by UHAP Section 3.10.01 through 3.10.06. Promotion and tenure processes are described in UHAP 3.12, and post-tenure processes in UHAP 3.10.04 through 3.10.06.

II. PROCESS

A. Roles of the Peer Review Committee and Department Head

1. The Peer Review Committee consists of the SOM P&T Advisory Committee as defined in the SOM Bylaws. Elections for appointment to the P&T Committee are conducted by secret ballot in spring of each year, and the maximum term of office is two consecutive academic years. The Director calls the first committee meeting of each year, presides until a member is elected to chair the new committee, and does not attend meetings thereafter unless invited.
2. The functions of the Peer Review Committee are to maintain this document, as approved by the faculty; and to conduct annual peer reviews, third year pre-tenure reviews, tenure and promotion reviews, and post-tenure reviews of all faculty as required by University regulations. A summary of the peer evaluation for each faculty member is transmitted directly to the Director by the Chair. The Director, working with the Peer Review Committee, evaluates the faculty member on the basis of information provided by the faculty member, peer evaluators, students, and other information as is available. By April 15th following the calendar year under review, the Director provides the faculty member with a preliminary written evaluation that reflects the summary from the Peer Review Committee and his/her evaluation (see details under II.B.). The evaluation "shall be based on written criteria and shall address, at a minimum, a discussion of the faculty member's (1) past and present performance, (2) professional progress, and (3) future expectations, based on written agreement between the faculty member and unit head" (UHAP 3.10.0 I).
3. The Director and faculty member meet no later than May 15 to discuss the Director's written evaluation, and to agree upon goals, assignments, and expectations for the next annual review. The faculty member provides comments as desired, signs the document, and returns it to the Director within 15 days of this meeting. Any significant disagreements between the faculty member and the Director about either the evaluation or the work assignment shall be mediated by the Peer Review Committee. If this mediation process fails, an appeal may be made to the Dean.

B. Annual Performance Review

1. Each faculty member is expected to submit the Annual Performance Review Portfolio (APRP) to the SOM Peer Review Committee no later than the first day of classes in the spring semester. The APRP shall consist of the following:

- SOM Annual Faculty Performance Evaluation Toolset (PETS)
- Load Report (spring, summer & fall calendar year semesters)
- Workload/proportional weighting
- Courseload
- Student Evaluations
- Course descriptions and syllabi
- Any supplemental material

This APRP shall serve as the primary source of information for the Annual Performance Review by the SOM Peer Review Committee and the Director (see II.C.). Any faculty member not submitting their APRP by the deadline will be evaluated only on material that is in their Faculty PETS Load Report data entries. The SOM Peer Review Committee will review and evaluate all faculty Annual Performance Review Portfolios between February 1st and March 1st.

"Every annual review of teaching will consist of peer and student input, including student evaluations of faculty classroom performance in all classes, and other expressions of teaching performance." (UHAP 3.10.01).

2. The overall department goals for division of responsibility in teaching/advising, research/creative activity, and service/outreach support the missions of the SOM, College, and University. Workload assignments for individual faculty are flexible, and are established annually in terms of the goals stated during the Annual Performance Review Conference with the Director. A typical faculty workload assignment is 40% teaching/advising, 40% creative activity/research, and 20% service. It is expected that these assignments will vary as careers progress and in accordance with the strengths of each faculty member, but remain consistent with and in support of the missions and budgetary constraints of the SOM, College, and University. Sabbatical leaves and creative leaves without pay are evaluated as full-time research/creative activity. Administrative assignments are separately evaluated by the Dean of the College of Fine Arts.

3. Faculty shall be rated in three primary areas of responsibility (teaching/advising, research/creative activity, and service/outreach) according to a five-level scale (1-Unsatisfactory, 2-Needs Improvement, 3-Meets Expectations, 4-Exceeds Expectations, 5-Truly Exceptional). The Peer Review Committee and the Director will assign numerical ratings for each of the three areas consistent with the workload assignment, and the Director will generate an overall rating.

A rating of "unsatisfactory" in two of the three individual areas would normally dictate an overall rating of "unsatisfactory."

C. Third Year Review for Tenure-Eligible Faculty

From the University Handbook for Appointed Personnel (found at <http://web.arizona.edu/~uhap/>):

1. UHAP 3.12.04 Assistant Professors Rev. 4/2003. An initial appointment as an assistant professor is for a period of one academic year. The appointment may be renewed at that rank no more than six times, i.e., no faculty member may hold the title of assistant professor for more than seven academic years. The rank of Assistant Professor is not tenurable. Assistant professors without prior service are permitted six years to tenure unless the Provost approves of a shorter period and the candidate agrees in writing at the time of appointment.

2. A person promoted to assistant professor from the rank of instructor may not be reappointed in a tenure-eligible position more than six successive times including any appointments as a tenure-eligible instructor.

3. An assistant professor may be recommended for promotion, for nonrenewal or for other change in status at any time through the sixth year of tenure-eligible service.

4. Exceptions to the time table for tenure and retention review are described in UHAP Section 3.06.

5. Before the end of the third year in rank assistant professors shall be informed in writing by their department head that they are being recommended for: (a) reappointment for a fourth, fifth and sixth year as assistant professor (this does not necessarily preclude consideration for promotion effective the sixth year, nor does it preclude possible nonretention at the end of the sixth year); (b) promotion for the fourth year; or (c) nonrenewal at the expiration of the fourth year of service in rank. During a third-year review, departments may seek additional assessments from outside the department and the University regarding a candidate's professional accomplishments, stature as viewed by peers, and scholarly potential.

6. Reappointment in rank at the end of three years may be made without college or University review, but assistant professors must be formally evaluated at this stage by the department head and departmental standing committee on faculty status. This evaluation shall be expressed in writing, identifying any problem areas which may preclude the granting of tenure, and given to the nontenured faculty member. Decisions not to reappoint, however, must follow from the full review process described in UHAP Subsection 3.12.07. The college may require college review of all retention cases.

7. Before the end of the sixth year in rank, assistant professors shall be informed in writing by the department head and dean that they are being recommended for: (a) promotion to the rank of associate professor with tenure; or (b) appointment as assistant professor for a seventh and terminal year. See UHAP Section 3.15. A faculty member/academic professional cannot waive the right to tenure or renewal review. There must be a review, even in the absence of a Promotion and Tenure packet, unless the faculty member/academic professional submits a letter of resignation in which he/she (a) waives his/her right to a review and (b) resigns as of the end of what would be the terminal year.

D. Review for Tenure and/or Tenure and Promotion

Each year before a candidate who chooses or is required to apply for promotion, the Office of the Provost issues a memorandum listing all criteria and expectations for this process. The process for tenure and retention review are described in UHAP Section 3.11.

E. Post-Tenure Review

1. The Post-Tenure Review portion will consist of the current APRP along with a "snapshot" review by the SOM Peer Review Committee and Director, considering the Director's written evaluation, faculty member's responses, and summaries of the faculty member's previous two year Annual Performance Reviews, "with substantial emphasis on the most recent year for evaluation of teaching" (UHAP 3.10.01). The Peer Review Committee will review, and the chair will summarize the Committee's evaluations and recommendations for the current Annual Performance Review, and forward these to the Director for final summary and evaluation. The Committee will review, and the Chair will summarize the Committee's evaluations and recommendations for the three-year Post-tenure Review period, and forward these to the Director for final summary and evaluation. The Director and the Peer Review Committee will autonomously conduct annual performance reviews of the calendar year for each faculty member and then review the previous two years as an appendix to complete the Post-tenure Review. The Director's role will be to share perceptions of prior years' peer reviews only where patterns of "needs improvement" or weak performance occur. All PETS entries and Self-Evaluation narrative summaries will remain "open" throughout the calendar year but will "close" on the first day of classes in the spring semester.

2. Tenured faculty who are "overall satisfactory" but deficient in a single area must enter a faculty development plan.

3. "In order to audit the Annual Performance Review process, the Dean of the College of Fine Arts shall review a sufficient number of tenured cases each year to ensure that over a maximum of five years, every tenured file is reviewed. The Dean's Level Audit will determine the adequacy, fairness and integrity of the process" (UHAP 3.10.01).

4. Faculty who are evaluated as "2-Needs Improvement" shall be offered support for "remedial improvement of performance" with the Director of the School assigned as their mentor. Those who are evaluated as "1-Unsatisfactory" shall be assigned a mandated performance improvement plan designed and mentored by the Director.

III. CRITERIA AND MEASURES

A. Faculty Ranks

INSTRUCTOR

An appointment as tenure-eligible instructor indicates that a search committee and the administration of the School of Music believe that the appointee is qualified to sustain an academic career and has the potential to progress to the ranks of assistant and then associate professor within seven years designated in the University Handbook for Appointed Personnel. The appointee must hold the terminal degree or have equivalent professional experience appropriate to the field of specialization in music. An individual who is an active candidate for the terminal degree may be appointed as instructor, but the position is then non tenure-eligible.

No individual may hold the rank of tenure-eligible instructor for more than four years. An appointment as non tenure-eligible instructor may, however, be renewed indefinitely. Within three years of an initial appointment as non tenure-eligible instructor, an individual whose evaluations meet the appropriate criteria may be promoted to the rank of non tenure-eligible assistant professor.

ASSISTANT PROFESSOR

Promotion to, or appointment as, an assistant professor is considered on the basis of promise as a teacher, scholar, and musician. The position offers the opportunity to develop potential in teaching, performance and/or research. The definition of research in music includes such creative activities as composition, public performance (e.g., faculty recitals, performance by ensemble groups) as well as such traditional disciplines as musicology, theory and music education. A part of the assistant professors' responsibility will be to serve on committees in his or her department.

ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR

Promotion to associate professor indicates that the assistant professor has shown excellence in teaching by demonstrating a thorough knowledge of his or her field. The candidate must also offer evidence of local, state and national recognition through research, publications, performances or composition. A recommendation for promotion means that the candidate's peers believe in his or her potential for further growth and expect that he or she will eventually be promoted to professor. The candidate should give evidence of the capacity for increased committee and administrative responsibilities. Promotion within the University from assistant professor to associate professor carries with it the granting of tenure. Initial appointment at the University of Arizona at the rank of associate professor implies that the individual will be evaluated for tenure or nonrenewal under the guidelines specified in the University Handbook for Appointed Personnel.

PROFESSOR

Promotion to professor indicates that the associate professor has achieved national recognition in performance, scholarship, or composition, and has given clear demonstration of superior teaching and maturity as a colleague. Work on committees and in other forms of University and public service are significant responsibilities. The SOM faculty and P&T Advisory Committee wish to emphasize that although these criteria appear to be reasonable guidelines for the evaluation of faculty performance, they are not to be construed as a sine qua non checklist. In some instances, all of the items under the three categories of criteria do not apply with equal validity to every teaching area.

B. Teaching/Advising

1. The instructional function of the University requires faculty members to communicate effectively both the current body of knowledge and the latest research in the classroom, other learning environments, with individual student contact, and through professional modes of publication and performance.
2. Examples of "Meets Expectations" for excellence in teaching include, but are not limited to:
 - organizing and conducting courses appropriate to the level of instruction and the nature of the subject matter;

- informing students of course content, objectives, schedule, and grading criteria at the beginning of the course through mandated course descriptions or syllabi;
 - receiving positive student evaluations and peer recognition for teaching;
 - meeting departmental expectations for student professional/career advising and mentoring;
 - encouraging students to participate actively in the learning process, and, according to their capabilities, in current discourse and debates within a field;
 - enabling students to articulate issues and solve problems on their own;
 - being committed to improvement in teaching and encouraging feedback from students;
 - being available outside the classroom for further instruction and advice through regular office hours and/or other avenues of communication; and
 - successfully directing students through their degree paths.
3. Examples of "Exceeds Expectations" for excellence in teaching include, but are not limited to:
- bringing to the learning environment not only traditional pedagogical approaches but also innovative techniques and materials as appropriate;
 - integrating innovative technology into teaching;
 - demonstrating sustained evidence of student success and recognition in performance, scholarship, and/or research/creative activity;
 - advising and mentoring students at all levels, including alumni and prospective students;
 - receiving consistently superior student evaluations and peer recognition for outstanding teaching.
4. Examples of "Needs Improvement" and/or "Unsatisfactory" performance in teaching include, but are not limited to:
- fails to meet courses on a regular basis;
 - fails to be available for student/faculty/staff consultation;
 - fails to provide students with course descriptions or syllabi; and
 - fails to serve on student committees;
 - receives substantial percentage of unsatisfactory student evaluations and peer assessment of teaching;
 - poor performance on student committees (e.g., failure to attend recitals, read and advise students on written theses, dissertations, lecture-recital proposals and documents, etc).
5. Measures used to assess the quantity and quality of these activities may include, but are not limited to:
- student evaluations of teaching;
 - peer review by the P&T Advisory Committee;
 - administrative annual reviews as required by ABOR and UHAP regulations;
 - commendations of faculty and staff colleagues, and university leaders;
 - awards and honors;
 - self evaluation;
 - Director's evaluation;
 - peer observations of teaching;
 - teaching assistant input;
 - adoption of curricular or teaching materials at other institutions;
 - special honors, recognition or awards for teaching excellence or innovation;
 - new course development or significant revision of existing courses, integration with other courses, and other contributions to the development of curriculum.
6. A rating of "Needs Improvement" will be awarded when the faculty member's activities and performance range between the categories of "Meets Expectations" and "Unsatisfactory."
7. A rating of "Unsatisfactory" will be awarded when the faculty member fails to complete activities and performance expectations under "Meets Expectations."
8. A rating of "Truly Exceptional" will be awarded when the faculty member's activities and performance surpass "Exceeds Expectations."

C. Research/Creative Activity

1. The research/creative activity function of the University requires faculty members to be actively engaged in the expansion of intellectual, artistic, and scholarly frontiers; in the creation and/or application of new knowledge; and in the integration of knowledge from various disciplines. This scholarly activity is to be interpreted in the broadest possible sense, consistent with the research mission of the University. For activity performed within a service or community setting, the faculty member must demonstrate how the activity merits artistic evaluation and should not be considered only as an act of service or teaching.

2. Examples of "Meets Expectations" for excellence in research/creative activities include, but are not limited to:

- engaging in research leading to publication (e.g., books, book chapters, refereed journal articles, peer reviewed conference papers, monographs, abstracts, reviews, editions, and online publication);
- performing in solo recitals, ensemble performances, and conducting master classes or workshops of local and regional significance;
- demonstrating a high degree of musicality and technical skill in performance;
- being respected as a performer, creative artist, and/or scholar by both students and colleagues;
- engaging in ongoing programs of scholarly and/or creative activity;
- receiving grants and contracts or other outside support for projects;
- producing deliverable systems (e.g., hardware, software, designs, etc., as well as the necessary technical reports);
- editing books or journals;
- producing non-refereed publications including electronic media;
- creating compositions or arrangements;
- creating original choreography and/or staging of existing repertoire;
- creating audio and/or video recordings or multi-media productions; and
- giving convention and conference presentations.

3. Examples of "Exceeds Expectations" for excellence in research/creative activities include, but are not limited to:

- showing a sustained program of scholarly research and publication or creative contributions;
- performing in solo recitals, ensemble performances, and conducting master classes or workshops of national and/or international significance;
- significant recognition for research, scholarship, publication, or creative activity;
- responsibility and recognition achieved by being named to important professional positions; and
- receipt and renewal of grants, contracts, awards and fellowships, where appropriate;
- achieving high quality as judged by independent peers both inside and outside the University.

4. Examples of "Needs Improvement" and/or "Unsatisfactory" performance in research/creative activity include, but are not limited to:

- lack of evidence of ongoing research or other forms of creative activity;
- failure to relate research/creative activity to mission of the department;
- lack of performance activities (studio/performance faculty).

5. Measures used to assess the quantity and quality of these activities may include, but are not limited to:

- demonstrated progress toward completion of a project;
- culmination of a project;
- reviews of a completed project;
- importance of a venue, stature of event, and/or significance of a publication;
- invited, refereed, or non-refereed status;
- role of the participant (i.e., collaborator and degree of responsibility);
- peer review by the P&T Advisory Committee;
- administrative annual reviews as required by ABOR and UHAP regulations;
- commendations of faculty and staff colleagues, and university leaders;
- awards and honors;
- self evaluation;
- Director's evaluation;
- research assistant input;

- adoption of research materials or publications at other institutions;
- special honors, recognition or awards for research/creative activity;
- research grant that creates student employment through grant funding or other activity.

6. A rating of "Needs Improvement" will be awarded when the faculty member's activities and performance range between the categories of "Meets Expectations" and "Unsatisfactory."

7. A rating of "Unsatisfactory" will be awarded when the faculty member fails to complete activities and performance expectations under "Meets Expectations."

8. A rating of "Truly Exceptional" will be awarded when the faculty member's activities and performance surpass "Exceeds Expectations."

D. Service

1. Service becomes an increasingly important part of a faculty member's activities as he or she advances through the professorial ranks. Service is divided into two general categories: Citizenship and Outreach. Citizenship includes: participation on departmental, college, and University committees, and activity in professional associations and on public committees where faculty disciplinary knowledge is required. These activities may serve the community, profession, state and/or nation. Outreach has the potential to blend teaching and research/creative activity. It involves delivering, applying, and preserving knowledge for the direct benefit of external audiences in ways that are consistent with University and unit missions. The sharing of one's expertise with the greater community is encouraged as it elicits research ideas and contributions.

2. Examples of "Meets Expectations" for excellence in service include, but are not limited to:

- serving on area, department, college, and university committees with a high level of interest and participation;
- participating in administration or coordination of programs within the department;
- advising student organizations beyond those directly related to teaching duties, including Honors programs;
- conducting pre-registration academic advising;
- holding office in state, regional, academic, or professional organizations;
- developing outreach activities such as classes, workshops, and performances for groups outside the university;
- contributing to the development or enrichment of the department, college or university through fundraising, recruitment, and promotional activities;
- being a participating and constructive member of his/her teaching area and fulfilling faculty responsibilities;
- showing interest in School of Music functions by attending convocations, faculty and student recitals and presentations, faculty meetings, and concerts by major performing organizations;
- serving as a judge, critic or reviewer on a local, state, or regional level;
- presenting community lectures or performances; and
- actively participating in faculty governance at unit, college or university levels;

3. Examples of "Exceeds Expectations" for excellence in service include, but are not limited to:

- chairing department, college or university committees and/or making significant contributions;
- directing the administration or coordination of major components within the department and making significant contributions;
- holding major office in state, regional, national, or international publication or organization;
- serving on editorial board of a state, regional, national, or international publication;
- establishing a state, regional, national, or international publication or organization;
- serving as a cultural or educational consultant to a state, regional, national, or international organization;
- serving as a judge, critic or reviewer on a regional, national or international level;
- making a significant contribution to the development or enrichment of the department, college, or

- university through fundraising, recruitment, and promotional activities;
 - providing non-credit courses, extension programs, or short courses to governmental agencies and professional organizations; and
 - helping to acquire, design, or redesign departmental facilities.
4. Examples of "Needs Improvement" and/or "Unsatisfactory" performance in service include, but are not limited to:
- failure to participate in area, department, college, and university activities with an appropriate level of interest;
 - failure to be familiar with University, College of Fine Arts, and School of Music policies and curricula;
 - failure to take advantage of opportunities to develop community outreach activities; and
 - failure to attend convocations, faculty and student recitals and presentations, faculty meetings, and/or concerts by major performing organizations.
5. Measures used to assess the quantity and quality of these activities may include, but are not limited to:
- peer review by P&T Advisory Committee;
 - administrative annual reviews as required by ABOR and UHAP regulations;
 - self evaluation;
 - Director's evaluation;
 - commendations of faculty and staff colleagues, and university leaders;
 - awards and honors; and
 - letters of acknowledgement from community leaders for public service.
6. A rating of "Unsatisfactory" will be awarded when the faculty member fails to complete activities and performance expectations under "Meets Expectations".
7. A rating of "Needs Improvement" will be awarded when the faculty member's activities and performance range between the categories of "Meets Expectations" and "Unsatisfactory."
8. A rating of "Truly Exceptional" will be awarded when the faculty member's activities and performance surpass "Exceeds Expectations" in an extraordinary manner.

IV. OUTCOMES OF THE REVIEW PROCESS

A. General Expectations

Given the high quality of the SOM and its faculty, and the very stringent standards applied to the hiring and promotion processes, it is expected that ratings of unsatisfactory in any of the three areas will be very rare and that an overall unsatisfactory rating will be even more unlikely. A small fraction of the faculty may be identified from time to time as needing improvement, and it is expected that faculty development support from the department and university, as well as mentoring by other faculty, will assist those individuals in quickly regaining the expected productivity levels. While some faculty may from time to time receive a rating of truly exceptional in one of the three areas, an overall rating of truly exceptional would be regarded as a career milestone. Thus it is anticipated that the vast majority of the faculty of the department will meet or exceed expectations for excellence in performance in the individual areas as well as overall.

B. Rewards

As shown in Section II.B.3. Annual Performance Review, those faculty with overall ratings in the top three categories will be eligible for available salary increases, support for growth and development, and other rewards that may be available. This applies to tenure-eligible faculty as well as to tenured faculty. The allocation of these rewards will be determined by the Director and the SOM P&T Advisory Committee, subject to any external constraints that may apply, and consistent with any and all University and College of Fine Arts policies and procedures. Those faculty with an overall rating in the needs improvement category may be eligible for departmental and university support for remedial improvement of performance, and may be eligible for certain salary increases (e.g. cost-of-living adjustments). Those

faculty receiving an overall unsatisfactory rating will not be eligible for any salary increases unless required by State law, but may receive departmental and university support for improvement of performance.

C. Relationship to Tenure and Post-Tenure Processes

Tenure-eligible faculty are also required to participate in the tenure processes described in UHAP 3.12. The annual performance reviews are taken into account as part of the promotion and tenure process, but such evaluations are not determinative on promotion and tenure issues. Satisfactory ratings in the annual performance reviews do not necessarily indicate successful progress toward promotion and tenure. Progress toward promotion and tenure requires accomplishment over a period of years in the broader range of faculty responsibilities, and includes evaluation by external referees, a component not included in the annual review process. Criteria and decisions with regard to promotion and tenure are detailed in UHAP 3.11.

For tenured faculty, the annual review is not intended to be a re-tenuring process; it is simply an opportunity to assess progress toward the goals outlined in Article I of this document. Those tenured faculty who receive a rating of unsatisfactory in any of the three individual areas, or an overall rating of unsatisfactory, however, are required to participate in the post-tenure processes described in UHAP 3.10.04 through 3.10.06.

D. Expectations for the Next Review Year

Criteria for annual performance are intended to recognize long-term faculty activities and outcomes. Concentration in one of the three major areas of faculty responsibilities during a particular year is permissible, and may be encouraged. These criteria are designed to be sufficiently flexible to meet the particular objectives of the department without undermining the objectives of the College or University. It is important that each faculty member has goals, assignments, and expectations for the next annual review, documented in writing, according to the process specified in Article II.

The University of Arizona, College of Fine Arts
THE SCHOOL OF DANCE
ANNUAL, PRE-TENURE, TENURE AND PROMOTION, AND POST-TENURE REVIEWS IN
THE SCHOOL OF DANCE: PROCESS, CRITERIA AND MEASURES, AND OUTCOMES

(Approved by the faculty of the School of Dance, December 3, 1997)
(Amended May 6, 1998; April 4, 2007; March 4, 2009)

I. Introduction

II. Process

- A. Roles of the Peer Review Committee and Department Head
- B. Annual Performance Review
- C. Third Year Review for Tenure-Eligible Faculty
- D. Review for Tenure and/or Tenure and Promotion
- E. Post-Tenure Review

III. Criteria and Measures

- A. Faculty Ranks
- B. Teaching/Advising
- C. Research/Creative Activity
- D. Service

IV. Outcomes of the Review Process

- A. General Expectations
- B. Rewards
- C. Relationship to Tenure and Post-Tenure Processes
- D. Expectations for the Next Review Year

I. INTRODUCTION

Faculty members in the School of Dance of The University of Arizona are evaluated with respect to all personnel matters on the basis of their performance. The annual performance review is intended to support faculty members in achieving excellence in their duties and responsibilities. It serves as a basis for the assessment and enhancement of faculty performance and provides a measure of accountability to the people of Arizona.

The function of the review is both formative and summative: it involves faculty in the design of their own performance expectations within the context of the department's mission and budgetary constraints, and it provides a peer and administrative review process to evaluate the success of each year's work. More specifically, this formal review is intended to serve the following functions:

- i. To involve faculty members in the design and evaluation of objectives and goals of their academic programs and in the identification of the performance expectations central to their own personal and professional growth
- ii. To assess actual performance and accomplishment in the areas of teaching/advising, research/creative activity, and professional service/outreach through the use of peer and administrative review
- iii. To promote the effectiveness of faculty members through an articulation of the types of contributions they might make that enhance the university

- iv. To provide a written record of faculty performance to support personnel and merit salary decisions
- v. To recognize and maximize the special talents, capabilities and achievements of faculty members
- vi. To assist faculty members in improving their contributions in any areas where performance is considered by their peers and/or administrators to be below expectations
- vii. For tenured faculty members, to fulfill the ABOR policy 6-20I H: Post-tenure Review

The purpose of this document is two-fold:

- i. To specify the processes, criteria, and measures used in the SOM to achieve the goals of the annual performance review,
- ii. To clarify the relationship of this review to the tenure and post-tenure processes that apply to all tenure-eligible and tenured faculty.

This document is intended to be consistent with applicable portions of the Bylaws of the School of Dance; the University Guidelines, Criteria, and Evaluation Procedures for Promotion and Tenure (April 28, 1997); the Arizona Board of Regents (ABOR) Policy Manual; and the University of Arizona Handbook for Appointed Personnel (UHAP). In case of conflict, the provisions of UHAP and of ABOR shall prevail. In general, the annual performance review is covered by the ABOR Policy Manual Section 6-211 and by UHAP Section 3.10.01 through 3.10.06. Promotion and tenure processes are described in UHAP 3.12, and post-tenure processes in UHAP 3.10.04 through 3.10.06.

II. PROCESS

A. Roles of the Peer Review Committee and Department Head

1. The Peer Review Committee consists of the School of Dance P&T Advisory Committee as defined in the School of Dance Bylaws. Elections for appointment to the P&T Committee are conducted by secret ballot in spring of each year, and the maximum term of office is two consecutive academic years. The Director calls the first committee meeting of each year, presides until a member is elected to chair the new committee, and does not attend meetings thereafter unless invited.

2. The functions of the Peer Review Committee are to maintain this document, as approved by the faculty; and to conduct annual peer reviews, third year pre-tenure reviews, tenure and promotion reviews, and post-tenure reviews of all faculty as required by University regulations. A summary of the peer evaluation for each faculty member is transmitted directly to the Director by the Chair. The Director, working with the Peer Review Committee, evaluates the faculty member on the basis of information provided by the faculty member, peer evaluators, students, and other information as is available. By April 15th following the calendar year under review, the Director provides the faculty member with a preliminary written evaluation that reflects the summary from the Peer Review Committee and his/her evaluation (see details under II.B.). The evaluation "shall be based on written criteria and

shall address, at a minimum, a discussion of the faculty member's (1) past and present performance, (2) professional progress, and (3) future expectations, based on written agreement between the faculty member and unit head" (UHAP 3.10.0 I).

3. The Director and faculty member meet no later than May 15 to discuss the Director's written evaluation, and to agree upon goals, assignments, and expectations for the next annual review. The faculty member provides comments as desired, signs the document, and returns it to the Director within 15 days of this meeting. Any significant disagreements between the faculty member and the Director about either the evaluation or the work assignment shall be mediated by the Peer Review Committee. If this mediation process fails, an appeal may be made to the Dean.

B. Annual Performance Review

1. Each faculty member is expected to submit the Annual Performance Review Portfolio (APRP) to the School of Dance Peer Review Committee no later than the first day of classes in the spring semester. The APRP shall consist of the following:

School of Dance Annual Faculty Performance Evaluation Toolset (PETS)
Load Report (spring, summer & fall calendar year semesters)
Workload/proportional weighting
Courseload
Student Evaluations
Course descriptions and syllabi
Any supplemental material

This APRP shall serve as the primary source of information for the Annual Performance Review by the School of Dance Peer Review Committee and the Director (see II.C.). Any faculty member not submitting their APRP by the deadline will be evaluated only on material that is in their Faculty PETS Load Report data entries. The School of Dance Peer Review Committee will review and evaluate all faculty Annual Performance Review Portfolios between February 1st and March 1st.

"Every annual review of teaching will consist of peer and student input, including student evaluations of faculty classroom performance in all classes, and other expressions of teaching performance." (UHAP 3.10.01).

2. The overall department goals for division of responsibility in teaching/advising, research/creative activity, and service/outreach support the missions of the School of Dance, College, and University. Workload assignments for individual faculty are flexible, and are established annually in terms of the goals stated during the Annual Performance Review Conference with the Director. A typical faculty workload assignment is 40% teaching/advising, 40% creative activity/research, and 20% service. It is expected that these assignments will vary as careers progress and in accordance with the strengths of each faculty member, but remain consistent with and in support of the missions and budgetary constraints of the School of Dance, College, and University. Sabbatical leaves and creative leaves without pay are evaluated as full-time research/creative activity. Administrative assignments are separately evaluated by the Dean of the College of Fine Arts.
2. Faculty shall be rated in three primary areas of responsibility (teaching/advising, research/creative activity, and service/outreach) according to a five-level scale (1-Unsatisfactory, 2-Needs

Improvement, 3-Meets Expectations, 4-Exceeds Expectations, 5-Truly Exceptional). The Peer Review Committee and the Director will assign numerical ratings for each of the three areas consistent with the workload assignment, and the Director will generate an overall rating.

A rating of "unsatisfactory" in two of the three individual areas would normally dictate an overall rating of "unsatisfactory."

C. Third Year Review for Tenure-Eligible Faculty

From the University Handbook for Appointed Personnel (found at <http://web.arizona.edu/~uhap/>):

1. UHAP 3.12.04 Assistant Professors Rev. 4/2003. An initial appointment as an assistant professor is for a period of one academic year. The appointment may be renewed at that rank no more than six times, i.e., no faculty member may hold the title of assistant professor for more than seven academic years. The rank of Assistant Professor is not tenurable. Assistant professors without prior service are permitted six years to tenure unless the Provost approves of a shorter period and the candidate agrees in writing at the time of appointment.
2. A person promoted to assistant professor from the rank of instructor may not be reappointed in a tenure-eligible position more than six successive times including any appointments as a tenure-eligible instructor.
3. An assistant professor may be recommended for promotion, for nonrenewal or for other change in status at any time through the sixth year of tenure-eligible service.
4. Exceptions to the time table for tenure and retention review are described in UHAP Section 3.06.
5. Before the end of the third year in rank assistant professors shall be informed in writing by their department head that they are being recommended for: (a) reappointment for a fourth, fifth and sixth year as assistant professor (this does not necessarily preclude consideration for promotion effective the sixth year, nor does it preclude possible nonretention at the end of the sixth year); (b) promotion for the fourth year; or (c) nonrenewal at the expiration of the fourth year of service in rank. During a third-year review, departments may seek additional assessments from outside the department and the University regarding a candidate's professional accomplishments, stature as viewed by peers, and scholarly potential.
6. Reappointment in rank at the end of three years may be made without college or University review, but assistant professors must be formally evaluated at this stage by the department head and departmental standing committee on faculty status. This evaluation shall be expressed in writing, identifying any problem areas which may preclude the granting of tenure, and given to the nontenured faculty member. Decisions not to reappoint, however, must follow from the full review process described in UHAP Subsection 3.12.07. The college may require college review of all retention cases.
7. Before the end of the sixth year in rank, assistant professors shall be informed in writing by the department head and dean that they are being recommended for: (a) promotion to the rank of associate professor with tenure; or (b) appointment as assistant professor for a seventh and terminal year. See UHAP Section 3.15. A faculty member/academic professional cannot waive the right to tenure or renewal review. There must be a review, even in the absence of a Promotion and Tenure packet, unless the faculty member/academic professional submits a letter of resignation in which he/she (a) waives his/her right to a review and (b) resigns as of the end of what would be the terminal year.

D. Review for Tenure and/or Tenure and Promotion

Each year before a candidate who chooses or is required to apply for promotion, the Office of the Provost issues a memorandum listing all criteria and expectations for this process. The process for tenure and retention review are described in UHAP Section 3.11.

E. Post-Tenure Review

1. The Post-Tenure Review portion will consist of the current APRP along with a "snapshot" review by the School of Dance Peer Review Committee and Director, considering the Director's written evaluation, faculty member's responses, and summaries of the faculty member's previous two year Annual Performance Reviews, "with substantial emphasis on the most recent year for evaluation of teaching" (UHAP 3.10.01). The Peer Review Committee will review, and the chair will summarize the Committee's evaluations and recommendations for the current Annual Performance Review, and forward these to the Director for final summary and evaluation. The Committee will review, and the Chair will summarize the Committee's evaluations and recommendations for the three-year Post-tenure Review period, and forward these to the Director for final summary and evaluation. The Director and the Peer Review Committee will autonomously conduct annual performance reviews of the calendar year for each faculty member and then review the previous two years as an appendix to complete the Post-tenure Review. The Director's role will be to share perceptions of prior years' peer reviews only where patterns of "needs improvement" or weak performance occur. All PETS entries and Self-Evaluation narrative summaries will remain "open" throughout the calendar year but will "close" on the first day of classes in the spring semester.

2. Tenured faculty who are "overall satisfactory" but deficient in a single area must enter a faculty development plan.

3. "In order to audit the Annual Performance Review process, the Dean of the College of Fine Arts shall review a sufficient number of tenured cases each year to ensure that over a maximum of five years, every tenured file is reviewed. The Dean's Level Audit will determine the adequacy, fairness and integrity of the process" (UHAP 3.10.01).

4. Faculty who are evaluated as "2-Needs Improvement" shall be offered support for "remedial improvement of performance" with the Director of the School assigned as their mentor. Those who are evaluated as "1-Unsatisfactory" shall be assigned a mandated performance improvement plan designed and mentored by the Director.

III. CRITERIA AND MEASURES

A. Faculty Ranks

INSTRUCTOR

An appointment as tenure-eligible instructor indicates that a search committee and the administration of the School of Music believe that the appointee is qualified to sustain an academic career and has the potential to progress to the ranks of assistant and then associate professor within seven years designated in the University Handbook for Appointed Personnel. The appointee must hold the terminal degree or have equivalent professional

experience appropriate to the field of specialization in music. An individual who is an active candidate for the terminal degree may be appointed as instructor, but the position is then non tenure-eligible.

No individual may hold the rank of tenure-eligible instructor for more than four years. An appointment as non tenure-eligible instructor may, however, be renewed indefinitely. Within three years of an initial appointment as non tenure-eligible instructor, an individual whose evaluations meet the appropriate criteria may be promoted to the rank of non tenure-eligible assistant professor.

ASSISTANT PROFESSOR

Promotion to, or appointment as, an assistant professor is considered on the basis of promise as a teacher, scholar, and musician. The position offers the opportunity to develop potential in teaching, performance and/or research. The definition of research in dance includes such creative activities as choreography, public performance (e.g., faculty recitals, performance by ensemble groups) as well as such traditional disciplines as musicology, theory and music education. A part of the assistant professors' responsibility will be to serve on committees in his or her department.

ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR

Promotion to associate professor indicates that the assistant professor has shown excellence in teaching by demonstrating a thorough knowledge of his or her field. The candidate must also offer evidence of local, state and national recognition through research, publications, performances or composition. A recommendation for promotion means that the candidate's peers believe in his or her potential for further growth and expect that he or she will eventually be promoted to professor. The candidate should give evidence of the capacity for increased committee and administrative responsibilities. Promotion within the University from assistant professor to associate professor carries with it the granting of tenure. Initial appointment at the University of Arizona at the rank of associate professor implies that the individual will be evaluated for tenure or nonrenewal under the guidelines specified in the University Handbook for Appointed Personnel.

PROFESSOR

Promotion to professor indicates that the associate professor has achieved national recognition in performance, scholarship, or choreography, and has given clear demonstration of superior teaching and maturity as a colleague. Work on committees and in other forms of University and public service are significant responsibilities. The School of Dance faculty and P&T Advisory Committee wish to emphasize that although these criteria appear to be reasonable guidelines for the evaluation of faculty performance, they are not to be construed as a sine qua non checklist. In some instances, all of the items under the three categories of criteria do not apply with equal validity to every teaching area.

B. Teaching/Advising

1. The instructional function of the University requires faculty members to communicate effectively both the current body of knowledge and the latest research in the classroom, other learning environments, with individual student contact, and through professional modes of publication and performance.

2. Examples of "Meets Expectations" for excellence in teaching include, but are not limited to:

- organizing and conducting courses appropriate to the level of instruction and the nature of the subject matter;
- informing students of course content, objectives, schedule, and grading criteria at the beginning of the course through mandated course descriptions or syllabi;
- receiving positive student evaluations and peer recognition for teaching;
- meeting departmental expectations for student professional/career advising and mentoring;
- encouraging students to participate actively in the learning process, and, according to their capabilities, in current discourse and debates within a field;
- enabling students to articulate issues and solve problems on their own;
- being committed to improvement in teaching and encouraging feedback from students;
- being available outside the classroom for further instruction and advice through regular office hours and/or other avenues of communication; and
- successfully directing students through their degree paths.

3. Examples of "Exceeds Expectations" for excellence in teaching include, but are not limited to:

- bringing to the learning environment not only traditional pedagogical approaches but also innovative techniques and materials as appropriate;
- integrating innovative technology into teaching;
- demonstrating sustained evidence of student success and recognition in performance, scholarship, and/or research/creative activity;
- advising and mentoring students at all levels, including alumni and prospective students;
- receiving consistently superior student evaluations and peer recognition for outstanding teaching.

4. Examples of "Needs Improvement" and/or "Unsatisfactory" performance in teaching include, but are not limited to:

- fails to meet courses on a regular basis;
- fails to be available for student/faculty/staff consultation;
- fails to provide students with course descriptions or syllabi; and
- fails to serve on student committees;
- receives substantial percentage of unsatisfactory student evaluations and peer assessment of teaching;
- poor performance on student committees (e.g., failure to attend recitals, read and advise students on written theses, dissertations, lecture-recital proposals and documents, etc).

5. Measures used to assess the quantity and quality of these activities may include, but are not limited to:

- student evaluations of teaching;
- peer review by the P&T Advisory Committee;
- administrative annual reviews as required by ABOR and UHAP regulations;
- commendations of faculty and staff colleagues, and university leaders;
- awards and honors;
- self evaluation;
- Director's evaluation;
- peer observations of teaching;
- teaching assistant input;

- adoption of curricular or teaching materials at other institutions;
- special honors, recognition or awards for teaching excellence or innovation;
- new course development or significant revision of existing courses, integration with other courses, and other contributions to the development of curriculum.

6. A rating of "Needs Improvement" will be awarded when the faculty member's activities and performance range between the categories of "Meets Expectations" and "Unsatisfactory."

7. A rating of "Unsatisfactory" will be awarded when the faculty member fails to complete activities and performance expectations under "Meets Expectations."

8. A rating of "Truly Exceptional" will be awarded when the faculty member's activities and performance surpass "Exceeds Expectations."

C. Research/Creative Activity

1. The research/creative activity function of the University requires faculty members to be actively engaged in the expansion of intellectual, artistic, and scholarly frontiers; in the creation and/or application of new knowledge; and in the integration of knowledge from various disciplines. This scholarly activity is to be interpreted in the broadest possible sense, consistent with the research mission of the University. For activity performed within a service or community setting, the faculty member must demonstrate how the activity merits artistic evaluation and should not be considered only as an act of service or teaching.

2. Examples of "Meets Expectations" for excellence in research/creative activities include, but are not limited to:

- engaging in research leading to publication (e.g., books, book chapters, refereed journal articles, peer reviewed conference papers, monographs, abstracts, reviews, editions, and online publication);
- performing in solo recitals, ensemble performances, and conducting master classes or workshops of local and regional significance;
- demonstrating a high degree of musicality and technical skill in performance;
- being respected as a performer, creative artist, and/or scholar by both students and colleagues;
- engaging in ongoing programs of scholarly and/or creative activity;
- receiving grants and contracts or other outside support for projects;
- producing deliverable systems (e.g., hardware, software, designs, etc., as well as the necessary technical reports);
- editing books or journals;
- producing non-refereed publications including electronic media;
- creating compositions or arrangements;
- creating original choreography and/or staging of existing repertoire;
- creating audio and/or video recordings or multi-media productions; and
- giving convention and conference presentations.

3. Examples of "Exceeds Expectations" for excellence in research/creative activities include, but are not limited to:

- showing a sustained program of scholarly research and publication or creative contributions;
- performing in solo recitals, ensemble performances, and conducting master classes or workshops of national and/or international significance;

- significant recognition for research, scholarship, publication, or creative activity;
- responsibility and recognition achieved by being named to important professional positions; and
- receipt and renewal of grants, contracts, awards and fellowships, where appropriate;
- achieving high quality as judged by independent peers both inside and outside the University.

4. Examples of "Needs Improvement" and/or "Unsatisfactory" performance in research/creative activity include, but are not limited to:

- lack of evidence of ongoing research or other forms of creative activity;
- failure to relate research/creative activity to mission of the department;
- lack of performance activities (studio/performance faculty).
-

5. Measures used to assess the quantity and quality of these activities may include, but are not limited to:

- demonstrated progress toward completion of a project;
- culmination of a project;
- reviews of a completed project;
- importance of a venue, stature of event, and/or significance of a publication;
- invited, refereed, or non-refereed status;
- role of the participant (i.e., collaborator and degree of responsibility);
- peer review by the P&T Advisory Committee;
- administrative annual reviews as required by ABOR and UHAP regulations;
- commendations of faculty and staff colleagues, and university leaders;
- awards and honors;
- self evaluation;
- Director's evaluation;
- research assistant input;
- adoption of research materials or publications at other institutions;
- special honors, recognition or awards for research/creative activity;
- research grant that creates student employment through grant funding or other activity.

6. A rating of "Needs Improvement" will be awarded when the faculty member's activities and performance range between the categories of "Meets Expectations" and "Unsatisfactory."

7. A rating of "Unsatisfactory" will be awarded when the faculty member fails to complete activities and performance expectations under "Meets Expectations."

8. A rating of "Truly Exceptional" will be awarded when the faculty member's activities and performance surpass "Exceeds Expectations."

D. Service

1. Service becomes an increasingly important part of a faculty member's activities as he or she advances through the professorial ranks. Service is divided into two general categories: Citizenship and Outreach. Citizenship includes: participation on departmental, college, and University committees, and activity in professional associations and on public committees where faculty disciplinary knowledge is required. These activities may serve the community, profession, state and/or nation. Outreach has the potential to blend teaching and research/creative activity. It involves delivering, applying, and preserving knowledge for the

direct benefit of external audiences in ways that are consistent with University and unit missions. The sharing of one's expertise with the greater community is encouraged as it elicits research ideas and contributions.

2. Examples of "Meets Expectations" for excellence in service include, but are not limited to:

- serving on area, department, college, and university committees with a high level of interest and participation;
- participating in administration or coordination of programs within the department;
- advising student organizations beyond those directly related to teaching duties, including Honors programs;
- conducting pre-registration academic advising;
- holding office in state, regional, academic, or professional organizations;
- developing outreach activities such as classes, workshops, and performances for groups outside the university;
- contributing to the development or enrichment of the department, college or university through fundraising, recruitment, and promotional activities;
- being a participating and constructive member of his/her teaching area and fulfilling faculty responsibilities;
- showing interest in School of Dance functions by attending convocations, faculty and student recitals and presentations, faculty meetings, and concerts by major performing organizations;
- serving as a judge, critic or reviewer on a local, state, or regional level;
- presenting community lectures or performances; and
- actively participating in faculty governance at unit, college or university levels;

3. Examples of "Exceeds Expectations" for excellence in service include, but are not limited to:

- chairing department, college or university committees and/or making significant contributions;
- directing the administration or coordination of major components within the department and making significant contributions;
- holding major office in state, regional, national, or international publication or organization;
- serving on editorial board of a state, regional, national, or international publication;
- establishing a state, regional, national, or international publication or organization;
- serving as a cultural or educational consultant to a state, regional, national, or international organization;
- serving as a judge, critic or reviewer on a regional, national or international level;
- making a significant contribution to the development or enrichment of the department, college, or university through fundraising, recruitment, and promotional activities;
- providing non-credit courses, extension programs, or short courses to governmental agencies and professional organizations; and
- helping to acquire, design, or redesign departmental facilities.

4. Examples of "Needs Improvement" and/or "Unsatisfactory" performance in service include, but are not limited to:

- failure to participate in area, department, college, and university activities with an appropriate level of interest;
- failure to be familiar with University, College of Fine Arts, and School of Dance policies and curricula;
- failure to take advantage of opportunities to develop community outreach activities; and

- failure to attend convocations, faculty and student recitals and presentations, faculty meetings, and/or concerts by major performing organizations.
5. Measures used to assess the quantity and quality of these activities may include, but are not limited to:
- peer review by P&T Advisory Committee;
 - administrative annual reviews as required by ABOR and UHAP regulations;
 - self-evaluation;
 - Director's evaluation;
 - commendations of faculty and staff colleagues, and university leaders;
 - awards and honors; and
 - letters of acknowledgement from community leaders for public service.
6. A rating of "Unsatisfactory" will be awarded when the faculty member fails to complete activities and performance expectations under "Meets Expectations".
7. A rating of "Needs Improvement" will be awarded when the faculty member's activities and performance range between the categories of "Meets Expectations" and "Unsatisfactory."
8. A rating of "Truly Exceptional" will be awarded when the faculty member's activities and performance surpass "Exceeds Expectations" in an extraordinary manner.

IV. OUTCOMES OF THE REVIEW PROCESS

A. General Expectations

Given the high quality of the School of Dance and its faculty, and the very stringent standards applied to the hiring and promotion processes, it is expected that ratings of unsatisfactory in any of the three areas will be very rare and that an overall unsatisfactory rating will be even more unlikely. A small fraction of the faculty may be identified from time to time as needing improvement, and it is expected that faculty development support from the department and university, as well as mentoring by other faculty, will assist those individuals in quickly regaining the expected productivity levels. While some faculty may from time to time receive a rating of truly exceptional in one of the three areas, an overall rating of truly exceptional would be regarded as a career milestone. Thus it is anticipated that the vast majority of the faculty of the department will meet or exceed expectations for excellence in performance in the individual areas as well as overall.

B. Rewards

As shown in Section II.B.3. Annual Performance Review, those faculty with overall ratings in the top three categories will be eligible for available salary increases, support for growth and development, and other rewards that may be available. This applies to tenure-eligible faculty as well as to tenured faculty. The allocation of these rewards will be determined by the Director and the School of Dance P&T Advisory Committee, subject to any external constraints that may apply, and consistent with any and all University and College of Fine Arts policies and procedures. Those faculty with an overall rating in the needs improvement category may be eligible for departmental and university support for remedial improvement of performance, and may be eligible for certain salary increases (e.g. cost-of-living adjustments). Those faculty receiving an overall unsatisfactory rating will not be eligible for any salary increases unless required by State law, but may receive departmental and university support for improvement of performance.

C. Relationship to Tenure and Post-Tenure Processes

Tenure-eligible faculty are also required to participate in the tenure processes described in UHAP 3.12. The annual performance reviews are taken into account as part of the promotion and tenure process, but such evaluations are not determinative on promotion and tenure issues. Satisfactory ratings in the annual performance reviews do not necessarily indicate successful progress toward promotion and tenure. Progress toward promotion and tenure requires accomplishment over a period of years in the broader range of faculty responsibilities, and includes evaluation by external referees, a component not included in the annual review process. Criteria and decisions with regard to promotion and tenure are detailed in UHAP 3.11.

For tenured faculty, the annual review is not intended to be a re-tenuring process; it is simply an opportunity to assess progress toward the goals outlined in Article I of this document. Those tenured faculty who receive a rating of unsatisfactory in any of the three individual areas, or an overall rating of unsatisfactory, however, are required to participate in the post-tenure processes described in UHAP 3.10.04 through 3.10.06.

D. Expectations for the Next Review Year

Criteria for annual performance are intended to recognize long-term faculty activities and outcomes. Concentration in one of the three major areas of faculty responsibilities during a particular year is permissible, and may be encouraged. These criteria are designed to be sufficiently flexible to meet the particular objectives of the department without undermining the objectives of the College or University. It is important that each faculty member has goals, assignments, and expectations for the next annual review, documented in writing, according to the process specified in Article II.

**University of Arizona
School of Theatre, Film and Television
Ratified by the TFTV Faculty February 19, 2015**

GUIDELINES FOR PROMOTION AND TENURE

Refer to the University Handbook for Appointed Personnel (UHAP) Chapter 3 and the Vice Provost for Faculty Affairs website for all University regulations regarding promotion and tenure.

To be considered for appointment to or promotion within the faculty of the School of Theatre, Film and Television, all candidates must have an appropriate degree and/or equivalent professional stature.

The Theatre, Film & Television Faculty Promotion and Tenure Committee (herein after referred to as P&T Committee) is the standing committee on Promotion and Tenure. Duties, responsibilities, and committee membership of the P&T Committee are defined in the School of Theatre, Film and Television Bylaws. The Director of the School of Theatre, Film and Television does not attend Promotion and Tenure meetings unless invited and his/her role at the meeting is justified in writing.

The P & T Committee's vote to confirm or deny tenure and/or promotion must be supported in a detailed written statement to the Director of the School. The vote of the Committee and any Minority opinions must be clearly supported and based on evidence presented in the candidate dossier. The P & T Committee recommendation is forwarded to the Director of the School. The Director recommendation is prepared as a separate action from the P & T Committee. Both Committee recommendations and the Director recommendations are forwarded with the candidate's dossier to the College of Fine Arts Committee on Promotion and Tenure. The Director will notify the candidate of the nature of the School's recommendation at the time the file is sent forward in accordance with UHAP section 3.3.02.

Criteria for Promotion and Tenure (all ranks)

To determine a candidate's suitability for promotion and/or tenure, his/her proficiency in teaching, research or creative endeavors, and service will be evaluated.

Criteria to be used in the evaluative process are detailed below.

Teaching

Effective teaching is an essential component of a faculty member's performance at the University. It is expected that a faculty member must maintain a professional and courteous demeanor in dealings with students. The faculty member should display an enthusiasm for and dedication to the subject being taught, meet classes as scheduled, grade fairly and carefully, and be accessible to students. In addition, the faculty member should possess an ability to communicate clearly and honestly with students, while challenging them to do original and rigorous work. It is highly desirable that the faculty member foster the intellectual and creative development of students and create an atmosphere where ideas may be freely and easily exchanged and in which opposing and conflicting opinions may be discussed.

In developing course content, the faculty member should display a thorough knowledge and command of the appropriate subject, including clear evidence of updating course content to reflect new developments in the field and in pedagogical techniques. Courses should be carefully organized with clear statements of appropriate goals for each course and a skillfully designed means for achieving these goals. The teacher should demonstrate a skill in organizing material to reflect a sense of purpose, order, and movement to classroom activities. The creation of new courses within a discipline, or of an interdisciplinary nature, constitutes further evidence of teaching achievement, as does the implementation of new methodologies or materials.

Other evidence of effective teaching may be found in a faculty member's direction of individual research and creative projects, academic advising of students, development of texts or instructional materials, participation in the University Honors program and, supervision of student artistic or production activity.

A faculty member's efforts to improve teaching may also be evidenced by active participation in teaching workshops and conferences, as well as self-instruction in new and emerging teaching tools.

Appendix A outlines the criteria used in the evaluation of teaching effectiveness.

Service

Each faculty member is expected to contribute to the work of the School, College, and University, as well as to his/her own field of specialization. Participation on School, College, ~~of Fine Arts~~ and University committees, service work for regional and national professional organizations related to the faculty member's field of expertise, and community service (local, state and national) will be considered.

Service is divided into two general categories: outreach and citizenship (further broken down into intramural and extramural). Outreach includes those activities in which the faculty member brings his/her expertise to outside lay or non-peer groups, including high school workshops, master classes, recruiting, touring productions, etc. Citizenship includes those activities in which the faculty member is functioning within a professional/peer group. Intramural service is defined as service within the University community: School, College, and University. Extramural service is defined as service outside of the University community: the profession, community, state, and/or nation.

Research/Creative Work/Scholarship

Each member of the faculty is expected to engage in a definite, continuing program of research: creative and scholarly endeavors appropriate to his or her academic discipline and teaching responsibilities. An individual faculty member may engage in both scholarly and creative activity. However, substantial accomplishment and expertise in the faculty member's area of specialization must be demonstrated. Professional excellence (not just competence) is expected in research or other creative work. Scholarship is evidenced by a comprehensive knowledge of the subject area and the ability to communicate that knowledge effectively in appropriate written, oral, and/or artistic form. High standards of academic integrity are expected of all faculty.

High quality research and creative endeavors lead to better teaching, to innovation in the continuing review of the curriculum, and to the professional growth of the faculty. Research and creative endeavors may take various forms, but all should have a clear relation to the academic mission of the school.

Publication

For faculty engaged in research/scholarship, significant and substantial publication is to be attained and maintained. The reputation and stature of the publication or publisher within the academic community is an important factor. Articles published in refereed journals and books (print or electronic) that have been reviewed by major scholars in the field are considered to be of greater importance than works that have not been refereed or reviewed. Serving as the editor of a major publication or the author of an essay, review, or bibliography published in a substantial scholarly work is also considered to be a valid part of a scholar's record of publication. Textbooks, anthologies, and computer software programs intended primarily as teaching tools are considered significant scholarly contributions only insofar as they present new ideas or synthesize scholarly research. Scholars are also expected to present research at major professional meetings as evidence that they are achieving national recognition and developing a position of leadership in their area of specialization. Invited or juried conference papers receive more weight than those not receiving prior review. While the quality of work is generally given greater consideration than quantity, the quantity of work must be sufficient to demonstrate the promise of sustained scholarly distinction.

Creative Endeavors

Providing students with professional training of the highest possible quality is central to the School's mission. Every effort is made to recruit and hire faculty who have already established their credentials as professional artists. It is imperative that the faculty artist maintain a significant and substantial pattern of creative work in the profession. In turn, the School has an obligation to honor requests for release time to support professional activity during the academic year and to encourage artistic engagement during the summer.

As with publication, the quality of creative work is generally given greater consideration than quantity, however there should be sufficient quantity to demonstrate the promise of sustained distinction and productivity. Generally, extramural creative work will be given greater weight than on campus work, however, creative work undertaken on campus will constitute a valid part of the artist's record of creative work.

For production activity performed within a service or community setting, the artist must demonstrate how the completed work merits artistic evaluation and should not be considered as an act of service. Artist-teachers are also expected to present papers and/or conduct workshops at major professional meetings as evidence that they are achieving national recognition and developing a position of leadership in their area of specialization.

Appendix B contains a non-exclusive listing of suggested areas and types of research/creative work/scholarship.

Criteria for tenure-track ranks

Assistant Professor

An appointment to Assistant Professor is based upon an effective and promising teaching record, as well as the demonstrated potential to meet the demands of the School's criteria for promotion and tenure. Evidence of promise in research and creative endeavors and service should be apparent.

Associate Professor

Teaching: Contributes to School's teaching load. Receives positive student evaluations. Contributes to development of school's academic program as evidenced by contributions to course syllabi. Receives favorable peer teaching evaluations from senior colleagues. Participates in student advising, including service on graduate student thesis or dissertation committees.

Publication/Creative Endeavors: Engages in quality original publications/creative endeavors as evidenced by publication/performance record. Establishes the promise of sustained activity in one or more areas. Provides evidence of recognition at regional and national levels. Contributes to grant and contract activities. Involves graduate students in collaborative research and scholarly/creative activities.

Service: Contributes to School committees. Contributes to profession through service to professional organizations. Contributes to local, state, and/or national community by sharing expertise.

Professor

Teaching: Exercises leadership in School's teaching load. Receives recognition as a teacher through awards or other documentation. Exercises leadership in School's academic program development as evidenced by experience in originating or revising courses as documented in course syllabi. Receives positive student and peer teaching evaluations. Outstanding record of student advising, mentoring of undergraduate capstones, and service on graduate student thesis or dissertation committees.

Publication/Creative Endeavors: Demonstrates record as a productive scholar/artist through continuing publication/performance activity over a period of years. Establishes a clear and coherent line of inquiry. Provides evidence of recognition at national and international levels. Exercises leadership in seeking outside funding for research through grants and contracts. Engages students in collaborative research and scholarly/creative activities.

Service: Exercises leadership in School through service as committee chair and/or outstanding and continued service to School committees. Contributes to College and University committees. Contributes to profession through outstanding and continued service, providing evidence of national and international impact.

APPENDIX A

Teaching Evaluation Mechanisms

- I. Quality of Instruction and Effectiveness
 - A. University Teaching Evaluations are required.
 - B. Peer evaluation of the candidate's teaching effectiveness is required. Such evaluations should include scheduled classroom visitations as well as evaluation of course syllabi, examinations, and Teaching Portfolio as prescribed by the most recent University Promotion and Tenure Dossier Template.
 - C. Course development or new courses offered.
- H. Quality of Instruction
 - A. A chronological list of courses taught since appointment in rank, including the average enrollment in each class, is required.
 - B. The number of thesis and/or monograph committees chaired, or served on, is required.
 - C. Documentation of student contact is required. This may include activities such as advising, mentoring, office hours, career counseling, off-campus internships/observations, and independent studies.
- III. The Provost's annual memo, "Promotion and Tenure Process and Preparation Dossiers" and the most recent University Promotion and Tenure Dossier Template in force at the time of review will guide the evaluation.

APPENDIX B

Scholarly and creative endeavors may be realized in diverse ways. The School recognizes that venues and opportunities for scholarly and creative efforts are constantly changing. The P&T process will take these changes into account.

APPENDIX B.1

Creative Endeavors

The candidate's record of creative endeavors must provide evidence of sustained and significant contributions to the field as measured by quality, more than quantity. However the candidate's record should demonstrate the promise of sustained effort and continued distinction.

Evidence of the quality and significance of creative endeavors may be realized in diverse ways. Determination of the status and reputation of the producing organization, exhibition venues, or other appropriate means of display or performance is part of the review process. It is recognized that the prominence of venues for screenings, performances, and other exhibitions is constantly emerging and shifting and must be considered when assessing the impact, significance, and professional profile of a candidate's work.

Evaluation of a candidate's creative effort should be primarily based on the following criteria. The sequence of the items should not be construed as a priority listing, Each item has intrinsic value and should be considered on its own merits.

Creative Endeavors

Regional, national, and/or international recognition of a faculty member's production activity is essential.

Primary evidence of significant creative contribution to and sustained creative activity in original film or theatre work includes (but may not be limited to) the following:

- Actor
- Cinematographer
- Choreography
- Consultant
- Costume Designer
- Costume Production Technologist
- Dramaturg
- Editor
- Fight Choreographer
- Film Director
- Lighting Designer
- Musical Director
- Playwright
- Producer
- Production Manager
- Projection Designer
- Properties Artisan
- Scenic/Production Designer
- Scenic Artist
- Screenwright
- Sound Designer
- Stage Director
- Stage Manager
- Technical Design
- Technical Production
- Vocal/Style Coach
- Associate roles

Evaluation of Creative Endeavors

Evaluation of work in this category may include (but may not be limited to) consideration of the following:

- Professional size and scope of the Screening, Producing Organization or Performance Venue, as evaluated by professional peers. Indicators of size, scope, significance, and professionalism may include one or more of the following:
 - Union or Professional Guild presence (Screen Actors Guild -American Federation of Television and Radio Actors (SAG -AFTRA), Actor's Equity Association (AEA), Stage Directors and Choreographers Society (SDC), American Guild of Variety Artists (AGMA), American Guild of Musical Artists (AGMA), Society of American Fight Directors (SAFD), United Scenic Artists (USA), International Association of Theatrical Stage Employees (IATSE)
 - Industry recognition, such as invitation to participate in film markets, attachment of sales agents, producers, or actors
 - Size of production budgets
 - Size of audience reached (League of Regional Theatre (LORT), Distribution Contract)
 - Exhibition of work in juried screenings, film festivals, theatres, museums and through broadcast
 - Qualitative assessment by qualified authorities.
- Pursuit and attainment of funding for film projects
- Invitations to present creative work at universities or other non-profit organizations
- Commercial or educational distribution of original project via such venues as distribution companies, theaters, television, View on Demand (VOD) or online platforms (such as iTunes), and libraries
- Completion of an original or adapted screenplay or play script
- Professional engagement in a creative, consultant, or managerial role on a professional production
- Reviews of work or citations of work in refereed professional venues including peer-reviewed journals both print and on-line
- Present adjudicated, juried or invited workshops, master classes, guest lectures, exhibitions, screenings and performances or papers at other educational institutions, museums, galleries, and performance spaces or at national or international conferences or festivals
- Publication of an article, textbook, or computer software program in refereed or reviewed publication which articulates an original creative technique or a new theoretical application or analysis of existing techniques
- Pursuit and attainment of funded research
- Production or performance of original devised or scripted work by another theatre company or performance ensemble

APPENDIX B.2

Research and Scholarship

Publication

Local, national and/or international recognition of a faculty member's research/scholarship and publication is essential. The candidate's record of research/scholarship must provide evidence of sustained and significant contributions to the field as measured by quality, more than quantity. However, the candidate's record should demonstrate the promise of sustained effort and continued distinction. The scholarship should have impact on the field to which it contributes.

Scholarly effort may be realized in diverse ways. Determination of the scholarly status and reputation of publication venues is part of the review process.

Primary evidence of sustained scholarship includes (but may not be limited to) publication or acceptance for publication of the following:

- books or monographs with reputable publishers
- scholarly contributions to refereed professional venues including peer-reviewed journals both print and on-line
- edited anthologies
- translations
- applied scholarship (i.e., textbooks, teaching materials) that is firmly grounded in the candidate's own contributions to research in the field
- collaborative works in peer-reviewed journals, anthologies, and on-line publications
- citations, reprints, reviews, and translations of one's scholarship
- scholarly papers (invited and submitted) presented at local, regional, national, and international professional organizations
- participation in professional colloquia and panels of a scholarly nature
- management of or contribution to scholarly and/or professional websites
- publication of books, book chapters, artists pages, performance texts, oral histories, and articles in refereed journals
- critical reviews of the candidate's published works by recognized authorities
- criticism
- play scripts or performance texts
- awards, fellowships, research grants

Additional evidence of sustained scholarship may include (but may not be limited to) the following activities:

- scholarly works published in non-refereed venues, including on-line and alternative venues
- contributions to reference works, such as encyclopedia and bibliography entries
- invitations to review: manuscripts for publication, grant applications, and candidates for promotion at peer institutions
- invitations to present research to scholarly communities
- research-based contributions to outside institutions, communities, or businesses

- textbooks which present new ideas or synthesize scholarly research

The University of Arizona School of Theater, Film & TV
 Criteria Summary for Promotion and Tenure by Rank
 Ratified Feb. 19, 2015

	Associate Professor	Professor
<p>Teaching/Advising <i>Effective teaching is an essential component of a faculty member's performances at the University. It is understood that a faculty member must maintain a professional and courteous demeanor in dealings with students. Course content should display a thorough knowledge and command of the appropriate subject, including clear evidence of updating course content to reflect new developments in the field and in pedagogical techniques.</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Contributes to the School's teaching load. • Receives positive student evaluations. • Demonstrates effective teaching methods as evidenced by quality of students' work. • Contributes to development of School's academic program as evidenced by course syllabi. • Receives favorable teaching evaluations from senior colleagues. • Participates in student advising, including service on graduate student report and thesis committees, and dissertation committees (if applicable). 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Exercises leadership in School's teaching. • Exercises leadership in School's academic program development as evidenced by originating or revising courses as documented in course syllabi. • Receives recognition as a teacher through awards or other documentation. • Receives positive student and peer teaching evaluations. • Maintains outstanding record of student advising, including service as chair of graduate student committees, dissertation committees, independent studies, honors theses, etc. (as applicable).
<p>Research/Creative Endeavors <i>Each member of the faculty is expected to engage in a definite, continuing program of research: creative and scholarly endeavors appropriate to his or her academic discipline and teaching responsibilities. Substantial accomplishment and expertise in the faculty member's area of specialization must be demonstrated. High standards of academic integrity are expected of all faculty.</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Engages in quality original scholarly/artistic endeavors as evidenced by a record of publications, performances, screenings, and/or other juried recognition. • Provides evidence of recognition at regional and national levels. • Establishes the promise of sustained creative research or scholarly activity in one or more areas. • Pursues intramural and extramural funding for research. • Engages students in collaborative scholarly and creative endeavors. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Engages in quality original scholarly/artistic endeavors through continued publications, performances, screenings, and/or other juried recognition over a period of years. • Establishes a clear and coherent line of inquiry that significantly contributes to the body of work in the field. • Provides evidence of recognition at national and international levels. • Exercises leadership in seeking intramural and extramural funding for research. • Engages students in collaborative scholarly and creative endeavors.
<p>Service <i>Each faculty member is expected to contribute to the work of the School, College, and University, as well as to his/her own field of specialization. Regional and national professional organizations related to the faculty member's field of expertise, and community service (local, state and</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Contributes to School committees. • Contributes to the profession through service to professional organizations and/or professional journals. • Contributes to local or state community by sharing expertise. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Exercises leadership in School through service as committee chairperson and/or outstanding and continued service to School committees. • Contributes to college and university committees. • Contributes to the profession through outstanding and continued service to professional organizations and/or professional journals, providing evidence of national and international impact.

<i>national) will be considered.</i>		
--------------------------------------	--	--

draft

We deleted the Service Appendix C because it appears to be redundant with the narrative about service and the Provost's document lists service categories. Appendix C needs to be elaborated in much more detail or deleted. We recommend that it be deleted