

College of Fine Arts  
Dance Program  
Guidelines for Annual Evaluation, Tenure/Promotion,  
Post-Tenure Review and Workload

CONTENTS

I. Introduction .....	2
II. Annual Evaluation.....	3
A. Annual Faculty Review	
B. Evaluation Report	
C. Outcomes	
D. Ratings Failing to Meet Academic Responsibilities	
E. Merit-Base Salary Increases	
F. Peer Observation of Teaching	
III. General Criteria for Annual Evaluations, Tenure-Track Review, Tenure, and Promotion.....	7
A. General Expectations	
B. Criteria	
C. Criteria for Classifying Dance Research as Major or Minor	
IV. Specific Criteria for Tenure and Promotion .....	12
A. Tenure & Promotion to Associate Professor	
B. Promotion to Full Professor	
C. External Review of Tenure and Promotion Candidates	
V. Post-Tenure Review .....	14
A. Procedure	
B. Teaching	
C. Research and Creative Work	
D. Service	
VI. Workload Determination Policy .....	17
A. Objective	
B. Criteria for Workload Determination	
C. Guidelines	
D. Appeal	

# INTRODUCTION

## Preface

This document provides guidelines and criteria for evaluation of performance within the global field of dance and in the many specialized fields within that category. It should be understood that allowances must be made for the emergence of new specializations as well as interdisciplinary creative, research, and performance possibilities when these apply to a faculty member's interests. It is the responsibility of the faculty member to make the case for the relative significance of an individual research-creative work and, in turn, for the appropriate committee and the director to clarify that same significance to those outside the field of dance who will also be making evaluations based on less familiarity with the scope of both the general and specialized fields.

The information contained in this document is complementary to UTRGV policy especially as delineated in UTRGV HOP Policies ADM 06-502, Annual Faculty Evaluation; ADM 06-504, Post-Tenure Review; and ADM 06-505, Faculty Tenure and Promotion.

## Statement of Performance Expectations

Unit expectations: It is the expectation of the Dance Program that the faculty shall consist of the most highly qualified persons available. Nothing in these guidelines shall be construed so as to prevent the Program from acting within Regents, University, and College guidelines and policies in pursuit of this objective. Dance Program faculty members are expected to:

- Teach loads as assigned by the Director, in accordance with the faculty workload policy. Some faculty members will teach a combination of studio/technique, studio/performance, and theory/lecture courses in accordance with the faculty workload policy.
- Provide guidance to students as needed.
- Develop and maintain a distinctive program of research and/or creative activity that brings them regional, national, and perhaps international, recognition in one or more areas of endeavor.
- Contribute in appropriate capacities of service to their areas, the Dance Program, College, The University of Texas Rio Grande Valley, and in their professional fields.
- Adhere to professional standards as outlined in UTRGV HOP ADM 06-106, D.4.

These criteria and procedures are to be used in conjunction with the appropriate sections of the UTRGV Handbook of Procedures on Faculty Tenure and Promotion (ADM 06-505). The HOP, Format for Faculty Review Dossier, Faculty Peer Observation of Teaching and Selection of External Reviewers source documents (found on the Office of the Academic Affairs's website under the Faculty Resources tab) should be consulted for additional pertinent information concerning the topics discussed in this document.

## **Standards for Acceptable Performance for Tenure-Track Faculty:**

The extended commitment inherent in the granting of tenure requires an established record of past achievement and the potential for future achievement. It is expected that each person awarded tenure will have demonstrated a meritorious level of achievement in the areas of teaching, research/performance/creative activity (hereafter referred to as “research-creative work”), and service.

## **Standards for Acceptable Performance for Tenured Faculty:**

Tenured faculty in the Dance Program must maintain a high standard of performance in all areas of responsibility. It is recognized that teaching and research interests and service responsibilities change and develop over time. Regardless of the nature of these changes or the amount of effort allocated to each activity, the standards for achievement remain high throughout the faculty member's tenure at the university. An annual evaluation rating for an already tenured faculty member of meets expectations (on a scale of exceeds expectations, meets expectations, does not meet expectations, or unsatisfactory) must be achieved to indicate a minimal level of performance.

If a tenured faculty member fails to achieve a rating of meets expectations or higher in teaching, research, or service, the faculty member in conjunction with the Director of the Dance Program will develop a plan to address the areas of concern. Continued failure to achieve an acceptable level of performance will result in a review by the Personnel Committee and the forwarding of a recommendation to the Director of the Dance Program. UTRGV HOP ADM 6-502 (Annual Evaluation) states that two consecutive annual evaluations of “unsatisfactory” may trigger the Post-Tenure Review process.

***Differential Allocation of Effort:*** Each full-time member of the Dance Program faculty is expected to engage in teaching, research, and service. Under normal circumstances, each faculty member will adhere to a general norm of 60% teaching, 30% research, and 10% service allocation of effort. The Director in consultation with the faculty member will determine exceptions to these percentages of effort.

## **ANNUAL EVALUATION**

### **Overview**

Annual Faculty Evaluation is the regular review process for assessing the work and professional accomplishments of faculty members. Each faculty member will submit a portfolio of prescribed materials to the Director on the date indicated in the Pathways for Review Deadlines found on the Office of Academic Affairs’s website under the [Faculty Resources](#) tab. The Personnel Committee will conduct the review. Given the early timeline for such decisions, Annual Evaluations will follow the academic year. Results of Annual Faculty Evaluations are used to inform decisions regarding merit-based salary increases.

---

<sup>1</sup> This paragraph addresses annual review standards after the faculty member has earned tenure.

The continued failure to meet standards being judged by the annual evaluation committee requires the Director and Personnel Committee to become involved.

### **A. Annual Faculty Review**

It is the responsibility of each faculty member to submit materials that accurately and effectively document the member's activities in teaching, research/performance/creative activity, and service for the academic year under consideration. Also see Annual Faculty Evaluations & Tenure-Track/Tenure and Promotion Reviews Process and Guidelines.

For lecturers and tenured faculty, the Annual Evaluation Portfolio will include:

- Annual Narrative Summary of Achievements
- Current Curriculum Vitae
- Tabular Summaries of:
  - Teaching Evaluations
  - Teaching Achievements
  - Research-Creative Activities
  - Service
- Peer Observations of Teaching Evaluations (as required, see F., below)
- Course Syllabi and Student Course Evaluations

For tenure-track faculty, the Annual Faculty Review is based on the Faculty Review Dossier. Tenure-track faculty should consult the Format for Faculty Review Dossier for a detailed description of requirements.

### **B. Evaluation Report**

The Personnel Committee and the Director of the Dance Program will prepare independent evaluation reports (ratings and comments) on each respective faculty member using the Annual Evaluation Recommendation Form. The faculty member will have the opportunity to review these reports at each level and submit appeals according to the timeline indicated in the Pathways for Review Deadlines. (Also see C. Outcomes, below.)

The Committee will base the evaluation of each faculty member on criteria defined in this document in the section **Criteria for Annual Faculty Evaluation, Progress Toward Tenure Review, and Promotion and Tenure**. Evaluation of each category will consider, on balance, both the quantity and quality of work. The Evaluation Report will include a single rating for each category (Teaching, Research, and Service) according to the following scale:

- 4 – Exceeds Expectations
- 3 – Meets Expectations
- 2 – Does Not Meet Expectations
- 1 – Unsatisfactory

Faculty will also receive an Overall Rating, determined by the scores in the three evaluation areas: Teaching, Research-Creative Activities, and Service. The Overall Rating will be calculated as follows:

- **Exceeds Expectations:** Faculty must have a “4 – Exceeds Expectations” rating in two of the three areas, and a “3 – Meets Expectations” or “Exceeds Expectations” in the third area.
- **Meets Expectations:** Faculty must have at least a “3 – Meets Expectations” in the two major areas (teaching and research) and a “3 – Meets Expectations” or “2 – Does Not Meet Expectations” in the third area. In the case of a faculty member having received a “2 – Does Not Meet Expectations,” it should be made clear that although he/she has met expectations for the purpose of the Annual Evaluation, he/she will need “3 – Meets Expectations” scores or better in all areas for the purpose of tenure and promotion. Also, see C. Outcomes, below.
- **Does Not Meet Expectations:** Faculty member received a score of at least “3 – Meets Expectations” in two areas, and a rating of “1 – Unsatisfactory” in the third area. Alternatively, the faculty member may have received a rating of “2 – Does Not Meet Expectations” in two areas.
- **Unsatisfactory:** Faculty member received scores that do not qualify for a “Does Not Meet Expectations” rating.

There will also be a brief narrative included in the Evaluation Report for each category, justifying the assigned rating. The Personnel Committee may also choose to include a summary paragraph with suggestions/commendations.

The Evaluation Report will also assess the following for each faculty member in comparison to other faculty members with similar specializations on the basis of: a) heaviness of teaching load, b) overall quantity of research productivity, and c) overall quantity of service obligations. This assessment will identify one of three comparative levels for each category: 1) significantly higher/more than the median for all faculty, 2) at or about the median for all faculty, or 3) noticeably lower than the median for all faculty.

### **C. Outcomes**

All ratings of “3 – Meets Expectations” or above (according to the ratings defined above) require no special action or sanction. A rating of “2 – Does Not Meet Expectations” or “1 – Unsatisfactory” in any category is considered to be failing to meet academic responsibilities and requires further corrective steps, described below. A faculty member has the right to appeal the results of an individual evaluation. Appeals must be made in writing and submitted to the Director within 10 working days (see Pathways for specific timeline) of receiving the Evaluation Report. Appeals must clearly explain the rationale for challenging the determination of the Tenure and Promotion Committee.

Each faculty member is encouraged to meet annually with the Director to discuss his/her productivity, evaluation, and expectations for the future. Such meetings are required for all tenure-track faculty members as part of the annual review process.

#### **D. Ratings Failing to Meet Academic Responsibilities**

Following the procedures outlined in UTRGV HOP ADM 6-602 (Annual Faculty Evaluation):

*If the annual performance evaluation raises concerns about the faculty member's performance in one or more areas, as indicated by "does not meet expectations" or "unsatisfactory," this may indicate that the faculty member could benefit from additional support...A tenured faculty member whose overall annual performance evaluation is "Unsatisfactory" for two consecutive annual reviews may additionally be reviewed under the procedures described in HOP ADM 6-504, Post-Tenure Review. The decision to undertake a comprehensive performance evaluation outside of the normal time-frame of six years will be made by the EVPAA in consultation with the Dean of the college.*

The Program Director shall consult annually with the Dean, and the Dean shall consult annually with the Executive Vice-President for Academic Affairs (EVPAA), on the progress of any faculty member who falls within the category of overall failure to meet minimum academic responsibilities.

#### **E. Merit-Based Salary Increases**

Merit funds, when available, will be awarded based on a summative review of the faculty member's previous three years of Annual Evaluation Reviews. This review will be pro-rated for faculty who have been at the university for less than three years. Faculties receiving "Meets Expectations" or "Exceeds Expectations" in all areas over a three-year period are eligible for a merit increase.

#### **F. Peer Observation of Teaching**

For faculty members in tenure-track and lecturer positions, a peer observation of teaching is required every year (tenured faculty need a Peer Observation of Teaching once every three years). Peer Teaching Evaluations will consist of written reports by one tenured colleague chosen by the faculty member in consultation with the Director. Evaluations should address overall effectiveness and organization of the observed instruction. Although there is no prescribed format, reports should include critical and constructive comments, and also clearly identify any concerns of the reviewer. The faculty member is responsible for identifying a peer observer and arranging a date for the observation to take place. After the teaching evaluation is submitted to the Director, the observed faculty member will be given the option to submit a statement within one week addressing anything in the report s/he feels is inaccurate or needs clarification. For more information, please refer to the institutional guidelines on Faculty Peer Observation of Teaching.

# GENERAL CRITERIA FOR ANNUAL EVALUATIONS, TENURE-TRACK REVIEW, TENURE, AND PROMOTION

## Overview

Annual Evaluations, Tenure Track Reviews (including 4th Year Review, Tenure-Promotion (to Associate Professor), and Promotion (to Full Professor) are all part of the review process (see ADM 06-505) overseen by tenured faculty members. Tenured faculty elect a Tenure-Promotion Committee to make extensive recommendations on tenure-promotion candidates in a report to the Director that includes a summation and interpretation of the faculty vote as well as a report of their own considerations and evaluation of each tenure-promotion candidate.

### A. General Expectations

Recommendations for annual faculty evaluation, progress toward tenure review, tenure and promotion as well as post-tenure reviews shall be based on the record of the faculty member in teaching, research/creative activity (hereafter referred to as research), and service.

#### 1. Teaching

Since teaching is generally the primary component of a faculty workload, faculty members must demonstrate enthusiasm for teaching and the ability to stimulate students to achieve at the highest level possible.

#### 2. Research

Research may include any of a wide variety of activities depending upon the field of specialization and the interests of the faculty member. It is expected that each faculty member will pursue research or professional activities appropriate to his or her field of specialization and will achieve regional, national and/or international recognition among his or her peers in one or more such fields of activity.

#### 3. Service

Service refers to activities that utilize the professional expertise of the faculty member. Each member of the faculty is expected to render appropriate service at various points of the career to the Dance Program, the College, the University, the profession, and the public at large.

ADM 06-505 states: “excellence in research/scholarship/creative activities or service is insufficient grounds for promotion or tenure in the absence of effective teaching.”

### B. Criteria

The Personnel Committee, making evaluations based on the following criteria, are expected to evoke the appropriate openness and gravitas in determining collectively the relative weight of each contribution. Additionally,

- It is not expected that a faculty member will engage in all of the activities listed under the following categories.

- It is not expected that a faculty member will be equally active in each of the three categories.
- The quality of the contributions is of greater importance than the quantity.
- Prestige and/or scope of the publication or presentation venue are important contributing factors in determining the significance of research and creative activity.
- The lists below in each category are not intended to be exclusive or exhaustive and should be amended to include new paradigms of creative-research work and teaching as these emerge over time.

### **Teaching**

Evidence to be considered in the evaluation of teaching shall include, but not be limited to:

- Level of achievement and success of current students (e.g. students placing in competitions or winning an award for performance/research);
- Level of achievement and success of former students (e.g. student attending graduate school, performs as a member of a professional ensemble, receives recognition/award);
- Student Course Evaluations;
- Peer Observation of Teaching;
- Development of new courses, full revision of existing course, instructional programs, teaching materials, or innovative teaching techniques;
- Written statements by colleagues;
- Written statements by former students;
- Honor or award for teaching excellence;
- Obtain additional professional certification in an area specific to your discipline;
- Development of new degree program;
- Overload taught, multiple course preparations;
- Supervise independent study (i.e. student teacher, thesis defense, mentoring student work, supervising senior choreography project, supervise rehearsal in preparation for performance);
- Conduct TExES preparation sessions.

### **Research-Creative Work**

Evidence to be considered in the evaluation of research activity will be examined according to quantity and quality of productivity. The pursuit and awarding of external funding (e.g. grant writing) for research-creative work will be recognized as significant for all faculty members.

Research-Creative work evidence may also include:

- New choreographic work;
- Restaging of a previously choreographed and performed work;
- Honors or awards for scholarly/artistic work;
- Commissions for performance and/or dance work/choreography;
- Presentation, performance, choreography, paper, speaking, in conferences, master classes, lectures, workshops, seminars, clinics, conferences, and meetings of professional societies;



- Direct full length production (concert);
- Performances with university student groups of extraordinary activity and quality such as international or national touring venues or significant performances by invitation;
- Production of a commercial dance video/film produced by a professional videographer;
- Scholarly publication of books, contributions to professional journals;
- Papers, articles, reviews, chapters; in books, or substantial electronic media;
- Panelist at professional meetings;
- Appearances as guest lecturer or guest artist;
- Setting work as a guest artist/choreographer;
- Original set or costume design.

### **Research-Creative Work in multiple areas:**

It is understood that a faculty member is not limited only to the research activities listed in one area. It is recognized that many faculty members perform, choreograph, write, edit, publish, consult, video record, and participate in a wide variety of professional activities. Such breadth of activity is encouraged. However, each faculty member's primary efforts should be directed towards those activities in the area of his or her appointment.

### **Service**

Service is an essential aspect of faculty evaluation. Because of the visibility the Dance Program seeks to maintain in the region, state, nation, and world, the service component is significant.

Activities considered in the evaluation of service may include:

- Serve as artistic director of a UTRGV performing dance company;
- Active participation, elective or appointive leadership roles (officer) in professional associations, or attendance at professional meetings/conferences, (e.g. ACDA, TAPHERD/ NDEO/ AAPHERD, NDA, IADMS, ANGF, CORD);
- Student advisement, degree plans; and degree audit preparation;
- Serving on committees of the Dance Program, College and/or University;
- The writing of peer faculty observations;
- Administrative duties, including division director, direct special project, preparation of program reports;
- Utilization of the professional abilities and expertise of the faculty members in public service, (e.g.: serve as member of board of directors);
- Administrative duties pertaining to organization/implementation of a festival, conference;
- Recruiting an individual guest artist, master class instructor, or scholarly speaker to a campus event;
- Organize overnight field trips;
- Serve as rehearsal director for a guest artist work;
- Oversee costume or set construction;
- The writing of letters of recommendation for students.

A satisfactory and nurturing environment for teachers and students within the Dance Program requires the development and maintenance of ensembles and classrooms with sufficient quality and quantity to support the Program's performance and academic programs. It is the responsibility of the faculty member to attract, recruit and retain qualified dance majors. Evidence of developing and/or supporting recruitment and retention programs may include:

- Active and ongoing communication with prospective students by letter, telephone or e-mail;
- Active involvement in the recruiting activities of the Dance Program;
- Developing opportunities to work with prospective students;
- Active contact with public and private school instructors and participation in dance-related community organizations;
- Participate in career day/night;
- Organizer of summer dance camp, seminars, workshops;
- Organize, participate in Dance Program auditions;
- Mentoring and sponsoring student organizations;
- The pursuit and awarding of external funding (e.g. grant writing, fund raising) for the performing groups and program should be recognized as significant for all faculty members.

### **C. Criteria for Classifying Dance Research as Major or Minor**

In assessing research during the annual faculty evaluation process, progress toward tenure review, and when a faculty member applies for promotion and tenure, it is necessary to classify research accomplishments as major or minor. The following criteria are to assist in making that determination.

#### **Choreography**

One must consider many variable and subjective factors when evaluating the artistic merits of a choreographed work, but the following criteria should usually be considered when ranking works as having greater or lesser significance.

#### ***Major research by a choreographer typically fits at least one of the following criteria:***

- A choreographic work in any genre that requires substantial creative time and effort by the choreographer (performance length and/or artistic merit may possibly be considered in an evaluation);
- A commission for a major work in any medium by a highly respected and widely known dance company or dance department from an institution of higher learning;
- Publication and/or recording of a major work;
- A successfully completed research grant for a choreographic project from a national or international foundation or agency;
- A successful entry in a national or international, impartially refereed adjudication conference or contest;
- A performance of the choreographer's work, especially at nationally or internationally prominent venues or performed by performers of national and international prominence.

***Minor research by a choreographer typically fits at least one of the following criteria:***

- A choreographic work of smaller proportion or of lesser difficulty, requiring less time and creative effort to complete;
- A commission for an original work by local performers or smaller organizations (e.g., faculty member, high school dance program, local/campus theatre or music productions)
- Original choreography of smaller proportion

**Performance**

In the field of dance performance, public performance is equated with publication. When classifying dance performance as major or minor, the factors of repertoire, performance venue, critical review, and the performer's role in a given performance should be considered, and depending on these factors, can raise or lower the classification of a performance.

**Performance types listed from major to minor:**

- Solo performance with a large professional dance company or leading role in a professional dance concert or theatrical production
- Dance performance as a member of a professional company or as a part of an ensemble for a theatrical production
- Performance in a professionally produced dance video recording
- Performance in a UTRGV or local dance concert or theatrical production
- Performance at a dance symposium, conference, festival, or lecture-demonstration

**Scholarly Research**

Scholarly research in dance usually results in publication or the presentation of a paper, lecture, movement session, or work in electronic media. The classification of the results of research as major or minor is based on several factors; the topic being considered and its relative scope and importance; the length, form and style of the final product; and the audience for who it is intended.

***Major publications typically fit at least one of the following criteria:***

- Book, monograph, textbook, book chapter or work in electronic media of substantial significance and scope;
- A scholarly article published in a refereed journal;
- A lengthy, scholarly article based on original research written for a major dance publication.

***Minor publications typically fit at least one of the following criteria:***

- A relatively brief monograph, textbook, or work in electronic media;
- A brief article on a less substantial topic, published in a magazine or regional journal;
- A review of a book, dance performance, or work in electronic media.

***Major papers, lectures, or movement sessions typically fit at least one of the following criteria:***

- A substantial, scholarly paper, lecture, or movement session selected by committee, presented at a regional, national, or international meeting of a professional organization;

- A substantial, invited paper, lecture, or movement session presented at a meeting of a professional organization or at another university.

***Minor papers, lectures, and/or movement sessions typically fit at least one of the following criteria:***

- A non-adjudicated paper, lecture, or movement session, presented at a state or regional meeting;
- A paper, lecture, or movement session presented at a university function or as an invited guest lecturer in another school or university

Funded grants that may be considered major research are typically large, externally funded grants made available to the faculty member by a state, national or international agency. Moreover, grant writing attempts and efforts are to be acknowledged in some form as significant contributions to Research-Creative work.

Funded grants that may be considered minor research are normally smaller, internally funded grants from within the university.

## **SPECIFIC CRITERIA FOR TENURE AND PROMOTION**

The guiding principle with respect to research-creative work (and to a lesser extent teaching) for the two primary stages of faculty advancement, tenure and promotion to associate professor and promotion to full professor, should be that of seamless progress in the professional stature of the individual.

### **A. Tenure & Promotion to Associate Professor**

Dance faculty can be expected to follow the criterion of developing their professional profiles through focusing on publications, choreography, performance, or a combination of two or all three areas. It is difficult to quantify an acceptable number for a tenure-promotion portfolio given the variety of possibilities and the limitations on national performance due to the academic responsibilities of the individual. Nevertheless, some combination that satisfies 4 - 6 of the criteria classified as major over the period of review should be viewed as reasonable.

*Note: Meeting these expectations for research-creative work does not guarantee the granting of tenure-promotion since candidates are evaluated on their overall achievement in teaching, research-creative work, and service. In all cases, the fulfillment of a record of achievement as detailed in UTRGV Policy ADM 06-505 takes precedence.*

### **B. Promotion to Full Professor**

The same general principles (stated in previous sections) apply to awarding the title of Full Professor. Additionally, while an increase in the quantity of achievements may be slight, and increase in the quality of achievements is expected. It must be understood that in the case where a faculty member has moved primarily into scholarly research, teaching assignments and roles within the Dance Program have to be formally reassessed.

*Note: Meeting these expectations for research-creative work does not guarantee the granting of tenure-promotion since candidates are evaluated on their overall achievement in teaching, research-creative work, and service. In all cases, the fulfillment of a record of achievement as detailed in UTRGV Policy ADM 06-505 takes precedence.*

## **C. External Review of Tenure and Promotion Candidates**

### **Summary**

In the spring semester of the candidate's 5th year, the candidate, director and department's tenure and promotion committee will compile a list of at least eight names to contact for external reviews of the candidate's professional achievement, half submitted by the candidate and half by the director. These potential reviewers will be contacted during the candidate's final review year. Additional information can be found in the document Selection of External Reviewers.

### **Selection of Reviewers**

During the spring term of the year before a candidate's final review year (normally, Review 5 out of 6), the candidate will assemble a list of at least four potential external reviewers to submit to the committee chair of the year's departmental tenure committee (the penultimate tenure committee, hereafter PTC). When compiling this list, the candidate is strongly encouraged to consult the candidate's mentor, the department's tenured faculty, and the director. With the list of potential reviewers, the candidate must include their CV's, a brief explanation of why they are appropriate reviewers, and a description of the candidate's previous interactions (if any) with the recommended reviewers. The candidate should acknowledge in writing any prior relationship (a close personal friendship, an advisor, colleagues in a graduate program or academic department) with a potential referee. This list and supporting documentation should be submitted to the PTC on the date indicated in the Pathways for Review Deadlines found on the EVPAA's website under the Faculty Resources tab. The Director will in addition compile a list of four potential external reviewers, consulting with appropriate faculty members as needed and likewise compiling the reviewer's CVs and detailing their respective expertise.

### **The Review Process**

The candidate will provide the director with a copy of the candidate's CV, a summary or statement addressing the candidate's professional achievement, and links or attachments of supporting documentation (e.g. programs, recordings, publications, etc). Within the supporting candidate's statement and the director's letter it is recommended to briefly address the candidate's department/university responsibilities, service activities, and any other relevant information to give the external reviews a general idea of the candidate's workload.

The external reviewers will provide an evaluation of the candidate's achievements in the category of professional achievement only. External reviewers should address the extent to which the publication(s), performances, and professional activities represent a contribution to the scholarship in the candidate's field. External reviewers should be asked to provide at least a one to two paragraph evaluation of the candidate's record of professional activity. They will be asked to assess the quality of the candidate's reputation (regional, national, or international) and

to assess whether the candidate's credentials would merit tenure at their institution. reviewers will send their reviews to the director and these will be kept confidential. The total number of outside reviewers should be distributed in such a way that roughly half of the reviewers are chosen by the candidate and half by the director.

It is possible fewer than four reviews will be received in a timely fashion. If the candidate met his or her responsibility in terms of submitting appropriate names for reviewers, the fact fewer than four reviews are obtained can in no way be held against the candidate by internal reviewers.

Once reviews have been chosen for inclusion, the director will add the reviews, together with a current CV of the reviewers, into the candidate's final review dossier after the candidate has submitted that dossier to the director, and before the dossier is submitted to the tenure and promotion committee during the candidate's final review year.

### **The Role of the External Reviews**

The external reviews of a candidate's scholarly accomplishments are intended to be just one facet of the candidate's dossier. They are intended to provide internal reviewers with some additional insight into the candidate's record, especially as nationally and internationally known scholar or artist.

Outside reviews should not be construed as more significant than the internal reviews, especially those at the department level where faculty have a richer perspective of the candidate's overall performance in terms of the three areas of review: teaching, professional achievement, and service.

## **POST-TENURE REVIEW**

### **Overview**

The purpose of this policy is to provide additional guidelines and outline procedures for the periodic evaluation of tenured faculty in the Dance Program. The purpose of PTR is to provide guidance for continuing and meaningful faculty development, to assist faculty to enhance professional skills and goals, to refocus academic and professional efforts, when appropriate, and to assure that faculty members are meeting their professional responsibilities to their department. Additional guidelines for this review will be found in the HOP [ADM 06-502](#).

All criteria for Teaching, Research, and Service described in the General Criteria and Specific Criteria for Tenure-Promotion sections of this document apply to Post-Tenure Review. Faculty should also consult the [Annual Faculty Evaluations & Tenure-Track/Tenure and Promotion Reviews Process and Guidelines](#) document.

### **A. Procedures**

All tenured faculty are to be evaluated annually, with a comprehensive evaluation performed every six years after the last successful comprehensive review for tenure, promotion, or PTR. The sixth year review is to include evaluation of all three areas of professional responsibility

(teaching, research-creative activities, and service) taken as a whole. Tenured faculty in the Dance Program must maintain a high standard of performance in all areas of responsibility. It is recognized that teaching, research interests, and service responsibilities change and develop over time. Regardless of the nature of these changes or the amount of effort allocated to each activity, the standards for achievement remain high throughout the faculty member's tenure at the university.

It is important that each faculty member be allowed and encouraged to develop an individual profile, particularly in the area of research-creative activities.

## **B. Teaching**

In addition to the criteria listed under Teaching in the General Criteria section of this document, tenured faculty should provide leadership in evaluating and updating curriculum in their areas. Faculty should have an acknowledged record of success in undergraduate teaching.

Other possible evidence of teaching effectiveness may include:

- Funding received for teaching innovations
- Teaching awards
- Selection to teach in prestigious programs

## **Faculty Expectations**

Faculty in the areas of dance technique, performance, theory, and education should:

- Regularly participate in teaching a variety of technique, performance and theory courses as needed.
- Work cooperatively in their areas for equitable assignment of courses and provide leadership in evaluating and updating dance curriculum.
- Provide leadership in recruiting efforts for the academic Dance Program in general, and for their specific performance areas.
- Have an acknowledged record of success in advising students in their academic careers, toward achievement of professional goals, and in honors and senior thesis work.
- Assist students in special projects, and development of presentations and papers for publication.
- Remain current in recent advancements in dance techniques and scholarship in both general and appropriate specialized subject areas, and current developments should be incorporated into course curricula, as applicable.

## **C. Research and Creative Work**

Faculty are expected to show continued development and growth as well as increasing visibility in their scholarly or creative work. Artistic or scholarly achievements must be supported by substantial publications or equivalent artistic creations and/or performances. Associate professors must show scholarly and creative work in sufficient quality and quantity to show a continuing development of a national reputation. Professors must show evidence that they are

nationally and, where applicable, internationally recognized scholars or creative artists in their chosen field.

### **Faculty Expectations**

In the field of dance, it is noted that faculty may select one area of focus or a combination of several areas, depending on their expertise or research interests. These include choreography, performance, writing, scientific research, film production, historical research, folklore, etc.

In the area of choreography and performance, faculty are expected to show continued growth and development as choreographers and/or performers. Their development should reflect learning through their presentations of new repertoire and/or performing in diverse locations and venues. Faculty will produce new choreography regularly and in sufficient quality to maintain visibility and a significant reputation as a choreographer. Faculty must show evidence that their choreography is performed, and it is incumbent on them to demonstrate the importance of commissions and performance venues.

Some faculty may also choose to engage in scholarly activity that results in publication of original ideas or the results of research in the form of books, chapters, articles, reviews, or critical editions of dance.

Because scholarly work may be in progress over a span of years before it is brought to completion, it is essential that faculty members show continuing, tangible progress in their projects. Some faculty may develop specialties in pedagogical, historical, theoretical, or kinesiological studies pertaining to their area of expertise; this work may be disseminated in publications that may or may not be refereed, clinics, conference presentations, or broadcasts.

Publication is not specifically required of all faculty, however such activities are commended and serve to strengthen the reputation of both the individual and the Dance Program. While publications may enhance a strong record of performance, they will not compensate for a weak performance record.

### **D. Service**

Tenured faculty are expected to provide increasing leadership and service to the Dance Program, the institution, and the profession. In the Dance Program, faculty are expected to participate in

- Faculty meetings and committees
- Curriculum development and academic planning
- Area and Dance Program governance
- Student and faculty recruiting
- Review of tenure-track faculty

Faculty are also expected to engage in professional service that reflects the visibility of their own research-creative work and teaching.



# WORKLOAD DETERMINATION POLICY

## Overview

This policy provides procedures for the Workload Review of tenured faculty. The Workload Review will be used to determine whether a tenured faculty member in the Dance Program will be assigned a “Teaching Load” (12 credits each fall and spring term) or a “Research Load” (9 credits each fall and spring term). For the complete policy governing faculty academic workloads please consult HOP policy [ADM 06-501](#).

### A. Objective

The standard assignment for all tenure-track faculty is a Research Load. All faculty, when first granted tenure and promoted to associate professor, should be continued on a Research Load. The Workload Review in the Dance Program follows the same timeline as the Post-Tenure Review process for tenured faculty. The purpose of the Workload Review, however, is to determine if tenured faculty have been productive in terms of scholarly and/or creative professional achievement sufficient to be continued on a Research Load or to be placed on a Research Load if previously assigned a Teaching Load.

### B. Criteria for Workload Determination

The Dance Program recognizes that as faculty move from tenure-track to tenured, associate professor and then professor, responsibilities are likely to change which affect scholarly and creative professional achievement. Faculty workload should take into consideration the duties of the individual faculty member; for example, a faculty member who has been elected to chair a major university committee (graduate council, curriculum committee, SACS review...), while on a research load of 3/3 should not be penalized for this vital service by being expected to continue scholarly or creative publication at the level expected prior to obtaining tenure. Thus, expectations for maintaining a 3/3 research workload after tenure, should take into consideration the overall responsibilities of the tenured faculty member and not simply relate to his/her professional achievement without such consideration.

To qualify for a Research workload in the Dance Program, faculty will meet the following minimum criteria in professional achievement within the 6-year review period:

- In the area of choreography and/or performance: 4-6 works that meet the criteria that are classified as major (as well as local and regional engagements)
- In the area of scholarly work: 2-3 published articles in juried academic journals which in turn could be considered equivalent to 2 such articles in addition to a national conference presentation.
- A combination of choreography/performance and scholarly work: a sum of 4-6 in both areas that meet the criteria considered major (as well as local and regional engagements)

### C. Guidelines

The Workload Review is separate from the Post-Tenure Review but follows the same timeline and thus occurs six years after the faculty member’s previous Tenure/Promotion or Post-Tenure

review. The review will be conducted by the Program's elected Workload Committee which shall consist of three (3) tenured faculty members elected in November prior to the January of the review. At least one member of the elected committee should be in the discipline of each faculty member under review; the chair will conduct an independent review after the Committee has completed its review. If the two reviews result in conflicting recommendations, both recommendations will be forwarded to the Dean. The Dean will decide the issue in consultation with the Director and the Chair of the Workload Review Committee.

A faculty member who had previously been assigned a Research Load who is placed on a Teaching Load as a result of a Workload Review may request another follow-up Workload Review in any year prior to the next scheduled Post-Tenure Review by informing the department chair in September prior to the January review if that faculty member feels that additional works accomplished since the previous Workload Review warrant a new review. This will not change the Post Tenure Review cycle for that faculty member.

Faculty members who have administrative assignments entailing a course reduction (for example, the Graduate Advisor) will keep the same workload as when they began the assignment and will have their research expectations adjusted accordingly during this assignment. Anyone who has received three or more year-long course reductions for administrative purposes during the years under review should initially be granted a Research Load for the ensuing six years once the faculty member no longer holds that administrative assignment. A faculty member may always request to be placed on a Teaching Load.

#### **D. Appeal**

A faculty member may appeal a Workload Review decision, following the procedures outlined in HOP policy ADM 06-111:

- A request for reconsideration must be initiated by the affected faculty member in writing no more than ten (10) working days after the faculty member has been notified of the recommendation.
- The written request must state grounds for the request and include supporting evidence.
- The committee or evaluator with whom a request is filed shall submit a written response to the faculty member within ten (10) working days of receipt of the request. The respondent shall address the substance of the appeal in explaining why the respondent found the appeal either to be convincing or unconvincing.
- Copies of the response are to be sent to the faculty member and placed in his or her evaluation portfolio before forwarding the materials to the next level of evaluation.
- A faculty member may write a reply to the evaluator's response for inclusion in his or her portfolio. The reply must be submitted within five working days of the faculty member's receipt of the evaluator's response.