Rank and Status Professorial Faculty Review Procedures

with College of Fine Arts and Communications Rank and Status Professorial Faculty Review Procedures (CFACPRP) embedded.
Approved by the Academic Vice President's Council June 29, 2022.

with The Department of Theatre and Media Arts Rank and Status Policy embedded.
Approved by the Academic Vice President's Council on May 18, 2023.

These procedures are to be used in conjunction with the Rank and Status Policy. They establish procedures for evaluating professorial faculty members in the initial (third-year) review for continuing faculty status (CFS) candidacy, the final (sixth- or seventh-year) review for CFS, and reviews for rank advancement. They also set forth the timetable for the scheduled reviews. Additionally, they outline faculty members' responsibility to prepare the materials to be evaluated in the reviews, as well as the roles to be played in the review process by department review committees, department faculty, department chairs, college review committees, deans, and the university-level Professorial Faculty Council on Rank and Status. Attached as appendices to these procedures is a list of materials that should be included in the faculty member's portfolio, a waiver statement to be signed by the faculty member before external or internal reviews are solicited, and a sample letter for use by chairs in soliciting external reviews of a faculty member's work.

1. Content of the Portfolio

Faculty members are responsible for preparing the portfolio to be used in their initial, final, or rank advancement review. Departments, colleges, the Faculty Center, and others may provide resources to assist or guide faculty members, but those resources cannot substitute for the faculty member's professional achievement and thoughtful presentation of the portfolio.

1.1 Materials to Include in the Portfolio
Evidence to be included in the portfolio is summarized in Appendix A. The faculty member should be thoughtful and measured about what to include in the portfolio, because the portfolio itself is an indicator of professional maturity. A portfolio that is professional, thorough, and concise is especially persuasive. Letters from students should not be included. A copy of the portfolio prepared for the initial review should be retained by the department and made available if requested during the final CFS review.

1.2 Additional Information
Information included in the original portfolio cannot be altered or removed after the review process commences. However, reviewers at any level may request, receive, or obtain additional information from the faculty member or others after the candidate submits the portfolio. Such additions include but are not limited to documents indicating the acceptance of additional publications, additional student evaluations, and late-arriving external review letters. If a

reviewer believes the additional information materially affects the reviewer's recommendation, it should be dated and added to the portfolio as an addendum, and it must be shared with prior levels of review unless it appears that the new information would not change their recommendations. For example, documents that strengthen the portfolio need not be shared with prior review levels that made positive recommendations, and documents that weaken the portfolio need not be shared with prior review levels that made negative recommendations.

Appeal or rebuttal statements from the faculty member may not be added to the portfolio following a negative recommendation at the department or college level. Such materials may be submitted only as part of an independent examination of the academic vice president's recommendation. (*See* Rank and Status Independent Examination Procedures.)

2. The Rank and Status Review Process

2.1 Mandatory Pre-CFS Reviews
2.1.1 Initial (Third-Year) Review
The initial review will assess the faculty member's performance and promise in teaching, scholarship, and citizenship, including efforts to begin mentoring students within one or more of these areas. The same procedures apply to initial and final CFS reviews, *except that external reviews of scholarship are not required for initial reviews*. Faculty members who successfully demonstrate that they are making satisfactory progress in the initial review will be granted CFS candidacy. Faculty members who are not granted CFS candidacy, or who do not submit a portfolio, will not receive another contract after the existing contract year ends. The university, at its sole discretion, may grant such an individual a one-year temporary position while the person seeks employment elsewhere.

The CFS timetable begins with the start of the first fall semester that the faculty member is employed in a CFS–track position at BYU. The initial review will take place during winter semester of the third year, unless a different timeline is established in the hiring offer letter (*see* Faculty Hiring Policy, section 3.16) or the CFS clock is extended for approved personal or parental leaves or other extenuating circumstances (*see* Rank and Status Policy, section 5.4).

The deadline by which a faculty member must submit a portfolio to the department is established by the department. Barring unforeseen circumstances, the calendar for subsequent levels of review is as follows:

TMA faculty material is due no later than December 1.

2.1.1 CFACPRP Initial (Third-Year) Review
Departments should submit reviews to the college by February 1st annually, unless requested differently by the college.

Department reviews to colleges:	No later than March 1
College reviews to university:	March 20
Decisions to faculty:	June 1

2.1.2 Final (Sixth- or Seventh-Year) Review
The final CFS review will assess the faculty member's performance in teaching, scholarship, and citizenship, including student mentoring within one or more of these areas. To receive CFS, faculty members must clearly demonstrate that they meet the department, college, and university standards set forth in the relevant rank and status documents. Faculty members who are not granted CFS or who do not submit a portfolio will be notified that they will not receive another contract after the current contract year ends. The university, at its sole discretion, may grant such an individual a one-year temporary position while the person seeks employment elsewhere.

The final review will take place during fall semester of the sixth year (or seventh year, in colleges that have adopted a seven-year review period, *see* Rank and Status Policy section 5.3), unless a different timeline is established in the hiring offer letter (*see* Faculty Hiring Policy, section 3.16) or the CFS clock is extended for approved personal or parental leaves or other extenuating circumstances (*see* Rank and Status Policy, section 5.4). Rank advancement from assistant professor to associate professor normally takes place at the same time unless an alternative timeline was agreed upon at hiring.

The deadline by which a faculty member must submit a portfolio to the department is established by the department. Barring unforeseen circumstances, the normal calendar for subsequent levels of review is as follows:

TMA faculty material is due no later than June 15.

2.1.2 CFACPRP Final (Sixth- or Seventh- Year) Review
Departments should submit reviews to the college by October 1st annually, unless requested differently by the college.

Department reviews to colleges:	No later than November 1
College reviews to university:	December 1
Decisions to faculty:	May 1

2.2 Rank Advancement to Professor
A faculty member first becomes eligible to apply for advancement to the rank of professor during the fifth year of service as associate professor. If the review is successful, the rank advancement takes effect fall semester of the following year. The annual calendar for reviewing applications for advancement to professor is the same as for final CFS reviews.

2.3 Allegations of Faculty Misconduct or Violations of University Policy

If reviewers believe that a faculty member may have engaged in misconduct or otherwise violated university policy, the reviewers should notify the department chair and the dean. The dean will notify the academic vice president, who will ensure that the allegations are investigated according to established university procedures. At the request of the faculty member or the academic vice president, the rank and status review process may be stayed while the allegations are investigated and resolved.

3. Assessing a Faculty Member's Contributions

A faculty member's contributions should be evaluated according to established department and college criteria and performance standards defined in the relevant rank and status expectations documents.

Because the relevant groups of eligible voters may be different (e.g., an individual might be eligible to vote on rank advancement but not CFS), all reviewing bodies must hold separate votes on rank advancement and CFS.

3.1 Assessing Mentoring
A faculty member's efforts to mentor students should be reviewed under the broader headings of teaching, scholarship, or citizenship rather than as a separate (fourth) area in the rank and status review portfolio. Mentoring that might fall under more than one category should NOT be described redundantly in multiple sections of the review portfolio. Rather, the faculty member should describe a given mentoring activity in one section and, if necessary, mention it briefly by reference in other relevant sections. Because approaches to student mentoring vary across disciplines, faculty members should describe their mentoring efforts and articulate their benefit to students in a manner that reviewers from other disciplines can understand and evaluate. Colleges and departments should include discipline-specific definitions of mentoring within their own rank and status expectations documents.

3.1 Assessing Mentoring in TMA
Mentored learning is at the heart of TMA faculty contributions to teaching, scholarship, and citizenship. The primary goal of mentored learning in TMA is to assist individuals in their quest for perfection and eternal life through critical engagement with the arts and creation of the arts in our particular fields. This mentoring occurs in a myriad of environments, including (but not limited to) classrooms, labs, studios, stages (live stages; sound stages), and virtual spaces. These environments should foster individual or group scholarship and/or creative work in which faculty work closely with students. Mentored learning may occur during student-driven projects closely supervised by faculty or faculty scholarly and creative projects in which students act as assistants or as co-creators

Faculty should provide meaningful experiential-learning experiences for students, invite students to participate in scholarly activities when appropriate, and work alongside students in citizenship activities. Faculty members should engage not only in secular mentoring but also in

spiritual mentoring. In consultation with department leadership, candidates should decide on which area (teaching, scholarship, or citizenship) they should focus their mentoring efforts. When reporting mentored learning activities, candidates should (a) emphasize how they have personally integrated intellectual and spiritual mentorship into the area of focus, (b) evaluate whether their efforts were successful, and (c) demonstrate steps they have taken to improve.

3.2 Assessing Teaching

In assessing a faculty member's overall effectiveness in teaching, evaluators should consider:

1. Teaching load relative to department expectations, including such factors as the number of new preparations, number of different courses taught, size of sections, and level of courses (general education, lower division, upper division, graduate).

2. The teaching portfolio, in which the faculty member documents his or her efforts to evaluate and improve student learning and the learning environment, and to engage in ongoing processes of improvement. In TMA, the teaching portfolio allows candidates to document, from one semester to the next, their efforts to infuse faith, gospel methodology, personal insights, and intellectual rigor into all learning spaces. Part of this portfolio includes faculty peer reviewer feedback across time and candidates' description of their teaching successes and their efforts to improve areas of weakness.

3. Mentoring and experiential learning opportunities that the faculty member has provided for students outside the traditional classroom, and any measurable outcomes of that mentoring. In TMA, mentored-learning environments are an integral and necessary part of teaching. Faculty should train students in skills, provide opportunities for closely supervised practice, and inspire students through faith-based instruction and example. Teaching in TMA embraces not only traditional classroom lectures but also studio-based practical classrooms; the intense mentoring of rehearsals; preproduction, production, and postproduction processes; internship supervision; and a variety of activities based on the apprenticeship-based traditions of the varied fields of study.

4. The number of graduate and honors students mentored as committee member or chair, including thesis and dissertation titles.

5. Reports from substantive confidential peer reviews of teaching regarding achievement of learning outcomes, alignment of course and program learning outcomes, learning activities, learning assessments, interactions with students, cultivation of an inclusive and respectful learning environment, course design and organization, course materials, and the faculty member's efforts to improve the quality of teaching.

   CFACPRP: The CFAC summative peer evaluations should be preceded by regular peer review and formative evaluations of the faculty's teaching. Faculty members in the process of rank advancement should receive at least one peer visit followed by a written formative evaluation each semester. Peer reviewers should assess student learning by

examining learning outcomes, learning activities, and learning assessments. They should also assess the learning environment by appraising a faculty's ability to establish mentoring relationships, effective and inspiring learning spaces, and appropriate materials and resources. Reviewers should also note the faculty's interest in and efforts to improve their courses including evidence of appropriate professional development within the discipline. Formative evaluations should be shared with the faculty. When possible, those who write the summative review required in the portfolio should have participated in the formative review process.

Pre-CFS Candidates in TMA

In TMA, mentors of pre-CFS faculty members serve as the primary peer reviewers of their mentees. Mentors should spend time each semester assessing candidates' teaching—reviewing course materials, interviewing candidates, and visiting classes—and should provide feedback throughout the year. Mentors should explicitly initiate conversations about the ways that instructors integrate faith into their courses and inspire students in their learning. These conversations, in turn, should be a key part of the candidates' self-assessment process.

Candidates should complete an annual assessment at the end of each calendar year, using the recommended peer-review form. The department may ask mentors to write a summative teaching review for candidates. Additionally, a second faculty reviewer will also peer review candidates' teaching during the year before each university review (the third-year review for continuing CFS and the sixth-year review for CFS) and write a summative peer-review letter for the portfolio. These reviews will provide additional assessments of teaching in the rank and status portfolio.

Candidates for Full Professor in TMA

Candidates continue to self-evaluate their teaching each year from their achievement of CFS until they apply for rank advancement to full professor. Various peer reviewers assess the teaching of CFS candidates, and two faculty reviewers will be assigned during the year before the final review to write a summative peer-review letter for the portfolio. These reviews will provide additional assessments of teaching in the rank and status portfolio.

6. Student ratings including comments, with emphasis on trends or recurring themes.

7. Evidence that grade distribution is appropriate and consistent with department and college norms.

3.3 Assessing Scholarship

Consistent with the criteria below, departments and colleges determine the types of publications and creative works that signal scholarly achievement. Department rank and status expectations documents should outline the relative value of different types of scholarly

products in the discipline; standards for assessing quantity, quality, originality, and impact of scholarly work; and discipline-specific expectations regarding the reputation, selectivity, and impact of scholarly presses, journals, or performance and exhibition venues. Evidence of scholarship should emphasize work performed at BYU since hire into a CFS-track position or since the last rank advancement.

3.3 CFACPRP Assessing Scholarship
Each department/school rank and status document should describe its criteria for evaluating scholarship and creative work. Faculty's creative work/scholarship should have national and international scope. It should also support student learning. Candidates are responsible to document the impact of their work within the criteria set forth by the department/school. Impact may be demonstrated through recognition and citation by other researchers and creators, adoption of ideas in the work by others within the academic community and/or the industry, or other disciplinary recognition such as an invitation to perform, conduct, direct, or exhibit work in a well-respected venue, festival, or competition.

Each of the departments/schools within the CFAC follows established national norms regarding the review of published scholarship and peer review of creative work. When developing criteria to assess a faculty member's scholarship, the CFAC invites departments/schools to carefully reference guidelines established by disciplinary organizations and to align those goals with the criteria in the university and college rank and status documents.

3.3 Assessing Scholarship in TMA
In TMA, ongoing, high-quality, student-focused scholarship should be the goal. Scholarship should also further the purposes of the Church. Faculty should meet the following scholarship expectations:
- At the assistant-professor level, candidates should demonstrate that they are emerging as scholars by planning for and developing a record of peer-reviewed publications, presentations, and/or productions of scholarly and/or creative work.
- At the associate-professor level, candidates should have a focused, consistent record of a peer-reviewed work (i.e., publications, presentations, and/or productions) that influences its intended audience and/or the discipline at large.
- At the professor level, candidates should have a body of peer-reviewed work that has received positive recognition nationally and/or internationally (given disciplinary norms). Professors should also be able to demonstrate their ongoing influence on their intended audience and/or the discipline at large.

Faculty should complete a minimum of one significant, peer-reviewed work each year. There will certainly be years when a candidate focuses on preparing for the publication or presentation of a major work. In these years, professorial faculty members should consider contributing smaller works to keep active in the field. Candidates should consult with department leadership as they plan their scholarship across time.

Candidates should make publishing and presentation decisions with disciplinary norms well in mind. Candidates should contextualize any inherent peer review, qualifications of peer reviewers, statistics, reach information, and venue reputation of each specific work. Candidates should also define and describe their role(s) in collaborative work. When possible, candidates should include statements from collaborators that review and explain the candidate's specific role. Candidates should make scholarship decisions in consultation with department leadership; annual stewardship interviews should address all these areas as needed.

3.3.1 Criteria for Evaluating Scholarship
In reviewing a faculty member's scholarship, reviewers should consider whether that scholarship:
1. Is consistent with disciplinary norms of the department and college and with the university mission
2. Makes the faculty member a more effective teacher
3. Involves students where possible
4. Generates new knowledge, understanding, insight, interpretation, or application
5. Is endorsed by peer review in accordance with national disciplinary norms and department rank and status expectations documents. (Departments or colleges may regularly use on-campus reviews as the primary method of peer review only with approval from the dean and the academic vice president.)
6. Has received final acceptance for publication, exhibition, or performance

3.3.1 CFACPRP Criteria for Evaluating Scholarship
Within the arts and communications disciplines peer review may include, but is not limited to, the academic peer review of scholarly writing or presentation and/or an invitation to perform or produce a work, or have work performed (e.g., visual artist, composer, playwright, producer, director, etc.) in a reputable venue, festival, or competition.

1. Faculty are encouraged to publish, present, or perform work in nationally and internationally recognized publications, venues, competitions, or festivals. Work should be adjudicated by nationally or internationally recognized peer-reviewers. Local venues may also be deemed reputable depending on the standing of the venue, exhibition, competition, or prestige of the peer reviewer. These exceptions should be described in department/school documents and should reflect the selectivity and quality of the festival or competition for which the work is accepted, the stature or the reputation of the client, peer reviewer, and other demonstrable impact of the work on the discipline and the world at large.

2. Non-academic adjudicators can also provide a form of peer review. This type of review, which includes critical reviews of creative work in journals, newspapers, magazines, or online sources is one form of valuing the work. Departments/schools and the faculty are responsible to contextualize the weight of this type of review.

3. Creative work may be evaluated on campus and, in many cases, the size or scope of an arts or communications performance or product requires on-campus reviews of the creative work. Evaluators for on-campus review processes should be respected within the discipline and have a clear understanding of works created within an academic environment. The peer reviewer selection processes must be outlined with department/ school rank and status documents, which are then approved by the CFAC Rank and Status Committee and the CFAC Dean.

    TMA Peer-Review Selection Process
    TMA defines peer review as critical assessment according to national disciplinary norms by qualified peers. Peer review can be:
    a) inherent, as evidenced by indicators like being accepted for publication, being selected for presentation, performing at a quality venue, receiving a commission for a work, or being invited to write, perform, and produce a work;
    b) formally published, like reviews in academic journals or the quantity or quality of a work's citations;
    c) popularly published, like reviews or articles in mass-media publications or the popular press; or
    d) commissioned, as when the department brings an external reviewer in to formally assess creative work.

    TMA expects inherent peer review for all scholarship. Publications may also receive formally published and/or popularly published peer reviews. Creative works will rarely receive formally published peer reviews, but they may receive popularly published peer reviews. In most cases, creative works will receive TMA-commissioned peer reviews. Commissioned peer reviewers must represent regional, national, or international peer institutions and should have professional credentials at least equal to those of the candidates they review. Popularly published peer reviews alone are not sufficient review for creative work on their own, but candidates can use them to provide additional evidence and context to other forms of peer review.

    Candidates should seek out published critical reviews from acknowledged reputable sources and identify creative works for commissioned peer review. Works should receive the highest possible review criteria within performance, performer, and venue constraints. Artifact and document gathering (including recordings/interviews) that contextualize the peer review of scholarship should be ongoing.

4. Juried performances, exhibitions, competitions, festivals, art commissions, design commissions, advertising commissions including commercial and/or client-based work, and/or peer-reviewed creative activities are to be regarded as analogous to publications in other fields. Indicators of the quality and significance of this type of work might include, but are not limited to, work that is widely produced and/or disseminated or

viewed, work that has been selectively measured using quantitative means (e.g., an acceptance rate of ten out of one hundred), work that is performed, recorded, produced, or published in a well-respected venue, or other evidence that demonstrates national or international recognition. It should be noted that the most dissemination opportunities for commissioned work in the fine arts and communications are within venues wherein impact is determined by numerous, varied, and nuanced considerations. As such, departments/schools should outline the unique criteria for valuing this type of work based on disciplinary standards.

5. Because of the diversity in reputation, selectivity, venue, type of creative works, and in evaluating published scholarship in each of the disciplines, departments/schools are responsible to specifically outline acceptable criteria for the evaluation of published or creative work in their own rank and status documents. Departments/schools should distinguish between high quality publication/performance/presentation venues and those that do not meet the standard of the department/school. They should describe any relevant information regarding expectations for quality and quantity of the work produced.

TMA Criteria for Evaluating Scholarship—Publications and Creative Work
For scholarly publications:
   a. Candidates should publish with reputable university presses, scholarly publishers, or trade houses (and there are publishers that are all three) so that faculty work can be disseminated to libraries, researchers, and students around the world. When candidates can demonstrate a significant peer-review process, online versions of traditional publishing can also be appropriate, especially if the work lends itself to nontraditional publication. The department accepts many types of publications for scholarly advancement (e.g., book or performance reviews, journal articles, contributed essays in collections, edited collections, and monographs). Candidates should consult with department leadership about acceptable publishers in advance.

   b. Self-publishing is generally not an acceptable format for academic scholarship, though the department may consider a self-published work if it receives rigorous and adulatory peer review after publication.

   c. In their portfolio, candidates generally should only include artifacts that have been published. However, a completed manuscript and proof of its acceptance into an appropriate scholarly journal or (for a book) proof of its contract with a reputable publishing house can be acceptable evidence of progress. Candidates should discuss these situations with their mentor and the department chair.

d. Faculty members should contextualize how their representative work meets the standards for each rank, and how their scholarship is student-centered and furthers the purposes of the Church in meaningful ways.

For creative work:

a. Candidates should create work that is presented at reputable university, community, or professional venues/festivals so that students, scholars, and the public can view it. The department accepts many presentation venues for scholarly advancement. Candidates should discuss appropriate venues with their mentor and the department chair.

b. The pursuit of many professional performance and media arts endeavors requires artists to be away from their homes and their responsibilities at BYU for extended periods of time. The demands of such absences may make some types of professional work difficult or even impossible to pursue for full-time professorial faculty. As such, local venues—including BYU's theater, broadcast, and performance spaces—can be more appropriate venues for faculty than those that require extended time away from BYU.

c. Creating significant works of theatre, performance, film, or digital media requires the expertise of individuals of many talents. At times one individual may have multiple responsibilities on a single project (i.e., writing a film and directing the same film, or designing sets and designing lights on the same theatre production). In these cases, TMA recognizes the significance of each responsibility as separate evidence of scholarship provided that the scope of the responsibility would stand on its own. In these cases, up to two of the three featured examples of scholarship required for the portfolio could come from a single project.

d. An ongoing, multiple-year commitment is characteristic of many creative projects in performing and media arts. Some scholarship is long term or even career-length work (e.g., research; development; preproduction, production, or postproduction work on a film, documentary, television, internet, or theatre production over multiple years; establishment of a successful directing or producing career; or ongoing significant work at an annual theatre or media festival). TMA accepts the use of high-level artistic endeavors across multiple reviews (e.g., in both rank advancements to associate professor and professor). However, it is vital that the candidate contextualize the advancement of knowledge or competence in each review on its own merits as if it were a new work.

e. Several departments of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints (i.e., LDS Motion Picture Studio, BYUTV, LDS Conference Center productions) provide

opportunities for professional-level artistic work. Work for the Church in an artistic capacity may often be an appropriate scholarly activity. Faculty, in consultation with their mentor and department chair, should consider projects like these that further the purposes of the Church worldwide.

f. Candidates should contextualize how their representative work meets the standards for each rank. The full range of creative roles necessary in creating works of theatre, performance, film, and digital media—actors, designers, directors, devisors, producers, writers, and more—are acceptable positions. Peer review, the role, and the venue choice may all contribute to evidence of high-quality creative work. Faculty members should contextualize how this scholarship is student centered and whether it furthers the purposes of the Church in meaningful ways.

6. When defining criteria for published scholarship, departments/schools should outline expectations. Faculty members should publish work in which they are the sole author or lead collaborator on co-authored works. Faculty may also publish work with co-authors that is highly valued. Faculty/student co-authored works are also highly valued. Departments/schools should further describe the standards for assistant, associate, and professor in relationship to publication and authorship in their documents.

7. Creative work is often collaborative. Faculty should be able to clearly identify their key role in the development of the creative work and should regularly lead out in the development of the work. Because of the diversity in evaluating creative work in each of the disciplines, departments/schools are responsible to specifically outline acceptable standards for assistant, associate, and professor in relation to the evaluation of collaborative work in their own rank and status documents.

8. Faculty at the assistant professor level should demonstrate that they are emerging as scholars by planning for and beginning to develop a record of publication, presentation, and/or production of creative work that receives peer review. Associate professors should have a focused record of publication, presentation, and/or production of creative work that has received significant peer review at the national level. They should also be able to demonstrate a growing body of work that influences the discipline at large. Professors should have a body of work that has received significant peer review nationally and possibly internationally given the disciplinary norms. They should also be able to demonstrate their ongoing influence in the discipline at large.

To provide the scope and explanation of disciplinary norms, department/school documents should include, but are not limited to, the following kinds of scholarship review criteria:

1. Scholarship review criteria for defining acceptable peer reviewers for creative work (e.g., client-commissioned work, exhibitions adjudicated by non-university personnel,

etc.). This should include criteria for defining the type and quality of reviewers that the department/school engages to evaluate creative work that is produced with students and/or in a BYU campus venue. The CFAC requires that peer reviewers evaluating creative work on campus have an academic rank at least equal to that of the faculty member being reviewed or have established professional credentials which signal that they are an expert in the discipline.

2. Scholarship review criteria for defining acceptable published scholarship and creative work. This should be based on disciplinary criteria that can be validated external to BYU. Acceptable scholarly publication outlets should be defined and contextualized (e.g., journal articles; monographs; textbooks; open access journals; trade magazines; local press publications and exhibitions). The appropriate dissemination of creative work should also be defined and contextualized (intended audiences, performance, and production venues, juried creative works like paintings, illustrations, public performances, large scale productions, and commissioned work, etc.).

3. Scholarship review criteria for documenting acceptance of publication (e.g., in press or accepted with proof from publisher). It is preferred that the artifact be published and that artifact reviews be available.

4. Scholarship review criteria for documenting the production and acceptance of creative work (e.g., selectivity and prominence of venue, exhibition, competition, etc.).

5. Scholarship review criteria for measuring quality, quantity, and originality (e.g., disciplinary rankings, acceptance rates, distribution data, publisher's reputation, quality of editorial board, disciplinary perceptions of rigor and prestige of the venue, festival, or competition, etc.) and how metrics are applied to assist reviewers outside the discipline to assess the quality and impact of the work within disciplinary norms—including defining acceptable progressing publication and presentation rates for assistant, associate, and professor faculty who produce traditional scholarship.

6. Scholarship review criteria for defining authorship that reflect disciplinary norms (e.g., sole author vs. joint author; first author vs. second author, key production or creative role vs. secondary production or creative role, etc.).

7. Scholarship review criteria for external funding received.

3.4 Assessing Citizenship
3.4.1 Criteria for Evaluating Citizenship
In evaluating a faculty member's citizenship contributions, reviewers should consider whether the faculty member:
   1. Supports and furthers the mission of the university and the Aims of a BYU Education.

2. Adheres to the university's Church Educational System Honor Code and observes university policies.
3. Exhibits honor, integrity, collegiality, civility, respect, and concern for others.
4. Demonstrates a commitment to creating an atmosphere of unity and belonging at the university.
5. Attends department and college meetings and convocations.
6. Attends, and encourages students to attend, devotionals and forums.
7. Participates in the intellectual life of the department, college, and university.
8. Participates in citizenship, leadership, and governance activities within the university.

3.4.2 Other Citizenship Activities

Departments and colleges will define internal and external citizenship expectations for CFS and rank advancement. Faculty members might meet those expectations by:

1. Serving the profession, including holding offices and assignments in professional associations, organizing professional conferences and panels, editing journals or newsletters, serving on editorial boards, reviewing grant proposals, or serving as scholarly referees. Especially for mid- and late-career faculty, such service typically extends beyond local and regional organizations and venues.
2. Collaborating with colleagues in teaching, scholarship, citizenship, or student mentoring.
3. Mentoring colleagues.
4. Strengthening the university through administrative service; committee service; assignments in the Jerusalem Center and study abroad; or teaching general education, honors, religious education, and interdisciplinary courses.
5. Participating in international and other activities that enhance BYU's approved outreach efforts.
6. Participating with students in experiential learning activities.
7. Making scholarship accessible and influential beyond the academic community, such as by engaging with the media in areas of faculty expertise (*see* Media Contact Policy), shaping public policy related to scholarly work (*see* Political Neutrality Policy), and marketing intellectual property that results from scholarly work (*see* Intellectual Property Policy).
8. Employing professional expertise in service to the community or the Church of Jesus Christ (*see* Cooperation with The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints Policy).

3.4 CFACPRP Assessing Citizenship
Departments/schools should assess a faculty member's citizenship using the university guidelines. Further discipline-specific guidelines for the assessment should be clearly outlined in the department/school rank and status documents. The CFAC committee will evaluate evidence of citizenship based on the university guidelines and the unique clarifications in the department/school rank and status document.

3.4 Assessing Citizenship in TMA

All TMA faculty should be contributing disciplinary citizens at the local and national/international levels. This involves, first and foremost, robust participation in the department, including (but not limited to) serving on committees, mentoring colleagues, participating in departmental study abroad and field study programs, developing and assessing curriculum, and furthering department initiatives. This also includes serving the college and university as requested. Faculty should contribute to the profession through serving in national organizations, participating in outreach programs, or making scholarship accessible or influential beyond the academic community. All TMA faculty should demonstrate collegiality that befits a disciple of Jesus Christ.

4. Department-Level Review

4.1 Department Review Committee

The department review committee comprises at least three faculty members who have earned CFS and, whenever possible, the rank aspired to by the faculty member under review. The department chair appoints the committee and its chair. The committee conducts a thorough review of the faculty member's teaching, scholarship, and citizenship. The department committee and the department chair are in the best position to contextualize the portfolio with respect to disciplinary norms. That context gives critical guidance to subsequent reviewers unfamiliar with the faculty member's academic culture. The department chair neither attends nor participates in meetings of the department review committee.

4.2 Waiver

Before the department chair or department review committee solicits reviews from faculty, external peers, or others, the faculty member must indicate in writing whether they waive their access to those reviews. Potential reviewers should receive a copy of the signed waiver statement, and it should be included in the faculty member's portfolio (*see* Appendix B).

4.3 Review Letters of Citizenship Activities

The department review committee may solicit reviews from those who have closely observed the faculty member's citizenship activities.

4.3 CFACPRP Review Letters of Citizenship Activities

Departments/Schools should invite review letters of citizenship activities when faculty have achieved unusual excellence in a citizenship capacity within their discipline or at the university. The CFAC also invite review letters of citizenship activities when faculty have struggled significantly in their role as a citizen. In either case the faculty should be notified by the department/school that these will be included in the portfolio. In most cases review letters of citizenship activities will not be required.

4.4 Student Ratings of Teaching

In initial and final CFS reviews, the department review committee will include in the portfolio the Student Ratings Summary Report, including all student comments, for every class taught. For rank advancement reviews, the portfolio will include the summary report for every class taught during at least the past five years. The department committee's report to the department chair should consider trends in evaluations, as well as the types of classes taught (e.g., large vs. small, lower vs. upper division, required vs. elective, new preparation vs. repeated).

4.5 Peer Reviews of Teaching

Peer reviews that are thorough and balanced are an essential tool for understanding the faculty member's effectiveness as a teacher. The department chair ensures that at least two peers evaluate the faculty member's teaching and includes confidential written reports of those evaluations in the portfolio. The department chair may delegate this responsibility to an associate chair or to the department review committee. These reports assess the achievement of learning outcomes; the effectiveness of practices and activities in and out of the classroom; the appropriateness of course content, materials, and assessments; the faculty member's interactions with students and cultivation of a respectful and inclusive learning environment; and the engagement of the faculty member in processes of continuous improvement. The faculty member will facilitate these evaluations by providing reviewers with relevant materials (e.g., teaching portfolio, syllabi, examples of learning activities, slides, quizzes, exams). Ideally, peer reviewers should conduct multiple classroom visits over several semesters.

4.5 CFACPRP Peer Reviews of Teaching

As stated in the CFACRSP the CFAC summative peer evaluations should be preceded by regular peer review and formative evaluations of the faculty's teaching. When possible, writers of the summative review should have participated in the formative review process.

4.6 External Reviews of Scholarship

In final CFS reviews and rank advancement reviews, but not initial (third-year) reviews, the department chair secures external reviews of the faculty member's scholarship from at least three well-regarded faculty members at other academic institutions. The department chair may delegate this responsibility to an associate chair or to the department review committee. The faculty member may recommend external reviewers and should describe his or her relationship with each suggested reviewer. Ultimately, however, reviewers are chosen by the department chair, associate chair, or department review committee. Reviewers should hold at least the rank being sought and should not have personal or professional ties to the faculty member that might be expected to bias the reviews (e.g., peers who are co-authors, close collaborators in professional organizations, or doctoral advisors). All review letters, together with a curriculum vitae for each reviewer, must be included in the portfolio.

Appendix C contains a sample invitation to external reviewers. The following materials are sent with the invitation or in a subsequent communication: the faculty member's curriculum vitae

(containing embedded links to scholarly work wherever possible), information about the faculty member's teaching assignment, three samples of scholarship selected by the faculty member for inclusion in the portfolio, a summary of the department, college, and university standards for assessing scholarship, and the signed form indicating whether the faculty member has waived the right to know the identity of reviewers and see their letters. Departments should allow ample time for selecting and contacting potential reviewers, conveying materials, and receiving review letters.

Whoever selects the external reviewers (department chair, associate chair, or department review committee) will describe in writing (1) how the reviewers were selected, (2) their standing in the field, and (3) their relationship (if any) with the faculty member. This statement must be included in the portfolio along with external reviewers' letters and their curricula vitae.

4.7 Department Review Committee's Vote and Report

All members of the department committee should thoroughly review the portfolio. After thoroughly reviewing the portfolio and comprehensively considering its strengths and weaknesses, the department review committee will, by majority vote, recommend granting or denying CFS candidacy, CFS, or rank advancement. A tie vote signals lack of majority support and is considered a recommendation for denial. The committee will report its vote to the department chair and describe in writing the faculty member's strengths and weaknesses in teaching, scholarship, and citizenship, including student mentoring within one or more of these areas. Dissenting members of the committee may choose to include a dissenting report.

Because the department is most familiar with the faculty member's performance and with scholarship standards in the department and the discipline, the committee's report should carefully and thoroughly assess the faculty member's scholarship to help guide reviewers at the college and university levels. This evaluation should consider the quantity of publications or creative works, including pace and trajectory; the quality and reputation of publication or performance venues; the work's impact, including, when appropriate, citation counts or other metrics; and the relative weight that different types of scholarly products carry in the discipline.

If the faculty member believes that a member of the department review committee is unable, because of personal or professional conflicts of interests, to assess the portfolio objectively, the faculty member should notify the department chair of the potential conflict and the basis for her or his belief as soon as practicable after the faculty member learns of the composition of the department review committee. If the chair believes there is a basis for concern, he or she will direct the committee member to recuse himself or herself from deliberations and voting. If this reduces the committee to fewer than three members, the department chair will appoint an alternate committee member for that review.

The department committee's report is final and should not be revised as a consequence of the subsequent department discussion. If the department committee believes any updates are

necessary as a result of additional information gained in the department discussion, they should be provided as an addendum to the committee's report.

4.8 Availability of Committee Report and Portfolio

Before the department faculty deliberations and voting, the committee report and portfolio will be available to all CFS faculty and all CFS-track faculty in the department except the faculty member under review. Each eligible voter is responsible to review the portfolio carefully. The committee report and portfolio, including the identities of all outside reviewers and the content of any recommendation letters, are confidential. Faculty may not copy any part of the portfolio or letters and should not discuss them except with other department faculty members in appropriate professional settings.

4.9 Department Faculty Deliberations and Voting

The department review committee will report its evaluation and recommendation(s) at a department faculty meeting open to all CFS faculty and all CFS-track faculty in the department, except the faculty member under review. Including all faculty broadens the discussion, helps communicate expectations, and informs faculty who will be evaluated in the future. Sufficient time should be allowed for thorough deliberations on each portfolio, even if this requires multiple department meetings.

Only faculty with CFS are eligible to vote in initial and final CFS decisions; only faculty with at least the rank being sought are eligible to vote in rank advancement decisions. Because the groups of eligible voters may be different (e.g., some are eligible to vote on rank advancement only, others are eligible to vote on CFS and rank advancement for the same candidate), all reviewing bodies must hold separate votes on CFS and rank advancement.

Members of the department review committee vote with that committee, and if eligible, also vote with the department faculty. The department chair and dean, however, do not vote with the department faculty.

Only faculty members physically or virtually present for department deliberations may vote. Exceptions require approval from the chair and dean; those granted exceptions are deemed present for purposes of voting.
Voting is by secret ballot, and the recommendation is determined by a majority vote of eligible faculty members who vote to recommend either granting or denying the application. A tie vote signals lack of majority support and is considered a recommendation for denial. The majority recommendation but not the vote count is shared with the department faculty. Only the department chair may inform the faculty member of the majority recommendation.
The department chair will prepare a summary of deliberations, reporting the vote count and summarizing key elements of department deliberations, including any concerns raised about accuracy of the department review committee's report or issues not included in the report. This summary of deliberations is added to the portfolio, separate from the chair's independent evaluation. The chair may delegate responsibility for drafting the summary of deliberations.

If the faculty member under review believes that any member of the department faculty is unable, because of personal or professional conflicts of interest, to assess the portfolio objectively, the faculty member should notify the department chair of the potential conflict and the basis for his or her belief. If the department chair believes there is a basis for concern, he or she should address this concern in the department chair's report, but no eligible voter who attends the department deliberations may be prevented from voting.

4.10 Department Chair's Report
In addition to reporting the vote count and summarizing department deliberations in the portfolio, the department chair will independently evaluate in writing the faculty member's strengths and weaknesses in teaching, scholarship, and citizenship. This report should not merely restate the committee's and external reviewers' findings but should offer the chair's unique perspectives. The chair must recommend granting or denial of CFS candidacy, CFS, or rank advancement. Like the department committee, the chair should assess the faculty member's performance in light of scholarship standards in the department and the discipline and should explain the quality of publication or performance venues and the relative weight that different types of scholarly products carry in the discipline. The chair's report should also assess the faculty member's progress in addressing any concerns raised in prior reviews, drawing from annual review letters and prior rank and status review summaries.

4.11 Informing the Faculty Member of a Positive Recommendation
If the recommendations of the department committee, the department faculty, and the department chair are positive, the chair will inform the faculty member of the department recommendations without disclosing vote counts or details of the deliberations and will advance the portfolio to the college.

4.12 Informing the Faculty Member of a Negative Recommendation
If the department committee, the department faculty, or the department chair recommends denial of CFS candidacy, CFS, or rank advancement, the department chair will inform the faculty member and will explain the reasons for the negative recommendation. Vote counts remain confidential. A third person should be present at this meeting, e.g., an associate chair or the chair of the department review committee. This meeting should occur before college-level review begins. The chair should inform the faculty member of the option to withdraw the application. The faculty member should be reminded that department deliberations result in non-binding recommendations, and that only the academic vice president's recommendation is subject to independent review (*see* Rank and Status Independent Examination Procedures).

A faculty member's withdrawal of an application for CFS candidacy or CFS constitutes notice of resignation from the university at the end of the contract year. The university, at its sole discretion, may grant such an individual a one-year temporary position while the person seeks employment elsewhere. If the faculty member elects not to withdraw the application, it will be forwarded to the college review committee.

5. College-Level Review

5.1 Colleges without Departments
In colleges without departments, the college review committee, the college faculty, and the dean will perform the functions of the department review committee, the department faculty, and the department chair as described in Section 4: Department-Level Review.

5.2 College Review Committee
The college review committee is composed of at least three faculty members who have achieved CFS and, where possible, the rank aspired to by the faculty members under review. The dean appoints the committee and the committee chair. An associate dean may be assigned to guide the work of the college committee. The dean neither attends nor participates in meetings of the college review committee. Committee members from the same department as the faculty member under review who have voted with their department faculty may participate in deliberations but do not vote again.

5.2 CFACPRP College Review Committee
The dean appoints an associate dean to serve on the committee and to oversee the rank and status process. The associate dean participates in and manages the process but does not vote. The associate dean appoints a primary and secondary reader for each candidate's file.

5.3 College Review Committee's Vote and Report
Members of the college review committee should conduct their own independent review of the faculty member's performance, using the department's and college's established criteria and performance standards as defined in their rank and status expectations documents. The college review committee will recommend by majority vote to grant or deny CFS candidacy, CFS, or rank advancement. A tie vote signals lack of majority support and is considered a recommendation for denial. The committee will write an independent report evaluating the faculty member's teaching, scholarship, and citizenship, including student mentoring within one or more of these areas, and reporting the committee's vote. Dissenting members of the committee may choose to include a dissenting report.

If the faculty member believes that a member of the college review committee is unable, because of personal or professional conflicts of interests, to assess the portfolio objectively, the faculty member should notify the dean of the potential conflict and the basis for his or her belief as soon as practicable after the faculty member learns of the composition of the college review committee. If the dean believes the potential conflict would compromise the integrity of the review process, the dean will instruct the committee member to recuse himself or herself from deliberations and voting. If this reduces the committee to fewer than three members, the dean will appoint an alternate committee member for that review.

5.3 CFACPRP College Review Committee's Vote and Report

The primary and secondary reviewers lead the CFAC committee through a deliberation of the file. Each area of faculty responsibility is discussed and evaluated by examining the evidence provided in citizenship, teaching, scholarship, and mentoring. While the roles of primary and secondary readers are vital to the process, each committee member is expected to read each file and participate fully in the drafting and completion of the committee letter. Following the deliberations, the associate dean calls for a vote.

5.4 Dean's Report
After the college review committee's vote, the dean will independently evaluate in writing the faculty member's strengths and weaknesses in teaching, scholarship, and citizenship, including student mentoring within one or more of these areas. The dean's report should not merely repeat previous findings but should offer the dean's unique perspectives. The dean must recommend granting or denial of CFS candidacy, CFS, or rank advancement.

5.5 Informing the Faculty Member of a Positive Recommendation
If the college review committee's recommendation and the dean's recommendation are positive, the dean will inform the faculty member of the positive recommendations without disclosing vote counts or details of the deliberations and will advance the portfolio to the associate academic vice president – faculty development (AAVP – FD).

5.6 Informing the Faculty Member of a Negative Recommendation
If the college committee or the dean recommends denial of CFS candidacy, CFS, or rank advancement, the dean will inform the faculty member and will explain the reasons for the negative recommendation. Vote counts remain confidential. The department chair should be present at this meeting. The dean should inform the faculty member of the option to withdraw the application. The faculty member should be reminded that department and college deliberations result in non-binding recommendations and that only the academic vice president's recommendation is subject to independent review (*see* Rank and Status Independent Examination Procedures).

A faculty member's withdrawal of an application for CFS candidacy or CFS constitutes notice of resignation from the university at the end of the contract year. The university, at its sole discretion, may grant such an individual a one-year temporary position while the person seeks employment elsewhere. If the faculty member elects not to withdraw the application, it will be forwarded to the AAVP – FD.

6. University-Level Review

6.1 Professorial Faculty Council on Rank and Status
The Professorial Faculty Council on Rank and Status is composed of at least eight and not more than twelve professorial faculty members, all of whom have CFS or hold the rank of professor. At least three-fourths of the appointed council members must be present to constitute a quorum. Council members from the same department as the faculty member under review

who have voted with their department faculty may participate in deliberations but do not vote again. The AAVP – FD serves as chair of the council but does not vote. The academic vice president appoints each council member and appoints a vice-chair from among the council members.

If the faculty member believes that any member of the Professorial Council on Rank and Status is unable, because of personal or professional conflicts of interest, to assess the portfolio objectively, the faculty member should notify the AAVP – FD of the potential conflict and the basis for the belief before the deadline to advance the portfolio to the AAVP – FD. If the AAVP – FD believes there is a basis for concern, he or she will ask the council member to recuse himself or herself from deliberations and voting.

The AAVP – FD determines which portfolios will be reviewed by the Professorial Faculty Council on Rank and Status. University council review is mandatory in cases where the college functions as a single academic unit without departments; a recommendation from any prior level of review is negative; or the number of dissenting votes cast at any prior level is considered significant by the associate academic vice president. Only the AAVP – FD may waive the university council review.

For those portfolios that are reviewed by the Professorial Faculty Council on Rank and Status, the Council will use the department's and college's established criteria and performance standards as defined in their rank and status expectations documents and will determine whether the department and college reasonably applied their written criteria.

The university council will recommend, by majority vote, to grant or deny CFS candidacy, CFS, or rank advancement. A tie vote signals lack of majority support and is considered a recommendation for denial. The council's evaluation and recommendations are forwarded to the academic vice president.

6.2 Recommendations that Differ from College Recommendations
If the Professorial Faculty Council on Rank and Status is considering making a recommendation that differs from that of the dean or the college review committee, the council may ask the dean for clarification or more information before forwarding its recommendation to the academic vice president.

6.3 Academic Vice President's Recommendation
After considering the recommendations from all prior levels of review, the academic vice president will make an independent recommendation to the university president to grant or deny CFS candidacy, CFS, or rank advancement. In extraordinary circumstances, the academic vice president may recommend a delay of the review. The vice president's recommendation will be informed by the recommendations of the department, college, and (if applicable) university-level reviewers, but will provide unique perspectives resulting from the vice president's independent review.

If the academic vice president recommends against granting CFS candidacy, CFS, or rank advancement, the faculty member will be informed of the recommendation in a letter delivered by the AAVP – FD. The letter will summarize the recommendation and its underlying reasons.

Upon receiving the letter, the faculty member may (1) withdraw the application, (2) allow the recommendation to go forward for the president's final decision without comment, or (3) request an independent examination of the academic vice president's recommendation as detailed in the [Rank and Status Independent Examination Procedures](#).

A recommendation by the academic vice president to delay the review is not subject to independent examination. Should the faculty member choose to reject the offer of a delay, the academic vice president's recommendation becomes denial, and the faculty member may exercise any of the three options listed above. By withdrawing an application for CFS candidacy or CFS, a faculty member resigns from employment at the university, effective at the end of the current contract period. The university, at its sole discretion, may grant the individual a one-year temporary position while the person seeks employment elsewhere.

6.4 President's Decision

After receiving the recommendation of the academic vice president and the results of any independent examination, the president will decide whether to grant or deny CFS candidacy, CFS, or rank advancement, or take any other action. The president has the exclusive authority, in the exercise of the president's sole discretion, to make the decision. All determinations in the rank and status process other than the president's decision are only recommendations. The president's decision is final.

The faculty member will receive written notice of the president's decision. Copies of the notification letter will be sent to the academic vice president, the AAVP – FD, the dean, and the department chair. If the president's decision is not to grant CFS candidacy or CFS, the university, at its sole discretion, may grant the individual a one-year temporary position while the person seeks employment elsewhere.

Appendix A
Click here to view [Appendix A](#).

Appendix B
Click here to view [Appendix B](#).

Appendix C
Click here to view [Appendix C](#).