



---

**RANK AND STATUS POLICY**

14 January 2008

With additional expectations specified by the College of Fine Arts and Communications (highlighted in red). Approved by the Academic Vice President's Council 23 August 2017. With additional expectations specified by the Department of Theatre and Media Arts (highlighted in blue). Approved by the CFAC Dean's Office 27 July 2018.

**EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

This policy governs the retention, granting of continuing faculty status, and rank advancement of faculty. It establishes standards of performance in all three areas of faculty responsibility, citizenship, teaching, and scholarship, and criteria by which faculty performance is to be evaluated. The policy also establishes the procedures to be followed in evaluating faculty in the initial (third-year) review, the final (sixth- or seventh-year) review, and for rank advancement, along with the timetable for the scheduled reviews. The policy also specifies the responsibilities of faculty members for preparing materials to be used as the basis of evaluation in the reviews, as well as the responsibilities of department rank and status committees, department chairs, department faculty, college rank and status committees, deans, and the university council on rank and status. It also establishes the timetable for mandatory reviews. In its treatment of this process, the policy also deals with issues of confidentiality, the adding of materials to the file, procedures for delaying continuing status reviews, and support for the mission of the university. The policy also establishes the process of independent examination of rank and status decisions available to faculty members. Attached as appendices to the policy are checklists to be used in making sure all relevant materials are placed in the faculty members' files, and sample letters for use by chairs in soliciting external reviews of the faculty members' work.

**1. INTRODUCTION**

TMA: The Department of Theatre and Media Arts is committed to both the mission of Brigham Young University "to assist individuals in their quest for perfection and eternal life," and the "Aims of a BYU Education" which "should be (1) spiritually strengthening, (2) intellectually enlarging, and (3) character building, leading to (4) lifelong learning and service." We recognize the power of theatre and film, both realized and analyzed, to educate, enlighten, enrich, and entertain while expressing awareness of the truths of the human experience and a commitment to developing the infinite potential of individuals. This policy will be effective on 1 January 2019, and shall apply to all faculty members equally, regardless of their rank or status.

**1.1 Overview**

This policy describes the university's standards and procedures for hiring faculty and for granting candidacy for continuing faculty status, continuing faculty status, and rank advancement. Continuing faculty status is defined at the university as "an automatically renewed appointment." The automatic renewal is accomplished by the issuance of a contract for the next academic year unless the faculty member is terminated for cause. A faculty member's rejection of a contract has the effect of indicating a withdrawal from the university and a relinquishment of continuing faculty status. Such an action ends the employment relationship with the university.



**TMA:** This policy describes the expectations of faculty members within the Department of Theatre and Media Arts. These expectations will be carefully reviewed when faculty members are applying for

- Candidacy for continuing faculty status,
- Continuing faculty status, and
- Rank advancement.

## 1.2 Individual Responsibility

Fundamental to the purpose of this policy is the understanding that the individual bears the burden of becoming familiar with the university's policies, procedures, and standards for review, and for presenting persuasive evidence to the university that he or she is appropriately qualified for hiring or for receiving candidacy, continuing faculty status, or rank advancement. While the university is not obligated to hire or to grant candidacy, continuing faculty status, or rank advancement to any individual, the university agrees to provide a fair review process as described in this policy.

**CFACRSP:** The URSP, college, and department/school documents should be shared with faculty early in the first year of hire and the candidate's Professional Development Plan should be crafted with full knowledge of all documents. Candidates should remember that they bear the burden of becoming familiar with the university's policies, procedures, and standards of review that are articulated in university, college, and department rank and status documents. When being evaluated for any level of rank or status review, each faculty member is responsible for presenting persuasive evidence to each level of evaluation for which he or she is qualified (URSP 1.2). Faculty dossiers must be prepared with the CFAC template and utilizing the Faculty Profile System reports as requested by the template.

**TMA:** Fundamental to the purpose of this policy is the understanding that the individual bears the burden of becoming familiar with the university's policies, procedures, and standards for review, and for presenting persuasive evidence to the university that he or she is appropriately qualified for receiving candidacy, continuing faculty status, or rank advancement. While the university is not obligated to hire or to grant candidacy, continuing faculty status, or rank advancement to any individual, the university agrees to provide a fair review process as described in this policy. Faculty dossiers must be prepared with the CFAC template and utilize the Faculty Profile System reports as requested by the template.

In addition, TMA adheres to the policies and procedures set forth in URSP 1.3 – 1.6 and in the same sections of the CFACRSP. TMA understands that college and department rank and status policies may not contradict or waive any requirement of the URSP or apply a lower standard. If there is a conflict between a college or department policy and the URSP, the URSP governs.

## 1.3 Changes

These standards and procedures may be changed from time to time, and such changes apply to all faculty regardless of when they were hired or the standards and procedures that then prevailed.

## 1.4 Exceptions

The academic vice president may approve exceptions to this policy to accommodate particular needs.



### 1.5 College and Department Policies

Colleges and departments are encouraged to create their own rank and status policies and to review and update them periodically to reflect current expectations, department, college, and university needs, and disciplinary standards. College and department rank and status policies must be approved by the dean and the academic vice president. College and department rank and status policies may not contradict or waive any requirement of this policy or apply a lower standard. If there is a conflict between a college or department policy and this policy, this policy governs.

**CFACRSP:** As directed by this University Rank and Status Policy (URSP 1.5), the College of Fine Arts and Communications (CFAC) Rank and Status Policy (CFACRSP) was created to define college expectations. It is intended to be broad enough to encompass the range of disciplinary perspectives in the CFAC and is written with the understanding that each department/school has diverse expectations within their respective fields that are articulated with more specificity in their rank and status policies.

This policy draft has been approved by the CFAC departments/schools on August 7, 2017, and was submitted to the office of the BYU Academic Vice President for approval.

This document

- provides departments/schools with college perspectives that can be utilized in creating and refining their rank and status policies, as well as other faculty expectations documents created for faculty members that provide disciplinary guidelines regarding citizenship, teaching, scholarship, and professional service (URSP 1.5, 3.2, 3.3, 3.4) within their areas;
- supports each faculty member in assessing his or her progress towards Continuing Faculty Status (CFS) and/or rank advancement and is specifically designed to aid chairs/directors and faculty members in annual stewardship reviews where faculty performance is evaluated; and
- helps candidates understand college rank and status expectations and process used at the college level in concert with the URSP.

This document DOES NOT

- contradict or waive any requirement of the URSP or apply a lower standard. The CFAC recognizes that if there is a conflict between a CFAC or department/school policy and the URSP, the URSP governs (URSP 1.5);
- specify all of the responsibilities of faculty members for preparing rank and status materials to be used as the basis of evaluation in the reviews; or
- provide the mandatory timetable for these reviews which is found within the URSP and is more specifically articulated for the disciplines within each department/school rank and status policy.

### 1.6 Nondiscrimination

The standards and procedures in this policy will be applied without illegal discrimination on the basis of sex, race, color, national origin, age, veteran status, or disability. Because of the university's religious mission, in hiring decisions strong preference is given to members of The



---

Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints.

## **2. APPOINTMENT OF FACULTY MEMBERS**

(Replaced by Faculty Hiring Policy, October 1, 2012.)

**CFACRSP:** The CFAC adheres to the hiring policies set forth in the URSP, the BYU Faculty Hiring Policy (FHP), and the Non-CFS Track Academic Appointments Policy (NTAA). Using the URSP, FHP, and the NTAA, departments/schools are expected to work in concert with the CFAC Dean's Office to ensure that the recruiting and hiring practices outlined in these documents are effectively practiced.

**TMA:** TMA adheres to the hiring policies set forth in the URSP, the BYU Faculty Hiring Policy (FHP), the Non-CFS Track Academic Appointments Policy (NTAA), and the CFACRSP. Using these documents, TMA works in concert with the CFAC Dean's Office to ensure that the recruiting and hiring practices outlined are effectively practiced.

### **All But Dissertation (ABD)**

The CFAC will not approve an ABD candidate unless the conditions are met as set forth in the FHP (2). This includes visiting faculty appointments.

### **Faculty – Professorial and Professional**

#### **Vacancies**

Faculty are hired in the college into one of two different tracks, professorial or professional (FHP 3.2; 3.10; 3.11), based on the curricular and disciplinary needs within the department. The faculty position tracks are judiciously determined with the department/school, college and university at the time of retaining and opening any faculty position.

**TMA:** Faculty are hired in the department and college into one of two different primary tracks, professorial or professional (FHP 3.2; 3.10; 3.11), based on the curricular and disciplinary needs within the department. TMA subdivides these primary tracks into more specific categories. See TMARSP 3.1.1.1. The faculty position tracks are judiciously determined with the department/school, college and university at the time of retaining and opening any faculty position. TMA adheres to those policies outlined in the CFACRSP on these appointments.

#### **Hiring Decisions**

The college and university are committed to the general model of a professorial faculty that engages in both teaching and scholarship/creative work (FHP 3.10). CFAC professorial scholarship or creative work is adjudicated within academia and also in competitive festivals, competitions, and in client-based work as described in this document. CFAC professional faculty may also engage in professional service that is deemed scholarship or creative work for the reasons stated below. The work performed by professional faculty is invaluable and critical to performing specialized functions within departments/schools.

#### **Initial Classification (Professorial)**

As stated in FHP 3.10 and URSP 5.1.D, professorial faculty are required to hold an appropriate



terminal degree from an accredited institution of higher education that is appropriate to the applicant's discipline and position such as the Master of Fine Arts (MFA). The degree accepted nationally within a CFAC specialty area generally meets this requirement and is acceptable to the college. Faculty candidates hired into professorial tracks should be prepared to engage in high quality teaching and to contribute critically peer reviewed, high quality scholarship and creative works to their disciplines in accordance with expectations outlined in section 3.10 of the FHP.

Departments/schools selecting professorial faculty should align hiring decisions with the degree requirements articulated by national accrediting bodies. For example, the College Art Association affirms "the Master of Fine Arts (MFA) is the terminal degree in studio art practice. The Master of Fine Arts (MFA), the Master of Design (MDes), the Master of Art and Design (MAD), the Master of Graphic Design (MGraph), are among the terminal degrees in design practice."

For the School of Music, CAA online and the National Association for Schools of Music Accreditation Handbook states, "Faculty members shall be qualified by earned degrees and/or professional experience and/or demonstrated teaching competence for the subjects and levels they are teaching. Teachers of performance, composition, and other applied subjects normally are, or have been, deeply involved as practicing artists in the specific disciplines or specializations they are teaching.... NASM recognizes the availability of doctorates for specialists in performance, composition, and some other applied disciplines. At the same time, the Association recognizes that some highly qualified practitioners may hold other academic degrees." At BYU, in accordance with terminal degree requirements of the Faculty Hiring Policy, music faculty candidates being considered for professorial tracks typically have one of these "other degrees" that are considered to be terminal degrees in the discipline which include the DMA (Doctor of Musical Arts), Master of Music (MM) or Master of Arts (MA)(NASM, online).

Degree requirements must be stated in the position vacancy request and approved by the AVP Council prior to posting the faculty position. Approvals for filling professorial faculty positions are dependent on position justifications (FHP 3.2), as well as on disciplinary criteria and expectations that align with the principles outlined in FHP 3.10. As noted in the University Faculty Hiring Policy, the Academic Vice President or an appointed designee, is authorized to approve exceptions to this policy to accommodate extenuating circumstances (FHP 1.5).

### **Initial Classification (Professional)**

As indicated in FHP 3.11, professional faculty are hired to perform specialized functions that are congruent with the curricular and structural needs of the departments/schools. While terminal degrees appropriate to the applicant's discipline and position are preferred but not required for professional faculty positions (FHP 3.11), URSP 6.6.1.C suggests that appropriate degrees as determined by the department/school may be deemed less important when appropriate, than assuring that the professional faculty position meets specialized curricular and structural needs of the department/school. Because of this, equivalent professional training or experience may be deemed sufficient along with a Bachelor's degree in a related field (FHP 3.11). There are no exceptions to a minimum of a Bachelor's degree for any hire.

When preparing to recruit for a CFAC professional faculty position, chairs/directors will outline expectations for professional service in teaching along with creative work, production, and any other specialized responsibilities. These responsibilities are determined when departments, in



consultation with the college, prepare position vacancy requests for AVP Council consideration. These requests include a “position description stating the specific responsibilities and expectations of the position and the ways in which performance will be evaluated” (FHP 3.11). Criteria will always include citizenship and professional service in teaching, and may include forms of professional services in scholarly/creative work as determined by the department/school. This is often referred to as a professional faculty expectations document. This expectations document accompanies the official offer letter that is approved by the AAVP-Faculty. This document must be congruent with the structural needs within the department/school regarding the curriculum and discipline and not based on any potential faculty candidate’s credentials.

In every case, the professional faculty member’s expertise within their given field should serve the needs of the students by providing connections to arts and communications industries or public school settings. Professional faculty may be assigned professional service that is deemed scholarship or creative work in order to strategically maintain/develop/influence connections with professional entities. This informs teaching and allows faculty to contribute to their disciplines. However, this scholarship or creative work should not be evaluated using the same standard as that of professorial faculty. Instead, the expected purpose, quality, and quantity of a faculty member’s professional service in scholarship or creative work and how it will be evaluated for rank and status should be described within the professional faculty expectations document drafted for the position vacancy request and offer letter. Those faculty members with expectations for both professional service in teaching and scholarship or creative works will have a teaching load that is balanced with those scholarly or creative expectations.

Professional faculty who do not have professional service in scholarship or creative work expectations will be expected to maintain a higher teaching load as described in their professional faculty expectations document. In addition to professional service in scholarship or creative work, individual professional faculty member’s teaching load expectations are outlined in the professional faculty expectations document and both areas may be further modified in annual stewardship reviews. In most cases, professional faculty have a greater responsibility than professorial faculty to connect students directly to the industry in which they produce practical or creative work.

### **Graduate Faculty Status**

Departments/schools should respect the university requirement for assigning graduate faculty status at the time of hire (FHP 3.13). In exceptional instances, college or department/school criteria for graduate faculty may differ. The College of Fine Arts and Communications does not approve graduate faculty status for faculty without appropriate degrees as stated in the Graduate Faculty Status Policy. A faculty member without graduate status but with a particular expertise may occasionally serve as a fourth member of a thesis committee but may not serve as a chair or primary member of the committee. Any exception must be approved by the CFAC deans and Graduate School dean.

## **3. EXPECTATIONS OF FACULTY MEMBERS**

### **3.1 General Expectations**

**CFACRSP:** The College of Fine Arts and Communications supports the general expectations for



faculty as defined in the URSP 3.1.1-10. Chairs/directors and faculty should be well informed of these expectations. As directed in the URSP, new faculty should develop a Faculty Development Plan in their first year at BYU (URSP 3.1.2) in consultation with a faculty mentor and department chair/school director. Each year, faculty should participate in an annual performance (stewardship) review (URSP 3.1.4).

### 3.1.1 Faculty Standards

Brigham Young University is a private university with unique goals and aspirations that arise from the mission of The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints. A faculty member's responsibility is to engage in high quality citizenship, teaching, and scholarship (or citizenship and professional service, for professional faculty) and to make affirmative contributions to the university mission. Faculty should provide students an education that is spiritually strengthening, intellectually enlarging, character building, and leading to lifelong learning and service. (See The Aims of a BYU Education.) It is a condition of employment that faculty members act in accordance with university policies and, the Church Educational System Honor Code, including the Dress and Grooming Standards, and refrain from behavior or expression that seriously and adversely affects the university mission or The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints. LDS faculty who are members of The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints also accept as a condition of employment the standards of conduct consistent with qualifying for temple privileges. They are expected to live lives reflecting a love of God, a commitment to keeping his commandments, and loyalty to the Church. They are expected to be role models to students of people who are proficient in their discipline and faithful in the Church. All faculty are expected to be role models for a life that combines the quest for intellectual rigor with spiritual values and personal integrity. They are expected to engage in continuing faculty development, and to maintain high levels of performance throughout the course of their careers.

**TMA:** The Department of Theatre and Media Arts expects excellence of our faculty. All faculty should perform at the highest levels of citizenship, teaching and scholarship (or citizenship and professional service for professional faculty) as outlined in URSP 3.1.1. Additionally, TMA aspires to create a process of peer evaluation that promotes these high standards for faculty of all ranks. The future of the department depends in large part on the quality of the judgment used in making rank and status decisions. Each recommendation will be made with the greatest possible care and will be the result of thorough and rigorous scrutiny of all relevant information.

#### 3.1.1.1. Faculty Categories

In order to more carefully define the responsibilities of individuals within the department, TMA has divided its faculty into the following categories, which will be designated at the time of the hire:

- A. Theatre or Media Arts Professorial
  - Theatre or Media Arts Teacher/Scholar
  - Theatre or Media Arts Teacher/Artist
  
- B. Theatre or Media Arts Professional
  - Theatre Professional



---

- Media Arts Professional

A professorial faculty member's responsibility is to engage in high quality citizenship, teaching, and scholarship. A professional faculty member's responsibility is to engage in high quality citizenship and professional service, which includes teaching and scholarship (as set forth in URSP 6.5). All faculty are to make affirmative contributions to the university mission. Specific expectations regarding a faculty member's focus should be set forth in the position description or in the department rank and status policy, and should be included in the file prepared for rank and status reviews (see URSP 7). These specific expectations are included in TMARSP 5 and 6.

### 3.1.2 Faculty Development Plan

New faculty should meet with their department chair during their first year to develop a faculty development plan for the period of employment through their final continuing faculty status review. The faculty development plan should describe the faculty member's proposed activities in the areas of citizenship, teaching, and scholarship (or citizenship and professional service, for professional faculty). The faculty development plan should include a statement of:

- A. The faculty member's self-assessment of his or her strengths, skills, competencies, interests, opportunities, and areas in which the faculty member wishes to develop.
- B. The faculty member's professional goals in citizenship, teaching, and scholarship (or citizenship and professional service, for professional faculty) and the plan to accomplish these goals.
- C. The relationship between individual goals and department and university aspirations and needs.
- D. Resources needed to accomplish the professional goals, including budgetary support, equipment, time, etc.
- E. The faculty member's activities and accomplishments so far in achieving the goals.
- F. The faculty member's comments, if desired, on measures used to assess success in his or her professorial or professional responsibilities and in accomplishing the goals set forth in the plan.

Faculty are encouraged to use the Faculty Center's resources in developing the plan. Faculty members should update and review the plan with the department chair in their annual interviews. Parts of the faculty development plan may form the basis for the personal statement which the faculty member produces for the file at the time of the third-year and final continuing faculty reviews (Appendices A and B). The faculty development plan is a planning tool, and does not constitute a commitment that the university will employ the faculty member for the period covered by the plan or that the faculty member will receive continuing faculty status if the goals in the plan are met.

Retention of faculty depends on the overall quality of their performance and on the university's evolving needs. Continuing faculty status reviews are performed at the department, college, and university levels, and continuing faculty status is granted only by the university president.

**CFACRSP:** The specialized responsibilities for CFAC professional faculty are determined at the time of hire and are described in the professional faculty expectations document (as described in Section 2 of this document) that accompanies the official offer letter from the university. If needed, the expectations described in this letter can be adjusted after the hire takes place





---

according to the needs of the department/school. When appropriate, adjustments are developed by the faculty and his or her chair/director in consultation with the CFAC deans, and these adjustments become a part of the Faculty Development Plan.

**TMA:** TMA adheres to the university policy as set forth in URSP 3.1.2. The department expects all faculty to create a faculty development plan for the period of employment through their final continuing faculty status review as outlined in URSP 3.1.2.

### 3.1.3 Effectiveness in All Areas of Responsibility

Faculty are expected to perform high quality work in citizenship, teaching, and scholarship (or citizenship and professional service, for professional faculty). Failure by faculty with continuing status to maintain acceptable performance constitutes adequate cause for termination. (See Faculty Hiring Policy and Faculty Discipline and Termination Policy) Faculty members have different strengths. However, the performance of faculty must be above acceptable minimum standards in all areas of responsibility. Most professorial faculty early in their careers should have a balance of teaching and scholarship, with lighter committee and other administrative assignments. The allocation of time in these three areas may vary among faculty or over a faculty member's career, depending on changes in assignments due to legitimate university and department needs. Reviewers in the rank and status process will exercise reasonable flexibility, balancing heavier responsibilities in one area against lighter responsibilities and performance in another.

**TMA:** TMA supports the university policy as set forth in URSP 3.1.3. Faculty members must be effective in all areas of rank and status evaluation, though the specific balance among the areas may vary from one faculty member to another. For certain faculty members, the balance may also vary from one year to another. The department will be flexible in the case of individual faculty members in order to balance heavier responsibilities in one area against lighter ones in another. It is the responsibility of the faculty member to express concern in a timely manner when assignments, including administrative duties, seem out of balance, and it is the department chair's responsibility to respond sensitively and quickly to such concerns. Each faculty member is expected to carry an appropriate share of the departmental workload in citizenship, teaching, and scholarship, or citizenship and professional service.

### 3.1.4 Annual Performance Reviews and Interviews

Continuing performance evaluations will be carried out for all faculty. The department chair, dean or designee, will conduct an annual performance review of, and an annual stewardship interview with, each faculty member in the department, including faculty with continuing faculty status. These interviews are the primary vehicle for tracking and encouraging continuing faculty development, and through which the performance of faculty with continuing faculty status is monitored, and through which performance expectations are communicated. These interviews should identify performance problems early, implement progressive steps to help a faculty member be successful in all areas of professorial responsibility, and create a record of discussions about performance problems and attempts made to remedy them. Departments are encouraged to have a department committee assist in conducting the annual performance reviews. In the annual interview the chair and the faculty member will review performance and develop goals and strategies for development and improvement. A written summary of the department chair's evaluations should be given to the faculty member and a copy placed in his or



her department personnel file. A copy of the letter will be sent to the dean. In addition to serving as a regular, systematic process for reviewing faculty members' past performance, the annual stewardship interview process should also contain a prospective, developmental component. It is the primary opportunity for department chairs to monitor and help encourage continuous faculty development. Faculty development needs and opportunities should be discussed in each annual interview, regardless of a faculty member's past performance. Faculty should include in the materials submitted for the annual review a statement of plans for faculty development. The interview should include discussion of time and other resource implications of the development plans. All faculty members are expected to engage in continuous development and improvement in scholarship and teaching. Department chairs should encourage efforts and support opportunities for faculty development.

**CFACRSP:** The written summary of the department chair/school director's annual stewardship evaluations should be given to the faculty member and a copy placed in his or her department/school personnel file. A copy of the letter will be sent to the dean. This process will help all parties communicate clearly about a candidate's progress through the CFS and promotion process. Chairs/directors should weigh the progress of professorial faculty in citizenship, teaching, and scholarship against the criteria set forth in the college and department/school rank and status documents and in the context of the URSP. Professional faculty are annually reviewed according to the criteria set forth in their professional faculty expectations document, department/school and college rank and status documents, and in the context of the URSP. During their annual review, chairs/directors are admonished to augment the initial professional faculty expectations documents in conjunction with any changes/clarifications that are necessary for their professional faculty role and detail the changes in a new document that accompanies the annual stewardship evaluation. (See 6.1 Definition of Professional Faculty section in this document.) Where revisions have occurred, the rank and status dossier should include an explanation for those revisions and an evaluation of the professional faculty member's performance against the prior professional faculty expectations document up to the time of the revision. These documents (including any revisions) must be included in the rank and status dossier for initial and final reviews as well as for advancements in rank.

**TMA:** TMA supports the university policy as set forth in URSP 3.1.4. In addition, TMA clarifies that the standard for judging acceptable performance will depend in part on particular assignments and expectations identified during annual reviews. During the annual review process, faculty work will be assessed using the following categories: exceeded expectations, met expectations, partially met expectations, or failed to meet expectations. For those faculty members who have not yet achieved full professor rank and/or CFS status, a portion of the annual performance review will be focused on the faculty member's rank and status progress, with specific recommendations for improvements in areas deemed deficient. It is the responsibility of the candidate to address any potential deficiencies identified during the annual review.

### 3.1.5 Academic Freedom

Occasionally, evaluation of faculty for rank and status may involve issues of academic freedom. In such cases, BYU's principles of academic freedom should be respected.

These issues, however, will be reviewed within the faculty rank and status process rather than under university procedures governing faculty discipline or academic freedom grievances. (See Faculty Discipline and Termination Policy; Faculty Grievance Policy) Note that the faculty rank and status process considers academic freedom issues under a different standard than would



apply in a disciplinary or academic freedom grievance proceeding. This is because disciplinary and academic freedom grievance proceedings are concerned with whether a faculty member has engaged in conduct or expression that seriously and adversely affects the university mission or the Church. A faculty rank and status review, on the other hand, focuses not merely on the presence or absence of harm, but on the quality of the faculty member's overall affirmative contribution to the University. Thus, the faculty rank and status process applies a higher standard for citizenship, teaching, and scholarship (or citizenship and professional service, for professional faculty) than would apply in a disciplinary or academic freedom grievance proceeding. For instance, assessments of teaching quality in a faculty rank and status review consider not just whether a teacher is incompetent or has harmed students or the university mission, but--far beyond the absence of harm--whether the teaching is affirmatively of high quality. The same approach applies to issues of citizenship and scholarship.

**TMA:** TMA adheres to the university policy as set forth in URSP 3.1.5.

### 3.1.6 Annual Performance Reviews for Faculty with Continuing Status

All faculty are expected to perform at acceptable levels in all areas of their responsibility, citizenship, teaching, and scholarship, or professional service. (See 3.1.2) The standard for judging acceptable performance will depend in part on particular assignments and expectations formulated during the annual review process. Such assignments and expectations may vary over the course of a faculty member's career. If, in the annual performance interview, a faculty member's performance is evaluated as below acceptable levels it is the faculty member who bears the responsibility for achieving and maintaining acceptable performance. The department chair should take steps to see that reasonable efforts and resources are expended to assist the faculty member's efforts toward development and the maintenance of acceptable levels of performance. These efforts along with the chairs' evaluations should be documented on an ongoing basis. Development opportunities and activities should also be discussed in each annual interview. Generally, three consecutive annual reviews in which the faculty member's performance is judged to be below acceptable standards constitute adequate cause for termination of the faculty member's employment. Furthermore, a recurrent pattern of negative performance reviews over a period of years, even if they do not occur in consecutive years, may also constitute adequate cause for termination. These provisions do not mean that the university must wait three years or more before terminating a faculty member's employment. In some situations, immediate termination may be appropriate. In other situations, termination may be appropriate if the faculty member does not correct the problem within a reasonable period of time (See Faculty Hiring Policy and Faculty Discipline and Termination Policy).

**TMA:** TMA adheres to the university policy as set forth in URSP 3.1.6.

### 3.1.7 Unacceptable Performance by Faculty with Continuing Status – First Year

Following an annual evaluation in which a faculty member's performance is judged to be unacceptable in any area, the faculty member and the chair will work together to produce a written improvement plan specifying in detail expectations and performance standards to be met, a reasonable time frame in which to meet the expectations and standards, criteria against which performance will be evaluated, methods by which satisfactory performance will be assessed, and specific efforts and resources that will be committed by the faculty member and by the department to the process. A copy of this plan will be included in the faculty member's



file along with the department chair's written summary evaluation. These documents will be reviewed as part of the next year's annual evaluation. The chair will notify the dean of the results of the evaluation and the improvement plan. The dean should evaluate the thoroughness and reasonableness of the evaluation and improvement plan, and may suggest modifications to the conclusions of the annual review or the plan for improvement as well as next steps to be carried out in the development process.

### **3.1.8 Unacceptable Performance by Faculty with Continuing Status – Second Year**

If, after following the procedures outlined in section 3.1.7, the next (a second) annual review also results in a judgment that the faculty member's performance, including the implementation of the improvement plan, is below acceptable levels, the chair will inform the dean, who will review the case and conduct a performance evaluation. The dean may enlist the participation of the College Rank and Status Committee in the evaluation. The faculty member may also request a performance review by the College Rank and Status Committee. The dean, the department chair, and the faculty member will meet to review the evaluation and the improvement plan, develop a strategy for addressing the below standard performance, and take steps determined by the dean to be necessary so that the faculty member has reasonable resources available to allow opportunity to achieve an acceptable level of performance. The dean will write a summary evaluation, provide a copy for the faculty member, and place a copy in the faculty member's file.

### **3.1.9 Unacceptable Performance by Faculty with Continuing Status – Third Year**

Following the procedures specified in Sections 3.1.7 and 3.1.8, in the event of a negative performance evaluation in the following year's (a third) annual performance review by the chair, the file containing the record of the last three annual performance reviews will be sent to the Academic Vice President. The Academic Vice President, the dean, and the department chair will meet to discuss the performance record of the faculty member, along with the efforts expended toward improvement by the faculty member and the support provided by the department and college. The dean, in consultation with the department chair, will make a recommendation to the Academic Vice President as to whether the faculty member's appointment should be terminated for adequate cause (failure to maintain acceptable standards of performance) at the end of the current contract period. The Academic Vice President will consider the recommendation and decide whether to terminate the faculty member's employment, or propose other remedies.

3.1.10 Appeal of the Academic Vice President's decision to not renew the faculty member's appointment for adequate cause is governed by the Faculty Discipline and Termination Policy.

**TMA:** TMA adheres to the university policy as set forth in URSP 3.1.7-10

## **3.2 Citizenship**

### **3.2.1 The Citizenship Standard**

As a university owned by The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints, Brigham Young University expects all faculty to adhere to the highest standards of personal behavior and to exemplify honor and integrity. Faculty who are members of The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints should be loyal to the Church, and all faculty should support the university mission and work to further the principles stated in the Mission of Brigham Young University and The Aims of a BYU Education.



Faculty should observe university policies. They should willingly serve on committees and in other department, college, and university assignments. They should mentor, encourage, advise, and collaborate with colleagues. Although professionalism requires rigorous review and critique, faculty should always interact with colleagues, students, and others with civility and respect. They should promote collegiality and harmony in their departments. They should not denigrate other faculty or students or engage in disruption, manipulation, or contention. They should not abuse the moral climate of discourse on the campus. Faculty should be involved in the discipline by serving as referees of scholarship and by providing service and leadership in professional associations. They are encouraged to use their professional expertise to give service to the community and the Church. They should actively participate in the life of the university community by attending department, college, and university meetings.

**TMA:** All faculty of the Department of Theatre and Media Arts are expected to fulfill the Citizenship Standard defined in the URSP, section 3.2.1. Within the department, the university, the community and the larger academic and professional discipline, all faculty members, whether professorial or professional, must devote an appropriate portion of their time and energy to service activities that move the discipline forward and contribute to the creation of a community of scholars and artists. Expectations may include, but are not limited to:

#### A. Department/University

- Active participation in the intellectual life of the department through activities that promote mentoring, collaboration and mutual progress among faculty members, between faculty and staff, and among faculty, staff and students
- Affirmative contributions to the collegiality, civility, respect, cooperation and overall spirit of Christian love and service within the department
- Attendance at committee meetings, departmental faculty meetings, college meetings, university conferences, devotionals and convocation and commencement exercises
- Conscientious service on departmental, college and/or university committees
- Support of departmental, interdisciplinary and co-curricular programs
- Active involvement in the intellectual and creative life of the department through attendance at guest lectures, forums, performances, etc.
- Presentation of guest lectures in classes other than your own
- Mentoring student organizations or performing groups
- Writing letters of recommendation for peers in this or other departments
- Participation in new faculty searches or Rank and Status reviews
- Receiving a rating of “met expectations” or better on annual stewardship interviews (See departmental document “Annual Reviews” in the TMA Faculty Handbook for definitions of evaluation categories.)

#### B. Profession

- Attendance at and participation in professional conferences
- Organizing or hosting professional meetings or conferences
- Adjudicating or evaluating creative works at other universities, national conferences or in the profession
- Writing letters of recommendation for peers or evaluations of programs



outside the university

- Service on boards or committees of professional societies or journals
- Editing newsletters, journals or other professional publications

### C. Community

- Participation or leadership in local church, school or civic events through consultation, performance, etc.
- Contribution to the artistic or intellectual life of the LDS Church, either at home or abroad.

### 3.2.2 Assessment of Citizenship

The following citizenship criteria will be used in the assessment of all faculty members:

- For faculty who are members of The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints, loyalty to the Church.
- Support for and affirmative contributions to the university mission and The Aims of a BYU Education.
- Behavior reflecting honor, integrity, collegiality, civility, respect, concern for others, adherence to the university Church Educational System Honor Code, and observance of university policies.

Although a faculty member may participate in only a portion of the following and other citizenship activities, evaluation of citizenship should consider the following evidence:

- Participation in activities that strengthen the university, including administrative service, committee service, assignments in the Jerusalem Center and Study Abroad, and the teaching of General Education, Honors, Religious Education, and interdisciplinary courses.
- Active participation in the intellectual life of the department, college, and university.
- Willing participation in citizenship, leadership, and governance activities in the department, college, and the university, including service in rank and status reviews, curriculum review and development, hiring processes, student advising, etc.
- Collaboration with colleagues in citizenship, teaching, or scholarship (or citizenship and professional service, for professional faculty).
- Mentoring colleagues.
- Service to the profession, including holding offices and committee assignments in professional associations, organizing professional meetings and panels, editing journals and newsletters, serving on editorial boards, and serving as referees of scholarship. Such service may include, but should extend beyond, strictly local and regional venues over a faculty member's career.
- Employment of professional expertise in service to the community and the Church.
- Attendance at department and college meetings, devotionals, forums, convocations, etc.
- Collaborative participation in international and service-learning activities and other activities that enhance BYU's approved outreach efforts.

**CFACRSP: Departments/schools should assess a faculty member's citizenship using the university**



guidelines set forth in URSP 3.2.2. Further disciplinary 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 URSP 3.2.2 and the unique clarifications in the department/school rank and status document.

**TMA:** TMA adheres to the university policy as set forth in URSP 3.2.2. In addition, TMA supports the following assessment practices

- A. Individual: It is the responsibility of each faculty member to keep an accurate record and report all citizenship activities in the FPS.
- B. Departmental: Specific goals for citizenship performance will be identified and reviewed during the annual stewardship interview with the department chair and suggestions for modifications will be made for the coming year. Faculty work will be assessed using the following categories: exceeded expectations, met expectations, partially met expectations, or failed to meet expectations.

### 3.2.3 Review Letters of Citizenship Activities

Department chairs and department review committees may solicit review letters evaluating a faculty member's citizenship activities from those who have closely observed these activities. Review letters should address the quality, quantity, and significance of the service.

**CFACRSP:** The CFAC requires departments/schools to solicit at least two review letters (and no more than six) evaluating a faculty member's citizenship activities. These letters can come from within the university or from peers who have served with the faculty in disciplinary organizations, and are different than the peer teaching review letters. This pertains to all dossiers regardless of the rank or status for which they are applying. Departments/schools must outline the process for selecting reviewers in their rank and status policies. Reviewers should be at the same rank or higher than the candidate.

**TMA:** In consultation with the faculty member, TMA solicits at least two review letters (and no more than six) evaluating a faculty member's citizenship activities. These letters can come from within the university or from peers who have served with the faculty member in disciplinary organizations, and are different than the peer teaching review letters. This pertains to all dossiers regardless of the rank or status for which they are applying. TMA supports the university policy outlined in URSP 3.2.3 and the college policy as outlined in CFACRSP 3.2.3.

## 3.3 Teaching

**TMA:** Teaching in Theatre and Media Arts embraces not only the traditional classroom lecture, but also studio-based practical classrooms, the intense mentoring of the rehearsal, preproduction, production and post-production processes, supervision of internships, and a variety of activities growing from the apprenticeship-based traditions of the varied fields of study.

### 3.3.1 The Teaching Standard

The high quality education of students is, and should be, the most important activity of Brigham Young University faculty. Good university teachers are themselves eager learners who imbue their teaching with the excitement of learning. They care about their students. They are enthusiastic about sharing their knowledge with students and helping them learn. They have high standards, set clear expectations, and hold students to high levels of academic performance. They are well prepared and well organized, and they make good use of class time.



They prepare well-designed syllabi, course materials, assignments, and examinations. They provide helpful evaluations of student work in a timely manner. They are consistently available to help students at least during reasonable designated consultation hours outside class. They are always engaged in the process of improving their teaching. They master the content of their courses and stay current with the literature and techniques of their disciplines. They are mentors and role models to students. They provide an education that is spiritually strengthening, intellectually enlarging, character building, and leading to lifelong learning and service. (See The Aims of a BYU Education.)

**CFACRSP:** Teaching and mentoring are the primary means through which faculty achieve the goals described in the *Aims of a BYU Education* and are vitally important. Each candidate should observe the descriptions as outlined in the URSP 3.3.1 section. In addition, each CFAC faculty member is expected to pursue the following teaching standards:

- A. Faculty should actively work to improve their teaching and adopt best practices. They should actively use assessment instruments and other campus teacher improvement services (e.g., students comments, mid-term evaluations, other resources as necessary, etc.) to identify areas of strength and opportunities for improvement.
- B. Departments/schools and faculty should establish well-defined learning outcomes for their courses and contribute to the development of strategic learning outcomes.
- C. Faculty should mentor students and build strong mentored-learning environments that may involve both undergraduate and graduate students. Candidates responsible for mentoring graduate students should have a proven record of mentoring in accordance with the principles of quality graduate education at BYU (URSP 3.3.2.F).

**TMA:** All faculty members who have teaching assignments in the Department of Theatre and Media Arts are expected to uphold the Teaching Standard defined in the URSP 3.3.1. For professorial faculty, this is part of the expectations of their teaching loads. For professional faculty, teaching is part of their professional service.

### 3.3.2 Assessment of Teaching

**CFACRSP:** Departments/schools should assess a faculty member's teaching using the university guidelines set forth in URSP 3.3.2—including the Teaching Portfolio (URSP 3.3.2.C). Further disciplinary guidelines for assessment should be clearly outlined in the department/school documents. The CFAC committee will evaluate evidence of teaching based on URSP 3.3.2 and the unique clarifications in the department/school rank and status documents.

In assessing a faculty member's overall performance, evaluators should be sensitive to teaching loads, the number of preparations required, extra time spent working with students individually, and similar factors. Although faculty may participate in only a portion of these and other teaching activities, evaluation of teaching should consider evidence such as:

- A. Description of teaching activities and quality, including:
  1. List of courses taught by semester, with enrollment numbers.
  2. New courses developed.
  3. Supervision of independent study and research
  4. Supervision of academic internships and service-learning experiences.





- 
5. Supervision of graduate students as a committee chair or member.
- B. Student evaluations, including:
1. University student evaluation forms and students written comments.
  2. Written or oral comments solicited by the department review committee from a representative sample of students. **The CFAC requires departments/schools to solicit at least two (and no more than six) review letters from students or alumni evaluating a faculty member's teaching activities. These are in addition to the citizenship review letters. This pertains to all dossiers regardless of the rank or status for which they are applying. The department/school must outline the process for selecting student reviewers in their rank and status documents which is consistent across all levels of review.**
- C. Peer evaluations. Peer evaluation is as important for teaching as it is for scholarship. The department review committee will obtain at least two substantive confidential peer evaluations of teaching from BYU faculty members qualified to make evaluations of the faculty member's approach to pedagogy, teaching activities and materials. The faculty member will assemble a teaching portfolio containing syllabi, textbooks, handouts, multimedia materials, assignments, learning exercises, examinations, and other course materials. The peer evaluations should concentrate on a review of the teaching portfolio, but should also include classroom visits. Ideally, the classroom visits should be conducted over several semesters prior to the faculty member's third- and sixth-year reviews. **The CFAC summative peer evaluations must assess the materials in the teaching portfolio as well as at least two classroom visits in separate semesters in different classes prior to deliberations by the department/school rank and status committee. The written assessment should focus on the teaching portfolio along with observations from the classroom visits and include the areas below.**

Peer evaluations might best assess such areas as:

1. Whether the course reflects the current state of the discipline.
2. The faculty member's mastery of the course content.
3. The course objectives, including whether the course meets the objectives of the curriculum of which it is a part.
4. The course organization.
5. The methods used to foster and measure learning.
6. The materials in the teaching portfolio (syllabi, textbooks, handouts, multimedia materials, assignments, learning exercises, examinations, and other course materials).
7. The faculty member's general concern for and interest in teaching.
8. The overall quality of teaching.

Other examples of meaningful peer evaluation of teaching might include reports from graduate schools or employers regarding students' performance, and professional invitations based on a faculty member's reputation as a teacher.

- D. Description of steps taken to evaluate and improve teaching, including:
1. Performing self-evaluations of teaching.



- 
2. Studying teaching techniques.
  3. Obtaining assistance from the Faculty Center.
  4. Presenting at, or attending seminars, workshops, and conferences on teaching.
  5. Involving students or peers in improvement efforts.
  6. Appropriately implementing instructional innovations, including technology.
  7. Participating in course or curriculum development.
  8. Writing textbooks, supplements, or other instructional materials.
  9. Receiving grants aimed at improving teaching.
  10. Taking professional development leaves to improve teaching.
  11. Engaging in the scholarship of teaching and learning.
- E. Other evidence of quality teaching, such as:
1. Teaching awards and honors received.
  2. The quality of text materials used.
  3. Information about the faculty member's availability to students.
  4. Effectiveness in implementing innovative teaching methods, including technology.
  5. Effectiveness in mentoring students.
  6. Other evidence of positive impact on students, including working with students in mentored learning environments.
- F. Products of high quality teaching and mentoring, including:
1. Evidence of student achievement.
  2. Student scores on standardized test when appropriate.
  3. Student papers and examinations that evidence learning.
  4. Students' scholarly or creative works.
  5. Honors and masters theses and Ph.D. dissertations supervised.
  6. Successful academic internship and service-learning programs.
  7. Student placement in graduate school or meaningful employment.
- G. Example of course materials, such as:
1. Course materials prepared for students, including syllabi, textbooks, handouts, multimedia materials, assignments, learning exercises, examinations, and other course materials
  2. Materials developed for on-campus, online, or distance education courses.

**TMA:** In addition to the assessment standards identified in URSP 3.3.2, TMA upholds the following assessment standards. Effective performance in the classroom and other teaching activities will be assessed by review of evidence such as:

- A. Individual faculty members' description of teaching activities (including list of courses, new courses developed, supervision of independent study and research, academic internships, service-learning experiences and graduate students, either as committee chair or member)
- B. Student evaluations (including formal university reviews of each course taught and written or oral comments solicited by the Rank & Status Committee). Faculty in the Department of Theatre and Media Arts are expected to receive student evaluations that consistently meet the university mean for each course taught, and/or



- demonstrate consistent improvement over time. Written student comments should suggest a record of teaching excellence.
- C. The TMA Rank and Status committee solicits from the candidate names of current and former students who can write letters evaluating the candidate's teaching. No more than three student letters will be included in the candidate's dossier.
- D. Peer evaluations (to be completed by at least two faculty members over the course of at least two semesters. These two faculty members will each visit at least two different courses, at least two times each. Peer evaluations also include a review of the teaching portfolio and may include interviews with students.)
- E. Documented examples of quality student mentoring on scholarly papers, performances, etc.
- F. Review of course content and how it fits in with departmental curriculum and university goals.
- G. Teaching Portfolio: Faculty in the Department of Theatre and Media Arts are expected to develop and maintain a teaching portfolio. In addition to departmental peer review of select classes, the portfolio will serve as another assessment of teaching and should include the following for up to three classes taught:
- Representative syllabi, assignments, lecture notes, means of assessment (written exams, criteria for performance or creative project evaluation, etc.) for the three selected classes
  - Other teaching materials (Power Point presentations, assessments, websites)
  - Selected sample student work with accompanying teacher responses
- H. Other Evidence of Excellence: To document excellence in teaching, reviewers should consider the following evidence:
- Participating in programs at the Faculty Center
  - Implementing technology into the classroom
  - Developing new curriculum
  - Writing instructional materials
  - Receiving grants aimed at improving teaching and learning
  - Receiving teaching awards
  - Providing evidence of student success in traditional and/or creative scholarship
  - Participating in the mentored learning environment and deeper student learning programs
  - Developing innovative teaching methods
  - Positive peer assessments of innovations in teaching
  - State, regional, national, or international recognition as a masterteacher
  - Recognitions and accomplishments in regional and national competitions of students' professional work, especially when the faculty member acted as an advisor, director or mentor in the lab, production, or organization for which the work was done
  - Presentations related to teaching and learning
  - Receiving a rating of "met expectations" or "exceeded expectations" on annual stewardship interviews (See departmental document "Annual Reviews" in the TMA Faculty Handbook for definitions of evaluation categories.)



- 
- Participating in program development or improvement

### 3.4 Scholarship

**TMA:** Among Brigham Young University’s definitions of scholarship are those scholarly endeavors that improve “the education of the minds and spirits of students” and enhance “the quality of people’s lives.” (URSP, Section 3.4.2) The Department of Theatre and Media Arts embraces these definitions and seeks to fulfill them. In addition to the more traditional venues of scholarly work, TMA espouses “aesthetic or intellectual expression reflecting achievement in creative or performing arts,” URSP 3.4.2) as one of our central goals.

**3.4.1 Purpose of Scholarship.** The highest purpose of scholarly and creative work (collectively referred to in this policy as “scholarship”) is to serve God and humanity. Scholarship should contribute to the university mission. It should achieve one or more of the following objectives: improving the education of the minds and spirits of students, contributing to the expansion of truth throughout the world, facilitating the solution of pressing world problems, and enhancing the quality of people’s lives. Scholarship extends the university’s influence and reputation, which benefits our students, serves our local and worldwide communities, and makes friends for the university and the Church. Scholarship should infuse and inspire the faculty member’s teaching both directly and indirectly. It must not interfere with or detract from teaching, but support and strengthen it. University faculty members must be learners in order to be teachers worthy of the name. They must be intellectually alive and current in their disciplines, not only through participating in the substantive developments of the discipline, but also through constantly honing the skills and tools of scholarship used in the discipline.

In most disciplines this means that faculty will bring to their work the rigor of writing, subject the work to the criticism of scholarly peers, and share their insights with colleagues and students. A scholar is characterized by devotion to discovering and learning, by rigor and thoroughness in that learning, and by the determination to profess what is learned.

**CFACRSP:** CFAC faculty members should be lifelong learners. This requires intellectual currency within the faculty members’ associated discipline. All faculty should participate in the substantive developments of the discipline, and continually refine disciplinary tools used to develop high quality scholarship or creative work within the discipline. In the CFAC, this means that faculty will bring to their work the rigor of thinking, writing and creating. They will subject their scholarship or creative work to the critique of qualified peers, and share their insights with colleagues and students. A CFAC scholar is characterized by dedication to ongoing learning as they develop new ideas, create innovative work, and proceed with rigor and thoroughness in order to benefit their students.

Additionally, in recognition of Brigham Young University’s distinct religious mission, we hope that all scholarship within the college is “bathed in the light and color of the restored gospel and...perfumed lightly with the spirit of the Gospel” (Spencer W. Kimball, 1967). With this in mind, candidates should produce scholarship and creative work that is recognized by the disciplinary community as advancing knowledge, specifically achieving the objectives outlined in the URSP 3.4.1, and also contributing to their own spiritual development and to the spiritual development of those around them within the context of the disciplinary work. These goals are most easily



accomplished if the candidate has a well-defined area of scholarship and/or creative work that is clearly articulated in their self-assessment portion of their rank and status dossier.

**TMA:** TMA supports the university policy on the purpose of scholarship as outlined in URSP 3.4.1 and CFACRSP 3.4.1. Candidates should produce traditional and/or creative scholarship that is recognized by the disciplinary community as advancing knowledge, specifically achieving the objectives outlined in the URSP 3.4.1, and also contributing to their own spiritual development and to the spiritual development of those around them within the context of the disciplinary work. These goals are most easily accomplished if the candidate has a well-defined area of traditional and/or creative scholarship, as articulated in the self-assessment portion of the rank and status dossier. Additionally, in recognition of Brigham Young University's distinct religious mission, we hope that all scholarship within the college is "bathed in the light and color of the restored gospel and...perfumed lightly with the spirit of the Gospel" (Spencer W. Kimball, 1967).

### 3.4.2 Forms of Scholarship

Because of diversity among the academic disciplines and because of the variety of intellectual tasks with which faculty are concerned, a faculty member's scholarship may take different forms, so long as the work is of high quality. Scholarship includes, among other things, the discovery of new knowledge and original insights that add to the world's body of knowledge and understanding; the application of existing knowledge to the solution of practical problems; the integration of existing knowledge through interdisciplinary work; studying and improving the presentation of existing knowledge; and aesthetic or intellectual expression reflecting achievement in creative or performing arts.

**CFACRSP:** The CFAC recognizes published scholarship and scholarly presentations which includes, but is not limited to books, articles, book chapters, and academic presentations as scholarship. The CFAC also recognizes creative work which includes, but is not limited to, performance, production, exhibition, or composition of arts or communications works as scholarship. These forms of scholarship should add to and improve upon the existing knowledge, aesthetic representations, or intellectual expressions within the faculty member's disciplinary area. Because of the broad spectrum of norms within the arts and communications fields, faculty should focus their work on the valued forms of scholarship and creative works in terms of reputation, selectivity, quality, and impact (URSP 3.4.4.1.E,G). Given the range of scholarly products that the university policy allows (URSP 3.4.2; 3.4.3; 3.4.4.2) and the department/school discipline-specific products that are created, the college level reviewers rely on the department/school guidelines to assign relative value to the type, quantity and quality of scholarship produced by faculty in the college. CFAC department/school documents should purposefully outline standards for publications/presentations and creative forms of scholarship within their discipline that best match the forms of scholarly activity described in the URSP 3.4.

**TMA:** TMA supports the university definition of scholarship as set forth in URSP 3.4.2. The department further clarifies the definition of scholarship in theatre and media arts as those activities of high quality that systematically advance the teaching, research, intellectual discourse, or practice of the discipline through rigorous inquiry or production and:

- Are significant in the institution, community or the profession
- Have clearly stated and well-formulated goals
- Are creative, innovative or original
- Can be documented
- Can be peer-reviewed through one or more of a variety of methods



### 3.4.3 The Scholarship Standard

Professorial faculty (and professional faculty whose responsibilities include scholarship) are expected to demonstrate consistent productivity of high quality scholarship over their entire careers. The scholar's record shows a growing body of works that have stood the test of exposure to and evaluation by other scholars in the discipline. Each discipline has its own scholarly traditions and its own channels for communication among scholars, and therefore each department should establish criteria for defining and evaluating scholarship within its discipline. A faculty member's scholarship should then be measured against those criteria. Both quality and quantity are relevant in assessing a faculty member's scholarly record. It should be recognized that one truly exceptional scholarly or creative work may be more important than several others. It should also be recognized that a faculty member may choose to work in an area in which progress is exceptionally difficult and in which results submitted for peer review are necessarily few and infrequent. While the expected type and quantity of scholarship vary by discipline, subject area, and the fraction of a faculty member's assignment devoted to scholarship, the expected level of quality must always be high.

**CFACRSP:** CFAC faculty should demonstrate ongoing productivity of high quality published scholarship and/or creative work and will be evaluated on the consistency with which they produce high quality scholarship and/or creative works. Both quality and quantity are relevant in assessing a faculty member's scholarly record. The department/school documents should establish criteria for defining and evaluating scholarship within each discipline and a faculty member's scholarship/creative work should be measured against those criteria for quality and quantity. The CFAC has provided guidelines for establishing and clarifying department/school criteria in 3.4.4.1 and 3.4.4.2 of this document (also see URSP 3.4.4.1 A-M).

Nonetheless, a major portion of scholarly or creative work should have substantive peer review according to the national disciplinary norms as outlined in the department/school rank and status policy and in the context of the URSP. Peer review might include publication in high quality, peer-reviewed journals or presentation of creative work in reputable juried venues that have acceptable levels of status as defined in the department/school documents.

Faculty may also seek peer review of creative work presented on campus or at local venues. This type of review must match the high quality of peer review in juried venues and should be conducted by well-respected regional or national peer-evaluators from the discipline who understand the contexts of creating work in academic settings (see URSP 3.4.4.1.E-H). Departments/schools must outline standard processes for high quality peer evaluation in their unique department/school documents. A description of these processes should include common standards for selection of the reviewer, descriptions of appropriate methods for adjudicating the work, and an explanation of the scope and quality of the written evaluation provided as documentation at each review. In each type of review, disciplinary norms should determine the quality and importance of the reviewer and the review process.

Work that has not received peer-review from a reputable source does not carry the same weight as work that is peer reviewed. Departments/schools should define the value of non-peer-reviewed work in their documents.

Those disciplinary scholarship or creative work quality and quantity norms determined at the



---

department/school or program level, as outlined in the department/school rank and status document, must be approved by the CFAC Rank and Status Committee and the CFAC Dean's Office.

**TMA:** The Department of Theatre and Media Arts subscribes to the criteria required by Brigham Young University in URSP 3.4.4.1, in addition to those specifically adopted for the evaluation of professorial or professional faculty by the primary academic or professional organizations, venues, and processes of our field. The standards of these organizations, venues, and processes have been incorporated into this document. Also, because the department is composed of a strong combination of traditional and creative scholars and industry professionals, Section 6 (Scholarship/Professional Expectations) necessarily contains standards for scholarly, creative, and professional review.

#### 3.4.4 Assessment of Scholarship

**TMA:** TMA follows the URSP 3.4.4.2 in regard to traditional scholarship. TMA also accepts creative scholarship from both Professorial and Professional track candidates. The Department requires external academic review for all candidates, including those on the Professorial track. All review of scholarship will be sought from scholars and/or academic professionals who are of an equal or higher rank than the rank for which the candidate is applying; they must represent regional, national, or international BYU peer institutions. Additional requirements for academic and professional assessment are detailed in this document for each faculty track and for each type of scholarship.

The three examples of scholarship featured in the candidate's dossier for rank and status review must be peer reviewed.

##### 3.4.4.1 Criteria

**CFACRSP:** Each department/school rank and status document should describe its criteria for evaluating scholarship and creative work. Generally, faculty should seek to influence the discipline through their scholarship or creative work. Therefore, scholarship and creative work have an impact when they are effectively evaluated, shared in performance venues and/or disseminated. 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, 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 has established national norms regarding the review of published scholarship and peer evaluation 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 established in the university and college rank and status documents.

Within the context of the various disciplines, the following criteria are relevant in evaluating scholarship. In addition to the criteria described in the URSP 3.4.4.1, within the contexts of Art, Communications, Dance, Design, Music, Theatre and Media Arts, the following additional criteria are relevant in evaluating the various forms of scholarship that meet the CFAC standards for scholarly work:



- 
- A. Scholarship should be consistent with disciplinary norms and department, college, and university missions. Scholarly work includes presentation, publication, performance, creative production or composition of arts or communications works and should be consistent with disciplinary norms. Within the CFAC, scholarship takes on various forms and includes but is not limited to
1. Published Works (Books, Journal Articles, Book Chapters, Compositions, Screenplays, and etc.). These are primarily produced by scholars in Communications, and within sub-disciplines in Music, Theatre and Media Arts, and by education faculty within each of the disciplines.
  2. Scholarly Presentations. These are primarily produced by scholars in Communications, and within sub-disciplines in Music, Theatre and Media Arts, and by education faculty within each of the disciplines.
  3. Performances and Productions. These are primarily produced by faculty within sub-disciplines in Dance, Music, Theatre and Media Arts.
  4. Art work. These are primarily produced by faculty in Art and Design.
  5. Media Production. These are primarily produced by faculty in Art, Communications, Design, Music, and Media Arts.
- B. It should contribute to a faculty member's overall effectiveness as a teacher within the arts and communications disciplines.
- C. It should be of high quality and contain some element of originality, either in the form of new knowledge, new understanding, fresh insight, or unique skill or interpretation.
- D. It should be subject to peer review in any of several appropriate ways on this campus and elsewhere, for the purpose of verifying the nature and quality of its contribution by those competent to judge it. In some departments and colleges, a variety of situations may make on-campus reviews of scholarship the most appropriate means of evaluation. A decision by a department or college to regularly use on-campus reviews as a primary method of peer review must be approved by the dean and the academic vice president.

The CFAC standards include works that are subject to rigorous peer review. 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 and etc.) in a reputable venue, festival or competition.

The reputation and selectivity of venues, exhibitions, competitions, and peer-reviewers of performance, creative production or composition of arts or communications creative works is relevant in evaluating the quality and impact of scholarship. Faculty are encouraged to present/perform work in nationally and internationally recognized 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.





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

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. As stated in 3.4.3 of this document, 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.

Juried performances, exhibitions, 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/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 majority of 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/school should outline the unique criteria for valuing this type of work based on disciplinary standards.

- E. The reputation and selectivity of scholarly presses and journals are relevant in evaluating the quality and impact of scholarship. Generally, faculty are encouraged to publish in nationally and internationally recognized peer-reviewed scholarly presses and journals in the discipline. The further removed that scholarship is from this format, the greater the responsibility of the faculty member and the department to provide for a critical evaluation that verifies the quality of the work. Because of the diversity in reputation, selectivity, venues, 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 venues and those that do not meet the standard of the department/school. This criteria should describe any relevant information regarding expectations for quality and quantity of the work produced.

The CFAC department/school rank and status documents provide more specificity with regard to disciplinary standards and expectations for scholarship (URSP 3.4.3) and articulate the relative value of scholarship products noted in URSP 3.4.2; 3.4.4.2 that are based on disciplinary norms. Though quantity of publications and the number of productions, performances, exhibitions, etc. matter, each reviewer at each stage of the process must judge the quality of the contribution and make it an important component of the evaluation. Different reviewers will place different weights on the components of each file, but it is expected that departments/schools, both through their documents and through the individual process of mentoring, will help faculty understand how to best make the case for favorable evaluation.



When defining criteria for published scholarship, departments/schools should outline expectations. Faculty members are expected to publish work in which they are the sole author or lead collaborator on co-authored works. This type of authorship should make up a substantive portion of representative publications. The CFAC also gives credence to experiential learning associations that culminate in faculty/student co-authored works. Departments/schools should further describe the standards for assistant, associate, and professor in relationship to publication and authorship in their documents.

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 relationship to the evaluation of collaborative work in their own rank and status documents. In general, the CFAC encourages faculty at the assistant professor level to 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.

- F. Generally, publications count in the rank and status process when they are accepted for publication with a completed manuscript and a contract for publication.
- G. The same criteria that apply in evaluating scholarship published in paper formats (quality, peer review, publisher's reputation and selectivity, etc.) also apply to scholarship published in electronic formats. CFAC disciplines regularly produce creative work in online, web-based, and digitally integrated formats. The same criteria that apply in evaluating other forms of creative work also apply in this environment. Departments/schools should develop specific evaluative criteria related to the disciplinary context for evaluating this work.
- H. Generally, course materials that are used primarily inside the university and that are not disseminated in the wider discipline count in the category of teaching rather than in the category of scholarship.

**TMA:** TMA adheres to and supports the criteria set forth in URSP and CFACRSP 3.4.4.1. In addition to the university and college criteria, TMA assigns each faculty member to a specific track. The faculty tracks are identified in TMARSP 3.1.1, for which specific scholarship expectations and criteria will be set forth in TMARSP 5 (professorial) or TMARSP 6 (professional).

In general, TMA encourages faculty at the assistant professor level to 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.

#### 3.4.4.2 Evidence of Scholarship

**CFACRSP:** Evidence should emphasize work performed while employed at BYU and since the last rank and status review unless otherwise described in the candidate's hire letter (URSP 3.4.4.2). All rank and status committees within the college will evaluate evidence of scholarship based on the URSP 3.4.4.2, the college expectations, and the unique clarifications in the department/school document. Judging what is sufficient evidence of high-quality scholarship (URSP 5.2) is a difficult and complex task that should take into account a variety of dimensions, including the views of external peer reviewers, citations, book reviews and/or other evidence of influence, the reputation of the publication, and production, exhibition, or venue outlets, the nature of the review process, and colleagues' own judgments of the merits of the arguments and the methods, among other things.

Other factors to consider include the flow of publications and creative work, the complexity of the publication or creative work, the thematic nature or focus of the publication or creative work, the degree to which the candidate is becoming known for their expertise, the quality and impact of publication, producing or exhibition venues, demonstration of leadership in collaborative work, and the degree to which the candidate shows increasing ability to publish scholarship or produce creative work (e.g., performances, exhibitions, commissioned work and etc.) in high-quality outlets or venues over time, among other things.

In all cases, it will be difficult to build a case for CFS and promotion when much of the record is based on non-critically peer reviewed published scholarship or creative work, scholarship that is not evaluated by suitable academic peers, lower-tier publications/creative work, works that repackage the scholarship of others, works published by presses without strong disciplinary reputations (including non-academic presses), or creative work that is not juried or is presented in venues that do not have a high quality artistic reputation.

Evidence of scholarship includes but is not limited to the following, so long as the above criteria are satisfied. Evidence should emphasize work performed at BYU and since the last rank advancement.

- A. Refereed scholarly publications, including books, articles, refereed conference proceedings, etc.
- B. Other scholarly publications, including books, textbooks, monographs, book chapters, abstracts, translations which contribute to a body of knowledge or reflect significant scholarly activity and expertise, etc.

Published scholarship that is read, critiqued, cited, and influences the work of academic peers is important for consequential impact in any CFAC discipline. While the quantity of publications or creative work may vary from candidate to candidate, nothing can substitute for work that withstands the scrutiny of outside reviewers and has an impact on the discipline.

Likewise creative work should shape contemporary critical discourse and/or practice in the field. Performances, exhibitions, and other showcases of creative work should advance understandings of fine arts or communications production. High quality creative work should attract regional,



national, and/or international public audiences and should be shared or disseminated in reputable artistic venues. Creative work should demonstrate a reputation for innovation and originality in exploring new ideas and modes of production that influence the discipline.

- C. Technical reports and similar publications that present new ideas or incorporate scholarly research, and which contribute to the professional literature, the advancement of professional practice, or the improvement of professional education.
- D. Peer-reviewed or juried creative works, such as paintings, public performances, exhibits, published poetry, and published essays.

Critical peer review of published scholarship and creative work by academic peers, including juried creative works, is essential to an evaluation and should be established for all creative works originated.

- E. Other creative works.

For collaborative work, faculty should articulate their role and recognize that a successful dossier will include evidence that the faculty member is contributing ideas, establishing an independent scholarly or creative work agenda, and taking the lead in a portion of their published scholarship or creative works. It is the candidate's responsibility to inform reviewers regarding norms for critical review of publication or creative work along with details of their unique contribution to collaborative work.

It is essential to the university's mission that some faculty engage in scholarship that specifically addresses topics or issues with religious, moral, and ethical implications or that touches on matters of concern to BYU's supporting institution. This work is encouraged and supported by the college. It is expected that this work will be excellent and that its creative production and publication will meet the quality standards for scholarship outlined above. Because the university values such work, the College Rank and Status Committee will accord it appropriate consideration as scholarly products. CFAC faculty should carefully consider how they balance work developed in support of BYU'S supporting institution with the need to establish a body of work that has been juried or reviewed by peers within their academic discipline and faculty members should consult chairs and mentors to determine a successful pattern of scholarly productivity.

- F. Grants for research or creative work, when resulting from a competitive process of peer review. Grants may evidence the quality of the prior body of work upon which the research proposal is based. Proposals which received high ratings but no funding may also be considered.
- G. Intellectual property developed, such as software or patents.
- H. Presentations at professional meetings and conferences. Although presentations are evidence of scholarly activity, they should be developed into publications.
- I. Awards or other recognition for scholarship.

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

- Disciplinary criteria for defining acceptable peer reviewers for disciplinary and sub-disciplinary 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 (see



also section 7.9.6 below). 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 or sub-discipline.

- Other disciplinary criteria for acceptable peer review (e.g., blind review, academic peer review, national academic press editorial board review, adjudicated artistic performance reviews, selectivity and prominence of venue, exhibition, or competition and etc.)
- The relative value of different forms of acceptable published scholarship and creative work 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; text-books; 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.).
- Criterion for documenting acceptance of publication (e.g., in press or accepted with proof from publisher). It is preferred that the book be published and that book reviews be available.
- Criterion for documenting the production and acceptance of creative work (e.g., selectivity and prominence of venue, exhibition, competition, etc.).
- Descriptions of how a faculty member's record of published scholarship or creative work is measured against criteria of 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 (see section 5.1 below for college standards).
- Expectations of authorship or creation are defined, measured and 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.).
- Descriptions of how a creative faculty member's creative work is measured against the criteria of quality, quantity, and originality reflected in disciplinary norms (e.g., importance of venues, exhibition space, as well as criteria for evaluating juried performances, juror credentials, scope of work, or stature and reputation of clients for a commissioned work).
- Expectations and evaluation guidelines related to external funding.

**TMA:** TMA supports the university policy as set forth in URSP 3.4.4.2 and the college policy as set forth in CFACRSP 3.4.4.2. Additionally, the department acknowledges that some work needs further clarification. Some of these cases and considerations may include:



- 
- A. Multiple Responsibilities on Single Projects: The creation of significant works of theatre and/or film require 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 evidences 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 could come from a single project.
- B. Career-length: Some creative endeavors fall into a category best described as long term or even career-length projects. The Theatre and Media Arts Department accepts the use of high-level artistic endeavors in multiple reviews. It is expected that these projects may be at the center of faculty dossiers throughout a career at Brigham Young University. The on- going nature and multiple-year commitment of such projects are characteristic of performing and media arts. Since questions may be raised when such projects are cited in the dossier of the TMA faculty members during multiple reviews, it is important that the candidate and department contextualize the advancement of knowledge or competence in the on-going work. Examples of such career-length projects, which should be considered on their individual merit and continuing contributions to the body of knowledge and competence during each review process, might include the following:
- Research, development, pre-production, production, or post-production work on a film, documentary, television, or theatre production over multiple years
  - Traditional scholarship that spans multiple years
  - Creation and supervision of an ongoing television program
  - Establishment of a successful directing or producing career
  - Establishment and fostering of on-going multi-project initiatives that produce multiple works in a particular genre (or for a particular audience)
  - Ongoing significant work at an annual theatre or film festival.
- C. Time and Location Considerations: The pursuit of many professional theatre and media arts endeavors require artists to be away from home and responsibilities at Brigham Young University for extended periods of time. The demands of such absences may make some types of professional work either impossible to pursue for full-time professional faculty, or will severely limit the frequency of such pursuits. The department recognizes that even professional opportunities close to home are often not an option for the faculty member. These factors will be taken into consideration in evaluating TMA faculty dossiers. Quality of the work should weigh more heavily than quantity.
- D. Organizational Facilitation: The Department of Theatre and Media Arts recognizes leadership and facilitation of state, regional, national, and international professional organizations as substantive work. However, such work cannot be substituted for more than one cited example of scholarship in the faculty dossier.



#### 4. CONTINUING FACULTY STATUS REVIEWS

**CFACRSP:** The CFAC follows the Continuing Faculty Status review process as outlined in the URSP. Departments/schools should make faculty candidates aware of the CFS review process early in the first year of hire.

##### 4.1 Initial and Final Reviews

The first six years of service after appointment in a continuing faculty status track until continuing faculty status is granted are a probationary period during which a faculty member's performance is reviewed annually by the department chair. New faculty members should receive mentoring during this probationary period. To receive continuing faculty status, faculty members must pass two formal university reviews.

During the winter semester of their third year, an initial review will occur to assess their progress and to decide whether to advance them to candidacy for continuing faculty status. If the candidate continues to meet expectations during the probationary period, a final continuing faculty status review will occur beginning fall semester of their sixth year. An exception to this six-year schedule of reviews may be granted to an individual college based on considerations unique to the nature of the disciplines represented in the college. Colleges may petition to extend the probationary period to seven years for all faculty within the college. Permission to extend the probationary period must be requested in writing by the dean, and can be granted only in writing by the academic vice president. It is expected that the decision to extend the probationary period to seven years will reflect the individual nature of the disciplines and the best interests of the colleges and the university. Faculty members in colleges that have adopted a seven-year schedule for continuing status reviews may, at their sole discretion, elect to undergo a final continuing status review in their sixth year of service. Each faculty member must declare in writing to the department chair his or her intention whether to undergo a final review in their sixth or seventh year by April 1 of his or her fifth year.

The same criteria of evaluation will apply for a sixth- as for a seventh-year review. If a faculty member elects to undergo a final continuing status review in the sixth year, and if that review is negative, or if the faculty member withdraws at any point during the review process, he or she will not be permitted to subsequently elect to undergo review in the seventh year. The decision as to whether to undergo review in the sixth or the seventh year should be made after careful consultation with the department chair and the dean. Except as provided otherwise by this policy, the initial and final continuing faculty status reviews and their timing are mandatory. Requests to delay a scheduled review or to review a faculty member early for either continuing faculty status or rank advancement must be made in writing by the faculty member, and approved by the department chair, the dean and the Academic Vice President. A faculty member may withdraw from the process at any stage, but withdrawal constitutes a 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.

**TMA:** TMA adheres to the university policy as set forth in URSP 4.1.

##### 4.2 Purpose of the Reviews

The purpose of the continuing faculty status reviews is to assure the present and future fulfillment of promise sufficient to warrant a permanent commitment to a faculty member by



the university. Granting continuing faculty status creates a long-term relationship that significantly affects the quality of the university, its ability to fulfill its mission, and the lives of its students over many years. The principal reasons for the continuing faculty status reviews are to provide the best education for our students, to assist in faculty development, and to establish ongoing expectations for faculty.

Assessments and recommendations by reviewers at all levels should be as candid, honest, and complete as feasible within the guidelines specified in this policy. Strengths and weaknesses of faculty members should be fully discussed by reviewers, and specific reasons for positive or negative recommendations should be clearly stated.

**TMA:** TMA adheres to the university policy as set forth in URSP 4.2.

#### 4.3 Initial (Third-Year) Review

The initial review will include an assessment of the faculty member's performance and promise in citizenship, teaching, and scholarship (or citizenship and professional service, for professional faculty). Essentially the same procedures apply to initial and final continuing faculty status reviews, except that external reviews of scholarship are not required in initial (third-year) reviews. Faculty who are progressing satisfactorily will be granted candidacy for continuing faculty status. The Faculty Council on Rank and Status will draft comments to the faculty member indicating areas for praise and concern to help the faculty member prepare for the final review. The letter will be placed in the faculty member's personnel file and included in the final review file. Faculty who are not progressing satisfactorily and who do not become candidates for continuing faculty status will be notified that they 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 normal calendar for initial reviews is:

Department reviews to colleges: March 1

**CFACRSP:** Departments should submit reviews to the college by February 1st annually, unless requested differently by the college.

**TMA:** TMA adheres to the university policy as set forth in URSP 4.3. TMA will submit reviews to the college by February 1st annually, unless requested differently by the college.

College reviews to university: March 20

Final decisions to faculty: June 1

#### 4.4 Final (Sixth-Year) Review

The final continuing faculty status review will include an assessment of the faculty member's performance and promise in citizenship, teaching, and scholarship (or citizenship and professional service, for professional faculty). To receive continuing faculty status, faculty must clearly demonstrate by their performance that they meet or exceed the department, college, and university standards as set forth in their rank and status documents. The rationale for a negative decision will be communicated to the faculty member by the chair, the dean, or the Academic Vice President for Faculty.





Faculty who are not granted continuing faculty status will be notified that they 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 normal calendar for final reviews is:

Department reviews to colleges: November 1

**CFACRSP:** Departments should submit reviews to the college by October 1<sup>st</sup> annually, unless requested differently by the college.

**TMA:** TMA adheres to the university policy as set forth in URSP 4.4. TMA will submit reviews to the college by October 1st annually, unless requested differently by the college.

College reviews to university: December 1

Final decisions to faculty: April 30

#### 4.5 Delay of the Continuing Faculty Status Reviews

Professional development leaves taken during the first six years count as part of the six-year probationary period. By contrast, personal leaves (including leaves for illness or other significant extenuating circumstances) do not count as part of the six-year probationary period, and therefore delay the continuing faculty status reviews. Any eligible time off as defined by the Family and Medical Leave Act (FMLA) will run concurrently with a qualifying university leave (see Faculty Leaves Policy). A faculty member who is unable to work full-time should request a full-time or part-time personal leave. Extenuating personal or family circumstances may also justify postponing a review. During the probationary period, a faculty member may request a one-time, one-year delay in the schedule of rank and status reviews because of specific extenuating personal or family situations, such as, pregnancy, childbirth, special parenting needs, personal or family illness, or other similar personal or family circumstances without taking a personal leave if they are able to meet their normal full-time teaching or other professional assignments. Delays of continuing faculty status reviews are exceptional, and must be approved by the chair, the dean, and the academic vice president in writing before the rank and status review process begins.

**TMA:** TMA adheres to the university policy as set forth in URSP 4.5.

#### **TMA: 4.6 Annual Stewardship Interviews**

Each member of the TMA faculty, whether on professorial or professional track, will be reviewed annually by department leadership. In these stewardship interviews, the particular types of activities that will be most appropriate to the faculty member's appointment will be identified and reviewed. It is expected that all professorial faculty will have a consistent and significant record of high quality scholarly and/or creative activity. It is expected that all professional faculty whose professional service includes scholarship will have a consistent and significant record of high quality scholarly and/or creative activity. High quality will be evidenced by reports of "met" or "exceeded expectations" in their evaluations. It is imperative that both the candidate and the department chair maintain an accurate written record of the proceedings of all annual interviews, including directions and guidelines suggested by the department leadership. Each TMA faculty member is expected to participate in these annual interviews. These stewardship interviews and reports prepare faculty to move successfully through the rank and status process and provide an opportunity for the faculty to get feedback on their scholarship, citizenship, and



---

teaching. Each faculty member participates in the annual stewardship interview process.

## 5. RANK ADVANCEMENT FOR PROFESSORIAL FACULTY

**CFACRSP:** The CFAC recognizes the three categories of rank advancement outlined in the URSP. This portion of the document requires that departments/schools further define terms used to describe candidate proficiency as part of the expectations set forth within the unique disciplines. Each section below articulates the responsibility of the department/school and faculty.

Department/school documents should specifically define what “high quality” work means. The URSP, college and department/school documents should be shared with faculty early in the first year of hire and the candidate’s Professional Development Plan should be crafted with full knowledge of all documents.

**TMA:** TMA adheres to the policies and procedures set forth in URSP and CFACRSP 5. In addition to the guidelines given in the university document, TMA has further clarified and defined the standards for professorial faculty within the disciplines of theatre and media arts as outlined below.

The three academic ranks for professorial faculty are assistant professor, associate professor, and professor. The minimum university requirements for these ranks are:

### 5.1 Assistant Professor

- A. Understanding of the importance of citizenship and willingness to engage in high quality citizenship. Candidates for candidacy for continuing faculty status must understand the importance of citizenship at the university and within the discipline. They must also demonstrate a willingness to engage collegially in appropriate citizenship activities as assigned by the department chair/school director or planned with the faculty mentor. Department/school documents should clearly define what “willingness to engage in high quality citizenship” means within their department/school.
- B. Definite promise of high quality teaching. Candidates should demonstrate promise of high quality teaching and mentoring. They also should be able to articulate their efforts to consistently improve their teaching and mentoring as outlined in 3.3.1 of this document. Department/school documents should clearly define what “promise of high quality teaching” means within their department/school.
- C. Interest in and evidence of ability to produce high quality scholarship. Candidates should demonstrate a persistent interest in scholarship and/or creative work within their disciplinary community. There should be clear evidence that the candidate’s scholarship and/or creative work shows promise of high quality. Department/school documents should clearly define what persistent “interest in” and shows “ability to produce high quality scholarship” or creative work means within their discipline at the initial review for candidacy for continuing faculty status.
- D. The doctoral degree or other appropriate terminal degree, such as the Master of Fine Arts (MFA) degree or the degrees accepted nationally within a CFAC specialty area generally meets this requirement. Any deviation from these



degree requirements must have been stated and approved at the time of hire. See Section 2 in this document. In exceptional cases, when a master's degree, professional experience, or other training is considered sufficient by similar institutions of higher education, such degree, experience, or training may suffice (The university Faculty Hiring Policy supersedes this verbiage in the 2008 URSP).

**TMA:** TMA adheres to the policies and procedures set forth in URSP and CFACRSP 5.1 and the descriptions of citizenship, teaching, and scholarship in URSP 3.2.2, 3.3.2, and 3.4.4.

## 5.2 Associate Professor

- A. A sufficient record of high quality university citizenship.

As described in URSP 5.2, candidates prepared for the final continuing faculty status review and promotion to associate professor must have a "sufficient record" of citizenship at the university and within the discipline. They must also demonstrate collegiality and a willingness to engage in appropriate citizenship activities as assigned by the department chair or planned with the faculty mentor.

- B. A sufficient record of high quality teaching.

Candidates should also demonstrate "a sufficient record" of teaching and mentoring (URSP 5.2.B). They should be able to articulate their efforts to consistently develop and improve their teaching and mentoring as outlined in 3.3.1 in this document.

- C. A sufficient record of high quality scholarship since appointment as an assistant professor.

Faculty must demonstrate a persistent interest in the development of scholarship and/or creative work within their disciplinary community nationally. There should be clear evidence that the candidate's scholarship and/or creative work shows "sufficient record" of being high quality (URSP 5.1.C) and has met the standard disciplinary norm for continuing faculty status. Likewise, candidates for associate professor should show evidence of an emerging external reputation in his/her area(s) of expertise (URSP 3.4.1).

- D. A minimum of six years in service as an assistant professor to demonstrate over time the faculty member's proficiency in citizenship, teaching, and scholarship. Therefore, the review for rank advancement will normally occur during the faculty member's sixth year of service as an assistant professor, and rank advancement would take effect fall semester of the following year. (In rare and exceptional cases, extraordinary faculty members may be considered for advancement before the six-year minimum.)

**TMA:** TMA adheres to the policies and procedures set forth in URSP 5.2 and CFACRSP 5.2 and the descriptions of citizenship, teaching, and scholarship in URSP 3.2.2, 3.3.2, and 3.4.4.

## 5.3 Professor

- A. An established record of high quality university citizenship.
- B. An established record of high quality teaching. Candidates also should be able to articulate their efforts to expertly develop, and improve their teaching and mentoring.
- C. An established record of high quality scholarship since becoming an associate professor. Candidates should demonstrate a marked scholarly contribution to their field of study. There should be clear evidence that the



candidate's scholarship and/or creative work shows an established record of being high quality and has met the standard disciplinary norm for professor status. They should be recognized nationally or internationally in their focused area of scholarship and/or creative work within their disciplinary community and show evidence of a sustained external reputation in the field of expertise (URSP 3.4.1) and should have received peer review within a national or international forum. Their scholarship and/or creative work should build the reputation of the CFAC and university.

Department/school documents should clearly define what "established record" of scholarship or creative work means within their discipline at the Professor review.

- D. At least five years in service as an associate professor to demonstrate over time the faculty member's proficiency in citizenship, teaching, and scholarship. Therefore, the earliest that a review for rank advancement could occur is during the faculty member's fifth year of service as an associate professor, and rank advancement would take effect fall semester of the following year. (In rare and exceptional cases, extraordinary faculty members may be considered for advancement before the five-year minimum.)

**TMA:** TMA adheres to the policies and procedures set forth in URSP 5.3 and CFACRSP 5.3 and the descriptions of citizenship, teaching, and scholarship in URSP 3.2.2, 3.3.2, and 3.4.4.

- 5.4 **Calendar for Rank Advancement Reviews.** The normal calendar for rank advancement reviews is the same as for final continuing faculty status reviews. (See 4.4.) A nomination for rank advancement, even though it accompanies a nomination for continuing faculty status at the time of the sixth-year review, must be considered and evaluated as a separate proposition. All reviewing bodies must make a recommendation regarding rank advancement separate from the recommendation regarding continuing faculty status.

**TMA:** TMA adheres to the policies and procedures set forth in URSP 5.4.

### **TMA: 5.5 Definition of Professorial Faculty Tracks within TMA**

In addition to the guidelines given in the university document, TMA has further clarified and defined the standards for professorial faculty within the disciplines of theatre and media arts as outlined below.

#### **5.5.1 Theatre and Media Arts Professorial**

The Department of Theatre and Media Arts recognizes and encourages the diversity of scholarship that takes place among its faculty members on a professorial track. All scholarship must be substantive, of high quality, directed toward those activities expected in the area of his/her appointment, and subject to peer review as defined in the scholarship expectations in this document (5.5.5.1, 5.5.5.2, and 5.5.5.3). Traditional scholarship includes, among other things, primary empirical research, historical research, theory development and testing, methodological studies, and philosophical inquiry and analysis, usually ending in publication. Creative scholarship may include, but is not limited to full-scale theatrical productions, feature films, documentaries, experimental productions, performance art, animated short films, television productions, new media projects, etc. Similar criteria are used to assess scholarship, whether that scholarship is written or creative.



---

### 5.5.2 Purpose of Scholarship

Theatre and Media Arts encourages scholarship that is innovative within the constraints of the institution. We value writings or creative works that combine concepts and original works from theatre, media or other disciplines in creating new patterns, placing knowledge in a larger context, or illuminating data in meaningful ways. The expectation of research or creative activities is that such efforts should lead to some type of formal public presentation, whether written and/or performed, related to one's professional or academic activities. Publication and public exhibition help to extend the university's influence and reputation, which in turn benefits our students, the community, our professions, and the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints.

### 5.5.3 Professorial Scholarship Discriminations

The Department of Theatre and Media Arts recognizes that the significance of individual artistic and scholarly endeavors varies, and one activity may weigh more heavily than another during a continuing faculty status or rank advancement review. However, the department does not privilege certain *types* of traditional or creative scholarship above others, but rather evaluates all scholarship according to assessment tools outlined in the track descriptions in this document.

Scholarship should:

- Be consistent with department, college, and university missions
- Contribute to a faculty member's overall effectiveness as a teacher
- Be of high quality and contain some element of originality
- Be subject to peer review

### 5.5.4 Evidence of Scholarship

Specific examples of work that provides evidence of scholarship in each individual area of expertise are detailed in the track descriptions that follow. Generally, evidence of scholarship follows the URSP 3.4.4.2. Further clarification can be found in TMARSP 3.4.4.2.

### 5.5.5. Categories in Professional Track

Those faculty following a Theatre and Media Arts Professorial track can be divided as follows.

- Theatre or Media Arts Teacher/Scholar, whose primary activities usually follow traditional scholarly paths, but which can include both traditional and creative scholarship
- Theatre or Media Arts Teacher/Artist, whose activities are primarily creative

#### 5.5.5.1 Scholarship expectations – Theatre or Media Arts Teacher/Scholar

- A. Scholarship Assessment: All traditional scholarship should be evaluated by peer review. Peer review is understood to mean full manuscript or presentation review by a knowledgeable jury of professionals or qualified editors and readers. This type of peer review is inherent when printed material is accepted for publication/presentation by a recognized scholarly press or professional organization. All printed work included as evidence of excellence in scholarship in a faculty dossier for continuing status or advancement in rank should be read and reviewed by other external professionals or scholars as well, and should receive favorable reviews. This requirement does not eliminate, however, the dialogue that naturally occurs when scholars hold differing views of the theories or conclusions of others. External experts should have professional credentials at least equal to those of the candidate



- 
- B. Examples of Traditional Scholarship may include, but are not limited to the following non-prioritized activities. Generally, publications count in the rank and status process when they are accepted for publication with a completed manuscript and, when customary, with a contract for publication.
- Chapters, articles or entries contributed to books or encyclopedias edited by others and published by a scholarly press
  - Refereed conference proceedings
  - Peer reviewed journal articles
  - Technical reports and similar publications that present new ideas or incorporate scholarly research, and which contribute to the professional literature, the advancement of professional practice, or the improvement of professional education
  - Textbooks, monographs, abstracts, translations that contribute to a body of knowledge or reflect significant scholarly activity, etc.
  - Books published by a scholarly press following editorial and peer review. (Self-published materials ordinarily should not be included in this category, but may be used to document citizenship in the community or profession.)
  - Grants for research, when resulting from a competitive process of peer review (Grants may evidence the quality of the prior body of work upon which the research proposal is based. Proposals that received high ratings but no funding may also be considered.)
  - Presentations at professional meetings and conferences, which lead to peer reviewed, published articles
  - Invitations to teach master classes or lead intensive workshops
  - Demonstration of professional competence through successful employment by reputable professional companies
  - Studies of artistic organizations and institutions
- C. Evaluating Traditional Scholarship: It is the responsibility of both the faculty member and the department to properly document and contextualize the validity of scholarship presented in a dossier. This may be done by commenting on the review process through which a work has been chosen, identifying the credentials of the reviewers and/or publishers, placing the journals in which articles have been published in their proper professional context, etc.
- D. Electronic Publishing: The Theatre and Media Arts Department recognizes the proliferation and increasing reputation of electronic publishing venues. All electronically published faculty work will be assessed with the same criteria used to determine the validity of more traditionally published material. Electronic journals will be evaluated for:
- Rigorous peer review
  - Reputation within the discipline
  - Size and sophistication of audience/readership
  - Acceptance rate for submissions
  - Frequency of journal content being cited by other scholars
  - Awards and recognition for the electronic publication



---

### 5.5.5.2 Scholarship Expectations - Theatre Teacher/Artist

- A. Scholarship Assessment: All creative scholarship should be evaluated by peer review. Peer review for professorial creative scholarship is understood to mean full presentation review by university peers and at least one outside adjudicator. Jurors or outside experts should have credentials at least equal to those of the candidate, representing both regional and national/international BYU peer institutions. Theatre and Media Arts also recognizes that, just as peer review is inherent when printed material is accepted for publication by a recognized scholarly press, there is often inherent peer review when teacher/artists receive funding for or are invited to participate in creative activities with other notable educational or professional organizations.
- B. Examples of Creative Scholarship may include, but are not limited to:
- Directing, producing, writing, designing, choreographing or performing with university productions that exhibit exceptional quality and activity
  - Directing, producing, writing, designing, choreographing or performing with LDS church productions that exhibit exceptional quality and activity
  - Outstanding direction, design, choreography or performance of major works that are exceptionally demanding, involving collaboration with guest artists or other off-campus groups.
  - Writing an original script that is accepted for publication or performance
  - Substantial, commissioned professional work obtained through competitive channels
  - Individual performance or performance art
  - Premieres, professionally adjudicated productions, or interdisciplinary projects
  - Off-campus performances, such as invited appearances of scenes, design presentations or entire productions at a regional or national meeting of the American College Theatre Festival
  - Invited work at other universities
  - Demonstration of professional competence through successful employment by reputable professional companies
  - Artistic direction of a theatre company
  - Establishment of a viable theatre company
  - Performances or papers for professional societies, seminars and conferences
  - Grant awards in support of production or performance
  - Awards or other recognition such as union memberships, invited presentations or lectures, and invitations to teach master classes or lead intensive workshops
  - Significant mentoring of junior colleagues in research leading to creative projects
- C. Evaluating Creative Scholarship: Actual production of theatrical performances, or in other words, practical application of theatrical knowledge, can be considered as significant scholarship. It should be recognized as such when it can be shown to have educational or professional significance through appropriate documentation. It is the responsibility of the faculty member and the department to properly define and contextualize the validity of scholarship presented in a dossier. This may be done by commenting on the review process through which a creative project was assessed, identifying the credentials of the reviewers, placing the venues in which productions have been performed in their proper context, soliciting letters of support from employers and co-workers, etc. Requirements for evaluations vary according to the creative activity and venue.



- D. University or Community Creative Work: Part of the mission of the theatre production program at BYU is to provide cultural resources to the university and community; to expose students through the production process to pertinent related areas of knowledge or experience; to develop new or experimental work; to allow theatre students to experience all phases of production; to train theatre artists. Because of the months, and sometimes years, it takes to develop theatrical productions, TMA recognizes on-campus and community work as proof of appropriate creative activity when supported by favorable written evaluations from jurors or outside experts.

The department commissions jurors or outside experts who are selected based on 1) their affiliation with a BYU peer institution/program and who are of an equal or a higher rank than the candidate or 2) who otherwise have credentials qualifying them for the review. These reviewers will be provided with guidelines and parameters for evaluation, whose comments may include the following:

- Assessment of the overall artistic merit of the production
  - Analysis of the production elements
  - Uniqueness of the artist's voice
  - Assessment of the extent and quality of the contributions made by the artist being evaluated
  - Collaboration with other members of the production team
  - Clarity of expression
  - Command of artistic technique
  - Theatrical implementation of scholarly preparation
  - The ability, where appropriate, to tell a story and present dramatic action
  - Facilitation of the work and characterization of the actor
  - Comparison of presentation with productions of other programs having similar missions and goals
- E. LDS Church Productions: TMA recognizes that the opportunity for professional level artistic work exists within several departments of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints. Although most non-compensated Church service opportunities should be reported in the citizenship section of a faculty dossier, certain activities are appropriate for inclusion as examples of creative scholarship. These should include appropriate peer or expert reviews and might include, but are not limited to:
- Direction, art direction, costume design, actor coaching, etc., of LDS Motion Picture Studio productions
  - Acting in an LDS film or video production
  - Directing, designing or performing in productions at the LDS Conference Center or other high profile church projects
- F. Professional and Semi-Professional Productions: There is an inherent peer review that exists each time a production team is created. Directors, actors, choreographers, scenic designers, costume designers, dramaturges, and other artists routinely submit to live, electronic or portfolio auditions where their skills are assessed. Evaluations such as these that lead to commissions and contracts can be considered positive peer review, since they imply acceptance of artistic standards and reputation. Also, the quality of the venue or organization and its





---

scope of influence are of much greater importance than its geographical location. When contextualizing the validity of the work for a faculty dossier, the following may be considered:

- Is the professional status of the organization widely recognized?
- Are the artists involved members of recognized professional unions that are exclusive and limited to artists functioning at recognized and established levels of professional competence?
- Are the artists involved compensated with a competitive, living wage for their work?
- Is the organization able to hire participants from a national pool of available artists?
- What is the size and scope of the pool of potential artists and presenters?
- What is the size of the audience?
- What are the demographics of the audience?
- What print and electronic media regularly review the organization's work?
- What is the academic response to works presented?
- What competitive funding sources has the producing organization successfully utilized?

#### 5.5.5.3 Scholarship Expectations – Media Arts Teacher/Artist

- A. Scholarship Assessment: All creative scholarship should be evaluated by peer review. Peer review for professorial creative scholarship is understood to mean full presentation review by university peers and at least one outside adjudicator. Jurors or outside experts should have professional credentials at least equal to those of the candidate. Theatre and Media Arts also recognizes that, just as peer review is inherent when printed material is accepted for publication by a recognized scholarly press, there is inherent peer review when teacher/artists receive funding for or are invited to participate in creative activities with other educational or professional organizations
- B. Examples of Creative Scholarship may include, but are not limited to:
- Directing, assistant directing, writing, producing, editing, animating or acting as the cinematographer for university productions that exhibit exceptional quality and activity
  - Directing, assistant directing, writing, producing, editing, animating or acting as the cinematographer for LDS Church productions that exhibit exceptional quality and activity
  - Outstanding direction, authorship, cinematography, etc. of major works that are exceptionally demanding, involving collaboration with guest artists or other off- campus groups
  - Invited work at other universities
  - Writing an original screenplay that is accepted for production
  - Premieres, professionally adjudicated productions or interdisciplinary projects
  - Commissioned professional work
  - Substantial participation in the creation of feature films, short films, documentaries, television series or pilots, television public service announcements or commercials, radio narrative presentations, radio commercials, industrial long and short form, web distribution, etc.



- 
- Creative works of documented quality that are broadcast locally, regionally, nationally, or internationally
  - Creative works that are accepted for presentation at reputable regional, national or international festivals
  - Demonstration of professional competency through successful employment by reputable professional companies
  - Preparation of productions or papers for professional societies
  - Securing of competitive grants awarded in support of productions and projects
  - Awards or other recognition such as union memberships, invited presentations or lectures, and invitations to teach master classes or lead intensive workshops
- C. Evaluating Creative Scholarship: Actual creation of media productions, or in other words, the practical application of specialized knowledge, can be considered as significant scholarship. It should be recognized as such when it can be shown to have educational or professional significance through appropriate documentation. It is the responsibility of the faculty member and the department to properly define and contextualize the validity of this type of scholarship when included in a dossier. This may be done by commenting on the review process through which a creative project was assessed, identifying the credentials of the reviewers, placing the venues in which productions have been presented in their proper context, soliciting letters of support from employers and co-workers, etc. Requirements for evaluations vary according to the creative activity and venue.
- D. University of Community Creative Scholarship: The mission of the media production program at BYU is to provide cultural resources to the university and community; to expose students through the production process to pertinent related areas of knowledge or experience; to develop new or experimental work; to allow media arts students to experience all phases of production; to train media artists. Because of the months, and sometimes years, it takes to develop media productions, TMA recognizes on-campus and community work as proof of appropriate creative activity when supported by favorable written evaluations from jurors or outside experts.

The department commissions jurors or outside experts who are selected based on 1) their affiliation with a BYU peer institution/program and who are of an equal or a higher rank than the candidate or 2) who otherwise have credentials qualifying them for the review. These reviewers will be provided with guidelines and parameters for evaluation, whose comments may include the following:

- Assessment of the overall artistic merit of the creative project
- Analysis of the production elements
- Uniqueness of the artist's voice
- Assessment of the extent and quality of the contributions made by the artist being evaluated
- Collaboration with other members of the production team
- Clarity of expression
- Command of artistic technique



- 
- Artistic implementation of scholarly and/or creative preparation
  - The ability, where appropriate, to tell a story and present dramatic action
  - Comparison of presentation with productions of other programs having similar missions and goals
- E. LDS Church Productions: TMA recognizes that the opportunity for professional level artistic work exists within several departments of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints. Although most non-compensated Church service opportunities should be reported in the citizenship section of a faculty dossier, certain activities are appropriate for inclusion as examples of creative scholarship. These should include appropriate peer or expert reviews and might include, but are not limited to:
- Directing, assistant directing, writing, producing, editing, animating or acting as the cinematographer for KBYUB productions
  - Directing, assistant directing, writing, producing, editing, animating or acting as the cinematographer for LDS Motion Picture Studio productions
  - Writing, producing, editing or adding visual elements to productions at the LDS Conference Center or on other high profile church projects
- F. Professional and Semi-Professional Productions: There is an inherent peer review that exists each time a production team is created. Directors, screenwriters, producers, cinematographers, artistic directors, animators, editors, and other artists routinely submit to live, electronic or portfolio auditions where their skills are assessed. Evaluations such as these that lead to employment or production funding can be considered positive peer review, since they generally imply acceptance of artistic standards and reputation. Also, the quality of the venue or organization and its scope of influence are of much greater importance than its geographical location. When contextualizing the validity of the work for a faculty dossier, the following may be considered:
- Is the professional status of the organization widely recognized?
  - Are the artists involved members of recognized professional unions that are exclusive and limited to artists functioning at recognized and established levels of professional competence?
  - Are the artists involved compensated with a competitive, living wage for their work?
  - Is the organization able to hire participants from a national pool of available artists?
  - What is the size and scope of the pool of potential artists and presenters?
  - What is the size of the audience?
  - What are the demographics of the audience?
  - What print and electronic media regularly review the organization's work?
  - What is the academic response to works presented?
  - What competitive funding sources has the producing organization successfully utilized?



---

## 6. PROFESSIONAL FACULTY

(For additional guidance on Professional faculty, see Faculty Hiring Policy.)

### 6.1 Definition of Professional Faculty

Professional faculty are faculty who have specialized responsibilities. Professional faculty include teaching faculty, research faculty, clinical faculty, librarians, athletic professionals, and others. Professional faculty enjoy the same basic privileges as professorial faculty. They may receive continuing faculty status (except for athletic professionals, including trainers) and rank advancement. They may vote in departmental decisions regarding faculty appointments, continuing faculty status, rank advancement, and all other matters. They may serve as chairs or deans, on committees, and in other administrative assignments, and they are eligible for university awards.

**CFACRSP:** While the university document describes several variations of professional faculty, CFAC professional faculty primarily fit into the teaching faculty category (Teaching Professor).

As stated in Section 2, Appointment of Faculty Members (see Initial Classification Professional in this document), the specialized responsibilities for CFAC professional faculty are determined at the time of hire. Professional faculty must meet the standards for citizenship and professional service in teaching described in this document and the URSP. Additional expectations related to the specialized functions they will be performing for the department/school will be outlined in the letter of expectation that accompanies the offer letter. If needed, the expectations described in this letter can be adjusted after the hire takes place according to the needs of the department/school. When appropriate, adjustments are developed by the faculty, his or her chair, and in consultation with the CFAC deans. These adjustments become a part of the Faculty Development Plan as mentioned in 3.1 and URSP 3.1.2. For any annual review or for any rank and status review, the faculty member will be reviewed with reference to the expectations document, and any revisions, based on the time frame applicable to the period during which a particular expectations document was in force. This expectations document, as well as any revisions, will be included in the rank and status dossier for initial and final reviews as well as for advancements in rank. Where revisions have occurred, the rank and status dossier should also include an explanation for any revisions.

**TMA:** TMA adheres to the policies and procedures set forth in URSP 6 (6.1 – 6.6) and CFACRSP 6. In addition to the guidelines given in the university document, TMA has further clarified and defined the standards for professional faculty within the disciplines of theatre and media arts as outlined below. The Department of Theatre and Media Arts recognizes and encourages the diversity of creativity that takes place among its faculty members on a professional track. All creative work must be substantive, of high quality, and directed toward those activities defined in the area of his/her appointment.

### 6.2 Creating a Professional Faculty Position

**CFACRSP:** CFAC departments and schools should follow the instructions in the URSP 6.2 and FHP 3.11 when creating a professional faculty position.

To create a professional faculty position, the department and the dean must submit a written request to the academic vice president. The memorandum should justify the request and include a position description stating the specific responsibilities and expectations of the position and the ways in which performance will be evaluated.



Transferring current faculty from one track to another should be done to meet university needs rather than to accommodate a faculty member who is not succeeding in his or her current track.

### 6.3 Evaluation of Professional Faculty

This rank and status policy applies to professional faculty, except that athletic professionals are not eligible for continuing faculty status. Professional faculty are evaluated in citizenship and professional service. The department review committee should solicit review letters of a faculty member's citizenship and professional service from those who have closely observed those activities. Except in third-year reviews, external review letters should also be sought when a faculty member's citizenship or professional service has extended beyond the university. A sample letter to external reviewers is attached as Appendix E. The department review committee needs to obtain external review letters of scholarship only if scholarship is a primary area of the faculty member's professional service.

**CFACRSP:** The CFAC supports the university standards for the evaluation of professional faculty, which are described in URSP 6.3-6.5 and 6.6-6.6.3. As directed in the URSP 6.3, the URSP applies to professional faculty who are evaluated on their performance in citizenship (URSP 6.4) and professional service (URSP 6.5). This college rank and status document outlines the expectations for citizenship as described in section 3.2 above and evaluated accordingly.

Professional service expectations are fully described in Section 2 Initial Classification Professional in this document. As stated in that section the expectations are related in the faculty expectations document at the time of hire and are evaluated according to the corresponding teaching 3.3 section and scholarship 3.4 sections above. Departments/schools are responsible to clearly outline expectations for professional faculty in these two categories in their unique rank and status documents as well as the expectations document mentioned in 6.1. These expectations should meet disciplinary norms and/or industry standards. Each section below articulates the responsibility of the department/school and faculty.

**TMA:** Professional faculty in the Department of Theatre and Media Arts enjoy the same basic privileges as professorial faculty. They may receive continuing faculty status and rank advancement. They may vote in departmental decisions regarding faculty appointments, continuing faculty status, rank advancement, and all other matters. They may serve as chairs, on committees, and in other administrative assignments, and they are eligible for university awards.

Professional faculty are evaluated in citizenship and professional service, which is teaching and scholarship. Professional service encompasses work in the specific university assignments given to a professional faculty member. Specific expectations regarding a professional faculty member's assignments should be set forth in a Letter of Expectations provided to faculty member at the time of hire. Professional faculty should be evaluated according to those expectations and the standards in this policy. A professional faculty member in TMA may have scholarship responsibilities in either traditional or creative work. If they have scholarship responsibilities, those activities will be evaluated according to the criteria outlined in section 3.4 of the URSP and section 3.4 of the TMARSP documents.

#### 6.7.1 Definition of Purpose of Professional Creative Scholarship

Professional creative scholarship in the Department of Theatre and Media Arts is an aspect of the professional track candidate's professional service. It is generally a creative project or extended effort of substantial scope that demonstrates the professional track candidate's area(s) of expertise and/or fulfills the professional track candidate's job description. Professional creative scholarship may be created in



---

service to the profession, in service to the immediate or extended community, or in service to mentored student learning.

In addition, professional creative scholarship serves to:

- Keep professional track faculty members current in their disciplines
- Involve students in projects which employ a professional model
- Provide potential employment opportunities for students
- Assist professorial track colleagues in the execution of creative scholarship
- Bring the faculty member's experience with professional projects into the classroom

### **6.7.2 Professional Creative Scholarship Distinctions**

The Department of Theatre and Media Arts recognizes that the significance of individual artistic and scholarly endeavors varies, and one activity may weigh more heavily than another during a continuing faculty status or rank advancement review. However, the department does not privilege certain *types* of professional creative scholarship above others, but rather evaluates all scholarship according to assessment tools outlined in the track descriptions in this document.

### **6.7.3 Professional Expectations for Theatre or Media Arts Professional Track Faculty**

While professional faculty members in the Department of Theatre and Media Arts are expected to maintain links with the theatre and media arts professions, their primary responsibility is to the university. When faculty members involve students in commercial enterprises, the students must either receive financial compensation, class credit, or internship credit through the department. Such endeavors must be cleared with the department to avoid conflicts of interest.

### **6.7.4 Assessment of Professional Creative Scholarship**

Professional creative scholarship should be given the rigorous review to which professorial scholarly creative work is subjected, but this type of review may take different forms, some of which are addressed in TMARSP 6.7.6. All professional track candidates submitting creative scholarly examples are subject to peer review as defined in TMARSP 6.7.6.1 and in TMARSP 6.7.6.2. Because academic peer reviewers may not be familiar with professional creative scholarship, it is important that a candidate's dossier include proper contextualization regarding the assessment of the scholarly evidence. All creative scholarly examples should include a description of the material's scope (including the duration of the effort from inception to completion) and the candidate's role in the process. Professional creative scholarship may be evaluated by peer reviewers in at least one of three ways. Sometimes more than one of the following assessment tools applies to a single scholarly example, but only one of the following assessment tools is required for each scholarly example:

- Was the scholarly example favorably vetted by peer professionals? This may be evidenced by acceptance into a reputable festival/competition, by a favorable review from a reputable publication/reviewer, or it may be



---

evidenced by commercial commission or dissemination. The quality of the example is determined by the academic peer reviewer based upon the professional competence demonstrated by the example and upon the evidence of favorable review from peer professionals. This evidence is included by the candidate in the scholarship portion of the dossier. It may include the profile of the company or individual commissioning/acquiring the work, the entity reviewing the completed piece, the festival venue, the extent of the distribution or screening, etc.

And/Or

- Did the scholarly example include a compelling and substantial mentoring component? This is professional work created in service to students, beyond the scope of the candidate's normal course load. The quality of this scholarship is determined by the academic peer reviewer based upon the professional competence demonstrated in the example and upon the evidence of mentoring provided by the candidate in the scholarship portion of the dossier. Evidence should detail the nature of the mentoring experience including the instruction, the scope of the project, any funding secured, the number of students involved, etc.

And/Or

- Was the scholarly example created at the request of the community, the department, the college, the university, or a fellow faculty member in need of professional assistance? This is substantial professional work created in service to the local or extended community. The quality of this scholarship is determined by the outside reviewer based upon the professional competence demonstrated in the example and upon the context provided by the candidate in the scholarship portion of the dossier. Evidence may include a description of the project, details regarding the commissioning entity or scholar, the impact of the completed project on the local or extended community, etc.

Professional track candidates submitting creative scholarship must clearly articulate the types of assessment most appropriate for their individual submissions. Without this context, peer reviewers may feel that a creative scholarly example lacks an element of assessment to which it is not subject (i.e., a student mentoring environment that focuses on the process of production rather than being created for distribution). The creative scholarly materials submitted by professional track candidates must always demonstrate a high level of professional competence related to the candidate's area(s) of expertise.

### 6.7.5 Division of Tracks

In order to identify examples of scholarly or creative activities appropriate to the many areas of expertise within the department, TMA has divided its professional faculty into the following categories:

- Theatre Professional
- Media Arts Professional



### 6.7.5.1 Professional Expectations – Theatre Professional

Professional Creative Scholarship Assessment: All work submitted as evidence of creative scholarship by a professional track candidate is subject to peer review. Peer review is understood to mean full presentation review by academic peers. It may also include professional assessment by an outside adjudicator or inherent review by an external professional entity. Jurors or outside experts should have professional credentials at least equal to those of the candidate.

Just as favorable peer review is inherent when printed material is accepted for publication by a recognized scholarly press, there is inherent peer review when professional faculty receive funding for or are chosen to participate in creative activities with other educational or professional organizations. It is the candidate's responsibility to identify and outline specific instances of inherent peer review when completing the dossier.

A. Examples of Professional Creative Scholarship may include, but are not limited to:

- Directing, producing, writing, designing, choreographing or performing with university productions that exhibit exceptional quality and activity
- Directing, producing, writing, designing, choreographing or performing with LDS church productions that exhibit exceptional quality and activity
- Outstanding direction, design, choreography or performance of major works that are exceptionally demanding, involving collaboration with guest artists or other off- campus group
- Writing an original script that is accepted for publication or performance
- Substantial, commissioned professional work obtained through competitive channel
- Individual performance or performance art
- Premieres, professionally adjudicated productions or interdisciplinary projects
- Off-campus performances, such as invited appearances of scenes, design presentations or entire productions at a regional or national meeting of the American College Theatre Festival
- Invited work at other universities
- Demonstration of professional competence through successful employment by reputable professional companies
- Artistic direction of a theatre company
- Establishment of a viable theatre company
- Performances or papers for professional societies, seminars and conferences
- Grant awards in support of production or performance
- Awards or other recognition such as union memberships, invited presentations or lectures, and invitations to teach master classes or lead intensive workshops
- Significant mentoring of junior colleagues in research leading to creative projects





- 
- A student mentoring environment resulting in a project of significant scope
  - A significant project created in service of the immediate or extended community

B. Areas of Competency: Skills by which TMA faculty on the Theatre Professional Track may demonstrate professional competence may include, but are not limited to:

- Producing
- Directing
- Assistant Directing
- Choreographing
- Playwriting
- Designing
- Performing
- Stage Managing

#### 6.7.5.2 Professional Expectations – Media Arts Professional

A. Professional Creative Scholarship Assessment: All work submitted as evidence of creative scholarship by a professional track candidate is subject to peer review. Peer review is understood to mean full presentation review by academic peers. It may also include professional assessment by an outside adjudicator or inherent review by an external professional entity. If adjudicators are solicited, they should have professional credentials at least equal to those of the candidate.

Just as favorable peer review is inherent when printed material is accepted for publication by a recognized scholarly press, there is inherent peer review when professional faculty receive funding for or are commissioned to participate in creative activities with other professional or educational organizations. It is the candidate's responsibility to identify and outline specific instances of inherent peer review when completing the dossier.

B. Examples of Professional Creative Scholarship: At least one of the following components should be applied to the examples of professional creative scholarship that is included for review in a dossier:

- Assignments in the department, college, university, BYUB, or LDS Church-sponsored endeavors in which the faculty member applies a high level of professional competence related to the candidate's area(s) of expertise in creating a professional product
- Student mentoring environments resulting in projects of significant scope
- High quality commissioned professional work competitively obtained
- Having a feature length screenplay optioned or acquired
- Substantial funding from outside sources leading to production
- Broadcast in regional, national and/or international venues
- Acceptance in national or international festivals
- Favorable reviews from educational organizations such as BEA or UFVA



- 
- Distribution in regional, national and/or international venues
  - Grants and awards in support of production
  - Invitations to give master classes, workshops, lectures or other presentations at other universities, conferences or festivals
- C. Variety and Range of Scholarship: Theatre and Media Arts recognizes and encourages the diversity of professional creative scholarship that takes place among its professional track faculty members. A variety of projects are acknowledged as professionally relevant and include, but are not limited to:
- Short film
  - Feature film
  - Documentary work
  - New Media Projects
  - Television series and pilots
  - Television commercials
  - Radio narrative presentations
  - Radio commercials
  - Industrial long and short form
  - Production for web distribution
  - Religious or institutional work
- D. Areas of Competency : Skills by which Theatre and Media Arts faculty on the Arts professional track may demonstrate professional competence may include, but are not limited to :
- Directing
  - Producing
  - Screenwriting
  - Executive Producing
  - Production management
  - Assistant directing
  - Cinematography
  - Animation
  - Editing
  - Sound design and mixing
  - Art direction

#### 6.4 Citizenship

The standards and assessment evidence for citizenship described in section 3.2 apply to professional faculty.

#### 6.5 Professional Service

Professional service encompasses work in the specific university assignments given to a professional faculty member. Specific expectations regarding a professional faculty member's assignments should be set forth in the position description or in the department or college rank and status policy, and should be included in the file prepared for the rank and status review. Faculty should be evaluated according to those expectations and the standards in this policy. While there are many types of assignments, some of the more common assignments and the



---

related standards and assessment evidence are listed below:

### 6.5.1 Teaching Faculty

The standards and assessment evidence for teaching described in section 3.3 apply to teaching faculty. They also apply to other professional faculty to the extent that their responsibilities include teaching.

6.5.2-6.5.5 Since Research, Clinical, Librarian, and Athletic Professionals do not apply to the CFAC, we have not included their criteria in this document.

### 6.6 Rank Advancement for Professional Faculty

Academic ranks for professional faculty include:

- A. Assistant teaching professor, associate teaching professor, and teaching professor.
- B. Assistant research professor, associate research professor, and research professor.
- C. Assistant clinical professor, associate clinical professor, and clinical professor.
- D. Assistant librarian, associate librarian, and senior librarian.
- E. Assistant athletic professional, associate athletic professional, and athletic professional.

To hold these ranks, faculty must meet department, college, and university standards in citizenship and professional service. Any other rank designations must be approved by the academic vice president.

**CFACRSP:** The CFAC recognizes the three categories of rank advancement outlined in the URSP. This portion of the document requires that departments/schools further define terms used to describe candidate proficiency as part of the expectations set forth within the unique disciplines. Each section below articulates the responsibility of the department/school and faculty.

#### 6.6.1 Assistant Professional (Assistant Teaching, Research, or Clinical Professor; Assistant Librarian; and Assistant Athletic Professional)

- A. Understanding of the importance of citizenship and willingness to engage in high quality citizenship. **CFACRSP:** Professional candidates preparing for the initial review for candidacy for continuing faculty status must understand the importance of citizenship at the university and within the discipline. They must also demonstrate collegiality and a willingness to engage in appropriate citizenship activities as assigned by the department chair/school director or planned with the faculty mentor.
- B. Definite promise of high quality professional service. Professional service generally includes teaching and mentoring. Faculty also should be able to articulate their efforts to consistently improve their professional service according to their letter of expectations as outlined in section 3.3.1 above. They should demonstrate a persistent interest in professional service within their disciplinary or industry community.

Department/school documents should specifically define what “promise of” high quality professional service means at the Assistant Professional initial review.



- C. An appropriate degree, such as a doctor's degree, a master's degree, or other degree as determined by the department. When appropriate, equivalent professional training or experience may be considered sufficient. **As stated in Section 2 of this document, the terminal degrees appropriate to the applicant's discipline and position are preferred but not required for professional faculty positions (FHP 3.11). URSP 6.6.1C suggests that appropriate degrees as determined by the department may be deemed less important when appropriate, than assuring that the professional faculty position meets specialized curricular and structural needs of the department/school. Because of this, equivalent professional training or experience is sufficient along with a Bachelor's degree in a related field (Faculty Hiring Policy 2012, p. 5).**

**6.6.2 Associate Professional (Associate Teaching, Research, or Clinical Professor; Associate Librarian; and Associate Athletic Professional)**

- A. A sufficient record of high quality citizenship. **CFACRSP: Candidates for the final continuing faculty status review and promotion to associate teaching professor must have a "sufficient record" of citizenship at the university and within the discipline. They must demonstrate a willingness to engage in appropriate citizenship activities as assigned by the department chair/school director or planned with the faculty mentor (URSP 6.6.2.A).**
- B. A sufficient record of high quality professional service. **Equally, candidates should demonstrate "a sufficient record" of professional service which generally includes teaching and mentoring (URSP 6.6.2.B). They also should be able to articulate their efforts to consistently develop and improve their professional service according to their letter of expectation.**

**Faculty must demonstrate a persistent interest in professional service within their disciplinary community nationally. There should be clear evidence that the candidate's professional service shows a "sufficient record of" (URSP 5.1.C), and has met the disciplinary or industry norm for associate teaching professor status. Candidates for associate teaching professor should show evidence of an emerging external reputation in the industry.**

**Department/school documents should clearly define what a "sufficient record" of professional service means.**

- C. An appropriate degree, such as a doctor's degree, a master's degree, or other degree as determined by the department. When appropriate, equivalent professional training or experience may be considered sufficient.
- D. A minimum of six years in service as an assistant professional that demonstrates over time the faculty member's proficiency in citizenship and professional service. Therefore, the review for promotion to associate professional will normally occur during the faculty member's sixth year of service as an assistant professional, and rank advancement would take effect fall semester of the following academic year. (In rare and exceptional cases, extraordinary faculty members may be considered for advancement before the six-year minimum.)

**6.6.3 Full Professional (Teaching, Research or Clinical Professor; Senior Librarian; and**



### Athletic Professional

- A. An established record of high quality citizenship. **CFACRSP:** Candidates for final promotion to teaching professor must have an “established record” of citizenship at the university and within the discipline. They must also demonstrate a willingness to engage collegially in appropriate citizenship activities as assigned by the department chair/school director, dean or university. Professional faculty should also actively participate in citizenship within the discipline or industry (URSP 6.6.3.A).
- B. An established record of high quality professional service. Candidates should demonstrate “an established record” of professional service, which generally includes teaching and mentoring in the CFAC (URSP 6.6.3.B). They also should be able to articulate their efforts to expertly develop, and improve their teaching and mentoring.

Candidates should demonstrate a marked contribution to the university and their field of study or industry. They should be recognized as experts in their area of professional service within their disciplinary community or industry. There should be clear evidence that the candidate’s professional service shows an “established record of” high quality (URSP 6.6.3.C) and has met the standard disciplinary norm for professional status. Candidates for full teaching professor should show evidence of a sustained external reputation in the field of expertise or industry (URSP 3.4.1) as stated in the letter of expectation.

Department/school documents should clearly define what “established record” of high quality professional service means.

- C. An appropriate degree, such as a doctor's degree, a master's degree, or other degree as determined by the department. When appropriate, equivalent professional training or experience may be considered sufficient.
- D. A minimum of five years in service as an associate professional to demonstrate over time the faculty member's proficiency in citizenship and professional service. Therefore, the review for promotion to full professional will normally occur during the faculty member's fifth year of service as an associate professional, and rank advancement would take effect fall semester of the following academic year. (In rare and exceptional cases, extraordinary faculty members may be considered for advancement before the five-year minimum.)

## 7. PROCEDURES FOR CONTINUING FACULTY STATUS AND RANK ADVANCEMENT REVIEWS

### 7.1 Overview

Initial and final continuing faculty status reviews and rank advancement reviews include evaluations at the department, college, and university levels. Essentially the same procedures apply to initial and final continuing faculty status and rank advancement reviews, except that external review letters of scholarship are not required in initial (third-year) reviews. Faculty preparing for third- and final reviews are solely responsible for their preparation, including preparation of their files. Failure of others to communicate with or to assist the faculty member being reviewed is not an excuse for lack of preparation or grounds for requesting an



---

independent examination of the academic vice president's recommendation.

### **7.2 Materials to Include in the File**

The faculty member is responsible for developing a file that is professional and complete as defined in this document. Materials to include in the file for professorial faculty are described in sections 3.2.2 and 3.2.3 (citizenship); 3.3.2 and 7.9.4 (teaching); and 3.4.4.2 and 7.3 (scholarship); and are summarized in Appendix A. Materials to include in the file for professional faculty are described in sections 6.3 (evaluation of professional faculty); 3.2.2, 3.2.3, and 6.4 (citizenship); 6.5 (professional service); 3.3.2 and 6.5.1 (teaching faculty); 3.4.4.2, 6.5.2, and 7.3 (research faculty); 6.5.3.2 (clinical faculty); 6.5.4.2 (librarians); and 6.5.5.2 (athletic professionals); and are summarized in Appendix B. A copy of the file prepared for the third-year review should be retained by the department and made available if requested for review during the sixth-year review.

### **7.3 Examples of Scholarship**

Only the best three examples of scholarship will be included in the file. The faculty member will include a brief explanation why they were selected. The faculty member will make available in the department office copies of all other written scholarship and evidence of all other creative work to be considered in the review. This work will be sent to subsequent review levels only if requested.

### **7.4 Size of the File**

The faculty member should be selective about what to include in the file, because the file itself is an indication of professional maturity. A concise file that emphasizes the best evidence is more persuasive than a file cluttered with documents. Personal letters from students to the faculty member should not be included. Plastic page protectors should be avoided (copies of certificates should be used instead of originals). Generally, with the exception of books submitted as examples of scholarship, the file should fit in a two-inch binder.

### **7.5 Additional Information**

Reviewers at any level may request, receive, or obtain additional information from the faculty member or others. If the college or university review committee adds documents to the file that materially affect the committee's recommendation, it is recommended that the documents be shared with the dean, the department chair, and the college and department review committees so that they can consider whether to change their recommendations. Such additions include but are not limited to documents indicating the acceptance of additional publications, additional student evaluations, and late-arriving external review letters. Documents that strengthen the file need not be shared with prior review levels that made positive recommendations, and documents that weaken the file need not be shared with prior review levels that made negative recommendations, since those documents would not change the recommendations.

### **7.6 Allegations of Violations of University Policy**

If reviewers believe that a candidate may have violated university policy, the reviewers will advise the faculty member of the specific allegations, and give him or her an opportunity to respond in writing. The allegations and the response will be included in the file.

### **7.7 Confidential Information**



In some cases, the candidate or reviewers may feel that certain information is sensitive or confidential and should not be shared broadly. Sometimes the problem may be resolved by including the information in the file in a redacted form which preserves confidentiality. Generally, the decision of what to include in the file should allow as many reviewers as possible to see the information on a need to know basis, while still maintaining confidentiality. In all cases the information will be shared with the department chair, the dean, the associate academic vice president for faculty, the academic vice president, and the president. If questions arise, reviewers should contact the associate academic vice president for faculty who will determine a course of action that takes these needs into account.

### **7.8 Departmental and Disciplinary Perspective**

Because the department is most familiar with the faculty member's performance and the standards in the department and the discipline, the reports of the department review committee and the department chair should specifically address the faculty member's performance in light of departmental and disciplinary standards to help guide reviewers at the college and university levels. Reviewers at the college and university levels should give appropriate deference to the department's perspective, although they should also conduct their own independent evaluation. College and university level reviews should reflect the perspective of the college and university at large.

### **7.9 Department Review**

#### **7.9.1 Department Review Committee**

The department review committee is composed of at least three faculty members, all of whom have continuing faculty status. The department chair appoints the committee and the committee chair.

#### **7.9.2 Waiver**

The department review committee chair will request the faculty member to sign a waiver of access to reviews solicited from students, faculty, external peers, and others. The signed waiver letter should be included in the faculty member's file. (See Appendix C.)

#### **7.9.3 Review Letters of Citizenship Activities**

The department review committee may solicit review letters evaluating a faculty member's citizenship activities from those who have closely observed these activities. Review letters should address the quality, quantity, and significance of the service. (See 3.2.3.)

#### **7.9.4 Student Evaluations of Teaching**

In initial and final continuing faculty status reviews, the department review committee will include in the file a report of all student evaluations for each class taught and a compilation of all student comments from all classes. Similarly, in rank advancement reviews, the file will include all student evaluations conducted during the past several years and a typescript of all student comments from those classes. Trends in ratings as well as the types of classes (e.g., large or small, undergraduate or graduate) should be considered. The department review committee may also solicit written or oral comments from a representative sample of students. (See 3.3.2.B.)



### 7.9.5 Peer Evaluations of Teaching

The department review committee will obtain written peer evaluations of teaching and include them in the file. (See 3.3.2.C.)

**CFACRSP:** The URSP outlines the specific criteria for evaluating teaching. Discipline-specific norms/expectations and criteria for evaluating teaching not specified in the URSP should be clearly defined in the department/school document (e.g., evaluating undergraduate and graduate student mentoring, graduate program involvement, graduate status criteria, expected number of office hours, etc. (URSP 3.3). Departments/schools should refer to the BYU policy on peer evaluation of teaching (see URSP 3.3 Teaching--note 3.3.2 "Assessment of Teaching" and under 3.3.2 "Peer Evaluations") when establishing processes for creating the teaching portfolio and the peer evaluation of teaching. The Faculty Center's Department Chair Coordinating Committee has prepared a checklist and related materials that are intended as guides for successfully navigating the process and can be accessed through the university's Department Chair website.

Summative peer evaluations by the department/school should include at least two classroom visits in separate semesters of two different classes and a comprehensive review of the candidate's teaching portfolio including learning outcomes, activities, assessments, and samples of the student work which describes the teacher's contribution to student learning (URSP 3.3.2.C-G). These visits should take place prior to the final review. Evaluations should also consider a variety of teaching materials included in the teaching portfolio. The reviewer should consider evidence of measures taken by the faculty to ensure that learning outcomes are met. They should also consider other indices which are presented/explained that can help describe or define teaching success based on disciplinary standards.

Reviewers should investigate and attempt to understand unusual teaching cases such as a high or low number of students or courses, new course preps, courses that involve time-intensive grading or mentoring, travel requirements, or other unusual time commitments out of class that are acknowledged.

Dates/timeline for peer evaluations of teaching should be specified in the department/school rank and status documents to facilitate meeting department/school, college and university calendar deadlines.

### 7.9.6 External Reviews of Scholarship

In final continuing faculty status and rank advancement reviews, the department review committee will obtain external reviews of the body of the faculty member's scholarship from at least three faculty members at well regarded academic institutions who have achieved reputations in the relevant field. The faculty member may recommend reviewers, but the department review committee and the department chair are responsible for selecting the reviewers. Generally, reviewers should hold equal or higher rank to that being sought, and they should be persons whose personal association with the candidate would not be expected to bias the reviews. The committee report will describe how the reviewers were selected, the reasons they were chosen, their stature in the field, and any relationship they may have with the faculty member. The committee will send the reviewers the faculty member's curriculum vitae, information about the faculty member's teaching assignment, samples of scholarship from the file, and a summary of the university and department standards for assessing scholarship. Appendix D is a sample letter to external reviewers. For professional faculty, the department





review committee needs to obtain external review letters of scholarship only if scholarship is a primary area of the faculty member's professional service.

Department chairs and department review committees should allow adequate time for selecting and contacting potential reviewers, conveying materials, and receiving review letters.

**CFACRSP:** Department chairs/school directors and rank and status committees should consider the following when selecting outside reviewers for dossiers and soliciting letters for scholarship:

- Deadlines for the department/school review committee and the department chairs/school directors to select reviewers, extend invitations, and submit materials should provide plenty of lead-time to assure reviews and vitas are obtained from at least three faculty members at well-regarded academic institutions who meet URSP standards (URSP 7.9.6).
- Reference should be made regarding the qualifications of external reviewers.
- Reviewers should be asked to describe the nature of their relationship, if any, with the candidate under review. External reviewers with potential conflicts of interest to the candidate should be avoided.
- External reviewers should represent senior and distinguished, or leading scholars, in comparable academic or research fields to that of the candidate.
- Reviewers should be selected from peer or aspirational institutions of higher education or from prominent departments/institutions in the candidate's area of expertise.
- Reviewers can be selected from institutions of a lesser standard, as long as that reviewer has established themselves as an outstanding scholar and educator within the discipline. The burden of proof rests upon the department and the rank and status committee.
- Reviewers should directly assess the candidate's scholarly or creative productivity and accomplishments relative to standards in the field and in relation to the department/school, college, and university documents.

#### 7.9.7 Review Letters of Citizenship and Professional Service for Professional Faculty

For professional faculty, the department review committee should solicit review letters of a faculty member's citizenship and professional service from those who have closely observed those activities. Except in third-year reviews, external review letters should be sought when a faculty member's citizenship or professional service has extended beyond the university. (See 6.3.) A sample letter to external reviewers is attached as Appendix E.

#### 7.9.8 Department Review Committee's Vote and Report

After evaluating the faculty member's performance, the department review committee will, by majority vote, recommend to grant or deny candidacy, continuing faculty status, or rank advancement. The committee will write a report to the department chair evaluating the faculty member's citizenship, teaching, and scholarship (or citizenship and professional service, for professional faculty), and reporting the committee's vote. A minority report may also be included in the file.

#### 7.9.9 Availability of Committee Report and File

Before the department vote, the committee report and the file will be available to all continuing faculty status faculty and all continuing faculty status track faculty in the department except the



faculty member being reviewed. Exceptions to this provision, allowing a department to restrict access to the file, or to parts of the file, must be approved by the dean and the academic vice president. The contents of the file and all recommendation letters are strictly confidential. Faculty may not make copies of documents in the file, and faculty should not discuss the contents of the file except in appropriate settings with other department faculty members.

#### 7.9.10 Department Vote

The department review committee will report its evaluation and recommendations to the department. The committee will make its presentation in a meeting open to all continuing faculty status faculty. It is strongly recommended that departments invite to this meeting all continuing faculty status track faculty in the department except the faculty member being reviewed, since this process broadens the discussion, helps communicate expectations, and assists faculty who will be evaluated in the future.

Restrictions on the attendance of continuing faculty status track faculty must be approved by the dean and the academic vice president. Only faculty with continuing faculty status may vote in initial and final continuing faculty status decisions, and only faculty with equal or higher rank to that being sought may vote in rank advancement decisions. The voting will be by secret ballot and by majority vote of faculty eligible to vote. The department chair will report the vote in the file. The department discussions are strictly confidential. Only the department chair should inform the candidate of the status of the person's file following the department vote.

**CFACRSP:** All faculty members with appropriate rank and continuing faculty status should have read the file and can vote at the department level.

Department/school faculty serving on the college or university rank and status committees should not abstain from voting at the department/school level and should vote as a faculty member at the department/school level and then as a committee member at the college or university level.

Department chairs/school directors should not abstain from voting with the department/school but will also provide a separate review of the candidate.

#### 7.9.11 Department Chair's Report

After the department vote, the department chair will write an independent evaluation of the faculty member's citizenship, teaching, and scholarship (or citizenship and professional service, for professional faculty) and include it in the file. The report will also assess the faculty member's progress in addressing concerns raised in past annual and rank and status reviews. The chair will then forward the file to the college committee.

**CFACRSP:** It is suggested that the following items be included in the department/school rank and status document and referred to/quoted by the chair/director in their letter as they pertain to the candidate:

- Department/school discipline-specific norms that describe the relative allocation of faculty time, effort, and contributions to citizenship, teaching and scholarship should be stated in the chair/director report. In the case of professional faculty, the allocation relative to citizenship and professional service in teaching and scholarship should be stated in reference to their expectations document.
- Expectations for attendance at meetings, responsiveness to communication, and the quality of interpersonal interactions are explicated. Clarification of



collegiality, relationships with students, staff, administration, adherence to Honor Code or other standards of citizenship are included.

- Circumstances where candidates have unusually heavy administrative service loads, or in which service at the national or international level has been extraordinarily significant, or where types of non-traditional scholarship counts as citizenship rather than scholarship is essential.
- Standard department teaching loads and mentoring expectations should be articulated relative to the candidate's responsibilities. Differing standards for student and peer evaluations based on types of courses with the department/school should be defined (e.g., team teaching, lessons, etc.).
- Guidelines for how student written comments are analyzed and weighted are presented (URSP 3.3.2.B.1, 7.9.4).
- The chair/director should contextualize/clarify what constitutes acceptable peer review and the avenues for scholarship/creative works as they relate to their department/school discipline which can assist reviewers' evaluations at levels above the department/school.

#### 7.9.12 Informing the Faculty Member of a Negative Recommendation

If the department committee, the department faculty or the department chair recommends to deny candidacy, continuing faculty status, or rank advancement, the department chair will inform the faculty member, and explain the reasons for the recommendation, in order to allow the faculty member to withdraw the application. The withdrawal of an application for candidacy or continuing faculty status 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.

#### 7.9.13 Colleges without Departments

In colleges without departments, the college review committee and the dean will perform the department review committee's and the department chair's functions described in this policy.

### 7.10 College Review

#### 7.10.1 College Review Committee

The college review committee is composed of at least three faculty members, all of whom have continuing faculty status. The dean appoints the committee and the committee chair.

**CFACRSP:** The preferred composition of the CFAC committee is to have representation from each department/school within the college. In practice, however, there may be times when 1) a particular department/school may not be able to provide a representative to serve on the committee, and 2) the CFAC dean may appoint more than one representative per department in years when there are a large number of candidates to consider.

The process for appointment typically involves careful consultation between the associate dean and the department chair/school director. Those appointed should have continuing faculty status at BYU, however, it is not required that they have the rank of professor.

To protect the confidentiality of the process, committee members should not discuss any



candidate's file or the CFAC deliberations with individuals who are not members of the committee. Nevertheless, the associate dean serving on the committee may seek clarification about a candidate's file from the department chair/school director. The college committee may also request additional information through the chair/director about the faculty member's work (URSP 7.5).

#### 7.10.2 College Review Committee's Vote and Report

The college review committee will recommend by majority vote to grant or deny candidacy, continuing faculty status, or rank advancement. The committee will write an independent report evaluating the faculty member's citizenship, teaching, and scholarship (or citizenship and professional service, for professional faculty), and reporting the committee's vote. A minority report may also be included in the file.

**CFACRSP:** 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 except in the case of a tie, in which case he or she will vote to break that tie. The associate dean appoints a primary and secondary reader for each candidate's file.

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, and scholarship or citizenship and professional service. 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.

#### 7.10.3 Dean's Report

After the college review committee's vote, the dean will write an independent evaluation of the faculty member's citizenship, teaching, and scholarship (or citizenship and professional service, for professional faculty) and include it in the file. The dean will then forward the file to the appropriate Faculty Council on Rank and Status.

#### 7.10.4 Informing the Faculty Member of a Negative Recommendation

If the college committee or the dean recommends to deny candidacy, continuing faculty status, or rank advancement, the department chair and the dean or an associate dean will inform the faculty member, and explain the reasons for the recommendation, in order to allow the faculty member to withdraw the application. The withdrawal of an application for candidacy or continuing faculty status 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 appropriate Faculty Council on Rank and Status.

**CFACRSP:** The CFAC candidate will also be informed when their file has been advanced with a positive recommendation from the college to the university level.

#### 7.11 University Review

**CFACRSP:** Following the deliberations at all levels of review, including the university level, and after the faculty member has received their notification from the university, faculty members will receive written and verbal feedback from a CFAC dean and their department chair/school director.



The purpose of this feedback is to be transparent about the faculty member's work and to explain how their work was perceived by peers from inside and in some cases outside of the university, consistent with any confidentiality obligations. Feedback should inform a faculty member's work towards the next steps in the CFS and/or promotion process.

#### 7.11.1 **Professorial and Professional Faculty Councils on Rank and Status** (updated September 30, 2013)

The Professorial Faculty Council on Rank and Status is composed of a minimum of eight and a maximum of twelve professorial faculty members, all of whom have continuing faculty status. It reviews the applications of professorial faculty. A quorum consists of at least three-fourths of the appointed members, rounded up to the nearest whole number of members. The Professional Faculty Council on Rank and Status is composed of six professional faculty members, all of whom have continuing faculty status. It reviews the applications of professional faculty. A quorum consists of four of the six members. The associate academic vice president for faculty serves ex officio as chair of each council, voting only in case of tie votes. The academic vice president appoints each council and the vice-chair of each council.

#### 7.11.2 **Faculty Council's Vote**

The Faculty Council will recommend, by majority vote, to grant or deny candidacy, continuing faculty status, or rank advancement, and will forward its recommendations to the academic vice president.

#### 7.11.3 **Recommendations that Differ from College Recommendations**

If the Faculty Council's recommendation differs from that of the dean or the college review committee, the Faculty Council may ask the dean for clarification or for additional information for the purpose of further consideration. The Faculty Council will then forward its recommendation to the academic vice president.

#### 7.11.4 **Academic Vice President's Recommendation**

After considering the Faculty Council's recommendation, the academic vice president will make an independent recommendation to the university president. This recommendation, informed by the recommendations produced by the department, college, and university level review bodies, is the university's official recommendation to the president. If the academic vice president's recommendation is against candidacy for continuing faculty status, the granting of continuing faculty status, or rank advancement, the candidate will be informed of the recommendation by means of a letter prepared and delivered to him or her by the associate academic vice president for faculty. The letter will state the recommendation, and summarize the reasons upon which the recommendation is based. Upon receipt of the letter recommending denial of continuing faculty status, candidacy for continuing faculty status, or rank advancement, the candidate may withdraw his or her application, request an independent examination of the academic vice president's recommendation as specified in Section 8, or allow the recommendation to go forward for the president's final decision without comment. Withdrawal of an application for continuing faculty status or candidacy for continuing faculty status constitutes resigning employment at the university at the end of the current contract period (See Section 7.10.4).

#### 7.11.5 **President's Decision**



The president, after receiving the recommendation of the academic vice president and the results of any independent examination (See section 8), has the exclusive authority, in the exercise of the president's sole discretion, to decide whether to grant candidacy, continuing faculty status, or rank advancement. The president also has the exclusive authority, in the exercise of the president's sole discretion, to determine whether the relevant standards have been met and whether the university will need the faculty member's particular contributions on a continuing basis. All determinations in the Rank and Status process other than the president's decision are only recommendations. The president will give the faculty member written notice of the decision. Copies of the letter will be sent to the academic vice president, the associate academic vice president for faculty, the dean and the department chair.

## **8. INDEPENDENT EXAMINATION OF ACADEMIC VICE PRESIDENT'S RECOMMENDATION**

**8.1 Filing a Request for an Independent Examination.** A faculty member may request an independent examination of the academic vice president's recommendation to deny candidacy, continuing faculty status, or rank advancement. A recommendation to delay a review for continuing faculty status or candidacy for continuing faculty status cannot receive an independent examination; however, a second recommendation to delay the same proposed action may be examined. A request for an independent examination may be based on either or both of two grounds: 1) that, given the information available in the file, the academic vice president's recommendation was unreasonable, or 2) that a substantial procedural error occurred in the rank and status process (see section 8.9).

To request an independent examination of the academic vice president's recommendation, the faculty member must, within ten calendar days after receiving the letter stating the academic vice president's decision, deliver written notice to the academic vice president of the request. The faculty member may select from the faculty an advocate to assist in the preparation and presentation of the materials to be presented to the examining panel.

### **8.2 Examining Panel**

The president will appoint an examining panel composed of two members of the Academic Vice President's Council (but not the associate academic vice president for faculty) and three faculty members who have continuing faculty status. The president will designate one of the members of the Academic Vice President's Council to chair the panel. The faculty members of the examining panel will be drawn from a pool of faculty nominated by their college deans as potential panel members. The faculty pool will be refreshed as needed as members accept other assignments or leave the university. Any member of the pool may serve on one or more examining panels during an academic year.

### **8.3 Copy of the File**

The associate academic vice president for faculty will give the faculty member and the university representative a copy of the file. The academic vice president shall appoint a faculty member or administrator to serve as university representative to prepare and present the university's response to the case presented in the independent examination. The names and other identifying elements will be removed from the review letters of citizenship, teaching,



---

scholarship, and professional service. Other information which the associate academic vice president for faculty determines in his or her discretion to be confidential may be provided in summarized form with identifying elements removed, provided that the information fairly reflects the substance of the confidential matters.

#### 8.4 Confidentiality

The information provided to the faculty member and the university representative will be held strictly confidential and will not be disclosed except as follows:

- A. The faculty member may share the information with the faculty member's advocate, and the university representative may share the information with such university employees as are reasonably necessary in preparing a case for the independent examination.
- B. If the faculty member or the university representative determines that information must be disclosed to witnesses to adequately present the case or the response, the faculty member or the university representative will request permission from the chair of the panel. The number of witnesses should be kept to a minimum. Witnesses will submit their testimony only in writing. Violations of confidentiality may be considered in the independent examination and may be dealt with as the panel deems appropriate.

#### 8.5 The Faculty Member's Statement

Within 30 calendar days after receiving the file, the faculty member will provide a written statement to the chair of the panel and the university representative stating his or her case. The statement will:

- A. Outline all claims on which the request for the independent examination is based.
- B. Outline all arguments and information that the faculty member wishes to be considered.
- C. List all witnesses whose statements are to be included in the independent examination.
- D. Include copies of all documents (except those already in the file) included in the independent examination.

#### 8.6 Response Statement

Within 30 calendar days after receiving the faculty member's statement, the university representative will provide a written response statement to the chair of the panel and the faculty member. The statement will:

- A. Outline all responses to the claims on which the case for requesting for the independent examination is based.
- B. Outline all arguments and information upon which the recommendation of the academic vice president was based.
- C. List all witnesses whose statements are to be included in the independent examination.
- D. Include copies of all documents included in the response to the faculty member's case.



---

### 8.7 Examination Meeting

The chair of the panel will provide to each member of the panel the complete rank and status file and the documents prepared by the faculty member and by the university representative. Only members of the panel will attend the meeting. The faculty member and the university representative will be invited to appear at the hearing to answer questions from the panel and to clarify the case they each prepared. The faculty member's advocate may attend during the faculty member's appearance before the panel. The faculty member will decide whether he or she, or the advocate, will take the lead in answering questions and clarifying for the panel. The amount of time allotted to the questions and clarifications will be limited, balanced for each side, and determined by the chair of the panel. Any exceptions to this process will be granted at the discretion of the chair of the panel. The panel's recommendation will be rendered on the basis of the documents provided and the case as clarified (See 8.9).

### 8.8 Additional Information

At the discretion of the chair the panel may request, receive, or obtain additional information from any source, including information not considered by other reviewers (See Section 7.5).

### 8.9 Presumptions

The panel will examine the academic vice president's recommendation with the following presumptions:

- A. In considering the substantive merits of the case, the panel will presume that the academic vice president's recommendation is reasonable and justifiable. Therefore, the faculty member has the burden of persuasion to demonstrate that the academic vice president's recommendation is without reasonable basis in light of all the information presented in the rank and status process.
- B. Within this policy and the independent examination, a procedural error is defined as a violation of this policy and the procedures it specifies. A procedural error occurs when a procedure required by policy is either not carried out, or is not carried out according to policy and is of such a severe nature as to cause substantial prejudice and deny a fair review. Intrusions into the process by persons external to the process may also constitute procedural errors. Disagreement about a decision or evaluation resulting from a procedure does not constitute grounds for claims of procedural error. If the case for requesting an independent examination is based on a claim of procedural error, the faculty member has the burden of persuasion to demonstrate that:
  1. A procedural error occurred.
  2. Because of the procedural error the faculty member suffered substantial prejudice and was denied a fair review.
  3. Upon full consideration of the case, including any information that was excluded because of a procedural error, the granting of candidacy, continuing faculty status, or rank advancement would be warranted.

### 8.10 Examining Panel's Recommendation

After considering the faculty member's case and the university's response, the panel will recommend by majority vote that the academic vice president's recommendation be sustained or reversed. The panel may make other recommendations regarding the case. Within 10 calendar days of the meeting the panel will give its recommendation and its reasons in writing to





---

the president, the academic vice president, the associate academic vice president for faculty, the faculty member, and the university representative, the dean, and the department chair.

#### **8.11 President's Decision**

After receiving the panel's recommendation, the president will decide whether to grant or deny candidacy, continuing faculty status, or rank advancement, or to delay the review. The president has the exclusive authority, in the exercise of the president's sole discretion, to make the decision. The president also has the exclusive authority, in the exercise of the president's sole discretion, to determine whether the relevant standards have been met and whether the university will need the faculty member's particular contributions on a continuing basis. All determinations in the Rank and Status process other than the president's decision are only recommendations. The president will give the faculty member written notice of the decision. Copies of the letter will be sent to the academic vice president, the associate academic vice president for faculty, the dean and the department chair.

#### **8.12 Exhaustion of Remedies and Waiver of Claims**

A faculty member may not initiate civil litigation or civil administrative remedies against the university or its employees, agents, officers, or trustees until all the remedies provided by these procedures have been exhausted. Failure to pursue an independent examination within the stated deadlines or to exhaust the remedies provided by these procedures will constitute a waiver of the faculty member's right to pursue any claim arising out of the university's actions in the matter, unless the right to pursue a statutory claim is preserved by law.



**APPENDIX A:  
CHECKLIST OF MATERIALS TO INCLUDE IN FILE FOR PROFESSORIAL FACULTY**

Please include the following material in the file in the order below. See section 7.2 regarding materials to include in the file. See section 7.4 regarding the size of the file.

Nomination Form

Curriculum Vitae

Reports from Review Committees, Department Chair, and Dean

1. Deans's Report. (7.10.3)
2. College review committee's report. (7.10.2)
3. Department chair's report. (7.9.11)
4. Report of department vote. (7.9.10)
5. Department review committee's report. (7.9.8)

Personal Statement

1. Self-assessment of citizenship, teaching, and scholarship (also address any areas of concern raised in the last review; in the final continuing faculty status review, also include the letter from the initial continuing faculty status review). (3.2, 3.3, 3.4, 4.3, 7.11.6)

Citizenship (3.2)

1. A description of committee assignments and other citizenship activities inside the university.
2. A description of citizenship activities in the profession. (3.2.2.H)
3. A description of other citizenship activities. (3.2.2)
4. Review letters of citizenship activities. (3.2.3, 7.9.3)



---

### Teaching (3.3)

1. A list of courses taught by semester, with enrollment numbers (identify new courses developed). (3.3.2.A.1, 3.3.2.A.2)
2. A list of graduate students supervised (indicate whether you were the committee chair or a committee member). (3.3.2.A.5)
3. A description of other teaching activities. (3.3.2.A)
4. A few illustrative copies of syllabi, handouts, assignments, examinations, etc. (3.3.2.G.1)
5. A description of steps taken to evaluate and improve teaching. (3.3.2.D)
6. A description of products of high quality teaching and mentoring. (3.3.2.F)
7. Student evaluations and a typescript of student comments. (3.3.2.B, 7.9.4)
8. At least two peer evaluations of teaching. (3.3.2.C, 7.9.5)
9. A list of teaching awards. (3.3.2.E.1)

### Scholarship (3.4)

1. A list of all scholarly and creative works (indicate whether each work is peer-reviewed, and describe your contribution to jointly authored works). (3.4.4.1, 3.4.4.2)
2. The three best examples of scholarship and a brief explanation why they were selected (all other scholarship will be available for review in the department office). (7.3)
3. Grants for research or creative works. (3.4.4.2.F)
4. A list of awards or recognition for scholarship. (3.4.4.2.I)
5. At least three external review letters of scholarship and a copy of the waiver letter. (7.9.2, 7.9.6)



---

**APPENDIX B:  
CHECKLIST OF MATERIALS TO INCLUDE IN FILE FOR PROFESSIONAL FACULTY**

Please include the following materials in the file in the order listed below. See section 7.2 regarding materials to include in the file. See section 7.4 regarding the size of the file.

Nomination Form

Curriculum Vitae

Reports from Review Committees, Department Chair, and Dean

1. Dean's report. (7.10.3)
2. College review committee's report. (7.10.2)
3. Department chair's report. (7.9.11)
4. Faculty position description or other statement of expectations regarding the faculty member's specific assignments. (6.5)
5. Report of department vote. (7.9.10)
6. Department review committee's report. (7.9.8)

Personal Statement

1. Self-assessment of citizenship and professional service (also address any areas of concern raised in the last review; in the final continuing faculty status review, also include the letter from the initial continuing faculty status review). (3.2, 4.3, 6.5-6.5.5.2, 7.11.6)

Citizenship (3.2)

1. A description of committee assignments and other citizenship activities inside the university. (3.2.2)
2. A description of citizenship activities in the profession. (3.2.2.H)
3. A description of other citizenship activities. (3.2.2)
4. Review letters of citizenship activities. (3.2.3, 6.3, 7.9.3)



---

**Professional Service (include those which apply):****Teaching (3.3)**

1. A list of courses taught by semester, with enrollment numbers (identify new courses developed). (3.3.2.A.1, 3.3.2.A.2)
2. A list of graduate students supervised (indicate whether you were the committee chair or a committee member). (3.3.2.A.5)
3. A description of other teaching activities. (3.3.2.A)
4. A few illustrative copies of syllabi, handouts, assignments, examinations, etc. (3.3.2.G.1)
5. A description of steps taken to evaluate and improve teaching. (3.3.2.D)
6. A description of products of high quality teaching and mentoring. (3.3.2.F)
7. Student evaluations and a typescript of student comments. (3.3.2.D, 7.9.4)
8. At least two peer evaluations of teaching. (3.3.2.B, 6.3, 7.9.5)
9. A list of teaching awards. (3.3.2.E.1)

**Scholarship (3.4)**

1. A list of all scholarly and creative works (indicate whether each work is peer-reviewed, and describe your contribution to jointly authored works). (3.4.4.1, 3.4.4.2)
2. The three best examples of scholarship and a brief explanation why they were selected (all other scholarship will be available for review in the department office). (7.3)
3. Grants for research or creative works. (3.4.4.2.F)
4. A list of awards or recognition for scholarship. (3.4.4.2.I)
5. At least three external review letters of scholarship (only if scholarship is a primary area of professional service) and a copy of the waiver letter. (6.3, 7.9.2, 7.9.6)



**APPENDIX C: WAIVER**

Date

To Prospective Reviewers:

As part of the review process for continuing faculty status or rank advancement, I recognize that letters of evaluation will be requested from supervisors, peers, or students. For your information, the following represents my choice regarding the waiver of my rights to see those letters.

I waive the right to see the letters of evaluation requested in the review process.

\_\_\_\_\_  
Signed by Faculty Member

I do not waive the right to see the letters of evaluation requested in the review process.

\_\_\_\_\_  
Signed by Faculty Member



**APPENDIX D:  
SAMPLE LETTER TO EXTERNAL REVIEWERS OF SCHOLARSHIP**

Date Addressee

Dear Professor \_\_\_\_\_ :

Dr. John/Mary Doe is being reviewed in his/her sixth year of service to determine whether his/her performance merits continuing faculty status and rank advancement to associate professor or whether his/her appointment at the university will be terminated [or, advancement to full professor]. The process will begin this fall semester.

Our policy requires evaluations from knowledgeable peers in the academic community. While our evaluation considers all aspects of performance--citizenship, teaching, and scholarly and creative work--we are interested in your assessment of his/her scholarship, particularly how the quality, originality, soundness of methodology, and productivity compare to that of other scholars at this stage of their careers. Your evaluation should also describe your relationship with Dr. Doe.

We need your assessment by ( date ). It would be helpful, however, if you could respond very briefly at your earliest convenience by phone (xxx-xxx-xxxx), fax (xxx-xxx-xxxx), e-mail (address), or letter to let me know that we can count on receiving your assessment by that time. [We offer an honorarium of \$ \_\_\_\_\_ for this service. Please include your social security number so that we can make arrangements for the honorarium payment.]

Enclosed for your consideration are a copy of Dr. Doe's curriculum vitae, information about his/her teaching assignment, samples of his/her scholarly work, and a summary of our university and department standards for assessing scholarship. Also included is a form indicating Dr. Doe's choice regarding the waiver of his/her rights to see the external review letters. The faculty member will see your letter only if he/she retains the right to review letters. However, if there is a negative decision and the faculty member appeals it, his/her entire file will be made available to him/her, although with names and other identifying factors removed.

If you have any questions, please do not hesitate to contact me. Thank you for your help and consideration.

Sincerely,



---

**APPENDIX E:  
SAMPLE LETTER TO EXTERNAL REVIEWERS OF PROFESSIONAL FACULTY**

Date Addressee

Dear \_\_\_\_\_ :

Dr. John/Mary Doe is being reviewed in his/her sixth year of service to determine whether his/her performance merits continuing faculty status and rank advancement to the associate level or whether his/her appointment at the university will be terminated [or, advancement to full \_\_\_\_\_]. The process will begin this fall semester.

Our policy requires evaluations from knowledgeable peers in the academic and professional community. While our evaluation considers all aspects of performance, we are interested in your assessment of his/her contributions in the area of \_\_\_\_\_. Your evaluation should also describe your relationship with Dr. Doe.

We need your assessment by ( date \_\_\_\_ ). It would be helpful, however, if you could respond very briefly at your earliest convenience by phone (xxx-xxx-xxxx), fax (xxx-xxx-xxxx), e-mail (address), or letter to let me know that we can count on receiving your assessment by that time. [We offer an honorarium of \$ \_\_\_\_\_ for this service. Please include your social security number so that we can make arrangements for the honorarium payment.]

Enclosed for your consideration are a copy of Dr. Doe's curriculum vitae, information about his/her professional assignment, and a summary of our university and department standards for assessing professional service in his/her field. Also included is a form indicating Dr. Doe's choice regarding the waiver of his/her rights to see the external review letters. The faculty member will see your letter only if he/she retains the right to review letters. However, if there is a negative decision and the faculty member appeals it, his/her entire file will be made available to him/her, although with names and other identifying factors removed.

If you have any questions, please do not hesitate to contact me. Thank you for your help and consideration.

Sincerely,