

DEPARTMENT OF DANCE PROCEDURES, GUIDELINES AND CRITERIA FOR REAPPOINTMENT, PROMOTION, CONFERRAL OF PERMANENT TENURE, TENURED FACULTY PERFORMANCE REVIEW, AND ANNUAL REVIEW

As revised by faculty and voted (3 for; 2 against) 9/7/17

The Department of Dance adopted its Procedures, Guidelines and Criteria for Reappointment, Promotion, Conferral of Permanent Tenure, Tenured Faculty Performance Review and Annual Review in accordance with the following documents: The Code of the Board of Governors of The University of North Carolina (The Code); Tenure Policies, Regulations, and Procedures of the University of North Carolina at Charlotte as currently in effect (TPRP-UNCC); and the College of Arts+Architecture Procedures for Reappointment, Promotion, and Conferral of Permanent Tenure (CoAA-RPT). If any part of the above-named documents are found to be in conflict, The Code, TPRP-UNCC, or CoAA-RPT shall prevail.

The Department of Dance recognizes work in the areas of research (creative, scholarly, and scholarship of teaching and learning), teaching, and service. Reappointment, tenure, and promotion dossiers in dance, like those presented by faculty across the university, must put forward a clear argument for the aesthetic, pedagogical, and/or intellectual contributions of the research agenda and appropriate achievement in teaching and service. Dance faculty believe, however, that the arts and scholarship that deals with art, identity, and the body may be marginalized and/ or underrepresented within the university and that our dossiers may need additional clarification to be legible to others. Further, dance faculty members may themselves identify as marginalized and/or underrepresented and this may help shape their professional work. With this in mind, we want to reinforce our interests in diversity and inclusion and note issues that are of particular concern to dance faculty. To do this, we have consulted and referred to the following: “The Work of Arts Faculties in Higher Education,” published by the National Office for Arts Accrediting Associations (1993, Revised February 2009); “Promotion and Tenure Procedures for Applied Arts Faculty-Custom Research Brief” (May 21, 2010, University Leadership Council); and “Women’s Studies Scholarship: A Statement by the National Women’s Studies Association Field Leadership Working Group.” See www.nwsa.org.

The University Leadership Council brief on research practices for applied arts faculty notes that:

In all cases, the criteria for assessing the quality of research, scholarship, or artistic activity will be the extent to which the evidence demonstrates:

- 1) a contribution to the advancement of knowledge or creative expression, 2) the enhancement of quality in the development of professional practice, 3) a contribution to

teaching effectiveness, and 4) an acknowledged respect by one's professional peers at a national level and international level. (p. 5)

In dance, "research, scholarship, or artistic activity" is rarely discrete and often employs disparate and entwining methodologies and delivery methods, among them bodily, creative, pedagogical, qualitative, and critical research practices enacted through performance, choreography, design, master teaching, community engagement, professional outreach, and publication. "Acknowledged respect by one's professional peers" in dance occurs in many forms including peer-reviewed publication, use of one's research to inform others' professional work, and invited evaluation appearing in the reappointment, tenure, and promotion dossier.

"Women's Studies Scholarship" is helpful and appropriate because of the critical work pursued by some faculty but moreover because of the central role women's and gender studies has had in theorizing about the operation of many kinds of difference and in creating practical change within institutions. Reappointment, promotion, and tenure deliberations and decisions in the Department of Dance should keep in mind the unique circumstances of candidates under review and the potential impact of such situations on candidates' work and evaluations. "Women's Studies Scholarship" includes examples:

Institutionalized obstacles, such as pay inequities, asymmetrical workloads, and gendered/ racialized service expectations (i.e., who does the institutional 'housekeeping' or 'reproductive labor,' that is, the often unrewarded work required to sustain people and institutions) should also be accounted for in evaluation of a candidate's contributions. For example, as John W. Curtis notes in an American Association of University Professors reports, 'Persistent Inequality: Gender and Academic Employment': 'The culmination of a faculty career, full professor status, remains an elusive goal for women. At only 28 percent of all full professor appointments, women are still outnumbered more than two to one at the most senior rank' (2011). Citing Misra et al (2011), Curtis also documents that 'disproportionate time spent in teaching and service was a significant obstacle for women associate professors to attaining full professor rank.'

We recognize that annual reviews, workload documents, and the chair's letter that accompanies the dossier are important in accounting for institutional and departmental obstacles and inequities.

I. DANCE DEPARTMENT REVIEW COMMITTEE

A. Function:

The Department Review Committee (DRC) shall make written recommendations on cases for reappointment, promotion, conferral of permanent tenure, tenured faculty performance review, and annual chair review. The DRC shall also advise the department chair on the reappointment of lecturers and senior lecturers and annual review for all full time faculty. In addition, the DRC may draft documents or

make recommendations pertaining to personnel issues as charged by the dean and/or department chair.

B. Confidentiality:

Deliberations by the DRC concerning reappointment, promotion, conferral of permanent tenure, tenured faculty performance review, and annual review for a particular faculty member and/or chair shall be held in closed session. Documents submitted or created in connection with these processes and the information contained therein shall be treated as confidential personnel information. Confidential records and information shall not be disclosed to or discussed with any person except those persons: 1) participating in the review as provided in these policies; 2) required or permitted to be consulted in accord with the requirements of department, college, or university policies; or 3) permitted access to such documents by law.

C. Composition:

The DRC is comprised of three tenured faculty elected from a slate of at least four candidates. Election takes place in the spring semester, usually at the last faculty meeting of each academic year, via secret ballot. Only tenured and tenure track faculty are eligible to vote for three candidates from the selected slate. The three with the highest number of votes will comprise the DRC, which will elect the committee chair. In the event that the department has a lack of eligible faculty to conduct elections: 1) the department chair may appoint the DRC committee members and, when required, 2) the Dean of the College of Arts+Architecture will, in consultation with the department chair, appoint a DRC committee member from another unit within the college. Dance faculty will typically not be asked to serve more than two consecutive terms. However, in the case outlined above, it may be necessary to ask faculty to serve more than two consecutive terms. Non-dance faculty may serve only one term. Faculty members being reviewed for promotion are ineligible to serve on the DRC.

The Tenured Faculty Performance Review Policy states “The department review committee or a special committee elected by the tenured members of the department, shall conduct the review of the faculty member's performance. The committee shall be elected according to the department, college and university procedures” (see www.provost.uncc.edu). Unless the Department of Dance appoints a separate “special committee” to conduct a tenured faculty performance review, a member of the DRC under such review must be excused from the committee during this review process.

II. PROCEDURES FOR REAPPOINTMENT, PROMOTION AND CONFERRAL OF PERMANENT TENURE, TENURED FACULTY PERFORMANCE REVIEW, ANNUAL REVIEW

A. Preparation:

A faculty member under review is expected to represent career achievement in the areas of research, teaching, and service by maintaining an accurate and complete curriculum vita. Here and throughout this document, “research” indicates faculty professional work across the areas of creative research, scholarly research, and/or the scholarship of teaching and learning. A candidate for personnel review is also required to create a personal commentary addressing his or her research, teaching, and service as outlined by the dean. The purpose of the statement is to explain the coherence and significance of the candidate’s professional effort to colleagues within and beyond the Department of Dance. The statement should reflect on accomplishments during the period of review, contextualize those accomplishments by referring to the work of researchers with similar interests and research programs, discuss present activities and work in progress, and detail future plans. This commentary is an important guide to the candidate’s review file, and the DRC will study it closely in the process of evaluation. It is also critically important to colleagues outside of dance who will participate in college or university levels of review.

Tenure track faculty members normally stand for reappointment during the third year of an initial, four-year contract. Presuming successful reappointment, the review for permanent tenure and promotion to associate professor normally occurs during the sixth year of appointment. The “tenure clock” may occasionally be accelerated or temporarily halted under special circumstances, the former if a faculty member comes to the university with time in grade elsewhere, the latter if a faculty member receives family medical leave or encounters other circumstances that may interrupt full-time employment. The tenure clock may not be extended in the case of research or professional leave. Such activities benefit the candidate on their path to tenure or promotion and are considered normative aspects of academic careers that contribute to the production of research.

All faculty members applying for tenure and/or promotion will assemble a representative research portfolio that will be used for external evaluation by recognized academics in the candidate’s field. Mentors and/or experienced faculty within the department may assist with suggested formats and specific materials for presentation.

The chair will create a list of possible outside reviewers as follows:

1. The candidate will be asked to submit the names of five tenured academics; their work in specific fields of dance study must represent the candidate’s research. Excluded from this list should be those who would have an obvious conflict of interest, such as but not limited to, dissertation committee members, collaborators, and co-authors, past or present.
2. The DRC will be asked to provide a short list of possible external reviewers.
3. The chair, from professional knowledge and the knowledge of experts in the candidate’s area of expertise, will generate a short list of possible external reviewers.

4. Using these lists the chair will identify and then contact four to six external reviewers. This group will include at least one reviewer proposed by the candidate. University guidelines require no fewer than three external reviewers.

B. Procedures for Conferral of Tenure with Promotion or Promotion to Full Professor

1. The dean shall notify, in writing, faculty members for whom review is mandatory and shall inform other faculty of their right to be reviewed for full professor during spring semester within each academic year. Those faculty will be informed of required due dates for submission of materials. (See CoAA Reappointment, Promotion, and Tenure Calendar.) In the case of promotion to full professor and/or consideration for the conferral of permanent tenure, the department chair will provide due dates for the candidate's list of potential external reviewers and the research portfolio that will be sent out for external review.
2. Those faculty requiring or requesting review shall submit the following materials to the dean by the announced due date:
 - a. Curriculum vita with appropriate citation and documentation.
 - b. A teaching portfolio which includes self-evaluation of teaching, course syllabi, comments from student evaluations, and selected artifacts from classes.
 - c. A portfolio of research materials. It is the task of the candidate to articulate a case that is fully documented and which includes information about the recognized quality of the venues and the manner in which research has been peer reviewed. The due date for the portfolio may be prior to that specified by the dean due to the need to send these materials to external reviewers. Two portfolios will be submitted: a research, and usually abbreviated teaching and service portfolio, in early summer, for submission to outside readers and a full portfolio by the dean's due date, usually the first day of school. Digital portfolios are required by the College of Arts+Architecture.
3. The department chair shall provide the DRC the information listed below since the candidate's most recent personnel action. In the case of promotion to full professor, the department chair will provide these documents for the previous three to five years. Again, digital portfolios are required by the College of Arts+Architecture. The following materials will be submitted separately to the dean's office for inclusion in the dossier.
 - a. Records of student course evaluations (numerical and narrative) since the individual's appointment, reappointment, promotion, or tenure, whichever is most recent.
 - b. Annual reviews and faculty response when applicable.
 - c. Peer teaching evaluations.

- d. Letters documenting and/or evaluating research, teaching, or service activities.
 - e. Department chair solicited external performance evaluations requested during the five years leading up to the tenure decision.
 - f. At least three external review letters requested specifically for the tenure materials. Once the review is complete all letters are available to the candidate upon request.
4. A separate dossier that excludes items usually supplied by the head (annual review, peer teaching evaluations, student evaluations) will be prepared for viewing by non-DRC tenured faculty. Currently, the dean's office prepares that dossier and supplies it to the department chair and DRC chair for distribution.
5. Line of Review
- a. The candidate submits the required materials to the dean who forwards them to the department chair. The materials are then passed on to the DRC with letters of transmittal.
 - b. Tenured faculty may review the abbreviated dossier (as described above) and submit comments on the case. All tenured associate and full professors may comment on reappointments and submissions for associate professor with tenure. Only full professors may comment on submissions for full professor. Written responses are to be addressed to the DRC, signed, and delivered to the DRC chair in a sealed envelope with signature across the sealed flap. Letters will be appended to the DRC recommendation and continue to move forward as the case advances. The DRC will set a due date.
 - c. Comments should reflect RPT guidelines
 - d. The DRC conducts its review and provides its recommendations in writing to the department chair.
 - e. The department chair conducts his/her review.
 - f. The department chair informs the candidate, in writing, of his/her recommendation.
 - g. If the department chair recommendation is positive, the chair shall, after consulting with the assembled DRC, submit the following to the Dean of the College of Arts+Architecture: 1) their determination and rationale; 2) the recommendation(s) and rationale(s) of the DRC; and 3) the faculty member's dossier. After receipt of these materials the dean shall deliver them to the College Review Committee (CRC).

- h. If the department chair determines not to reappoint, promote, or confer permanent tenure for a faculty member under review, s/he shall meet with the faculty member to explain the faculty member's right of rebuttal and to provide him or her with a copy of the chair's determination and its rationale as well as a copy of the recommendation(s) and rationale(s) of the DRC. Within ten business days after this meeting, the faculty member may submit to the dean and the chair his or her written rebuttal to the chair's determination. Upon receipt of the rebuttal, or, if the faculty member does not submit a rebuttal at the end of 10 business days, the chair shall submit: 1) his or her determination and rationale; 2) recommendation(s) and rationale(s) of the DRC; 3) the faculty member's rebuttal (if any); and 4) the faculty member's RPT dossier to the dean. (See also CoAA Procedures for Reappointment, Promotion, and Conferral of Permanent Tenure).

III. DANCE DEPARTMENT GENERAL CRITERIA FOR REAPPOINTMENT, PROMOTION, AND CONFERRAL OF PERMANENT TENURE

Introduction:

Dance faculty at all professorial ranks are expected to demonstrate competence in the three areas of accomplishment defined by the university: research, teaching, and service. The department recognizes that, because of the diversity of its faculty and the range of their professional expertise, individual programs of teaching, research, and service will take a variety of directions. In general, however, competence in research means a program of work that contributes to the production of new knowledge in dance, at levels of quality and quantity established in the discipline. Competence in teaching means proficiency in the classroom, from the preparation of instructional materials to the mentoring of students in alternative educational settings, as demonstrated in a candidate's teaching portfolio and as measured by indices of student course evaluations and peer review. Competence in service means effective contributions to the administrative and governance efforts of the department, college, and university, together with external professional and community work, as appropriate to an individual's rank, expertise, and experience.

At each level of review, the quality of a candidate's aggregate achievement must be substantiated by means of objective documentation and peer assessment. The general indicators of professional success are: 1) positive trajectory, which means that the candidate's research demonstrates steady and continuing development, as measured by frequency, rate, and quality, as well as teaching effectiveness and responsible service activities; 2) breadth of scope, which means that a candidate's accomplishments and reputation spread over time from local to national and/or international venues, as measured by publication in peer reviewed journals or presses, opportunities to perform, choreograph, design, or direct with recognized companies, and invitations to speak, read, coach, teach, consult, or engage in professional service beyond the campus; and

3) positive comparative evaluation, which means that the candidate enjoys the recognition of her or his peers as measured by reviews, letters of recommendation, honors or awards, written critiques, citations, grants, juried or refereed performances, and invitations.

Candidates whose primary work is creative research will receive tenure and/or promotion credit for research that meets the standards articulated in III A; candidates whose primary work is scholarly research will receive tenure and/or promotion credit for research that meets the standards articulated in III B; and candidates whose primary work is in the scholarship of teaching and learning will receive tenure and/or promotion credit for research that meets the standards articulated in III C. Candidates may also meet a combination of the standards listed in III A , B, and C. Teaching and service activities may evidence or support a candidate's research concerns and this should also be discussed. "Women's Studies Scholarship" (pg. 13) contains the idea that, academics have . . . long understood the false divides among the traditional categories of scholarship, teaching, and service. However, assessment measures for promotion and tenure often approach these as separate activities. This continuum needs to be more adequately accounted for in assessing candidates. For example, teaching and community engagement may be intertwined and also generate new ways of approaching scholarship.

A mix of professional accomplishments and measures of professional success is desirable, and it is the burden of a candidate, in consultation with the chair, to explain in her or his personal statement how the complete body of research illustrates the candidate's strengths, furthers his or her career goals, and reveals a coherent plan for growth.

A. Creative Research In Dance

Creative research can be an emergent, integrated, collaborative process which often engages historical, technical, or other research, and brings together disparate practices including choreography, coaching, scene design, costume design, lighting design, and sound design. The resulting achievements are diverse in character and may include live performance, master teaching, film and video, or digital artifacts such as blogs. The department accepts the inherent complexity of documenting creative research and allows appropriate latitude, consistent with professional guidelines, in the range of artifacts, including but not limited to choreographic notes, teaching plans, sketches, photographs, DVDs, peer reviews, and public recognition. Judging creative research is equally complex. Hence, when evaluating the creative work of a candidate for promotion and/or tenure, the department appreciates that the candidate's contributions are legitimately assessed both in and of themselves and in the context of the success of the process as a whole. The candidate's work need not be singled out to be credited for the success of a given project. However, it is the candidate's responsibility to clearly articulate their role in collaborative or group projects. All creative research must be peer reviewed or otherwise appropriately critiqued. Its success might be established through letters of evaluation from collaborators addressing various stages of a project as well as peer review.

1. Creative research and significance in any field of dance expertise might include:
 - a. Invited work successfully undertaken in an exceptional venue such as a Nationally or internationally recognized dance company, festival, or professional conference.
 - b. Adjudicated and/or invited work successfully undertaken in other substantial, off-campus venues.
 - c. Self-produced work successfully undertaken in substantial, off-campus venues.
 - d. Work successfully produced on campus, provided it is not part of a teaching load.
 - e. Work successfully produced in or disseminated through electronic media.
 - f. Work successfully presented on panels and programs of professional organizations and through residencies or opportunities to master teach or lead intensive workshops for dance professionals.
2. The DRC's judgment regarding "distinction" and "professional impact" in creative research depends on a variety of conventional benchmarks established in the discipline of dance and in the past practice of the university.
 - a. A candidate's work should describe a history of sustained productivity overtime. All records of artistic accomplishment, including those compiled prior to employment at the university, are counted in the review, but there is an expectation that the candidate will have concluded work at this institution, consistent with the benchmark of sustained productivity.
 - b. While the quantity of professional work does not by itself indicate quality or impact, it is reasonable to assume that candidates will average two new and significant off-campus creative activities per year during the period leading to tenure and promotion review.
 - c. A candidate should demonstrate the ability to attract invitations to work in substantial venues, as described above.
 - d. External peer reviews of specific performances are an essential indicator of significant accomplishment, especially written evaluations by colleagues in the area of a candidate's particular expertise, other dance professionals, or members of a production team.
 - e. Adjudication reports from regional or national festivals and reviews by professional critics are also useful indicators.
 - f. Repeated engagements in a substantial venue are a particularly noteworthy indicator of successful work.
 - g. Invitations or commissions to work for professional companies, colleges, universities, and/or institutions are a measure of distinction.
 - h. Inclusion in competitions or exhibits, especially those that are juried, also indicates growing reputation.
 - i. Awards, honors, and prizes offer helpful testimony of artistic accomplishment and should be listed in the curriculum vitae and explained in the personal commentary.

- j. Awards of externally sponsored funding, together with a record of successful grant proposal writing, are valuable credentials and should be accurately documented in the curriculum vitae and described in the personal commentary.
- k. The judgments of peers, including the referees who submit evaluations of the candidate in support of promotion and/or tenure review, should indicate that a candidate has achieved professional standing outside the department to the degree that is appropriate for the rank the candidate is seeking.
- l. For collaborative projects, candidates must include a letter from a team member or supervisor noting individual contributions within the project.

B. Scholarly Research in Dance

Scholarly research seeks to interpret, expand, and bring new insights to bear on existing knowledge, technologies, design methodologies, and the like, including those that make connections across disciplines. Successful research demonstrates evidence of a clearly defined scholarly agenda and a body of work that effectively illustrates significant professional contributions in the candidate's field of specialization. The products of scholarship are expected to be peer reviewed and disseminated to other academics, the profession, and/or the lay community. These products may demonstrate knowledge acquired through research, synthesis, practice, and collaboration.

1. Dance scholarship is most significantly published in academic, peer-reviewed journals (or e-journals) or as volumes or book chapters published by scholarly presses. Scholarly research in any field of dance (pedagogy, history, criticism, etc.) might also include:
 - a. Books or textbooks, authored, co-authored, edited, or translated, with academic, or professional presses, in electronic or visual media.
 - b. Published interviews, book or performance reviews, and review essays.
 - c. Chapters, essays, or articles in reference texts and anthologies.
 - d. Published educational resource materials in all media.
 - e. Funded grant awards for basic or applied research or professional service.
 - f. Juried papers given at international, national, or regional professional conferences.
 - g. Work successfully presented on panels and programs of professional organizations and through residencies or opportunities to master teach or lead intensive workshops for dance professionals.
 - h. Invited addresses, keynotes, papers, panels, master classes, workshops, residencies, conferences, and professional seminars given at international, national, or regional conferences.
 - i. Production of computer software.
 - j. Invited on-line publication.
 - k. Film or video production presented in a professional venue.
 - l. Editorial service, either as editor or on an editorial board.
 - m. Manuscripts accepted for publication but not yet published.

- n. Invited work successfully undertaken in an exceptional venue (such as a national or international conference keynote; nationally or internationally recognized work with a dance company, university or college department, or festival).
 - o. For collaborative projects, candidates must include a letter from a team member or supervisor noting individual contributions within the project.
2. The DRC's judgment regarding professional success in scholarship depends on a variety of conventional benchmarks established in the discipline of dance and in the past practice of the university:
- a. A candidate's scholarly research should describe a history of sustained productivity over time. All publications, including those completed at other institutions, are counted in the review, but there is an expectation that the candidate will have published work at this institution, consistent with the benchmark of sustained productivity.
 - b. The quantity of professional work does not by itself indicate quality or impact. It is reasonable to assume that candidates in scholarly fields will, during the period leading to tenure and promotion review, complete a book that is published or under contract for publication and two to three articles or, in the absence of a book, one significant article per year published in a peer reviewed professional journal. The traditional academic book, while a conventional measure of academic accomplishment, is not a prerequisite for achieving tenure or promotion.
 - c. A candidate should demonstrate the ability to place articles in professional (peer reviewed) journals, and/or to place book manuscripts with recognized academic or commercial presses serving broad readerships. The candidate should provide information about the press or journal such as their publication focus, methods of review, and submission/acceptance ratios. This information should be included on the curriculum vitae or in the personal commentary under the section devoted to scholarship.
 - d. Reviews of a candidate's published work and citations in the research of other scholars may provide helpful testimony regarding the impact of that work.
 - e. Awards of externally sponsored funding, together with a record of successful grant-proposal writing, constitute important scholarly credentials and should be accurately documented on the curriculum vitae and described in the personal commentary. Only funded grants count toward tenure and promotion.
 - f. Publication awards and prizes from presses, journals, or professional associations, along with other forms of recognition, provide helpful testimony of scholarly accomplishment and should be listed on the curriculum vitae and explained in the personal commentary.
 - g. Invitations to present papers, keynote addresses, as well as contributions to projects with state, national, or international significance argue for growing prominence in a field and should be noted in the personal commentary.

- h. The judgments of peers, including the referees who submit evaluations of the candidate in support of promotion and/or tenure review, should indicate that a candidate has achieved professional standing outside the department to the degree that is appropriate for the rank the candidate is seeking.

C. Scholarship of Teaching and Learning

Research in dance extends to the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning (SoTL). The UNC Charlotte Teaching and Learning Center states that the “aim of SoTL scholars is to engage in a rigorous and systematic inquiry process in order to critique, improve, enhance, and develop multiple perspectives that can help inform the teaching and learning process and enrich higher education in the 21st century.”

1. In addition to research disseminated through peer-reviewed journals and academic books, SoTL might include:
 - a. Reports and materials including curricular maps, standards, assessments and other outcomes of research derived from consulting activities in universities, schools, government agencies, business, or industry.
 - b. Instructional materials and curricula that have broad impact on the field.
 - c. Evidences of integrating and applying theoretical and practical knowledge in educational policy settings.
 - d. Explorations of philosophical, sociological, and historical connections between dance and education.
 - e. Master teaching, lecturing, and public presentation, including the transmission of historical, movement-based, and philosophical information, and ideas to other professionals.
 - f. Published educational resource materials in all media.
 - g. Funded grant awards for basic or applied research, curriculum development, or professional service.

2. The DRC’s judgment regarding professional success in SoTL depends on a variety of benchmarks established within the university and put forward by UNC Charlotte’s Teaching and Learning Center, in the discipline of dance, and in documents such as *Dance in the Work of Arts Faculty in Higher Education*. SoTL is successful when it:
 - a. Contributes to important agendas and initiatives in higher education.
 - b. Changes how teachers teach and contributes to our knowledge of the factors that make change happen.
 - c. Changes how we understand and talk about learning
 - d. Has direct and indirect effects on student learning and success.
 - e. Contributes to our knowledge of the conditions that affect the exchange and improvement of pedagogy
 - f. Strengthens development programs for higher education professionals.
 - g. Informs changes in the policies and procedures of the institution.
 - h. Affects the culture of academic life.
 - i. Leads to changes in how we define and evaluate scholarship.

D. Teaching

Successful teaching is understood as the combination of content, methodology, and preparation that effectively delivers instruction and associated services. The Department of Dance places a high value on sound pedagogy with innovative approaches and current/inclusive course content that reflects a diverse student population. The evaluation of teaching will also be made relative to department mission statement, strategic plan, and curricular map, which affect the candidate's teaching responsibilities.

1. Expectations for teaching in dance conform to normative expectations in other academic fields of study.
 - a. Regularly assigned theory/studio courses.
 - b. Master classes, workshops, and residencies for students.
 - c. Development of new programs, courses, or teaching methods.
 - d. Department, college, and university peer assistance and teacher mentoring.
 - e. Pedagogically oriented consulting work considered separately from scholarship.
 - f. Team-taught and interdisciplinary courses.
 - g. Curriculum development including grant support projects.
 - h. Supervision of independent studies, internships, and clinicals.
 - i. Sponsorship of and participation in extracurricular events or activities that support student teaching/learning.
 - j. Academic advising and/or mentorship.

2. Candidates for reappointment, promotion, and conferral of permanent tenure will present as evidence of their competence a teaching portfolio that includes the following materials:
 - a. A statement of teaching philosophy and general classroom practice, incorporated in the personal commentary.
 - b. Syllabi, exams, and other course materials.
 - c. In the case of tenure-track and tenured faculty, the department provides the DRC all student course evaluations, written and numerical, since the last mandatory review.
 - d. For tenure-track faculty, the department provides the DRC peer observations and evaluations as required by The Code of the Board of Governors of The University of North Carolina.
 - e. For guidance in preparing a teaching portfolio please see the department's teaching portfolio guidelines and information available on campus at the Center for Teaching and Learning.

3. Teaching competence may be demonstrated through, but is not limited to, evidence of the following benchmarks:
 - a. Command of the appropriate disciplinary subject areas.
 - b. Effective organization and presentation of course materials.
 - c. Clearly stated philosophy of teaching, manifest in course design and classroom method.

- d. Positive student evaluations and peer evaluations and evidence of adjustment in course design in response to feedback from peers and students.
- e. Performance at or near Department of Dance means for student evaluations.
- f. Teaching honors/ awards.
- g. In-depth understanding of pedagogy in alignment with course objectives.
- h. Integration of theory and practice.
- i. Course content that includes contributions from persons in historically underrepresented groups, support of diverse learning styles, and inclusive classroom climate.
- j. Appropriate assessments aligned with course objectives, pedagogy, and student population.
- k. Instruction that enhances student learning; differentiates teaching, assignments, and assessment to support student learning.
- l. Uses current technology in teaching and/or course design when appropriate.
- m. Responds appropriately to department, college, and university curricular and assessment initiatives.

E. Service

Service activities contribute to governance of the department, college, and university and support the professions and other appropriate communities. They also testify to the collegiality of individual faculty. All faculty are expected to share the routine responsibilities of departmental administration and governance, to take leadership roles for which they are qualified in the department, college and the university, and to perform in those professional or community service capacities for which their interests, expertise, and experience may qualify them. In a small department it is recognized that faculty may be called upon to assume extraordinary departmental, professional, or university service such as directing an arts education program, serving as director of concerts, acting as a funding agency program officer, or assuming administrative roles in the university. If possible, the faculty member and chair will meet to design a plan that allows the candidate the opportunity to meet department requirements for promotion and tenure. If not possible, the chair will record and account for the candidate's work through workload documents and annual reviews and in their recommendations for reappointment, promotion, and tenure. At a minimum, dance faculty members are expected to attend department meetings and to play responsible roles on committees to which they are assigned. Accomplishments in the area of service constitute a significant measure of the professional engagement and stature of faculty, including those seeking tenure and/or promotion.

Non-tenured faculty members are expected to assume meaningful service in the department or, less typically, the college or university. Non-tenured faculty should exercise reasonable discretion in accepting professional or community service responsibilities that might negatively affect productivity in research or effectiveness in teaching. Non-tenured faculty are encouraged to consult with the chair prior to accepting service responsibilities that exceed their normative assignment.

For all tenure-line faculty members, academic and community service activities must be documented. Documentation must include citations in the CV and personal statement, references in annual faculty performance reviews, and letters from committee or task force members.

1. Service on-campus to the institution may be academic or non-academic and includes:
 - a. Serving on departmental, college, or university committees and taskforces.
 - b. Chairing committees or accepting special committee or subcommittee assignments.
 - c. Creating, chairing, or serving on ad hoc committees.
 - d. Administering academic or support programs.
 - e. Helping to create new academic or support programs.
 - f. Administering student activities, organizations, and programs.
2. Service to the profession demonstrates sustained involvement and/or substantial contributions to one's field or communities that draw upon one's professional expertise including:
 - a. Serving and/or holding office in local, regional, national, or international professional associations/organizations.
 - b. Serving as a reader on an editorial board for journals or book publishers (including textbooks).
 - c. Performing external tenure/promotion reviews.
 - d. Teaching, consulting, or other activities related to professional expertise when not included in research.

IV. CRITERIA FOR SPECIFIC RANKS AND CONFERRAL OF PERMANENT TENURE

A. Reappointment as Assistant Professor

1. Terms of Appointment: Assistant professors are normally appointed initially to a term of four years and are reviewed in the third year for reappointment to a second term of three years as an assistant professor. For reappointment as assistant professor, a candidate is expected to have:

a. Initiated a program of creative/scholarly research with promise of discernible professional impact and continuing development.

See Sections III A, B, and C.

b. In teaching, there should be evidence of good to very good teaching skills, which includes relevant course content and effective teaching approaches, as indicated by peer review and student assessment. The candidate demonstrates teaching competence and skills in assessing student

learning as evidenced by a teaching portfolio, and documented success as a teacher through peer and student evaluations. See Section III D.

c. In service, candidates should demonstrate that they have actively participated in service activities on campus and in the field, including faculty governance in the department and local and regional service in the profession. See Section III E.

B. Promotion from the Rank of Assistant Professor to the Rank of Associate Professor with Conferral of Permanent Tenure

1. Terms of Appointment: Assistant professors are normally reviewed for promotion to associate professor with permanent tenure in their sixth year of employment (the second year of their second term of employment as assistant professor). However, the review for promotion and conferral of permanent tenure may occur before that time if it is deemed appropriate by the candidate's department chair in consultation with tenured department faculty. For permanent tenure and promotion to associate professor, a candidate is expected to have:
 - a. Met disciplinary standards in creative/scholarly research, including rate, quality, and quantity of accomplishment, and to have demonstrated its validity and relevance through wide dissemination and/or documented extensive use in the field. High quality, originality, and significance of contribution are more important than either volume or the particular type of scholarship represented. See Section III A, B, and C. In teaching, there should be evidence of very good to excellent teaching, which includes relevant course content, development of new courses or substantial course revision, or integration of technology, and effective teaching approaches as indicated by peer review and student assessment. Skills in assessing student learning should be evident through class artifacts and student course evaluations. See Section III C.
 - b. In service, candidates should demonstrate that they have actively participated in service activities on campus and in the field, including faculty governance at the department and college levels. Service as committee chair is one significant indication of engagement in faculty governance. A faculty member is also expected to contribute to regional and national service in the profession. See Section III D.

C. Promotion from the Rank of Associate Professor to the Rank of Professor.

Terms of Appointment: Individuals whose initial appointment has been as associate professor without permanent tenure are appointed from an initial term of five years and reviewed for conferral of permanent tenure and possible promotion to the rank of professor before the end of the fourth year of appointment. Associate professors may receive tenure without promotion. According to the Tenure Policies, Regulations, and Procedures of the University of North Carolina at Charlotte, Section 3. 2. 2: "When a faculty member's initial appointment by the institution is to the rank of associate professor without permanent tenure, the appointment is to a term of three to five years. During and before the end of the penultimate year of the appointment as associate professor, the faculty member shall be reviewed for permanent tenure."

1. If a faculty member is promoted to or reappointed to the rank of associate professor and has been awarded permanent tenure, review for promotion shall occur at least once every five years through Tenured Faculty Performance Review (TFPR). The faculty member may postpone consideration for promotion and simply complete the TFPR.
2. Promotion to the rank of professor is based upon achievement, distinction, and the impact of one's contributions, not duration of employment. An associate professor may be recommended for promotion at any time. However, time in rank may be a salient consideration to the extent that the impact of certain contributions accumulates and gathers force over time. An individual's aggregate contributions over a period of time may yield a level of achievement or recognition that might not be accorded to any of them individually considered. For promotion to full professor, a candidate is expected to have demonstrated significant, continuing accomplishment in all three areas of productivity:
 - a. In research, the candidate's record shows clear and continuous evidence of excellence. See Section III, A, B, and C.
 - b. In teaching, there should be demonstrated evidence of consistent excellence in teaching as indicated by new courses, leadership in department curriculum development, and skills in student assessment as well as pedagogical contributions to the field. The candidate's record demonstrates continuous commitment to and effectiveness in teaching. See Section III D.
 - c. In service, candidates should demonstrate that they have actively participated in service activities on campus and in the field, including faculty governance at the department, college, and university levels. Service as committee chair is one significant indication of engagement in faculty governance. A faculty member is also expected to contribute to regional and national service in the profession. See Section III E.

D. Department of Dance Tenured Faculty Performance Review

1. Purpose

Tenured Faculty Performance Review (TFPR) provides periodic and comprehensive review of the performance of all tenured members of the faculty who have been on continuous contract for a period of five years or more since their last cumulative review. TFPR promotes faculty development, productivity, and excellence and provides additional accountability. TFPR is based on academic criteria (teaching, research, and service) and informed by a set of directional goals (5 year plan) and college and department expectations regarding contributions to a positive work and academic culture. Possible outcomes of TFPR include 1) recognizing and rewarding faculty performance that exceeds expectations; 2) providing a clear path and timetable for improvement of faculty performance for those faculty who do not meet expectations; and 3) providing the imposition of appropriate sanctions for faculty who continue to not meet expectations.

2. Criteria for Faculty Excellence

In reviewing members of the tenured faculty, the Department Review Committee and the department chair will consider the following criteria as it relates to research, teaching, and service. They may also provide feedback on the faculty member's five-year plan and cultural contributions.

- a. Scholarly/Creative Activities/ Scholarship of Teaching and Learning
 - i. "Exceeds Expectations:" The faculty member has remained prolifically engaged in scholarship, as defined in Section III. A, B, and/or C. of the Department of Dance Reappointment, Tenure and Promotion, and Tenured Faculty Performance Review Guidelines, averaging two or more of these types of activities every year. A faculty member might also exceed expectations by producing a large-scale project such as a book or prestigious off campus concert.
 - ii. "Meets Expectations:" The faculty member has remained appropriately engaged in scholarship, as defined in Section III. A, B, and/or C. of the Department of Dance Reappointment, Tenure and Promotion, and Tenured Faculty Performance Review Guidelines, completing at least two of these types of activities during the review period.
 - iii. "Does Not Meet Expectations:" The faculty member has not remained sufficiently engaged in research, as defined in Section III. A, B, and/or C. of the Department of Dance Reappointment, Tenure and Promotion, and Tenured Faculty Performance Review Guidelines, completing fewer than two of these types of activities during the review period.
- b. Teaching
 - i. "Exceeds Expectations:" The faculty member demonstrates very good to excellent teaching through the implementation of a significant number of teaching accomplishments, as defined in Section III. D 3. of the Department of Dance Reappointment, Tenure and Promotion, and Tenured Faculty Performance Review Guidelines, supports the department's mission and academic plan through course development, curriculum design, and other teaching innovations, and meets the normative expectations of teaching, such as the timely reporting of grades, class attendance, and other professional teaching behaviors.
 - ii. "Meets Expectations:" The faculty member demonstrates satisfactory/average teaching traits through the satisfaction of teaching accomplishments, as defined in Section III. D 3. of the Department of Dance Reappointment, Tenure and Promotion, and Tenured Faculty Performance Review Guidelines, supports the department's mission and academic plan through course development, curriculum design, and other teaching innovations, and meets the normative expectations of teaching, such as the timely reporting of grades, class attendance, and other professional teaching behaviors.

- iii. “Does Not Meet Expectations:” The faculty member demonstrates substandard teaching traits through the unsatisfactory accomplishment of items defined in Section III. D 3. of the Department of Dance Reappointment, Tenure and Promotion, and Tenured Faculty Performance Review Guidelines, fails to support the department’s mission and academic plan through course development, curriculum design, and other teaching innovations, or fails to meet the normative expectations of teaching, such as the timely reporting of grades, class attendance, or other professional teaching behaviors.

c. Service

- i. “Exceeds Expectations:” The faculty member has served in significant leadership positions and/or directed significant initiatives that have produced tangible results in the university, community, and/or profession that are defined in Section III E of the Department of Dance Reappointment, Tenure and Promotion, and Tenured Faculty Performance Review Guidelines.
- ii. “Meets Expectations:” The faculty member has performed normative service as defined in Section III E of the Department of Dance Reappointment, Tenure and Promotion, and Tenured Faculty Performance Review Guidelines.
- iii. “Does Not Meet Expectations:” The faculty member has failed to provide normative service to the university, community, and profession as defined in Section III E of the Department of Dance Reappointment, Tenure and Promotion, and Tenured Faculty Performance Review Guidelines (by not agreeing to serve on committees, not attending meetings, not completing assigned work, not maintaining a professional demeanor, etc.).

3. Support for Faculty Excellence

A faculty member’s productivity is enhanced by their ability to plan, to clearly communicate their academic interests and trajectories to others, and by contributions to the various academic cultures in which they work: department, college, university, and professional. While not criteria per se, faculty may also receive feedback on their 5 year plans and contributions to the cultures in which they have served during TFPR.

Five-year plans are proposed by the faculty member with an update and related reflective narrative submitted with each annual review and with their TFPR materials. The plan shows a faculty member’s trajectory, including areas of interest, envisioned projects, and attendant milestones, in research, teaching, and service. These should relate to faculty interest and to department mission and strategic plan. The DRC and department chair should provide feedback about the legibility of the plans, their contribution to successful TRPR evaluations, and if applicable, their suitability for an associate professor moving towards full professor.

Positive cultural contributions include demonstrating leadership, respectful and empathic communication, cooperative decision-making, mutuality, and regard for and advancement of the department's mission and strategic goals. Likewise, negative actions such as uncooperative, disruptive, or combative behavior may demonstrate a lack of collegiality and significantly interfere with the mission of the department. We expect differing opinions, but a shared purpose and productive workplace.

4. Procedures for Tenured Faculty Performance Review

- a. The Dean of CoAA, in conjunction with the department chair, will notify faculty, in writing, of mandatory TFPR including the materials to be reviewed and the due date for submission.
- b. In accordance with the schedule for the review established by the dean, usually spring semester of the review year, tenured faculty being reviewed shall submit the following material by the announced deadline:
 - i. Complete curriculum vitae with appropriate citation.
 - ii. Directional goals/ 5 year plan.
 - iii. A statement describing his/her professional accomplishments in teaching, research, and service and how these accomplish inform his or her directional goals.
- c. The department chair shall provide the DRC with the candidate's annual reviews for the previous five years.
- d. Line of review
- e. The candidate submits material to the Dean of the CoA+A who forwards the materials to the Chair and DRC.
- f. The DRC provides its recommendation in writing to the department chair.
- g. Department chair forwards both his/her recommendation and that of the DRC to the Dean of CoAA with copies to the faculty member.
- h. The report and any response from the faculty member shall be made a part of the faculty member's permanent personnel record.

V. ANNUAL REVIEW

Revised and adopted by faculty vote, May 11, 2023

A. Purpose

Annual review is conducted on a calendar year basis for the period beginning January 1 and ending December 31 for purposes of encouraging faculty development and productivity as well as providing evaluation and recommendations to faculty members as they move toward reappointment, tenure, and/or promotion.

B. Criteria

The review considers the quality and quantity of research, teaching, and service efforts as those efforts relate to the department's mission, strategic plan and the criteria for the appropriate faculty rank.

C. Procedures for Annual Review

1. By October 30, the department chair notifies all full time faculty, who expect to be employed by the department during the next year, of the January 30 due date for submission of materials.

2. Faculty shall submit the following materials to the chair:

a. A curriculum vitae update for the review period only.

b. Documentation of activity listed on the curriculum vitae update.

c. Self-evaluation of research (if applicable), teaching, and service.

d. A summary page highlighting areas of strength, areas in need of improvement, notable achievements and specifics as to how the work has advanced the department's strategic plan. Faculty must also comment on any deviations from a standard workload in the semesters under review and the work they pursued in lieu of that.

e. Non-tenured faculty (assistant professors and lecturers) must submit a teaching portfolio. Teaching portfolio preparation guidelines are printed in the Department of Dance Faculty Handbook and guidance is also available in the Center for Teaching and Learning.

f. To support faculty research agendas and eventual TFPR considerations, faculty must yearly submit a set of directional goals/ 5 year plan and a statement describing their professional accomplishments in teaching, research, and service and how these accomplishments inform his or her directional goals. These may change over time and will not become benchmarks against which a faculty's work is evaluated. Instead, the DRC and chair will use these to support a faculty member's efforts towards promotion. The department chair shall provide the DRC with the faculty member's numerical and any narrative student evaluations and peer teaching evaluations for the review period. The department chair will also provide the DRC with relevant workload documents annotated to describe any deviations to the standard workload.

3. Line of Review The faculty member submits material to the department chair who forwards it to the DRC.

a. By April 1, the department chair and the DRC meet and discuss each faculty member's annual review file. DRC faculty members who are currently in the DRC recuse themselves from their own review.

b. By May 1, the department chair holds an annual evaluation conference with non-tenured, tenure-track faculty members. Prior to the conference, the chair forwards a draft evaluation to each faculty member. After the conference, the department chair shall then prepare a final written evaluation of said faculty member. Tenured faculty members will receive a copy of the draft evaluation, but will not have a conference unless a conference is requested by either the faculty member or the department chair.

c. By June 1, final faculty annual evaluations are sent to each faculty member. Each faculty member must sign a copy of their review and send the signed copy back to the department office to be placed in the faculty member's permanent file.

d. Faculty may meet with the department chair for clarification at any time after receiving the review.

e. Faculty have the option to write a response to any review. The response will be forwarded to the dean and placed in the faculty member's permanent folder. Faculty have between June 1-June 30 (30 days to respond).

f. Copies of faculty annual reviews are sent to the dean by June 30.

g. Contested annual reviews will be addressed through the formal university grievance process as described in Section IX of Tenure Policies, Regulations and Procedures of the University of North Carolina.

D. Supporting Documents and Resources:

The Code of the Board of Governors of The University of North Carolina, Section 602 Academic Tenure,
<http://www.northcarolina.edu/apps/policy/index.php?pg=toc&id=s4073>

College of Arts and Architecture Procedures for Reappointment, Promotion, and Conferral of Permanent Tenure
(<http://coaa.uncc.edu/sites/coaa.uncc.edu/files/media/pdfs/CoAA%20converted%20to%20pdfs/CoAA%20RPT%20Policy%20%28Approved%2012.15.08%29.pdf>).

Curtis, John. "Persistent Inequity: Gender and Academic Employment." Prepared for "New Voices for Pay Equity" on behalf of the American Association of University Professors. 2011.

Dance Department Faculty Handbook. Promotion and Tenure Procedures for Applied Arts Faculty, Custom Research Brief, May 21, 2010, University Leadership Council UNC Charlotte Center for Teaching and Learning www.teaching.uncc.edu/ University Policy 102.13, Tenure Policies, Regulations, and Procedures of the University of North Carolina at Charlotte <http://legal.uncc.edu/policies/up-102.13#s1>

Women's Studies Scholarship: A Statement by the National Women's Studies Association Field Leadership Working Group. www.nwsa.org

The Work of Arts Faculties in Higher Education, (1993) National Office for Arts Accrediting Associations (1993, Revised February 2009. "Publications" [www. arts-accredit.org](http://www.arts-accredit.org).