



Policy Manual of the College of Performing and Visual Arts

University of Northern Colorado

Ratified
12-10-2015

Contents

I. PURPOSE	3
II. AUTHORITY AND SUBORDINATION.....	3
III. ADMINISTRATIVE AND ACADEMIC STRUCTURE OF PVA.....	3
IV. COMMITTEES	3
A. Dean’s Faculty Advisory Council	3
B. PVA Curriculum Committee	4
C. PVA Collaborative Calendar Committee	4
D. Other Committees	4
E. School Personnel Committee.....	4
V. FACULTY EVALUATION PROCESSES.....	5
A. Annual and Biennial Review	5
1. Evaluation Criteria and Outcomes	5
2. Eligibility for Annual Review	6
3. Eligibility for Biennial Review	7
4. Timeline and Process for Annual / Biennial Review.....	7
B. Comprehensive Review	8
1. Eligibility for Comprehensive Review.....	9
2. Comprehensive Review Dossier	9
3. Comprehensive Review Peer Observation.....	9
4. Timeline and Process for Comprehensive Review / Promotion and Tenure	9
5. Director / Associate Dean Process – Comprehensive Review	10
C. Peer Observation	11
1. Peer Teaching Observation and Evaluation Process	11
D. Mentor-Protégé Program	11
VI. PVA-SPECIFIC GUIDELINES FOR TENURE AND PROMOTION	13
A. PVA Credentialing Requirements	13
B. PVA Guidelines for Instruction, Professional Activity, and Service	15
C. Other PVA-Specific Requirements for Promotion and Tenure	16
D. Contract Renewable Faculty Seeking Rank Change.....	16
E. School-Specific Performance Standards	16
VII. SABBATICAL LEAVE	17
A. Eligibility.....	17

B. Application	18
C. Appropriate Use of Sabbatical Leaves	18
D. Faculty Report Obligation	19
E. Institutional Accountability	19
F. Timeline and Process.....	19
VIII. FACULTY REASSIGNMENT AWARD	20
Purpose	20
A. Timeline and Process	20
B. Application Details	21
C. PVA Guidelines for Faculty Creative/Research Away Time	22
VIII. LINKS TO DOCUMENTS	22

I. PURPOSE

The Policy Manual (the “Policy Manual”) of the College of Performing and Visual Arts of the University of Northern Colorado (“PVA” and “UNC”) shall memorialize the policies and procedures of the PVA and constitute the governing rules and regulations of the Faculty Assembly of the PVA (the “Faculty Assembly”).

II. AUTHORITY AND SUBORDINATION

The Policy Manual is authorized by the consent of the Dean of the PVA and the ratification of the Faculty Assembly, subordinate to and consistent with the UNC Board of Trustees Policy Manual [http://www.unco.edu/trustees/Policy_Manual.pdf], as amended on December 8, 2015. The Policy Manual shall conform to the terms of the By-laws of the Faculty Assembly of the College of Performing and Visual Arts (the “By-laws”), as amended December 8, 2015. The By-laws are available on the PVA website [<http://arts.unco.edu/for-faculty-staff/>].

III. ADMINISTRATIVE AND ACADEMIC STRUCTURE OF PVA

The Dean is the chief academic and administrative officer of the PVA. The Dean shall delegate such authority and power to the Associate Dean and Directors as is necessary to realize the mission of the PVA (see By-laws); these parties shall constitute the administrative leadership of the PVA (“Administrative Leadership”). The Administrative Leadership will work in a spirit of shared governance with the Faculty Assembly in all matters that guide the academic mission of the PVA and the success of its students, faculty and staff, including development and articulation of policies, procedures and initiatives, subordinate to and consistent with the UNC Board of Trustees Policy Manual, as amended.

IV. COMMITTEES

Committees of the PVA and its Faculty Assembly are constituted as defined herein and as may be appropriate or necessary. These committees are advisory in nature. They meet as necessary and shall consist of members of the Faculty Assembly as appointed or elected.

A. Dean’s Faculty Advisory Council

The Dean’s Faculty Advisory Council (“DFAC”) shall be responsible to the Dean and to the Faculty Assembly for appropriate reports and recommendations concerning all matters referred to it by the Dean or by the Faculty Assembly. Responses to matters referred to the DFAC by the Faculty Assembly shall be reported to the Faculty Assembly. Responses to matters referred to the DFAC by the Dean shall be reported to the Dean and may be reported to the Faculty Assembly as appropriate or necessary. The DFAC shall consist of five faculty members, including at least one constituent member of each School duly elected from the Faculty Assembly of each School, and two members at-large elected by majority vote of the cumulative Faculty Assembly. The term of office for each member of the DFAC will be two years, such terms being staggered. The Chair of the DFAC shall be the Associate Dean of the PVA; in the absence of the Associate Dean the Dean may appoint a Chair from the members of the DFAC *ad interim*. The DFAC shall meet at the call of its Chair or by consent of a majority of its members.

B. PVA Curriculum Committee

The PVA Curriculum Committee reviews and make recommendations regarding curricular changes, new course proposals, academic matters requiring faculty action, and matters referred to the PVA Curriculum Committee by the originating unit (as defined in University Regulation 3-3-501(2)) or by the Dean. The PVA Curriculum Committee consists of the chair of each School's Curriculum Committee. The Dean will appoint the Chair of the PVA Curriculum Committee from among the members; in the absence of the appointed Chair the Dean may appoint a Chair from the members of the PVA Curriculum Committee *ad interim*. The PVA Curriculum Committee shall meet at the call of its Chair or by consent of a majority of its members.

C. PVA Collaborative Calendar Committee

The PVA Calendar Committee coordinates event calendars among the three Schools to avoid conflict of major events when possible, to encourage interdisciplinary collaboration where advisable, and to communicate activities of the College to our campus and regional community. The members of the PVA Calendar Committee shall consist of School Directors and/or a representative from each School to be determined by the Director.

D. Other Committees

Such other committees may be appointed by the Dean as necessary, or at the direction of the Faculty Assembly by vote of a simple majority of its members during any meeting at which a quorum is present. Such committees will be constituted (A) for such defined purposes as may be charged by the Dean or the Faculty Assembly, (B) for defined periods of time necessary to the purpose or charge, and (C) with appropriate representation among the Schools and other constituencies.

E. School Personnel Committee

Each School in PVA has a personnel committee appointed by the Director, which is responsible for evaluating annual, biennial, and comprehensive reviews, and recommending faculty for tenure and promotion. The School of Music uses the Annual Evaluation Committee for Annual / Biennial Review and the School Evaluation Committee for Comprehensive Review.

V. FACULTY EVALUATION PROCESSES

All faculty evaluated for annual / biennial or comprehensive review shall adhere to these policies. If there are inconsistencies, Board Policy prevails as the guiding document for specific College and School procedures. Evaluation of faculty consists of three evaluative areas: teaching, scholarly and creative activities, and service. Specific definitions of these three areas may be found in Board Policy 2-3-401 (2) and are discussed on page 16-17. Per Board Policy and University Regulations, PVA utilizes the five (5) point evaluation scale. Additionally, the College values narrative evaluation designed to be in alignment with the numerical score given to faculty. Faculty workload is assigned by the School Director and equals a total of 1.0 FTE. In consultation with the faculty member, specific workload assignments may be modified according to the greatest needs of the School. Recruiting and advising are categorized as service, while directing dissertations, theses, etc., is categorized under teaching. For more discussion of service, please see page 16.

A. Annual and Biennial Review

Annual and Biennial Review serve as performance evaluations and are used to determine eligibility for merit pay consideration.

Annual and Biennial Review criteria are described in Board Policy Part 8 Faculty Evaluation and also Title 3, Article 3, Part 3, 3-3-3-3(5) Performance Evaluation, and University Regulations Part 8. Links to Board Policy and University Regulations are in the appendix at the end of this document.

1. Evaluation Criteria and Outcomes

Per University Regulations:

(e) Evaluation Outcomes. Faculty are evaluated in each relevant performance area; contributions in each area vary according to assigned workload. In each area a faculty member's performance will be evaluated on a five (5) point scale. Each faculty member will receive an overall evaluation based on the outcome in the individual areas. This will be accomplished using a numerical weighting system which incorporates the percentage of workload for each of the performance areas as specified in the agreed upon faculty workload. The weighted average will be calculated by the following evaluation scale.

f) Evaluation Scale

V.	4.6 – 5.0	Excellent
IV.	3.6 – 4.5	Exceeds Expectations
III.	2.6 – 3.5	Meets Expectations
II.	1.6 – 2.5	Needs Improvement
I.	1.0 – 1.5	Unsatisfactory

Example of a Faculty Overall Evaluation

In this particular example, the faculty member has a work assignment of .60 for instruction, .20 for professional activity, and .20 for service, which equals 1.0.

Criteria	Evaluation Scale Rating	Evaluation Description	Evaluation Scale Rating Multiplied by Work Assignment Percentages	Total	Overall Evaluation
Teaching	4	Exceeds Expectations	4 x .60 =	2.4	
Professional Activity	4	Exceeds Expectations	4 x .20 =	.8	
Service	3	Meets Expectations	3 x .20 =	.6	
			TOTAL	3.8	IV. Exceeds Expectations

Faculty receive an overall evaluation on a five (5) point scale and a narrative that articulates their strengths and possible areas of improvement. It is critical that the overall evaluation and the narrative support each other. Each School provides a standards guide designed to aid all reviewers in their systematic evaluation of a faculty member’s productivity during the respective evaluation period (annual/biennial, 3rd year pre-tenure, promotion and/or tenure, and post-tenure). The School-specific standards may be found on the PVA website [<http://arts.unco.edu/for-faculty-staff/>]. All School specific standards must align with University and College policies and be approved by the Dean.

2. Eligibility for Annual Review

Tenure Track Faculty

- Years 1, 2, 4
- Year 3 is the pre-tenure comprehensive review (see page 8)
- 4th Year Annual Review

Per University Regulations, if, on the 3rd year pre-tenure review, the evaluatee receives “exceeds expectations” or higher in either instruction or professional activity, and “meets expectations” or higher in the other areas, then he/she may opt out of the 4th year annual review. If not, then a 4th year annual review is required. In the absence of an application for tenure, which would include the 5th year annual review, an annual review in the 5th year is required [See 3-3-801-G-IV].

Following the 3rd year pre-tenure review, a 4th year annual review is strongly recommended by the Dean’s Office to support the faculty member’s appropriate progress toward achieving tenure and promotion.

Contract Renewable Faculty

- Contract renewable faculty must complete an annual/biennial review at least once every other year, and may request an annual/biennial review in any year.

- Contract Renewable Faculty seeking rank change must submit a comprehensive review following the same process as tenure track faculty (see page 15 for College guidelines).

3. Eligibility for Biennial Review

- All tenured faculty must complete a biennial review, unless the faculty member is seeking promotion or required to complete a 5th year post-tenure comprehensive review.

4. Timeline and Process for Annual / Biennial Review

January

Faculty fill out current form which is available at: [<http://arts.unco.edu/for-faculty-staff/>] under Faculty Review Information, and submit it with their materials to the Associate Dean.

February

Annual and/or Biennial Review materials due to the appropriate committee (School Personnel Committee or School Evaluation Committee in SOM).

At the School level, the Director may invite comments from the faculty regarding the areas of teaching, professional activity, and service. In this case, the School determines how faculty comments are collected.

- The committee reviews the materials, then evaluates the faculty with both a narrative and overall evaluation measure between one (I) and five (V).

Materials due from School Committee to School Directors.

- School Director conducts an independent evaluation.
- The Director writes a memo containing the faculty overall evaluation, Director overall evaluation, and comments about the faculty member's performance.
- School Directors send status update to the faculty.

Materials due from School Directors to the Dean.

The Dean reviews the narrative and overall evaluation measure, and the Dean's Office confirms that proper protocols have been followed according to School, College, and University policies and procedures. The Dean shall indicate progress toward tenure and promotion.

- Dean's Office sends status update to the faculty.

May

Annual / Biennial Reviews due from Dean to Provost.

NOTE: At each evaluative level, the faculty member must be notified of the evaluative decision and the rationale that guided the decision, and must be given a chance to respond. These responses are then placed with the evaluation materials as the process moves to the next level.

B. Comprehensive Review

The Comprehensive Review process evaluates progress towards the next promotion milestone, which includes 3rd year pre-tenure, tenure, promotion, graduate status, and post-tenure review, and recommends faculty for tenure and promotion.

Comprehensive Review criteria are described in Board Policy Part 8 Faculty Evaluation and also Title 3, Article 3, Part 3, 3-3-3(5) Performance Evaluation and University Regulations Part 8. Links to Board Policy and University Regulations are in the appendix at the end of this document.

Per University Regulations, faculty compile a dossier. Each faculty member is evaluated on three (3) areas for promotion and tenure: teaching, scholarly and other professional activities, and service. In each area, a faculty member's performance will be evaluated on a five (5) point scale. To be considered for promotion and/or tenure, the faculty member's performance must, as a minimum, be rated "Level III" or above in each area.

V) Evaluation Scale

V.	4.6 – 5.0	Excellent
IV.	3.6 – 4.5	Exceeds Expectations
III.	2.6 – 3.5	Meets Expectations
II.	1.6 – 2.5	Needs Improvement
I.	1.0 – 1.5	Unsatisfactory

Example of a Faculty Overall Evaluation

In this particular example, the faculty member has a work assignment of .60 for instruction, .20 for professional activity, and .20 for service, which equals 1.0.

Criteria	Evaluation Scale Rating	Evaluation Description	Evaluation Scale Rating Multiplied by Work Assignment Percentages	Total	Overall Evaluation
Teaching	4	Exceeds Expectations	4 x .60 =	2.4	
Professional Activity	4	Exceeds Expectations	4 x .20 =	.8	
Service	3	Meets Expectations	3 x .20 =	.6	
			TOTAL	3.8	V. Exceeds Expectations

Faculty receive an overall evaluation on a five (5) point scale and a narrative that articulates their strengths and possible areas of improvement. It is critical that the overall evaluation and the narrative support each other. Each School provides a standards guide designed to aid all reviewers in their systematic evaluation of a faculty member's productivity during the respective evaluation period (annual/biennial, 3rd year pre-tenure, promotion and/or tenure, and post-tenure). The School-specific standards may be found on the PVA website [<http://arts.unco.edu/for-faculty-staff/>]. All School specific standards must align with University and College policies and be approved by the Dean.

1. Eligibility for Comprehensive Review

Comprehensive Review is used to consider persons undergoing evaluation for 3rd year pre-tenure review, promotion, tenure, graduate faculty status, and post-tenure review. The pre-tenure review is conducted at approximately the mid-point of a tenure-track faculty member's probationary period and is intended as a check on an individual's progress toward tenure. As such, the evaluative criteria and processes of the pre-tenure and comprehensive evaluations are the same, although accomplishments for the pre-tenure review will be considered within the context of a shorter time period.

2. Comprehensive Review Dossier

In accordance with Board Policy, a dossier of materials is developed by the faculty member. Materials should be compiled into a binder provided by the College.

3. Comprehensive Review Peer Observation

Peer Observation is required for Comprehensive Review toward tenure and promotion (see page 11).

4. Timeline and Process for Comprehensive Review / Promotion and Tenure

The timeline for submission of materials is determined by the Dean's Office based upon the Academic Affairs academic calendar.

September

The Dean's Office notifies faculty regarding status for eligibility for the next promotional milestone.

Faculty develop their dossier with the overall guidance of the mentor if desired. The dossier is compiled using the binder and dividers provided by the Dean's office.

January

Comprehensive Review dossiers due from faculty to Associate Dean for review of materials to ensure accuracy and completeness of materials.

February

At the School level, the Director may invite comments from the faculty regarding the areas of teaching, professional activity, and service. In this case, the School determines how faculty comments are collected.

Dossiers due to the appropriate committee.

- The committee reviews the dossiers, then evaluates the faculty with both a narrative and overall evaluation measure between one (I) and five (V).

Dossiers due from School Committee to School Directors.

- School Director conducts an independent evaluation.

Dossiers due from School Directors to the Dean.

- Dean conducts an independent evaluation.

School Directors send status update to the faculty.

March

Dossiers due from the Dean to the Provost.

Dean's Office sends a status update to Faculty prior to submitting reports.

April

Comprehensive Review recommendations from Provost to President.

May

President and Provost send final promotion and tenure summary recommendations to BOT (June meeting)

NOTE: At each evaluative level, the faculty member must be notified of the evaluative decision and the rationale that guided the decision, and must be given a chance to respond. These responses are then placed with the evaluation materials as the process moves to the next level.

5. Director / Associate Dean Process – Comprehensive Review

The following methodology is used for the promotion and/or tenure of a Director or Associate Dean within the College of Performing and Visual Arts.

According to Board Policy, Directors and Associate Deans within PVA are also appointed with faculty rank within a specific School. Therefore, their promotion/tenure process closely follows the College procedures in place for faculty evaluation. Due to the unique nature of their work within the College, there are also notable exceptions, all of which are described below.

1) Development of Materials. The same three areas for evaluation with different weighting factors-- Scholarship/Creative work (5%), Teaching (5%) and Service (90%) are evaluated by the faculty within the School. Director workload is assigned by the Dean. Faculty make comments, and vote with the criteria expressed in current Board Policy for voting procedures and voter eligibility. The comments are collected and summarized in a letter from the School Evaluation/Personnel Committee to the Dean. Votes are tabulated and collected by the Dean's Office and become a part of the promotion and/or tenure dossier.

2) For administrative appointments, administration effort is counted in the process as Service. In the other two areas--Teaching and Scholarship/Creative Works, the candidate needs to demonstrate competency in those two areas as defined by current Board Policy and University Regulations.

3) The Dean evaluates the documentation independently of the School process and makes a final recommendation to the Provost.

C. Peer Observation

Peer observation and evaluation supports teaching excellence in PVA. It is part of two processes: 1. Tenure track faculty are observed in the Mentor-Protégé process years 1, 2, and 4, and for 3rd year pre-tenure evaluation (see Mentor-Protégé Program below). 2. Peer observation is also part of the comprehensive review toward tenure and promotion.

1. Peer Teaching Observation and Evaluation Process

The Associate Dean coordinates with the appropriate School Personnel Committee to arrange the peer observation.

The School Personnel Committee member conducts the observation and writes a narrative that aligns with the criteria in the School guidelines. The faculty being observed may also request the use of the PVA Peer Teaching Observation and Evaluation form available at: [<http://arts.unco.edu/for-faculty-staff/>].

The observation should be completed by the last day of classes, and the narrative submitted to the faculty member and School Director by the first day of finals week.

Faculty who are observed include the Peer Teaching Observation and Evaluation form in their Annual or Comprehensive Review materials.

Faculty may request peer observation at any point.

School Directors may observe and evaluate teaching in the classroom/studio/ensemble. The Director decides if and when to observe the faculty member. The School Director's observation will be a part of a larger formal review process that supplements the Director's response to the faculty member's Faculty Annual Report. This observation will be focused on evaluating the effectiveness of the faculty member in the classroom/studio/ensemble for a report that becomes part of that faculty member's permanent record.

D. Mentor-Protégé Program

The PVA Mentor-Protégé program is designed to help faculty achieve appropriate progress towards tenure and/or promotion. The program provides a forum wherein new faculty may engage in dialogue about their professional development as educators, scholars, artists, and citizens of the university and in which senior faculty may share their experiences and insights into their academic fields and the institutional culture. Both formal and informal mentorship relationships and activities are encouraged. A formal mentor is assigned to new faculty by the Dean's office. A naturally-occurring affinity among faculty may foster informal mentorship.

The Mentor-Protégé program is not limited to tenure track faculty. Participation by faculty seeking promotion to Professor are welcome and encouraged to participate.

The Associate Dean coordinates the PVA Mentor-Protégé Program in collaboration with School Directors.

Key Mentor Responsibilities

Mentors serve as a role model, and in this capacity they give constructive feedback, provide support and encouragement, and serve as a resource for the policies and procedures of PVA. Mentors:

- Orient the protégé to departmental policies and culture.
- Introduce the protégé to tenure and promotion policies in PVA. Documents include:
 - Peer Teaching Observation and Evaluation form
 - Annual / Biennial Review
 - Information for Tenure Application Binder
 - School-specific criteria
 - New Faculty Orientation Checklist
- Assist the protégé in creating a timetable/plan for tenure or promotion. Discussion should include a 1 year and 5 year trajectory; also the protégé should talk with both the Mentor and School Director as his or her timetable/plan evolves.
- Arrange and conduct a Peer Teaching Observation and Evaluation with Protégé.
- Help the protégé define the expectations in creative/scholarly areas at the University.
- Serve as a source of information regarding service expectations.
- Assist the protégé in developing an understanding of expectations of the University and the College in the area of teaching.

Key Protégé Responsibilities

- Make time to meet with mentor.
- Exhibit openness to his/her Mentor's suggestions.
- Ask for help or feedback when needed.
- Ask questions and seek clarification regarding policies and expectations that are unclear.
- Be willing to listen and learn.
- Take advantage of opportunities presented.
- Be open and honest.
- Be proactive about his or her needs.

General Schedule of Mentor-Protégé Events

During the fall semester, the Dean's office organizes a series of discussions with the Mentors and Protégés. During the spring semester, the mentor conducts a peer observation and informally discusses the Protégé's teaching and plan for tenure and/or promotion.

The Mentor-Protégé Formative Peer Teaching Observation and Evaluation

PVA mentors conduct a formative peer teaching observation and evaluation annually during the spring semester as part of the mentoring relationship. The PVA Mentor will consult with the Protégé and together they will decide when the observation is to be scheduled. For the purpose of consistency, the Mentor uses the PVA Peer Teaching Observation and Evaluation form. This observation is not included in the formal evaluative process. The results of this observation are confidential to the Mentor/Protégé pairing and are aimed at helping the protégé improve effectiveness in the classroom/studio/ensemble. This confidentiality enables the mentor to provide candid feedback.

The Associate Dean will be notified when the Mentor-Protégé observation has been completed.

Summative Peer Teaching Observation and Evaluation

Faculty are also formally observed in the fall. A member(s) of the School Personnel/Evaluation Committee conducts a summative observation(s) of the protégé once a year. This formal observation provides comments that become a part of the annual review/ 3rd year pre-tenure/tenure and promotion review process for the protégé.

VI. PVA-SPECIFIC GUIDELINES FOR TENURE AND PROMOTION

These guidelines are presented in comportment with and are subordinate to Board policy and are intended to provide specific clarification to areas that are unique to the College.

A. PVA Credentialing Requirements

In adherence to Board Policy and University Regulations:

- A terminal degree is recommended and preferred for all faculty teaching undergraduate level courses.
- A terminal degree is preferred for all faculty, and a minimum of 18 graduate credit hours completed in the teaching discipline.
- All requests to waive formal educational experience must be presented to the Dean with evidence of experience and justification letter from the Director for approval.

In adherence to Board Policy and University Regulations, recommendations for promotion and tenure shall be based on the quality of the record of achievement by the faculty member in the arenas of Instruction, Professional Activity, and Service.

The College follows Board policy regarding faculty credentialing and looks to school-specific accreditation for further guidance in the case of faculty who may not have a doctorate or terminal degree, but equivalent experience.

The College maintains a faculty (this includes Lecturer, Senior Lecturer, Instructor, Assistant, Associate, Professor, Contract Renewable, and Adjunct) whose aggregate individual qualifications enable the academic unit and the specific educational programs offered to accomplish their purposes. Faculty members (including part-time faculty and graduate teaching assistants, as applicable) shall be qualified by earned degrees and/or professional experience and/or demonstrated teaching competence for the subjects and levels they are teaching.

The Graduate School is charged with Graduate Faculty Standing (GFS) and Doctoral Research Endorsement (DRE). For forms and more information, see:

[\[http://www.unco.edu/grad/faculty/graduate_faculty_status.html\]](http://www.unco.edu/grad/faculty/graduate_faculty_status.html).

Credentialing / School of Art and Design (NASAD)

Teachers of any studio subject normally are or have been deeply involved as practicing artists or designers in the particular disciplines or specializations they are teaching.

NASAD recognizes the Master of Fine Arts as the appropriate terminal degree for studio faculty. At the same time, the Association recognizes that some highly qualified artist-teachers may hold other academic degrees; others may not hold any academic degrees. In such cases, the institution should base appointments on experience, training, and expertise at least equivalent to those required for the Master of Fine Arts degree in the appropriate field.

The terminal degree for Art History is a Ph.D. in the field. The terminal degree for Art Education is a Ph.D. or Ed.D.

Credentialing / School of Music (NASM)

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; others may not hold any academic degrees. In such cases, the institution should base appointments on experience, education, and expertise at least equivalent to those required for the master's degree in music or another appropriate field.

Academic degrees are a pertinent indicator of the teacher's qualifications for instructing in theoretical, historical, and pedagogical subjects. Creative work, research, and publication are indicators of a teacher's qualifications, productivity, professional awareness, and contribution to various aspects of music and music-related fields.

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.

Credentialing / School of Theatre and Dance (NAST)

NAST recognizes the Master of Fine Arts as the appropriate terminal degree for performance, design/technology, and playwriting faculty. At the same time, the Association recognizes that some highly qualified artist-teachers may hold other academic degrees; others may not hold any academic

degrees. In such cases, the institution should base appointments on experience, training, and expertise at least equivalent to those required for the master's degree in the appropriate field.

Academic degrees are a pertinent indicator of the teacher's qualifications for instructing in theoretical, historical, and pedagogical subjects. In general, the Ph.D. and comparable doctorates are the appropriate terminal degrees in these fields; however, creative work, research, and publication are indicators of a teacher's qualifications, productivity, professional awareness, and contribution to various aspects of theatre and theatre-related fields.

B. PVA Guidelines for Instruction, Professional Activity, and Service

Instruction

Teaching excellence is a value embraced and practiced by PVA faculty, as expressed in UNC's vision statement and the university's well-established history of preparing educators. NASAD, NASM, and NAST standards further articulate that all faculty must be able to guide student learning and to communicate personal knowledge and experience effectively.

For consideration of promotion and tenure, PVA defines effective instruction as 1) a current knowledge base for each course taught; 2) clarity of instructor expectations; 3) a methodology and pedagogy that adequately conveys the knowledge base defined by the course objectives and course requirements as listed in each course syllabus; and 4) a fair and clearly communicated assessment capable of adequately measuring and demonstrating each student's achievement in the course. Effective instruction is measured by peer observation, student evaluation, and the annual / biennial / comprehensive review process.

Professional Activity

PVA recognizes that Professional Activity may include any of a wide variety of activities, depending upon the field of specialization, the interests of the faculty members, and activities expected in the area of the faculty member's appointment

At the college-level, professional activity is viewed in part by scope and the impact of activity at each rank. PVA supports a pyramid-model of work and professional development over time; that is, an assistant professor develops a foundational body of work that is local and regional, but achieving or showing the potential for a national and/or international presence. Professional activity aims for depth, breadth, and/or specialization. Faculty are generally expected to build a presence and profile that is national and/or international as one moves toward the Associate and Professor rank.

Service

Faculty are expected to contribute substantively in service efforts at the academic unit, college, and/or university level, as well as at the professional and/or community level, commensurate with their assigned workload and academic rank. As stated previously, recruiting and advising are categorized as service. Service is defined and coordinated in conjunction with the Director within each School based on the unique subjective and objective qualitative and quantitative nature of each faculty discipline and area. A faculty member may request a memo from the Director that articulates specific recruiting

expectations. As faculty moves through academic rank, leadership in service will bear more weight than participation. Additionally, the quantity of service activity should not be considered a substitute for the quality of the contribution.

C. Other PVA-Specific Requirements for Promotion and Tenure

Assistant Professor

- Degree requirements described in Credentialing, pg. 13
- Faculty member develops strong teaching skills.
- Faculty member develops a foundational body of work, one that is local and regional, but achieving or showing the potential of a national and/or international presence.
- Faculty member should demonstrate some service at the College, University, and community levels.
- Graduate Faculty status [See Graduate Faculty Guidelines on the UNC Graduate Council website].

Promotion to Associate Professor

- Through professional activity, faculty is specializing and continuing to establish a national and/or international presence and profile.
- Candidate demonstrates service at the college, university, and community levels.

Promotion to Professor

- Demonstrates a robust and specialized body of work - one that is national and international.
- Expectation of leadership in service at the college, university, and community level.
- To receive an endorsement required for the supervision of doctoral dissertations, faculty must achieve additional standards for scholarship and research advisement as described in the *Graduate Faculty Guidelines* [See University Regulations 3-3-801(2)(d)(III); Board Policy Manual 2-3-801(1)(m) and 2-3-801(2)(a)(VII).] Due to discipline-specific parameters, discussions and decisions about Doctoral Research Endorsement (DRE) status shall be conducted at the School level, and if desired, become a part of School performance standards.

D. Contract Renewable Faculty Seeking Rank Change

According to Board Policy, individuals in contract-renewable positions, except Visiting Faculty, are eligible for consideration for promotion to the next higher rank if they meet the minimum requirements for that rank. Therefore, their promotion process closely follows the College procedures in place for faculty evaluation. Due to the unique nature of their work within the College, Contract Renewable faculty are evaluated in the same three areas with different weighting factors—Teaching (70%), Scholarship/Creative work (20%), and Service (10%). Please note that this is a guideline and individual percentages may be negotiated by faculty.

E. School-Specific Performance Standards

Each school will develop specific performance standards that define the Board mandated levels of: excellent, exceeds expectations, meets expectations, needs improvement, and unsatisfactory (with numerical indicators). These performance standards may be descriptive phrase or statements, or a

specific weight assigned to a specific activity. These standards are determined and approved by faculty in each School.

If there are no School standards in place, the School reverts to College, Board Policy, and University Regulation guidelines.

The School-specific standards may be found on the PVA website [<http://arts.unco.edu/for-faculty-staff/>].

VII. SABBATICAL LEAVE

Per Board Policy 2-3-1001(1), the sabbatical leave program at the University is designed to provide an opportunity for faculty growth and renewal and must be for the manifest, demonstrable benefit of the University in the promotion of teaching and scholarship. The purpose of sabbatical leave is to enhance professional growth, knowledge in the discipline, students' educational experience, and the University's reputation.

Before starting the application process PVA Faculty must read the universities policies regarding sabbatical leave which can be found in the Board of Trustees Policy Manual and the University Regulations [<http://www.unco.edu/trustees/>].

A. Eligibility

Per Board Policy, tenured and tenure track faculty are eligible for sabbatical leave consideration during the sixth year of full-time service, with leaves taken in the seventh or in a subsequent year.

B. Application

The form must be completed electronically as there are areas with drop-down box options to select. All application materials should be submitted to your School Director. **Required Sabbatical Application Materials include:**

- Sabbatical Leave Application Form
- Curriculum Vitae
- Plan for Sabbatical Leave, must include the following:
 - Objectives of project/s
 - Activities and timeline
 - Contributions to: knowledge in the discipline; applicant's professional growth; students' educational experiences; University's reputation
 - Relevance to applicant's on-campus responsibilities
 - Explanation of any time sensitivity (e.g., a need to complete the project during proposed dates)

C. Appropriate Use of Sabbatical Leaves

Per Board Policy 2-3-1001(3), the activities undertaken during sabbatical leave must be related to the individual's on-campus responsibilities. The proposal must specify the effect on professional growth, development of knowledge in the discipline, influence on the students' educational experience, and the enhancement of the University's reputation. Once the goals and plan are approved, the faculty member is obligated to fulfill them, unless amended [See also 2-3-1001(5) Approval Procedures]."

Examples of acceptable sabbatical proposals include, but are not limited to:

- The pursuit of research or study at an institution of higher education or similar entity where improvement of oneself as a teacher-scholar is the focus.
- The pursuit of research projects or creative endeavors within a faculty member's specialty to advance knowledge; improve the "state of the art," or to produce material for publication.
- The acquisition of practical experience that will directly enhance the individual's capacity to meet University responsibilities.
- The pursuit of special studies or projects for the purpose of expanding institutional-related services beyond the faculty member's obligations.

Examples of unacceptable sabbatical proposals include, but are not limited to:

- Study at an institution of higher education, the primary purpose of which is to gain a degree in an area or discipline not related to current University responsibilities.
- Travel that is not directly related to University responsibilities. (A significant distinction is made herein between travel to improve oneself as a teacher-scholar and travel in and of itself.)
- Any sabbatical request within the faculty member's current obligations to the University. (Examples include rewriting of course materials, course development, and the like.)
- Activities or research not related to current University responsibilities.

D. Faculty Report Obligation

Per Board Policy 2-3-1001(8), in accepting a sabbatical leave, the faculty member agrees to provide to the department/school faculty a written report of the activities, the goals attained, and the benefits derived during the course of the leave. Upon approval of the faculty, the report will be forwarded to the department chair/school Director and the dean. The department chair/school Director and the Dean will review the report to ensure it clearly addresses how the sabbatical leave met the appropriate uses of sabbatical leaves as specified in 2-3-1001(3). If the department chair/school faculty or Dean finds the report unacceptable, the faculty member will be notified in writing and will have the opportunity to respond. Once the report has been accepted, copies will be forwarded to the CAO. Faculty members who do not submit an acceptable report within one academic year of completion of the leave shall not be eligible for subsequent sabbatical leaves.

E. Institutional Accountability

Per Board Policy 2-3-1001(9) (a), all sabbatical leave records and approved and disapproved plans, will be available for inspection, upon request, by the Joint Budget Committee, the Education Committees of the Senate and the House of Representatives, and the Colorado Commission on Higher Education. Withdrawn plans will not be included in the records and will be returned to the faculty members.

F. Timeline and Process

September

Deans provide HR and Provost with eligibility lists for faculty.

October

Faculty eligibility is confirmed by HR for Provost and Deans.

The PVA Dean's Office will invite all eligible faculty to a meeting to review the Sabbatical Leave Application process.

Faculty applications due to school Directors.

November

Director's recommendation to Dean.

December

Deans recommend sabbatical leaves to Provost.

February

Provost recommends sabbatical leaves to President.

President returns sabbatical leave recommendations to Provost.

March

Provost announces sabbatical leaves to the Board of Trustees.

VIII. FACULTY REASSIGNMENT AWARD

Purpose

The purpose of the Faculty Reassignment Program is to offer 3 faculty members a concentrated assignment in research, scholarship, and creative works (RSCW) during the academic year. This initiative is an outgrowth of the University of Northern Colorado's Research Plan 2012-2015, a comprehensive guide for enhancing RSCW at the institution. The plan includes a list of goals and strategies developed by the Research Advisory Council with input from the campus community.

A. Timeline and Process

November

Announcement of application materials.

January

Faculty submit applications electronically to PVA Dean's Office.

February

Dean's Faculty Advisory Council evaluates the applications and makes recommendations to the Dean based on the stipulated criteria.

Dean evaluates the applications in consultation with the Directors.

March

Dean makes final decision regarding faculty reassignments. Four awards are possible for the College.

B. Application Details

The call for applications is typically sent to faculty by the Dean in October / November.

As outlined in the Invitation for Proposals, the minimum criteria for reassignment awards established by the Research Advisory Council and Acting Assistant Vice President for research include:

- 1) Applicant is a full-time faculty member working in a tenured, tenure-track, or contract-renewable position for which accomplishments in research, scholarship, or creative works are an expectation.
- 2) Faculty member makes a solid case for having established a strong track record and the necessary groundwork to be able make significant progress on a clearly defined progress in the discipline. Groundwork will depend on the project but may include such initiatives as having established partnerships, collected pilot data, examined historical artifacts, submitted an application to the Institutional Review Board, obtained instruments, ordered supplies, or summarized relevant literature and practices.
- 3) Faculty member develops a strong plan in which he or she:
 - i) Prepares a compelling 2-page (single-space, 12-point font) prospectus for a meritorious project in research, scholarship, or creative works that contributes to a defined area of scholarship;
 - ii) Includes a timeline of project activities for the semester and explains how it will be possible to advance on the project during the period;
 - iii) Agrees to follow all relevant University rules and regulations in the conduct of the scholarship;
 - iv) Agrees to describe the reassignment during the faculty evaluation process;
 - v) Agrees to submit a 2-page summary of activities, specific outcomes, and future plans related to the reassignment to the Dean and the Assistant Vice President for Research within three months following the completion of the reassignment;
 - vi) Agrees not to accept any overload assignment (e.g., teaching an extra course) during the semester of the award; and if applicable:
 - vii) Explains unique circumstances if selecting one of the two variants: (a) concentrated time within a semester or (b) two-award request; in the latter case, additionally provides a summary of the proposed grant submission, potential funding agency, maximum funding for agency program, and justification of the project's merit and integrity.

In addition to the application materials, please include:

- Identification of the type of award (Standard Award, Alternative 1, Alternative 2)
- Identify which semester the reassignment will occur.

Submit all materials electronically to PVA Dean's Office.

C. PVA Guidelines for Faculty Creative/Research Away Time

Faculty who plan to be away for one week (up to 5 consecutive instructional days) to conduct professional activity during the semester submit a Travel Authorization form to the School Director for approval.

Faculty planning to be away for two to three weeks (10-15 consecutive instructional days) during the semester are encouraged to apply for a Faculty Reassignment Award. If the Faculty Reassignment Award application period is passed, faculty should meet the School Director.

Faculty planning to be away for three or more weeks (15 + consecutive instructional days) during the semester apply for sabbatical.

Last minute requests for faculty away time are reviewed and approved by School Director.

VIII. LINKS TO DOCUMENTS

Board Policy: http://www.unco.edu/trustees/policy_manual.pdf

University Regulations: http://www.unco.edu/trustees/University_Regulations.pdf

Graduate School forms for GFS and DRE:

http://www.unco.edu/grad/faculty/graduate_faculty_status.html

PVA Forms including Annual / Biennial Faculty Review, Promotion / Tenure, Sabbatical Leave Checklist, and School-specific performance standards: <http://arts.unco.edu/for-faculty-staff/>