



College	Herberger Institute for Design and the Arts	
Unit	School of Film, Dance and Theatre	
Document	Evaluation Plan	
Approved by the faculty		Date:
Reviewed by the dean		Date:

Provost office approval

Vice Provost for Academic Personnel	Date

Office of the University Provost

300 East University Drive
P.O. Box 877805 Tempe, AZ 85287-7805
(480) 965-4995 Fax: (480) 965-0785
<https://provost.asu.edu/>

ASU School of Film, Dance and Theatre

Evaluation Plan for Faculty and Academic Professionals with Teaching Assignments

I. Introduction

The following standards and practices for the review of the School of Film, Dance and Theatre (hereinafter referred to as “SoFDT”) faculty were accepted by a two-thirds vote of the full faculty on December 12, 2013.

This evaluation plan includes the purposes, policies and procedures for evaluation. The plan may be amended by the procedures used to amend the bylaws of the School. Written notice must be provided to all faculty/staff members, at least one week prior to the meeting, and shall include the time, place, location, date of the meeting and a general statement of the purpose of the amendment or the exact wording of the amendment to be given. A membership quorum must be present. A two-thirds vote of the membership present is required to adopt the proposed amendment.

The SoFDT adheres to the guidelines set forth in the Arizona State University (ASU) Policies and Procedures (ACD) Manual, and information in other documents issued by the Arizona Board of Regents, the university administration, and the Herberger Institute for Design and the Arts. This document also adheres to the Herberger Institute for Design and the Arts Annual Performance Review and Post Tenure Review document. Position documents from professional membership organizations, including: the University/Resident Theatre Association; the Association for Theatre in Higher Education; the American Alliance for Theatre & Education; and the United States Institute for Theatre Technology; may serve as additional references and support sources for the Director’s and Personnel Committee’s evaluation of faculty. Citation of these documents is encouraged, when necessary, to assist both Departmental and non-Departmental reviewers in understanding the discipline’s unique issues in faculty evaluation.

This plan does not supersede university tenure and promotion guidelines; the Director will notify those standing for these reviews of the current university requirements.

In this document, “faculty” also refers to academic professionals with teaching assignments.

II. Purposes of Evaluation

The primary purposes of the SoFDT evaluation plan are to establish faculty performance criteria, to reduce ambiguity in matters of evaluation, and to establish a coherent policy. The plan incorporates the university guidelines for assessing performance of faculty and academic professionals (ABOR 6-211 and 6-302), and the Institute and University guidelines for the post-tenure review process. For faculty, these guidelines include performance in:

1. Instructional Contributions (Teaching);
2. Research and Creative Activity; and
3. Professional, Institutional, and Community Service; and contributions to unit diversity goals.

Affirmative action and recruitment and retention goals for students from traditionally underrepresented groups are to be considered in all Instructional Contributions, Research and Creative Activity, and Service.

The secondary purposes of the departmental evaluation and compensation plan are to assist in professional development, and to aid decisions concerning salary adjustment. Professional development serves to improve and/or enhance future performance as well as assess past performance. The emphasis in the evaluation process is on quality.

Since this Departmental evaluation process also serves as the basis of the ASU post-tenure review process, 20% of the tenured faculty from each department randomly selected in the Herberger Institute for Design and the Arts will also engage in a review at the Dean's level.

III. Policies and Procedures for Faculty Evaluation and Compensation

A. Overview

The Director is responsible for conducting annual performance reviews for all tenured, tenure-track, and continuing appointment faculty, including lecturers, clinical professors and professors of practice. The faculty will be involved in the evaluation process in three ways:

1. The full faculty will review the evaluation process annually in conjunction with the SoFDT mission statement and the institute and university post-tenure review guidelines;
2. The elected faculty Personnel Committee will review faculty teaching and other supporting materials related to research/creative activity and service annually and assign a level of performance rating; in addition,
3. The Director, after reviewing each area's proposed course offerings for

the year (as prepared and submitted by the area coordinator), will negotiate performance assignments with each faculty member.

The annual performance evaluation covers the past three-year period, with more weight given to the most recent year, and is a thorough review of the individual faculty member's contributions through Instructional Contributions, Research and Creative Activity, and Service, with an emphasis on their quality.

Faculty performance in each of three contribution areas (Instructional Contributions, Research and Creative Activity, and Service) will be rated separately by the Personnel Committee and then by the Director as demonstrating "exceptionally meritorious," "highly meritorious," "meritorious," "satisfactory," or "unsatisfactory" performance. The Personnel Committee, and then the Director, will also assign a composite rating for overall performance. The school follows Institute standards for definitions of "exceptionally meritorious," "highly meritorious," "meritorious," "satisfactory," and "unsatisfactory."

Collaborative research/creative activity and co-teaching are valued as highly as individual effort.

B. Areas of Contribution

1. Instructional Contributions (Teaching)

a. Moving from both the premise that the school's assessment practices reflect our values, and that the function of measurement and evaluation is to further the school's aims and mission, excellence in teaching/mentorship shall be defined as both micro and macro practices supporting the mission of the school and the growth and individual achievement of students.

Our teaching practices are broad and diverse. They include classroom-based methods such as lectures and discussions, studio and production laboratory practices, online material delivery and interaction, and formal and informal individualized and small group mentorship. Excellence in teaching is not determined by specific methodology, format or venue but rather by the quality of faculty input and student outcome. Excellent teaching:

- Creates a positive environment where students are inspired, encouraged and supported to take risks and explore possibilities
- Fosters collaborative and cooperative learning communities
- Enhances student motivation
- Supports students from all ethnic and cultural backgrounds, of differing abilities, and with diverse K-12 educational experiences

- Grows students' intellectual and creative agility
- Increases students' personal and professional capacities
- Encourages professional integrity, artistic responsibility and social engagement
- Holds students to high standards of intellectual and artistic achievement

Excellent teachers share many practices, for example, excellent teachers:

- Prepare thorough and challenging course syllabi, course materials and assessments
- Integrate current thinking and evidence-based practices
- Try new pedagogical methods and technologies in the classroom
- Understand how students' individual experiences and particular courses fit into the school's arc of intellectual and creative discovery
- Attend seminars or colloquia for improvement
- Share successful techniques with colleagues
- Are available to students outside class time for discussion and counseling
- Provide opportunities for students to learn from each other to enrich their understandings
- Engage students in routine reflection about what they learned, how they learned it, and what it means to them
- Treat students with respect
- Respect their subject matter and aesthetic practices
- Use self-assessment to grow their own teaching and creativity

2. Research and Creative Activity

Measuring success and excellence in the arts is by definition a difficult task and cannot be easily compared to the same measures in other fields. So, too, the measure of success and excellence in scholarship/creative activity in the arts presents unique challenges. Scholarship in the School of Film, Dance and Theatre includes, and must often include, creative activity as well as traditional scholarly research. Scholarship/creative activity is vital, as it informs teaching and scholarship as well as fostering community embeddedness and advancing the field.

The measure of success for SoFDT faculty is excellent scholarship/creative activity. The faculty of SoFDT is engaged in a wide range of artistic and scholarly projects in the practical and theoretical areas, such as: Dance and Movement; Design, Production and Management; Film and Media; Performance Practice (acting/performing, directing); New Work development and Composition

(playwriting, screenwriting, choreography, musical composition); Performance Studies; Education and Community Engagement, civic practice and others. SoFDT faculty members can work exclusively in one area, or they can engage in hybrid forms of investigations.

- SoFDT defines scholarship and creative activities by comparing achievement and performance to the acknowledged best in one's field on a national/international level.
- SoFDT considers creative investigation crucial to the ongoing development of the artist. It is not limited to pedagogic activity, but should include active exploration that culminates in work that makes a contribution to the fields of film, dance, theatre and related fields.

3. Service

Engagement partners the university's knowledge and resources with those of the public and private sectors to enrich scholarship, research, and creative activity; to enhance curriculum, teaching and learning; to prepare educated, engaged citizens; to strengthen democratic values and civic responsibility; to address critical societal and ethical issues; and contribute to the public good.

- A creative/scholarship model of engagement involves both the act of engaging and the product of engagement.
- Engagement cuts across the mission of teaching, research, and service. It is not a separate activity, but a particular approach to campus-community collaboration.
- Engagement is reciprocal and mutually beneficial. There is mutual planning, implementation, and assessment among engagement partners.

Engagement is consistent with ASU's mission, and continuing commitment to transforming this institution to meet the needs of the 21st century. The SoFDT recognizes that community-based engagement crosses traditional disciplinary lines and is, in practice, intellectual and creative fusion.

C. Definition of Excellence

Excellence, to some degree, must be determined by impact on the field and establishment of a national/international reputation. However, if excellence is measured exclusively by how a contribution in film, dance, theatre or related field is perceived by the world at large it limits the usefulness of developing new work. The standard of excellence must constantly adapt to changing realities and must be measured in part by the degree of risk taking.

Excellence in the arts is sometimes hard to quantify, but it can be evaluated using the following criteria:

1. Productivity of research, scholarship and creative activity.
2. Diversity of research, scholarship and creative activity.
3. Quality of research, scholarship and creative activity.
4. Impact of research, scholarship and creative activity.

Performance scholarship and creative research can be manifested in any of a variety of media and formats, including but not limited to: in print and on video, in performance or presentation, in recorded digital or other electronic format, or online. All faculty are expected to produce and continue to pursue excellence in scholarly and/or creative research work. This work is manifest in one or more of the following:

1. Contribution of new knowledge to the field.
2. Contribution of new perspectives to the field.
3. Contribution to an ongoing dialogue with peers.
4. Demonstrated potential for changing the field.
5. Demonstrated potential for further activity.
6. Demonstrated entrepreneurship.
7. Contribution to civic and community engagement.

Research and creative accomplishments should be evaluated in the context of the faculty member's overall record, artistic growth, and contribution to the discipline. There should be evidence of continued and effective engagement in work of high quality and significance. No appointment or promotion to a tenured position will be made without evidence of distinction in research or creative activity. The faculty member's research record should show growth, direction and promise for the future (except in highly unusual and appropriate circumstances). Work within SoFDT that garners national recognition through presentation or publication will also be considered.

IV. Area Specific Criteria

A. Overview

SoFDT is organized into seven subject areas for administrative and curricular purposes. Each area has established criteria for scholarly/creative work. These are listed below (in alphabetical order).

B. Dance/Movement Area

1. Overview

Creative/Research Activity involves the faculty member in dialogue and dissemination with peers regarding the theorization and practice of dance. Faculty members are recognized as artist/scholars actively engaged with the rapidly expanding range of global contexts for dance, encompassing a range of approaches and activities, from traditional to experimental and emergent. As such, activity may involve the faculty member as sole author, or in collaboration with others within or across disciplinary boundaries. Faculty members recognize that creativity and research are at the heart of our program, informed by core principles of humanity, reflection, context, and leadership.

2. Nature of Creative and Research Activity

Creative/Research Activity will include the creation/performance/presentation of, and writing about, dance, movement and related disciplines. Some Examples of Creative/Research Activity include:

- Creating and/or performing an original dance/performance piece
- Writing an original text (book, article, conference presentation, review, narrative, etc.) related to the theorization and practice of dance
- Creating interdisciplinary installations and performances for venues and sites both traditional and non-traditional (e.g. conferences, proscenium stage, galleries, public spaces, natural environments, etc.)
- Reconstructing, staging, adapting, re-conceptualizing or notating an existing dance, dance/movement practice, or movement form
- Performing, dramaturgy, creating music for, or designing (costumes/sets/lighting) an original or existing dance work
- Conceiving, designing, implementing, and/or assessing new approaches to pedagogy involving dance/movement
- Developing, implementing, integrating, and assessing new technology as related to dance performance, choreography, pedagogy and/or scholarship
- Creating/conceiving and implementing scholarly/creative projects to engage with/build diverse communities, where “community” is broadly defined as a group of people having a particular characteristic in common

3. Philosophy of Evaluation of Creative/Research Activity

Research and creative accomplishments should be evaluated in the context of the faculty member's overall record, artistic/scholarly growth, and contribution to the discipline at local, regional, national, and international levels. There should be evidence of continued and effective engagement in work of high quality and significance. The faculty member's research record should show growth, direction, and promise for the future. No appointment or promotion to a tenured position will be made without evidence of distinction in research or creative activity.

Research in the area of dance and movement may be evidenced by traditional scholarship and publication activities. The creation, performance, and implementation of dance and dance related projects are also central to the discipline and are therefore considered a vital part of the evaluation process. The nature of dance choreography and performance, and related projects, should be specifically described and contextualized. Any choreographic, performance or related dance product should be considered juried when another institution, granting agency, external producing agent or other (professional, educational, community, government) organization reviews a number of works and judges their merits before accepting the work for monetary support, public performance, or implementation. Unsolicited written responses and reviews of a choreographic or performance product, or dance related project, are also a form of external adjudication; the reputation of the reviewers and the prestige of the venue will be considered. Choreography, performance and related work selected by organizations that offer opportunities to have work reviewed and selected for performance (or exhibition, installation, on-line presentation, implementation, etc.) may also be equated with a juried publication. Submitting dance-based projects to these kinds of organizations on an annual or biannual basis is recommended of tenure-track faculty with performance, choreography, and/or other dance-related projects as their principle areas of research.

To encourage a rich diversity of faculty contributions and support the evolution of academic careers, the Dance/Movement area acknowledges the importance of evaluation criteria. It is also essential to place such criteria in context in order to broaden our definitions of professional competence and humanize the assessment process. Although the evaluation process at all levels involves the presentation and review of faculty "products," the process of faculty evaluation must not be limited to the quantification or categorization of the most tangible outcomes of faculty work. At its best, the evaluation process examines all aspects of faculty activity, seeking to discover each faculty member's unique areas of excellence

and to understand how these areas interact to contribute to the department as a vibrant, honorable and compassionate dance community.

4. Evaluation Criteria

In the evaluation of faculty for purposes of annual evaluation and compensation, promotion and tenure or post-tenure review, aspects of productivity and quality are assessed as follows:

- **Productivity** is ordinarily measured by the number of research-based or creative products, including choreography, performance, music composition, conference presentations, and publications undertaken in the evaluation period at the regional, national or international level. Evidence of these efforts such as video and audio recordings, programs, external critiques, published or unpublished reviews, reprints, digital or on-line materials, and papers should be available for evaluation in a research portfolio or have been evaluated through a process approved by the Dance/Movement area during the appropriate time period. Consideration is given to the differences in time required to produce different types of research/creative products. Thus, evidence of progress on long-term research efforts (notes, photos, and audio/video documentation from collaborative planning sessions; documentation of time devoted to learning new methodologies and/or technologies for research; bibliographies of sources reviewed in a new area of scholarship; chapters from books in development, etc.) are also considered.
- **Quality** is measured by the extent to which the work reflects area standards; the impact on intended audiences/communities; the excellence, relevance, importance, innovation, and originality of the work; and the relationship between the research and the development or enhancement of the field at the regional, national and international level. High ratings are extended to faculty with national/international recognition, and/or creative and research efforts recognized for significant levels of achievement, which add to a sustained and cumulative record of work at the local and regional level. Indicators include the level of discourse generated by the research and creative work evidenced through editorials, reviews, personal/public letters/emails, social media exchanges, etc; quality of venue or publication/publisher; grants, awards, and honors received; presentations on the work at conferences and elsewhere; commissions and guest artist residencies for professional companies or at other institutions; centrality to mission of the area, school, institute and university; focus,

growth and progression through one's career; establishment of expertise and leadership in the field; and regional, national and international visibility in the field.

C. Design, Production and Management

The design, production and management area recognizes that creative scholarly work must be evaluated by the growth of the artist/scholar and by advancement of their discipline, not solely on the reputation of the venue or publication outlet. The design, production and management area also recognizes excellence in scholarship that reaches the scholar's optimum audience of professional peers.

Excellent work:

1. Contributes new knowledge or new perspectives to the artist/scholar's disciplinary field or sub-field.
2. Demonstrates the potential for changing or expanding the scholar's disciplinary field or sub-field or otherwise having an impact on the scholarship or practice of design, production, or management.
3. Possesses the potential for further artistic and scholarly development, research and publication.

Criteria for assessing excellence include but are not limited to:

1. Quality, quantity and diversity of creative and scholarly activity.
2. Juried or peer reviewed publication, exhibition, or presentation.
3. Engagement in work that garners national and/or international attention, through publication or presentation, whether that work originates on campus or off.
4. Invitation to work in venues or publish in outlets that routinely have the resources for engaging artists and scholars of national merit and choose artists based in the school.

D. Film and Media

The Film and Media Production Area recognizes that excellence in research and creative activity can be manifested in a wide variety of endeavors, including but not limited to:

1. Film, television and/or media development, production and/or marketing — evidence of continued and effective engagement in work of quality and significance, whether local, regional, national/international. Such evidence may include, but not be limited to:

- Letters of evaluation
 - Press and/or reviews
 - Publications commenting upon one's work
 - Exhibitions of one's work
 - Contracts for consultancy or advisement with professional organizations, companies or individuals
 - Options or writing contracts on written work
 - Peer evaluations, internal and/or external
2. Publication — book, script, article or review published in a recognized venue (whether now existing or established in the future).
 3. Invitations to and/or participation in professional or educational organizations to discuss disciplinary theory, practice, pedagogy, and/or research.
 4. Membership in professional guilds, associations or organizations recognized in core or related industries.
 5. Professional certifications and/or licenses granted by organizations in core or related industries.
 6. Continued professional contributions to productions or practices, including, but not limited to, consultancies.
 7. Developing, training and coaching of peers.
 8. Development of and engagement in community initiatives.

E. Performance/Directing Area

Creative Activity involves the faculty member in a creative dialogue with professional peers in some aspect of the creation and performance of theatre, theatrical events (encompassing a wide range of activities from traditional, to experimental, to community embedded performance work) or other forms of mediated performance such as television, film and radio. The Carnegie Foundation categorizes creative work within “scholarship of discovery.” [2] They write that scholarship of discovery “comes closest to what academics mean when they speak of research, although we intend that this type of scholarship also include the creative work of faculty in the literary, visual, and performing

arts.”[3]

The ultimate determination of the kind of scholarship a performance fulfills will depend on:

1. The artist’s initial questions of investigation.
2. The form of the artist’s documentation of inquiry.
3. The focus of the peer evaluation.

Like scholarly work, production and performance must:

4. Be presented publicly or in published form.
5. Be peer-evaluated
6. Contribute to the ongoing conversation with peers.

We define “peers” to mean colleagues in both the audience and the arts world.

Some Examples of Creative Work according to Boyer’s Categories of Discovery, Engagement or Integration[4]:

- Writing, adapting or translating a play
- Creating and/or performing an original performance piece
- Acting, directing, dramaturging, coaching or designing a production (as an application of the skills of the theatre artist)
- Directing new work
- Re-conceptualizing and directing a “classic” play
- Directing a production to implement different acting techniques and assessing the uses of those techniques
- Developing, implementing, and assessing a new arts technology
- Using a production to make connections with the community
- Training and coaching peers

Research and creative accomplishments should be evaluated in the context of the faculty member’s overall record, artistic growth, and contribution to the discipline. There should be evidence of continued and effective engagement in work of high quality and significance. No appointment or promotion to a tenured position will be made without evidence of distinction in research or creative activity. The faculty member’s research record should show growth, direction, and promise for the future. A work once counted for advancement cannot be counted again (except in highly unusual and demonstrably appropriate circumstances).[5] Work within the SoFDT that garners national recognition through presentation or publication will also be considered.

Creative work will be assessed on the basis of:

1. Letters of evaluation by professionals in the field
2. The relative importance of the venue
3. Press reviews
4. Publications commenting on the work
5. Exhibitions of or presentations about the work at national and international venues and conferences
6. Peer reviews and recommendations solicited by the unit.

F. Composition and New Works

The Dramatic Writing area incorporates a variety of genres and styles in the creation of new works. Some of our faculty may work primarily in one, but may also be working in other areas as well (such as directing, TYA, solo performance, dance and film.) These sections cover the work that is specific to their writing.

Playwriting

The Composition and New Works area evaluates creative work by playwrights employing the following criteria:

Playwrights must write, develop, produce and/or publish plays in a variety of venues. Quality of the product is of utmost importance, but evidence of developing the work in a collaborative process is also important. The playwright must be engaged with audiences and peers.

Creative work in playwriting will be assessed on the basis of:

1. Letters of evaluation by professionals in the field.
2. The relative importance of the venue and/or the publisher.
3. Press reviews.
4. Publications commenting on the work.
5. Exhibitions of or presentations about the work at national and international venues and conferences.
6. Peer reviews and recommendations solicited by the unit.

The program acknowledges that important work is created in less well-known, less traditional venues, particularly when work is embedded in a particular community. This work therefore creates value beyond the “mainstream” concept of success.

Screenwriting (to be revised to include more television writing)

The Composition and New Works area evaluates screenwriting using the following

criteria, including but not limited to:

1. Evidence of optioning or selling of a script to a production company.
2. Evidence of credit on a film, either on a major studio film or an independent company.
3. Evidence of membership in the Writers Guild of America.
4. Evidence of writing awards or some other recognition.
5. Participation in festivals or screenwriters' labs, or placement in screenwriting competitions.
6. Press reviews.
7. Letters of recommendation by members of the industry, established producers, directors, or fellow writers.

Television Writing

The Composition and New Works area evaluates TV writing using the following criteria, including but not limited to:

1. Evidence of optioning or selling of a script to a production company or network.
2. Evidence of credit on a television series or mini-series, TV special or TV film.
3. Evidence of membership in the Writers Guild of America.
4. Evidence of writing awards or some other recognition.
5. Participation in television writers' labs, or placement in TV writing competitions.
6. Press reviews.
7. Letters of recommendation by members of the industry, established producers, directors, or fellow writers.

G. Performance Studies (draft 11/13)

The Performance Studies area (PS) recognizes that excellence in scholarship can be manifested in a variety of media and formats including, but not limited to performance [TU1], print, and electronic and/or online formats. Excellent scholarship can appear in performance venues that require expert dramaturgical research, or in publications that choose their essays through a process involving expert referees, eminent scholars as curators, or editors who invite a submission, either for definite publication or for selection [TU2]. Excellent scholarship can appear in venues outside of the traditional theatre and performance studies publications, such as, but not limited to, publications in anthropology, dance, film, cultural studies, women's studies, African-American studies, childhood studies, etc. In addition to performance dramaturgy and publishing,

appropriate outlets for scholarship include conference papers, keynote addresses, workshop presentations, and other public venues where scholarship is presented to the scholar's professional peers [LG3].

The PS area therefore recognizes excellence in scholarship that reaches the scholar's optimum audience of professional peers [LG4], and accomplishes one or more of the following:

1. Contributes new knowledge or new perspective to the scholar's disciplinary field or sub-field.
2. Demonstrates the potential for changing or expanding the scholar's disciplinary field or sub-field.
3. Possesses the potential for further research and publication, e.g. a conference paper that leads to an article or book chapter [LG5].

H. Theatre for Youth, and Education and Community Engagement

Theatre for Youth and Education and Community Engagement recognizes that excellence in research/creative activity can be manifest in any of a variety of media and formats (e.g., performance, print, professional presentations, social and digital media).

Theatre for Youth and Education and Community Engagement recognizes excellence in research/creative activity that reaches the faculty's optimum audience of professional peers in the academy, the profession, and/or the community, and accomplishes one or all of the following:

1. Contributes, through research and/or creative activity, new knowledge or new perspectives to the faculty members' disciplinary field or sub-field;
2. Demonstrates the potential for influencing or expanding the faculty members' research/creative activity agenda; and/or
3. Demonstrates the potential for influencing or expanding the faculty members' disciplinary field or sub-field.
4. Professional, Institutional, and Community Service
 - a. Professional Service is expected of all members of the faculty and assessed for: (a) the nature of service, e.g. committee work, offices held; and (b) the level of contribution, e.g. international, national, regional, state. More demanding positions and contributions at the international or national levels are highly valued.
 - b. Institutional and Community Service are also expected of all members of the faculty. The school may choose to limit university, college, and unit-level committee work for probationary faculty so that they can focus on Instructional Contributions, Research and Creative Activity, Professional Service, but some service is also required of all faculty.

IV. Workload/Performance Assignments and the Evaluation Process

A. Weighting

Teaching, Research and Creative Activity, and Service will be weighted for evaluation purposes according to the individual faculty member's distribution of effort as designated in the Annual Responsibility Assignment. Distributions of effort may vary depending on individual faculty assignment and circumstances, but should generally align with:

- Tenure-track faculty: 40% Teaching, 40% Research and Creative Activity, 20% Service. This distribution is widely recognized by the university as standard, and distributions that favor Teaching or Service too highly may have a negative impact on the tenure and promotion process.
- Tenured faculty: 40% Teaching, 40% Research and Creative Activity, 20% Service
- Lecturers: 80% Teaching, 20% Service
- Professors of Practice: 50% Teaching, 30% Research and Creative Activity, 20% Service
- Clinical Professors (of any rank): 40% Teaching, 10% Research and Creative Activity, 50% Service. In the case of clinical professors, "Service" is principally defined as their responsibilities to the School in a non-classroom environment, including but not limited to: technical direction, production management, costume technology.

The process of determining annual faculty workload assignments begins with appropriate assignments for Teaching. For example, in a 40%/40%/20% (Teaching/Research and Creative Activity/Service) split, the 40% Teaching represents approximately two group instructions per semester and two or more small group advising/instructions (such as dissertation supervision or applied project supervision). Directing, designing, or acting in a major role on the Mainstage season—in ways that significantly engage students' interaction—may replace one teaching assignment per year. The minimal threshold for established levels of Research and Creative Activity will be determined by the Personnel Committee and the Director.

B. Negotiations of Assignments

The negotiation process will begin at the end of each calendar year and will be revised each spring semester immediately following the review of the previous year's annual report for each faculty member.

The Director in consultation with the subject area coordinators and the Personnel Committee will negotiate the workload/performance assignments for all faculty for the coming year.

All faculty will receive, in writing, the nature of weighting for their performance for the following year in the form of the Annual Responsibility Assignment, which shall be signed by the faculty member and the Director and submitted as a guiding document in the annual evaluation process.

C. Faculty Observations of Instructional Contributions

Each tenured faculty member who earns "meritorious," "highly meritorious," or "exceptionally meritorious" teaching ratings in his/her annual evaluations will be evaluated once every three years by another tenured faculty member observing his/her teaching. Reviewers will be selected from amongst the tenured faculty in the department. All other tenured faculty members and each non-tenured faculty member will be evaluated once each semester by a tenured faculty member observing his/her teaching. Observers will be selected randomly by the Personnel Committee. The observers will negotiate with the faculty members the specific dates and times of the observations. Any faculty member may request additional observations by peers for professional development or to enhance his/her teaching portfolio. The Personnel Committee evaluates all peer reviews.

Within a reasonable time after the observation, the observer will prepare a written evaluation (see Attachment 1, Peer Observation Report), a copy of which will be given to the faculty member who was observed. The faculty member may choose to meet with the observer to discuss the evaluation. The observer will then submit the evaluation, which includes a summary of the post-observation meeting (where applicable), to the School of Theatre and Film office for filing. The faculty member observed may also choose to submit a written response to the Personnel Committee.

Once each year, the Director of the School will observe the teaching of each non-tenured member of the faculty. The Director will observe tenured faculty teaching, at the Director's discretion, at least once every three (3) years.

D. Annual Evaluation Documents

Annual Evaluation Documents should be submitted according to current guidelines determined by the Personnel Committee and distributed to faculty every fall. These guidelines will be updated as necessary. The Annual Evaluation Documents shall include:

- a. Annual Responsibility Assignment Forms for the previous three years, and for the coming calendar year.
- b. Enrollment database form containing information on courses taught and number of students enrolled for the previous three-year period.
- c. Evaluation forms and letters for the previous two years (most recent year first). The evaluations forms and letters should include:
 - 1. Letter of evaluation from the Director.
 - 2. Letter of evaluation from the School's Personnel Committee
 - 3. Annual Faculty Performance Review: Part I: The Faculty Report
 - 4. Annual Faculty Performance Review: Part II: The Peer Evaluation
 - 5. Annual Faculty Performance Review: Part III: The Administrative Evaluation
 - 6. Student course evaluations for the three-year period.
 - 7. Peer teaching evaluations for the three-year period.
 - 8. Director teaching evaluations for the three-year period.
- g. A document *of no more than four pages* summarizing—relevant to the academic appointment of the faculty member—the following activities:
 - 1. Teaching
 - 2. Research/Creative Activity
 - 3. Service
 - 4. Contributions to Diversity.

These summaries must reflect the last three calendar years, with an emphasis on the most recent one.

These summaries should be in the form of lists. Faculty may include narrative content as necessary to contextualize the activities listed.
- h. A current and complete curriculum vitae.

The School administrative staff will compile all of the above documents make them available to faculty for review.

E. Time Table

Each faculty member will submit a dossier consisting of Annual Evaluation Documents no less than four weeks prior to the university due date for submission of faculty reviews.

F. Annual Reviews by the Personnel Committee and Director

Each spring semester, the Personnel Committee shall review from each faculty member all evaluation documents for the previous three (3) calendar years in a portfolio (see Attachment 6, Guidelines and Format: Portfolio for Annual Review, Faculty and Academic Professionals). Evaluation emphasis will be placed on the most recent calendar year's Instructional Contributions, Research and Creative Activity, and Service. The previous two (2) calendar years' documents serve as contextual background and reference for the most current calendar year's review. All faculty receiving salary from the university shall be evaluated, including those on sabbatical.

The Personnel Committee will rate each faculty member's performance in each of the four contribution areas: teaching/instruction, research/creative activity, service and contributions to the unit's affirmative action and diversity goals (contributions to affirmative action and diversity goals may be factored into each of the other categories or may be consolidated into the service category) with one of five ratings, exceptionally meritorious (5), highly meritorious (4), meritorious (3), satisfactory (2), unsatisfactory (1), and assign an overall rating.

The Personnel Committee will forward the Annual Faculty Performance Review forms, with appropriate sections completed, and a written letter of evaluation to the Director. The Director then will complete the department level of the process by reviewing the Annual Faculty Performance Review Forms and completing the appropriate sections. When necessary, the Director will negotiate differences in ratings with the Personnel Committee. Where differences remain between the evaluation by the Personnel Committee and the evaluation by the Director, the Director's decision prevails.

At the request of the faculty member, the Director will arrange a personal meeting to discuss in detail of the year's work, the evaluations received, and the merit assignments.

G. Faculty Administrative Evaluation

Those faculty who have significant departmental administrative or supervisory duties, specifically the Associate Director, Assistant Directors, Curriculum Coordinators, and Director of Graduate Studies will receive a separate evaluation of their administrative work by the Director, having solicited the input of the faculty and staff.

The Personnel Committee (or its designated representatives) is responsible for soliciting evaluations from faculty, staff, and students who work with the faculty member being

evaluated. Though evaluation procedures may vary according to the nature of the supervisory duties, in each case the Personnel Committee will ensure that the confidentiality of the respondents to the evaluation will be respected.

H. Salary Issues

In those years where discretionary raises are available, the Personnel Committee will meet to determine both the salary issues to be addressed (e.g., merit, external and internal markets, equity, salary compression and inversion), and the priority order in which they are to be addressed within University guidelines. The department Director, guided by faculty recommendation for the priority of salary issues to be addressed, and by the Personnel Committee's evaluations of faculty performance, will determine the amount of salary increase for each faculty member.

I. Tenure and Promotion Guidelines

The Director shall notify those standing for tenure and promotion of the current university requirements. Each faculty member is required to submit a file folder dossier with appropriate documentation evidencing excellence in teaching, research and/or creative activity, and service 2. For the final review of a faculty member prior to the recommendation for tenure of that faculty member, the Personnel Committee shall convene all tenured faculty to vote on the decision. For promotion to full professor, the Personnel Committee shall convene all full professors to vote on the decision. Those who vote will have access to the same materials used by the Personnel Committee in their evaluations, except solicited letters from outside reviewers. The faculty member being evaluated may request to be present at this meeting. The results of this vote will be included in the Personnel Committee's recommendation to the Director. One-half of the tenured faculty shall be considered a voting quorum.

J. Criteria for Tenure and Promotion

Criteria for Tenure and Promotion to Associate Professor: A record of excellence and the potential for continued excellence in teaching, research and/or creative activity in one or more areas of specialization as outlined below with an additional record of service as deemed appropriate for an assistant professor.”

Criteria for Promotion to Full Professor: To receive a positive recommendation for promotion to Full Professor the candidate must have established a national reputation in his/her field of endeavor and be evaluated as having been—over a sustained period of time:

- An effective and inspiring teacher
- An effective mentor
- A leader in curricular innovation
- A producer of a substantial record of creative activity and/or research that significantly enriches his or her area(s) of expertise
- A major influence in one or more areas of research or creative activity
- A possessor of a record of effective service within the university and his or her larger professional communities including leadership positions.”

K. Appeals Process

If any faculty member feels he or she has been evaluated unfairly, this matter should be discussed in detail with the Director and/or the Personnel Committee.

The appeals process will start at the departmental level. If the issue is not resolved at the departmental level, the faculty may appeal to the Dean of the Herberger College of Fine Arts, or other appropriate university administrators, for re-evaluation or adjustment of the evaluation. The Director shall write a summary letter putting forth reasons for the recommendations. Both the Director and the faculty member shall sign the summary letter, which then will be given to the Dean of the College. Signing by a faculty member does not necessarily imply agreement with the evaluation.

[2] Following taken from ATHE white paper.

[3] Glassic, Huber, and Maroff: Scholarship Assessed, 9.

[4] Ernest Boyer, *Scholarship Reconsidered: Priorities of the Professoriate* (Princeton, NJ: Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, 1990).

[5] UC Santa Barbara guidelines