

Department of Theater Arts Review, Promotion and Tenure Procedures and Guidelines

I. Procedures

A. Preamble

This policy applies to all represented faculty and is intended to comply with all provisions of Article 20 of the CBA. In the event of any discrepancies or inconsistencies, the CBA language applies for represented faculty. This policy also applies to all unrepresented faculty, unless a university-wide policy exists that contradicts the terms of this policy.

This policy is focused primarily on the criteria by which faculty are evaluated. Detailed descriptions of the processes by which reviews are conducted are presented in Article 20 of the Collective Bargaining Agreement and in relevant UO policies for unrepresented faculty. Procedures specific to the Department of Theater Arts are presented below. This document will be made available in the department or unit (as well as on the Academic Affairs website).

B. Department-Specific Procedures

i. Annual Reviews

Each tenure-track faculty member who has not received tenure and is not in the process of a tenure review will have an annual review conducted by the department head, usually in mid-April. These annual reviews are written by the Department Head and are forwarded to the College. The review is based on the candidate's annual report, which should include the following: (1) a CV, lists of publications and grants, and lists (by year and term) of their courses and committees to date; (2) a narrative description of the candidate's progress during the past year in research, teaching, and service (a brief paragraph for each area will suffice); and (3) a brief description of goals and plans for next year and beyond.

ii. Contract Renewal/Third-Year Review

The candidate's report, containing the items described in Article 20 of the Collective Bargaining Agreement and in relevant UO policies for unrepresented faculty, will be reviewed by the tenured members of the department. A department vote is held on whether or not to recommend renewal of the contract. Afterwards, a report is written by the department head and provided to the candidate. The file, including any

responsive material provided by the candidate within ten days of receipt of the report, is then forwarded for review by the dean and then the provost or designee. A fully satisfactory review indicating that the faculty member is on track towards promotion and tenure will lead to a contract extension up through the tenure and promotion year. If the contract renewal process determines that the faculty member's record is not satisfactory and that promotion and tenure are not likely, the faculty member will be given a one-year, terminal contract. A faculty member may also be given a renewable contract that does not extend to the promotion and tenure year if there are questions as to whether the faculty member will have a record meriting promotion at the end of the tenure and promotion period. In such cases, the faculty member will be required to go through another contract renewal process prior to the promotion and tenure review in order to determine if the faculty member has been able to remedy the shortcomings in the record identified in the contract renewal process.

iii. Review for Promotion and Tenure

a. External Reviewers

Late in the spring term prior to the year when the tenure case is to be considered, the department head will consult with members of the department and, when appropriate, members of any UO research institute/center with which the faculty member is affiliated, and prepare a list of external referees who will be invited to evaluate the research record of the candidate. Independently, the candidate will be asked to submit a list of potential external referees to the department head. External reviewers should generally be from comparable or more highly regarded institutions. Ideally, they should be full professors who have the appropriate expertise to evaluate the candidate's record. Dissertation advisors, close personal friends, or other individuals who might be viewed as having a conflict of interest, are not asked to be external reviewers.

b. Internal Reviewers

The department may also solicit on-campus letters from those familiar with the candidate's teaching, scholarship or service. In particular, inclusion of an internal review is the norm when a faculty member is a member of a research institute/center. This review is prepared by the director of the institute/center, in consultation with its senior members.

c. Promotion and Tenure Committee/Report

During the spring term, and prior to the deadline by which the tenure case must be submitted, the department head will appoint a promotion and tenure committee of tenured faculty to review the

case. This committee will be charged with submitting a written report to the department evaluating the candidate's case for promotion and tenure. In particular, the committee report will include an internal assessment of the candidate's work, a summary and evaluation of the external and internal referees' assessment of the candidate's work, an evaluation of teaching that includes a discussion of the numerical student evaluation scores, written comments, and peer reviews, and an assessment of department, university, professional, and community service. The committee report must conclude with a recommendation to the department regarding promotion and tenure. The committee report is generally made available in the department office to all tenured faculty of appropriate rank for review prior to the department meeting. Both associate and full professors vote in promotion to associate professor and tenure cases, but only full professors vote for promotion from associate to full professor.

d. Department Meeting and Vote

The department will typically hold a meeting in mid to late-October to decide the promotion and tenure recommendation for the candidate. Voting members meet and discuss the case, i.e., tenured associate and full professors for tenure decisions and only full professors for promotion to full. Following these discussions, members vote by signed, secret ballot on whether to recommend tenure and promotion (or just promotion in the case of a promotion to full professor). When all votes have been registered, the votes are tallied, usually by the department head, and the department is informed of the final vote tally. The anonymity of the individual votes will be maintained, although the signed ballots will be kept in a signed and sealed envelope by the department head in case they are requested by the dean or the provost. The department head does not vote.

e. Department Head's Review

After the department vote, the department head writes a separate statement providing a description of the process, including any unique characteristics of the profession (e.g., books versus articles; extent of co-authorship; significance of order of names on publications, etc.), as well as summarizes the department meeting in which the vote was taken. This statement concludes with the Department Head's opinion regarding the case for promotion and tenure that may or may not agree with the department vote.

II. Guidelines

The following guidelines provide a specific departmental context within the general university framework for promotion and tenure of faculty. The guidelines that apply to the candidate's promotion file are generally those in force at the time of hire or at the time of the most recent promotion. The following criteria are based on faculty performance in research, teaching and service, which are allotted proportional weights of 40 : 40 : 20, respectively.

RESEARCH (40%)

The Department of Theatre Arts honors the tradition of university faculty publishing their work and we interpret "publish" to mean "to make public" in a meaningful way. In Theatre Arts, creative production is a requirement for tenure coequal with scholarly publication.

Scholarly publication should advance original research which has been peer-reviewed for journals or books clearly important to the larger field. That is, the quality of the publication is as important as a quantity of publications which were not peer-reviewed or do not advance original research. In some cases textbooks of substantial research breadth or original methodology are also highly valued. Candidates for tenure and promotion will present published work as part of their dossier for external review.

Creative production should also advance original research and be reviewed by professionals in the appropriate field. Professional reviews for design, directing, playwriting, and sometimes acting should be arranged by the Department Head for university and professional theatre productions in which faculty participate during the period of review. Such professional reviews carry the same standing in the assessment of creative work as does peer-review in the assessment of published scholarship. These professional reviews will be kept confidential. Faculty may provide a brief (one-page) statement of intentions or limitations to the Department Head to pass on to the professional reviewer as additional context. These statements will be attached to the letter of review. Faculty should not solicit additional or competing reviews, though unsolicited letters and local press may be included in the supplemental file. As Design faculty are less likely to be publishing articles or essays for anthology, evidence of the research and illustration of final product should be included in the file. Renderings or photographs of designs singled out for special commendation in national journals or books should count as publication.

In both scholarship and creative work, the Department of Theatre Arts looks not only to the quality of the publication or production record but also to the rate of productivity. Consistent or steadily excellent scholarship and creative production is more important than singular accomplishment or erratic achievement. For both published scholarship and creative work, both the intrinsic quality of the work and the quality of the venue (e.g. producing company, publisher, journal, etc.) will be significant factors in evaluation.

For scholarly publication, a basic measure would be publication of one book during the period of review or one juried article or anthology essay published for each of the years leading to tenure review. Again, review will include attention to and evaluation of the quality of the research and publication as more important than the quantity of publications.

Design faculty typically design an average of two UT productions per season. Faculty who direct typically direct one mainstage production (in the Robinson theatre or Hope theatre) at least every other year, if not annually. Faculty who are not directing in a given season should make some significant contribution to the season in another way (dramaturgy, playwriting, acting). This is the minimum expectation. Off-campus venues such as local Eugene productions are valued as additional exposure and experience and may, in some cases, yield note for exceptional excellence or unusual regional attention.

As professional theatre is not a business that faculty may easily access at the most nationally notable levels, without extensive release time from teaching and advising, creative production is not to be expected to include work comparable to what a full-time practicing professional for a regional or repertory company might do. Nor are our faculty geographically situated to sustain the same kinds of professional associations or build similar professional reputations as theatre faculty in comparable institutions located closer to the networks of metropolitan or east coast professional theatres.

For Theatre Arts, in addition to at least five external review letters, professional artists are solicited to write review letters addressing particular design or directing efforts that the candidate is undertaking for University Theatre productions. The Department Head, in consultation with the junior faculty member, arranges for a professional theatre artist to attend and report candidly their views on the faculty member's creative work (design, directing, dramaturgy, playwriting, acting). These letters, in addition to senior faculty consensus based on experience of working in collaboration with the designer or director, form the basis of evaluation of artistic achievement. Local newspaper reviews or unsolicited/solicited letters from audience members regarding a particular design or directed production have far less weight in forming an evaluation of artistic achievement.

For both creative production and scholarly publication, awards or honors should be listed and their relative measure of recognition or achievement briefly explained in their personal statement for tenure review. Professional standing or impact on the field may be measured by significant appointments to national conference organizations – though these more typically enhance a candidate's credit in service. For designers, juried exhibitions and presentations for, and in some cases invitations to juried symposia are special measures of national or international value of the design work. Special care for junior faculty should be taken to not take on conference work or editing positions if they will in any way diminish ongoing and active scholarship and/or creative productivity.

In order for any publication, but especially book publication, to be counted towards promotion, the manuscript must be complete, accepted by a publisher, and “in production.” The University of Oregon’s Associate Provost defines “in production” as the completion of all work on the manuscript by the author, including all revisions. Similarly, articles and book chapters must either be “in print” or “forthcoming” in order to count towards a faculty’s publications. “Forthcoming” means that an article or book chapter has been accepted for publication and requires no further revisions or editing of any kind. A letter to this effect from a journal editor or editor of a volume of essays for each “forthcoming” publication is recommended. Generally, it is expected that the book should be “in production” and that each listed article or book chapter should be “forthcoming” by the time the candidate meets with the Dean in order for the publications to count fully towards promotion.

TEACHING (40%)

The department of Theatre Arts is committed to excellent teaching in all assigned courses as well as in mentorship arrangements that extend beyond the traditional classroom. In assessing teaching quality, the department relies on the following:

- numerical evaluations should be weighted in terms of percentage of response, and are expected to most often meet or exceed the departmental mean
- signed comments from student evaluations are reviewed for how they illuminate the numerical scores and may carry additional importance if they help to define a pattern found across courses or terms
- faculty review of numerical and written evaluations should take into consideration the clear differences between studio and lecture teaching, as well as the expected difference in rigor between lower- and upper-division courses
- course evaluations with a low percentage of responses will not be regarded as having the same weight or value as scores and comments from higher response rates.

Quality of Classroom Teaching

Faculty and Department Head review of the quality of teaching for tenure and promotion and review will include assessment of the following – across evidence in evaluations, enrollment records, and peer evaluations:

- organization of course schedule and syllabus, with clear expectations of student performance and evaluation criteria
- use of classroom time, including assignments, reading loads
- preparation and evidence of research for preparing new courses, particularly graduate seminars and upper division advanced courses

- innovation or special achievement in redesigning core courses - awards and other commendations.

Peer Evaluations

The university has a policy of peer review and evaluation of teaching in order to provide comprehensive and convergent evidence of faculty's teaching effectiveness. Each tenure-track faculty member must have at least one course evaluated by a faculty peer during each of the three years preceding the faculty member's promotion and tenure review. Each tenured faculty member with the rank of associate professor must have at least one course evaluated by a faculty peer every other year until promotion to full professor.

Theatre Arts guidelines for Peer Evaluation require observation of at least two class meetings in the ten weeks of a given course. Faculty being reviewed should make available a syllabus and any other materials (exams, assignments) relevant to the meetings observed.

Junior faculty preparing their tenure case should list (either within the CV or separately) all courses taught during the period of review and offer brief description of courses which are new to the department or especially innovative. In the candidate's personal statement, special care should be taken to make clear the relationship between the candidate's research/creative production and teaching.

A list of guest lectures or workshops for other departments or universities, especially as they contribute to ongoing interdisciplinary collaborations or associations of value to the university community or regional/national reputation, should be included in the CV.

Letters of Support

Letters from faculty or other colleagues/students on campus or outside of the university which attest to teaching guest lectures, workshops or other kinds of mentorship will not weigh significantly in evaluation of a candidate's teaching, especially if they are solicited or take on an obvious tone of advocacy. Unsolicited, objectively evaluative letters can be helpful, however, in further detailing a candidate's interdisciplinary collaborations, and trajectory of research/creative production.

Graduate Supervision and Committee Work

Untenured junior faculty are not expected to mentor or serve as chair for more than one dissertation or thesis at a time. They may serve on several committees, but it is important that such work does not defer or slow their research/creative

production or classroom teaching. Design faculty receive extra credit for serving on M.A. committees, when needed.

Faculty must be active in mentoring, including mentorship of directing and design projects, for graduate students, and including temporary assignment as adviser to new graduates in their first year.

Undergraduate Supervision

All faculty are assigned students to advise and are responsible for keeping in good contact. Faculty should be advising undergraduates to make plans for graduation that include the balances of production work, study abroad plans, and proceeding through the introductory to advanced courses of the major, as well as general university requirements.

All faculty are expected to post regular office hours every term and to make these known to their students on the first day of class, preferably printed in the syllabus.

All faculty also mentor and advise students in production for University Theatre as well as in independent projects for the Pocket Playhouse or Honors College thesis. Production, especially for University Theatre, should be seen as an ongoing laboratory beyond the classroom, in our shops and rehearsals as well as weekly production meetings scheduled by the Technical Director.

SERVICE (20%)

Service plays an essential role in promotion considerations and distinguishes between the requirements for promotion to associate professor and full professor. The Department of Theatre Arts is a small department in number of faculty, servicing four degree programs and a full production season. It is vitally important that Theatre Arts faculty participate responsibly and cooperatively in departmental governance beyond just weekly faculty meetings or University Theatre assignments. The common goals of the Department's programs, goals most often defined by what the faculty collectively agree is best for our students, should be as important in an individual faculty member's decision-making as their personal research and/or creative agenda. Our department expects that faculty will model the flexibility and cooperation in teamwork we want our students to adopt.

Service to the department, in faculty governance and University Theatre, are considered enough for junior faculty prior to promotion and tenure. For associate professors, however, university committee work, leadership in professional organizations at the regional or national levels, or significant administrative service are very important to post-tenure full professor reviews.

Community Service for our department is often folded in to what we do on a regular basis. Our role in the community of theatre makers for the Eugene-Springfield area has been described as the “mother-ship” – sharing materials, faculty and student expertise with many theatre and education organizations in the community over many productive years. Our productions attract about 50% public subscribers for attendance. Our productions also devote two or three performances to raising funds for a new charity every year. Even so, faculty outreach to community organizations, volunteering to teach a workshop or lead a discussion, sharing our expertise when invited, are valued and should be noted in any case for review. As with so many other areas for evaluation, if a candidate’s community outreach clearly extends to a sustained relationship or new set of ongoing projects, such service is most valued. Community contacts or events which are singular or do not seem to foster further relations or sustained research are less valued.

Equity and Inclusion

As stated in the collective bargaining agreement, (Section 12, Article 20) all statements for any review case (promotion and tenure, promotion to full, contract renewal, annual reviews) **“should also include discussion of contributions to institutional equity and inclusion.”**

III. Post-Tenure Review

A. Third-Year Post-Tenure Review

Primary responsibility for the third-year PTR process lies with the department head. The third-year PTR should be commenced by the department head no later than during the Winter term, in order to allow it to be concluded before the end of the candidate’s third-year post-tenure. The department head will contact the faculty member and request a CV and personal statement, including a discussion of contributions to institutional equity and inclusion. The department head will add to the evaluative file copies of the faculty member’s teaching evaluations received during the period under review, including quantitative summary sheets and signed written evaluations, as well as any peer evaluations of teaching conducted during the review period. Consistent with department policy and practice, the file will be reviewed first by a committee, which will provide a written report to the department head that may be used as received or placed in additional written context by the department head. For associate professors, the report will specifically present an honest appraisal of progress toward a successful review for promotion to full professor. If the faculty member has undergone an earlier sixth-year PTR that resulted in creation of a development plan due to unsatisfactory performance (see discussion of sixth-year PTR, below), the faculty member’s success in addressing concerns will be discussed. The report will be signed and dated by the department head and shared with the faculty member, who will also sign and date the report to signify its receipt. The faculty member may provide a written response if they desire

within 10 days of receipt of the PTR report; an extension may be granted by mutual agreement between the faculty member and the department head. The report and, if provided, response from the faculty member, will be placed in the faculty member's personnel file as maintained at the unit level.

B. Sixth-Year Post-Tenure Review

The process of the review is described in the Collective Bargaining Agreement, Article 20, or in parallel University policy for unrepresented faculty members. Since the sixth-year PTR is expected to be a deeper review of the faculty member's scholarship, teaching, and service, the Department of Theater Arts expects the candidate to provide a portfolio of publications (or documentation of other scholarship activities) and information regarding service contributions, in addition to the materials called for by CBA/UCO policy.

A development plan is required for faculty who are not achieving a satisfactory level of performance. The plan will be developed with appropriate consultation and discussion among the faculty member, the department head, and the dean. Ideally, there will be consensus regarding the development plan, but if consensus is not possible, a plan receiving the dean's approval will be forwarded to the provost or designee for review and approval.

If a sixth-year PTR results in creation of a professional development plan, future PTR for the faculty member will include consideration of the extent to which the terms of the development plan have been met. However, progress toward meeting the goals of such a development plan need not and should not be evaluated solely within the context of the PTR process.

Guidelines for Promotion to Full Professor

Promotion to Full Professor: Procedures

The university's procedures for promotion to full professor are described on the Academic Affairs website <https://academicaffairs.uoregon.edu/promotion-tenure>. There is no fixed probationary period leading to promotion to full professor, but faculty will normally be eligible for promotion after six years at the associate professor rank. The Department's internal procedures for promotion to full professor (regarding, for example, the selection of outside evaluators, rights of access to the promotion file, the selection of a departmental committee, meeting and voting protocols, etc.) mirror those of the promotion to associate professor, with the exception that only the department's full professors (and full professors from other units designated by CAS as committee members) participate in the promotion vote and recommendation.

Promotion to Full Professor: Criteria

It is expected that associate professors in the Department of Theatre Arts will continue to excel in all three areas of professional activity (research/creative production, teaching, and service) and that they will make ongoing contributions to

institutional equity and inclusion after the tenure decision. Professional careers develop along various paths, especially after the promotion to associate professor, and yet the distribution of work responsibilities for faculty (40% research/creative production, 40% teaching, 20% service) remains unchanged during the period leading to consideration for promotion to full professor.

Research/Creative Production

Two major categories of scholarly productivity play a co-equal role in the evaluation for promotion to full professor: 1) published scholarship and 2) creative work in support of theatre production for University Theatre and/or other university and professional theatre organizations. Within the rubric of published scholarship and creative work, the Department recognizes and values publicly-engaged or community-centered scholarship and creative practice, acknowledging that the products of such engagement may take non-traditional forms. As in the case of promotion to associate professor, the Department looks at both the quality of the work (as assessed by outside evaluators, professional reviewers, and/or juried exhibitions) and at the rate of productivity, which must be sustained and consistent in order to produce a favorable decision.

It is important for outside evaluators, UO faculty committees, and UO administrators to understand that tenure-line faculty in Theatre Arts are involved in various forms of scholarly and creative work, all of which the department values highly. Some faculty members emphasize publication as their primary form of academic productivity, which may include traditional scholarly research, adaptations, translations, playwriting, and other forms of theatre-making, while some faculty specialize in research for design and subsequent creation of costumes, sets, props, lighting, visual projections, and sound. While faculty typically engage in multiple areas of scholarly and creative work, we distinguish in the following paragraphs between two sets of expectations for TA faculty productivity, one applicable to colleagues focused mainly on publication, the other for colleagues focused on design and creation. In drawing that distinction, we are mindful that the two areas are in no way mutually exclusive and that the same candidate for promotion may show evidence of significant accomplishments in both publication and creative design.

- A basic expectation for candidates with an emphasis on published scholarship is publication of one sole-authored book (or project of comparable scope) during the period of review, or an average of one sole-authored, peer-reviewed article, book chapter, anthology essay (or project of comparable scope) published during each of the years leading to the review for promotion to full professor.* This expectation is in addition to the understanding that tenure-line faculty with a publishing emphasis are expected to make regular, sustained contributions to University Theatre productions, usually by serving as director, playwright, actor, or dramaturg for one UT production per year.

- A basic expectation for candidates with a design emphasis would be leadership in design work of significant quality (as assessed by outside evaluators, professional reviewers, and/or juried exhibitions) on an average of two productions for University Theatre and/or comparable university or professional organizations per year for each of the years leading to the review for promotion to full professor. Evidence of the quality of design work required for promotion to full professor should be presented in the form of a successful record of professional accomplishment that extends beyond the university community, for example through participation in regional theatre productions and/or nomination by juried competitions or exhibitions, such as the USITT Design Expo, World Stage Design, or Prague Quadrennial.

*“Comparable scope” implies 1) an equivalent investment of work and 2) demonstrable impact or influence that extends beyond the university community and is, thus, commensurate with the impact or influence of scholarly work published by a professionally acknowledged journal or press.

Teaching

The successful candidate for promotion to full professor must possess a record of sustained excellence in teaching. The Department understands “excellence in teaching” according to the principles outlined by the UO Teaching Engagement Program and the Provost’s Teaching Academy (<https://tep.uoregon.edu/teaching-excellence>), both of which identify “inclusive, engaged, and research-led” as values that define teaching excellence.

Inclusive teaching engages and values every student and attends to the social and emotional climate of the classroom. This principle is enacted through particular choices faculty make in their presentation of self and content and through deliberate ways of drawing on assets each student brings to the classroom. **Engaged** teachers participate in ongoing professional development, experimentation, and reflection about their work; they are connected to campus, national, and scholarly conversations about teaching and learning. **Research-led** teaching means the university’s research mission infuses into its undergraduate program. This can be as simple as faculty leading with questions and modeling expert thought by “thinking aloud” when encountering problems, or can be as significant as partnering with students to create new knowledge. A crucial second meaning of research-led is that it is informed by what we know about how students learn: actively, in contexts of high challenge and support, through collaborative work across differences of identity and viewpoint in response to frequent feedback, and with deliberate reflection on and integration of ideas across contexts.

Service

The successful candidate for promotion to full professor must possess a record of significant service to the department, the university, and the profession. Such a record will typically include leadership in some area of departmental governance, service on university-wide committees, and sustained participation in national or international professional societies or comparable professional organizations.

Summary of expectations:

For faculty with an emphasis on publication:

- publication of one book or project of comparable scope, or publication of one peer-reviewed article, book chapter, anthology essay, or project of comparable scope, during each of the years leading to the review for promotion
- a record of sustained contributions to an average of one University Theatre production per year
- a record of sustained excellence in teaching
- a record of significant service to the department, the university, and the profession, usually including leadership in some area of departmental governance, service on university-wide committees, and sustained participation in national or international professional societies or comparable professional organizations

For faculty with an emphasis on design and creation:

- a leading role in design work of significant quality (as assessed by outside evaluators, professional reviewers, and/or juried exhibitions) on an average of two productions for University Theatre and/or comparable university or professional organizations per year for each of the years leading to the review for promotion to full professor
- a successful record of professional accomplishment that extends beyond the university community
- a record of sustained excellence in teaching
- a record of significant service to the department, the university, and the profession. Such a record will typically include leadership in some area of departmental governance, service on university-wide committees, and sustained participation in national or international professional societies or comparable professional organizations