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/UO 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.