

Faculty Evaluation Plan, Theatre Department

Purpose: To articulate the standards and procedures for the annual evaluation of faculty within the Department of Theatre.

Applies to: Faculty within the Department of Theatre

Introduction

The faculty of the Department of Theatre is committed to excellence in teaching/advising, scholarship, and service. Regular, rigorous review of faculty performance is critical to maintaining a vital and productive department. The foundation of faculty evaluation is the annual evaluation, which is a continuing responsibility of the chair and faculty colleagues. The annual process provides an opportunity to review a faculty member's performance of responsibilities in the context of individual position descriptions and institutional and disciplinary standards, identify performance issues and provide strategies for development, renewal, or change, and assure that personnel decisions are sound and justifiable. The Department of Theatre is governed in this process by the provisions of the [Faculty Senate Rules and Regulations](#) and the [Faculty Code of Rights, Responsibilities, and Conduct](#), located in the Policy Library at www.policy.ku.edu.

Statement of Performance Expectations

1. Unit Expectations

When evaluating faculty performance, the Department of Theatre applies the College and University norms of 40% effort for teaching, 40% for scholarship, and 20% for service. These weights are the same for tenured and non-tenured faculty, although the department recognizes that the specific contributions of faculty members to the department's mission may differ depending on such factors as career stage and administrative assignments. These are typically documented with a Differential Allocation of Effort (DAE), the procedures for which are described further below.

Teaching and Advising.

Faculty are expected to teach four regularly scheduled courses per academic year. They are also expected to offer advising and to be responsive to department and university policy and directives concerning teaching, advising, and learning assessment. The department has no formal policy regarding the frequency with which faculty should accept requests to conduct directed studies at the graduate or undergraduate level, but views doing so as a voluntary teaching/advising overload and values such effort according to the ratings described below in "B. Standards for Acceptable Performance for Faculty Members". Faculty are required to keep regular office hours and to be willing to make appointments outside those hours if the need arises. According to rank and assigned responsibilities, they are expected to support graduate student evaluations, theses, dissertations, and professional development. Faculty are expected to strive for quality and achievement in teaching/advising consistent with university standards and department expectations described in the department's Promotion and Tenure Guidelines, formerly located in the Policy Library at <http://policy.ku.edu/CLAS/promotion-tenure-theatre>.

Scholarship.

The concept of "scholarship" encompasses not only traditional academic research and publication, but also the creation of artistic works or performances and any other products or activities accepted by the academic discipline as reflecting scholarly effort and achievement for purposes of promotion and tenure. Commensurate with the standards and expectations described in the department's Promotion and Tenure Guidelines, faculty are expected to engage in and maintain an ongoing program of

scholarship appropriate to their research program and rank, and to strive for national recognition among their peers in one or more fields of activity.

Service.

Faculty are expected to conduct themselves as citizens of the university and as active members of their field and sub-disciplines. They are required to contribute to the well-being of the department and the institution through service, typically in the form of committee assignments. At the junior faculty level, the majority of a candidate's service contributions may be in the department, the School of the Arts, the college and the university. Greater amounts of service to national or international professional organizations, and to the larger community, will be expected later in one's career.

2. Standards for Acceptable Performance for Faculty Members

During the pre-tenure period, faculty are expected to strive for a level of achievement in teaching/advising, scholarship, and service that is consistent with the standards and expectations for promotion to Associate Professor, as presented in the department's Promotion and Tenure Guidelines. During the post-tenure period, faculty are expected to sustain effort and achievement in teaching, scholarship, and service at a level at least that of the standards of their most recent promotion, as described in the department's Promotion and Tenure Guidelines and Post-Tenure Review Policy.

Faculty members are evaluated annually for the degree to which they are pursuing these performance standards. The ratings applied in this evaluation are "excellent," "very good," "good," "marginal," and "poor," as required by the Faculty Senate Rules and Regulations section 6.3.2.2.

To meet acceptable performance standards, a faculty member must receive at least a "good" rating in each of the areas of teaching/advising, scholarship, and service; strong faculty are likely to exceed these expectations. If a faculty member fails to meet the minimum level of performance (receiving a rating of marginal or poor in any area) during the annual evaluation period, the department chairperson and the individual will initiate a performance improvement plan (see section five "Outcomes of the Annual Performance Evaluation).

Sustained or chronic failure of a faculty member to carry out his or her academic responsibilities for three academic years, despite the opportunities for university faculty development and other appropriate interventions, is grounds for recommendation for dismissal from the University of Kansas in accordance with the procedures adopted in the Faculty Code of Rights, Responsibilities, and Conduct.

The clarification of rating categories as they apply to faculty evaluation in the Department of Theatre is described below. It is important to note that these clarifications are intended as suggested evaluation guidelines—not immutable requirements—for each rating. The Department's Faculty Evaluation Board is charged with interpreting and applying the ratings in light of each faculty member's career stage and research program.

Teaching/Advising

The appropriate evaluation of teaching/advising will be evaluated according to the expectations described in the department's Promotion and Tenure Guidelines. The appropriate distribution of teaching/advising responsibilities varies by rank. Some roles, such as chairing a Ph.D. dissertation committee, are restricted to tenured faculty. In the case of junior faculty, the quantity of advising responsibilities such as directed studies and graduate committees should be limited and managed according to the faculty member's progress towards tenure and upon mentor advice. Effort in excess of position/rank expectations should be duly recognized.

- Poor teaching/advising does not meet the basic expectations of the department. Evidence includes a failure to meet minimal requirements of teaching load, meet with classes, respond to students or to evaluate their work, refusal to engage with peer review of teaching, and

particularly ineffective or inappropriate classroom practices as evidenced in course syllabi, student and peer evaluations of teaching.

- Marginal meets the minimal requirements of teaching load, but without carrying the faculty member's share of the department's advising responsibilities. A faculty member's teaching may be evaluated as marginal if they demonstrate little course development, demonstrate a pattern of marginal advising effort such as refusal to supervise independent projects or serve on graduate committees, and refusal to address student evaluations or peer evaluations of teaching. This evaluation is also supported by evidence of poor communication and organization in the classroom, or marginal student evaluations.
- Good is reflected in evidence that a faculty member is carrying their load-appropriate share of the Department's curriculum, advising, and mentoring of students. The faculty member supports their assigned advisees, supervises a share of independent undergraduate projects and/or participates in graduate committees. Faculty members at this level seek peer evaluation and demonstrate evidence of development of teaching techniques and materials.
- Very Good meets and exceeds good standards. Evidence of this may include willingness to take on a greater share of directed studies and/or participation in graduate committees. Faculty who teach at a very good level are often in demand, as reflected in enrollments, waiting lists, requests to supervise directed studies, requests to serve as an outside member on graduate committees, and cross-listings with other departments. Evidence of efforts to develop teaching include new course development, participation in training events such as the Teaching Summit and workshops at professional meetings, as well as innovative course design or redesign. Faculty members evaluated at this level respond to directives from the department and university concerning required assessment of learning outcomes.
- Excellent applies to teaching/advising that meets and exceeds very good standards. Evidence of this distinction may be provided by innovation in teaching approaches and learning assessment, responding to initiatives and programs of the Department and KU's mission—such as collaborative and interdisciplinary initiatives, international efforts, and first-year and honors programs. Other evidence of distinction includes consistently and exceedingly strong feedback from students, teaching and advising responsibilities consistently beyond expectations of rank, campus-wide or national awards for teaching, number of graduate advisees completing their degrees, collaborative research projects with students and/or awards won by student advisees, conference presentations or peer-reviewed publications on pedagogy.

Scholarship

Effort in scholarship will be evaluated in light of rank-appropriate expectations. According to the Department's Promotion and Tenure Guidelines, examples of major creative activity include creator and/or key collaborator (e.g., director, designer, leading actor) role on a full-length theatre or performing arts project presented for the public in an educational or professional context and subject to critical review and/or peer evaluation, guest artist opportunities, and extended residencies. Examples of minor creative scholarship include but are not limited to staged readings; presentations of work-in-progress; or a lesser collaborative or consulting role in a theatre production or digital creation. Examples of major activity in the area of traditional academic research include the publication of peer-reviewed monographs, edited volumes, articles, and chapters. Minor publications typically include book and performance reviews, invited journal articles of brief length, and encyclopedia entries or similar reference work.

- Poor scholarship is represented by a calendar year in which none of the following are present: artistic work (major or minor), submission, acceptance and/or publication of academic research (major or minor); presentations, workshops or master classes in an external or KU venue; internal or external funding applications; demonstrated progress on any long-term major project.
- Marginal is represented by a calendar year in which includes progress on a long-term major project, but which lacks artistic work (major or minor); submission, acceptance and/or

publication of academic research (major or minor); presentation, workshop, or master classes at a national conference or professional venue; or internal or external funding grant application.

- Good includes such achievements as creative work (major or minor); submission, acceptance and/or publication of academic research (major or minor); presentations, workshops or master classes in an external venue; internal or external funding applications; demonstrated progress on any long-term project.
- Very Good is distinguished by major scholarship and/or achievements related to the development of long-term projects. Examples includes such achievements as one or more instances of a major creative work; submission, acceptance and/or publication of major academic research; invited or competitive presentations, workshops or master classes; seeking highly competitive external grants; significant progress on any long-term project such as securing a book contract, pursuing and receiving a commission for a creative work, or submitting a book prospectus and sample chapters to a press.
- Excellent scholarship is distinguished by quantity, achievement, and/or recognition. Examples of such distinction include major creative activity at a national or international professional venue; the conclusion of a long-term project such as the completion or publication of a monograph, edited volume, or multi-year artistic work; the creation of multiple creative works; the submission, acceptance or publication of multiple articles; multiple national or international presentations, workshops, or master classes; invited keynote address or extended artistic residency; the recognition of one's scholarship through major awards or national attention; the reception of highly competitive external awards or fellowships.

Standards for Service

The appropriate evaluation of service effort will be evaluated in light of rank and according to the expectations described in the department's Promotion and Tenure Guidelines. The amount and type of service typically varies by rank. Some roles, such as leading a college committee, are typically undertaken by tenured faculty only. In the case of junior faculty, service should be limited and managed according to the faculty member's progress towards tenure and upon mentor advice. Effort in excess of position/rank expectations should be duly recognized.

For purposes of annual evaluation, service activity is designated as "light," "medium" or "heavy" according to such factors as time spent, complexity, effort, role, scope, and significance.

- Poor service is reflected by low attendance at department meetings without assuming committee and/or leadership responsibilities and an absence of evidence of college, university, or professional and/or community service.
- Marginal service is reflected by standard required attendance at department meetings without assuming committee and/or leadership responsibilities and an absence of evidence of college, university, or professional and/or community service.
- Good service is demonstrated by assuming departmental committee service in addition to standard attendance at Department meetings; it may also include one or more instances of "light" service at the college, university, professional, and/or community level.
- Very Good service, in addition to standard attendance at department meetings, is demonstrated by assuming a leadership role in some aspect of department service and/or by multiple instances of "light" and "medium" service at the college, university, professional, and/or community level.
- Excellent service meets the standards of very good service at the department level, with the addition of one or more instances of "heavy" service at the college, university, professional, and/or community level.

3. Differential Allocation of Effort

The Department of Theatre expects faculty to devote equal attention to teaching and research. When evaluating faculty performance, the unit applies the weights of 40 percent for teaching, 40 percent for

research, and 20 percent for service to the university, community, and profession. These weights are the same for tenured and non-tenured faculty, although the unit recognizes that the specific contributions of faculty members to the unit's mission will differ depending on career stage.

Changes in the standard 40/40/20 allocation of effort for a set period of time can be initiated by the tenured faculty member or unit director. These changes can be short- or long-term and must correspond to changes in workload not just evaluation criteria. Reasons for alterations can include short-term items such as funded research or longer-term career-stage issues. Faculty members are not allowed to reduce their teaching or research to less than 10 percent on DAE agreements. Unit needs take precedent over individual needs when making decisions to alter a faculty member's allocation of effort; such redistribution must be consistent with the best interests of the unit. The most likely occasion for consideration of such changes is in discussion between the director and the individual faculty member following annual performance evaluations, or sooner so that appropriate arrangements may be made at the unit level for the coverage of course offerings. Changes in faculty effort are to be negotiated and agreed upon before the start of the next academic year. Any individualized changes in faculty allocation of effort will be negotiated with the chair and documented in the faculty member's personnel file.

For short-term DAE agreements (one academic year or less), the DAE is ultimately approved by the unit director or chairperson, with a copy of this endorsement sent to the contact associate dean. For long-term DAE agreements (lasting one year or beyond), approval must also be sought from the appropriate contact dean in the college. All DAEs are reported annually to the College Dean's Office. Agreements for long-term DAEs must be reviewed every three years, although either the faculty member or chairperson/director may request an earlier review in response to changed circumstances or performance. At that time, the agreement may be revised, terminated, or continued.

The selection among these options should be made following the guidelines and process for approval of long-term DAEs contained in the University Policy on [Differential Allocation of Effort \(DAE\)](#).

Annual Evaluation System

1. Overview

Evaluation of each faculty member is conducted by the department's Faculty Evaluation Board (FEB), made up of the department chairperson (non-voting ex officio) and three tenured faculty members drawn by lot, as described in the department's by-laws. The faculty evaluation system allows sufficient time for completion of the process prior to merit salary decisions. The Department's timeline for this process is as follows:

- A reminder of procedures and due date for annual activity reports is sent to all faculty before the holiday break at the end of the fall semester. Faculty prepares their report and supporting documentation and submits it to the FEB by February 1.
- The FEB reads and examines the materials submitted by each faculty member. The board then meets to discuss and scores each portfolio according to the "Portfolio and Annual Report Review and Evaluation" procedures described below, arriving by consensus at a score for each faculty member in teaching/advising, scholarship, and service.
- In March, the Chair sends a letter to each faculty member conveying the Board's evaluation of his/her annual performance.
- Within two weeks of receipt of the letter, the faculty member may request a conference with the Chair to express disagreement or to discuss their annual evaluation or other matters brought up by the evaluation. Following this conference, and upon written request to the Chair, a faculty member may meet with the FEB to discuss their evaluation and may request a reconsideration of the evaluation by the Board before the end of the spring semester.

- Merit salary is determined when the college forwards the year's merit salary allocation to the department (normally in May).

2. Portfolio or Annual Report Preparation

NOTE: Faculty are responsible for annually maintaining their PRO record, which is also accessed by administration for reports such as the College snapshot of departmental productivity. PRO provides an annual activity report and faculty are advised to view and update their PRO reports before submission of the faculty member's portfolio to the unit. In classifying your work as major and minor, please bear in mind the definitions in the unit's [Promotion and Tenure Guidelines](#).

Each faculty member is responsible for compiling an annual report with supporting materials that document both quantity and quality of effort in teaching/advising, scholarship, and service during the calendar year. These materials are submitted to the Faculty Evaluation Board (FEB) no later than February 1. The requirements for the report and supporting material are described on the Annual Faculty Evaluation Form (Appendix B).

3. Portfolio or Annual Report Review and Evaluation

Guided by the "Standards for Acceptable Performance" described above in item II.B., the Faculty Evaluation Board judges the annual portfolio and determines merit points based on a 100-point scale (adjusted accordingly for differential allocation of effort):

Teaching (40 points) and Scholarship (40 points):

- 33 – 40 Excellent
- 25 – 32 Very Good
- 17 – 24 Good
- 9 – 16 Marginal
- 0 – 8 Poor

Service (20 points):

- 17 – 20 Excellent
- 13 – 16 Very Good
- 9 – 12 Good
- 5 – 8 Marginal
- 0 – 4 Poor

The Faculty Evaluation Board then meets to discuss each portfolio and determine merit points. Discussions focus on the overall quality and quantity of each faculty member's accomplishments in light of their research program and career stage, as well as the immediate public impact of his/her contributions to the Department and University, and the broader significance such contributions hold at national and international levels. The FEB arrives at a final score for each faculty member in each area: teaching/advising, scholarship, and service.

Members of the Faculty Evaluation Board are expected to be thoroughly familiar with the protocols of the college governing promotion and tenure as well as with the unit protocols described in department documents. In addition, the chair and all board members will have made a good faith effort to attend presentations of faculty members' creative work at campus venues.

The process of annual evaluation shall be conducted impartially and fairly. No board member evaluates or ranks him/herself. The evaluation of a faculty member's record is a confidential personnel matter, and all steps will be taken to ensure full confidentiality in all stages of annual evaluation.

4. Annual Evaluation of Feedback Process

Following the conclusion of the Faculty Evaluation Board's deliberations, the Chair of the Department writes a letter to each faculty member conveying the judgments of the Board concerning teaching/advising, scholarly and/or creative activity, and service in relation to unit and university expectations. Any substandard performance of a faculty member must be explained in the evaluation letter. Following university policy, this written summary also includes information regarding the individual's progress toward tenure and/or promotion. In the case of less than satisfactory performance, the letter will convey the Faculty Evaluation Board's suggested strategies for improvement or renewal. This letter also reminds faculty of their opportunity to discuss this evaluation with the Chair within two weeks of receipt of the letter. A copy of this annual summary is retained in each faculty member's departmental file.

A faculty member may decide to meet with the Chair to discuss disagreements concerning evaluated performances, suggested strategies for improvement or renewal, progress toward tenure and/or promotion, and/or any requested changes to his/her differential allocation of effort. A faculty member may also request to see a list of the distribution of total merit points, indicating his/her ranking in comparison to all other faculty.

Following this conference, and upon written request to the Chair, a faculty member may meet with all the members of the Faculty Evaluation Board to discuss his/her evaluation and may request a reconsideration of the evaluation by the board before the end of the spring semester. Faculty from outside the Department may be involved at the request of the faculty member, the Faculty Evaluation Board, or the Chair. The choice of outside faculty must be guided by the nature of the contested issue(s). During this meeting, the faculty member may request a reconsideration of his/her evaluation by the Board. The faculty member may present additional evidence at this time.

Should a faculty member remain unsatisfied with the outcome of his/her meeting with the Faculty Evaluation Board, he or she may request a review by a faculty committee designated to hear such matters in the College.

5. Post-tenure Review and Integration into the Annual Evaluation Process

This section includes information for faculty members undergoing Post-tenure Review.

- The Department of Theatre has in place a Faculty Evaluation Plan that provides for annual evaluation of each faculty member by a committee, known as the "Faculty Evaluation Board" (FEB), made up of tenured faculty members chosen according to provisions stated in the Department's by-laws. The FEB will conduct post-tenure reviews when required and do so pursuant to the department's faculty evaluation plan (including the allocation of annual merit points) and in compliance with procedural instructions issued by the College.
- The Post-tenure Review committee will provide a copy of their report to the faculty member, who may submit a written response for inclusion in the post-tenure review file before it is forwarded to the chair for his or her review. If the chair agrees with the report, he or she will indicate that agreement in writing to the faculty member and place a copy in the post-tenure review file. If the chair disagrees with the committee's evaluation, he or she shall explain the reasons for any disagreement in writing, with a copy to the faculty member and the committee.
- Unit procedures for how Post Tenure Review will be integrated into the Annual Evaluation Process as outlined below in #6.

Additional information can be found in the [Unit's Post-tenure Review Policy](#).

6. Outcomes of the Annual Performance Evaluation

The evaluation process of the Department of Theatre, seen in all its aspects, yields multiple outcomes. It acknowledges faculty accomplishments or shortcomings and makes them matters of record. It initiates discussions that influence the planning of both individual career development and unit evolution. It assists in the identification of opportunities for faculty improvement and renewal. It provides annual as well as cumulative data for merit-salary recommendations, sabbatical-leave and grant applications, tenure and promotion decisions, post-tenure review, and reassignments of responsibilities. And it provides documentation that may be used, at extremes, in support of either recognition or dismissal.

Achievement of the Department and Individual Professional Goals: The annual statements of teaching/advising, scholarship, and service submitted annually by each faculty member allows the department chair and evaluation board to consider the faculty member's individual goals and coordinate their teaching, advising, research, and service to further these goals with those of the Department.

Differential Allocation of Effort: If a faculty member's performance requires improvement in any area, the chair will explore with the faculty member reallocation of effort from problem areas to areas where performance is more satisfactory, subject to the necessity for the unit to meet its research, teaching, and service obligations and the need for all faculty members to contribute appropriately. The process for differential allocation of effort is outlined above.

Merit Salary Decisions: The Department's merit salary allocation from the College is distributed on a dollar basis (i.e., each merit point is worth the same number of dollars, determined by dividing the total dollars available by the total number of merit points awarded). When merit recommendations are requested by the College, the Chair of the Department determines these recommendations by multiplying each individual's merit points total by the dollar value of one merit point. The number of points is multiplied by a dollar amount for each point based on the total number of points for the entire department. The total number of points for the entire department is divided by the allocation from the College in dollars, so each point is worth a dollar amount. The total number of points received by each faculty member is multiplied by the point dollar amount. If merit salary is not available for one or more years, the calculations described above will be based on the aggregate scores for all the years since the last merit salary decision.

Procedures for developing performance improvement plans

If the chair ascertains that a faculty member's performance seems to be failing to meet academic responsibilities, the administrator and the faculty member shall develop a written plan of methods to improve the faculty member's performance. The plan may include appropriate provisions for faculty development, such as campus opportunities for faculty continued renewal and development, or for other appropriate interventions. The chairperson may call upon the University administration for assistance in constructing such a plan, including provision for additional resources, where needed. A faculty member may reject any plan recommended to aid performance levels, but the faculty member must understand that a sustained overall failure to meet academic responsibilities is a basis for dismissal.

Responsibility for meeting departmental standards rests with the individual, but the Chair must assist faculty members to construct specific development and remediation programs. Faculty programs vary according to specialty and need. Faculty members required undertaking development activities as an outgrowth of the evaluation process will design a general strategy with the Chair of the Department. Together, they choose both a specific program and a departmental mentor to oversee the program and consult closely with the faculty member who has embarked upon it.

Procedures for addressing failure to meet academic responsibilities

If a faculty member has been informed that his/her performance still fails to meet academic responsibilities, the faculty member may request a review by a faculty committee designated to hear such matters in the College. The review committee will issue a non-binding recommendation on the appropriateness of this conclusion to the unit administrator. The administrator may change the evaluation after receiving the committee's decision, or may choose not to do so. In any event, the report of the committee will become a permanent part of the faculty member's personnel file within the academic unit and shall be available to the faculty member.

Department chairs shall consult annually with the dean, and the dean shall consult annually with the Provost on the progress of any faculty member who falls within this category of failure to meet academic responsibilities.

Sustained failure to meet performance expectations

Based upon the judgment that there has been a sustained failure to meet academic responsibilities, the Dean may recommend to the Provost that a tenured faculty member be dismissed. In making this determination, the Dean shall consider the nature of the failure to meet academic responsibilities, the reason or reasons for this failure, the number of years that the faculty member has failed to meet academic responsibilities, the level of discernible improvement in the faculty member's performance after being notified of any failure in performance, and the extent to which the faculty member has complied with the terms of any plan developed to improve the faculty member's performance. The Provost will review the case and, if the Provost agrees with the Dean's recommendation, the Provost will recommend to the Chancellor that the faculty member be dismissed. If the Chancellor agrees and recommends dismissal, this recommendation will go to the Faculty Rights Board.

Should any recommendation to dismiss be brought against a tenured faculty member based exclusively or in part on grounds of sustained failure to meet academic responsibilities, both the report(s) of the review committee(s), the annual written evaluation(s) of the unit administrator concerning the faculty member, any outside evaluations, and any germane written response by the faculty member to the charges shall be made available to the Faculty Rights Board.

7. Faculty Development Initiatives

The Department's objectives of faculty development are: 1) to provide faculty with options that support their professional growth and renewal, and 2) to maintain flexibility in response to changing faculty career aspirations consistent with the larger mission of the Department.

The Department acknowledges the necessity of continuous mentorship of junior faculty by senior faculty in preparation for their candidacy for tenure and promotion to associate professor. Initiation of this process is the responsibility of the Department and it continues until the faculty member achieves the rank of full professor. A tenure-track assistant professor should develop a relationship with a suitable mentor (appointed in consultation with the Department Chair) and establish a plan for scholarly and/or creative work that meets institution's policies and expectations.

Associate Professor Plan for Promotion to the Rank of Full Professor

The Department of Theatre will implement the following mentoring program to help faculty achieve excellence in teaching, research and service in order to be considered for promotion to the rank of professor. Our goal in establishing this mentoring component of our Faculty Evaluation Plan is to help our faculty set achievable goals that map a clear path to achieving the teaching, research and service expectations as outlined on the Department of Theatre By-Laws for Promotion and Tenure. Our expectation is that an associate professor will comply with what the College has traditionally recognized as the 40-40-20 formula for weighting research, teaching, and service. Our Department By-Laws recognize that “there is some flexibility in this weighted formula to assign a differential allocation of effort to a tenured faculty member, in light of the needs of the tenured faculty member and the departmental needs and aspirations.” (By-Laws Appendix A P. 26). Our faculty mentor plan includes teaching, research and service monitoring that delineates a clear time-line for each associate professor to meet the expectations for promotion to the rank of professor. Associate faculty members will be appointed a senior faculty member mentor in the department based on research interests in the field of Theatre and Performance Studies immediately in the fall following their successful promotion to associate professor.

Teaching

The associate faculty member will set dates with their assigned mentor for peer review evaluations of teaching for each semester following their promotion to associate professor and create quarterly meetings to review syllabi and evidentiary teaching tools (assignments, writing rubrics, etc.) to monitor and evaluate teaching growth. The Department of Theatre recognizes faculty teaching excellence in the department as “continued effectiveness and growth as a teacher, as reflected in such factors as mastery of the subject matter, strong classroom teaching skills, an ongoing commitment to student learning, and active involvement in providing advice and support for students outside the classroom.” (By-Laws Appendix A. P. 23) Mentors will help associate professors clearly articulate all aspects of their teaching philosophy as they grow as scholars and teachers by encouraging clear documentation of learning outcomes, student advising in and outside of the classroom, and engaged learning. All documentation of faculty teaching will be updated quarterly in PRO to effectively track progress in annual reviews.

Scholarship

The Department of Theatre’s concept of scholarship “encompasses not only traditional academic research and publication, but also the creation of artistic works or performances and any other products or activities accepted by the academic discipline as reflecting scholarly effort and achievement for purposes of promotion and tenure. While the nature of scholarship varies among disciplines, the University adheres to a consistently high standard of quality in its scholarly activities to which all faculty members, regardless of discipline, are held. In the Department of Theatre, faculty artist/scholars will be expected to demonstrate ongoing success in the University Theatre, and particularly for advancement to full professor, to show evidence of a national or international reputation in theatre.” (THR By-Laws Appendix A, p. 23). All associate professors will engage with their assigned faculty mentors to map a work plan for promotion to full professor by helping the associate professor identify professional journals, national and international magazines, performance venues, and other creative publishing opportunities to produce a body of scholarship and/or creative work that is at least equivalent to the amount and quality required for their initial promotion. Faculty mentors will work with the associate professor to identify and pursue appropriate conferences, publishing and performance opportunities, national and international grants to help the faculty member establish a national and/or international reputation in their field of expertise as outlined in the Department of Theatre Bylaws for promotion to the rank of professor. The faculty mentor will advise the associate professor about appropriate reviewers for creative work and the appropriate publication outlets that are recognized in the academy to warrant national and/or international reputation status

worthy of promotion to professor (6.2.3.1). All documentation of faculty scholarship will be updated quarterly in PRO to effectively track progress in annual reviews.

Service

Per the Department By-Laws, “service is an important responsibility of all faculty members that contributes to the University’s performance of its larger mission. Although the nature of service activities will depend on a candidate’s particular interests and abilities, service contributions are an essential part of being a good citizen of the University. “Associate professors will be mentored by professors in the Department of Theatre to achieve service and/or leadership positions in 1) University service; 2) Service to the discipline and/or profession; 3) Service to local (Lawrence, KS, Kansas City, MO, Kansas City, KS and its environs, etc.), state, national or international communities as per the Department Bylaws (6.2 4.1). This service can take many forms including, but not limited to, University committees (Provost, College, Professional Schools), board membership on national and international journals, public intellectual work in the field of theatre and/ or entertainment more broadly, publication in national magazines, blogs and/or websites, professional membership in creative organizations for theatre, local, national and international records of performance, directing, producing, design, dramaturgy, stage managing, etc. as it pertains to the making of theatre. A senior faculty mentor will help advise the associate professor about press, appropriate peer reviews and all documentation of service for promotion to the rank of professor. Senior faculty mentors will help the associate professor navigate service appointments and committee service as appropriate to publication and teaching goals in order to protect them from heavy demands of service requirements that often occur too early in the associate professor’s profile that deter them from reaching the publication and/or creative volume needed to obtain the rank of professor. All documentation of faculty service will be updated quarterly in PRO to effectively track progress in annual reviews.

Faculty development opportunities at the University include but are not limited to: ACE Fellows Program; Center for Teaching Excellence; Faculty Travel and International Travel Funds; General Research Fund; Hall Center for the Humanities Programs; IntraUniversity Professorships; National Fulbright Scholar Program; New Faculty General Research Fund; Progress toward Tenure Review; Sabbatical Leave; and Senior Administrative Fellows Program.

Research Intensive Semesters (RIS): CLAS offers all junior faculty members in good standing a reduced teaching responsibility at some point during the faculty member’s pre-tenure employment. Faculty members will be released from classroom teaching duties for up to one semester, depending upon the relevant departmental teaching expectations, and will be expected to concentrate on research intensive activities. Faculty members are eligible for a research intensive semester assignment up to and including the spring semester before their publication dossiers are sent out to external reviewers in June, with the latest possible Research Intensive Semester (RIS) assignment typically being the second semester of the fifth year. Faculty members in good standing who have stopped their tenure clock remain eligible for a RIS assignment. The actual decision of which year/semester the individual is assigned a research-intensive semester will be made in consultation with the department chair. Note that paid leaves and fellowships do not take the place of a RIS. Once the Chair approves the RIS for the junior faculty member, the details concerning the RIS should be confirmed to the faculty member in writing and documented in their personnel file. The Chair also provides a copy of this authorization to the College Dean’s Office so that RIS data can be tracked. Faculty members who are granted a RIS are expected to continue to meet their usual duties regarding departmental advising and other service activities.

See [Faculty Development Programs](#) for information about additional faculty development opportunities.

Appendices

Appendix A – Student Evaluation of Teaching

Appendix B – Annual Faculty Evaluation Reporting Instructions

Appendix C – Model for Peer Evaluations of Teaching
Appendix D – Evaluation Guide for Production Review

Appendix A – Student Evaluation of Teaching

The Department of Theatre utilizes the University's standardized “Student Survey of Teaching” form as the primary instrument for the student evaluation of teaching, administered according to the procedure described at <http://policy.ku.edu/provost/student-evaluation-of-teachers-procedures>. If and when these evaluations include narrative comments as well as numerical scores, the department considers these comments in the evaluation process.

Appendix B – Annual Faculty Evaluation Reporting Instructions

Recognizing that time spent on compiling documentation is time not spent on teaching or research productivity, the Department of Theatre seeks to align the components of the annual portfolio with the documentation that will be needed at other levels of review, including Progress Toward Tenure, Promotion and Tenure, and Post-Tenure Review.

To receive the most complete and fair evaluation of your annual activity, these are the components of your annual portfolio to be submitted to the Chair and members of the Faculty Evaluation Board:

1. Annual Report of Activity (“CLAS Annual Report SotA” in the PRO system).

Faculty are responsible for maintaining their PRO record, which is also accessed by administration for reports such as the College snapshot of departmental productivity. PRO provides an annual activity report that lists the courses and directed studies taught, graduate and undergraduate advisee activity, publications/forthcoming, creative activity, presentations, internal and external grant and award seeking, etc. Faculty are advised to update, view and correct their reports before the February 1 due date. In classifying your work as major and minor, please bear in mind the definitions in the Department’s Promotion and Tenure Guidelines

2. Annual Statement on Teaching/Advising, Scholarship, and Service

Provide a statement (approximately two - three pages) describing your effort and accomplishments for the year in teaching and advising, scholarship, and service. In teaching you might point out new courses, significant revision of courses, experiments with new approaches or methods of instruction, result of advising, directed studies etc. For scholarship, summarize your activities during the reporting period and explain how they serve your research program. For service, use this narrative to point out the key or particularly high-obligation service activities for the year. If you wish, add remarks regarding any conditions that you feel might be relevant to your merit evaluation.

3. Dossier of Supporting Documentation

The preferred format for your dossier of supporting documentation is electronic. The organization of folders and subfolders suggested below will allow you to prepare your annual materials in a way that will be most useful for subsequent evaluations.

Teaching/Advising

Student Survey of Teaching, including written comments

Peer Evaluations of Teaching

Course Syllabi

Additional Teaching Documentation

Include in this folder selective documentation of teaching effectiveness, such as teaching portfolios, unsolicited student letters, advising records, student awards, etc.

Record of Scholarship

Major Scholarship

Publications

Creative Work

Minor Scholarship

Publications

Creative Work

Additional Research

Include in this folder selective documentation of other notable research activity such as presentations and workshops; grants, keynote speeches; documentation of impact of scholarship such as unsolicited reviews, citations, online analytics, and awards.

Record of Service

Include in this folder selective documentation of service, particularly service at national and international levels and leadership roles in University or professional contexts; include acknowledgements and honors.

NOTES

1. Student Survey of Teaching. At the end of each semester, faculty are provided with copies of their student surveys. Upon request, the Department will compile your surveys for the year, including comments, and provide these to Faculty Evaluation Board.
2. Confidential Peer Evaluations of Creative Activity. Per the Department's by-laws, the Department seeks confidential external peer evaluations of creative activity for selected projects. If a peer evaluation was conducted for any of your activities, the Chair will share this evaluation with the Faculty Evaluation Board.

Appendix C – Model for Peer Evaluations of Teaching

Department of Theatre
Model for Peer Evaluations of Teaching
Approved October 22, 2009

NOTE: Of paramount consideration is that the evaluative process be a reflective process, i.e., that both evaluator and subject learn from each other in an atmosphere that is positive rather than negative. Research has shown that when evaluations are too judgmental, the process tends to break down and real improvement on the part of the teacher is negligible (indeed, there is a risk of conflict between the parties that can lead to dissension in the department).

1. Selection of the evaluator should be determined through the advisement of the Chair in consultation with the Faculty Mentor (for pre-tenure faculty members). It is required that each pre-tenure faculty member be evaluated at least once every year by a tenured faculty member; and that each tenured faculty member be evaluated by a tenured faculty member at least once every two years.
2. The Chair of the Department is charged with checking each fall semester to see that all faculty have begun the process of scheduling their evaluations by September 15th.
3. The evaluator and the evaluatee should meet several days or weeks prior to the evaluation to discuss the following:
 - When is the evaluation to take place? (This must be convenient and appropriate for both evaluator and teacher.)
 - What is the stated objective of the course generally, and of the particular classroom session to be evaluated specifically?
4. The evaluator will attend the agreed-upon class session in as unobtrusive a manner as possible. The teacher may want to announce in advance to the class that an evaluator is in attendance.
5. It is crucial that the evaluator and the teacher should meet soon after the class to discuss how the class was conducted. This is an informal opportunity for feedback from both parties.
6. The evaluator will prepare a written statement of evaluation/reflection that is primarily descriptive rather than judgmental. It could pursue the following suggested guidelines:
 - First, reiterate the stated objective of the course generally and of the particular classroom session.
 - Second, describe how the course material was organized.
 - Third, note the use (if relevant) of audio-visual aids.
 - Fourth, describe the teacher's method and manner of presentation. What means of contact were maintained with the class at large and with individual students? Were student feedback and questions entertained? Was discussion a part of the class?
7. A concluding statement that reflects both the evaluator's conclusions and the teacher's post-class feedback.
8. Consider organizing the above as a series of short prose paragraphs in a statement of no more than two pages in length.

9. The finalized form of the evaluation shall be shared with the teacher. This enables the teacher to respond to the evaluation if he or she deems it necessary. This response letter is then filed together with the evaluation in the evaluatee's departmental file. It should be emphasized that these documents remain confidential to all parties other than the evaluator and the evaluatee (until, of course, they are examined during Sabbatical and Promotion and/or Tenure proceedings). These evaluations may also be placed in the faculty member's annual merit file should she or he wish to include the evaluation in their files.

Appendix D – Evaluation Guide for Production Review

Department of Theatre
Evaluation Guide for Production Review

Faculty member:

Review written by:

Relationship to person (if any):

Description of observation:

Production review for theatre by on-site outside evaluator:

1. Assessment of overall artistic merit of the production.
2. Assessment of the extent and quality of the contributions made by the candidate to the production.
3. Comparison of the achievements evidenced in the production with those of other productions of theatre programs having similar scale, mission and goals.
4. Please attach current curriculum vitae with your review.

Signed

Date: _____

Review, Approval, & Change History:

12/12/2016: Approved by the Provost & Executive Vice Chancellor

12/09/2016: Approved by the Dean of the College of Liberal Arts & Sciences

10/09/2016: Approved by the faculty of the Theatre Department

07/01/2016: New Section 5 on Integration of Post-Tenure Review into the Annual Evaluation Process was added by direction of the Provost Office. New Boilerplate text replaces the current text at the beginning of Section 6:

The evaluation process of the Department of Theatre, seen in all its aspects, yields multiple outcomes. It acknowledges faculty accomplishments or shortcomings and makes them matters of record. It initiates discussions that influence the planning of both individual career development and unit evolution. It assists in the identification of opportunities for faculty improvement and renewal. It provides annual as well as cumulative data for merit-salary recommendations, sabbatical-leave and grant applications, tenure and promotion decisions, post-tenure review, and reassignments of responsibilities. And it provides documentation that may be used, at extremes, in support of either recognition or dismissal.

09/25/2015: Added the following statement to Section III.B. Portfolio or Annual Report Preparation:

NOTE: Faculty are responsible for annually maintaining their PRO record, which is also accessed by administration for reports such as the College snapshot of departmental productivity. PRO provides an annual activity report and faculty are advised to view and update their PRO reports before submission of the faculty member's portfolio to the unit. In classifying your work as major and minor, please bear in mind the definitions in the unit's [Promotion and Tenure Guidelines](#).

03/04/2015: Approved by the Provost and Executive Vice Chancellor

02/20/2015: Approved by the Associate Dean for the School of the Arts

02/19/2015: Approved by the Faculty in the Department of Theatre

Approved by:

Provost and Executive Vice Chancellor

Approved on:

December 12, 2016

Effective on:

December 12, 2016

Review cycle:

Every three years

Related Policies:

[Board of Regents requirements \(II.C.8\)](#)

[Article 7 Section 4 of the Faculty Senate Rules and Regulations](#)

[Faculty Evaluation Policy for tenure-track and tenured faculty](#)

[Faculty Code of Rights](#)

Contact Information:

Department of Theatre

University of Kansas

Murphy Hall 356

1530 Naismith Dr.

Lawrence, KS 66045-3140

kuthr@ku.edu

785-864-3511