

College of Fine Arts
Department of Theatre
Promotion Procedures and Policies
In Overall Evaluation of Tenure, Post-Tenure Review, and Annual
Evaluation

As per HOP ADM 06-505

CONTENTS

I. Procedures and Standards.....

- A. Introduction
- B. Procedures – Annual Review & Tenure
- C. Standards – Annual Faculty Evaluation Rating System

II. Annual Evaluation.....

- A. Annual Faculty Review
- B. Evaluation Report
- C. Outcomes
- D. Ratings Failing to Meet Academic Responsibilities
- E. Merit-Base Salary Increases
- F. Peer Observation of Teaching

III. General Criteria for Annual Evaluations, Tenure-Track Review, Tenure, and Promotion.

- A. General Expectations
- B. Criteria

IV. Specific Criteria for Tenure and Promotion

- A. Tenure & Promotion to Associate Professor
- B. Promotion to Full Professor

V. External Review Procedures.....

- A. General Parameters for Research/Scholarship
- B. Outside Adjudication

VI. Post-Tenure Review

- A. Procedure
- B. Teaching
- C. Research and Scholarship
- D. Service

VII. Workload Determination Policy

- A. Objective
- B. Criteria for Workload Determination
- C. Guidelines
- D. Appeal

VIII. Appendix

I. Procedures and Standards

A. Introduction

This document provides guidelines and criteria for evaluation of performance within the fields of theatre/ film and related disciplines. Allowances must be made for the emergence of new specializations as well as interdisciplinary creative, research, and performance possibilities when these apply to a faculty member's interests. It is the responsibility of the faculty member to make the case for the relative significance of an individual research-creative work and, in turn, for the appropriate committee and the Chair to clarify that same significance to those outside the field of theatre and its related disciplines who will also be making evaluations based on less familiarity with the scope of both the general and specialized fields.

At the same time, emphasis must be placed on the importance of all faculty pursuits and effort, not losing track of the core priorities of the university's strategic plan which is focused on educational opportunities, research impacting the Rio Grande Valley & beyond, student success, health & medical education, and community engagement. As the Department develops its own strategic plan, its elements must be incorporated into these university goals.

As this document is being written after the submission of completed materials submitted by faculty applying for tenure and promotion, it is not to be applied retroactively. Faculties whom have already submitted completed application forms and supporting documents will not be affected by any new criteria submitted in this document and will use the established approved documents under which they began their tenure or promotion process. New tenure and promotion guidelines will be put into effect in the following academic year after approval.

The information contained in this document is complementary to UTRGV policy especially as delineated in UTRGV HOP Policies ADM 06-502, Annual Faculty Evaluation; ADM 06-504, Post-Tenure Review; and ADM 06-505, Faculty Tenure and Promotion. It includes information from the UTRGV strategic plan and UTRGV College of Fine Arts Bylaws and our accrediting organization, the National Association of Schools of Theatre (NAST) guidelines of tenure and promotion criteria.

The purpose of the annual review is to evaluate the work of the department's faculty in the three areas of Teaching, Research/Scholarship, and Service as well as allow all faculty members the opportunity to provide proper evidence of continuing development. As UTRGV expands and develops into a research institution and moves away from the status of its legacy campuses as regional universities, and as

commensurate levels of resources and support are made available, the requirements for a faculty member's growth and achievement will change. Therefore, a faculty member's contributions to the strategic plan and/or mission of the department as well as the College of Fine Arts and UTRGV in all three areas will be considered as part of the annual review process.

In the area of Teaching, while the student evaluation scores will be a significant factor in assisting the annual review committee in the definition of this area of a faculty member's evaluation, these scores do not exclusively determine a faculty member's overall outcome. The committee will also consider other teaching effectiveness measures such as supervision of student research, development of new teaching aids, the creation of fresh courses, or materials, course enrollment, recruitment of students to the program, being recipient of a College or University teaching award, and/or peer evaluation of teaching effectiveness – all of which will help the committee assess the faculty member's commitment to pedagogical innovation and the expansion, improvement or modernization of the department's curriculum as well as the improvement or advancement in general student goals and intellectual rigor.

In the area of Research/Creative Work/Scholarship, in order to help the university realize its mission as an emerging research institution, it is essential the Department of Theatre's faculty members maintain an ambitious level of scholarly and/or creative activities that -- depending on the faculty member's discipline -- will add to knowledge and understanding of theater and film. While the unit must maintain and hopefully expand its mission as a significant presence or outlet for theatrical performance in the Rio Grande Valley, the review committee encourages faculty to look beyond the community to create or extend knowledge and/or modes of inquiry and/or artistic expression within their particular disciplines but also recognizes the university strategic plan of Student Success, community engagement, health and medical education, research impacting the Rio Grande Valley and beyond. To properly achieve their individual goals as well as those of the department, college and University, faculty are encouraged to seek professional and creative growth through projects, grants, publications, productions, scholarly materials, and professional opportunities outside the Valley on a state, regional, or national scale.

In the area of Service, as will be appropriate to the standards of the faculty member's field of endeavor, profession or particular discipline, the review committee must consider the specific merit of the service, including the extent and significance of the activities the faculty member has performed for the community within their discipline or profession, as well as any institutional service to the Department, College, and University. The merit or value of the service may include the extent and/or significance of participation in award and competition juries, editorial boards, publication and presentation review panels, or any legitimate professional entities or activities – as recognized by the

committee -- outside of or related to the university that pertains to a faculty member's discipline or profession. Consideration must also be given to recognition or certificates for university, professional, and community service and to contracts and grants funded to conduct the service.

In all three areas, the committee will consider the following annual reviews or scores as guidelines as opposed to specific and unalterable criteria. To reiterate, the annual review process as stipulated below is a framework, not a rigid blueprint.

Each fall semester the Department will evaluate lecturers, tenure track, and tenured faculty members (including one-year lecturers and those teaching a full load) employed during the preceding year in teaching effectiveness, research/scholarship and service. The faculty member being reviewed shall submit a faculty review dossier as defined and organized on the UTRGV Executive Vice President for Academic Affairs's website. The materials provided would include a curriculum vita; the Faculty Portfolio Tool, the tabular numerical summaries of student teaching evaluations, and evidence that supports teaching, service and research/scholarship. As UTRGV moves to an electronic review dossier, the report must follow the example displayed in the Executive Vice President for Academic Affairs's website. Please refer to the report spreadsheet at: <https://www.utrgv.edu/academicaffairs/faculty-resources/faculty-reviews/index.htm>

Tenure track faculty will provide additional documentation and support in the three areas as stipulated under department guidelines to fulfill their obligations for tenure, including providing at least one peer review a year (tenured faculty will provide at least one peer review every three years). This policy is aligned with ADM 06-505 of the UTRGV Handbook of Operating Procedures. Based on the departmental criteria described below, the evaluation will provide a numerical value for each of the three performance areas and will serve to place tenured faculty in the four review categories specified in Regents Rule 31102 under Section 5.1 (a. exceeds expectations; b. meets expectations, c. does not meet expectations, d. unsatisfactory). A score of 3.5 to 4.0 in the given category equates to a level that exceeds expectations a score of 3.49 to 3.0 equates to meet expectations. A score of 2.99-2 equates to a does not meet expectations. A score of 1.99-0 or less equates to unsatisfactory. This numerical value will also serve as the basis for any potential merit salary increase in a summary of all three areas. Merit is defined as an annual salary increase based on performance awarded tenured, probationary and lecturer faculty, but not teaching assistants or part-time faculty.

To remain current, this document may be reviewed yearly by the Department Policy Committee to confirm its status or offer revisions. The Chair or a quorum of the faculty will initiate this process in the spring semester.

B. Procedures – Annual Review & Tenure

1. The Committee

The Department Tenure and Promotion Committee shall have a minimum of three members, and will be composed of tenured faculty members (and one lecturer for any lecturers considered for promotion) who are at or above the rank under consideration and appointed at least half time in the department, with membership as defined in the Department's written policies and procedures or bylaws. If three tenured faculty members from the department are not available to meet this requirement, then the committee will invite and include an outside tenured faculty from another department. In the event that a lecturer is applying for promotion, a lecturer of higher rank from the department will be brought in to work with the committee for those lecture promotion dossiers. (If no lecturer is available, one will be invited from another department with similar expectations. (CFA bylaws, this link is being created by the Dean's office) Members shall be elected for one-year terms at the first Department meeting of the next given academic year which will be held consecutively and/or until there are adequate faculty of the appropriate rank available to effectively stagger appointments. Ideally, the Committee should reflect a balance from all the Department's disciplines or areas, and service on the Committee should be on a rotating basis insofar as possible with the goal of allowing every qualified faculty member to serve on the Committee before any other qualified faculty member has served a second term.

The committee members will select the Committee Chair to coordinate the business of the Committee and to be its representative at college meetings. All information presented to the Committee and to the Department Chair and their discussion and decisions will be strictly confidential. Materials submitted to the Committee shall be kept in a secure area in the department and shall remain on campus in the department area until the material is forwarded to the Dean. Committee members may not deliberate on their own files nor may they vote on their own files. In addition, they may not be present when their files are being discussed and voted upon.

Promotion and tenure are recognized as being two different awards, but the procedure for determining the candidate's qualifications shall be essentially the same. The Department Committee will screen and evaluate each candidate for promotion/tenure and will make its recommendation by either recommending or not recommending

the promotion/ tenure. The Committee will make its recommendation on the appropriate routing sheets and will return them with the FTP dossiers to the Department Chair. In the event that a Committee member is being considered, that member shall be declared temporarily recused and the alternate shall replace him/her. The Department Chair may not serve as a voting member of the Committee, but either party may request that the Department Chair participate in its discussions and provide additional information from the chair's resources.

The Committee chair will ensure that the committee's recommendation, including the justification, will be provided to both the candidate and the next level of university administration.

In the event that no one in the department is going up for tenure/ promotion, the department will form an annual review committee consisting of members of the department.

2. The Candidates

It is the responsibility of the individual faculty member to prepare an online dossier through the FPT containing information and materials in support of the application for promotion. The format to follow is provided by the Executive Vice President for Academic Affairs's Office via the link below:

<https://www.utrgv.edu/academicaffairs/faculty-resources/faculty-reviews/index.htm>

3. Applications and Appeals

The faculty member applying for promotion and/or tenure will submit formal application materials to the Department Chair at the time designated by the University. The Department Chair will relay the dossiers to the Committee Chair. The Committee will consider all materials submitted and may request additional information from a candidate. As far as possible, The Committee will work with individual faculty members to help them improve their dossiers. The Department Committee will study the dossiers, makes its ratings, and will include a confidential written statement evaluating the strengths and weaknesses of each faculty member. This statement will be included in the dossier as the committee evaluation for the benefit of subsequent readers at the higher levels of the university's administration.

The Committee Chair will promptly inform each candidate through the delivery of a copy of the appropriate routing forms containing the recommendation of the Committee.

The Committee will preserve the confidentiality of the dossiers. The Department Chair forwards dossiers of all faculty members applying for promotion to the Dean of the College of Fine Arts upon completion of the Chair review. Faculty wishing to appeal the recommendations of the Department Committee and/or the Department Chair will follow the procedures specified in the Handbook of Operating Procedures within Section: ADM 06-505.

C. Standards -- Annual Faculty Evaluation Rating System

1. All faculty members will submit to the Chair their completed Faculty Portfolio (FPT) dossier detailing the previous year's accomplishments self-rated as per the annual review criteria. For any elements or information not listed or uploaded into the FPT document, the faculty member will provide these materials to be evaluated by the committee. The due date for submission will match the date in the Pathway deadline document from the EVPAA's office.

2. Evaluation values in the three areas will be weighted according to the following standards.

a. Statement of Performance Expectations

Unit expectations:

1. Teach loads/allocation of effort are assigned by the Chair, in accordance with the faculty workload policy and the faculty member's professional growth plan. The standard tenured/tenure track workload is equivalent to 18 semester credit hours of undergraduate instruction per year or what is called 3/3. Percentage wise, this will be treated as 60% teaching, 20% research and 20% service (60-20-20.) For faculty members who are lecturers the standard workload is equivalent to 24 semester credit hours of undergraduate instruction per year or what is called 4/4. Percentage wise, this will be treated as 80% teaching, 10 percent research and 10% service (80-10-10.) As is aligned with Department, College of Fine Arts, and University policies, a course release or releases might be provided due to a faculty member's department or university obligations in administration, creative endeavor which directly supports the department's theatre, film, and/or community engagement responsibilities on some other properly recognized capacity. Individual faculty members may negotiate different percentages according to the unit's needs with written approval from the chair, dean and EVPAA (for example, a 60-30-10 research load).

2. Provide creative and professional support to students as needed.
3. Faculty members are expected to develop and maintain a distinctive program of research and/or creative activity that brings the Department state, regional, and national recognition in one or more areas of endeavor (teaching, research/creative work/scholarship, or service) or submit evidence in furtherance of these goals.
Additional guidelines to expectations and requirements of faculty members in the theatre department can viewed in the NAST Handbook: <https://nast.arts-accredit.org> or as revised in the future.
4. Contribute in appropriate capacities of service to their areas, the Department of Theatre, College of Fine Arts, The University of Texas Rio Grande Valley, and in their professional fields.
5. Adhere to professional standards as outlined in UTRGV HOP ADM 06-106, D.4. These criteria and procedures are to be used in conjunction with the appropriate sections of the UTRGV Handbook of Procedures on Faculty Tenure and Promotion (ADM 06-505). The HOP, Format for Faculty Review Dossier, Faculty Peer Observation of Teaching and Selection of External Reviewers source documents (found on the Office of the EVPAA's website under the Faculty Resources tab as well as in this document) should be consulted for additional pertinent information concerning the topics discussed in this document.

b. Standards for Acceptable Performance for Tenure-Track Faculty:

It is expected that each member of the faculty who is awarded tenure will have demonstrated a meritorious level of achievement in the areas of teaching, research/performance/creative activity (hereafter referred to as "research-creative work"), and service. The extended commitment inherent in the granting of tenure requires an established record of past achievement and the potential for future achievement. If a tenure track faculty member fails to achieve a suitable rating of meets expectations or higher in teaching, research, or service during any part of their tenure process, the faculty member in conjunction with the Chair of the Department of Theatre will develop a faculty growth plan to address the areas of concern.

c. Standards for Acceptable Performance for Tenured Faculty:

Tenured faculty in the Department of Theatre must maintain a high standard of performance in all areas of responsibility. It is recognized that teaching and research

interests and service responsibilities change and develop over time. Regardless of the nature of these changes or the amount of effort allocated to each activity, the standards for achievement remain high throughout the faculty member's tenure at the university. An annual evaluation rating for an already tenured faculty member of meets expectations (on a scale of exceeds expectations, meets expectations, does not meet expectations, or unsatisfactory) must be achieved to indicate a minimal level of performance.

If a tenured faculty member fails to achieve a suitable rating of meets expectations or higher in teaching, research, or service, the faculty member in conjunction with the Chair of the Department of Theatre will develop a plan to address the areas of concern. Continued failure to achieve an acceptable level of performance will result in a review by the Annual Review and/or Tenure Committees and the forwarding of a recommendation to the Chair of the Department of Theatre. UTRGV HOP ADM 6-502 (Annual Evaluation) states that two consecutive annual evaluations of "unsatisfactory" may trigger the Post-Tenure Review process.

Differential Allocation of Effort: Each full-time member of the Department's faculty is expected to engage in teaching, research, and service. Under normal circumstances, each faculty member will adhere to a general norm of 60% teaching, 20% research, and 20% service allocation of effort. The Chair in consultation with the faculty member will determine exceptions to these percentages of effort. For example, a course release or releases might be provided due to a faculty member's department or university obligations in administration or some other properly recognized capacity or assignment.

All faculty members are encouraged to meet with the Department Chair annually on an individual basis to consider their evaluation, expectations and general performance in all areas.

II. ANNUAL EVALUATION

Overview

Annual Faculty Evaluation is the regular review process for assessing the work and professional accomplishments of faculty members. Each faculty member will submit their completed Faculty Portfolio (FPT) dossier detailing the previous year's accomplishments and self-rated as per the annual review criteria of prescribed materials to the Chair on the date indicated in the Pathways for Review Deadlines found on the Office of the EVPAA's website under the Faculty Resources tab. If it is not practical or viable to form an Annual Review Committee, the Tenure and Promotion Committee will conduct the review. Given the early timeline for such decisions, Annual Evaluations will follow the academic year. Results of Annual Faculty Evaluations are used to inform

decisions regarding merit-based salary increases. The continued failure to meet standards being judged by the annual evaluation committee requires the Chair and Annual Review and/or Tenure & Promotion Committee to become involved.

A. Annual Faculty Review

It is the responsibility of each faculty member to submit materials that accurately and effectively document the member's activities in teaching, research/scholarship, and service for the academic year under consideration. Also see Annual Faculty Evaluations & Tenure-Track/Tenure and Promotion Reviews Process and Guidelines.

For lecturers, tenure track and tenured faculty, the Annual Evaluation Faculty Portfolio Tool dossier will include:

1. Annual Narrative Summary of Achievements
2. Current Curriculum Vitae
3. Tabular Summaries of:
 - a. Teaching Evaluations
 - b. Teaching Achievements
 - c. Research-Scholarship-Creative work
 - d. Service
4. Peer Observations of Teaching
5. Course Syllabi and Student Course Evaluations
6. External Reviews and/or Adjudications as required for tenure candidates
7. Supporting documents as needed

B. Evaluation Report

The Committee and the Chair of the Department of Theatre will prepare independent evaluation reports (ratings and comments) on each respective faculty member using the Annual Evaluation Recommendation Form. The faculty member will have the opportunity to review these reports at each level and submit appeals according to the timeline indicated in the Pathways for Review Deadlines. (Also see C. Outcomes, below.)

The Committee will base the evaluation of each faculty member on criteria defined in this document in the section Criteria for Annual Faculty Evaluation, Progress toward Tenure Review, and Promotion and Tenure. Evaluation of each category will consider, on balance, both the quantity and quality of work. The Evaluation Report will include a single rating for each category (Teaching, Research, and Service) according to the following scale:

- 4 – Exceeds Expectations
- 3 – Meets Expectations
- 2 – Does Not Meet Expectations
- 1 – Unsatisfactory

Faculty will also receive an Overall Rating, determined by the scores in the three evaluation areas: Teaching, Research-Creative Activities, and Service. The Overall Rating will be calculated as follows:

4--Exceeds Expectations: Faculty must have a “4 – Exceeds Expectations” rating in two of the three areas, and a “3 – Meets Expectations” or “Exceeds Expectations” in the third area.

3--Meets Expectations: Faculty must have at least a “3 – Meets Expectations” in the two major areas (teaching and research) and a “3 – Meets Expectations” or “2 – Does Not Meet Expectations” in the third area. In the case of a faculty member having received a “2 – Does Not Meet Expectations,” it should be made clear that although he/she has met expectations for the purpose of the Annual Evaluation, he/she will need “3 – Meets Expectations” scores or better in all areas for the purpose of tenure and promotion. Also, see C. Outcomes, below.

2--Does Not Meet Expectations: Faculty member received a score of at least “3 – Meets Expectations” in two areas, and a rating of “1 – Unsatisfactory” in the third area. Alternatively, the faculty member may have received a rating of “2 – Does Not Meet Expectations” in two areas.

1--Unsatisfactory: Faculty member received scores that do not qualify for a “Does Not Meet Expectations” rating.

Teaching

Exceeds Expectations (meets 4 of 6 below)

1. 90% or above on the yearly average of Teaching evaluations (FTP gives this info for us)
2. Positive Peer review of a class (for lecturer and tenure track)
3. Update all course materials/ create new course
4. Teaching an overload, large lecture section or 3 separate class preparations
5. Academic advising of students within faculty assigned track (Design, Performance, and Film)
6. Exceptional teaching not covered above at committee’s discretion.

Meets Expectations

1. 70% to 90% on the yearly average of teaching evaluations
2. Peer review of a class
3. Full teaching load as assigned

Does not meet expectations

1. 60%- 70% on the yearly average of teaching evaluations
2. No peer review of a class
3. Full teaching load not met

Needs Improvement

1. Below 60% on the yearly average of teaching evaluations
2. 2nd year without peer review of class
3. More than one semester of not meeting teaching load

All of this info should be available in the tabular summaries of the FPT and therefore make it easier for the faculty member to access the information and present it to the committee

Service

Exceeds Expectations (Faculty should meet 4 out of the 6, 3 out of 6 for lecturers)

Meets Expectations (Faculty should meet 3 out 6, 2 out of 6 for Lecturers)

Does not meet expectations (Faculty should meet less than 3)

Needs Improvement (2nd year of not meeting at least 3 areas)

1. Head of area/ program/ facility or chair of department
2. Member of 3 departmental committees or chair of 2 departmental (at least) committees
3. Member of college committee or above
4. Chair/ Supervisor of thesis or internship
5. 2 or more significant community involvement/ recruitment per semester (UIL, high school recruitment, film festivals, etc. Committee discretion)
6. Significant service not covered by the above guidelines

Professional Achievement/ Creative Work

Exceeds Expectations (Faculty should meet 2 out of the 5 or a combination or repetition of any 1 area, 1 out of 5 for lecturers)

Meets Expectations (Faculty should meet 1 out 5)

Does not meet expectations (Faculty does not meet 1 area)

Needs Improvement (2nd year of not meeting at least 1 area)

1. One major performance/ design/ Film/ directing project per year
2. One peer reviewed or juried publication per year
3. One presentation/ workshop per year at the state or above level
4. One grant outside of university per year or evidence of a grant in progress
5. Significant Creative work/ achievement not covered by above guidelines

There will also be a brief narrative included in the Evaluation Report for each category, justifying the assigned rating. The Annual Review and/or Tenure & Promotion Committee may also choose to include a summary paragraph with suggestions/ commendations.

C. Outcomes

All ratings of “3 – Meets Expectations” or above (according to the ratings defined above) require no special action or sanction. A rating of “2 – Does Not Meet Expectations” or “1 – Unsatisfactory” in any category is considered failing to meet academic responsibilities and requires further corrective steps, described below. A faculty member has the right to appeal the results of an individual evaluation. Appeals must be made in writing and submitted to the Chair within 10 working days (see Pathways for specific timeline) of receiving the Evaluation Report. Appeals must clearly explain the rationale for challenging the determination of the Tenure and Promotion Committee.

Each faculty member is encouraged to meet annually with the Chair to discuss his/her productivity, evaluation, and expectations for the future.

D. Ratings Failing to Meet Academic Responsibilities

Following the procedures outlined in UTRGV HOP ADM 6-602 (Annual Faculty Evaluation):

If the annual performance evaluation raises concerns about the faculty member's performance in one or more areas, as indicated by "does not meet expectations" or "unsatisfactory," this may indicate that the faculty member could benefit from additional support...A tenured faculty member whose overall annual performance evaluation is "Unsatisfactory" for two consecutive annual reviews may additionally be reviewed under the procedures described in HOP ADM 6-504, Post-Tenure Review. The decision to undertake a comprehensive performance evaluation outside of the normal time frame of six years will be made by the EVPAA in consultation with the Dean of the college.

The Chair of the Department shall consult annually with the Dean, and the Dean shall consult annually with the EVPAA, on the progress of any faculty member who falls within the category of overall failure to meet minimum academic responsibilities.

E. Merit-Based Salary Increases

Merit funds, when available, will be awarded based on review of the faculty member's previous year Annual Evaluation Review. Faculty receiving "Meets Expectations" or "Exceeds Expectations" in all areas over a will be eligible for a merit increase. In the event that merit has not been awarded in an extended amount of time, merit will be based from the end of the last merit award cycle or review period.

F. Peer Observation of Teaching

For faculty members in tenure-track and lecturer positions, a peer observation of teaching is required every year (tenured faculty will require a Peer Observation of Teaching once every three years). Peer Teaching Evaluations will consist of written reports by one tenured/tenure-track colleague chosen by the faculty member in consultation with the Chair. These evaluations should address overall effectiveness and organization of the observed instruction. Using the prescribed format ports should include critical and constructive comments, and also clearly identify any concerns of the reviewer. The format is available at the following link:

<https://www.utrgv.edu/academicaffairs/faculty-resources/faculty-reviews/index.htm>

Although the department's format is preferred, if it is acceptable to the faculty member and the Department Chair, the reviewer, if they come from outside the department, may use forms or formats provided by the reviewer's department at their particular college, university or department. The faculty member is responsible for identifying a peer observer and arranging a date for the observation to take place. After the teaching evaluation is submitted to the Chair, the observed faculty member will be

given the option to submit a statement within one week addressing anything in the report the faculty member feels is inaccurate or needs clarification. For more information, please refer to the institutional guidelines on Faculty Peer Observation of Teaching.

III. GENERAL CRITERIA FOR ANNUAL EVALUATIONS, TENURE-TRACK REVIEW, TENURE, AND PROMOTION

Overview

Annual Evaluations, Tenure Track Reviews (including 4th Year Review, Tenure-Promotion (to Associate Professor), and Promotion (to Full Professor) are all designated as part of the review process (see ADM 06-505) overseen by tenured faculty members. As established earlier in this document under Procedures, tenured faculty will select or elect a Tenure-Promotion Committee to make extensive recommendations on tenure-promotion candidates in a report to the Chair that includes a summation and interpretation of the faculty vote as well as a report of their own considerations and evaluation of each tenure-promotion candidate.

A. General Expectations

Recommendations for annual faculty evaluation, progress toward tenure review, tenure and promotion as well as post-tenure reviews shall be based on the record of the faculty member in teaching, research/creative activity (hereafter referred to as research), and service.

1. Teaching. As this can be considered the majority component of a faculty workload, faculty members must demonstrate classroom management, higher order thinking, and student engagement. ADM 06-505 states: “excellence in research/scholarship/creative activities or service is insufficient grounds for promotion or tenure in the absence of effective teaching.”

2. Research. Research or Scholarship may include any of a wide variety of activities depending upon a faculty member’s field of specialization, discipline and/or interests. All faculty members are encouraged to practice research or professional activities appropriate to his or her field of specialization and/or discipline and will achieve recognition among his or her peers in one or more such fields of activity.

3. Service. Each member of the faculty is expected to render appropriate service via efforts that employ the professional skills or expertise of the faculty

member. These activities may include but not be limited to committee, support, or professional work at the level of the Department of Theatre, the College, the University, the profession, and the public at large. At the committee's discretion, depending on the circumstances and/or level of a tenure track faculty member, committee or support work may be encouraged at the college or University level.

B. Criteria

The Committee, which will be making evaluations based on the following criteria, is expected to pay sufficient and thoughtful attention in evaluating the relative value of each potential contribution.

A faculty member is not required to participate in all the undertakings itemized below. A faculty member is not required to be equally active in each of the three categories. The quality of the contributions is of greater importance than the quantity – particularly in relation to Research/Scholarship/Creative Activity and whether the activity is local, regional, state, national or international.

In relation to Research/Scholarship the prestige and/or scope of the publication or presentation venue will be important contributing factors in the determination of the significance of the research and/or creative activity. The undertakings itemized below are not intended to be exclusive or exhaustive and should be amended to include new paradigms of creative-research work and teaching as these emerge over time. The Department Chair as well as the committee must pay close attention in regard to these continuing changes or opportunities.

1. Teaching

Evidence to be considered in the evaluation of teaching shall include, but not be limited to:

- a. Level of achievement and success of current students (e.g. students placing in competitions or winning an award for performance/research).
- b. Level of achievement and success of former students (e.g. student attending graduate school, performs as a member of a professional ensemble, receives recognition/award).
- c. Student Course Evaluations.
- d. Peer Observation(s) of Teaching.
- e. Development of new courses, revision of existing course(s), instructional programs, teaching materials, or innovative teaching techniques.
- f. Testimonials by colleagues.
- g. Testimonials by former students.

- h. Honors, awards, or recognition for teaching excellence.
- i. The achievement or earning of professional certification in an area specific to a faculty member's specialization or discipline.
- j. Development of a new degree program, particularly a graduate program, as commensurate levels of resources and support are made available.
- k. Overloads taught, multiple course preparations.
- l. The supervision of an independent study (i.e. student teacher, thesis defense, mentoring student work, supervising a senior video or theatre project, supervising a student rehearsal in preparation for a performance related to their studies).
- m. Supervision of internships and student research and creative activity, poster sessions and presentations at conferences and workshops.

2. Research-Scholarship

An important part of the mission of this academic unit is to produce community-based theatre, given that there is no local professional theatre available to our faculty, students, local alumni, or community residents. The large region we serve is remote from other cities and the nearest professional venue is over 300 miles away. Through their involvement in the praxis of community/local theatre and film, our faculty is providing major opportunities locally to develop skills in theatre/ film production. The National Association of Schools of Theatre supports our mission as a provider of community theatre.

Evidence to be considered in the evaluation of research activity will be considered according to quantity and quality of productivity. The pursuit of external funding (e.g. grant writing) is recognized as an example of research-scholarship for faculty members. Tenured or tenure-track faculty members should focus on research, creative works, or professional activities appropriate to his or her field of specialization, degrees held, and/or discipline that achieves state, regional, national and/or international recognition among his or her peers in one or more such fields of activity.

While all faculty members are encouraged to develop avenues for success at the state, regional and national levels, a faculty member with an exceptional track record of local and area research/creative work/scholarship could be adequate for tenure/promotion. This seems to be in line with the university's strategic plan and emphasis on student success, community engagement, and experiential learning. Depending on how a tenure track or tenured faculty member's career grows, evolves or changes, not every item need be achieved or addressed.

One must consider many variables and subjective factors when evaluating the artistic merits of a theatrical or cinematic work, but the following criteria should usually be considered when ranking works as having greater or lesser significance. Major responsibilities in this document may include any number of professional duties including but not limited to the following: directing, writing, acting, design, technical work, dramaturgy, stage management, cinematography, lighting for film, post-production, production management, artistic direction, stage combat, voice and movement, technical direction, shop management, company management, cutting/draping, etc., A theatrical or cinematic work that fits major research typically though not specifically meets one of the following criteria:

1. A theatre, film, or video production in any genre.
2. Work with a film or theatrical organization or entity, or a theatre or film department from an institution of higher learning.
3. Publication, production and/or recording of a major work.
4. A successful entry in a national or international, impartially refereed adjudication conference or contest.
5. A position of major responsibility in a production of theatrical/cinematic work.
6. A position of major responsibility by local performers or smaller organizations (e.g., faculty member, high school Department of Theatre, local/campus theatre, or music productions).
7. Original conception or direction of a small-scale production.
8. A position of major responsibility in a theatre/film production as a member of a professional company or as a part of an ensemble.
9. A position of major responsibility – in a performance in a professionally produced theatre, film or video recording.
10. A position of major responsibility in a performance in a UTRGV or local theatrical production.
11. A presentation at a theatre symposium, conference, festival, or lecture-demonstration.
12. Book, monograph, textbook, book chapter or work in electronic media of substantial significance and scope;
13. A scholarly article published in a refereed journal;
14. A lengthy, scholarly article based on original research written for a major theatre publication.
15. A relatively brief monograph, textbook, or work in electronic media;
16. A brief article on a less substantial topic, published in a magazine or regional journal;
17. A review of a book, theatre performance, or work in electronic media.

18. A substantial, scholarly paper, lecture, workshop, or movement session selected by committee, presented at a local, regional, national, or international meeting of a professional organization;
19. A substantial, invited paper, lecture, or movement session presented at a meeting of a professional organization or at another university.
20. A non-adjudicated paper, lecture, or movement session, presented at a state or regional meeting.
21. An invited paper, guest lecture, or presentation at an outside university, theatre festival, or venue of national significance.
22. A successfully completed research grant for a theatrical project from a national or international foundation or agency.
23. Grant application.

NOTE ON GRANTS: *A funded grant that may be considered major research is typically large, externally funded grants made available to the faculty member by a state, national or international agency. Moreover, grant writing attempts and efforts are to be acknowledged in some form as significant contributions to Research-Scholarship. A funded grants that may be considered minor research is normally smaller, internally funded grants from within the university.*

Other documented activity will be defined and/or reviewed at Faculty/Committee discretion.

Research-Scholarship in multiple areas:

It is understood that a faculty member is not limited only to the research activities listed in one area. It is recognized that many faculty members perform, design, write, edit, publish, consult, video record, and/or participate in a wide variety of professional activities. Such breadth of activity is encouraged. However, each faculty member's primary efforts should be directed towards those activities in the area of his or her appointment.

3. Service

Service is an essential aspect of faculty evaluation. Because of the visibility the Department of Theatre seeks to maintain in the region, state, nation, and world, the service component is significant.

Activities considered in the evaluation of service may include:

- a. Serve as Chair, director, or manager of a UTRGV performing Theatre Company.
- b. Active participation in elective or appointive leadership roles (officer) in professional associations, professional meetings or conferences, (e.g. TACWT, SAFD, UFVA, TFC, NAST, SETC, ATHE, USITT, USITT SW, TETA, etc.).
- c. Student advisement, degree plans; and degree audit preparation.
- d. Serving on committees of the Department of Theatre, College and/or University;
- e. The writing of peer faculty observation(s).
- f. Administrative duties, including Department Chair, area head, direct special project, preparation of program reports, etc.
- g. Facilitating, managing and maintaining student use of film/theater equipment.
- h. Utilization of the professional abilities and expertise of the faculty members in public service, (e.g.: serve as member of Faculty Senate).
- i. Administrative duties pertaining to organization/implementation of a festival, conference or other suitable entity.
- j. Student advisement.
- k. Organizational advisement.
- l. Recruiting an individual guest artist, master class instructor, or scholarly speaker to a campus event.
- m. Organize overnight field trips or portable productions.
- n. Serve as support or liaison for a guest artist's lecture or work.
- o. Advise or consult an off campus production.
- p. The writing of letters of recommendation for students.

To help facilitate a satisfactory and successful program for teachers and students within the Department of Theatre, it is the responsibility of the faculty member to attract, recruit and retain qualified theatre majors. Evidence of developing and/or supporting recruitment and retention programs may include:

- 1 Active and ongoing communication with prospective students by letter, telephone or e-mail.
2. Active involvement in the recruiting activities of the Department of Theatre.
3. Developing opportunities to work with prospective students.
4. Active contact with public and private school instructors and participation in theatre-related community organizations.

5. Participate in university of department career day/night.
6. Organizer of summer theatre camp, seminars, workshops.
7. Organize and/or participate in Department of Theatre auditions.
8. Mentoring and sponsoring student organizations.
9. The pursuit and awarding of external funding (e.g. grant writing, fund raising) for the performing groups and program should be recognized as significant for all faculty members.

IV. SPECIFIC CRITERIA FOR TENURE AND PROMOTION

The guiding principle with respect to research-creative work (and to a lesser extent teaching) for the two primary stages of faculty advancement, tenure and promotion to associate professor and promotion to full professor, should be conducted as a seamless progress in the professional stature of the individual.

A. Tenure & Promotion to Associate Professor

Theatre faculty can be expected to follow the criterion of developing their professional profiles through focusing on creative works. Major responsibilities in this document may include any number of professional duties including but not limited to the following: directing, writing, acting, design, technical work, dramaturgy, stage management, cinematography, lighting for film, post-production, production management, artistic direction, technical direction, shop management, company management, cutting/draping, etc., major creative works as defined in direction, performance, or a combination of two or all three areas. It is difficult to quantify an acceptable number for a tenure-promotion portfolio given the variety of possibilities and the limitations on national performance due to the academic responsibilities of the individual. Nevertheless, some combination that satisfies 3 - 6 of the criteria classified as major over the period of review should be viewed as reasonable.

B. Promotion to Full Professor

The same general principles (stated in previous sections) apply to awarding the title of Full Professor. Additionally, while an increase in the quantity of achievements may be slight, and increase in the quality of achievements is expected. It must be understood that in the case where a faculty member has moved primarily into scholarly research, teaching assignments and roles within the Department of Theatre have to be formally reassessed.

NOTE ON EXPECTATIONS: Meeting these expectations for research-scholarship does not guarantee the granting of tenure-promotion since candidates are evaluated on their

overall achievement in teaching, research-scholarship, and service. In all cases, the fulfillment of a record of achievement as detailed in UTRGV Policy ADM 06-505 takes precedence.

V. EXTERNAL REVIEW PROCEDURES

External reviewers will be employed to measure and support tenure and promotion documentation. In the spring semester previous to the candidate's application for promotion (and tenure if that applies), a process will be initiated that will follow the UTRGV Guidelines for the selection of external reviewers for faculty promotion and tenure which are available online at

<https://www.utrgv.edu/academicaffairs/faculty-resources/faculty-reviews/index.htm>

A. General Parameters for Research/Scholarship

The Tenure and Promotion Committee has produced this document to address issues of balance that relate with equating the various disciplines within the department in terms of concepts of quality and quantity, in widely disparate fields. This document is an attempt to put these issues in focus and find a balanced, fair and unbiased way to evaluate the work of colleagues, particularly when the evaluation is performed by those unfamiliar with the specific discipline.

B. Outside Adjudication

1. Research-Scholarship

a. Evaluations and awards from adjudicated contests or similar events are also welcome as support of the merit of the candidate's productivity.

b. An adjudication is required every two years for a tenured or tenure track faculty member.

c. In the case of UTRGV theatre performances, a qualified outside evaluator is asked to come on campus, all expenses paid, to see the production and write the review of all the candidates (director, actors, designers and technicians) involved. Generally, a fee is paid for this service. This is not required of lecturers.

d. In the case of an American College Theatre Festival (ACTF) adjudication, this would serve as an external review of work.

e. Whether a candidate is paid for the creative works is a non-issue. Scholars often publish without payment, and others may be getting royalties or similar compensation for their works. Sometimes a director, actor, technician or designer, etc., is paid directly for the work. At other times it is part of the adjusted workload for

the semester or an in-kind gift to another institution. The question of compensation can be ignored for the purpose of these evaluations.

NOTE ON ADJUDICATIONS: *This outside adjudication does not replace the external review required by the UT System, but serves as peer review of the candidate's Research/Scholarship.*

2. Non-scholarly publications

- a. Certain areas of the department lend themselves heavily to local formats. Writing articles for local papers, appearing as guest speaker at local events, *pro bono* consulting for local organizations, serving on boards of related interest groups, and so on are worthwhile community service and university service activities. While deserving of merit consideration, they do not fulfill the creative/scholarly standards for tenure and promotion. Publication and presentation for tenure should be in a broader venue, such as state, regional or national meetings and publications.
- b. An exception to the policy above should be made for materials originally published and produced for local consumption but which subsequently received formal recognition in a wider venue. In such cases, the tenure credit should apply to the year in which the award or re-publication took place, and not to the original year of production.
- c. Similarly, candidates who publish articles that have no link to the candidate's discipline should not count this work for tenure. No system is perfectly fair. However, the committee suggests that instituting such a system for new entrants on the tenure and promotion tracks would assure that work is being evaluated with expertise and without personal bias.

VI. POST-TENURE REVIEW

Overview

The purpose of this policy is to provide additional guidelines and outline procedures for the periodic evaluation of tenured faculty in the Department of Theatre. The purpose of this process is to facilitate continuing and meaningful faculty development, to assist faculty to enhance professional skills and goals, to refocus academic and professional efforts, when appropriate, and to assure that faculty members are meeting their professional responsibilities to their department. Additional guidelines for this review will be found in the HOP [ADM 06-502](#).

All criteria for Teaching, Research, and Service described in the General Criteria and Specific Criteria for Tenure-Promotion sections of this document apply to Post-Tenure Review. Faculty should also consult the Annual Faculty Evaluations & Tenure-Track/Tenure and Promotion Reviews Process and Guidelines document.

A. Procedures

All tenured faculty members are to be evaluated annually, with a comprehensive evaluation performed every six years after the last successful comprehensive review for tenure and promotion. The sixth year review is to include evaluation of all three areas of professional responsibility (teaching, research-creative activity-scholarship, and service) taken as a whole. Tenured faculty in the Department of Theatre must maintain a high standard of performance in all areas of responsibility. It is recognized that teaching, research-creative activity-scholarship, and service responsibilities change and develop over time. Regardless of the nature of these changes or the amount of effort allocated to each activity, the standards for achievement must be maintained at a high level throughout the faculty member's tenure at this institution.

It is important that each faculty member be allowed and encouraged to develop an individual profile, particularly in the area of research-creative activities.

B. Teaching

In addition to the criteria listed under Teaching in the General Criteria section of this document, tenured faculty should provide leadership in evaluating and updating curriculum in their areas. Faculty should have an acknowledged record of success in undergraduate teaching.

Other possible evidence of teaching effectiveness may include:

1. Funding received for teaching innovations
2. Teaching awards
3. Selection to teach in prestigious programs

Faculty Expectations

Faculty in the areas of theatre technique, performance, theory, and education should also:

- a. Regularly participate in teaching a variety of technique, performance and theory courses as needed.
- b. Work cooperatively in their areas for equitable assignment of courses and provide leadership in evaluating and updating theatre curriculum.

- c. Provide leadership in recruiting efforts for the academic Department of Theatre in general, and for their specific performance areas.
- d. Have an acknowledged record of success in advising students in their academic careers, toward achievement of professional goals, and in honors and senior thesis work.
- e. Assist students in special projects, and development of presentations and papers for publication.
- f. Remain current in recent advancements in theatre techniques and scholarship in both general and appropriate specialized subject areas, and current developments should be incorporated into course curricula, as applicable.

C. Research and Scholarship

Faculty in the post tenure process are expected to show continued development and growth as well as increasing visibility in their scholarly or creative work. Artistic or scholarly achievements must be supported by substantial publications or equivalent artistic creations and/or performances.

Faculty Expectations

In the field of theatre, it is noted that faculty may select one area of focus or a combination of several areas, depending on their expertise or research interests. These include direction, production, performance, writing, scientific research, film production, historical research, folklore, costumes, sets, lights, props, research in sociological, anthropological, and material culture, research in design, technology, fashion, architecture, interior design, etc.)

In the area of direction and performance, faculty is expected to show continued growth and development as directors, writers and/or actors. Their development should reflect learning through the production of theatrical or film projects in diverse locations, production sites, and venues. Faculty will produce, write, design, or perform new projects regularly and in sufficient quality to maintain visibility and a significant reputation in their chosen field or discipline. Faculty may also choose to engage in scholarly activity that results in publication of original ideas or the results of research in the form of books, chapters, articles, reviews, or critical editions of theatre.

Because scholarly work may be in progress over a span of years before it is brought to completion, it is essential that faculty members show continuing, tangible progress in their projects. Some faculty may develop specialties in pedagogical, historical, or theoretical studies pertaining to their area of expertise; this work may be

disseminated in publications that may or may not be refereed, clinics, conference presentations, or broadcasts.

Publication is not specifically required of all faculties, however such activities are commended and serve to strengthen the reputation of both the individual and the Department of Theatre. While publications may enhance a strong record of writing, performance, design, or production, they will not compensate for a weak record in the candidate's chosen field, whatever the area.

D. Service

Tenured faculty is expected to provide increasing leadership and service to the Department of Theatre, the institution, and the profession. In the Department of Theatre, faculty are expected to participate in the following:

1. Faculty meetings and committees
2. Curriculum development and academic planning
3. Area and Department of Theatre governance
4. Student and faculty recruitment
5. Review of tenure-track faculty

Faculty is also expected to engage in professional service that reflects the visibility of their own research-creative work and teaching.

VII. WORKLOAD DETERMINATION POLICY

Overview

This policy provides procedures for the Workload Review of tenured faculty. For the complete policy that governs faculty academic workloads please consult HOP policy [ADM 06-501](#).

A. Definition

The standard assignment for all tenure-track faculties is a Research Load. This is equivalent to 18 semester credit hours of undergraduate instruction per year or what is called 3/3. Percentage wise, this could be treated as 60% teaching, 20% research and 20% service (60-20-20). At the College of Fine Arts' discretion and at the Department's prerogative, this formula may be changed to a 60-30-10 percentage to increase the focus on research. Lecturers will be 80-10-10. Depending on a faculty's circumstance

via their creative or professional obligations or duties, a course release may be provided.

All faculties, upon being granted tenure and promoted to associate professor, should be continued on a Research Load. The Workload Review in the Department of Theatre follows the same timeline as the Post-Tenure Review process for tenured faculty. The purpose of the Workload Review, however, is to determine if tenured faculty have been productive in terms of a level of research or scholarship sufficient for them to be continued on a Research Load or to be placed on a Research Load if previously assigned a Teaching Load.

B. Criteria for Workload Determination

The Department of Theatre recognizes that as faculty move from tenure-track to tenured, associate professor and then professor, responsibilities are likely to change which affect scholarly and creative professional achievement. Faculty workload should take into consideration the duties of the individual faculty member; for example, a faculty member who has been elected to chair a major university committee (graduate council, curriculum committee, SACS review, etc.), while on a research load of 3/3 should not be penalized for this vital service by being expected to continue scholarly or creative publication at the level expected prior to obtaining tenure. Thus, expectations for maintaining a 3/3 research workload after tenure should take into consideration the overall responsibilities of the tenured faculty member and not simply relate to his/her professional achievement without such consideration.

To qualify for a Research workload in the Department of Theatre, faculty will meet the following minimum criteria in professional achievement within the 6-year review period:

1. In the area of direction, design/tech, film production and/or performance: 4-6 works that meet the criteria that are classified as major (as well as local and regional engagements)
2. In the area of scholarly work: 2-3 published articles in juried academic journals which in turn could be considered equivalent to 2 such articles in addition to a national conference presentation.
3. A combination of direction/performance/production/design/film production and scholarly work: a sum of 4-6 in both areas that meet the criteria considered major (as well as local and regional engagements)

C. Guidelines

The Workload Review is separate from the Post-Tenure Review but follows the same timeline and thus occurs six years after the faculty member's previous Tenure/Promotion or Post-Tenure review. The review will be conducted by the Program's elected Workload Committee that shall consist of at least three (3) tenured faculty members elected in November prior to the January of the review. At least one member of the elected committee should be in the discipline of each faculty member under review; the chair will conduct an independent review after the Committee has completed its review. If the two reviews result in conflicting recommendations, both recommendations will be forwarded to the Dean. The Dean will decide the issue in consultation with the Chair and the Chair of the Workload Review Committee.

A faculty member who had previously been assigned a Research Load who is placed on a Teaching Load as a result of a Workload Review may request another follow-up Workload Review in any year prior to the next scheduled Post-Tenure Review by informing the department chair in September prior to the January review if that faculty member feels that additional works accomplished since the previous Workload Review warrant a new review. This will not change the Post Tenure Review cycle for that faculty member.

Faculty members who have administrative assignments entailing a course reduction (for example, the Graduate Advisor) will keep the same workload as when they began the assignment and will have their research expectations adjusted accordingly during this assignment. Anyone who has received three or more year-long course reductions for administrative purposes during the years under review should initially be granted a Research Load for the ensuing six years once the faculty member no longer holds that administrative assignment. A faculty member may always request to be placed on a Teaching Load.

D. Appeal

A faculty member may appeal a Workload Review decision, following the procedures outlined in HOP policy [ADM 06-111](#):

VIII. APPENDIX – UTRGV approved documents and advisory documents (*)

A. University of Texas Rio Grande Valley FPT format:

<https://www.utrgv.edu/academicaffairs/faculty-resources/faculty-reviews/index.htm>

B. University of Texas Rio Grande Valley faculty tenure and promotion policies:

<https://www.utrgv.edu/hop/policies/adm-06-505.pdf>

C. *National Association of Schools of Theatre Handbook: <https://nast.arts-accredit.org/>

D. *United States Institute for Theatre Technologies guidelines:
<http://www.usitt.org/assets/1/6/TenurePromotionGuidelines2014.pdf>

E. University of Texas Rio Grande Valley, College of Fine Arts Bylaws:
<https://www.utrgv.edu/cofa/files/documents/cfabylawsamendedapproved5-3-19.pdf>