

- f. Adjunct faculty may be appointed to Departmental committees, except the Personnel Committee, as full voting members.

Endorsed by the regular faculty of the Department of Theatre, November 2, 1994.

C. PROMOTION AND TENURE

1. General Guidelines

Preparation of recommendations for promotion and tenure in the Department of Theatre will follow guidelines of the university as described in such documents as “College of Arts and Sciences Guidelines for Promotion and Tenure” (Revised 1989), “MU Guidelines for Preparation of Recommendations for Promotion and Tenure,” revised, September 1987; “Guidelines for Preparation of Promotion and Tenure Dossiers,” University of Missouri-Columbia, revised August 1990; UM Executive Order 6A, “Policy and Procedures for Promotion and Tenure, June, 1992, rev. September 1992”; and Academic Tenure Regulations, University of Missouri System, 1988, or the current revisions of these documents.

As in other fine arts, professional efforts in theatre involve a multitude of activities. Professional activities of all theatre professors include teaching, research, creative activities, and service. Few theatre professors, however, dedicate themselves with equal intensity to both research efforts leading to documented achievements in acting, design, directing, or playwriting. Some professors, usually those holding the MFA degree, choose a career path emphasizing teaching, creative activity, and service. Others, commonly those holding the Ph.D., opt for a career path in which research activities are emphasized as much if not more than creative activities, in addition to teaching and service. A few theatre professors build regional and national reputations on the basis of research and publication alone.

The assignment of the individual theatre professor must be related to the department’s needs and expectations in the areas of teaching, production, research and service. Service needs include, but are not limited to, administrative duties such as acting as administrator of educational programs within the department or as artistic director or technical director. The assignment must be determined in consultation with the department chair. Initially, at least up through the mid-point review for assistant professors, the assignment of the theatre professor will correspond closely to the expectation established in writing in the hiring process. In any case, the annual assignment of the individual professor will be recorded in writing at the time of the consultation. Given that evaluation of quality is inherently subjective, the following considerations seem central to the evaluation of any theatre professor’s work:

- a. Appropriateness to the faculty member’s documented assignment.

- b. Relevance to stated departmental goals.
 - c. Significance and quality of the endeavor as indicated by audiences, referees, readers, peers, and students, as recorded in reviews, visitation reports, student evaluations, and other appropriate forms.
2. Guidelines for Considering Creative Achievement for Promotion and Tenure

A variety of competencies are needed in theatre studies in higher education. On-campus preparation of plays for public performance allows directors, designers, playwrights, and actors an outlet for demonstrating artistic achievement. The level of this achievement should be documented. Off-campus work with reputable theatre companies may supplement the competencies demonstrated at the University of Missouri-Columbia. Since the approach to evaluating teaching and publications is described in the college and university guidelines, this statement describes only the type of documentation that may be presented in the dossier of a theatre artist.

THE FOLLOWING IS A RECOMMENDED CALENDAR TOWARDS PROMOTION AND TENURE

- I. On-campus activity
 - A. Evaluations
 - 1. By the Chair
 - 2. By faculty peers
 - 3. By outside experts
 - a. Comments and/or awards for works submitted in competitions, such as the American College Theatre Festival
 - b. Evaluations of slides, drawings, films, videotapes, photographs, light plots, scripts, etc.
 - 4. By audience members (optional)
 - a. Reviews in the media by competent critics.
 - b. Public response.
 - B. Selected documentation that creative work was done may be made available to the review committees.
 - 1. Directing: Program notes, video tapes, films, DVD's.
 - 2. Design: Working drawings, renderings, light plot photographs, slides, models.
 - 3. Acting: Photographs, video tapes, films.
 - 4. Playwriting: Scripts, video tapes, films, DVD's.
 - C. Evaluations of on-campus creative activity as a learning experience for students.
 - 1. By the Chair.
 - 2. By faculty peers.
 - 3. By students (optional).

When the Professors of the department decide promotion of an Associate Professor may be warranted, a sub-committee of Professors shall conduct an intensive review in the spring preceding the fall the recommendation is to be forwarded to the College. Should the number of theatre Professors be too small to form a committee, faculty from cognate disciplines may be invited to participate. This committee shall solicit outside letters from qualified, impartial reviewers suggested by the candidate to provide evaluations of his/her professional accomplishments. The sub-committee submits a written review of the candidate, with or without promotion recommendation, to all the Professors in the department who vote by secret ballot on whether to recommend promotion. Professors who concur in recommendation shall have the opportunity to participate in preparing the package to go to the College, and , if necessary, of defending it on appeal. Favorable recommendation, if that is the majority's will, goes to the Dean, with a record of the number of votes for and against promotion. The Chair prepares a separate recommendation.

Candidates have the right to a hearing for reconsideration in front of the Professors of the department, and candidates can appeal the department's decision to the College Promotion and Tenure Committee and to the Dean.

Recommendations include a complete resumé prepared by the candidate (including records of teaching, scholarship, creative activities or artistic achievements, and service). Copies of publications and other appropriate materials supplied by the candidate are also included. Outside letters comparing the candidate's work against nationally recognized standards or evaluating the candidate's national reputation, visibility, and potential for future growth are key. All solicited letters must be included in the recommendation package. The explanation of the process for selecting referees and a description of their credentials must be included. The recommendation is to include an informed assessment of the candidate's effectiveness as a teacher, according to processes established by the department. A record and evaluation of the candidate's activities in advising, administrative responsibilities, and service (on campus and professionally off-campus) shall be included. The department or the candidate may include any other relevant information, including evaluations from former students.

b. Annual Reviews

As stated in the College of Arts and Sciences Guidelines for Promotion and Tenure (Revised 1989), A faculty member who holds the rank of Associate Professor has the right to seek promotion to Professor in the sixth year following appointment to Associate Professor. Each year following the promotion to Associate Professor, the department's Professors must each file a written review of the contributions of each

Associate Professor to the departmental mission. These reviews will be placed in the faculty member's file. The faculty member may request a copy, discuss the review with the Chair, and may attach a written reaction to the annual review.

c. Mid-point review

The mid-point review should be accomplished in the third year of appointment as an Associate Professor or at a point in time such that three full years remain before the Associate Professor could anticipate a recommendation for promotion to Professor.

The mid-point review should be started not later than April 1 with a letter addressed to the Professors of the department from the Associate Professor. The letter should briefly characterize the Associate Professor's efforts and achievements in developing a national reputation in the discipline. The letter should be accompanied by a copy of an up-to-date vitae and the three most recent Annual Up-dates to the Faculty Cumulative Record for the Associate Professor in question.

The mid-point review should include a brief written evaluation of the Associate Professor by each Professor in the Department. Each evaluation need not be comprehensive, but in total, the Professors' evaluations should address the issue of the Associate Professor's development to date of a national reputation in the discipline and suggestions for development over the next three years. The Associate Professor may name five professionals (senior educators from outside the department or recognized theatre professionals) whose evaluations could supplement the evaluations of the Professors in the Department. The Department Chair will solicit evaluations from no more than two of these outside professionals.

A professor, acting as the representative of the Professors in the Department, will work closely with the Associate Professor to develop by June 30, an outline of developmental and professional activities to be undertaken by the Associate Professor in the ensuing three years. This outline is understood to be a goal statement and not a contract for promotion. The Associate Professor's plan might include:

- an outline of teaching assignments anticipated in the next three years and a plan for having selected courses submitted to student, peer, and/or other appropriate evaluations;
- an outline of anticipated directing, designing, or other artistic assignments with a plan for submitting at least two of these assignments to evaluation by Faculty Peers and by Outside Experts, according to procedural models set forth in "Models for Evaluating Creative Activity," a publication of the Association for Theatre in Higher Education;

- an outline of anticipated service responsibilities and a plan for submitting the Associate Professor's service achievements to peer evaluation.

Throughout the Associate Professor's plan, emphasis should be placed on efforts to develop and establish work that meets nationally recognized standards in the discipline. Accordingly, the plan might include, if teaching achievements are to be a major feature of the promotion dossier to be put forward, plans to develop teaching media having a significant impact off-campus: textbooks, publications on pedagogy, audio-visual media, workshops, lectures, and demonstrations. If creative achievements are to be a major feature of the promotion dossier, the plan might include entry of creative works in national competitions, as well as any efforts to bring the Associate Professor's creative activities to the attention of theatre educators on the national scene. If service achievements are to be a major feature of the promotion dossier, the plan might include major regional or national service activities focused at least in part on theatre in higher education.

The Professors in the Department will review the plan and, if necessary, make suggestions for revision on a timetable permitting the Associate Professor's plan to be approved by July 31.

5. Alternative Plans for Career Development for Associate Professors

The Department of Theatre recognizes that there may be Associate Professors who either choose not to seek promotion or whose job requirements may not allow them to develop a dossier meeting the requirements of the various personnel committees. It should be noted that there is a particular difficulty for creative artists who are not expected to publish. They may be expected to satisfy both the production needs of the department and to spend the time away from the department to establish a "national" reputation. In light of this dilemma, the department offers the following alternative plans for career development.

- a. That the Associate Professor wishes to be considered for promotion to Professor within the next five years and that the Associate Professor has developed, following the procedure used at the mid-point review for Associate Professors, a plan approved by the Professors in the department. A special feature of the Associate Professor's plan is that it must be staged in one-year increments, such that merit salary increases can be based, at least in part, on satisfactory progress according to the plan.
- b. That the Associate Professor wishes not to be considered for promotion to Professor, or is denied promotion at some level in the process and does not wish to be reconsidered. In such cases, the Associate Professor's annual evaluations will be primarily based upon undergraduate teaching

assignments and evaluations; service to the department, college, and university; and creative activity. Administrative duties on all levels may provide additional opportunities for a productive career with the university. The Associate Professor will develop a five year plan for teaching, service, and creative activity in cooperation with the chair and personnel committee of the department and with the approval of the dean of the college.

6. Post Tenure Review (Approved by faculty 9/3/04)

Tenured professors must be evaluated every year in the areas of teaching, research and/or creative activity, and service. The University model of 40:40:20 will be applied to each professor with the understanding that creative activity is equated with research. Evaluations are made by the Personnel Committee and the Chair. Each faculty member will be rated on a three-level scale (high, medium, low) in teaching, research, creative activities, and service.

a. Teaching is evaluated on (1) classroom performance as indicated by student TEQs and materials in the individual faculty member's teaching portfolio, and (2) by graduate students advised, research presentations by graduate students at professional meetings, and publications by graduate students. Classroom teaching and graduate student education are weighted equally.

b. Research is evaluated by: (1) peer-reviewed publications; (2) quality of journals in which the articles are published; (3) contribution of the individual faculty member in multi-authored papers; (4) presentations at professional meetings; and (5) external and internal research proposals submitted and grants awarded.

c. Creative activity is defined as any theatre related activities such as directing, designing, acting, playwriting, or dramaturgy. Creative activities at campus level are expected of all theatre faculty and will be evaluated appropriate to their contribution. Creative activities at national and regional levels will receive appropriately more weight as they reflect upon the reputation of the department.

d. Service contributions include those for department, campus, and profession. More weight is given to professional service, especially national offices, journal editorships, and organization of special sessions at national meetings since these reflect recognition of the individual by peers in the profession, and these activities bring recognition to our department.

Faculty will receive a yearly written evaluation from the chair. The faculty member must sign and return a copy of the evaluation and may provide a

response. If the overall evaluation is unsatisfactory, there must be a face-to-face discussion of the evaluation between the faculty member and the chair.

(the following is adapted from the university faculty handbook 310.015)

At five-year intervals a tenured faculty member will resubmit the annual reports and evaluation statements for the past five years, with a concise summary statement of research, teaching, and service activities for the five-year period, and a current curriculum vita to the chair. The first five-year review will be done five years after the tenure decision or the last formal review of the faculty member for promotion to associate professor/full professor. Faculty hired with tenure will be reviewed five years after they are hired.

Based on the five-year report, the chair will evaluate the faculty member's performance as satisfactory or unsatisfactory. The five-year evaluation process will be complete with a satisfactory evaluation. If the evaluation is unsatisfactory, then the five-year report will be sent to the department personnel committee. The personnel committee will perform its own full review of the performance of the faculty member over the five-year period and provide an independent assessment of the performance of the faculty member. The five-year evaluation process will be complete if the personnel committee judges the performance of the faculty member to be satisfactory.

In the event that both the chair and the personnel committee determine the performance of a faculty member to be unsatisfactory for the five-year period, the report will be forwarded to the appropriate dean. The dean will review the report and provide an assessment of the performance of the faculty member. The five-year evaluation process will be complete if the dean judges the performance of the faculty member to be satisfactory.

At every level of review, the faculty member will be provided with a copy of any written report that is part of these proceedings and will have the right of appeal of any evaluations, decisions, or recommendations to the next level of the process.

Formulation of Development Plan and Assessment of Progress

a. If a two-thirds majority of the members of the department personnel committee and the dean consider the performance of the faculty member to be unsatisfactory, a plan for professional development will be written. This plan will be developed by the faculty member, the personnel committee or a designated subcommittee, a mutually agreed upon mediator from outside the department, and the chair of the department. This development plan will have clear and attainable objectives for the faculty member and may include a reallocation of the faculty member's effort and a commitment of