

--

THEATRE ARTS DEPARTMENT
STATEMENT OF
DEPARTMENTAL STANDARDS AND PROCESSES FOR EVALUATION

Reviewed and Updated by the Theatre Arts Faculty
Submitted to the Professional Standards Committee
November 2021

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter 1: Introduction	
I. Function of This Document	3
II. Relationship of Faculty to Student Constituencies	3
III. Area of Teaching Specialty	3
IV. Diversity of Personnel	3
Chapter 2: Statement of Departmental Evaluation Standards	
I. Teaching	4
II. Professional and Scholarly Development	5
III. Student Advising	7
IV. University and Departmental Service	8
V. Community Service	9
Chapter 3: Application of Evaluation Standards	
I. Definitions	10
II. Standards	
A. Tenure-Line Faculty (General)	11
1. Teacher/Artist Faculty	11
2. Teacher/Administrator Faculty:	
Director of Theatre Production	14
B. Non-Tenure-Line Faculty	15
Chapter 4: Evaluation Processes and Procedures	
I. Processes for Evaluation	16
II. Grievance Process	16
Appendix: Copy of Letter to Adjudicators	17

CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION

I. Function of This Document:

The Theatre Arts Department acknowledges and endorses the general criteria and the hierarchy of criteria for faculty evaluation established in the Faculty Code. We feel it incumbent upon ourselves, however, to define more specifically the criteria to be used in evaluating faculty and teaching staff in order to ensure the highest caliber of teaching within the department and to ensure fairness in the evaluation process. It is to these ends that the following statement of evaluation standards has been adopted.

II. Relationship of Faculty to Student Constituencies:

The Theatre Arts Department has identified four major student constituencies: majors; minors or students taking additional courses beyond the introductory level; students taking single courses as electives or to fulfill a university core requirement; and students involved in co-curricular activities sponsored by the department. Department faculty and teaching staff have varying roles in serving these students. Evaluations should recognize contributions to these diverse constituencies on an individually appropriate basis.

III. Area of Teaching Specialty:

Within the department, faculty members and teaching staff will have assignments for particular courses in the curriculum. These assignments should be regarded as primary responsibilities. Any evaluation should consider the contributions of the faculty or staff member to their area(s) of responsibility.

IV. Diversity of Personnel:

The department acknowledges and endorses the diversity of its instructional skills and methods. The mix of art, philosophy, history, literature, performance, physical training, science, and technology is the benchmark of a successful theatre arts department. In this context, the department affirms the need for extensive, yet flexible standards for faculty and teaching staff evaluations. Several categories are designed to guide evaluations.

- A. Tenure-Line Faculty
 1. Teacher/Scholar Faculty
 2. Teacher/Artist Faculty
 3. Teacher/Administrator Faculty
- B. Non-Tenure-Line Faculty

--

CHAPTER 2: STATEMENT OF DEPARTMENTAL EVALUATION STANDARDS

I. TEACHING

The Theatre Arts Department recognizes excellent teaching as a fundamental requirement of all faculty. We understand excellence to be comprised of a high level of investment in curriculum design and course management that is effective in positioning students to achieve the course outcomes. Such pedagogical effectiveness combines both innovation and the maintenance tradition in methods, readings, and assignments. We affirm that diversity in teaching serves the department, the discipline, and the university.

A. Evidence of Teaching Excellence

We find the following to be useful indicators of pedagogical effectiveness

1. Course Design

- a. Outlines, syllabi, and objectives should be prepared for each course and made available to students and colleagues.
- b. Course Objectives and Learning Outcomes should be explicitly grounded in the goals of the discipline.
- c. Examinations, assignments, and projects should lead to the fulfillment of course goals.
- d. Course content should be appropriate for coordination with university and departmental goals and objectives.
- e. Research conducted for new course proposals, curricular review, or a new area of teaching responsibility.

2. Instructional Performance

Excellence in instruction should include demonstrated ability and flexibility in different teaching modalities as appropriate to the area of specialty and the situation within which teaching occurs: classroom, oral and written criticism, coaching, tutoring, studio, and rehearsal. Excellence in instruction also includes appropriate adaptation to varying levels of student achievement, as well as careful evaluation of student work.

The philosophy of the department includes an inherent commitment to applying the discipline's theoretical and critical insights outside of the classroom. Demonstrated and reported ability in teaching the curriculum in co-curricular and/or extra-curricular venues shall be accepted as additional evidence of teaching excellence. The department of Theatre Arts centers experiential learning through production and our department is not large or specialized enough to offer distinct classes in every area of theory and practice that matters to our work. For example, we teach and train our student stage managers through individual mentoring before they are assigned to co-curricular and extra-curricular productions. A similar process applies to dramaturgy and lighting design. For this reason activities that in other contexts may be classified as advising or service are also part of our

teaching repertoire, such as individual mentoring, overseeing conference presentations, sponsoring of student organizations or mentoring student theatre. The Department affirms that work in these areas can be counted as both service and teaching, and that candidates for promotion and tenure should make a clear argument to that end in their files when summarizing their work. Evidence of accomplishment in curricular-related encounters outside of the classroom may include student letters, conference or play programs, newspaper or journal articles documenting productions, and/or letters from colleagues with first-hand knowledge of the faculty member's work.

3. Student Intellectual Growth

Consistent with the philosophy of a small liberal arts institution, the department places a premium on working individually with students and involving them in the discipline which creates prime conditions for student intellectual growth. Examples of effectiveness in this area include management of student research, advising senior thesis projects, supervision of independent studies and internships for credit, creativity evidenced by original student investigation of their production and scholarship roles, student participation at conferences, and other projects appropriate to the field and supervised by the faculty member.

4. Student Evaluations

Please see the User Guide on Promotion and Tenure Standards and Procedures about language and bias in Student Evaluations of Teaching. With that in mind, the department looks for evaluations that indicate a consistent pattern of excellence from the standpoint of such things as challenging goals, demands for rigor, organization, availability of professor, and clarity of presentation. These shall be viewed as evidence of teaching effectiveness, along with other criteria as specified above.

B. Assessment of Teaching Excellence

The department views peer review as the most reliable indicator of teaching excellence. The candidate's courses (including rehearsal, if part of the candidate's teaching assignment) will be observed by multiple departmental colleagues on multiple occasions. The minimum expectation is that each candidate's teaching will be observed by each member of the department twice during each evaluation period. Colleagues will also review student evaluations and other teaching-related materials in the file prepared by the candidate. These materials may include: outlines, syllabi, objectives, assignments, examinations, prompt books, dramaturgical files, rehearsal notes, web sites, designs, working drawings, observations of teaching performance written by colleagues from outside of the department, visiting faculties interviews, self-evaluations, reports of curricular-related instruction, scholarly papers regarding pedagogical practices and strategies, and other relevant materials. A list of all submitted material must be included in the file.

II. PROFESSIONAL AND SCHOLARLY DEVELOPMENT

Professional and scholarly development strengthens understanding of the history of the discipline and maintains a faculty member's currency with new developments in theory, methodology, artistry, and application. The Theatre Arts Department houses traditional scholars, artistic scholars, and scholars who pursue both artistic and traditional scholarship. Artistic scholarship is distinguished from traditional scholarship in that the normal form of publication is public presentation (e.g., performance including concert readings and staged readings, design, production management, etc.), rather than published creative writing or scholarly research and analysis. The department acknowledges the legitimacy of both types of scholarship, and recognizes traditional and/or artistic scholarship as essential components of an individual faculty member's contribution to departmental excellence.

Departmental faculty are expected to articulate coherent themes that organize their professional development activities. A faculty member who is just beginning a professional career may be searching for their area of specialty, honing research skills, and applying their increasing understanding to the classroom. A faculty member with greater professional experience,

however, should be engaged in a program of traditional and/or artistic scholarship that demonstrates increasingly sophisticated mastery of their teaching and/or research emphasis area(s).

A. Evidence of Professional and Scholarly Development

There are a variety of scholarly and artistic activities that may demonstrate expertise and currency in the discipline. Due to the variety of job descriptions in the department, standards and expectations of faculty and teaching staff vary; specific applications of standards are contained in Chapter 3 of this document. The overarching qualities in professional and scholarly development that will be applied to evaluating evidence of excellence are **scope, rigor, and reach**.

In terms of **scope**, we look to understand the scale of the work undertaken with added weight given to professional and scholarly activities that have clearly required significant and/or sustained investment. **Rigor** aims to assess the quality of the work with added weight given to peer reviewed activities and work that has garnered significant acclaim. **Reach** acknowledges the goal of professional and scholarly work connecting with and contributing to the field beyond the department and university. More details about how scope, rigor, and reach are assessed are included in Section B of this chapter.

The breadth of areas encompassed within the department requires that evidence of professional and scholarly development come from sources outside the department and university, as well as from internal review. The evaluation committee for each file shall ultimately determine what constitutes scope, reach, and rigor. There cannot be a universal hierarchy given the relationship of scope, rigor, and reach in any single file because of the many forms in which the artists and scholars of the Department of Theatre Arts carry out professional and scholarly development. Rather, evaluators will look for a balance of scope, rigor, and reach of the accomplishments presented in each file. For instance, some evaluatees may have several projects that have a very wide reach and scope balanced with a few marked by the rigor of traditional peer review. Other evaluatees may have one major project of the highest level of scope (spanning years and venues) and rigor balanced by a few smaller projects with wide reach.

Evidence of scope, rigor, and reach may include: book or performance reviews in scholarly and popular publications in both print and online formats; discussion by peer level reviewers (directors, scholars, designers, performers) in outside letters submitted with the file; direct observations of the candidate's artistic work and reading of scholarly work by the review committee; reporting and publicity in local, national, or international outlets about artistic events or scholarly symposia and talks.

1. Original Scholarship

The department affirms that the production of traditional and/or artistic scholarship is the primary evidence of professional development.

Premiums will be placed on work that has been favorably endorsed by professionals within the discipline. For example, the following activities provide evidence of external recognition of a faculty member's professional contributions to their field: publication, including monographs, book chapters, textbooks, handbooks, journal articles, scholarly reviews, playscripts, screenplays, contributions to anthologies, and journal or book

editing; refereed convention papers; and professional participation in non-academic theatre and/or para-theatrical production as a designer, director, dramaturg, writer, actor, producer, production manager, or technical director.

2. Participation at Professional Meetings

The department believes that professional development relies upon continuous contact with colleagues in the discipline. Attendance at professional meetings is expected of all faculty members to ensure disciplinary currency. The expectation is, on average, one meeting per year, in person when possible, virtually if that serves conservation or safety goals. Attendance should result in a report to the department or university, or application of materials gained from those meetings to teaching and research, or both. Participation may include:

a. Invited papers: These are special opportunities for faculty to share particular insights with colleagues.

b. Presentation of papers, or other forms of participation in conference sessions as appropriate to the discipline such as play readings, which explore scholarly topics at regional or national conferences.

Workshop and seminar sponsorship: At these extended sessions faculty are engaged in teaching new techniques or content areas to peers

c. Workshop and seminar participation and application: In such sessions, faculty members learn new materials that may lead to curriculum modifications or alterations in pedagogical practices.

3. Other evidence of significant professional and scholarly development may include:

a. Significant contributions to professionally adjudicated on-campus productions (as, for example, director, designer, dramaturg, or playwright).

b. Direction of team or individual student research projects, when there is evidence of new scholarship on the part of the faculty member.

c. Consulting activities, when there is evidence of new scholarship on the part of the faculty member.

d. Service to professional organizations, especially in areas of conference planning, organizational leadership, awards evaluation, editorial leadership of publications, or roles on executive committees.

B. Assessment of Professional and Scholarly Development

The department views peer review as the most reliable vehicle for assessing the scope, rigor, and reach of a candidate's professional and scholarly development. In this department, peer review of professional and scholarly work takes both the form of faculty colleague's assessment of each other's work, outside peer review processes evaluating scholarship for publication, and the work of outside reviewers responding to artistic production.

A variety of materials may be useful for evaluating professional and scholarly development and should be included by the candidate in their file. These materials may include monographs; essays; other publications, including reviews of scholarly books or of theatrical productions; certificates of program participation; project prospectuses; production notebooks; design drawings and/or models; dramaturgical files; technical drawings; web sites; video tapes; portfolios; professional adjudications of on-campus productions; published reviews of the candidate's work; syllabi; lesson plans; correspondence; and consultation contracts. While there often may be greater rigor and scope to certain types of accomplishments (monographs; productions at large scale repertory theatres), the relationships between rigor, scope, and reach in the field of Theatre Arts is not necessarily hierarchical or uniform. The reach and rigor of many types of small-scale, chapter-length, collaboratively-authored, editorial, or festival-based modes of production or publication may have an even bigger impact on our field, our subfields, or our local and national communities than a monograph or production in an Equity house. Therefore, the Department of Theatre Arts will not rank forms and valid venues of professional work in advance of evaluating each individual file.

Given the status of Puget Sound as a teaching institution that offers little flexibility to the working artists on faculty (directors, designers, playwrights) to carry out productions off campus during the academic year and that offers less research leave than other types of institution, the Department of Theatre Arts affirms that achieving excellence in professional and scholarly development for tenure and/or promotion in rank does not require the publication of a monograph for traditional scholars nor does it require professional production in regional or national repertory theatres for artistic scholars (designers, directors, and playwrights). The Department also affirms, however, that achieving excellence that merits tenure and/or promotion in rank does require a composite set of achievements that demonstrate sustained engagement with the field that reaches beyond campus.

III. STUDENT ADVISING

--

The Theatre Arts Department affirms that faculty have an important role to play in advising students about academic and career choices. In the Theatre Arts Department, advising takes place both through formal assignments and through informal contact with students in curricular or co-curricular environments.

We find the following to be useful guidelines for evaluation of advising:

A. Evidence of Effective Student Advising

Effectiveness in student advising may be demonstrated by exhibiting an understanding of academic processes, an understanding of career options, maintenance of adequate advising records, and availability for student consultation.

1. Understanding of Academic Processes

Faculty and teaching staff should possess a thorough knowledge of university and department programs, goals, and philosophies. This knowledge should result in consistent student progress through university and department graduation requirements. Also, because theatre majors pursue a wide range of post-graduate career paths within and without theatre, advisees' schedules should reflect diversity of interest within the field, adequate specialization, and flexibility for various career paths. Advisors should facilitate intelligent, responsible student decisions.

2. Understanding of Student Services Program

Faculty and teaching staff should demonstrate knowledge of career counseling, skill development, graduate school, and academic advising programs available on campus. This knowledge should reflect an understanding that not all faculty are competent to counsel in all areas and should result in appropriate referral within or outside of the department., as evidenced by the faculty narrative about how they guide their advisees.

3. Maintenance of Records

The department requires advisors to maintain appropriate confidentiality on behalf of advisees, respond in a timely way to student alerts and advising notes, and provide documentation for petitions and other issues as required by the Registrar and the Academic Standards Committee.

4. Consultation

All faculty and teaching staff are expected to be available for student conferences at reasonable times.

B. Assessment of Effective Student Advising

The department views observation by department colleagues as the most reliable indicator of advising effectiveness. To assist in peer review, faculty members should provide materials and relevant information, including number of advisees and availability for student conferences. Faculty members may also include unsolicited student correspondence regarding helpfulness and guidance.

IV. UNIVERSITY AND DEPARTMENTAL SERVICE

The Theatre Arts Department recognizes that the program is strengthened by the degree of ownership felt by the people who participate in it. The department, thus, encourages participation by faculty and teaching staff in service activities that enhance their professional performances.

A. Evidence of Service

Excellence of university service shall be exhibited by consistent contributions to the department and the university. Many types of activities may serve as indicators of excellence in service to the university: successful handling of departmental assignments (regular and *ad hoc*); participation in and contribution to the development of department programs, curriculum, policies, etc.; service on university committees and/or Faculty Senate; participation in university programs (organizing guest lectures, presenting to university groups, advising campus organizations, participating in Admission programs, etc.). Attendance at university faculty meetings will not constitute evidence of service.

B. Assessment of Department and University Service

The department considers review by department or university colleagues to be the most reliable source of evidence of university and department service. Faculty and teaching staff should document their performance in department and university service. Participation and contributions to governance may be verified by letters or reports from appropriate colleagues.

V. COMMUNITY SERVICE

The department recognizes that relevant community service is related to professional qualifications and expertise. When such service enhances a person's overall skills and abilities, and when it reflects positively upon the university and/or department, the department recommends consideration of community service in the evaluation process. Community service is not, however, weighed heavily in evaluation.

A. Evidence of Community Service

Community service should reflect the insight offered by the discipline's theoretical and critical methods. Many activities indicate participation in community service, including but not limited to: participating in conference organization, organizing a conference session, serving as judge or critic for a performance or contest in the community, and serving in a capacity in which knowledge or skill is clearly associated with the academic discipline. Paid consulting (other than honoraria) shall not be considered evidence of community service.

B. Assessment of Community Service

The department views review by department and university colleagues as the most reliable vehicle for evaluation of community service. The faculty member should make the case for adequate community service by providing appropriate materials, such as letters from community representatives, records demonstrating contributions to community activities, and evidence of the outcomes of service activities.

CHAPTER 3: APPLICATION OF EVALUATION STANDARDS

Several categories of faculty are employed in the Theatre Arts Department. While all faculty are expected to demonstrate excellence in teaching, application of other criteria vary depending upon the nature of individual positions. The categories and specific criteria follow:

I. DEFINITIONS

A. Tenure-Line Faculty

The department affirms the definition of tenure-line faculty stated in Chapter I, Part B, Section 1 of the Faculty Code. In addition, within the category of Tenure-Line Faculty, Theatre Arts houses two special cases, outlined below.

1. Teacher/Artist Faculty

Teacher/Artists are tenure-line faculty members who have performance, playwriting, design, and/or production management responsibilities for one or more theatre productions per year. The department believes that theatre production is a fundamentally important educational experience for those majoring or minoring in theatre or who are participating in theatre production as a co-curricular activity. Consequently, one or more teaching units are regularly assigned for production responsibilities. The production assignment should be evaluated in all reviews since it is an important component of the teacher/artist's responsibilities.

2. Teacher/Administrator Faculty: Director of Theatre Production

The Director of Theatre Production is a tenure-line teacher/artist faculty member charged with ensuring a safe environment in which creative activities can be fostered. Other responsibilities include the design and production management of the theatre season, administration of theatre budgets, supervision of theatre staff and work-study students, and management of the facility and the equipment. In addition, this faculty member teaches three courses during the academic year. In all reviews, the administrative and production assignments should be evaluated since these are important components of the Director of Theatre Production's responsibilities.

B. Non-Tenure-Line Faculty

The department may employ visiting faculty, instructors, and adjunct faculty, normally to teach lower division courses, and/or as sabbatical replacements, and/or to teach Master Classes or Special Skills portions of regularly scheduled classes (such as the Stage Combat section of THTR 310). The department affirms the categorization of non-tenure-line faculty as outlined in the Faculty Code, Chapter I, Part B, Section 2.

II. STANDARDS

A. Tenure-Line Faculty (General)

As outlined by the Faculty Code, Chapter 3, all tenure-line faculty are subject to on-going evaluation within the department and periodic evaluation by the university. The department expects tenure-line faculty to demonstrate excellence in all of the areas of evaluation specified in Chapter 2 of this document. In evaluating faculty for tenure and/or promotion, the department will use the criteria specified in the Faculty Code (Chapter III, section 3d for tenure and Chapter III section 3e for promotion). Additional clarification regarding evaluation of teacher/artist faculty and the Director of Theatre Production follows.

1. Teacher/Artist Faculty

The teacher/artist is distinct from their colleagues by the nature of some teaching assignments, as well as by the nature of expectations for professional development within the discipline of theatre. In all other respects- teaching effectiveness, professional development, advising, university and community service- the teacher/artist should satisfy each evaluation criterion delineated in the Faculty Code at the same level of quality expected of their colleagues.

a. Teaching in the Rehearsal Process

Since the rehearsal process is the arena in which some of the most intensive teaching in the discipline takes place, the teacher/artist is evaluated for work as a teacher in the rehearsal process. Theatre production combines research, theory, experimentation, art, and practice in a mode analogous to the scientific laboratory. Faculty participation with students is intellectual and experiential, and both individual and collective. Training in production techniques (artistic, technical, and organizational) and communication of pre-production research and dramaturgy are among the important teaching elements in the rehearsal process.

Evaluation of teaching effectiveness in the rehearsal setting should be accomplished through the same process as that used in the evaluation of classroom teaching. Students completing evaluations of the director should include all of the actors, as well as those students who hold major production responsibilities that involve attending a large number of rehearsals, such as the stage manager, dramaturg, assistant director, and assistant stage manager(s).

While aesthetic judgments of on-campus theatre productions are relevant to assessments of professional development, such responses to the final product are not accurate indicators of teaching effectiveness in the production process. Thus, colleague review of the teaching effectiveness of directors and/or production managers should be made on the basis of observation by colleagues who visit rehearsals and/or production meetings, as appropriate to the candidate being evaluated.

b. Professional Development in On-Campus Productions

The department recognizes that preparation for, and presentation of, on-campus public performances allow the teacher/artist an important outlet for demonstrating artistic achievement and professional development. Teacher/Artist faculty manifest professional growth through artistic achievement when they, among other things, test the boundaries of language, form, and style in the unique circumstances of a production; demonstrate collaboration with the production team and exercise leadership within the collaborative process; exhibit clarity of expression; demonstrate a command of artistic technique; display the results of pre-production scholarly research on the play, playwright, and/or period in which the play was composed and/or previously produced; facilitate the performance of the actors involved in the production; and manifest a significant artistic vision.

Teacher/Artist faculty members have the responsibility to articulate the way(s) in which they believe their on-campus productions exhibit artistic achievement.

The department affirms that public performance is the locus of artistic achievement and that evaluation of on-campus production is essential to assessing the professional development of teacher/artist faculty. Thus, it is imperative that on-campus artistic scholarship be adjudicated by at least one outside expert. The Chair and Director of Theatre Production will maintain a list of appropriate potential evaluators. Either the Chair or the Director of Theatre Production will contact and contract with an evaluator to provide a written assessment of a particular production. A copy of the letter sent to adjudicators appears in the Appendix. (For the sake of consistency, we send this same letter to all evaluators.) The evaluator will submit their report to the Chair or to the Director of Theatre Production, who will then provide the teacher/artist with a copy to include in their evaluation file. The letter from the adjudicator will stand as submitted; the Chair or Director of Theatre Production will not ask for additions or revisions. If, however, in the opinion of the Chair or Director of Theatre Production, an adjudicator does not respond to the department's guidelines, they will not be asked to review future productions. In addition, when appropriate, portfolios and other artifacts may be sent to outside experts for evaluation. In so far as possible, outside evaluators should be without professional or personal connection with the teacher/artist being evaluated.

Those faculty who intend to evaluate the professional development of a teacher/artist colleague as demonstrated through on-campus productions must attend at least one live performance directed and/or designed by the faculty member. They may also, in consultation with the teacher/artist faculty member, make the additional effort to attend rehearsals and/or otherwise engage the creative process.

While the public performance is the locus of artistic achievement and evaluation, it cannot serve as the sole object/event through which the on-campus professional development of teacher/artist faculty can be assessed. Teacher/Artist faculty have the responsibility to document the aesthetic and intellectual processes that

--

culminate in the performance and/or design. This documentation may include director's or designer's research and/or process notes and/or journal, prompt books, a record of production meetings, dramaturgical files, working drawings, slides, or videos of rehearsals. Such documentation should be made available as part of the evaluation process. Drawing upon this documentation, teacher/artist faculty must construct a narrative that provides a framework for understanding the live performance and/or design. This narrative is especially vital to the evaluation process, since, unlike a publication, the final product of the artistic scholarship is no longer available for assessment, as it no longer exists in time and space. This narrative will be part of the evaluation file and should summarize the aesthetic and intellectual journey that leads to the live performance.

c. Other Professional Development

As noted in Chapter 2, Section II of this document, the department houses traditional scholars, artistic scholars, and those who pursue both traditional and artistic scholarship. The department acknowledges on-campus artistic achievement as an important element of the teacher/artist's professional development. Other artistic scholarship and/or traditional scholarship (as appropriate to the individual faculty member's professional development), however, must be in evidence.

(1) Professional Development in Artistic Scholarship

The department encourages teacher/artist faculty to engage in artistic scholarship beyond the university setting. Preparation for, and presentation of, off-campus theatrical and para-theatrical production allow the teacher/artist an important outlet for demonstrating artistic achievement and professional development. In addition, the department recognizes the important contribution of working with one's peers to the professional development of the theatre artist. The department acknowledges, however, that the production schedules of most professional theatres limit the opportunities for academic theatre artists to work outside of the academy, particularly during the regular academic year.

When the teacher/artist faculty member engages in artistic scholarship, their professional development will be evaluated as outlined in Chapter 2, Section II of this document. The teacher/artist who works in off-campus theatrical and/or para-theatrical production must provide evidence that such work manifests growth in artistic achievement as explained in Chapter 3, Section II, Item A.1 above. The teacher/artist may also document professional artistic development by demonstrating professional participation in non-academic artistic productions, invitations to teach master classes or lead intensive workshops, and professional recognition such as competitive union memberships, honors, and invited presentations and performances.

(2) Professional Development in Traditional Scholarship

When the teacher/artist faculty member engages in traditional scholarship, their professional development will be evaluated as outlined in Chapter 2, Section II of this document.

2. Director of Theatre Production

The Director of Theatre Production is a teacher/artist who designs for performance, provides production management, teaches in the department, manages the facilities, and administers the theatre production and facilities budgets. The department acknowledges that the unique character of this position requires adjustment in the nature of some evaluation standards. This position must be evaluated primarily upon the faculty member's artistic scholarship (creative activities including design and production management), and the candidate's teaching. Administrative capability will also be considered. In all respects-teaching effectiveness, professional development, advising, university and community service-the Director of Theatre Production should satisfy each evaluation criterion delineated in the Faculty Code at the same level of quality expected of their colleagues.

a. Teaching

The primary teaching role of the Director of Theatre Production in the department is to teach technical theater, design, and production-related courses. In addition, as this teacher/artist faculty member practices their art (both design and production management), they teach through example and demonstration.

Evaluation of both formal and informal teaching is, thus, an important factor in considering this faculty member for promotion and tenure. The Director is also expected to be familiar with the departmental program as a whole in order to understand the scope and progression of content encompassed in the courses taught. Quality of teaching by the Director of Theatre Production should be comparable to that expected of other tenure-line faculty as outlined in Chapter II, Section I of this document.

b. Professional Development

In the performing arts, artistic scholarship is usually disseminated through public performances, concerts, exhibitions, and readings. Due to the unique nature of the position of Director of Theatre Production, the creative activities that demonstrate professional development can encompass a broad spectrum of possibilities. These creative activities include design, management, and theatre technology. The process of preparing a production for public performance requires substantial traditional scholarly research methodologies combined with the creative practices inherent in the creation of any original artwork. Unlike some arts, the theatre production is not the product of a single artist, but rather the result of a collaboration of artists working together. In this collaborative medium, directors,

designers, and technicians share responsibility for developing an interpretation, production concept, and visual style for a given production. The department recognizes that participation in theatrical production is a normal mode of professional endeavor for theatrical designers and technicians and considers this work to be artistic scholarship.

Professional development for the Director of Theatre Production should be assessed on the basis discussed for other teacher/artists in this chapter under Section II, Item A. Faculty may base evaluations partially upon the portfolio prepared by the candidate. Faculty reviewing professional development in on-campus production, however, must also take the opportunity to view the candidate's work in performance in order to understand the context in which and for which the work was created.

c. Administrative Responsibilities

As the Director of Theatre Production is partially an administrative position, effective budget and facilities management, as well as ability to formulate goals and set priorities, will be considered in promotion and tenure evaluations. Evidence of successful administration may include reports prepared by the candidate and letters from appropriate colleagues.

B. Non-Tenure-Line Faculty

Quality of teaching by non-tenure-line faculty should be comparable to that provided by tenure-line faculty; consequently, non-tenure-line faculty are subject to all of the standards regarding teaching effectiveness outlined in Chapter 2 of this document. Visiting faculty are evaluated each semester by the Department Chair. Although the role of non-tenure-line faculty in the department is usually as teachers of introductory courses or as sabbatical replacements, these faculty are expected to be familiar with the departmental program as a whole in order to understand the scope and progression of content encompassed in the course(s) they teach. In the case of courses that also meet University Core requirements, non-tenure-line faculty are expected to be familiar with the guidelines of the core rubric served by the course. In the case of multi-section courses, the Department Chair or designee will work with non-tenure-line faculty to ensure consistency in scope and workload across sections.

CHAPTER 4: EVALUATION PROCESSES AND PROCEDURES

I. PROCESSES FOR EVALUATION

A. Tenure-line Faculty

Departmental evaluation of tenure-line faculty will follow the Faculty Code. Please see Chapter 3 for university-wide specifics.

1. Obtaining Evidence of Teaching Effectiveness

Student evaluations, using standard university evaluation forms, will be administered as mandated in the Faculty Code. Faculty being considered for tenure must have formal course evaluations from the most recent four semesters of teaching.

2. Evaluation Procedure

For university evaluations specified in the Faculty Code, Chapter 3, the department will use the following procedure:

- a. The individual being evaluated will prepare a file, as described in the annual memo to faculty from the Professional Standards Committee. This file is due to the Department Chair (or an evaluation coordinator chosen to conduct the Chair's evaluation) one month prior to the evaluation due date published by the Professional Standards Committee.
- b. The file will be available electronically for a minimum of two weeks, during which time all tenure-line department faculty in residence will review the file and draft evaluation letters.
- c. Tenure-line department faculty will submit letters to the files Head Officer one week prior to the published PSC deadline.
- d. The tenure-line department faculty (exclusive of the member under review) will then meet to discuss the case.

The Department Chair (or head officer in the case of a Chair's evaluation) will then write a summary of the department's deliberation and recommendations which will be signed by all who participated in the summary. They will include in that summary lists of the names of those persons who participated in departmental deliberations and the names of those persons who submitted letters to the department. This summary, the department letters, and the individual's evaluation file will then be forwarded to the Faculty Advancement Committee. A summary of the deliberation will be made available to the person being evaluated, as will, in the event of a closed file, a summary of departmental and outside letters.

B. Non-Tenure-Line Faculty

Non-tenure-line faculty who teach their own classes will be evaluated each semester by the Department Chair. The Chair will review student evaluations, course syllabi, and assignments. The Chair will then provide feedback to each non-tenure-line faculty member, assessing his or her performance.

Those non-tenure-line faculty teaching master classes or special skills sections of regularly scheduled classes will not be subject to formal evaluation. Any decision to rehire, however, will be based on informal assessment of demonstrated teaching effectiveness.

II. GRIEVANCE PROCESS

Should a faculty member have a grievance regarding departmental evaluation or reappointment, the faculty member shall follow procedures specified in the Faculty Code.

(2021) Document prepared by
Sara Freeman
Jess K Smith
Kurt Walls
Wind Dell Woods.

Appendix: Copy of Letter to Adjudicators for Directing and Design

The department affirms that public performance is the locus of artistic achievement and that evaluation of on-campus production is essential to assessing the professional development of teacher/artist faculty.

Thus, it is imperative that on-campus artistic scholarship be adjudicated by at least one outside expert.

from the Statement of Departmental Standards and Processes for Evaluation, Theatre Arts, Univ. of Puget Sound

Dear (Insert Name of Adjudicator):

Thank you for agreeing to adjudicate the work of a University of Puget Sound faculty member in theatre.

Please find below a statement from the Professional Standards document for our department so that you may more fully understand what we use as criteria for evaluating a director or designer's work. Individuals reviewing design work will also find there questions from the USITT Promotion and Tenure Guidelines for designers.

The form of your response should be a three to five page letter that honestly evaluates the production. This letter must be sent to the chair of the department, (fill in name), within one week of attending the production.

Please note the date and time of the performance you attended. When writing your review you should keep the following principles in mind as they relate to either the production's directing or its design.

1. Our plays are cast utilizing University of Puget Sound students exclusively. (We may, on very rare occasions, use a guest artist to fill an unusual role.) We are a Theatre Department within a small liberal arts university; we eschew the pre-professional training approach to theatre. Students are almost always undergraduates, generally ranging in age from 17 to 22.
2. We strive to present a wide variety of theatrical forms; within a four-year cycle a director may present a musical, an American drama, a period comedy, or an absurdist classic.
3. We take the outside adjudication very seriously. We have had adjudicators attend the production but then fail to send in a letter. This seriously affects the faculty member under review, so we ask that you faithfully follow our procedures.

-
4. At some point in your letter, please address specifically professional growth and artistic achievement as described in excerpt below from our department standards for faculty evaluation: "Professional Development in On-Campus Productions."

Thank you for undertaking this vital task. Sincerely,

Insert Name of Chair or Designee
Department of Theatre Arts University
of Puget Sound
1500 N. Warner: CMB 1084
Tacoma, WA 98416
Email address; phone number

"Professional Development in On-Campus Productions"
Excerpted from the Professional Standards Document, Theatre Arts, Univ. of Puget Sound

The department recognizes that preparation for, and presentation of, on-campus public performances allow the teacher/artist an important outlet for demonstrating artistic achievement and professional development. Teacher/Artist faculty manifest professional growth through artistic achievement when they, among other things, test the boundaries of language, form, and style in the unique circumstances of a production; demonstrate collaboration with the production team and exercise leadership within the collaborative process; exhibit clarity of expression; demonstrate a command of artistic technique; display the results of pre-production scholarly research on the play, playwright, and/or period in which the play was composed and/or previously produced; facilitate the performance of the actors involved in the production; and manifest a significant artistic vision. Teacher/Artist faculty members have the responsibility to articulate the way(s) in which they believe their on-campus productions exhibit artistic achievement.

The department affirms that public performance is the locus of artistic achievement and that evaluation of on-campus production is essential to assessing the professional development of teacher/artist faculty. Thus, it is imperative that on-campus artistic scholarship be adjudicated by at least one outside expert. The Director of Theatre Production will maintain a list of appropriate potential evaluators. Either the Chair or the Director of Theatre Production will contact and contract with an evaluator to provide a written assessment of a particular production. The evaluator will submit their report to the Chair or to the Director of Theatre Production, who will then provide the teacher/artist with a copy to include in their evaluation file. In addition, when appropriate, portfolios and other artifacts may be sent to outside experts for evaluation. In so far as possible, outside evaluators should be without professional or personal connection with the teacher/artist being evaluated.

--

Those faculty who intend to evaluate the professional development of a teacher/artist colleague as demonstrated through on-campus productions must attend at least one live performance directed and/or designed by the faculty member. They may also, in consultation with the teacher/artist faculty member, make the additional effort to attend rehearsals and/or otherwise engage the creative process.

While the public performance is the locus of artistic achievement and evaluation, it cannot serve as the sole object/event through which the on-campus professional development of teacher/artist faculty can be assessed. Teacher/Artist faculty have the responsibility to document the aesthetic and intellectual processes that culminate in the performance and/or design. This documentation may include director's or designer's research and/or process notes and/or journal, prompt books, a record of production meetings, dramaturgical files, working drawings, slides, or videos of rehearsals. Such documentation should be made available as part of the evaluation process. Drawing upon this documentation, teacher/artist faculty must construct a narrative that provides a framework for understanding the live performance and/or design. This narrative is especially vital to the evaluation process, since, unlike a publication, the final product of the artistic scholarship is no longer available for assessment, as it no longer exists in time and space. This narrative will be part of the evaluation file and should summarize the aesthetic and intellectual journey that leads to the live performance.

Additional Questions for Potential Consideration by Individuals Evaluating Design (From the United States Institute for Theatre Technology (USITT) *Tenure and Promotion Guidelines*)

1. Does the work illustrate the production concept?
2. Does the work satisfactorily solve the problems presented by the script, concept or the design?
3. Is the work appropriate to the budget and personnel limitations of the producing organization?
4. Does the work satisfactorily support and enhance the work of the rest of the production team, including the director/choreographer and designers?
5. Is the work appropriate to the theatre, the stage, and the production schedule ?
6. Does the work reflect the appropriate level of planning and management for a quality theatre production?