POLICY ON RENEWAL, PROMOTION, AND TENURE DEPARTMENT OF THEATRE AND DANCE UNIVERSITY OF NEW MEXICO

Date: 11/20/03

PART ONE: CRITERIA

INTRODUCTION

In matters of Renewal, Promotion, and Tenure the Department of Theatre and Dance is guided first by the Faculty handbook which establishes that evaluation is based on the four principal areas:

- 1. Teaching
- 2. Scholarship, research, and other creative work
- 3. Service
- 4. Personal characteristics

And secondly by the document, Tenure and Promotion (Section 4) in the University of New Mexico Faculty Handbook that lays the groundwork for the application of the areas stated above.

The Department of Theatre and Dance recognizes and accepts its responsibility to judge itself and its members by standards which may differ in some respects from those of other departments. For judging the work of the artist/teacher/scholar we have articulated special standards determined by the centrality of creative work in the functioning of this department. In noting differences, however, we do not suggest that such standards are any less rigorous than those of other units in the College of Fine Arts or the University of New Mexico. We merely wish to emphasize the [peculiar] unique problems which faculty in the performing arts face in developing criteria against which to measure their achievement. Although these measures are difficult to enunciate, we have nevertheless tried to make them both specific and viable.

The probationary period at UNM normally consists of six academic years. During this period probationary faculty member is expected to mature professionally, so as to be in a position to be evaluated for permanent tenure at the end of the six-year period. A faculty member beginning the first year sets in motion a clock such that at the end of the third year a decision must be reached whether to continue the faculty member's appointment for a second half of the probationary period. In that event, no later than the end of the sixth year of service a tenure decision must be reached. The faculty member during their probationary period will have one major evaluation in their mid-probationary year but will also receive written annual evaluations during the other years.

The Annual Evaluation

The final tenure decision will be made on the cumulative record presented during the 6 year of service. In substantial measure, however, this record and the tenure decision will be informed by the annual evaluations made of the faculty member during the probationary period.

The annual evaluation has the following elements: The annual review is meant to help mid-probationary faculty prepare for tenure. The intent is to give each mid-probationary faculty clear feedback on their strengths and particularly any concerns about the faculty's performance as they move toward tenure.

- 1) The mid-probationary faculty member will provide an updated vita/resume. In addition the mid-probationary faculty is invited to also prepare a brief self-analysis, addressing the areas of teaching, scholarship/creative work, service and personal characteristics including the areas/issues that s/he has been focusing on during the current academic year.
- 2) The updated resume, and voluntary additional letter and summaries of the ICES reports will be made available for review by the <u>full time tenured</u> faculty.
- 3) The full time tenured faculty will fill out and submit to the chair, an evaluation form on each mid-probationary faculty which will comment on strengths and concerns in relation to the work of each mid-probationary faculty.
- 4) The Chair will meet with the Department's Personnel Committee, summarize the confidential evaluations and discuss the evaluation of each midprobationary faculty.
- 5) The Chair will write the annual letter of evaluation for each mid-probationary faculty based on the information in the faculty evaluations and the discussion in the Personnel Committee. After receiving their written copy each mid-probationary faculty will meet with the Chair to discuss the letter.

Timetable for The Department of Theatre and Dance for Mid-Probationary Status:

Previous Spring Semester.

At the end of the spring semester before the fall's evaluation period, the Chair offers the candidate the dossier shell.

Fall Semester:

1st Week - dossier is partially ready.

4th Week (Sept. 15th) - deadline for candidate to inform Chair of intention for promotion

10th Week (Oct. 31st) - Candidate turns in dossier (dossier is closed).

14th Week (November 26th) - Teaching evaluations are due.

Outside Evaluation letters are due, both alumni and scholars/artists.

Spring Semester:

3rd Week (February 2nd) - Peer Evaluations are due. 4th Week (February 13th) - Meet with Personnel committee.

5th Week (February 21st) - Chair recommendation due

9th Week (March 21st) - Chair sends the dossier to the Dean

SPECIFIC PROVISIONS FOR MID-PROBATIONARY REVIEW

1) Purpose and Standards

The purpose of the mid-probationary review is to enable the department to evaluate progress towards tenure, to inform the probationary faculty member of his or her strengths and weaknesses, and to decide whether or not to continue the faculty member's appointment. The review entails evaluation of the faculty member's achievements in the four categories of teaching, scholarly work, service, and personal characteristics, according to the standards specified in this Policy and the criteria of the academic unit.

2) The mid-probationary review requires identification of the specific areas of strength and weakness demonstrated by the faculty member and the evidence supporting conclusions to that effect. The aim of the required identification of areas of strength and weakness is to give the faculty member a clear picture of the performance levels by which he or she is to be judged and offer the opportunity to correct any noted deficiencies prior to subsequent reviews. The existence of some identified deficiencies in this review are considered normal, as it is not anticipated that the probationary member will have fully attained the standards required for the award of tenure by the time of the mid-probationary review.

For a positive mid-probationary review there should be demonstration of, or at least clear progress toward, the competence or effectiveness in all four evaluation categories expected of tenured faculty, as well as promise of excellence in either teaching or scholarly work. If the University concludes that insufficient progress towards tenure has been made and that deficiencies are unlikely to be corrected in the time remaining before the tenure decision, then a negative mid-probationary decision is both appropriate and necessary.

Department of Theatre and Dance

The Tenure Decision Process

What follows is a description of the four contexts pertinent to personnel evaluation, both as a continuing process, and in its more intensive application when decisions concerning hiring, contract renewal, promotion, and tenure are at hand.

Also the Department recognizes that an evaluation process should take into consideration the encouragement, opportunity, and resources the department has been able to afford the candidate undergoing evaluation.

Teaching

No faculty member deficient in teaching will be hired, retained, or promoted regardless of his/her excellence in other areas. We will, of course, distinguish the kind of students with whom the candidate is most and least effective, although effectiveness as a teacher will be judged by the progress of students whom the candidate habitually teaches, and not those in special, unrepresentative categories. One of the ways we will judge effectiveness is by soliciting the opinions of past and present students.

Evaluation of faculty member's teaching

In measuring effectiveness of teaching, we will consider the following categories of student progress: general and specialized knowledge; ability to manipulate ideas; skill in expression; research techniques; effective factors such as curiosity, courage, perseverance, self-discipline, sensuous awareness, and where applicable, the psychomotor skills associated with performance. In measuring these categories, we will consider the following measures:

1. The candidate's own evaluation

- 2. Peer evaluations, [including that of the chairperson];
- 3. Student evaluations: ICES, open student meetings with the Chair and solicitation of written letters to the Chair;
- 4. Student evaluation of non-course learning experiences (in production and other creative experiences); evidence of student's commitment to field can be a factor.
- 5. Does the candidate actively explore alternative means in fulfilling his or her duties, particularly as they concern teaching?

In addition to the above elements of evaluation, the department will conduct a process for peer visitation of the candidate faculty's classes. These visitations will be conducted by the Personnel Committee members. In each case at least two faculty members, one from the candidate's area of teaching and one from outside the area, will arrange to visit classes on more than one occasion. Time will be reserved during those class periods for the evaluators to talk to the students. The visiting faculty will include in their peer review their responses to candidate's teaching utilizing the following guidelines:

Responsibilities of teacher:

Planning curriculum
Organizing the learning environment
Planning and implementing the lesson
Assessing student progress
Counseling students
Providing and following syllabus
Knowledge of subject

Personal Traits

Responsibility
Honesty
Enthusiasm
Empathy/respect
Presentation skills
Confidence

Classroom traits

Prompt
Prepared
Resourceful
Clear/coherent
Practical
Realistic
Open
In control of the class

Assessment traits:

Assess by objectives
Use valid instruments
Vary techniques
Provide timely feedback
Display understanding
Informed
Grade consistently

These peer reviews need not be limited to classroom visits, but could include analysis of video tapes or a careful evaluation of course outlines, texts, supplementary material, reading lists, classroom activities, etc.

Creative Activity/ Scholarship

Both creative activity and scholarship are important aspects of theatre and dance. Both aspects have great variety within them; and there is frequently a mixture and interdependence of creative activity and scholarship which confounds easy separation.

Scholarship in theatre and dance may include the investigation, elucidation, and communication of such important aspects of theatre and dance as theory, history, and criticism of performance, design and technical practice, dance and movement, and pedagogy. The scholarly methods employed may include field studies, behavioral research, critical analysis, historical research, and all the methods familiar to scholars in learned professions. When they work in those areas and use these methods, theatre and dance scholars should be judged using criteria common to scholarship anywhere.

Because theatre and dance are living arts, however, there may be times when scholarly activity is more practical than theoretical. Serious scholarship must, for example, be part of a designer's preparation for a production assignment, the culmination of that scholarship, whether it be a new reading of the play in question or testing of some hypothesis related to the production, is captured in the performance itself. Thus, in evaluating that performance, one judges both scholarship and artistry.

Judgment concerning creative work is far more subjective than that concerning scholarship. In this area it is expected that there will sometimes be disagreement among peers as to the artistic success or value of certain activities; the aim is to discover consensus among knowledgeable evaluators. However, objective aspects are always present in creative activity and should be considered with the same precision normally applied to scholarly work. Finally, in those cases where aesthetic judgments are

inevitable, every effort will be made to articulate the aesthetic bases at work in both the creator and critic.

The equivalency of creative and scholarly activity in terms of professional advancement has been repeatedly supported by the National Association of Schools of Theatre and of Dance. This position is affirmed by the Department of Theatre and Dance.

In judging the quantity of creative activity and scholarship we will consider:

- 1. Books, plays, film scripts, monographs, and articles published under refereed conditions; direction, choreography, production, acting, dancing, designing under professional conditions;
- 2. The above contracted for or at press;
- 3. Books, monographs, or articles submitted for publication;
- 4. Creative activity generated as part of one's employment at the university of New Mexico either on campus or elsewhere;
- 5. Presentations at professional meetings;
- 6. Other productions, roles, designs, and demonstrations of serious intent presented for the public.

In judging the quality of such scholarship or creative activity, we will consider:

- 1. Self evaluation of scholarship or creative work;
- 2. Colleague's evaluation of such work;
- 3. Reviews of published or performed work;
- 4. Solicited or unsolicited evaluations from qualified judges outside the department;
- 5. Participating students' evaluation of the work in question;
- 6. Critical response from general audiences.

In this department, creative work is integrated into the teaching mission of the faculty. The committee, and all subsequent levels of reviews shall be cautioned to bear in mind the educational context within which the creative activity originated and not to hold educational elements accountable to standards which might pertain in a purely artistic sphere.

Service

Our responsibility to serve the department, college, university and professional organizations takes many forms as it responds to the needs of different constituencies. In many cases these activities are essential to the maintenance of effective faculty governance of the department, college or university. All faculties are expected to play a role in this area. We are interested in measuring the effect of service in this area:

1. Did the work make an important difference to the group served?

- 2. Does the candidate assume day-to-day responsibilities in the department?
- 3. Does the candidate challenge the department's thinking in order to foster clearer and more creative solutions to the problems it faces?

It is the candidate's responsibility to document the amount and quality of service.

Personal Characteristics

The previous three categories all have a common aspect: each involves the candidate with the outside world represented by the student, the scholarly and creative aspects of the discipline itself, or the larger community. None, however, examines the candidate's relationship to colleagues in the department. We feel that this aspect of a faculty member's work is important enough to warrant a category of its own.

Although UNM uses the term 'Personal Characteristics,' we prefer the term "Collegiality." Collegiality is not superficial sociability. It centers on the colleague's ability to practice professional courtesy in relationship with faculty, staff and students and his or her contribution to the growth of the group. Collegiality develops synergy in the department. We intend to judge this by certain questions:

- 1. Is the candidate able to uphold commonly accepted standards pf professional courtesy and behavior as these relate to the collaborative nature of the art and practice of theatre and dance and to the conduct of the educational mission of the department?
- 2. Does the candidate stimulate his or her colleague's professional growth?
- 3. The candidate demonstrates respect for others.

FACULTY RANKS AND TITLES

INTRODUCTION

Appointment or promotion to the junior ranks of instructor or assistant professor represents a judgment by the department, college/school, and University that the individual has the required qualifications and expertise and that the individual will function to sustain the mission of the University and enrich its academic environment. In a similar manner, appointment or promotion to the senior ranks of associate professor or professor represents an implicit prediction that the individual will continue to make sound contributions to the University. Deans and departmental chairs normally look to the senior ranks for advice and counsel regarding policy matters, including appointment and promotion of other faculty.

Promotion to Assistant Professor

Individuals who are demonstrably competent in the subject matter of the courses to be taught and who have indicated a serious commitment to a faculty career may be considered for this faculty rank. This appointment is typical for most faculty who are beginning their probationary service. While it is not expected that persons appointed at this rank shall have acquired an extensive reputation in their field, it is expected that they will continue to increase their knowledge, to improve their teaching ability and to present the results of their scholarly work in ways appropriate to their field.

Promotion to Associate Professor

Promotion from Assistant to Associate typically occurs at the tenure decision since the faculty member being considered would have been at the rank of Assistant for the six years of the evaluation process. The faculty handbook indicates that a guide for service in rank from Associate to Full Professor is five years.

In addition to the guidelines concerning teaching, creative activity/scholarship, service and personal characteristics the Department will further consider the following criteria in matters of promotions in rank:

- 1. The individual has contributed to the development of the Department through:
 - a. strengthening its academic programs
 - b. contributing to the credibility of its programs on the regional and national level
 - c. an ability to provide leadership in his/her area of special interest
- 2. The individual's work has shown a continuing pattern of development through:
 - a. being instrumental in refining and developing programs in which he/she has been especially involves
 - b. written work shared with his/her peers in the profession or creative work that has culminated at some point in a significant major work (a work that has size, scope, seriousness, and completion)
 - c. a contribution to the development of the profession in national, regional organizations
- 3. The individual has contributed to an open collegial environment through:
 - a. participation in the working processes of the department as in committee work, special assignments, recruiting, advisement, etc.
 - b. respect for the collaborative process that is fundamental to the art and practice of Theatre and Dance
 - c. willingness to participate and contribute to the ferment of ideas and goals that are part of the ongoing life of a departmental faculty.

Promotion to Full Professor

Qualifications for promotion to the rank of full professor include the attainment of high standards in teaching, scholarly and creative work, and service to the University or profession. Promotion indicates that the faculty member is of comparable stature with others in his or her field at the same rank in comparable universities. Service in a given rank for any number of years is not in itself a sufficient reason for promotion to professor.

The anticipated length of service in the rank of associate professor prior to consideration for promotion to the rank of professor is at least 5 years.

Individuals who have attained high standards in teaching and who have made significant contributions to their disciplines may be considered for this faculty rank. They shall also have developed expertise and interest in the general problems of university education and their social implications, and have shown the ability to make constructive judgments and decisions. It is expected that the professor will continue to develop and mature with regard to teaching, scholarly work, and the other qualities that contributed to earlier appointments.

Appointment or promotion to Professor represents a judgment on the part of the department, college/school, and University that the individual has made significant, nationally recognized scholarly or creative contributions to his or her field and an expectation that the individual will continue to do so.

Professors are the most enduring group of faculty, and it is they who give leadership and set the tone for the entire University. Thus, appointment or promotion should be made only after careful investigation of the candidate's accomplishments in teaching, scholarly work, and leadership.

In theatre and dance, it is assumed that a full professor has achieved an international reputation in teaching, creative or scholarly work. In other words, the candidate is expected to be an expert in his or her field and is a force in the broader theatre and dance community with invitations to teach, lecture, perform, direct, write or choreograph.

PART TWO: PROCEDURES

I. INTRODUCTION

The criteria for contract renewal, promotion, and tenure will be applied by way of the following procedures. Changes in these procedures will be allowed only with the concurrence of the affected candidate and chairperson. Such departures will be clearly indicated in the department's recommendation.

II Function of the Chairperson

- A. The chairperson of the Department of theatre and Dance shall initiate the procedures for renewal, promotion, and tenure; when required by contractual conditions described in the UNM Faculty Handbook.
- B. The chairperson of the department will see that the dossier of each candidate is properly assembled, scrutinized, and transmitted to the appropriate College and University administers and committees. S/he may not prevent the passage of a dossier upwards—although s/he may recommend to the candidate that removal of a dossier from consideration might be in the candidate's best interest. The candidate has the right not to submit a dossier for consideration. However, the candidate cannot delay a tenure decision or a mid-probationary decision if the faculty contracts office stipulates that the candidate is in their mid-probationary or 6th year.
- C. The chairperson shall transmit in writing on an annual basis the progress of the individual faculty member and the expectations of the department in regard to the individual faculty member. The annual evaluation is described beginning on page 2 of this document.
- D. The chairperson is responsible for handing out peer evaluation forms; meetings with students to discuss candidate's teaching; arranging for a teaching team to evaluate candidate's teaching and sending out the necessary letters for outside evaluation of the candidate.

III. Function of the Personnel Committee

The personnel committee will recommend to the chair on all matters of tenure and promotion in relation to code faculty. In this regard the committee, in consultation with the chair, will oversee the procedures specified in this document. The committee will advise the chair in matters of annual review and contract renewal in relation to non-code faculty.

The committee will advise the chair on matters related to annual salary increases, and merit adjustments as the rise in the annual budget process.

IV. Function of the Mentor

The Chair, in consultation with the Personnel Committee, will assign one faculty member to a candidate beginning the promotion process to serve as a Mentor. The Mentor will be from the candidate's area and will be from the department's full-time faculty. The Mentor's responsibilities will be the following:

1. In the first semester the mentors will develop, with the candidate, a tenure plan that outlines the department's expectations for the candidate in the areas of teaching, research/creative activity and service.

- a) This plan will be approved by the Personnel Committee and the Chair at a Personnel Committee meeting during the fall semester.
- b) The tenure plan should be updated every fall semester as the candidate's activities evolve.
- c) The tenure plan will serve as a basis for part of the Chair's annual evaluation of the candidate.
- 2. The Mentor will become familiar with the candidate's teaching, research/creativity and service work and will help to clarify the department's expectations and give advice on the candidate's progress
- 3. The Mentor will make sure that all the necessary materials for the candidate's dossier have been included in the portfolio.

Check List for Mid-Probationary candidate:

Mentor Check List for Tenure Track Faculty

Year I

- Faculty Handbook/Pathfinder
- Department Promotion and Tenure Document
- Outline of Timeline for Tenure
- Sign up for ICES
- Uses of ICES
- University, College and Dept. Committee membership
- Community Service
- Necessity of yearly Chair Evaluations written, signed, dated by candidate
- Mentor will attend classes or recommend evaluator/s
- Heart to heart talk from senior faculty on how universities work if appropriate.
- Research / Creative Plan: National/International. What counts? How much?
- Develop tenure plan
- Planning for Dossier
- Tenure plan due to personnel committee after Spring Break

Year II

- ICES
- University, College and Dept. Committee membership
- Community Service
- Chair Evaluation written, signed, dated by candidate
- Mentor will attend classes or recommend evaluator/s
- Research / Creative; major work coming to fruition
- Discussion of Timeline for Dossier

Year III

- ICES
- University, College and Dept. Committee membership

- Community Service
- Dossier Due
- Discuss Time line for Third year review
- Personnel Committee assigns teaching evaluators
- Research / Creative; major work coming to fruition

Year IV

- Review of third year evaluation /Tenure plan next three years
- ICES
- University, College and Dept. Committee membership
- Community Service
- Chair Evaluation
- Mentor will attend classes or recommend evaluator/s
- Research / Creative work towards major achievements

Year V

- Check Tenure plan progress
- ICES
- University, College and Dept. Committee membership
- Community Service
- Chair Evaluation
- Mentor will attend classes or recommend evaluator/s
- Research /Creative work towards major achievements
- Plan for outside evaluators
- Tenure dossier

Year VI

- ICES
- University, College and Dept. Committee membership
- Community Service
- Outside Evaluators
- Dossier Due
- Time line for Tenure review
- Personnel Committee assigns teaching evaluators
- Research /Creative; major work coming to fruition

V. The Dossier

A. Function

The dossier of each candidate consists of an organized collection of all materials needed to evaluate the candidate with a description of the criteria and procedures employed and the summary decisions made at each administrative level.

B. Contents

When the dossier leaves the department, it should include at least three major parts:

- 1. A copy of the department's "Policy on Renewal, Promotion, and Tenure."
- 2. A recommendation from the chairperson of the department
- 3. Such materials as are needed to document that the decision of the chairperson has been arrived at with participation and recommendation of the department; personnel committee and convincingly demonstrate to subsequent decision levels that the department has acted in accordance with the criteria and procedures set down in the "Policy on Renewal, Promotion, and Tenure." In a case where the Personnel Committee and the chairperson disagree, the chair will also forward a recommendation from the Personnel Committee.

C. Documentation

It is not necessary to forward to subsequent decision levels all information collected. Summaries may be prepared for such complex items as questionnaire response and reviews. However, the raw data will remain with the committee until the entire process is completed.

D. Sources of Information

- 1. The candidate. It will be the candidate's responsibility to furnish the committee:
 - a. The mid-probationary faculty member will provide an updated vita/resume. In addition the mid-probationary faculty will prepare a brief self-analysis, addressing the areas of teaching, scholarship/creative work, service and personal characteristics including the areas/issues that s/he has been focusing on during the period under evaluation, syllabi, ICES Reports from several years.
 - b. Access to present classes so that questionnaires may be distributed and for peer review of teaching.
 - c. A bibliography of all scholarly publications, with photocopies or reprints of all publications since the last review.
 - d. An annotated list of the candidate's creative work.
 - e. An annotated list of those services to the candidate's profession, community, university, and department which he

or she considers of sufficient magnitude to warrant consideration.

- f. External evaluations of creative work and scholarship
- 2. The chairperson will solicit or provide:
 - a. Peer evaluations from fellow department members.
 - b. Student evaluations from:
 - 1) Alumni
 - 2) Former students
 - 3) Present students
 - 4) Advisees
 - c. Such external letters as may be warranted

IV. Schedule

- A. The Dean of the College of Fine Arts will provide the department with a date by which he/she must receive the dossier and recommendation. That is the 'Due Date'.
- B. The Candidate:
 - In cases of promotion in rank the candidate will notify the chairperson of his or her wish to be considered no later than September 15. In cases of tenure the university determines the calendar and due date for submission of materials and decisions. All materials required from the candidate should be in the hands of the chairperson one month previous to the due date.
- C. The chairperson may discuss any questions or tentative conclusions s/he may have with the candidate at any point in the proceedings.
- D. The chairperson of the department should meet with the candidate in the week following the due date to inform him/her of the chairperson's recommendation and reasons for it.

Post Tenure Review See Faculty Handbook, Section 4.9