

**BYLAWS of the Department of Theatre**  
**University of Kansas**

*Approved by the Theatre Department*  
*October 22, 2009*

**1. Membership and Voting Privileges**

**(a) Voting Membership.** The voting membership of the Department of Theatre, hereafter, “the Department”, shall consist of all faculty holding tenured or tenure-track appointments of .50 FTE or greater in the Department; two elected representative of the Department’s unclassified or university support staff; one elected representative of the Department’s graduate students; and two elected representatives of the Department’s undergraduate students.

**(b)** All those with Voting Membership shall have one vote each, with the following exceptions:

*When considering faculty appointments from the outside, or lecturer or GTA appointments to teach at the 300-level or above, only tenured and tenure-track faculty may vote. Student and staff views on faculty appointments are important and encouraged. Non-voting student and staff representatives shall serve on departmental search committees for outside faculty.*

*When considering changes to the curriculum, tenured and tenure-track faculty and student representatives may vote. Staff representatives shall not vote. When considering changes to the graduate curriculum, the undergraduate student representatives shall not vote.*

*In matters involving confidential student information (e.g. grades, financial aid, admissions), only tenured and tenure-track faculty may vote, staff may remain in the meeting, and student representatives shall be excused from the meeting.*

*In matters involving graduate admissions, graduate teaching or research assignments, or other graduate student concerns (e.g. annual evaluation), only faculty who are members of the KU Graduate Faculty in either Regular or Dissertation Status shall vote, and staff and student representatives shall be excused from the meeting. Tenured and tenure-track faculty who are not members of the Graduate Faculty may remain in the meeting and may offer input, but may not vote.*

**(c)** Emeritus Faculty, Courtesy Faculty, Visiting Faculty, Adjunct Faculty, Unclassified Staff, University Support Staff, and Graduate Teaching Assistants are welcome to attend regularly scheduled department meetings, but shall not vote.

## 2. Department Meetings

By majority vote, the Department Meeting establishes policy and expresses the will of the Department in all matters brought to it for action. Matters such as recommendations for faculty hires, curricular changes, and departmental procedures or regulations must be brought before a Department meeting. The decisions of the Department are binding on its administrators, faculty, staff, and students.

The Department shall meet at least once per calendar month during the academic year – more often as determined by the Chair or by written request of at least three voting members. Notice of meetings shall be publicized at least three days in advance.

Except as provided here, conduct of meetings shall be governed by Robert's Rules of Order. The Chair votes only to make or break a tie. An exception occurs in motions to amend the bylaws, when the Chair may vote to provide or deny the required two-thirds majority.

- (a) **Voting Eligibility of Absent Faculty.** Faculty on leave retain full voting rights. Faculty on phased retirement may vote only during semesters in which they actively serve.
- (b) **Quorum.** A quorum shall be deemed to exist when 50% or more of voting members are physically present. A quorum call may be used to determine the actual number of people present at the time a vote is to be taken; otherwise the attendance recorded in the minutes shall be binding. If there is no quorum, anyone eligible to vote may request that the vote be conducted via e-mail and the request shall be granted.
- (c) **Proxy Votes.** A majority of those present and eligible to vote must approve the acceptance of proxy votes. A prerequisite for this is that the motion under consideration must have been previously publicized and remains either unchanged or changed only by friendly amendments. The motion to allow proxy votes must be voted on prior to the vote on the motion to which it pertains. If a motion to accept proxy votes fails, then a majority vote to conduct the issue by e-mail shall prevail.
- (d) **E-mail Ballot.** When a motion is referred to an e-mail ballot, those eligible to vote are those eligible to vote on the original motion. The e-mail ballot must include the motion and brief statements pro and con, and allow a reasonable time for responses. Unreturned ballots shall be counted as abstentions.
- (e) **Secret Ballots.** Any voting member's request that a motion be decided by secret ballot rather than by voice vote shall be honored.
- (f) **Visitors at Meetings.** Non-voting visitors to meetings are sometimes necessary and helpful. Invitations to such persons shall be subject to the will of the Department.
- (g) **Minutes.** Whenever possible, a non-voting member of the Department staff shall serve as Recording Secretary and take minutes of the meeting, which shall include a report of members in attendance. Minutes (redacted, if necessary, to preserve student and/or employee privacy) shall be made publicly available. A unanimous vote is required to temporarily suspend the taking of minutes.

### 3. Officers

- (a) **Chair of the Department of Theatre.** This person is appointed by and serves at the pleasure of the Dean of the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences. Ordinarily, candidates for this office are nominated and voted upon by the Department and recommended to the Dean for a term of three to five years. Only tenured members of the Department faculty are eligible to serve as Chair.

The Chair guides day-to-day and longer-term activities of the Department of Theatre, and officiates at Department meetings (unless noted otherwise). As its chief administrative officer, the Chair is responsible for the operation of the Department within the guidelines set forth in these bylaws. The Chair represents the Department in all appropriate external forums and exercises direct supervision over the internal functions of the Department, delegating such authority where appropriate. As an appointee of the Dean of the College, the Chair is responsible for communicating College policy to the Department, and for bringing before the Department for appropriate consideration and timely action all business originating from the College or University. In accordance with College and University policy, the Chair serves as the Budget Officer for the Department, and is responsible for oversight of the use of all State and KU Endowment funds at the Department's disposal.

- (b) **Artistic Director.** This person is recommended to the Chair for appointment from among candidates evaluated by the voting membership. The Artistic Director serves at the pleasure of the Chair. The Artistic Director is responsible for the implementation of the pedagogical, artistic, and research missions of the Department in the context of theatre production. Only tenured members of the Department faculty are eligible to serve as Artistic Director.

The Artistic Director, with the assistance of appropriate department staff, is responsible for supervision of the theatre production facilities and the full range of activities undertaken by the University Theatre. These include staging of performances, fundraising and publicity for Department-sponsored public events, and interaction with other units of the College and University and the general public as a representative of the Department. In consultation with the Chair, and with the advice of the University Theatre Committee and appropriate faculty, the Artistic Director determines production assignments for Department-sponsored performances. Subject to approval by the Chair, the Artistic Director shall have broad discretionary authority in dispersal of the funds allocated, collected, or otherwise obtained for the purposes of theatrical production.

Additionally, the Artistic Director acts as a counselor to the Chair, serving as his or her representative as needed.

- (c) **Director of Graduate Studies.** This person is appointed by the Chair of the Department from among candidates nominated by the voting membership, and serves at the pleasure of the Chair. The Director of Graduate Studies is responsible for oversight of all matters related to the Department's graduate programs. Only faculty who are members of the KU Graduate Faculty in Regular or Dissertation Status are eligible to serve as Director of Graduate Studies, though untenured faculty may serve in this capacity.

Additionally, the Director of Graduate Studies acts as a counselor to the Chair, and may be asked to represent the Department both on and off-campus in matters particular to graduate education.

#### 4. Standing Committees

The provisional membership of committees shall be announced at the first meeting that takes place after their appointment. Approval by the Department, by majority vote, shall be required. The Faculty Evaluation Board shall be determined by lot and shall not be subject to vote.

Standing committee or *ad hoc* committee members, except student members of search committees, have full voting rights in that committee. The chair of a committee votes only to make or break a tie vote.

- (a) **Faculty Evaluation Board (FEB).** This consists of three tenured faculty members drawn by lot who serve two-year, staggered terms. They are expected to be thoroughly familiar with the tenure and promotion protocols of the College. The FEB is responsible for evaluating the portfolios of all tenured and tenure-track faculty members on an annual basis in February. The Chair of the Department serves as the FEB chair ex-officio. (See Faculty Evaluation Plan, Appendix I.)
- (b) **Promotion and Tenure Committee (PTC).** This consists of all tenured members of the Department. In cases involving promotion to the rank of Full Professor, voting is restricted to Full Professors. The Chair of the Department serves as the PTC chair. The PTC is responsible for evaluating candidates for third-year review, tenure, and promotion in rank. For each such candidate, the Department Chair appoints an *ad hoc* committee of faculty that gathers and evaluates relevant material, and presents a report to the PTC. In the event of a favorable decision the *ad hoc* committee assists in the preparation of materials to be submitted to the College. The *ad hoc* committee must include one tenured faculty member from a department other than Theatre within the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences.
- (c) **University Theatre Committee (UTC).** This consists of four faculty including the head of the design program, and at least two staff members including the managing director and the technical director, appointed by the Department Chair in consultation with the Artistic Director. In addition, there shall be one undergraduate student representative and one graduate student representative elected annually by their peers. The Artistic Director has the option of serving as the chair of this committee. On routine matters, UTC's actions take the form of non-binding recommendations to the Artistic Director. However, on questions involving the selection of Department-sponsored theatrical productions and other public programs conducted in Departmental theatre spaces, the recommendations of the committee are submitted to the Department for consideration and action. In matters involving confidential student information, student representatives shall be excused from the meeting.
- (d) **Direct Hire Search Committee (DHSC).** This consists of three faculty members appointed by the Department Chair, plus a non-voting graduate student representative elected annually by the graduate students in the Department. The DHSC is responsible for proposing direct hire candidates who qualify under the Equal Opportunity Office's guidelines for minority status to the Department.
- (e) **Allocations Advisory Committee (AAC).** This consists of four faculty members, including the Department Chair, the Artistic Director, and two elected members, in consultation with appropriate staff members. The Managing Director and the Accountant serve as *ex officio* members. This committee advises the Chair on the allocation of funds

and grants awarded to faculty and staff (including Kimbell grants and travel funds), guest artists and lectureships. The committee advises the Chair on issues of budget, including standard allocations, other expenditures, and rescissions. This committee meets bi-monthly.

- (f) Scholarships and Awards Committee.** This consists of three faculty members appointed by the Department Chair. This committee is responsible for evaluating and recommending to the Department students for general University scholarships and departmental awards, except for grants secured by individuals with specific administrative requirements.

**Other Committees.** Other *ad hoc* committees may be created by the Department Chair, by the Artistic Director, or by action of the Department itself, as needed. *Ad hoc* committees shall be typically of short duration and created for a well-defined, temporary task. Search committees shall include at least one voting faculty member from a department other than Theatre within the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences, and shall include at least one non-voting student representative.

## 5. Faculty Performance Evaluation

The Department's faculty performance evaluation procedures may be found in a separate document entitled "**Faculty Performance Evaluation Plan**," herewith attached as Appendix I. The "Faculty Performance Evaluation Plan," may be modified by two-thirds majority vote of the tenured and tenure-track faculty.

## 6. Program Review

- (a) Internal Review.** The undergraduate curriculum shall be reviewed by the Department every five years, or whenever requested by a two-thirds majority of the voting membership. By approval of the Department, the Chair may appoint an *ad hoc* committee for this purpose, which will then make a recommendation to the voting membership.

The graduate curriculum shall be reviewed by the Department every five years, or whenever requested by a two-thirds majority. By approval of the Department, the Director of Graduate Studies may appoint an *ad hoc* committee for this purpose, which will then make a recommendation to the voting membership.

The practices and procedures of the University Theatre, to the degree that they are independent of curricular offerings, shall be reviewed by the Department every five years, or whenever requested by a two-thirds majority. The Department may appoint an *ad hoc* committee for this purpose, which will then make a recommendation to the voting membership.

- (b) External Review.** The Department shall undergo a comprehensive external review once every ten years, or as directed by the College or University. Procedures for conducting the External Review shall be determined in consultation with the Dean of the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences or an appropriate designee thereof.

## 7. Grievance Procedures

The Department's grievance procedures may be found in a separate document entitled "**Department of Theatre Grievance Procedures**," herewith attached as Appendix II. The Grievance Procedures may be modified by two-thirds majority vote.

**8. Conflicts Between Department of Theatre Bylaws and College or University Policy**

Should these Bylaws be found in conflict with any duly-authorized College or University policy, the rules and policies of the latter shall take precedence.

**9. Ratification and Amendments**

These Bylaws shall be considered ratified when approved by a two-thirds majority vote of the tenured and tenure-track faculty and current staff and student representatives.

Once ratified, these Bylaws may be amended by a two-thirds majority vote of the voting membership of the Department. Amendments must be circulated at least two weeks before the Department meeting in which the proposed amendments are to be formally presented.

## **Department of Theatre**

### **Faculty Evaluation Plan**

**Approved by the Faculty on October 22, 2009.**

#### **Introduction**

This plan for annual faculty evaluation assesses the value and quality of faculty performance within the context of programmatic missions in the Department of Theatre and its overall relationship to the rest of the University of Kansas. To address the unique adjudication of live theatre productions, the Department also draws on the recommended practices and procedures of the Association for Theatre in Higher Education (“Guidelines for Evaluating Teacher/Artists for Promotion and Tenure”) and other professional associations such as the Association of Theatre Movement Educators (“Suggested Models and Guidelines for Evaluating Teaching and Creative Activity for Promotion and Tenure”), the United States Institute for Theatre Technology (“Tenure and Promotion Guidelines”), and the Voice and Speech Trainers Association (“Recommended Models for Evaluating Teaching, Creative/Research, and Service Activities”).

The faculty recognizes the abuses to which this document may be subject. Therefore, we frame its contents within the principle of maximum advantage: The plan for faculty evaluation should be used in a way that produces the most benefits for the constituencies whom it addresses and serves, including primarily faculty and students. The evaluation process is designed to yield multiple outcomes including data for merit salary decisions, progress toward promotion and/or tenure, differential allocation of effort, strategies for renewal or faculty development, criteria for disciplinary action or dismissal, and information for departmental planning. These criteria and procedures for faculty evaluation fall within the Department’s commitment to the principles of academic freedom for faculty and students, and within those principles, to the system of tenure. The Department is also committed to the University of Kansas’ Faculty Code of Rights, Responsibilities, and Conduct adopted by the Faculty Senate in 1971 and revised by the Faculty Council and approved by the Chancellor in 1981, 1992, and 1994 (<http://www.provost.ku.edu/policy/faculty/handbook/c2.shtml#2e>). However, although tenure protects faculty from discriminatory, unfair, arbitrary, or capricious dismissal, it is not designed to shield faculty from the consequences of nonperformance or inadequate performance. Accordingly, the process of regular, rigorous faculty review is part of the Department’s responsibility, and also expresses the Department’s commitment to provide support for its faculty as appropriate.

## 1. Departmental Expectations

Specialists in theatre often engage in scholarly work that is essential to their development as scholars, artists, and teachers. The nature of scholarship encompasses not only traditional academic research and publication, but also the creation of artistic works or performances and any other products or activities accepted by the academic discipline as reflecting scholarly effort and achievement for purposes of promotion and tenure. While the nature of scholarship varies among disciplines, the University adheres to a consistently high standard of quality in its scholarly activities to which all faculty members, regardless of discipline, are held. From Article VI of the Faculty Senate Rules and Regulations as approved by Faculty Senate, May 3, 2007. Creative efforts are considered roughly equivalent to the more traditional path of scholarly publication. Specialties include, but are not limited to, the following: actors, directors, dramaturgs, scenographers; specialists in movement, choreography, stage combat, voice, speech, dialects, and texts; and, research scholars in theatre and performance studies. While it is recognized that theatre faculty will sometimes choose to straddle the lines between specialties (e.g., directors will write books, designers will direct, etc.), and that this can be a good thing, the job description under which they were hired, as well as their need for outstanding achievement, mandates each faculty member to pursue a specialty. It will be achievement in this specialty that is the most important, though not the sole, criterion for promotion, tenure, and retention.

Without attempting the difficult task of establishing equivalencies between articles, books, designs, directing projects, coaching, etc., we acknowledge that achievement outside one's areas of specialty will contribute, in possibly substantial ways, to a faculty member's overall stature. At the same time, we reaffirm that a faculty member's reputation may be built on activities entirely within his or her specialty. Faculty who are on probationary appointment leading to consideration for tenure and/or promotion must satisfy the tenure and promotion requirements of the Department (Appendix A). Post-tenure faculty must continue to satisfy the Department's expectations for adequate performance in the areas of teaching, research, and service (Appendix A). Sustained or chronic failure of a post-tenure faculty member to carry out his or her academic responsibilities for three academic years, despite the opportunities for university faculty development and other appropriate interventions, is grounds for dismissal from the University of Kansas in accordance with the procedures adopted in the Faculty Code of Rights, Responsibilities, and Conduct.

### A. Teaching and Advising (40%)

#### 1. Teaching

Faculty are expected to teach four regularly scheduled courses per academic year. Teaching assignments should reflect this normative commitment, as mandated by the College and the University at large. Faculty are strongly advised to rotate the teaching of freshman and sophomore and/or introductory courses at least once every two years.



Teaching in the Department also occurs outside courses in the context of theatre productions – an essential part of the relationship between the Department and University Theatre. Both course and production assignments are made with particular regard for student need, programmatic resources, faculty qualifications, and faculty preference.

In a Research 1 university, a teacher in good standing knows his or her field thoroughly and strives continually to be a leader in that field throughout his or her career. To share knowledge in a way consistent with the mission of a major research university, a teacher must be more than an effective presenter of information, ideas, and/or practices discovered or constituted by others. In addition, a good teacher must know how to analyze and critique the evidence and/or methods that form the basis for the knowledge he/she is responsible for sharing. This is accomplished chiefly by participating in the creation of that knowledge, whether in the form of scholarship or artistic works highly regarded by those conversant with a faculty member's field.

In addition, an effective teacher must strive always to engage students in the subject matter chiefly through his/her own attitudes and enthusiasm. Respect for the subject, the students, and the educational process is regarded as a primary condition of good teaching. The usual signs of that respect include courtesy, appropriately challenging assignments, as well as rigorous, timely, and substantial feedback.

## 2. Advising

Advising is a particularly broad rubric within the Department, as teachers spend many hours providing students with extensive feedback of their artistic and scholarly endeavors, particularly in the context of studio and production work.

Teachers must also offer more typical kinds of advising related to enrollment and career guidance. The Department monitors advising quite closely, and faculty are expected to be responsive to directives issued by the offices of the Chair and the College. The times and places of most advising sessions are clearly mandated. Faculty are required to post office hours and must be willing to make appointments outside those hours if the need should arise. Some of this time takes place in response to the work students are doing on theatre projects.

A particularly important type of advising is that which supports thesis projects in scenography, theses and dissertations, and holding graduate programs in high regard. Faculty must accept a fair share of the responsibility for supporting the work of graduate students. The Graduate Director has principal responsibility for overseeing the distribution of thesis and dissertation assignments. Student need and preference, together with faculty qualifications, are among the chief concerns in assigning advisors and committee members to theses and dissertations.

## **B. Scholarly and/or Creative Activity (40%)**

Faculty are expected to engage in and maintain an ongoing program of scholarly research and/or creative activity appropriate to their fields of specialty and job descriptions throughout their careers. Scholarly and/or creative activities include: a) traditional print publication (e.g., articles, books, book chapters, editing of books and journals); b) work on productions (e.g., acting, scenographic design (costume, scenery, lighting, sound), directing, dramaturgy, movement design and coaching, voice design and coaching, musical direction, and choreography); and, c) conferences (e.g., invited or peer-reviewed papers, panels, workshops, or other presentations). Each faculty member should conduct research and/or creative projects that come before peers who are qualified to make insightful judgments of quality.

## **C. Service (20%)**

All faculty are expected to conduct themselves as citizens of the University. They are therefore required to contribute to the well-being of the Department and the larger institution through participation on committees.

The majority (although not all) of a junior faculty member's service contributions may be focused at the Departmental level by serving on its committees. Tenured faculty are urged to participate on College and University level committees.

Of particular significance is professional service rendered at the local, state, regional, national, and international levels. These opportunities are important, especially when they enhance the reputation and influence of the Department, the College, and the University.

## **2. Standards for Acceptable Performance for Tenured Faculty**

During the post-tenure period, faculty must sustain a level of effort and achievement in teaching, scholarly and/or creative activity, and service that is *commensurate with* the current levels required by tenure. The term “commensurate” is here intended to acknowledge that some tenured faculty may elect or be requested to reappportion their effort in a way that departs from the normal 40-40-20 distribution. The term also indicates that, whatever the ratio, the overall amount of effort contributed by all faculty must be equal.

Scholars and/or artists are expected to publish a body of scholarship and/or produce a body of creative work that is at least equivalent to the amount and quality required for their initial promotion. Associate professors are also expected to establish a national or international reputation in their field of expertise. Tenured faculty are also expected to provide greater amounts of service at the College and University levels and in state, regional, national, or international professional organizations throughout their careers.

The cumulative portfolio of a faculty member who fails to meet these *minimum* standards of acceptable performance will be considered below the Department norm when any of the following conditions prevail over a three-year period:

- a. When student teaching evaluations are consistently poor, or when peer teaching evaluations find a teacher's work unacceptable.
- b. When entries under "scholarship" do not include at least one good faith submission to a recognized research outlet and/or when entries under "artistic work" do not include a successful artistic production and/or performance endeavor in the University Theatre or comparable artistic venue.
- c. When the amount of service falls below the normal expectations for pre-tenured or tenured faculty, or when the quality of service has not met the requirements of the service tasks undertaken.

Faculty may argue for exceptions (e.g., a long-term project) and equivalencies (e.g., a cluster of regional publications, professional engagements, or conference papers). Similarly, off-campus service related to the Department's disciplines may help satisfy the third category of achievement. Arguments for exception or equivalency must be accompanied by evidence and documentation, and the issue of quality must remain foremost.

### **3. Process for Differential Allocation of Effort:**

Consistent with the Regent's policy, the University allows for differential allocations of effort among tenured faculty. This does not apply to non-tenured faculty on tenure-track appointments who must satisfy the 40-40-20 profile mentioned above. With respect to post-tenure faculty, a redistribution of effort may be appropriate under either of the following conditions:

- a. Changes in the standard 40-40-20 allocation of effort for a set period of time can be initiated by the tenured faculty member or Department Chair. These changes can be short or long-term and must correspond to actual changes in work-load, not just evaluation criteria. Reasons for alterations can include short-term items such as funded research, or longer term, career-stage issues. College policy does not allow faculty members to reduce their teaching or research to less than ten percent on permanent Differential Allocation of Efforts (DAE) agreements. Departmental needs take precedence over individual needs when decisions to alter a faculty member's allocation of effort are made; such redistribution must be consistent with the best interests of the unit. The most likely occasion for consideration of such changes is in discussion between the Chair and the individual faculty member following annual performance evaluations, or sooner, so that appropriate arrangements may be made at the unit level for the coverage of course offerings. Any changes in faculty allocation of effort will be negotiated with the Chair and documented in the faculty member's personnel file.

- b. For temporary DAE agreements (one academic year or less), the DAE is ultimately approved by the Chair of the department. For permanent DAE agreements (lasting one year or beyond), approval must also be sought from the appropriate contact dean in the College. All DAEs are reported annually to the College Dean's Office. For permanent DAEs, the supporting documentation is also provided to the College and the Provost's offices.

#### **4. Annual Evaluation System**

##### **A. Overview**

The faculty evaluation process must allow sufficient time for discussions with faculty concerning their performance and future expectations prior to the time lines established for merit salary decisions. Data for merit salary decisions is only one of multiple outcomes of the evaluation process. The Department's timeline for this process is as follows:

1. The "Annual Faculty Evaluation Report Form" (Appendix B) is distributed before the holiday break at the end of the fall semester. Faculty must fill out and return this form, along with appropriate documentation, by February 1<sup>st</sup>.
2. The Faculty Evaluation Board reads and examines the materials submitted by each faculty member in February. The Board then meets with the Department Chair to discuss and score each portfolio according to merit, and the Chair averages the scores and presents the final scoring to the Board for further discussion or revision.
3. In March, the Department Chair sends a letter to each faculty member conveying the Board's evaluation of his/her annual performance.
4. Within two weeks of receipt of the letter, faculty may request a conference with the Department Chair to express disagreements or to discuss their annual evaluation or other matters brought up by the evaluation. Following this conference, and upon written request to the Chair, a faculty member may meet with the Faculty Evaluation Board to discuss his/her evaluation and may request a reconsideration of the evaluation by the Board before the end of the spring semester.
5. Merit salary is determined when the College forwards the year's merit salary allocation to the department (normally around late April/early May).

## **B. Portfolio or Annual Report Preparation**

To prepare for the submission of annual reports, each faculty member is expected to accumulate appropriate materials and documented evidence throughout the previous calendar year in order to create a long-term portfolio. To assist in the preparation of evaluative materials, the Department uses the following guidelines in regard to peer evaluations of teaching, creative projects, and service.

Each faculty member must submit persuasive evidence to document the level and quality of his/her teaching and advising, scholarly research and creative endeavors, and service and administration during the previous calendar year. These materials are organized according to the “Annual Faculty Evaluation Report Form” (Appendix B) as follows:

1. Records of teaching should include: a) a one-page (single-spaced) statement of teaching accomplishments regarding new courses, significant revision of courses, experiments with new approaches or methods of instruction, etc.; b) classes taught by semester with the number of students enrolled, including independent studies; c) copies of syllabi and student evaluations (as required by the Provost’s Office); d) peer reviews of teaching according to the schedule set forth in the Model for Peer Evaluation (Appendix C); and e) teaching awards, honors, or evaluative responses to teaching. Records of advising should include: a) numbers of undergraduate and graduate students advised; and, b) honors or creative projects, M.A. theses, M.F.A. projects, or Ph.D. comprehensive/oral exams and dissertations chaired or supervised, including dates completed when relevant, both within or outside the Department.

Further compelling evidence of teaching quality and effectiveness may include: a) course portfolios (e.g., selected readings, assignments, grading rubrics, samples of student work, or students’ written comments); b) professional development of teaching (e.g., participation in seminars, workshops, or presentations); and, c) publications in regard to teaching, as well as other numerous forms of peer evaluation and documentation recommended by KU’s Center for Teaching Excellence. Teaching may also include mentoring of new faculty or colleagues.

2. Records of academic and/or creative scholarship should include: a) a one-page (single-spaced) statement that describes philosophical interests, overviews of the year’s accomplishments, and/or a research agenda that explains how present plans will serve scholarly and creative activities in the next five years; b) a list of major and minor, refereed or reviewed, publications, creative projects, and conference presentations; c) external and internal grant activity with proposals; d) copies of critiques, reviews, honors, or other responses to academic/creative scholarship; and, e) copies of publications and conference papers, book contracts, letters of acceptance from publishers or editors, etc.

To evaluate the quality of work in the University Theatre or outside venues, creative projects may include (but are not limited to) the following documentation, in order of importance:

- a. Anonymous assessments from evaluators from outside the University with national or international reputations in areas of expertise. The outside evaluator will ordinarily hold a tenured appointment at an equivalent research institution (or should be someone familiar with the tenure and promotion process and preferably associated with a research institution), and qualified by experience and training to render an informed, objective evaluation of creative or research activity in the appropriate field. The outside expert's written evaluation will emphasize the artistic merit of the candidate's contribution to the observed production or, in the case of research, the extent and quality of scholarly work.
- b. Regional and national competition in the Kennedy Center's American College Theatre Festival or other respected national or international festivals (with accompanying evaluations, if given).
- c. Critical notices, theatre reviews, and production evaluations from the popular press.
- d. Evaluation by peers in the University community.
- e. Evaluation by peers in the Department.

With the understanding that live performance cannot be fully appreciated when recorded, creative research projects will on occasion be vetted by outside evaluators, whose identity is withheld from the person under review, and should include (but are not limited to):

- a. Archival production video or DVD of the project (or selected scenes).
- b. Statement of creative research agenda.
- c. Director's concept, casebook, and notes.
- d. Designer's concept, drawings, and notes.
- e. Rehearsal footage.
- f. Publicity and critical notices or media reviews.

3. Record of service should include dates and levels of activity (H = High, M = Medium, L = Low) in: a) Departmental, College, and University committees; b) theatre-related service outside the University, including local, state, regional, national, or international professional organizations (e.g., editor or referee for journal, guest-teaching, professional duties, or volunteer service); c) honors or awards for professional services; and, d) any evaluations provided by people regarding that service.
4. Faculty members may also note mitigating conditions that may affect the categories above (e.g., long-term projects). They may also provide any information concerning teaching, professional development, or service not requested specifically above, that they feel to be relevant to their annual evaluation and add to their portfolio whatever additional kinds of compelling evidence they believe appropriate to their merit claims.
5. Faculty members must also submit an updated Curriculum Vitae and highlight the respective activities of the previous year.

While it is understood that the scope and scale of certain forms of teaching and creative work may be difficult to present in portfolio form, each colleague is expected to include evidence that ensures a balanced, comprehensive representation of all work. If a faculty member is away for an extended period, he or she should supply materials concerning his/her activities, but as a general rule, the Board shall be guided by evidence in the files for the prior two years in the event that current evidence is not available.

### **C. Portfolio or Annual Report Review and Evaluation**

Evaluation of each faculty member is done by the Faculty Evaluation Board, made up of the Chair of the Department (non-voting *ex officio*) and three other faculty members drawn by lot, who are expected to be thoroughly familiar with the tenure and promotion protocols of the College. No board member evaluates or ranks him/herself. In addition, the chair and all board members will have made a good faith effort to attend all public presentations of faculty members' creative work in the University Theatre.

Although annual evaluations and recommendations for merit salary increases are based primarily on achievements during the previous calendar year, the Board's assessments encompass both a short and long-term perspective of teaching, scholarship, and service by asking the basic question: "What is the overall value and quality of the contribution made by this individual?"

Each board member judges portfolio materials and awards preliminary merit points on a 100-point scale, based upon each faculty member's overall contribution to the

Department’s mission and his/her judgments of merit as follows (adjusted accordingly for differential allocation of effort):

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

- 33 – 40 Exceptional
- 25 – 32 Very Good
- 17 – 24 Good
- 9 – 16 Fair
- 0 – 8 Poor

**Service (20 points):**

- 17 – 20 Exceptional
- 13 – 16 Very Good
- 9 – 12 Good
- 5 – 8 Fair
- 0 – 4 Poor

Bonus Points: 1 – 10 points possible for truly extraordinary contribution.

The Faculty Evaluation Board and Chair then discuss the content of each portfolio and reconcile preliminary merit points. Discussions focus upon the overall quality and quantity of each faculty member’s accomplishments, as well as the immediate public impact of his/her contributions to the Department and University, and the broader significance such contributions hold at national and international levels.

**D. Annual Evaluation Feedback Process**

Based on the judgments of the Faculty Evaluation Board, the Chair of the Department writes a letter to each faculty member that describes, reviews, and evaluates his/her teaching, scholarly and/or creative activity, and service in relation to the Department’s expectations. Any substandard performance of a faculty member must be explained in the evaluation letter. Following the College’s requirements, this written summary also includes information regarding the individual’s progress toward tenure and/or promotion to respective ranks and the Faculty Evaluation Board’s suggested strategies for improvement or renewal of respective performances. This letter also reminds faculty of their opportunity to discuss this evaluation with the Chair within two weeks of their receipt of this letter in March. A copy of this annual summary is retained in each faculty member’s departmental file.

A faculty member may decide to meet with the Chair to discuss disagreements concerning evaluated performances, suggested strategies for improvement or renewal, progress toward tenure and/or promotion, and/or any requested changes to his/her normal 40-40-20 distribution of effort. S/he may also request to see a list of the distribution of



total merit points, indicating his/her ranking in comparison to all other faculty. When a tenured faculty member fails to meet the minimum standards of acceptable performance, the Chair and the individual will develop a written plan to address the areas of difficulty. The goal of intervention is to help faculty members meet or exceed the minimum performance norms of the Department. This effort may require that faculty participate in remediation programs.

#### **E. Conflict Resolution/Review Process**

In cases of faculty disagreement with the Chair concerning their annual evaluation, a faculty member may write a formal request to the Chair to meet with all members of the Faculty Evaluation Board before the end of the spring semester. Faculty from outside the Department may be involved at the request of either faculty member, the Faculty Evaluation Board, or the Chair. The choice of outside faculty must be guided by the nature of the contested issue(s). During this meeting, the faculty member may request a reconsideration of his/her evaluation by the Board. The faculty member may present additional evidence at this time.

Should a faculty member remain unsatisfied with the outcome of his/her meeting with the Faculty Evaluation Board, s/he may appeal this annual evaluation through the grievance process at the College level within six months from his/her meeting with the Faculty Evaluation Board (<https://documents.ku.edu/policies/CLAS/grievance.htm>).

#### **F. Outcomes of the Annual Performance Evaluation**

##### **1. Achievement of the Department and Individual Professional Goals:**

When the faculty member meets with the Chair to discuss the most recent evaluation, a part of that discussion will be on the long-range goals of the faculty member. Similarly, the Department Chair will discuss with the faculty member the long-range goals and directions of the Department. Through this discussion, both the faculty member and the Department Chair can coordinate teaching, advising, research, and service to further both the individual's goals and those of the Department. Although faculty renewal and development is an ongoing process, the annual evaluation process offers an opportunity for the Department and Chair to assist in faculty renewal and development. Outcomes of this discussion might include altering the faculty member's allocation of effort profile, or might involve encouraging and assisting a faculty member who is seeking outside funding for research, or might involve arranging for post-graduate specialized instruction in a methodology or content area. Of special importance is the mentoring of untenured faculty and those faculty members building a portfolio for promotion to Full Professor.

2. Differential Allocation of Effort

The annual evaluation should also include a review of the assignment of differential allocation of effort with any tenured faculty member to determine if any changes are needed and what changes are appropriate and practical. If a faculty member's performance requires improvement in any area, the chair will explore with the faculty member reallocation of effort from problem areas to areas where performance is more satisfactory, subject to the necessity for the unit to meet its research, teaching, and service obligations and the need for all faculty members to contribute appropriately. Changes in the distribution of effort will be documented in the faculty member's personnel file.

3. Merit Salary Decisions

The Department's merit salary allocation from the College is distributed on a dollar basis (i.e., each merit point is worth the same number of dollars, determined by dividing the total dollars available by the total number of merit points awarded). When merit recommendations are requested by the College (normally in late April/early May), the Chair of the Department determines these recommendations by multiplying each individual's merit point total by the dollar value of one merit point. The number of points is multiplied by a dollar amount for each point based on the total number of points for the entire department. The total number of points for the entire department is divided by the allocation from the College in dollars, so each point is worth a dollar amount. The total number of points received by each faculty member is multiplied by the point dollar amount.

4. Outcomes for Failing to Meet Performance Expectations

Under the University's post-tenure review policy, if it is determined during the course of the Annual Faculty Performance Evaluation that the faculty member has failed to meet the minimum acceptable level of performance expectations in teaching, research, or service, then the Department Chair and the faculty member will work together to develop a plan for development to improve performance in areas of weakness over the next calendar year. Such a plan will include a review of the performance expectation, a clear statement of the areas needing improvement, identification of the support and resources that will be provided to assist in meeting the expectations, a specific time-frame for the evidence of improvement, and possible consequences if performance standards are not met.

Three consecutive years of failure in any one area constitutes a sustained failure to meet the minimum acceptable level of performance. The Chair may call upon the University administration for assistance in constructing such a plan, including

provision for additional resources, where needed. A faculty member may reject any plan recommended to aid performance levels, but the faculty member must understand that a prolonged failure to meet academic responsibilities is a basis for dismissal.

Department chairs shall consult annually with the dean, and deans shall consult annually with the Provost, on the progress of any faculty member who fails to meet minimum academic responsibilities. Based upon the judgment that there has been a sustained overall failure to meet academic responsibilities, a dean may recommend to the Provost that a tenured faculty member be dismissed. In making this determination, the dean shall consider the nature of the failure to meet academic responsibilities, the reason or reasons for this failure, the number of years that the faculty member has failed to meet academic responsibilities, the level of discernible improvement in the faculty member's performance after being notified of any failure in performance, and the extent to which the faculty member has complied with the terms of any plan developed to improve the faculty member's performance. The Provost will review the case and, if the Provost agrees with the dean's recommendation, the Provost will recommend to the Chancellor that the faculty member be dismissed. If the Chancellor agrees and recommends dismissal, this recommendation will go to the faculty committee on Tenure & Related Problems (T&RP) for a hearing as specified in the Handbook for Faculty and Other Unclassified Staff (See C.2.f.)

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

### **G. Faculty Development Initiatives**

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

The Department acknowledges the necessity of continuous mentorship of junior faculty by senior faculty in preparation for their candidacy for tenure and promotion to associate professor. Initiation of this process is the responsibility of the Department and it continues until the faculty member achieves the rank of full professor. A tenure-track assistant professor should develop a relationship with a suitable mentor (often appointed

in consultation with the Department Chair), engage in activities during probationary years, and establish a review plan for scholarly and/or creative work that is evaluated in a manner appropriate to the institution's policies and expectations. The candidate has the right to regular and consistent evaluations throughout the probationary years.

Primary responsibility for meeting departmental standards rests with the individual. But administrators, such as the Chair and/or Artistic Director, must also assist faculty members to construct specific development and remediation programs. Faculty programs vary according to specialty and need. Faculty members required to undertake development activities as an outgrowth of the evaluation process design a general strategy with the Chair of the Department. Together, they choose both a specific program and a departmental mentor to oversee the program and consult closely with the faculty member who has embarked upon it.

---

## **Appendices**

Appendix A – Promotion and Tenure Procedures for the Department of Theatre

Appendix B – Annual Faculty Evaluation Report Form

Appendix C – Model for Peer Evaluations

Appendix D – Evaluation Guide for Production Review

Appendix E – Instrument(s) used for the student evaluation of teaching (Curriculum and Instruction Survey)

**Department of Theatre**  
**Promotion and Tenure Procedures**  
**Adopted by a Faculty Vote on October 22, 2009.**

**General Provisions**

***Scope and Purpose.*** The award of tenure and/or promotion in rank are among the most important and far-reaching decisions made by the University because an excellent faculty is an essential component of any outstanding institution of higher learning. Promotion and tenure decisions also have a profound effect on the lives and careers of faculty. Recommendations concerning promotion and tenure must be made carefully, based upon a thorough examination of the candidate's record and the impartial application of clearly articulated standards pursuant to prescribed procedures.

It is the purpose of these procedures to promote the rigorous and fair evaluation of faculty performance during the promotion and tenure process by (a) Establishing university-wide standards and procedures for the evaluation of teaching (or professional performance), scholarship, and service; (b) Creating a mechanism for the approval of written criteria and procedures by the department; (c) Preserving and enhancing the participatory rights of candidates, including the basic right to be informed about critical stages of the process and to have an opportunity to respond to negative evaluations; and, (d) Clarifying the responsibilities, roles, and relationships of the participants in the promotion and tenure review process so as to promote more effective interaction among them.

Each level of review, including the initial review, the intermediate review, and the university level review, conducts an independent evaluation of a candidate's record of performance and makes independent recommendations to the Chancellor. Later stages of review neither affirm nor reverse earlier recommendations, which remain part of the record for consideration by the Chancellor. It is the responsibility of each person involved in the review process to exercise his/her own judgment to evaluate a faculty member's teaching (or professional performance), scholarship, and service based upon the entirety of the data and information in the record. No single source of information, such as peer review letters, shall be considered a conclusive indicator of quality.

***Academic Freedom.*** All faculty members, regardless of rank, are entitled to academic freedom in relation to teaching and scholarship, and the right as citizens to speak on matters of public concern. Likewise, all faculty members, regardless of rank, bear the obligation to exercise their academic freedom responsibly and in accordance with the accepted standards of their academic disciplines.

Tenured faculty members may be dismissed only for adequate cause, in cases of program discontinuance, or under extraordinary circumstances caused by financial exigency.

**Confidentiality.** Consideration and evaluation of a faculty member's record is a confidential personnel matter.

No person shall participate in any aspect of the promotion and tenure process concerning a candidate when participation would create a clear conflict of interest or compromise the impartiality of an evaluation or recommendation.

If a candidate believes that there is a conflict of interest, the candidate may petition to have that person recuse him/herself. If a committee member does not recuse him/herself, a decision about whether that person has a conflict of interest shall be made by a majority of the other committee members.

### **Promotion and Tenure Standards**

**General Principles.** The University strives for a consistent standard of quality against which the performance of all faculty members is measured. Nonetheless, the nature of faculty activities varies across the University and a faculty member's record must be evaluated in light of his/her particular responsibilities and the expectations of the discipline. Teaching and scholarship should normally be given primary consideration, but the particular weight to be accorded to each component of a faculty member's activities depends upon the responsibilities of the faculty member. In the case of non-teaching faculty and unclassified academic staff, comparable professional responsibilities, as defined by our department and the standards of our disciplines, may be evaluated instead of teaching. The College has traditionally recognized the 40-40-20 formula for weighting research, teaching, and service. There is some flexibility in this weighted formula to assign a differential allocation of effort to a tenured faculty member, in light of the needs of the tenured faculty member and the departmental needs and aspirations.

**Teaching.** Teaching is a primary function of the University, which strives to provide an outstanding education for its students. The evaluation of teaching includes consideration of syllabi, course materials, and other information related to a faculty member's courses; peer and student evaluations; a candidate's own statement of teaching philosophy and goals; public representations of teaching; and other accepted methods of evaluation, which may include external evaluations.

High quality teaching is serious intellectual work grounded in a deep knowledge and understanding of the field and includes the ability to convey that understanding in clear and engaging ways.

The conduct of classes is the central feature of teaching responsibilities at KU, but teaching also includes supervising student research and clinical activities, mentoring and advising students, and other teaching-related activities outside of the classroom.

For the award of tenure and/or promotion to associate professor, the record must demonstrate effective teaching, as reflected in such factors as command of the subject matter, the ability to communicate effectively in the classroom, a demonstrated commitment to student learning, and involvement in providing advice and support for students outside the classroom.

For promotion to the rank of professor, the record must demonstrate continued effectiveness and growth as a teacher, as reflected in such factors as mastery of the subject matter, strong classroom teaching skills, an ongoing commitment to student learning, and active involvement in providing advice and support for students outside the classroom.

***Scholarship.*** The concept of “scholarship” encompasses not only traditional academic research and publication, but also the creation of artistic works or performances and any other products or activities accepted by the academic discipline as reflecting scholarly effort and achievement for purposes of promotion and tenure. While the nature of scholarship varies among disciplines, the University adheres to a consistently high standard of quality in its scholarly activities to which all faculty members, regardless of discipline, are held. In the Department of Theatre, faculty artist/scholars will be expected to demonstrate ongoing success in the University Theatre, and particularly for advancement to full professor, to show evidence of a national or international reputation in theatre. Candidates for promotion to associate professor will normally have in print, or accepted for publication, either (1) one book-length study; or (2) at least five articles in refereed journals, and peer reviewed or refereed chapters in books; or (3) refereed critical editions, compilations, translations, or electronic publications equivalent in scholarly significance to either (1) or (2). Categories (2) and (3) may be mixed. Scholars in theatre often engage in creative activity important to their development as teachers and researchers, such as directing, dramaturgy or design assignments for the University Theatre. In such cases, these contributions are to be valued and weighed toward promotion and tenure by the Department. Candidates for promotion to full professor are expected to publish a body of scholarship and/or creative work that is at least equivalent to the amount and quality required for their initial promotion, and they are expected to have established a national or international reputation in their field of expertise. (6.2.3.1)

For the award of tenure and/or promotion to the rank of associate professor, the record must demonstrate a successfully developing scholarly career, as reflected in such factors as the quality and quantity of publications or creative activities, external reviews of the candidate’s work by respected scholars or practitioners in the field, the candidate’s regional, national, or international reputation, and other evidence of an active and productive scholarly agenda.

For promotion to the rank of professor, the record must demonstrate an established scholarly career, as reflected in such factors as a substantial and ongoing pattern of publication or creative activity, external reviews of the candidate’s work by eminent scholars or practitioners in the field, the candidate’s national or international reputation, and other evidence of an active and productive scholarly career.

**Service.** Service is an important responsibility of all faculty members that contributes to the University's performance of its larger mission. Although the nature of service activities will depend on a candidate's particular interests and abilities, service contributions are an essential part of being a good citizen of the University. The Department of Theatre accepts and values scholarly service to the discipline or profession, service within the university, and public service at the local, state, national, or international level. For promotion to associate professor, the majority (though not all) of a candidate's service contributions may be focused at the departmental level. Greater amounts of service at the College and University level (and in national or international professional organizations and the larger community) will be expected later in one's career. These additional service contributions are expected for promotion to the rank of full professor. (6.2.4.1.)

For the award of tenure and/or promotion to associate professor, the record must demonstrate a pattern of service to the University at one or more levels, to the discipline or profession, and/or to the local, state, national, or international communities.

For promotion to the rank of professor, the record must demonstrate an ongoing pattern of service reflecting substantial contributions to the University at one or more levels, to the discipline or profession, and/or to the local, state, national, or international communities.

**Criteria for Review.** The criteria shall provide for the evaluation of teaching (or professional performance), scholarship, and service as "excellent," "very good," "good," "marginal," or "poor," defined as follows:

- (a) "Excellent" means that the candidate substantially exceeds disciplinary and department/unit expectations for tenure and/or promotion to this rank.
- (b) "Very Good" means the candidate exceeds disciplinary and department/unit expectations for tenure and/or promotion to this rank.
- (c) "Good" means the candidate meets disciplinary and department/unit expectations for tenure and/or promotion to this rank.
- (d) "Marginal" means the candidate falls below disciplinary and department/unit expectations for tenure and/or promotion to this rank
- (e) "Poor" means the candidate falls significantly below disciplinary and department/unit expectations for tenure and/or promotion to this rank.

Absent exceptional circumstances, successful candidates for promotion and tenure will meet disciplinary expectations in all categories, and strong candidates are likely to exceed normal expectations in one or more categories.



***Procedures for Review.*** Responsibility for the initial review lies with the department in which the candidate has his or her principal appointment. The initial review shall be conducted pursuant to section 5 of Article VI of the Faculty Senate Rules and Regulations. The unit review committee (consisting of all faculty holding the appropriate academic rank) shall evaluate the candidate's research, teaching (or professional performance), and service.

No students or untenured faculty members, except unclassified academic staff with the rank equivalent to or higher than associate professor, shall serve on the department promotion and tenure committee or vote on any recommendation concerning promotion and tenure.

The Provost's guidelines shall provide for a summary evaluation section to be prepared by the committee at each level and shared with the candidate upon completion of the initial review. The evaluation section shall include: (a) the recommendation of the committee, its rating of the candidate in the areas of teaching (or professional performance), scholarship, and service, and a statement of the reasons for those ratings; (b) if the initial or intermediate procedures provide for the faculty holding the necessary rank to vote as a committee of the whole, whether the committee of the whole concurred in the recommendations; and, (c) the concurrence or non-concurrence of the department chair, the dean of the school or college, or head of the administrative unit.

***Initiation of Review.*** Prior to the beginning of the spring semester, the Provost notifies all faculty whose mandatory review year will be the following academic year, with copies provided to department chairs. Upon receipt of this notice or if a faculty member requests it prior to the mandatory review year, the department shall initiate procedures for evaluating the candidate for the award of tenure.

As part of the annual faculty evaluation process, the department shall consider the qualifications of all tenured faculty members below the rank of full professor, with a view toward possible promotion in rank during the following academic year. After considering a faculty member's qualifications, if the department determines that those qualifications may warrant promotion in rank, it shall initiate procedures for reviewing the faculty member for promotion.

It is the responsibility of the candidate to complete the appropriate portions of the form and provide necessary documents and information in accordance with the Provost's guidelines, with assistance from the department conducting the initial review.

The Department, as the committee responsible for the initial review, shall receive the form and accompanying materials from the candidate and finish compiling the record of the candidate's teaching, scholarship, and service in accordance with the Provost's guidelines. The committee shall follow the approved written procedures for initial review.

The departmental review committee shall provide for the solicitation of outside reviewers to assist in the evaluation of a faculty member's scholarship and in accordance with College procedures. Emphasis shall be placed on selecting reviewers who hold academic rank or a professional position equal to or greater than the rank for which the candidate is being considered.

When soliciting external reviews of a candidate's scholarship, the department committee shall inform prospective reviewers of the extent to which the candidate will have access to the review. The College's confidentiality policy regarding soliciting external reviewers for the promotion and tenure review process is as follows:

*"As a part of the promotion and/or tenure review process, we are soliciting assessments of Professor \_\_\_\_\_'s research contributions from academic colleagues and distinguished professionals. These letters will become part of the candidate's promotion and tenure dossier and are treated as confidential by the University to the extent we are permitted to do so by law."*

**Recommendations.** Upon completion of the record, the committee conducting the initial review shall evaluate the candidate's record of teaching, scholarship, and service in light of the applicable standards and criteria and make recommendations concerning the award of tenure and/or promotion in rank.

Departmental procedures stipulate that the committee recommendation shall be forwarded for consideration to a committee of the whole consisting of all faculty members holding the appropriate academic rank in the department. The Promotion and Tenure Committee of the Department of Theatre is composed of all tenured faculty members. The Chair of the Department serves as Chair of the Promotion and Tenure Committee and is responsible for preparing and submitting departmental recommendations concerning promotion and tenure and all relevant administrative forms to the College Office by the appropriate deadlines. In the fall semester of each academic year, the Chair of the Department will request that any faculty member who wishes to be a candidate for promotion and/or tenure in the following academic year inform the Chair of his/her candidacy. The Chair of the Department in consultation with the candidate for promotion and/or tenure and appropriate faculty, in line with the College guidelines, will submit a list of twelve potential outside evaluators (six from the candidate and six from the faculty) for approval by the Dean of the College. It is the responsibility of the candidate for promotion and/or tenure to prepare all of the materials to be submitted in support of his/her application. For each such candidate, the Department Chair appoints an *ad hoc* committee of faculty that gathers and evaluates relevant material, and presents a report to the PTC. In the event of a favorable decision, the *ad hoc* committee assists in the preparation of materials to be submitted to the College. The *ad hoc* committee must include one tenured faculty member from a department other than Theatre within the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences. (6.5.4.1)

The Department Chair shall communicate the recommendations of the initial review to the candidate and provide the candidate with a copy of the corresponding evaluation section of the promotion and tenure form. Negative recommendations shall be communicated in writing and, if the review will not be forwarded automatically, the Chair shall inform the candidate that he or she may request that the record be forwarded for further review.

Favorable recommendations, together with the record of the initial review, shall be forwarded to the College Committee on Appointments Promotion, and Tenure (CCAPT) conducting the intermediate review. Negative recommendations resulting from an initial review shall go forward for intermediate or University Committee on Promotion and Tenure (UCPT) review only if it is the candidate's mandatory review year or if the candidate requests it.

### **Intermediate Review**

***Record for Review.*** The candidate may submit a written response to a negative recommendation at the initial departmental review level, or to a final rating of teaching, research, or service below the level of "good" included in the evaluation section of the recommendation. The written response goes forward with the dossier to the next level of review at CCAPT.

***Request for Information.*** A request for information by the intermediate review committee (CCAPT) shall be sent to the Department Chair who shall immediately provide a copy to the candidate and inform the initial review committee. The Chair and/or committee shall prepare the Department's response in accordance with the initial review procedures.

The candidate shall be afforded an opportunity to participate in the preparation of the Department's response and/or to submit his/ her own documentation or comment to the CCAPT.

## Annual Faculty Evaluation Report Form

January 1 – December 31, 2009

NAME \_\_\_\_\_

RANK \_\_\_\_\_

### I. Record of Teaching

- A. Statement of teaching accomplishments in the evaluation period i.e. new courses, significant revision of courses, experiments with new approaches or methods of instruction, etc.
- B. Classes taught during period, semester, and number enrolled. (Please attach a copy of teaching evaluations and syllabi.)
- C. Advisement. List separately and provide numbers: undergraduate advising, graduate advising, honors projects, MA theses, MFA projects, and PhD theses supervised (include dates completed, when relevant). Advisement in the context of creative projects or in other arenas such as graduate examinations. Include service on any graduate examination either in the department or for other units.
- D. Teaching awards, honors or evaluative responses to teaching, including any peer review documentation.

### II. Record of Scholarship (6.2.3.1 the concept of “scholarship” encompasses not only traditional academic research and publication, but also the creation of artistic works or performances and any other products or activities accepted by the academic discipline as reflecting scholarly effort and achievement for purposes of promotion and tenure. While the nature of scholarship varies among disciplines, the University adheres to a consistently high standard of quality in its scholarly activities to which all faculty members, regardless of discipline, are held. From Article VI of the Faculty Senate Rules and Regulations as approved by Faculty Senate, May 3, 2007.

- A. Major Scholarship: interests/philosophy/plan. Provide a statement (approximately one page, single-spaced) describing your activities during the reporting period and how they will serve your scholarship plan for the next five years (please attach).

- B. Attach a list of major scholarship, conventions or other scholarly presentations. Where applicable, specify if refereed or reviewed. Separate Major from Minor work. Where applicable include complete bibliographic data.

For scholarly presentations: include: title, time, place, sponsoring agency, and whether refereed. Indicate whether presentations were subsequently published.

- C. Grant Activity (please list on this sheet)
1. External proposals (please attach copy of proposals).
  2. Internal (KU) proposals (please attach copy of proposals).
- D. Copies of critiques, honors, or responses to scholarship (please attach).
- E. Documentation of scholarship during merit period (please attach).

**III. Record of Service.** Please list dates and, for each activity, use the following symbols to indicate H = High, M = Medium, L = Light

- A. Committees served on or other service during merit salary year
1. Departmental
  2. College
  3. University
- B. Professionally related service outside the University, including guest teaching, volunteer service, professional duties, etc. (Services as a referee or editor go here.) Indicate whether service is local, regional, national, or international.
- C. Honors or awards for professional service (please attach documentation).
- D. Any evaluations provided by people regarding that service (please attach).
- IV.** Please note here and/or provide documentation of any conditions which you feel mitigate any of the categories above, or provide any information concerning teaching, professional development, or service not requested specifically by this form that you feel to be relevant to your merit evaluation.
- V.** Please attach an updated Curriculum Vita and highlight current merit year activity.

## **Department of Theatre**

### **Model for Peer Evaluations**

**Approved by the Faculty on November 19, 2009.**

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

1. Selection of the evaluator should be determined through the advisement of the Chair in consultation with the Faculty Mentor (for pre-tenure faculty members). It is required that each pre-tenure faculty member be evaluated at least once every year by a tenured faculty member; and that each tenured faculty member be evaluated by a tenured faculty member at least once every two years.
2. The Chair of the Department is charged with checking each fall semester to see that all faculty have begun the process of scheduling their evaluations by September 15<sup>th</sup>.
3. The evaluator and the evaluatee should meet several days or weeks prior to the evaluation to discuss the following:
  - When is the evaluation to take place? (This must be convenient and appropriate for both evaluator and teacher.)
  - What is the stated objective of the course generally, and of the particular classroom session to be evaluated specifically?
4. The evaluator will attend the agreed-upon class session in as unobtrusive a manner as possible. The teacher may want to announce in advance to the class that an evaluator is in attendance.
5. It is crucial that the evaluator and the teacher should meet soon after the class to discuss how the class was conducted. This is an informal opportunity for feedback from both parties.
6. The evaluator will prepare a written statement of evaluation/reflection that is primarily descriptive rather than judgmental. It could pursue the following suggested guidelines:
  - First, reiterate the stated objective of the course generally and of the particular classroom session.
  - Second, describe how the course material was organized.
  - Third, note the use (if relevant) of audio-visual aids.

- Fourth, describe the teacher's method and manner of presentation. What means of contact were maintained with the class at large and with individual students? Were student feedback and questions entertained? Was discussion a part of the class?
7. A concluding statement that reflects both the evaluator's conclusions and the teacher's post-class feedback.
  8. Consider organizing the above as a series of short prose paragraphs in a statement of no more than two pages in length.
  9. The finalized form of the evaluation shall be shared with the teacher. This enables the teacher to respond to the evaluation if he or she deems it necessary. This response letter is then filed together with the evaluation in the evaluatee's departmental file. It should be emphasized that these documents remain confidential to all parties other than the evaluator and the evaluatee (until, of course, they are examined during Sabbatical and Promotion and/or Tenure proceedings). These evaluations may also be placed in the faculty member's annual merit file should she or he wish to include the evaluation in their files.

**Department of Theatre**

**Evaluation Guide for Production Review**

**Faculty member:** \_\_\_\_\_

**Review written by:** \_\_\_\_\_

**Relationship to person (if any):** \_\_\_\_\_

**Description of observation:** \_\_\_\_\_

---

**Production review for theatre by on-site outside evaluator:**

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

Signed \_\_\_\_\_

Date: \_\_\_\_\_



## **Curriculum and Instruction Survey**

### **Student Survey of Teaching**

Beginning in Fall 2008, the following measures were set forth by the University of Kansas:

- This instructor provided content and materials that were useful and organized.
- This instructor set and met clear goals and objectives for the course.
- What this instructor expected of me [student] was well defined and fair.
- What this instructor expected of me [student] was appropriately challenging.
- This instructor's teaching was clear, understandable and engaging.
- This instructor was encouraging, supportive, and involved in my [student's] learning the course material.
- This instructor was available, responsive and helpful.
- This instructor demonstrated respect for students and their points of view.
- [Student's] Amount learned compared to courses at a similar level.  
(Much Less, Less, the Same, More, Much More)

## **Department of Theatre**

### **Grievance Procedure**

**Approved by the Faculty on November 19, 2009.**

*These procedures have been reviewed by the Office of the General Counsel  
and are effective March 26, 2010.*

Pursuant to Article XIV of the University Senate Code and Articles V and VI of the University Senate Rules and Regulations (USRR) of the University of Kansas, Lawrence, the Department of Theatre establishes the following procedure to hear grievances arising within the Department of Theatre. Appeal of a grievance heard at the department level is to the Judicial Board. This procedure shall not be used to hear disputes assigned to other hearing bodies under USRR Article VI.

For disputes involving alleged academic misconduct or alleged violations of student rights, the initial hearing normally will be at the unit level. There is an option to hold an initial hearing at the Judicial Board level if both parties agree, or either party petitions the Judicial Board chair to have the hearing at the Judicial Board level and the petition is granted. The petition must state why a fair hearing cannot be obtained at the unit level; the opposing party has an opportunity to respond to the petition (USRR 6. 4.3.1).

Except as provided in USRR 6.5.4., no person shall be disciplined for using the grievance procedure or assisting another in using the grievance procedure. The Department of Theatre shall provide a copy of this procedure to anyone who requests it.

1. To start the grievance process, the complainant must submit a written grievance to the Department Chair. The complaint shall contain a statement of the facts underlying the complaint and specify the provision(s) of the Faculty Code of Conduct, University Senate Code, the University Senate Rules and Regulations, the Code of Student Rights and Responsibilities, or other applicable rule, policy, regulation, or law allegedly violated. The complaint shall also indicate the witnesses or other evidence relied on by the complaining party, and copies of any documents relevant to the complaint shall be attached to the complaint.
2. At the time the complaint is submitted to the Department Chair, the complaining party shall provide a copy of the complaint, with accompanying documents, to the respondent(s).
3. Upon receipt of the complaint, the Department Chair shall contact the respondent to verify that the respondent has received a copy of the complaint and to provide the respondent with a copy of these procedures.
4. Pursuant to University Senate Code 14.2.d, a respondent has the privilege of remaining silent and refusing to give evidence in response to a complaint. The respondent also has the right to respond and give evidence in response to the complaint.

5. The respondent shall submit a written response to the Department within 14 calendar days of receiving the complaint. The response shall contain the respondent's statement of the facts underlying the dispute as well as any other defenses to the allegations in the complaint. The response shall also identify the witnesses or other evidence relied on by the respondent and shall include copies of any documents relevant to the response. The respondent shall provide a complete copy of the response to the complaining party.
6. Upon receipt of the response, the Department Chair shall contact the complaining party to verify that a copy of the response has been provided.
7. Upon receiving the complaint and response, or if the respondent fails to respond within the 14-day time period, the Department Chair shall appoint a committee to consider the complaint. The committee members shall be disinterested parties who have not had previous involvement in the specific situation forming the basis of the complaint; the chair for a grievance hearing will be appointed by the Chair of the Department. Faculty members involved in a particular grievance will be replaced for that grievance by another faculty member appointed by the Chair of the Department.
8. Pursuant to USRR 6.8.4.2, the chair of the committee may contact other hearing bodies within the University to determine whether a grievance or complaint involving the underlying occurrence or events is currently pending before or has been decided by any other hearing body.
9. Time limits. To use this procedure, the complainant must file the written complaint with the Department within six months from the action or event that forms the basis of the complaint. The six-month time period shall be calculated using calendar days (including weekends and days during which classes are not in session).
10. Upon receiving the complaint, if the chair of the committee determines that any of the following grounds exist, he or she may recommend to the Department Chair that the complaint be dismissed without further proceedings. The grounds for such dismissal are: (a) the grievance or another grievance involving substantially the same underlying occurrence or events has already been, or is being, adjudicated by proper University procedures; (b) the grievance has not been filed in a timely fashion; (c) the Department Chair lacks jurisdiction over the subject matter or any of the parties; (d) the grievance fails to allege a violation of a University rule; (e) the party filing the grievance lacks standing because he or she has not suffered a distinct injury as a result of the challenged conduct and has not been empowered to bring the complaint on behalf of the University; or (f) the party filing the grievance has been denied the right to file grievances pursuant to USRR 6.5.4.
11. If the chair of the committee determines that a grievance on its face properly should be heard by another body, the chair will recommend that the Department Chair send the grievance to the appropriate hearing body without further proceedings in the Department. The Department Chair will send a copy of the referral to the complainant(s) and any responding parties.
12. Prior to scheduling a hearing, the parties shall participate in mediation of the dispute unless either party waives mediation. Mediation shall be governed by USRR 6.2.3.
13. If mediation is successful, the mediator will forward to the Department Chair, the committee chair, and all parties a letter describing the outcome of the mediation and the terms upon which the parties have agreed to resolve the dispute. This letter shall be a recommendation to the Department Chair. The Department Chair will notify the mediator, the committee chair, and the parties that the recommendation has been accepted, modified, or rejected.

14. If mediation is not successful, the mediator will notify the Department Chair, the committee chair, and the parties that mediation has terminated. If mediation is not successful, or if it is waived by either party, the grievance committee will schedule a hearing no later than 30 calendar days from the written submission of the complaint. The 30-day period may be extended for good cause as determined by the chair of the committee. The 30-day period shall be suspended during the mediation process. The hearing will be closed unless all parties agree that it shall be public.
15. Each party may represent himself or herself or be represented by an advisor or counsel of his or her choice.
16. Each party has the right to introduce all relevant testimony and documents if the documents have been provided with the complaint or response.
17. Each party shall be entitled to question the other party's witnesses. The committee may question all witnesses.
18. Witnesses other than parties shall leave the hearing room when they are not testifying.
19. The chair of the committee shall have the right to place reasonable time limits on each party's presentation.
20. The chair of the committee shall have the authority and responsibility to keep order, rule on questions of evidence and relevance, and shall possess other reasonable powers necessary for a fair and orderly hearing.
21. The hearing shall not be governed by the rules of evidence, but the chair of the committee may exclude information he or she deems irrelevant, unnecessary, or duplicative. Statements or admissions made as part of the mediation process are not admissible.
22. The committee will make an audiotape of the hearing but not of the deliberations of the committee. The audiotape will be available to the parties, their authorized representatives, the committee and the Department Chair. If a party desires a copy of the audiotape or a transcript of the tape, that party will pay for the cost of such copy or transcript. In the event of an appeal, the audiotape will be provided to the appellate body as part of the record of the case.
23. After the presentation of evidence and arguments, the committee will excuse the parties and deliberate. The committee's decision will be a written recommendation to the Department Chair. The committee shall base its recommendations solely upon the information presented at the hearing.
24. The committee will send its written recommendation to the Department Chair and the parties as soon possible and no later than 14 calendar days after the end of the hearing.
25. Within 14 calendar days of receiving the committee recommendation, the Department Chair will notify the parties of the acceptance, modification, or rejection of the recommendation. The Department Chair will advise the parties of the procedure available to appeal the decision.

Approved: \_\_\_\_\_ signature on file \_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_\_ 3-26-10 \_\_\_\_\_  
Department Chairperson

These procedures have been reviewed by the Office of the General Counsel and are effective March 26, 2010.