This document establishes policy and procedures to be followed by the Department of Theatre at Oklahoma State University for the evaluation of clinical, tenure track, and tenured faculty for the purposes of Reappointment, Promotion, and Tenure. The RPT policy and procedures set forth in this document have been made in accordance with the guidelines established by the Oklahoma State University Policy and Procedures (#2-0902 and #2-0903) and the Personnel Procedures of the College of Arts and Sciences. The policy and procedures for faculty evaluation aim to support and advance the mission and goals of the Department.

I. Mission

The Department of Theatre at Oklahoma State University, as a cultural force for the state of Oklahoma, is committed to providing students at the university with a comprehensive professionally-focused theatre education within the context of a liberal arts education which:

- Embraces the values of a liberal arts education;
- Fosters lifelong intellectual pursuits;
- Develops creative, collaborative, and communications skills;
- Enables professional careers;
- Creates works of theatre that educate students, enrich the cultural life of our communities, and maintain a regional reputation for excellence.

II. Goals

The goals of the Department in regards to the hiring, reappointment, promotion, and tenure of faculty are to:

- Provide students with faculty who have attained or show promise in attaining national or international prominence in their respective fields;
- Provide students with passionate, skilled, and committed educators;
- Support the land-grant mission of the university by providing local communities with theatre artists and scholars with demonstrated merit and creativity;
- Maintain a departmental reputation for scholarly and creative excellence;
- Foster a departmental atmosphere of collegiality and mutual support;
- Support the faculty in their career aspirations.

III. Evaluation Criteria for Initial Appointment

A. Assistant Professor
1. For an initial appointment to a tenure-track position, Assistant Professors are required to have an appropriate terminal degree, such as MFA, DFA, or PhD.

2. At time of initial appointment, Assistant Professors are expected to demonstrate promising and original research and/or creative activities and substantial course or curriculum materials. Professional contacts and activities are preferred for theatre practitioners. Other desirable activities may include participation in appropriate professional societies or organizations.

B. Associate Professor

1. For an initial appointment to the rank of Associate Professor, candidates are required to have an appropriate terminal degree, such as MFA, DFA, PhD, or international equivalent.

2. Candidates must have a record of previous achievement comparable to standards established for an Associate Professor in the department and as outlined below in this document.

3. Associate Professors are expected to continue developing a strong trajectory of excellence in teaching, research and/or creative activities, and service. Professional contacts and activities are preferred for theatre practitioners. Other desirable activities may include participation in appropriate professional societies or organizations.

C. Professor

1. For an initial appointment to the rank of Professor, candidates are required to have an appropriate terminal degree, such as MFA, DFA, PhD, or international equivalent.

2. Candidates must have a record of previous achievement comparable to standards established for a Professor in the department and as outlined below in this document.

3. Professors are expected to continue developing a strong trajectory of excellence in teaching, research and/or creative activities, and service. Professional contacts and activities are preferred for theatre practitioners. Other desirable activities may include participation in appropriate professional societies or organizations.
D. Clinical Instructor

1. For an initial appointment as a Clinical Instructor, candidates are required to have an appropriate terminal degree, such as the MFA.

2. At time of initial appointment, Clinical Instructors are expected to demonstrate a record or promise of accomplishment in clinical teaching and clinical care.

E. Visiting Assistant Professor

1. For an appointment as a Visiting Assistant Professor, candidates are required to have an appropriate terminal degree, such as MFA, DFA, PhD, or international equivalent.

2. At time of initial appointment, Visiting Assistant Professors are expected to demonstrate a record of teaching and research or professional activity appropriate for the duties outlined in the job description.

3. Visiting Assistant Professors do not undergo annual Appraisal and Development review.

4. Visiting Assistant Professors are not eligible for tenure or promotion, although they may apply for a tenure-track appointment if one becomes available.

F. Adjunct Professor

1. For an appointment as an Adjunct Professor, candidates are required to have an appropriate graduate degree, such as MA, MFA, DFA, or PhD.

2. At time of initial appointment, Adjunct Professors are expected to demonstrate a record or promise of teaching those subjects for which they are hired.

3. Adjunct Professors do not undergo annual Appraisal and Development review.

4. Adjunct Professors are not eligible for tenure or promotion, although they may apply for a tenure-track appointment if one becomes available.
IV. Selection and Constitution of the Personnel Committee

A. Selection

1. Each Spring by March 1 the faculty of the Department of Theatre shall elect a Personnel Committee Chairperson from the tenured faculty, whose term shall be for one year beginning March 15. The Chair may be re-elected for a second term, but may not serve in that office when he/she is being considered for a promotion. The Chair is a full voting member on any action before department Personnel Committee.

2. a. After the election of the Personnel Committee Chairperson and prior to March 15, the Personnel Committee shall be elected by the faculty.

b. The Personnel Committee will consist of no less than three (3) and no more than five (5) full-time members of the department, that is, the elected Personnel Committee Chairperson and 2-4 elected faculty members-at-large.

c. All members of a Personnel Committee must be of rank or higher than the rank for which the RPT action is concerned. If there are less than three faculty members at the desired rank or above, then the members of the committee in consultation with the Department Head will solicit faculty at the desired rank from similar departments or disciplines at the University to assist the committee with the review and recommendation.

d. When the RPT action concerns a Clinical Faculty member, one of the elected faculty members-at-large must be a Clinical Faculty member at the desired rank or above. If there are no available Clinical Faculty in the department at that rank, this person may be chosen from similar departments or disciplines at the University to assist the committee with the review and recommendation.

3. A faculty member may not serve on any Personnel Committee during the time of his/her own tenure and/or promotion action. Each member-at-large is a full voting member of any action before the Personnel Committee to which he/she is appointed.

4. Given that faculty from a given unit may serve on the departmental and/or college level committee, they must vote only once and only at one level.
B. Conduct of Business

1. In cases involving mandatory reappointment or tenure action, it is the responsibility of the Department Head to give timely notice of the required upcoming action to the Chairperson of the Personnel Committee and to the candidate under review (see Appendix A: Timelines and Due Dates).

2. In all other cases of tenure and/or promotion, any faculty member may initiate the review process by applying in writing to the Personnel Committee Chairperson and the Department Head. The application shall be made no later than March 15 in the academic year prior to which the candidate wishes to be considered for tenure and/or promotion.

3. The Personnel Committee may decline to consider a promotion for anyone who has applied for and been denied a promotion at the department level in each of the two previous years. If a candidate is denied promotion by the College or University, the department shall follow university policy, which requires that a candidate wait two years before reapplying for promotion.

4. The Personnel Committee Chairperson must give each committee member-at-large a minimum of two full working days’ notice for any meeting of a Personnel Committee. After every reasonable effort has be made to accommodate the schedules of the committee members, business may then be conducted at any meeting of a Personnel Committee as long as a majority of the committee members is present. Voting in absentia is not permitted.

C. Action

1. Once the Personnel Committee has read and considered all evidence, presented on a particular action, including input from departmental faculty at any rank, the Committee will prepare a recommendation report. The report shall include:

   a. Statement of the personnel action being taken.

   b. Rationale for the Committee’s recommendation: a summary and evaluation of all of the evidence for and against the recommendation and any items of evidence considered essential by the Committee. All strong comments, both positive and negative, voiced in any peer review letter must be addressed in the Committee’s rationale. The criteria cited in the recommendation statements should consistently adhere to
the department’s written academic unit standards (see section XII), and statements should make explicit and specific references to the criteria listed in the academic unit standards.

c. Recommendation on the action requested. In instances where the committee’s recommendation is split, both minority and majority recommendations must be included in the recommendation report and distinctly labeled “majority report” and “minority report.”

d. The tally of the final voting on the recommendation shall be expressly stated in the action report, i.e., 3 for, 1 against.

2. The Chairperson and all members-at-large of the Personnel Committee shall sign the Committee’s recommendation report, attach it to the Reappointment, Promotion and Tenure file (hereafter, RPT file), and forward it to the Department Head.

3. The Chairperson of the Personnel Committee shall give the candidate a confidential copy of the Personnel Committee’s recommendation report at the time the report is forwarded to the Department Head. If the recommendation report is negative, the candidate has the option to respond in writing (maximum of 1000 words) addressing the issues mentioned in the report. The response must be submitted to the Department Head within three working days of receipt of the negative recommendation report, and this response letter will be included in the candidate’s RPT file.

4. Upon receiving and reviewing the Committee’s recommendation report and the candidate’s RPT file, the Department Head will review the candidate’s file and consider the recommendation of the Personnel Committee. If the Department Head is unable to act in accordance with the Personnel Committee’s recommendation, reasons must be communicated to the Personnel Committee in writing.

5. The Department Head shall then write his/her own recommendation report which shall be addressed to the Dean of the College. Once the Department Head’s recommendation has been completed, the Head shall send confidential copies to the candidate and to the Chairperson of the Personnel Committee, who will then share it with the rest of the committee. If the candidate has not responded to a negative recommendation from the Personnel Committee, the candidate may choose to respond to a negative recommendation by the Department Head in a separate report to the Dean of the College. According to university policy, the candidate has three working days following the
receipt of the recommendation to formulate a response (no longer than 1,000 words), but may only respond to one negative recommendation.

6. All deliberations of the Personnel Committee shall be confidential.

V. Evidence

A. *University Policy Statement to Govern Appointments, Tenure, Promotions and Related Matters of the Faculty of Oklahoma State University* section 1.2.1 states, “It shall be the personal responsibility of the faculty member to show that applicable qualifications for reappointment, tenure or promotion have been met.” The contents of RPT files are determined in part by the University RPT Recommendations Form for Development of the RPT Documentation File. The list of items on this form is only a minimal list of items that may be provided. Additional items may be added which help to promote the action of the candidate. The collection and presentation of the contents of the candidate’s RPT file is shared by the Department Head and the Candidate as listed on that form.

B. The Personnel Committee may recommend changes or clarification to items in the RPT file during the Committee’s review of the RPT file. Should there not be sufficient time to incorporate the recommended changes or should changes be too substantive, the Personnel Committee may recommend that the action be deferred, except in those cases where mandatory consideration is required.

C. All faculty members of any rank may provide directly to the personnel committee written input regarding any other faculty member’s RPT action. The input received will be addressed in the committee’s written recommendation to the Department Head.

D. External Peer Reviews

1. All External Peer Reviews must be handled in a confidential manner.

2. Criteria for Selection of External Peer Reviewers

   a. The Department prefers that External Peer Reviewers have professional or academic experience such that they are able to understand and appreciate the role of the candidate at OSU. These may include professional theatre practitioners or academics within the candidate’s discipline from universities and departments of similar size, scope, and mission.
b. The External Peer Reviewers should be persons who are recognized as reputable scholars and/or artists in the field of theatre and should have no direct professional or personal interest in the advancement of the candidate’s career, such as advisor, mentor, or co-author.

c. In the case of promotion and tenure of an Assistant Professor, all External Peer Reviewers must hold a tenured position at the rank of Associate Professor or Professor or have equivalent professional experience. In the case of the promotion of an Associate Professor to Professor, the External Peer Reviewers must hold the rank of Professor or have equivalent professional experience.

3. Selection Process of External Peer Reviewers

a. By April 1 of the academic year prior to the year the candidate plans to apply for promotion and /or tenure, the candidate and the Personnel Committee, including the Department Head, will each generate a ranked list of 5 or more possible External Peer Reviewers. According to OSU policy, the candidate may also specify the names of persons who should NOT be considered as possible reviewers. These lists will be reviewed by the Department Head and the Chairperson for appropriateness of selection based on each of the Reviewer’s field of expertise and knowledge or relationship to the candidate. The Department Head and Chairperson together will select 5 External Peer Reviewers from the two lists, being sure to include at least 2 names from each of the original lists. The Department Head will contact the selected reviewers and request their participation in the RPT process for the candidate. If a reviewer declines the invitation to serve, an alternate reviewer from the combined lists will be selected. The final list of names for External Peer Reviewers shall be confidential and not revealed to the candidate.

b. Once the list of External Peer Reviewers is finalized, the candidate will assemble the evidence for review, hereafter referred to as the candidate’s dossier, to be sent to the External Peer Reviewers. The dossier differs from the complete RPT file in that it contains pertinent summaries and examples of the candidate’s evidence. In September of the academic year in which the candidate applies for promotion and/or tenure, the candidate will give the dossier to the Department Head who in turn will forward it to the reviewers.

c. The candidate will be given the option of waiving all access to the written peer evaluations. Final instructions submitted to the
External Peer Reviewers will disclose whether or not the candidate has waived access to the review, and a copy of the waiver will be provided to each of them.

d. After the selection of External Peer Reviewers has been finalized, any communication with these external reviewers will be limited exclusively to the Department Head.

e. The Department Head will facilitate the External Peer Review process and will be responsible for communicating review instructions and collecting review letters. Copies of letters of instruction shall be provided to the candidate and included in the RPT file.

f. All strongly positive or negative comments in any of the External Peer Review letters must be addressed in the Personnel Committee’s recommendation letter. Letters of recommendation from the Committee or from the Head should make no references (name, institution, etc.) that would allow identification of External Peer Reviewers when the candidate has waived the right to see the peer review letters.

4. Required Peer Reviews by rank.

a. External Peer Reviews are not required for reappointment at the same rank.

b. As Clinical Faculty appointments do not require research or creative activity as part of the job description or annual Appraisal and Development process, External Peer Reviewers are not required for any promotion at the Clinical Faculty rank.

c. Reappointment to Assistant Professor
External Peer Reviews are not required for reappointment at the same rank. However, external peer evaluations used for Annual Appraisal and Development may be included and considered in the reappointment process.

d. Tenure and Promotion to Associate Professor
The university requires a minimum of three External Peer Reviews for tenure and promotion to the rank of Associate Professor. For faculty members whose primary form of creative/research activity is in the area of performance or production, the RPT file must contain at least one additional external peer evaluation of creative activity in support of a production since Reappointment.
e. Promotion to Full Professor
The university requires a minimum of five External Peer Reviews for promotion to the rank of Full Professor; the reviews assess work since promotion to Associate Professor. For faculty members whose primary form of creative/research activity is in the area of performance or production, at least two additional external peer evaluations of creative activity in support of a production must have been conducted since the time of tenure and promotion.

VI. Evaluative Terms for Performance Evaluation

A major component of the candidate’s RPT file will be the annual Appraisal and Development evaluations (“A&Ds”) furnished to the candidate by the Department Head in consultation with departmental faculty. The A&Ds give descriptions of the candidate’s accomplishments or deficiencies in applicable areas, namely teaching, research and creative activity, service, and clinical care. Section XII below details the Academic Unit Standards and their ranking by scale as adopted by the Department of Theatre for the purposes of evaluation. Candidates’ performance in the applicable areas will be evaluated according to the evaluative terms and their rank in scale:

1. Unsatisfactory, defined as unacceptable, inadequate, or below department expectations

2. Good, defined as meeting department expectations

3. Excellent, defined as above department expectations

4. Outstanding, defined as well above departmental expectations

VII. Required A&D Rating for Purposes of Reappointment, Promotion, and Tenure

A. All tenured and tenure-track candidates will be evaluated in the areas of Teaching, Research and Creative Activity, and Service.

B. All clinical faculty candidates will be evaluated similarly to tenure-track faculty but primarily in clinical teaching and clinical care activities (2-0903, 2.02). Any activities in service and research will be evaluated as above expectation, but no service or research activities will replace or be given prominence over teaching and clinical care.

C. Reappointment at Assistant Professor

a. To be reappointed at the rank of Assistant Professor the candidate must show consistent performance at the rank of “Excellent” in
two areas of evaluation, preferably teaching and research and creative activity, and a minimum of “Good” in the third.

b. At the time of reappointment the candidate must also demonstrate strong potential to be promoted to Associate Professor, to be granted tenure, and to continue a strong trajectory of teaching, research and creative activity, and service.

D. Tenure and Promotion to Associate Professor

a. To be tenured and promoted to Associate Professor the candidate must show consistent performance at “Excellence” in two areas of evaluation and a minimum of “Good” in the third area since the time of reappointment.

b. Promotion in rank is granted only when there is reasonable assurance that the faculty member will continue to meet the academic unit standards adequate for promotion. The candidate must demonstrate the promise of a continued trajectory of strong teaching, research and creative activity, and service.

E. Promotion to Professor

a. To be promoted to Professor, the candidate must show a minimum of “Outstanding” in one area of evaluation and a consistent performance of “Excellence” in the other two areas.

b. The candidate must show consistently strong contributions to the profession in the years since tenure.

c. Promotion to Professor does not award time spent at Associate Professor but rather a sustained level of excellent achievement.

F. Promotion to Clinical Assistant Professor

a. A Clinical Instructor may apply for promotion to Clinical Assistant Professor after five years of employment. No early promotion will be allowed.

b. For promotion, Clinical Instructors must be consistently rated at “Excellent” in one of the two categories of evaluation, and at a minimum of “Good” in the other.
G. Promotion to Clinical Associate Professor

a. A Clinical Assistant Professor may apply for promotion to Clinical Associate Professor after four years at the rank of Clinical Assistant Professor. No early promotion will be allowed.

b. For promotion, Clinical Assistant Professors must be consistently rated at “Excellent” in both of the two categories of evaluation.

H. Promotion to Clinical Professor

a. A Clinical Associate Professor may apply for promotion to Clinical Professor after four years at the rank of Clinical Associate Professor. No early promotion will be allowed.

b. For promotion, Clinical Associate Professors must be consistently rated at “Outstanding” in one of the two categories of evaluation, and at a minimum of “Excellent” in the other.

VIII. Evaluation of Teaching for Clinical, Tenure-track, and Tenured Faculty

A. While many factors contribute to a faculty member’s recognition as an effective educator, evaluation of a candidate’s teaching will focus significantly upon the following areas:

1. Knowledge of Subject matter
2. Teaching methodology
3. Development and revision of courses
4. Supervision and mentorship of students

B. The materials used for evaluation may include:

1. Written Peer Review Teaching Evaluations of the candidate by Department Peer Reviewers
   a. All faculty, including tenured, tenure-track, and clinical, must be reviewed by a Department Peer Reviewer once each semester (see Peer Teaching Review Guidelines).
2. Teaching materials and teaching portfolio
3. Annual Appraisal and Development evaluations
4. Student teaching evaluations expressly designed for the purpose of faculty review, which can only be considered as partial assessment of the faculty’s teaching.

C. The candidate’s Teaching Portfolio could include, but is not limited to, the following evidence:

1. Samples of syllabi, including TH 1500, TH 2500, TH 3500, and Independent Study courses, etc.; class schedules; and course outlines per class; with explanations of revisions in content, organization, and presentation of material

2. Sample examinations and projects

3. Sample grading scales and rubrics for evaluating student work

4. Honors contracts and participation on thesis and creative component committees

5. Self-evaluation and assessment of teaching philosophy, methodology and classroom procedures

IX. Evaluation of Research and Creative Activity Activities

A. While research and creative activity for theatre artists and scholars take many forms, primary evidences for Research and Creative Activity for the Department of Theatre include activities in support of production, publication, and conference participation.

1. The Department of Theatre expects tenured and tenure-track faculty to be working theatre artists and scholars who model professional standards and activities both on- and off-campus.

2. It is the responsibility of the candidate to note the importance or value of each venue and activity undertaken.

B. The materials used for evaluation could include, but is not limited to:

1. External or published reviews of the candidate’s Research and Creative Activity, both on- and off-campus

2. Departmental peer review of the candidate’s Research and Creative Activity activities

3. Yearly Appraisal and Development evaluations
4. Written evaluations of the quality of work from organizations or individuals to whom Research and Creative Activity activities were provided

5. Funding applied for and awarded. External awards will be more highly regarded by the committee than funding provided by the university.

6. Documentation and/or written reviews of the quality of papers and workshops presented at conferences and professional venues.

7. Documented mentorship of students, including thesis and creative component supervision

C. For evaluation of evidence the following criteria will be considered:

1. Preference is given to peer-reviewed journals and publications over non-juried work.

2. The regional, national, and international regard of the professional venues of creative activities or conferences of presentations will be taken into consideration when reviewing activities at those venues

3. Letters and reviews unsolicited by the candidate will be more highly regarded than solicited letters and reviews

4. Growth and quality of the candidate's Research and Creative Activity

X. Evaluation of Service Activities

A. The Oklahoma State University Policy and Procedures 2-0110, Procedures to Govern Workload Assignments of Faculty Members, defines service rather broadly and includes such forms of service as extension, public service, university service, and professional development. Assignment of service occurs on the departmental level and assignments must take into consideration availability of resources and all faculty members' workloads in other areas. Service typically demands the smallest percentage of effort of the three primary areas of evaluation.

B. Service is not a formal area of evaluation for clinical faculty, although service performed by clinical faculty may be taken into consideration in addition to services rendered in teaching and clinical care.

C. Because of the value placed on teaching and research and creative activity, tenure-track faculty by necessity will shoulder proportionally less service requirements than tenured faculty. It is the responsibility of the Department
Head to protect tenure track faculty from excessive service assignments that may impede progress towards tenure.

D. Types of service typically recognized and evaluated by departments of theatre at peer institutions are: department, college, and university service; professional service; and community service.

E. Department Service. Candidates are expected to participate in Department Service annually unless on sanctioned university leave. Areas of Department Service may include:

1. Serving on standing and ad hoc committees
2. Serving in Assigned Administrative Positions such as Graduate Coordinator, Head of Performance, Head of Design/Tech, or other titled positions.
3. Serving as faculty advisor to student organizations
4. Serving in a recruitment capacity
5. Assisting in departmental business, i.e., audience and alumni relations, communications, etc.

F. College Service: Candidates are expected to participate in College Service regularly. College Service may include:

1. Service on a standing or ad hoc council or committee or other assignments on the college level.
2. Activities that benefit the College such as Extension endeavors, Alumni and Public Relations, Advisor for non-departmental Student Organizations, technical support for annual College Congress, etc.
3. Serving as an Academic Integrity Facilitator

G. University Service: Candidates are expected to participate in University Service regularly. University Service may include:

1. Service on a standing or ad hoc university council or committee or other assignments on the university level.
2. Activities that benefit the University such as Extension endeavors, Alumni and Public Relations, Advisor for non-departmental Student Organizations,
H. Professional Service: Candidates are expected to provide service to their professional organizations. Professional Service may include but is not limited to:

1. Serving as an officer, conference planner or committee/commission member, and other service positions for professional organizations
2. Serving as an editor for a reputable scholarly journal
3. Serving as an External Peer Reviewer for manuscripts or another university’s RPT Action
4. Serving as an adjudicator for a professional or university theatrical performance outside OSU
5. Serving as a consultant for a theatre venue outside OSU
6. Serving as a judge or script reader for a play competition or a professional theatre’s literary department
7. Serving in external review of peer institutions, departments, or faculty (NAST, RPT, etc.)

I. Community Service. In support of the University’s land-grant mission, faculty are expected to share their expertise with the community and state. Community Service may include but is not limited to:

1. Judging community or high school competitions
2. Adjudicating community or high school productions
3. Advising schools or organizations
4. Providing workshops or other forms of training
5. Hosting organizations in the OSU Theatre facilities

XI. Evaluation of Clinical Care

A. Clinical Faculty candidates will be evaluated on the following clinical care activities:

1. Maintenance, repair, and cleanliness of the laboratory for which they are responsible.
2. Maintenance, repair, and cleanliness of equipment in the laboratory for which they are responsible

3. Maintenance and cleanliness of storage areas associated with the laboratory for which they are responsible

4. Management of the budget for the laboratory for which they are responsible, if assigned

5. Management and supervision of personnel, i.e., lab students and hired labor

6. Management of the rental of items in the laboratory for which they are responsible, if assigned

7. Keeping current in advances in the field’s practices

8. Practice of established safety procedures

9. Completion of all other assigned duties

XII. Academic Unit Standards

The following academic unit standards shall be employed by the Department in all Appraisal and Development (A&D) annual reviews. In order to earn the rating of unsatisfactory, good, excellent, or outstanding, a faculty member need not meet all of the criteria listed for each category, but rather meet sufficient criteria that demonstrate attainment of a category in the opinion of departmental peers. The criteria listed are by no means exhaustive.

A. Teaching

1. Unsatisfactory
   - Course syllabi lack university or departmental required information
   - Does not provide syllabi to Theatre Office in timely fashion (start of every semester)
   - Neglects to use D2L (or current university system) in appropriate courses for course assignments and student communication
   - Employs dated teaching tools or relays dated content
   - Does not report required 6-week or final grades by deadlines
   - Student evaluations below departmental mean
   - Department Peer Review Teaching Evaluation at the rank of Unsatisfactory for the past academic year
   - Misses a significant number of classes or is habitually late
   - Is habitually unprepared for daily lessons
   - Does not make provision for missed classes
Does not participate in the assessment of courses or does not make improvements to courses
- Does not keep office hours
- Presents an incomplete or inadequate teaching portfolio (see §V. D.)
- Does not return graded projects, assignments, papers, or tests in a timely manner
- Does not provide students with adequate written directions for completing, or methods of evaluation for, projects, assignments, papers, or tests

2. Good
- Course syllabi complete with university and departmental required information
- Provides syllabi to Theatre Office in timely fashion (start of every semester)
- Uses D2L (or current university system) in appropriate courses for course assignments and student communication
- Employs current teaching tools (smart classroom technology, Dropbox, etc.) if applicable
- Has knowledge of and utilizes current trends in the field
- Reports required 6-week and final grades by deadlines
- Student evaluations at departmental mean
- Department Peer Review Teaching Evaluation at the rank of Good
- Makes provision for missed classes
- Participates in assessments and makes improvements to courses
- Keeps office hours and is available to students out of class
- Presents a complete and satisfactory teaching portfolio (see §V. D.)
- Returns graded projects, assignments, papers, and tests in a timely manner
- Provides students with adequate written directions and methods of evaluation for projects, assignments, papers, or tests

3. Excellent
Meets the criteria sufficient for a rating of Good and in addition:
- Uses novel or innovative teaching methods
- Sponsors guest artists in classes
- Acts as guest lecturer or artist on campus
- Sponsors and organizes field trips
- Takes pedagogical workshops or workshops to enhance teaching
- Student evaluations above departmental mean
- Department Peer Review Teaching Evaluation at the rank of Excellent
- Creates a positive atmosphere in class
4. Outstanding

Meets the criteria sufficient for a rating of Good and in addition either satisfies multiple criteria satisfactory for Excellent or:

- Wins a teaching award
- Receives invitation to present on pedagogy at a conference
- Acts as guest lecturer or artist off campus or at another university
- Students consistently ask for more classes from said teacher or find ways to work with him/her in course practica
- Instills students with a genuine love and/or respect for the subject matter

B. Research and Creative Activity

1. Unsatisfactory

- No research or creative activity presented
- No research or creative activity in progress
- Creative activity in support of a departmental production was of poor or mediocre quality in the majority opinion of departmental peers
- Does not meet with, or provides inadequate mentorship to, assigned students for mentorship

2. Good

- Research or creative activity in progress
- Paper or workshop presented, or roundtable participation, at a professional conference
- Creative activity in support of a departmental production that was novel or innovative in the opinion of departmental peers
- Creative activity in support of a departmental production received outside adjudication with a positive evaluation
- Provides adequate mentorship to assigned students for mentorship

3. Excellent

- Publication of a peer-reviewed article in a reputable journal
- Creative activity in support of a professional production with positive written evaluation
- Creative activity in support of a production at a peer or better institution with positive written evaluation
- Invitation to present a paper at a professional conference
- Successful grant writing and funding
- Mentors students beyond those assigned (for example non-majors)
- Assists students in applying for internships
- Invites students to participate in current research project or professional creative activities
- Participates in an interdisciplinary project with other units on campus or elsewhere
4. Outstanding
- Creative activity in support of a professional production at a major national or international venue with positive written evaluation
- Publishes a scholarly book (preferably a monograph) or play with adequate peer review at a reputable press
- Publishes multiple peer-reviewed articles in a year
- Wins a research or creative activity award
- Participates in an interdisciplinary project with other units on campus or elsewhere that results in publication or public performance

C. Service

1. Unsatisfactory
- Does not volunteer to serve on any departmental, college, or university committees
- Does not assist with recruitment efforts
- Does not share expertise with local or state constituencies
- Does not assist in departmental business, i.e., audience and alumni relations, communications, etc.

2. Good
- Serves constructively on at least one departmental, college, or university committee
- Assists with recruitment efforts
- Shares expertise with local or state constituencies in the form of judging competitions, adjudicating productions, advising schools or organizations, providing workshops, etc.
- Assists in departmental business, i.e., audience and alumni relations, communications, etc.

3. Excellent
Meets criteria sufficient for a rating of Good and in addition:
- Serves constructively on or chairs a major college or university committee necessitating appointment or election, i.e., OSU Faculty Council, etc.
- Successfully chairs a departmental, college, or university committee
- Serves as departmental Area Head, i.e. Head of Performance or Head of Design/Tech
- Assists with two or more recruitment events
- Effectively advises student organization(s)
- Holds an office in a regional professional organization
- Shares expertise nationally or internationally as in consulting or other similar activity
4. Outstanding
Meets the criteria sufficient for a rating of Good and in addition either satisfies multiple criteria satisfactory for Excellent or:
- Holds an office in a national or international professional organization
- Serves as editor or contributing editor of a reputable scholarly journal
- Serves in external review of peer institutions, departments, or faculty (NAST, RPT, etc.)

D. Clinical Care

1. Unsatisfactory
- Disregards maintenance, repair, and cleanliness of laboratory
- Disregards maintenance, organization, and cleanliness of storage areas
- Disregards maintenance, repair, and cleanliness of equipment
- Neglects assigned duties
- Neglects advances in the field’s practices
- Neglects safety procedures
- Does not effectively communicate with other production areas
- Poor accounting of expenses and/or revenue, if applicable
- Poor management of rental items, if applicable
- Poor management of personnel, i.e., lab students and hired labor, if applicable
- Habitually over budget in expenses, if applicable

2. Good
- Timely and satisfactory maintenance, repair, and cleanliness of laboratory
- Timely and satisfactory maintenance, organization, and cleanliness of storage areas
- Timely and satisfactory maintenance, repair, and cleanliness of equipment
- Keeps current in advances in the field’s practices
- Practices adequate safety procedures
- Efficiently completes assigned duties
- Effectively communicates with other production areas
- Timely, clear, and sufficient accounting of expenses and/or revenue, if applicable
- Timely and satisfactory management of rental items, if applicable
- Efficient management of personnel, i.e., lab students and hired labor, if applicable
- Meets budget in expenses, if applicable
3. Excellent
Meets criteria sufficient for a rating of Good and in addition:
- Creates a positive working atmosphere in the laboratory
- Anticipates and solves unforeseen problems in space, storage, equipment, and personnel
- Resourceful within budget constraints
- Updates current safety practices to higher than required.
- Consistently works to improve skill level of student work force.
- Consistently communicates well with other production areas as well as visiting artists

4. Outstanding
Meets the criteria sufficient for a rating of Good and in addition either satisfies multiple criteria satisfactory for Excellent or:
- Wins an award or distinction in field
- Assists in the successful grant writing and funding
- Develops documented or disseminated advances in the field's practices
- Creates improvements in the accounting of expenses and/or revenue
- Acts as point person for visiting artists or invites visiting artists to campus
- Participates in a partnership of creativity with design faculty in planning and executing production work
APPENDIX A  
TIMELINES AND DUE DATES  

The Following are approximate dates by which the various stages of evaluation should begin or end. A calendar will be established by the Chair of the Personnel Committee and the Department Head prior to the consideration of each case.

I. REAPPOINTMENT & CLINICAL PROMOTION

   A. Notification by Department Head to candidate and Chairperson of the Personnel Committee (SEPTEMBER 1).

   B. Formation of the Personnel Committee for that action (SEPTEMBER 15, if not already appointed by MARCH 15 of year prior to consideration).

   C. Candidate’s submission of RPT file to the Chair for completion (November 1).

   D. Submission of candidate’s RPT file to Personnel Committee for review (NOVEMBER 15).

   E. Written input from departmental faculty at any rank to the Personnel Committee (November 15).

   F. Personnel Committee’s recommendation, along with candidate’s files, sent to Department Head and also to the candidate (DECEMBER 15).

   G. Department Head’s recommendation, along with the Personnel Committee’s recommendation, sent to candidate. A copy of the Department Head’s recommendation is also sent to the Personnel Committee (JANUARY 25).

   H. Candidate’s RPT file sent to the Dean of the College (FEBRUARY 1).

II. MANDATORY TENURE AND PROMOTION

   A. Faculty elects a Chair of the Personnel Committee (by MARCH 1 of year prior to consideration)

   B. Faculty elects Members-at-Large of Personnel Committee (by MARCH 15 of year prior to consideration).

   C. Notification by Department Head to candidate and Chairperson of the Personnel Committee (MARCH 15 of the year prior to consideration).

   D. External Peer Reviewers identified (APRIL 1)

   E. Candidate’s submission of RPT file to the Chair for completion of external
peer review dossier (OCTOBER 1).

F. Submission of candidate’s RPT file to Personnel Committee, with external peer review letters, for review (NOVEMBER 15).

G. Written input from departmental faculty at any rank to the Personnel Committee (November 15).

H. Personnel Committee’s recommendation, along with candidate’s files, sent to Department Head (DECEMBER 15).

I. Department Head’s recommendation, along with the Personnel Committee’s recommendation, sent to candidate. A copy of the Department Head’s recommendation is also sent to the Personnel Committee (JANUARY 25).

J. Candidate’s files sent to the Dean of the College (FEBRUARY 1).

III. REQUEST FOR EARLY TENURE AND PROMOTION CONSIDERATION OR REQUEST FOR PROMOTION TO FULL PROFESSOR

A. Request for early Tenure and/or Promotion actions must be sent to the Department Head and Chairperson of the Personnel Committee no later than March 15 of the year prior to the year that consideration is to take place.

B. The timeline for early Tenure and/or Promotion and Promotion to Full Professor shall be the same as that of MANDATORY TENURE AND PROMOTION (II. above).
APPENDIX B
SAMPLE LETTER OF INVITATION TO SERVE AS AN EXTERNAL PEER REVIEWER VIA MAIL OR E-MAIL

Date

Name
Address
City, State Zip

Dear Professor XYZ:

You have been identified as a potential external reviewer for Prof. EX who is currently under consideration for (Tenure and/or Promotion to Rank) in the Department of Theatre at Oklahoma State University. I would like to request your assistance with this matter. Should you agree to serve as a reviewer, I would supply you with the candidate’s credentials as well as other pertinent materials by mid-October and request that we receive your written evaluation of the candidates work no later than______.

Would you be kind enough to indicate your willingness to serve in this capacity and if so, could you please inform us of your current relationship to the candidate and under what circumstances you know his/her work?

Thanks in advance for your assistance in this important task.

Sincerely,

Andrew Kimbrough
Head of Theatre
APPENDIX C
SAMPLE LETTER OF INSTRUCTIONS TO PEER REVIEWERS

Date:

Name
Address
City, State Zip

Dear Professor:

Thank you for agreeing to serve as an external peer reviewer for Faculty X. Prof. X is under consideration for (Tenure) (and/or) Promotion to (Associate/Full Professor) in the Department of Theatre at OSU. Prof. X is generally responsible for teaching (area of specialization) as well as (primary production responsibilities) in our Department.

As you are regarded as a leading scholar/artist in theatre, we would appreciate your assistance in evaluating Prof. X's record by providing us with a written assessment of Prof. X's work. Your input will be significant, but will not be the only information considered by the faculty personnel committee on this matter. As part of your assessment we ask that you comment on the following:

1. Please describe the extent to which you know the candidate and the circumstances under which you have come to know his/her work.

2. Specific strengths and weaknesses of the candidate’s research/creative work.

3. The degree of creativity and originality of the work and its significance within the field.

4. How the candidate compares with others in this field with similar training and experience.

5. How you would categorize this candidate’s performance: below average, above average, or outstanding, compared to others in this field at a similar point in their careers.

The Departmental Personnel Committee will conduct the evaluation of Prof. X’s teaching. However, if you feel that the vitae or other materials provided suggest any strengths or deficiencies that might affect classroom teaching, we would be glad to know of these.

I have included the following materials for your review: 1. a curriculum vita; 2. a faculty workload summary; 3. a statement in which the candidate explains his/her scholarly and professional accomplishments, the goals that have guided him/her, and his/her future research agenda; and 5. other materials specific to the Professor’s area of research/creative activities.
I ask that, along with your assessment letter, you also provide us with your vita or a short biography, which I must provide in abbreviated form for inclusion in the document sent forward to the Dean and Tenure and Promotion Committee of the College of Arts and Sciences at OSU. I would like to have these materials prior to DROP DEAD DATE if possible. Prof. X has/has not waived his/her right to review your written assessment of his/her work.

If I can answer any further questions for you regarding this process, please feel free to contact me. Thanks again for your assistance in this matter.

Sincerely,

Andrew Kimbrough
Head of Theatre