Department of: SCHOOL OF THEATRE : DANCE
Year: 2016 - 2017

1) Department Chair:

[Signature] 4.20.16

2) Dean:

[Signature] 4/29/16

3) Chair, UM Unit Standards Committee:

[Signature] 6/15/18

4) Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs:

[Signature] 7/17/18
SCHOOL OF THEATRE & DANCE UNIT STANDARDS

FACULTY EVALUATION AND ADVANCEMENT

This statement focuses primarily upon the procedures and standards for evaluation of the faculty of the School of Theatre & Dance and assures the context of the current Collective Bargaining Agreement (CBA), especially Articles 9 and 10. For full details of the University evaluation procedures (Student Evaluation Committee, Faculty Evaluation Committee, Director(s)’ Review, Dean’s Review, Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs’ Review, appeals procedures, routing procedures and deadlines), faculty should study the CBA. The unit standards and procedures discussed below are intended to be in addition to and consistent with those provided in the current Collective Bargaining Agreement (CBA), and in the event of any omissions or inconsistencies, the terms of the Collective Bargaining Agreement shall prevail.

Overview of the Advancement Process of the School of Theatre & Dance for Tenured and Probationary Appointments

CRITERIA FOR FACULTY ADVANCEMENT

Full-time faculty should be evaluated on the basis of their assigned duties and any terms specified in the letter of appointment. The CBA and these Unit Standards define the expectations for teaching, research/creative scholarship, and service. These expectations will be used by the Faculty Evaluation Committee (FEC), Director(s), Dean and Provost as the basis for assessing the quality of teaching, research/creative scholarship, and service and to assess progress toward the achievement of tenure and promotion.

General Timetable for Advancement

During the first Faculty/Staff Meeting of the spring term prior to the evaluation year, the Unit will elect the Faculty Evaluation Committee (FEC). The FEC will elect a chair. The committee chair will select a student representative to the FEC. In the following fall, all faculty members should indicate whether they need to be evaluated and specify what type of action, if any, they are seeking (Normal, Merit, Tenure, or Promotion).

During the fall semester of the evaluation year, the following deadlines will be met:

- October 15: Student Evaluation Committee (SEC) reports are due to the FEC. All letters, IPRs, and supporting documentation are due in the School office via the approved submission model
- November 15: FEC reports are due to the School Director(s)
- December 15: Director(s)’ evaluations are due to the Dean of the College of Visual and Performing Arts
- February 15: Dean’s evaluations are due to the Provost
Full professors who are tenured, in accordance with CBA 10.340, are reviewed every three years, and Associate Professors every two years, for “normal salary increments.” See CBA for details.

Eligibility and Documentation for Advancement

A faculty member may request consideration for tenure, promotion, merit, or a normal salary increment if they think the School and CBA criteria have been met. Each member of the School eligible for evaluation will prepare an Individual Performance Record (IPR) in accordance with CBA 10.210. The IPR, with any additional documentation, will comprise the evaluation file of the individual faculty member to be reviewed by the FEC, the Director(s), the Dean, and the Provost.

FACULTY EVALUATION COMMITTEE (FEC)

The FEC is a critical part of the faculty governance process in each school/department. Through the FEC, the faculty has an essential role in monitoring the professional development of individual faculty, as well as in guiding the developmental quality of the faculty as a whole. The strength of the faculty is a significant determinant of the quality of the programs being offered to students; therefore, faculty serving on this committee should have the perspective of the whole school’s growth and development at heart. Serving on the FEC is a serious responsibility and those selected to it need to recognize that it will take time and a commitment to the task.

The intent of this committee is to guide, direct, and assist faculty in their professional advancement, as well as serve the School of Theatre & Dance in its continuous commitment to improve the creative, teaching, and learning environment for the students who choose to attend the program.

By consensus of the unit, the FEC of the School of Theatre & Dance will be comprised of three tenured or tenure-track faculty members elected annually by the tenured/tenure-track faculty of the School of Theatre & Dance. At least two members of the FEC must be tenured. When possible, there will be one representative from each of the following areas: Dance, Design & Technology, and Performance & Practice. If appropriate, a fourth member shall be a faculty member at-large. Those faculty serving must hold an appointment of at least .5 FTE. The FEC shall be elected by the tenured/tenure-track faculty at the first Faculty/Staff Meeting of each spring term and serve for a year until a new FEC is elected. A student observer will be appointed each year by the FEC chair in consultation with the FEC and shall be representative of students in the School’s programs. The student observer will have full rights of participation save voting.

The FEC will elect its chair from the voting membership of the FEC and this faculty member will chair all meetings of the FEC as well as all meetings of the tenured/tenure-track faculty of the School pertaining to matters of normal salary increments, merits, promotions, and tenures.

FORMAL REVIEW BY FEC

During the formal review, the FEC will review the performance of each faculty member in the School in accordance with the School’s Unit Standards and the University-wide criteria and procedures. The FEC will review each faculty member’s evaluation file including the IPR, the Student Evaluation Committee’s (SEC) report, and all other appropriate documentation. The FEC
may also request documentation or other evidence from the faculty member being evaluated; however, the faculty member is not required to comply with this request. The FEC may also receive or seek comment from any source relevant to the evaluation of any faculty member in the School, so long as the comment is relevant to the approved Unit Standards and so long as the faculty member to whom the comment pertains is afforded full opportunity to review and respond to the statement (CBA 10.120). As stated in the CBA 10.230: “Any material solicited at this, or subsequent steps, must be made available to the individual being evaluated within five (5) days of its inclusion. The individual is given ten (10) days to prepare a written response, which becomes part of the evaluation record.”

After full deliberation, the FEC will prepare a written evaluation and recommendation for each faculty member. Each faculty member will receive a copy of their evaluation and recommendation and may request a discussion of the evaluation with the FEC. The faculty member under review is afforded full opportunity to review and respond.

Copies of the FEC’s final evaluation and recommendation for each faculty member will be signed by both the FEC chair and the faculty member and will be forwarded to the School’s Director(s) and the faculty member concerned by November 15. If the faculty member is in disagreement with the recommendation, they may directly appeal to the FEC in accordance with CBA 10.230.

The FEC must submit a final written listing of all formal actions it has taken to the full tenured/tenure-track faculty of the School of Theatre & Dance by December 1.

**STUDENT EVALUATION COMMITTEE (SEC)**

The role of the SEC is to provide meaningful feedback to the professor and the School regarding the quality of instruction provided by the professor. The SEC does not respond to any “requests for action or advancement by a faculty member.” Its task on an annual basis is to evaluate a faculty member’s abilities at teaching and to assess the quality of instruction offered based on student evaluations. Although student evaluations do not play a direct role in determining faculty advancement, they do collectively support or detract from such requests for action.

It is the policy of the School of Theatre & Dance to request evaluations of faculty performance by students. In order to ensure freedom of expression, SEC members shall be assured of the anonymity of their input without fear of faculty reprisal. No student may be penalized, harassed, approached, or denied fair treatment as a result of participation on the SEC. It will be the responsibility of the School’s Director(s) to maintain this policy.

Consistent with CBA 10.220, a Student Evaluation Committee of five of the School’s majors shall be appointed by the School’s Director(s) (in consultation with each program) with one representative from each of the following areas:

- Undergraduate programs: Dance, Design & Technology, and Performance & Practice
- Graduate programs: Design & Technology and Performance & Practice

Members of the SEC will elect their own chair from their membership.
The SEC also includes in its membership a faculty observer appointed by the School’s Director(s). When possible, this will be the FEC chair. They shall enjoy all rights of full participation and access to information except voting. Student evaluations shall be submitted by October 15 each year to the Administrative Associate III of the School of Theatre & Dance.

In order to assist members of the SEC in the successful completion of faculty evaluations, the School’s Director(s) will provide a list of guidelines and responsibilities at the first meeting. This will include, but not be limited to, the following:

1. A list containing the names of each faculty member to be evaluated and each faculty member’s teaching responsibilities for the year under review.
2. Photocopies of pages from that section of the current CBA dealing with the responsibilities and expectations of the SEC.

The committee shall review the teaching effectiveness of the faculty members in the bargaining unit who are in the academic unit for which the SEC is appointed. The unit shall either use an existing course evaluation form, prepare and use its own course evaluation form, or use the form prepared by the UFA Administration Committee and shall make all completed course evaluation forms available to the SEC by September 20. Each faculty member must have at least one course evaluated each semester they teach and provide the results to the SEC. The committee shall review course evaluations and may seek or receive relevant evidence from students who have taken courses from or have been advisees of the faculty member being evaluated. The committee shall prepare a written evaluation of the teaching and advising of each faculty member whose performance is reviewed. Each written evaluation shall be signed by the chairperson of the SEC and the faculty member being evaluated by October 15. A faculty member may append a response to the SEC report (CBA 10.220, p. 39).

The SEC shall neither review the documentation prepared by the faculty member nor have any responsibility for application of Unit Standards.

**SCHOOL’S DIRECTOR(S) EVALUATIONS**

In accordance with CBA 10.240, the School’s Director(s) will review the performance of each faculty member in the school, taking into account the faculty member’s evaluation file including the faculty preliminary review, the Faculty Evaluation Committee statement, and the Student Evaluation Committee statement. The Director(s) will prepare a separate evaluation of the performance of each individual faculty member.

The School’s Director(s) will make a written recommendation appropriate to the individual for each of the following areas. The names on the list of recommendations for merit increase will be ranked in order of priority by the School’s Director(s), taking into account the Director’s ratings (normal, above normal, outstanding) across the three areas of evaluation, teaching, creative research/scholarship, and service. Additionally, the School’s Director(s) will evaluate faculty and make recommendations regarding the following:

- Retention or non-retention
- Promotion
- Tenure
The Director(s) may also append any additional comments or recommendations relevant to faculty performance based on the Unit Standards and criteria from the perspective of the school’s Director(s).

The faculty member will receive and sign a copy of the Director(s)’s evaluation and recommendation. The faculty member’s signature on both the FEC recommendation and the Director(s)’ recommendation does not indicate agreement with the conclusions reached in each step of the evaluation process. If the need arises, individual faculty members may elect to formally request that the evaluation process be reviewed by initiating a formal appeals process as outlined in CBA 10.230 and 10.240.

The recommendations of the SEC, FEC and the School’s Director(s), together with the faculty member’s evaluation file, will be sent by the School’s Director(s) to the Dean of the College of Visual and Performing Arts (CVPA) by December 15.

For appeal procedures beyond the School level, please refer to the CBA 10.230 & 10.240. Restraints of the evaluations and appeals are prescribed CBA 10.300.

CRITERIA AND STANDARDS FOR EVALUATION OF FACULTY ADVANCEMENT

Any recommendation for tenure, promotion, or merit will address the three major areas of faculty responsibilities: teaching, research/creative scholarship, and service. The responsibility for providing evidence and documentation that they have met the School’s criteria for advancement and salary determination lies with the faculty member. The School assumes the professional expertise to judge the quality of the faculty member’s teaching, research/creative scholarship, and service. Faculty performance in teaching, research/creative scholarship, and service will be rated by the FEC, the Director(s), and the Dean as one of the following:

- Outstanding
- Above Normal
- Normal
- Less-than-Normal

Criteria for Evaluation of Teaching Effectiveness

The burden of bringing forward evidence of effectiveness as a teacher rests with the faculty member. Evidence may consist of reports of classroom visits by peers and colleagues, student evaluations of teaching effectiveness, and letters or reports supporting effective teaching from outside sources. Such letters, reports, and evaluations will be evaluated by the FEC for the appropriateness, general knowledge, and expertise of the writer. The major factors taken into account in the evaluation of teaching effectiveness include:

A. Observation of Teaching by Peers

Effective teaching can be recognized by direct observation of the professor’s:

1. Choice of material (focus for the class)
2. Sense of order (priority of material) and general organizational abilities
3. Ability to create an environment receptive to learning and/or creative thinking for the students
4. Ability to observe, define, and communicate development or regression in the students
5. Fairness and thoroughness in examination and evaluation of their students
6. Excitement about and continued development in subject areas
7. Ability to excite and stimulate students
8. Ability to collaborate with colleagues in teaching and curriculum development
9. Ability to teach in varied formats: in the laboratory by model or demonstration; through the collaborative process of production; in large/small groups by lecture or leading discussions
10. Ability to advise and counsel students in their academic and creative development and their professional growth
11. Appropriate communication skills
12. Ability to articulate and achieve the stated outcomes designed for each course

**Note:** In accordance with CBA 6.200, each faculty member must submit a copy of their syllabi each semester for each course they teach to the School’s Administrative Associate.

**B. Evaluation by Observation of Student Development**

Effective teaching can, likewise, be identified by observation of the development and continued success of students who have worked with the faculty member under review. Specific improvements in student actors, dancers, directors, designers, technicians, choreographers, etc., who continue to work in the program, and who have worked directly with and/or under the tutelage of faculty members, should give evidence of teaching effectiveness.

**C. Evaluation by Review of Alumni**

A list of alumni who have worked with the faculty member under review, along with a factual statement of what these past students are presently doing in or directly related to the faculty member’s area of teaching specialization, can likewise be used as evidence of teaching effectiveness, if appropriate. Such a list need not be limited to the faculty member’s teaching experience solely with the University of Montana.

**D. Observation of Teaching Effectiveness in Creative Works**

It should be clearly noted that the production of public performance is considered an integral part of the teaching and training process. Consequently, faculty involvement in various productions will be evaluated for its specific teaching contribution. The faculty in the School of Theatre & Dance should use the production process to integrate and relate the various skills and principles developed in class settings.
E. Observation of Teaching Effectiveness as a Mentor/Supervisor of Student Creative Works

It is an expectation that faculty members in the School of Theatre & Dance will be assigned to mentor students involved in specific production assignments. Effective teaching in this area involves actively assisting the student in the creative process pertinent to their particular assignment. This could include, but is not limited to, preliminary discussions and analysis of the work to be produced and monitoring the ongoing process through the realization of the product. This will involve attendance at conceptual meetings, production meetings, and appropriate rehearsals as well as one-on-one consultations with the student. Ongoing assessment of the student’s work is an essential part of the mentoring relationship.

F. Student Evaluation

Effective teaching will also be evaluated by students in the program and in specific classes of the faculty member under review. Appropriate student evaluation feedback and procedures will be utilized in order to give direct evidence from the students as to the faculty member’s teaching effectiveness. CBA 10.220, stipulates that each faculty member must have at least one course evaluated each semester they teach and provide the results to the SEC.

G. Participation in General Education

Participation in undergraduate General Education, normally by teaching courses that satisfy General Education requirements, can also be used as evidence of teaching effectiveness.

The following are unit expectations for Normal, Above Normal, and Outstanding in the area of Teaching:

Normal: create clear and concise syllabi in line with CVPA guidelines; provide clear objectives, criteria and on-going assessment for the development of each individual student; teach effectively through methodologies appropriate to the class; provide evaluative evidence of teaching effectiveness through student evaluations; demonstrate continued growth in their subject area, i.e acting, dance, design, directing, general studies, and/or technology; foster a classroom environment consistent with the University of Montana’s policy on cultural diversity, respect for differences, and academic fairness; maintain regular office hours; mentor students at the undergraduate and graduate levels; perform teaching duties as assigned by program head.

Above Normal: meet expectations listed above for Normal plus significant activity in one of the following: design, develop, and implement a new course or program that significantly enhances opportunities for student learning; awards or recognition for teaching at the collegiate or regional level; outreach to other organizations or departments (e.g., guest lectures, demonstrations, performances and collaborations); serve as instructor of record for a practicum course, thereby combining teaching and artistic practice in a leadership capacity; sponsor visiting scholars; serve as rehearsal director for guest-artist choreography; or organize field experiences. Significant activity may include one of the above but is not limited to this list.
Outstanding: meet expectations listed above for Normal and Above Normal plus significant activity in one additional activity as listed for Above Normal.

Criteria for Evaluation of Research/Creative Scholarship

All faculty members of the School of Theatre & Dance, in accordance with their area of professional specialization, are expected to participate regularly in the creative work of the School. The intent of this expectation is twofold: that the faculty will continue to practice and develop in their work as creative artists, and that their ongoing creative contribution will serve to both better the quality of productions in the School and to provide, by example, a model for students. The School acknowledges that creative scholarship ranks equally with research and scholarly production CBA 6.210. Consequently, creative scholarship will receive equal consideration for promotion, tenure, and merit.

The individual’s area of professional specialization is determined by job description and may include dancing, choreographing, directing, acting, designing, writing (creative), etc.

A. Documentation of Creative Work

The creative life of the School is of such importance that ongoing evaluations of creative work are necessary and desirable. Each tenured or tenure-track faculty member is encouraged to document creative work with letters, reviews, critiques, etc., as part of the yearly review process.

For untenured faculty in tenure-track positions, it is particularly important to build a well-documented file of creative work using the criteria suggested in this section and to submit this documentation annually as a part of the review process. The same is true for those seeking a merit increment or promotion.

The principal burden of bringing forward documentation of quality in creative work rests with the faculty member under review. Although quantity will not compensate for quality as the major value, all creative work (both on- and off-campus) will be considered in evaluations for the period under review. Additional material may be solicited by the FEC as part of the review process.

B. Criteria for Assessing Creative Work

Evidence of expertise in creative work can include the following:

1. Quality of Process
   a. Thorough and appropriate preparation and research
   b. Ability to offer imaginative thought to the developmental process
   c. Ability to articulately participate in/lead the collaborative process
   d. Organizational skills demonstrated throughout preparation, rehearsal, and performance

2. Quality of Product
   a. Conceptual integrity—product is well-interpreted, imaginative, innovative, self-consistent, and consistent with other elements of production
b. **Craftsmanship**—product is well-articulated, rendered, staged, danced, acted, written, etc., and demonstrates accomplished skills

**C. Criteria for Assessing Research**

Both creative work and conventional academic scholarship involve rigorous research. It may be used for public performance, publication, presentations, or new technology. Such contributions to the body of knowledge in the field may result in the following: books; chapters in books; encyclopedia entries; anthologies; lab manuals; articles in refereed journals; articles in non-refereed journals; papers/panels/presentations at appropriate meetings, conventions, conferences, etc.; book reviews; editing; research/project grants; creative and instructional media; and others. The evaluation of these activities will be affected by the stature of the publications, the nature of the materials published, and the significance of the professional papers, workshops, and panels, as deemed appropriate by the FEC.

**D. Documentation**

1. Letters of evaluation from colleagues, collaborators, knowledgeable audience, etc.
2. Professional critiques
3. Professional reviews
4. Self-assessment, including ability to account for a particular intent, approach, or process related to rehearsal/performance
5. Written/visual/auditory records

The following are unit expectations for Normal, Above Normal, and Outstanding in the area of Research/Creative Scholarship:

**Normal:** serve as an artist or craft member of a production team for a School of Theatre & Dance Mainstage Season or Studio Series production.

**Above Normal:** meet expectations listed above for **Normal** plus significant activity in one of the following: serve as an artist or craft member for a production team at professional, regional, national, and/or international level; collaborate with Theatre & Dance/CVPA productions that are outside of expected programmatic loads (e.g., *Odyssey of the Stars*, Opera Workshop, voice coaching, dramaturgy, direction, choreography for musicals, etc.); present peer-reviewed or invited performances, workshops, or lectures at conferences or festivals at professional, regional, national, and/or international level; premiere a new work at professional, regional, national, and/or international level; receive an invitation to contribute to a production or performance as an artistic member of the production team at professional, regional, national, and/or international level; present peer-reviewed or invited research or lectures at conferences, workshops, or festivals at the professional, regional, state, national, and/or international level; publish plays, books, reviews, articles, or papers at the professional, regional, state, national, and/or international level; apply for and receive grants on the local, University, state, or national level. Significant activity may include one of the above but is not limited to this list.
Outstanding: meet expectations listed above for Normal and Above Normal plus significant activity in one additional activity as listed for Above Normal.

Criteria for Evaluation of Service

Due to the nature of the discipline and the artistic expertise assembled in the School of Theatre & Dance, it is recognized by the faculty that service is both an opportunity and responsibility extending to the campus, the community, the state, and the region, both nationally and internationally. The burden of bringing forward evidence of service activities rests with the faculty member. Criteria for evaluation of such service can include:

1. Participation in fulfilling School needs, including occupying a school leadership and/or service office
2. Participation in professional organization(s)
3. Participation in faculty governance at the University of Montana through the Faculty Senate and/or its constituent committees and subcommittees
4. Active and productive participation in other campus committees
5. Conducting professional training, including workshops and seminars, for professionals in public education, business, industry, or government
6. Rendering professional service as a member of private or public boards or committees
7. Consulting or serving as a guest artist, compensated or uncompensated, that meets one or more of these criteria:
   a. Contributes to professional growth
   b. Contributes to the professional growth of students
   c. Creates positive publicity for the discipline and/or the University
   d. Brings new resources to the University
8. Outreach that translates the findings and knowledge of our specialty areas to a community outside of the University, including, but not limited to, public/private education, public lectures, presentations and demonstrations
9. Other significant public, community, or University service which contributes to professional growth and/or results in improvements in recruitment of students, retention of students, higher graduation rates, positive visibility of the University in the media, or acquisition of new University resources

The evaluation of the quality of the service efforts rendered by a faculty member should be made by the FEC as to its significance and worth for the faculty member, the School, the College and the University as a whole.

The following are unit expectations for Normal, Above Normal, and Outstanding in the area of Service:

Normal: regularly attend scheduled School meetings; serve on School-wide committees; represent the School or University in community and educational outreach; participate in appropriate and timely advising.

Above Normal: meet expectations listed above for Normal plus significant activity in one of the following: chair significant School, College, and/or University committees; organize recruitment
field experiences, opportunities, and special events; serve on committees at the state, regional, national, and/or international level; serve in a leadership role in a regional or national professional organization appropriate to one’s discipline; serve in a leadership role in the School; serve as a choreographer, director, voice coach, technician, designer, actor, dancer, dramaturg in a School, College, or University event that is outside of regular programmatic expectations. Significant activity may include one of the above but is not limited to this list.

Outstanding: meet expectations listed above for Normal and Above Normal plus significant activity in one additional activity as listed for Above Normal.

GENERAL CRITERIA FOR PROMOTION AND TENURE

IPRs should be prepared in accordance with CBA 10.210.

All promotions are based on evidence of continuing significant contributions to this institution by the applicant and are not considered to be the automatic consequence of years in rank.

At the heart of the School of Theatre & Dance mission is professional training in theatre and dance. Therefore, in accordance with national accrediting agency standards and depending on the faculty member’s area of specialization, terminal-degree status may include:

- In normal cases, a faculty member who holds a Ph.D. or MFA degree in theatre or dance from a fully accredited institution with established theatre or dance programs
- In exceptional cases, a faculty member who holds an MA degree from a fully accredited institution in theatre or dance and who has a significant professional resume and credentials to indicate a solid reputation for excellence in their professional work which is recognized by the FEC, the Director(s), and the Dean
- Again, in exceptional cases, a faculty member who has established significant professional status in theatre or dance and who has a continued, well-established, and recognized reputation for excellence in his/her professional work which is recognized by the FEC, the Director(s), and the Dean

Normal Promotion Criteria for Advancement from Instructor to Assistant Professor

1. Evidence of significant contributions at the School level
2. Possession of the terminal degree or the equivalent in the faculty member’s area of expertise

Normal Promotion Criteria for Advancement from Assistant Professor to Associate Professor

1. Possession of the terminal degree or the equivalent in the faculty member’s area of expertise
2. A minimum of four years’ rank, except in unusual circumstances; a recommendation for a promotion which will take effect after four years in rank must be based on meritorious achievement
3. Evidence of significant contributions to the School, College, and University by effective teaching, excellence of creative work, and effective service as outlined above

Normal Promotion Criteria for Advancement from Associate Professor to Professor

1. Possession of a terminal degree or its equivalent in the faculty member’s area of expertise
2. A minimum of five years in the rank of Associate Professor
3. Demonstrable evidence of continued satisfactory contributions to the School, College and University through effective teaching, creative excellence, and effective service, as for promotion to Associate Professor. It is recommended, but not obligatory, that faculty members applying for Professor supply a letter of recommendation from an outside reviewer who is engaged in similar work at another educational institution or professional company or work site.

University Standards for Faculty Advancement are outlined in CBA 10.110.

Tenure Criteria

A probationary faculty member is, in effect, evaluated for tenure and a contract renewal each year during the fall evaluation period. The School of Theatre & Dance has established a review process for probationary appointments that includes collaboration with the FEC of the School. This process is stated in CBA 9.310.

Recommendation for continuous tenure in the School of Theatre & Dance will be based on the following:

1. Possession of a terminal degree or its equivalent in the faculty member’s area of expertise
2. Completion of five years in academic rank, at least three of which must be at the University of Montana, before application for tenure
3. Achievement of the minimum academic rank of associate professor, except in unusual circumstances
4. Continued evidence of outstanding teaching effectiveness in the faculty member’s area of professional expertise
5. In accordance with CBA 9.320, demonstrated accomplishments and prospects for professional growth, activity in creative work and/or research, and/or involvement in professional societies, and/or receipt of grants, contracts, fellowships, and recognized public service. It is recommended, but not obligatory, that faculty members applying for tenure supply a letter of recommendation from an outside reviewer who is engaged in similar work at another educational institution or professional company or work site.

CRITERIA FOR SALARY DETERMINATION
(CBA 10.110)

A. Merit Award

Above-normal performance in at least two of the three areas—teaching, research/creative scholarship, and public service; or normal performance in at least two areas and outstanding performance or special recognition in at least one of these areas. The burden of bringing forward evidence of teaching effectiveness, research/creative scholarship, or public service activities rests on the faculty member.

B. Normal Increment

The performance of the majority of faculty members will generally be evaluated as normal. They will be expected to grow in value to the institution and will be rewarded with a normal increment to their salary.

C. Less-than-Normal Increment

A recommendation for Less-than-Normal may be given to a faculty member who consistently refuses to work in accord with School and/or University policies, is irresponsible in their teaching duties, or habitually lacks fitness to perform the duties expected of their position. A less-than-normal recommendation will lead to a tenure review (CBA 17.000).

It is understood that the absence of performance in any one or two of the areas of teaching, research/creative scholarship, and service does not justify a less-than-normal increment, if the quantity of performance in the remaining area or areas is proportional to the FTE of the appointment, if the quality of performance in the remaining area or areas is at least normal, and if the individual has assigned duties solely in the remaining area or areas.

Note: The Dean may recommend to the Provost any percentage of salary adjustment of a normal increment awarded in a given year that they determine as appropriate when a less-than-normal is awarded.

PROBATIONARY APPOINTMENT REVIEWS AND EVALUATIONS

In accordance with CBA 9.230, the criteria for a faculty member’s NON-REAPPOINTMENT is defined thus:

“A probationary appointee has no right to reappointment, and a probationary appointment shall automatically expire at the end of the specified term in absence of a written reappointment signed by the President. The President may request and review, but shall not be obligated to adhere to, recommendations from the unit, dean, and the Provost regarding questions of renewal of probationary appointments.

In cases of non-reappointment for financial or programmatic considerations, the probationary appointee will be so notified in writing. Written notice of non-renewal of
a probationary appointment shall be mailed or given by the President or their designee at least four (4) months prior to the expiration of the first appointment, seven (7) months prior to the expiration of the second appointment, and twelve (12) months prior to the expiration of the third or later appointment.”

Probationary Review and Evaluation Process

Individual faculty members are encouraged to review the rights of probationary appointments as outlined in CBA 9.200.

First-Year Probationary Appointments: The Director(s) of the School of Theatre & Dance, in consultation with appropriate program heads, will appoint a mentor to work with each first-year probationary faculty member. Mentors will advise new faculty on necessary documentation as well as the Unit Standards for normal activity in teaching, research/creative scholarship, and service. The Director(s) of the School of Theatre & Dance, in collaboration with the FEC, shall review each new probationary appointment (tenure-track) during their first year within the first four months.

If a letter of non-renewal is to be issued, the evaluation process of the FEC and the School’s Director(s) should be completed in sufficient time for the President to issue such a letter four (4) months prior to the end of the probationary appointee’s contract.

Second-Year Probationary Appointments: The FEC of the School of Theatre & Dance, in accordance with the Unit Standards of the School, will review second-year probationary appointments (tenure-track) and make a clear recommendation to the Director(s) as to whether a letter of renewal should be issued seven (7) months prior to the end of the second contract.

If a letter of non-renewal is to be issued, the evaluation process of the FEC and the School’s Director(s) should be completed in sufficient time for the President to issue such a letter seven (7) months prior to the end of the probationary appointee’s contract.

Third-Year and Later Probationary Appointments: The FEC of the School of Theatre & Dance, in accordance with the Unit Standards of the School, will review probationary appointments (tenure-track) in their third and subsequent years leading to tenure and make an annual recommendation as to whether a letter of appointment renewal should be issued. This review process will include all requested documentation within the Unit Standards of the School.

If a letter of non-renewal is to be issued, the process from the FEC and the School’s Director(s) should be completed in sufficient time for the President to issue such a letter twelve (12) months prior to the end of the probationary appointee’s contract.

NON-TENURABLE APPOINTMENTS

Non-tenurable appointments, also known as adjunct appointments, include four types: lecturers, adjunct faculty at any rank, research faculty at any rank, and visiting faculty at any rank. A non-tenurable appointment includes faculty members identified in University Policy 350, as well as
any appointment, however designated, not supported by a state-appropriated tenure-line position. Each faculty member appointed to a non-tenurable position shall be informed in writing by the Dean that the appointment is non-tenurable and therefore carries no expectation of reappointment.

Non-tenurable faculty in the School of Theatre & Dance will have student evaluations taken for each course they teach; the Director(s) of the School, in cooperation with the head of the program in which the non-tenurable faculty member teaches, will determine if a letter of reappointment is appropriate.

Rights of Non-Tenurable Appointees

In addition to the rights and privileges of non-tenurable appointments as are outlined in CBA 9.100 & 9.110, members of the bargaining unit holding non-tenurable appointments shall:

1. Hold an FTE assignment which represents the actual proportion of full-time load as determined by the Dean in consultation with the unit, taking into consideration expectations of teaching, research/creative scholarship, and service and their relationship to the Unit Standards

2. For initial appointment, and any subsequent reappointment, be hired at no less than at the salary floors (CBA 13.300), pro-rated by FTE

3. In the case of reappointment, have the normal increase in force for a given year (CBA 13.220) added to their salary (pro-rated by FTE)

Discharge for cause of non-tenurable faculty is governed by the procedures outlined in CBA 18.400.

Non-tenurable faculty who are bargaining-unit members and apply for non-tenurable appointments comparable to those they have already held shall be given special consideration for such appointments as follows: if, after applicable EO/AA compliance, two or more such faculty are equally qualified by degrees, teaching evaluations, and relevant experience in the discipline, the person with the most experience at UM shall be considered by the hiring authority as most qualified for the position. Any non-tenurable faculty member dismissed from a previous position for cause forfeits his or her seniority at the time of dismissal.