

EASTERN ILLINOIS UNIVERSITY

Office of the Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs

MEMORANDUM

Blair M. Lord
Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs

217-581-2121
blord@eiu.edu

To: James K. Johnson, Dean, College of Arts & Humanities

Date: September 29, 2008

Subject: DAC Revision Approval; Department of Theatre Arts

Consistent with Article 8.7.c. of the *2006-2010 EIU-UPI Unit A Agreement* (Agreement), the attached revised statement of Departmental Application of Criteria (DAC) is approved. This approval is consistent with your recommendation and is effective for evaluations commencing in January, 2009. As always, any reading of the DAC shall be consistent with the *Agreement* or its successor agreement(s).

The process for the review and revision of the DAC is intended to be collaborative among the department faculty members, the chairperson, the dean and the Provost. In that spirit, I wish to offer some observations which I would ask that you discuss with the Department:

1. I note in I.B.1.b. that the inclusion of written comments on student evaluations is permissive. Making the inclusion of student responses to open-ended items permissive, appears contrary to the spirit of the principle of wholeness as applied to student evaluations, a basic principle of such evaluations. If a student evaluation is done for a given course section, a compilation of all the completed evaluations should be included in the evaluation portfolio. I would further note that even if not required to be included, evaluators may request additional information during the evaluation process, including responses to open-ended items on student evaluations.
2. In I.B.3. I note the specification for the minimum number of peer and Department Chair evaluations required for tenure, promotion, or PAI applications. Consideration should be given to whether a single peer visitation and a single Chair visitation in a single year provide a sufficiently representative sample for a five-year/10-semester evaluation period for faculty applying for promotion to the rank of full professor or for a PAI.
3. With regard to V.A., while it is true that annual evaluation of annually contracted faculty is limited to the area of teaching/performance of primary duties, annually contracted faculty members who have not qualified for a performance-based increase based on successive annual evaluations may submit evaluation materials for evaluation for a performance-based increase that document evidence of superior performance in teaching/primary duties, in the aggregate. Those materials may be

supplemented by evidence of contributions to the University that are in addition to those contractually required. The afore-mentioned sentence needs to be modified to recognize this.

4. With regard to the evaluation of technology-delivered course sections, the Office of Assessment and Testing has a secure confidential online student course evaluation option that is equivalent to the traditional paper bubble forms.

Thank you for your conscientious work during the DAC revision process. It is very much appreciated as is the engagement of the Department of Theatre Arts in the discussion and consideration of the DAC revision. The department is encouraged to continue to include in its various discussions the academic goals that have been articulated for the University.

attachments: Revised DAC; Department of Theatre Arts

cc: Chair, Department of Theatre Arts (with attachments)

Revised November 2003
Emended March 2004
Emended March 2007
Emended September, October 2007

Department of Theatre Arts
Departmental Application of Criteria

Notes:

1. Faculty in Theatre Arts are charged through the Departmental Mission Statement with the task of producing plays in order to: (a) Equip students with knowledge and skills necessary to secure employment in the theatre (and, by extension, film or television) or in educational theatre; (b) Provide the community and the campus with opportunities for cultural enrichment; and (c) Provide theatrical works that become ancillary teaching tools for departments or areas that include drama in their courses (e.g., English, Foreign Languages, Speech Communication, Philosophy, History, African-American Studies, Women's Studies, etc.).
2. Because of this, and because theatre is a creative art, faculty members at Eastern (and at universities of a similar size and mission) record their production-related duties under *both* Primary Duties and Research /Creative Activities. The rationale for this is that theatrical production falls into three phases:
 - a. Pre-production phase, for which CUs are *not* assigned. It is here that all planning and "envisioning" occur. During this phase:
 - i. Directors, designers, dramaturgs, and other production personnel *conduct research* (e.g., on the playwright, the play itself, the period, period styles, historical/cultural considerations, critical commentary on the play and author, and so on). (It should be noted that while all plays will have a director and designers of scenery, lights, and costumes, not all plays will employ a dramaturg.)
 - ii. The director begins to form his or her production concept. This is both an informed interpretation of the play *and* possible approaches to the play, including its visual style. This process may take weeks or months. At some point during this phase, the director begins to collaborate with the play's dramaturg (if one is on-staff for the show) and the play's scenic, lighting, properties, sound, and costume designers.
 - iii. Before meeting with the director, the designers and dramaturg have been conducting their own independent research and formulating ideas, approaches, and concepts.

- iv. Finally, all members of the production team meet in an initial "brainstorming session" on how best to approach the play, given their interpretations of the script. These meetings continue until all agree on how the production will proceed.
 - v. This is the planning phase, when approaches and ideas are "dreamed up" or created. This phase involves both research and creative activity.
- b. The next phase of production is the "execution phase", for which CUs are assigned. During this phase, which actively involves hands-on work with students:
- i. The director schedules and conducts rehearsals 5-6 nights per week for (usually) three hours per night. The rehearsal period lasts 4-6 weeks until the production is scheduled for technical and dress rehearsals.
 - ii. During this 4-6-week period, the designers build, paint, and decorate the set; select or make the costumes and accessories (including make-up and wigs); and hang, gel (color), and focus the lights with the help of students in the shops. One of the designers also supervises or creates properties and sound. Shops are open Monday through Friday and sometimes on Saturdays and Sundays, depending on the complexity of the tasks at hand.
 - iii. During the 4-6-week period, the dramaturg, if one is on-staff for the play, attends rehearsals and responds to concerns the director, the designers, and the actors have regarding language, cultural context, and history. S/he also facilitates discussions with production personnel on the ideas raised by the play and plans methods of production-phase audience engagement in consort with the director. Furthermore, s/he prepares the program notes for the playbill during this time.
 - iv. During the last week, the play goes through 3-4 technical and dress rehearsals. All production personnel participate in these. The play then opens and, at the end of performances, all materials must be dismantled or stored.
 - v. This is the period during which students learn professional skills involved in mounting, preparing, and performing a live play. This is the student laboratory experience of theatre, and it is not unlike the hands-on experience in the sciences, athletics, music, or similar disciplines.
- c. The last phase is the production phase. (After the play's last dress rehearsal, the designers' responsibilities shift to maintenance of the design, while the director supervises performances to ensure all runs smoothly.) Dramaturgs, if employed, engage the show's audiences in a variety of manners, notably during "talk-backs," which are dramaturg-led audience discussion.

- d. It is during this third phase that all the planning and research are *realized* during live performance. This is the end of the processes; all work is on public display—much like an artist's showing or a concert.
 3. For reasons enumerated above, the Primary Duties segment is divided into "Classroom and Related Activities" and "Production-Related Activities." Documentation of activities and means of evaluation of these activities are enumerated below.
-

I. PRIMARY DUTIES: CLASSROOM AND RELATED ACTIVITIES FOR TENURE-TRACK AND TENURED FACULTY

A. Documentation of Primary Duty Classroom and Related Activities

1. Faculty in their first five probationary years must include (as appropriate) for each course taught during the evaluation period: copies of syllabi, handouts, exams and quizzes, critique forms, skills checklists, and related teaching materials (e.g., visual aids, charts, time-lines, study guides, "how-to" materials, web-related assignments or study aids; etc.). Those teaching multiple sections of a single course need present materials for only one section.
2. Tenured faculty must include representative teaching materials similar to those above but may choose to include materials from only two or three courses taught during the evaluation period.
3. Any faculty applying for tenure, promotion, or P.A.I. should include as wide a variety of teaching materials as possible—such as those listed in #1 above. (See Contract for Tenure directions.)

B. Evaluation of Primary Duties (Classroom and Related Activities)

1. Faculty in their first five probationary years must present:
 - a. A minimum of one peer evaluation of teaching for each semester. (Peers may come from outside the Department; however, if the class being evaluated is a majors' course, the peer must come from within the Theatre Arts Department. Faculty teaching multiple sections on the same course may *choose* whether to have each section evaluated. Peer evaluations cannot be anonymous.)
 - b. All Purdue evaluations for each course taught during the evaluation period, including multiple sections of the same course. (If student comments are included, all comments from a given section must be included in the portfolio.)
 - c. A minimum of one Chair evaluation of teaching per academic year.
2. Tenured faculty must present:
 - a. A minimum of one peer and one Chair evaluation per five years of teaching. Peers should come from within the Department.

- b. Purdue evaluations for at least one course per semester during the evaluation period.
3. Tenured faculty applying for promotion or P.A.I. must evaluate all classes and include all Purdue evaluations in the portfolio; they must also include a minimum of one peer evaluation and a minimum of one Chair evaluation—all from the year of application. One of these evaluations may come from the production-related area
4. In all cases, peer and chair evaluators are encouraged to include discussion of syllabi, handouts, graphics, AV materials, and/or similar classroom learning materials.
5. **Relative weight** of the above: Chair and Peer evaluations are of equal weight, followed by student evaluations.
6. In general, a mean Purdue rating of below 3.0 in any single course may be the basis for a rating of Unsatisfactory. However, the DPC shall also take into consideration the level of the course, the enrollment of the course (e.g., majors' or general education), the number of students enrolled, and the *aggregate* of other materials and evaluations presented.

I. (Continued)

PRIMARY DUTIES: PRODUCTION-RELATED ACTIVITIES FOR WHICH CUs ARE ASSIGNED

CUs are assigned for *the execution of* production-related primary duties in one of two areas: (1) directing or (2) execution of the design (i.e., building and preparing sets, hanging and preparing lights, and making costumes). Choreography and dramaturgy, which also may qualify for CU credit, shall be treated the same as for direction of a play.

A. Documentation of Production-Related Activities

1. **Directors (or choreographers):** The range of materials that directors (or choreographers) may present to document their activities includes, but is not limited to:
 - a. Rehearsal schedules presented as evidence of work accomplished
 - b. Rehearsal log (where available)
 - c. Representative pages from a promptbook or choreographer's chart (unless used under Research/Creative Activity)
 - d. A summary statement of goals to be accomplished during the production as a whole or portions of the rehearsal process
 - e. Schedule of supervision of performances (dates and times)
 - f. Handouts or outlines of talks aimed toward aiding the actors or designers in their tasks. These may include, but are not limited to character notes, notes on movement, rehearsal notes, pronunciation guides, dialect guides, and similar
 - g. Peer visit(s) conducted during rehearsals (While *peers* should be persons knowledgeable in the area, directors/choreographers may

choose to invite a peer from outside the Department; for example, a choreographer may choose to invite a peer from the Dance area.);

h. Chair visit(s) conducted during rehearsals

2. **Designers:** The range of materials that designers may present to document their activities includes, but is not limited to:
 - a. The number of students supervised during the execution phase;
 - b. The number of hours spent during the execution phase;
 - c. A list or brief summary of activities/tasks during the execution phase;
 - d. A schedule showing supervision of dress and technical rehearsals;
 - e. Peer visit(s) conducted during any portion of the execution phase (See note in "g" directly above.)
 - f. Chair visit(s) to the shop.

B. Criteria for Peer/Chair Evaluation of the *Execution Phase of Production*

Because faculty are working with students during this phase, criteria for evaluation of directors, designers, and choreographers are similar to those used for measuring effective teaching/lab teaching; these criteria include, but are not limited to:

1. Effective organization of tasks;
2. Effective communication of skills or techniques being taught (e.g. power tools, construction, acting, dance, and similar);
3. Effective teaching devices observed in use (e.g., a painting technique, a costume construction technique, hang-focus technique, a way of handling a speech or a movement, creating a character, executing a dance step, etc.);
4. Evidence that students are absorbing and profiting from the instruction;
5. Indications that students are learning skills that will carry forward into future endeavors;
6. Indications that students feel the faculty member has created a positive environment for learning and creating in an arts situation;
7. Indications that students are learning the ethics and expectations of the profession.

II. RESEARCH/CREATIVE ACTIVITY

A. For directors, designers, choreographers, and dramaturgs, documentation of activities associated with the *pre-production phase* (the research and creative portion for which CUs are not assigned) and the *post-production phase* (the realized work) may include but is not limited to the following:

1. A bibliography of works consulted while the concept was being formed;
2. Schedule of production meetings and conferences;
3. Notes from research and production conferences;
4. Visual evidence of planning, including sketches, renderings, collages, light plots, models, swatches, color charts, floor plans, photocopies of period details, details of choreography, choice of music, etc.;
5. Concept or "vision" statement or major goal in the production (e.g., to recreate a period play with great attention to historical accuracy; or to present the play as the author intended it to be presented, as seen in his/her commentary on the script; or to re-interpret the play in an interesting new light that makes it more accessible to contemporary audiences, while still preserving the spirit of the author's intentions; etc.);
6. Explanation of how the research was incorporated into the production—in layman's terms. That is, what did these choices contribute to the production?
7. If applicable, a statement of how or why research elements were changed or modified for the production;
8. Representative pages of a promptbook, unless used above under Primary Duties;
9. Photographs, newspaper or other reviews of the realized work, including Peer and Chair evaluations.

B. Criteria for Peer/Chair evaluation of the pre-production and the post-production phases may include but are not limited to such considerations as:

1. Directors:

1. Defensible interpretation of the script
2. Effective use of the ground plan to form interesting and varied movement
3. Effective use of theatrical space in terms of actors, setting, costumes, light, and properties
4. Effective and varied picturization and composition
5. Effective use of actors to create the world of the play
6. Evidence of effective actor coaching
7. Actors' understanding of the play/character
8. Creation of interesting and dramatic (or comic) "moments" that contributed to the overall effect of the production
9. Overall effectiveness of director's choices
10. How well the play held spectators' attention

11. Effectiveness of the director's work in training students for future endeavors
12. Effectiveness of the director's work in contributing to the department's on-campus mission
13. Effectiveness of the director's work in contributing to the department's community outreach mission

2. Designers:

1. Possible concept/interpretation perceived in viewing
 2. Effectiveness of design in relation to concept (style or mood or spirit)
 3. Effectiveness of design in relation to theatrical space
 4. Effectiveness of design in establishing time period, locale, season, personality, socioeconomic status, occupation, etc.
 5. Effectiveness of design in regard to other design elements
 6. Effectiveness of design in regard to director's needs
 7. Effectiveness of design in regard to actors' needs
 8. Effectiveness of design in regard to time and fiscal/staffing budgets
 9. Effectiveness of the designer's work in contributing to the Department's on-campus mission
 10. Effectiveness of the designer's work in contributing to the Department's community outreach mission
3. **Other:** choreographers, dramaturges, fight coaches, dialect coaches, and similar will be evaluated using criteria similar to those in #1 above (Directors).

C. Traditional scholarly activities that are not related to specific Departmental productions may include but are not limited to:

1. Publication of books, monographs, portions/chapters of books, edited books or anthologies, journal articles, conference papers, book reviews, adaptations, translations, and similar *published* works, including web-related works;
2. Documented activities as an editor or editorial consultant, including web-related activities;
3. Documented activities as a reviewer, evaluator, respondent, or adjudicator of theatrical productions;*
4. Documentation of publishable work in progress;
5. Participation in professional workshops, panels, professional meetings or conferences where the individual is a *presenter, panelist, coordinator, moderator* or similar;
6. Participation in the above where the individual is an attendee;
7. Participation in any research or artistic capacity in any extra-departmental performance work presented inside or outside of the University or the Community during the evaluation period;

8. Documented activity as a supervisor of student creative activities (e.g., supervision of design, directing, choreography, and honors projects);
9. Awards, grants, and similar evidence of scholarly excellence.

* Activities in II – C – 3 above may be listed in the Research/Creative Activity area or they may be listed in the Service area—but not both.

III. SERVICE

A. All tenured and tenure-track faculty are expected to participate in activities that contribute to the Department, the College, the University, and the community, although not all four areas are necessary for each evaluation period. Activities may include, but are not limited to:

1. Contributions to the operation of the Department, including departmental committees, departmental meetings, recruitment, curriculum, curriculum revision, or similar;
2. Service on College or University committees or service groups;
3. Sponsorship of, or involvement in, campus student groups;
4. Service in community activities where the individual's professional expertise is a factor.
5. Service as a reviewer, evaluator, respondent, or adjudicator of theatrical productions;*

* Activities in III – A – 5 above may be listed in the Research/Creative Activity area or they may be listed in the Service area—but not both.

B. Evaluation of Service Activities:

While it is difficult to place a relative value on service, several factors shall be taken into consideration:

1. The *level* of participation (e.g., chairing a committee or significant duties on a committee);
2. The degree of *commitment* involved in the task;
3. Quality of the work produced as a result.

IV. Relative Weighting of Activities:

A. Primary duties shall be considered the most important, Research/Creative Activity the second most important, and Service the third most important.

B. Concerning Research/Creative Activity: Departmental production-related activities and responsibilities receive more relative weight than traditional scholarly activities. This philosophy reflects the Theatre Arts Department's commitment to production and the Department's mission statement. In those cases where a faculty member has been assigned no Departmental production-related responsibilities during the evaluation period, extra-departmental creative work and/or the individual's scholarly activities shall be evaluated in lieu of Departmental production work.

V. DOCUMENTATION OF ACTIVITIES FOR ANNUALLY CONTRACTED FACULTY

- A. Although Annually Contracted faculty are evaluated only on teaching and classroom-related activities, individual may wish to document achievements in creative/research and/or service as well.
- B. Documentation materials and evaluation criteria of Annually Contracted faculty are the same as for tenure-track faculty.
- C. For documentation of classroom materials and teaching, see I-A-1.
- D. For evaluation criteria of classroom teaching, see I-B-1 and I-B-5.

VI. DISTANCE LEARNING: DOCUMENTATION OF MATERIALS AND EVALUATION CRITERIA

- A. Documentation of activities in distance learning may include, but is not limited to:
 - 1. Hard copies of the home page for the course, which should include links to the syllabus, reading materials and assignments, a calendar or schedule of assignments and readings, instructions for completing assignments and exams, instructions for contacting the professor, and directions for participating in online chatrooms (if appropriate); the instructor also should provide sample exams and quizzes, and directions for completing instructor evaluations.
 - 2. The instructor must provide the URL of the website.
 - 3. The instructor must arrange for at least one chair evaluation and one peer evaluation per semester the online course is taught.
 - 4. The instructor must arrange for student evaluation of the course.
- B. Evaluation of activities in distance learning shall be similar to the evaluation of materials in a traditional classroom setting, with the exceptions noted below:
 - 1. Peer evaluations must be written by observers competent in distance learning materials and methods; if none exist within the

Theatre Arts Department, one shall be selected from outside the Department.

2. If the course is an online version of an on-campus course, syllabi and other teaching materials must be comparable to the on-campus version and consonant with the official course description as approved by CAA.
- C. Evaluation criteria for online courses includes, but is not limited to:
1. Rigor and quality of materials, assignments, and exams or projects; if applicable: degree to which the online course approximates the on-campus version;
 2. Quality of the links, their accessibility and maintenance;
 3. Quality of faculty-student interaction, including how accessible the instructor seems;
 4. Degree to which assignments, readings, and exams or projects reflect or assess course content.
 5. Student evaluations below a mean average of "3" on the Purdue scale *may* be grounds for a rating of Unsatisfactory. However, in such cases, the DPC may wish to consider the *aggregate* of materials presented by the instructor before assigning a rating of Unsatisfactory.

Approved by the Theatre Arts Faculty October 8, 2007

Jerry D. Eisenhower, DPC Chair