

**DEPARTMENT OF THEATRE AND DANCE  
FLORIDA ATLANTIC UNIVERSITY**

**ANNUAL FACULTY EVALUATION GUIDELINES**

It is the philosophy of the Department of Theatre and Dance that all faculty hired by Florida Atlantic University are highly qualified and excel in Teaching, Research/Creative Activity, and Service. As each faculty member hired is a specialist in their area, comparisons between sub-disciplines and averaging scores across the department is not an effective method of ranking and evaluation of a faculty member's contribution to the program. If any member of the department is not producing at their highest level of accomplishment, the entire success of our students, department, and production program are affected.

Although each evaluated area of Instruction, Research/Creative Activity, and Service is rated on its own merits and quality, consideration will also be based generally on the following evaluation guidelines for each area. While tenured and tenure earning faculty are evaluated in all three areas, instructors and Lecturers are evaluated on teaching and service only. All evaluations are predicated on annual assignments. Tenure earning faculty should note that the Department values its Promotion and Tenure Criteria and therefore should regularly consult the Department's Criteria for Promotion and Tenure when discussing their annual assignment with the Chair.

The Chair should determine faculty evaluation ratings based on these guidelines, the faculty member's annual assignment, and the Annual Faculty Report requirements. Following college and provost guidelines, each faculty member will submit a written Annual Faculty Report detailing his or her activities during the preceding year in the three evaluated areas of Teaching, Research/Creative Activity, and Service. Faculty are evaluated in each of these three areas based on the following prescribed ratings categories:

- Exceptional
- Outstanding
- Good
- Needs Improvement
- Unsatisfactory

Based on the outcome of the area evaluations, an overall annual evaluation rating is then assessed based on the same prescribed categories.

To determine the overall evaluation, a calculation shall be made based on the evaluation in each of the three areas using the following numeric values:

Exceptional:	5
Outstanding:	4
Good:	3
Needs Improvement:	2
Unsatisfactory:	0

To ensure that the overall annual evaluation rating reflects the individual faculty member's annual assignment, that rating shall be determined by multiplying the percentage assigned to the faculty member in each of the evaluated areas by the numeric value of the rating (2 through 5 above) achieved in each area. The three scores shall be added together and the overall annual evaluation rating shall be determined per the following standards:

Exceptional: An overall rating of 4.15 or above  
Outstanding: An overall rating between 3.25 and 4.14  
Good: An overall rating between 3 and 3.24  
Needs Improvement: An overall rating of 0 to 2.99  
Unsatisfactory: Failed to implement improvement action plan.

Please note: to achieve an overall rating of Unsatisfactory, the faculty member or instructor must have received a Needs Improvement in the preceding year's evaluation and have failed to implement the improvement plan related in response to that evaluation, thereby failing to improve their performance from the previous year.

As annual assignments are made, the faculty member will work with the Chair to weight their efforts in Teaching, Research/Creative Activity, and Service. These percentages are then used to calculate the overall annual evaluation score.

For example, if the annual assignment has weights of 65% Teaching, 20% Research and 15% Service, and the faculty member earns a rating of Outstanding in Teaching (4), Exceptional in Research or Creative activities (5), and Exceptional in Service (5), the overall annual evaluation rating is calculated as follows:

Teaching =  $65\% \times 4 = 2.6$   
Research =  $20\% \times 5 = 1$   
Service =  $15\% \times 5 = 0.75$   
Overall Annual Evaluation Rating =  $4.35 = \text{Exceptional}$

**Instruction:**

Instruction incorporates a broad range of activities along with instructional work in the traditional classroom. Both quantitative and qualitative data will be used for evaluating faculty members' instructional accomplishments and to assess overall performance in this area of the assignment.

Tenure seeking faculty are expected to focus on developing their classroom teaching; the department expects the newly-hired faculty member to use the first few years at FAU to develop both a teaching repertoire and sufficient familiarity with FAU students' abilities and characteristics to be able to design effective classes.

As faculty members acquire more teaching experience, the department expects them to expand their instructional roles: for instance, by mentoring students, serving on M.F.A. and Ph.D. committees, involvement in co-curricular activities, serving on curricular committees, or supporting junior faculty and Graduate Teaching Assistants in their instructional development.

Some of the most important elements of instructional work are in assigned classes. The department evaluates instructional work based upon multiple data points from items A and B below. The department values using: Peer Evaluation, best practices systems and standards accepted in pedagogy for a discipline, Student Perception of Teaching trends, and other materials presented by an instructor to evaluate classroom instruction.

A. *Objective materials to evaluate assigned classes.*

- Student assessment of instructional quality, indicated through but not exclusively by SPOT scores. The department views SPOT scores on an arc covering multiple classes over the review period and in context of several semesters rather than viewing them as an individual data point. SPOT scores are also considered in the context of departmental and college means, as well as the appropriateness of standard SPOT score categories to the specifics of the individual course under consideration. These scores should also be considered in the context of the number of students who responded to the survey, whether each

course is lower-division, upper-division, or graduate; whether each course is required; and whether each course is a new preparation for the faculty.

- The department recognizes that no single item adequately captures student sentiment about an instructor and a course. Faculty are encouraged to include any information to annotate their SPOT scores and any other student feedback to document instructional work.
- Annotated documentation showing best practices for classroom techniques and pedagogical methods.
- Syllabi.
- Peer evaluation for tenure and post-tenure review documentation.

B. *Subjective materials to evaluate assigned classes.*

- Instructional techniques, focusing on use of class time, classroom dynamics, interactions, and resolving problematic situations (such as academic dishonesty, tardiness, conflicts) appropriately.
- Methods for evaluation of student learning, such as data concerning graduates and former, present, and past students as documented by the faculty member, peer evaluation, and awards nominated for and won.
- Other materials as submitted by the instructor.

In addition to classroom teaching, there are a variety of ways in which instructional activities are undertaken. Tenured faculty and Senior Instructors are expected to take a larger role in instructional activities in the program. Tenure seeking faculty are not expected to undertake significant activity in this area, however all activities should be documented for the chair to consider in the annual evaluation. As appropriate to assignment and accomplishments, faculty may provide evidence of work such as:

C. *Materials to evaluate other instruction related activities.*

- serving on or chairing thesis or dissertation committees
- advising students about the graduate and undergraduate major
- offering Directed Independent Study courses
- writing letters of recommendation for students applying to graduate and other outside programs or academic employment
- developing and revising courses
- developing and revising curricula
- mentoring of Graduate Teaching Assistants
- offering master classes and workshops
- successful grant funding for teaching proposals and/or other pedagogical activities
- participating in workshops/programs to improve and develop instruction
- participating in the design and implementation of assessment practices
- providing summative or evaluative peer evaluations of classroom teaching
- production activity both in rehearsal and performance
- working with colleagues to assist them in improving their instruction
- providing instructional mentorship for graduate teaching assistants
- working on recruitment and retention of majors
- organizing and/or participating in co-curricular events sponsored by the department
- contributing to College and University recruitment and retention initiatives
- nominations for and receipt of teaching awards

While all faculty are expected to demonstrate excellence in teaching, we recognize that for tenure earning faculty there may be a period of adjustment and refining of skills. Therefore, while the assessment bar is set high for tenure earning faculty, it is set even higher for tenured faculty.

### **Criteria for Tenure seeking faculty:**

*Exceptional:* Well-designed syllabi; evidence that the faculty member has been able to design and deliver challenging classes that significantly improve students' skills; very positive peer reviews from faculty evaluating classroom work; positive to very positive student feedback as measured by SPOT scores over the majority of the evaluation period and in context of larger trends as described in Section A above; methods for student evaluation that simultaneously challenge and provide opportunity for the development of significant critical thinking skills; one item from section C that is of significance to the quality of instruction in the Department of Theatre and Dance.

*Outstanding:* Well-designed syllabi; evidence that the faculty member has been able to design and deliver challenging classes that significantly improve students' skills; positive peer reviews from faculty evaluating classroom work; positive to very positive student feedback as measured by SPOT scores over the majority of the evaluation period and in context of larger trends as described in Section A above; methods for student evaluation that simultaneously challenge and provide opportunity for the development of significant critical thinking skills.

*Good:* Adequately designed syllabi; demonstrated methods for student evaluation that are appropriate to the level and kind of class taught; mostly positive student feedback as measured by SPOT scores over the majority of the evaluation period and in context of larger trends as described in Section A above; evidence of time and energy devoted to the challenges of becoming an effective classroom teacher at FAU.

*Needs Improvement:* Poorly designed syllabi; negative or no peer review of courses; less than positive student feedback as measured by SPOT scores over the majority of the evaluation period that reinforce similar less-than-favorable trends as described in Section A above; no compelling evidence in the material submitted for peer evaluation as to why this negative feedback should be discounted as a definitive indicator of problems; persistent patterns of canceled classes and unexplained absences; no supporting items from section C that are of significance to the quality of instruction in the Department of Theatre and Dance to mitigate an assessment of Needs Improvement.

### **Criteria for Tenured faculty:**

*Exceptional:* Well-designed syllabi; demonstrated methods for student evaluation and instruction that simultaneously challenge and provide opportunity for the development of significant critical thinking skills; evidence that the faculty member has been able to design and deliver challenging classes that significantly improve students' skills; positive to very positive student feedback as measured by SPOT scores over the majority of the evaluation period and in context of larger trends as described in Section A above; three items from section C that are of significance to the quality of instruction in the Department of Theatre and Dance.

*Outstanding:* Well-designed syllabi; demonstrated methods for student evaluation that simultaneously challenge and provide opportunity for the development of significant critical thinking skills; evidence that the faculty member has been able to design and deliver challenging classes that significantly improve students' skill; positive to very positive student feedback as measured by SPOT scores over the majority of the evaluation period and in context of larger trends as described in Section A above; two items from section C that are of significance to the quality of instruction in the Department of Theatre and Dance.

*Good:* Adequately designed syllabi; demonstrated methods for student evaluation that are appropriate to the level and kind of class taught; evidence of time and energy devoted to the challenges of becoming an effective classroom teacher at FAU; positive student feedback as measured by SPOT scores over the majority of the evaluation period and in context of larger trends as described in Section A above; one

item from section C that is of significance to the quality of instruction in the Department of Theatre and Dance.

*Needs Improvement:* Adequately designed syllabi; less than positive student feedback as measured by SPOT scores over the majority of the evaluation period that reinforce similar less-than-favorable trends as described in Section A above; no compelling evidence in the material submitted as to why this negative feedback should be discounted as a definitive indicator of problems; persistent patterns of canceled classes and unexplained absences; no supporting items from section C that are of significance to the quality of instruction in the Department of Theatre and Dance.

### **Research and Creative Activity:**

In the discipline of Theatre and Dance, creative activity and scholarly research are interchangeable as indicators of professional growth and stature. Typically, faculty members strive to engage in multiple research and creative projects each year, however specialized projects may involve an entire year or even multiple years to reach fruition.

It is important to recognize the unique nature and high academic demands that working on a creative product in a university setting requires. Simply being a professional in the discipline does not qualify one to work on a production at a university. Along with all the traditional demands, the faculty member must be prepared to help students develop critical thinking, procedural skillsets, and analytic abilities during the production process. While a successful production is always the goal, in academic productions the learning outcomes of the students is of the utmost importance.

In addition to the interrelationship between creative activities and teaching, it is also important to recognize the limited internal opportunities for faculty to work with students on a production. Assignment to work on a production in the department is a competitive process and no faculty member is guaranteed an assignment in the production program. As such, the department holds university work in the same regard as professional work through a vetting process of internal assignment.

Because of the large number of sub-disciplines and specializations within theatre and dance, it is inherently difficult to evaluate the work of a designer, director, dancer, performer, or research oriented faculty member as a single element. The department recognizes that excellence in creative activities and research is documented by a pattern of sustained and significant work over time. Therefore, when deciding upon the overall portfolio of material presented for evaluation, the department seeks an approach that evaluates the whole body of work. The activities presented can be judged in terms of quality, significance, or quantity.

While this document provides guidelines for ratings associated with individual projects, multiple activities that suggest broad engagement and recognition should be sought by faculty to raise their rating. To assist evaluating each faculty member upon their own merits, the following guidelines listed below should be applied to levels of creative activity or research. Please note that the use of the term “extensive” and “moderate” are primarily meant to indicate the degree of effort required for the activity (ie. “refereed book” [extensive] vs “refereed article” [moderate]) but can also be used to indicate the stature of the activity (ie. “professional production” [extensive] vs “non-professional production” [moderate]).

*Examples of extensive creative activities or research:*

- Primary work on a university production (such as directing, performing, designing, choreographing, stage managing)
- Work on a professional production (meaning work for which the individual was paid at a venue where most of the primary artists are also paid; unless a case can be made to justify otherwise)

- Acceptance of a work to a refereed presentation
- First hand or direct research or development of creative material
- Refereed books
- Support work on at least three university productions (such as vocal or movement coaching, sound engineering, dramaturgy, props master, assistant directing etc.)

*Examples of moderate creative activities or research:*

- Support work on at least two university productions (such as vocal or movement coaching, sound engineering, dramaturgy, props master, assistant directing etc.)
- Work on a non-professional production (meaning work done at a venue where most of the primary artists are not paid)
- Acceptance of a work to a non-refereed presentation
- Refereed articles, chapters, and creative publications
- Conference papers
- Conference presentations
- Other professional activities

*Exceptional:* This rating recognizes evidence of creative or research activity in the extensive category AND at least one creative or research activity in moderate category OR evidence of exceptional quality of creative or research activity in the extensive category.

*Outstanding:* This rating recognizes evidence of creative or research activity in the extensive category OR multiple creative or research activities in the moderate category.

*Good:* This rating recognizes evidence of some moderate creative or research activity.

*Needs Improvement:* This rating indicates that a faculty member has had no creative activity or publication, conference presentation, or evidence of professional activity.

**Service:** While the Department of Theatre and Dance expects all faculty members to serve and participate actively in Department, College, and University governance, the Department prioritizes tenure earning faculty members' research and creative activities over service and thus evaluates them by criteria different from those applied to tenured faculty members.

**University Service:**

- chairing a committee or taskforce (University, College, or Department)
- serving on a committee or taskforce (University, College, or Department)
- serving as an officer in College FA or UFF
- mentoring a junior colleague
- advising student bodies, such as an Alpha Psi Omega or a Dance Club
- other services to the Department, College, and University

**Professional service:**

- organizing or chairing panels for professional conferences
- judging professional competitions
- serving as an officer in state, regional, and professional organizations
- serving as a referee for scholarly journals and presses
- writing external reviews of P&T cases
- other professional services

Recognizing that, for tenure earning purposes, tenure earning faculty should place greater emphasis on their teaching and research/creative activity, *tenured* faculty have added expectations with regards to service.

**CRITERIA FOR TENURE EARNING FACULTY:**

*Exceptional:* To earn this rating, a faculty member is expected to serve productively in one committee or provide extensive service to the university in some other capacity and engage in one other activity listed above.

*Outstanding:* To earn this rating, a faculty member is expected to serve productively in one committee or provide extensive service to the university in some other capacity.

*Good:* To earn this rating, a faculty member is expected to serve in one committee.

*Needs Improvement:* This rating indicates that a faculty member does not meet the criteria of Good.

**CRITERIA FOR TENURED FACULTY MEMBERS:**

*Exceptional:* To earn this rating, a faculty member is expected to have engaged in three activities listed above.

*Outstanding:* To earn this rating, a faculty member is expected to have engaged in two activities listed above.

*Good:* To earn this rating, a faculty member is expected to serve on one University, College, or Department committee.

*Needs Improvement:* This rating indicates that a faculty member does not meet the criteria of Good.