

**COVER SHEET FOR PROPOSED CHANGES TO DEPARTMENT/COLLEGE
PERSONNEL PROCEDURES**

TT

MCCAMC
COLLEGE

Ineatre
DEPARTMENT

In order to facilitate a complete and expeditious review by the Personnel Planning and Review Committee (PP&R) of the change(s) you propose to your personnel procedures, please adhere to the format described below, and also fill out the Background Information. Attach this memo as a cover sheet for the written material you submit to PP&R. PP&R assumes that the initiating Department or College Committee has determined that the proposed new or revised procedures are consistent with Section 600 and with the Collective Bargaining Agreement.

FORMAT: *Please use a complete copy of your existing procedures as the starting point for the proposed revisions that you submit to PP&R for approval. Strike over any text that you wish to have deleted from your written procedures, and/or underline any text that you wish to have added to your written procedures.*

RECEIVED
CSUN

DEC 18 2019

BACKGROUND INFORMATION:

Office of
Faculty Affairs

- Are proposed changes those of College or Department procedures? (check one)
- Date that current proposed changes were sent forward 10/30/19
- Department or College initiating proposed changes Ineatre
- Describe briefly the general reason(s) for your proposed change(s) (e.g., "proposed changes were initiated by the Department in response to a request from the College Personnel Committee, which felt that existing promotion criteria were too rigorous"). Proposed changes were in response to 1) reviewer feedback see definitions of peer review, 2) need for content and format that is more user-friendly to review, 3) departmental interest in the option of an M.O.U. and clarifying its use, 4) updates to address electronic student evaluations, 5) notes from the faculty and Dean.
- For Department Personnel Procedures, list the date the department faculty voted to approve the proposed changes: 10/29/2019
- For College Personnel Procedures, list the date the college faculty voted to approve the proposed changes: 11/15/2019

FOR DEPARTMENT PERSONNEL PROCEDURES: (Sign & Print Name)

Larry Biederman 10/30/19
Chair, Department Personnel Committee Date

Anamarie Dwyer 10.30.19
Department Chair Date

FOR DEPARTMENT PERSONNEL PROCEDURES OR COLLEGE PERSONNEL PROCEDURES:

[Signature] 12/16/2019
Chair, College Personnel Committee Date

Daniel W. Hoshen 12/17/19
College Dean Date

[Signature] 6/18/20
Chair, Personnel Planning and Review Committee Date

(for PP&R use only)	Fall 2020	
Spring 2020	Fall 2023 For Changes in Criteria	Fall 2024
Approval Date	Effective Date (see attached)	Date of Next Review

Revised 10.16

INTRODUCTION AND OVERVIEW

The Department of Theatre values excellence in teaching, scholarship, and creative activity in their many forms. We also value active involvement in the Department, College, University and community. We view the evaluation process as an opportunity for dialogue with our colleagues with a view towards achieving success in all forms of our work throughout the University, in our professional pursuits, and our communities.

All Department of Theatre personnel evaluations will conform to the Mike Curb College of Arts, Media, and Communication (MCCAMC) Personnel Handbook and to the Academic Personnel Policies and Procedures detailed in Section 600 of the CSUN Administrative Manual. Section 600 is updated at the beginning of each academic year, based on changes in each year's printing of Section 600 by the University. Section 600, the MCCAMC Personnel Handbook, and the Department of Theatre Personnel Policies and Procedures will be distributed annually, and faculty members have a responsibility to review and follow all the policies and procedures in these documents each year.

The following procedures specify and elaborate on the aforementioned policies and procedures to help candidates for advancement apply them to the unique contexts of our work at CSUN and beyond.

Probationary faculty members may elect to create an optional Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) to further clarify the criteria of their Retention, Tenure, and Promotion (RTP) process. When the faculty member has an approved MOU, it should be used by all evaluators in the faculty member's RTP process as a supplement to the criteria of the Departmental Personnel Policies and Procedures, the College Personnel Handbook, and Section 600 of the CSUN Administrative Manual. Information on the creation and use of the MOU can be found in the last section of this document.

I: PROFESSIONAL PREPARATION

I.A. Degree Requirements:

A terminal degree (MFA or Doctorate) is normally required for tenure and advancement to the ranks of Associate Professor and Professor.

I.B. Degree Equivalencies:

In special cases, the department will consider equivalencies to the professional preparation requirement, per Section 600 of the CSUN Administrative Manual. Any faculty member hired in such a case will have the terms of the degree equivalency defined in their MOU (see Section IV).

II: EVALUATION PROCEDURES FOR TEACHING EFFECTIVENESS

II.A. Class Visits:

The Department Personnel Committee and the faculty member being considered for retention, tenure and/or promotion will select classes currently taught by the faculty member to be visited by at least one member of the Department Personnel Committee.

The chair of the Department Personnel Committee (DPC) will initiate the visits in a letter on behalf of the committee and the Department Chair, requesting that the candidate email all evaluators class schedules and syllabi for all courses. All class visits are scheduled with the instructor directly in consultation with each visitor.

Visits to first-year probationary instructors are made each semester. Visits to the classes of other full-time faculty members being considered for retention, tenure and/or promotion are made once each year, normally in the fall semester, so that deadlines for evaluation may be met.

After each visit, but before a written report is prepared, either the evaluator or the instructor may request to have a discussion with the other. That meeting can address issues such as context within the course and pedagogical matters that may arise during the visit.

The written report is given to the instructor, within 14 calendar days of the visit using a Class Visit form. Each visit report will address the following areas of evaluation:

- Organization, quality, and appropriateness of the course syllabus
- Lesson design
- Presentation of the lesson
- Communication abilities
- Command of the subject matter
- Interaction with students
- Professional demeanor appropriate to the academic field of study

Per section 612.5 of the CSUN Administrative manual, the candidate may request a meeting to discuss the class visit report within ten (10) calendar days of when the report is placed in their campus mailbox. The candidate may also submit a rebuttal statement or response in writing within the ten (10) calendar days. At the conclusion of the ten (10) calendar days, the report, and any response or rebuttal statement, will be placed in the candidate's Personnel Action File (PAF) and be sent to the Chair of the Department Personnel Committee and to the Department Chair.

II.B Student Evaluations:

1. Course Evaluation Procedures

The University administered Student Evaluations of Faculty (SEFs) via an online survey process (through www.csun.edu/sef) serve as the primary means of measuring student assessments of teaching effectiveness. The criteria on these forms are reviewed, revised (if deemed necessary), and approved by the tenure-track faculty of the department at least every five years when these Departmental Personnel Procedures are reviewed (or sooner, if deemed necessary).

For first-year faculty, SEFs are used for at least two courses in the fall semester and at least two in the spring semester. Thereafter, SEFs are used for at least one section of each course taught by each faculty member at least once each academic year. However, more data is always welcome and probationary faculty are encouraged to request that student evaluations be conducted in every course they teach each semester.

At least one of the classes evaluated by the students using the online student survey shall be clearly applicable to the major in Theatre unless the faculty member is teaching only non-major classes.

Faculty members should make a strong effort to get completed surveys from a majority of the students enrolled in each course or in rehearsal/production activities, and this is best achieved by providing ample time during a class session to complete the survey. Faculty members can access the percentage of responses at www.csun.edu/sef and should monitor progress in case there is need to encourage greater student response while the surveys remain available.

When the results are returned to the Department, the Chair or members of the Department Personnel Committee may meet individually with each faculty member being considered for retention, tenure and/or promotion, to discuss the strengths and weaknesses revealed by the student evaluations, and to seek ways of augmenting and/or improving their teaching.

2. Student Consultation Procedures

An open meeting of the Department Personnel Committee with the Department Chair, to which interested students are invited, is mandatory in order to provide students the opportunity to consult with the Committee. The following notice will be posted in the Department, in places where students will become aware of the open meeting, and the notice will be read in Department classes for two weeks prior to the open meeting:

"CSUN requires periodic review and evaluation of all faculty members which includes consideration of students' views of faculty members' teaching. In accordance with this requirement, students wishing to share their thoughts about the teaching of _____ are encouraged to meet individually with the Department Personnel Committee and Department Chair on _____, from _____ to _____, in _____. Information obtained may be shared with the faculty member, but no student identifiers will be used, except with written and signed permission from the student in accordance with university personnel policy. Students who cannot meet with the Committee and Department Chair during the scheduled times are invited to confer individually with members of the Committee [members listed] and/or the Department Chair."

Per Section 613, appropriate action follows these meetings, if necessary, such as the provision of a written, signed statement by the student. The oral comments are informational only. Student comments that are not provided in writing and accompanied by the student's signature and ID number may not be cited in any formal personnel action. All written and signed statements will be handled in accordance with Section 600 of the CSUN Administrative Manual.

II.C Other Sources of Evaluation:

Additional sources of evidence of teaching effectiveness may include student work completed under the supervision of the faculty member, course syllabi and lesson plans, outlines, schedules, bibliographies, and other instructional materials provided to students.

III: CONTRIBUTIONS TO THE FIELD OF STUDY

III.A Approved Criteria for Contributions to the Field of Study

The Department of Theatre acknowledges that creative activity will routinely include research and scholarship and that the definitions of these pursuits often overlap. We define Contributions to the Field of Study as any professional work within the theatre profession, or a professional application of theatre practices, undertaken independent of CSUN teaching responsibilities, that creates a positive impact on the field, be it locally or globally.

Examples may include:

- Publication (e.g. books, articles, plays)
- Conferences (e.g. reading papers, panel participation)
- Professional theatre productions, performances, media and gaming content (e.g. acting, directing, musical direction, vocal direction, choreography or movement direction, design, stage management, theatre management, dramaturgy)
- Public performances, professional or community engagements, resulting from applications of the faculty members professional theatre expertise
- Professional coaching, training, consultancies (e.g. teaching professional classes and workshops)
- Play development (e.g. writing, devising, acting, directing staged readings or workshops)
- Research culminating in a measurable product, demonstration, or outcome.

As an alternative or supplement to the criteria above, the candidate has the option to create and get approval for an MOU, an option to undertake only if the RTP candidate feels the existing policy does not sufficiently ensure they are pursuing activities that all parties agree fulfill departmental criteria.

If the RTP candidate's discipline does not engage in the measurable activities of a typical academic path or is not listed among the criteria above, or if there is need to clarify the activities under review when the timing of the work precedes the RTP candidate's appointment date, an MOU will address such concerns. Information on the creation and use of the MOU is described in the last section of this document.

With or without an MOU, new DPC members must assure consistency to probationary faculty members by honoring policies, standards, and approvals made by previous committees unless changed formally in the process of policy revision or a revised MOU with a faculty member.

III.B Evaluation Criteria for Contributions to the Field of Study

All evidence of Contributions to the Field of Study will be evaluated using both documentation and peer review.

1. Documentation

Documentation can be access to the work itself and/or materials that describe and substantiate the work and the process entailed. The department defines the following as acceptable criteria for documentation:

- Review copies of published work
- Audio, video, or other recordings of the work
- Transcripts and photographs of the work
- Preparatory materials demonstrating the process of creating the work including production books, prompt books, working drafts, design renderings models, drafts, sketches, and notes
- Grant and funding submissions related to the work
- Programs, program notes, study guides and other supplements to the work
- Marketing and public relations materials promoting the work
- Evaluations of the work made by participants, collaborators, clients, students, or other subjective individuals that do not qualify as sources of objective peer review

2. Peer Review

The department defines the following as acceptable criteria for peer review:

- Published critical reviews of the work, positive or otherwise, from established and discerning sources, assessing its efficacy to its audience or impact on the field (the review need not cite the candidate by name, nor directly address the candidate's contribution, as long as there is assessment of the work to which the candidate contributed)
- Community, regional, national or international recognition or awards
- Written evaluation by qualified and objective academic and professional colleagues who are not participants in the work being evaluated with advance written approval of the Department Personnel Committee
- Written evaluation (by qualified adjudicators) of work submitted for competitions deemed relevant to the field with advance written approval of the Department Personnel Committee

The department encourages faculty members to ensure that the cumulative impact of all peer reviews in the Professional Information File (PIF) comes from a **range** of established and discerning sources. If peer reviews of multiple works are coming from a single or limited pool of reviewers, or if the majority of peer reviews do not demonstrate clear and discerning critical evaluation, the DPC and Department Chair will not have the endorsements they need to adequately review and approve the candidate's file.

Faculty members should seek ongoing consultation with the current DPC members to ensure they are getting acceptable and strong peer reviews of their work before it is too late to get the work assessed.

In the absence of the examples of peer review stated above, or where the strength of the peer review sources is in question, the Department Personnel Committee, in consultation with the candidate, will generate a list of peer reviewers external to CSUN, from which two individuals will be selected to submit peer reviews to the Department Personnel Committee. The candidate will select one reviewer and the Department Personnel Committee will select the other reviewer.

IV: COMMUNITY AND UNIVERSITY SERVICE

The Department's criteria for Community and University Service evaluation are the same as those stated in the College Personnel Handbook and in Section 600 of the CSUN Administrative Manual.

V. MEMORANDUM OF UNDERSTANDING (MOU)

V.A Purpose of Memorandum of Understanding

The purpose of an MOU is not to limit a faculty member, but to assist the faculty member through the personnel process, and to provide direction, clarity, and flexibility to the faculty member regarding the various responsibilities and expectations specific to them. Keep in mind that an MOU is prepared to guarantee consistency in the personnel review process, particularly since there are yearly changes in the membership of the Department Personnel Committee. Should the faculty member choose not to negotiate an MOU, the approved Departmental Personnel Procedures stated herein, and the criteria stated in the College Personnel Handbook and in Section 600 of the CSUN Administrative Manual will provide the guidelines for the candidate's progress through the RTP process.

V.B Process and Application

Should the probationary faculty member choose to create an MOU, it is the responsibility of that faculty member to express this intention in writing to the Department Chair and the Department Personnel Committee by the first week of the Spring semester prior to the Fall semester in which the faculty member's RTP evaluation will occur. The faculty member will consult with the Department Chair and the Department Personnel Committee, and the College Dean in order to develop a plan outlining the expectations that the faculty member will need to meet, as described in the Faculty Position Announcement and specific to their area(s) of expertise and academic discipline(s) and in addition to the provisions of the College Personnel Handbook and Section 600 of the CSUN Administrative Manual, in order to be recommended for retention, tenure and/or promotion. The faculty member and the Chair of the DPC may consult with other faculty in the RTP candidate's area in arriving at the appropriate criteria for the MOU.

A letter describing the plan – the MOU – will be drafted by the probationary faculty member and signed by the Chair, the Department Personnel Committee, the College Dean, and the probationary faculty member. This document will be included in the faculty member's PAF to clarify criteria by all parties in the review process.

The MOU will provide detailed guidance for both the probationary faculty member and those involved in the personnel review process. It will be expected that the probationary faculty member will demonstrate satisfactory and consistent progress toward the goals stated in the MOU during each year of review. Consequently, these criteria will be considered along with the provisions of the College Personnel Handbook, the requirements of Section 600 of the CSUN Administrative Manual, and the Departmental Personnel Procedures stated above, during the faculty member's first two personnel reviews (in their second and third years of service).

V.C Contents of the MOU

The MOU is likely to include, but is not limited to, responsibilities concerning the following:

- Area of specialization
- Teaching assignments
- Special non-teaching activities
- Additional education and/or degrees required
- The definition of a terminal degree equivalency
- The definitions of creative work and scholarly activity

The MOU does not and cannot override departmental policies but may add or clarify criteria specific to the candidate's activities that are mutually agreed upon by the candidate, Chair, and DPC to be helpful to the evaluation process.

When new faculty elect to create an MOU, all parties involved in its creation and approval should designate which achievements initiated before appointment to CSUN, or within a period of service credit, can be considered in the RTP evaluation process, as well as Departmental expectations of additional achievements made since the appointment date. Such clarifications would address ambiguities in Sections 632.4.1 and 641.2.3 of the CSUN Administrative Manual.

V.D Amending the MOU

The MOU may be amended each year, and extended, upon the agreement of the faculty member, the current Chair of the Department Personnel Committee, the Department Chair, and the College Dean. In such a case, the first MOU would constitute the plan of action for the first year and would serve as the template for the second-year review. Any second-year modification to the MOU agreed upon after the completion of the second-year review would apply to the next review, and any subsequent modifications would apply to each subsequent year's review.

V.E Lack of Agreement

If the various parties cannot reach an agreement on an MOU, the probationary faculty member and their evaluators will follow the approved Departmental Personnel Procedures stated above and the criteria stated in the College Personnel Handbook and in Section 600 of the CSUN Administrative Manual.