

ASSOCIATION FOR THEATRE IN HIGHER EDUCATION

GUIDELINES FOR EVALUATING TEACHER/ARTISTS FOR PROMOTION AND TENURE (rev. 5/2000)

This document is intended for all institutions with faculty in theatre and performance studies. It focuses on the assumption that preparation of theatrical events for public performance allows the teacher/artist a viable opportunity for demonstrating artistic achievement which is crucial to promotion and tenure decisions.

The production of plays and performances (hereafter referred to as theatrical events) and the study thereof constitute the discipline of theatre. In recognition of the artistic component of theatre, most institutions of higher education now include "creative activity" as a legitimate component for promotion and tenure consideration. Many institutions, adopting the 1990 "Boyer model" for evaluating scholarship, have placed creative activity as one component of the "scholarship of discovery" and "scholarship of application" in that model [i]. ATHE's guidelines for employing the model, "Scholarship For The Discipline of Theatre," expands on the criteria used by many institutions regarding various forms of traditional scholarship, such as teaching, scholarly publication, and service, in promotion and tenure deliberations (see appendix).

In addition, this document is congruent with the National Association of Schools of Theatre (NAST) accreditation guidelines, which state that creative production and professional work in theatre *must* be equivalent to scholarly publication or research as a criterion for advancement. [ii]

DEPARTMENTAL/INSTITUTIONAL RESPONSIBILITIES

1. At the time of appointment both the institution and the teacher/artist must agree upon clearly defined institutional expectations concerning teaching performance, creative activity, research/publication, and service (or, in terms of the Boyer model guidelines, the scholarship of discovery, teaching, application, and integration).
2. Institutions and departments are obligated to provide a sufficiently flexible schedule and adequate support to allow the teacher/artist/scholar to pursue those creative and/or scholarly endeavors appropriate to promotion and tenure.
3. When the creative activity of these teacher/artists in preparation of theatrical events for public performance is to be evaluated for purposes of promotion and tenure, institutions and departments must:
 - a) specify carefully that portion of the process ascribable to each teacher/artist;
 - b) provide an agreed upon method of evaluating goals, process, and outcome; and
 - c) validate that evaluation through peer review.

DOCUMENTATION AND EVALUATION OF CREATIVE ACTIVITY [iii]

1. Documenting On-Campus Creative Activity

The quality of artistic process and achievement and the learning experience it provides to students can be documented by a variety of measures. This documentation should be accumulated over an extended period of time and should include:

- a) written evaluation by the chair;
- b) written evaluation by faculty peers;
- c) written evaluation by outside experts.

Candidates should submit additional documentation, which may include:

- d) written evaluation of work submitted for competitions by qualified adjudicators [iv];
- e) research and analytical materials;
- f) scripts of original produced plays, including adaptations and translations;
- g) slides of productions, working drawings, video tapes, photographs, light plots, and other supporting material;
- h) directors' production books, study guides, and program notes;
- i) marketing and public relations materials;
- j) evidence of outreach activities, such as symposia, seminars, and workshops and other events;
- k) letters from the public;
- l) testimonials;
- m) reviews in the professional media;
- n) awards.

2. Documenting Off-Campus Professional Activity

A teacher/artist may document the quality of off-campus professional activity in a variety of ways including:

- a) demonstrating a record of continuous activity in the profession through appointed or elected leadership positions in professional organizations;
- b) demonstrating professional recognition through such achievements as competitive union memberships; honors and accolades; invited presentations, lectures and performances.
- c) demonstrating peer approval of skill mastery, such as invitations to teach master classes or lead intensive workshops;
- d) demonstrating professional competency through successful employment by reputable professional companies.

GUIDELINES ON THE USE OF OUTSIDE EXPERTS IN THE EVALUATION OF CREATIVE ACTIVITY

Since no recognized jury equivalent to those used by professional journals exists to evaluate creativity activity, theatre departments should attempt to approximate this practice when seeking outside expert evaluation. For example, a list of potential jurors agreeable to the department and the dean might be maintained from which jurors could be drawn to provide a written response to production work. Jurors or experts should have professional credentials at least equal to those of the candidate. Schools should be prepared to underwrite the cost of bringing jurors to the campus for an on-campus production. In the case of designers, portfolios and other design documentation may be sent to jurors for evaluation in addition to on-campus production response. It is important that, in so far as possible, such jurors or experts be without professional or personal connection with the teacher/artist or institution.

The work of playwrights, librettists, and composers may be considered successfully adjudicated when accepted for performance or published by a reputable leasing company or established publisher. Self-produced or self-published work would need independent outside evaluation before being considered successfully adjudicated.

Unlike the teacher/scholar who submits only successful efforts for promotion and tenure, the teacher/artist submits the total corpus of on-campus creative activity to some level of evaluation. Given this distinction and the subjective nature of artistic evaluation, departments should insist upon expert documentation of a fair sample of the teacher/artist's work. Moreover, the teacher/artist, like the teacher/scholar, should have the right to select the work to be evaluated by outside expert jurors and the right of reasonable refusal of names on the potential juror list when possible.

Revised in April, 2000 by the Task Force on Promotion and Tenure of the Professional Development Committee consisting of Anne Fliotsos and Jon Fraser, Co-Chairs; Terry Silver-Alford, Jeannie M. Woods, Michael Wright. Approved, May, 2000, by the Governing Council.

APPENDICES

A. *Scholarship for the Discipline of Theatre: Association for Theatre in Higher Education White Paper.*

SCHOLARSHIP FOR THE DISCIPLINE OF THEATRE: AN ASSOCIATION for THEATRE in HIGHER EDUCATION WHITE PAPER

In 1985, the American Association for Higher Education (AAHE) and the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching began to explore expanding notions of scholarship in the academy, the relationship between teaching and scholarship, and the connection between the academy and its community. Ernest Boyer, President of the Carnegie Foundation, brought this dialogue to national and international attention through his 1990 publication, *Scholarship Reconsidered*.¹ In this groundbreaking study, Boyer proposed that “colleges and universities need a fresh vision of scholarship in order to tap the full range of faculty talents and encourage other activities that also need to be done.”² Confirming the necessity for both traditional notions of scholarship and this broader perspective, Boyer urged the academy to acknowledge and reward the activities of its faculty that meet the criteria for these expanded ideas of scholarship. (These notions of expanded scholarship are discussed in detail below.) In 1995, the Carnegie Foundation published *Scholarship Assessed* precisely to address the question of how to establish “criteria of ‘excellence’”³ for the evaluation of its broader categories of scholarly activity.

In 1997, the Carnegie Foundation secured a six-million-dollar, five-year grant from the Pew Charitable Trusts to focus this initiative in three critical areas: through fellowships for individual educators “who wish to investigate and document significant issues and challenges in teaching and learning in their field”; “through a companion program for colleges and universities prepared to make a public commitment to fostering teaching as scholarly

¹ Ernest L Boyer, *Scholarship Reconsidered: Priorities of the Professoriate* (Princeton, New Jersey: Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, 1990).

² Mary Taylor Huber, “Evaluating Outreach: Scholarship Assessed’s Approach.” (Web document of Penn State Outreach at <http://www.outreach.psu.edu/News/Pubs/Monograph.eval.html> 4 June 2001).

³ Ibid.

work”; and “through work with scholarly societies who are interested in supporting teaching and learning in the disciplines.”⁴

In the mid-to-late 1990s, members of the Association for Theatre in Higher Education (ATHE), responding to their campuses’ engagement with this national and international dialogue, began to seek guidance from ATHE about the application and assessment of the Boyer model for our discipline. In 1998, ATHE initiated the drafting of its White Paper on “Scholarship for the Discipline of Theatre.” ATHE leaders and individual members started developing closer connections with the Carnegie Foundation, especially the Carnegie Academy for the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning (CASTL). In August 2000, the Governing Council of ATHE approved ATHE’s formal association with CASTL as an affiliate member. In so doing, ATHE joined a number of professional and scholarly organizations in the arts, the humanities, the social sciences, and the physical and applied sciences—including the American Psychological Association, the American Philosophical Association, the College Music Society, the National Communication Association, and many others--in creating documents addressing their disciplines’ application of the Boyer concepts. Four ATHE members (Suzanne Burgoyne, Richard Gale, Judith F. Garey, and Kathleen Perkins) have been selected for the highly competitive faculty fellowship program that accepted only 30 fellows per year. Over 200 academic institutions in the United States, many of which employ ATHE members, have initiated “campus conversations” around the Boyer concepts and have committed themselves to these expanded notions of scholarship and their attendant enhanced focus on teaching and learning. In 2001, ATHE received a CASTL grant to revise its White Paper in response to members’ comments and questions as well as to new concepts from the ongoing national and international dialogue.

Introduction

- This document seeks to assist individual and organizational members of ATHE to understand this dialogue on scholarship, and how it applies to our discipline

⁴ Mary Taylor Huber, “Disciplinary Styles in the Scholarship of Teaching: Reflections on the Carnegie Academy for the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning.” (Web document of the Carnegie Foundation at <http://www.carnegiefoundation.org/eLibrary/docs/disciplinarystyles.htm> 4 Jan. 2001).

- The document further seeks to clarify ATHE’s position on this dialogue
- This document endeavors to guide individual ATHE members as they proceed through the phases of their academic life, from graduate student through retirement
- Neither this document, nor the Boyer model, attempts to replace the traditional tri-part criteria for promotion and tenure (Teaching-Service-Scholarship), instead, it advocates expanding our understanding of the last of these

Using terminology first proposed by Ernest Boyer in *Scholarship Reconsidered*, and refined in *Scholarship Assessed*,⁵ this document explains an expanded concept of scholarship for the theatre, which includes: 1) the scholarship of discovery, 2) the scholarship of teaching and learning, 3) the scholarship of engagement and 4) and the scholarship of integration. The unique culture and context of each academic institution, and the priorities of each Theatre unit, will determine the relevance and value of the proposed standards in any given setting. A quick overview of this terminology follows:

Boyer’s Category	Definition	General Examples
Scholarship of Discovery	Where new and unique knowledge is generated	Research and publication, creation of original work
Scholarship of Teaching and Learning	Where bridges are creatively built between the discipline and the student’s learning/understanding.	Work that deepens our understanding of teaching and learning in the discipline, or sharpens our focus on student learning
Scholarship of Engagement	Where the emphasis is on the use of new knowledge in solving society’s problems, or in creating civically engaged citizens	Application, practice
Scholarship of Integration	Where new relationships among disciplines are discovered or created	Cross-, Multi- and Inter-disciplinary scholarship in any of the above categories

⁵ C. Glassick, M. Huber, & G. Maeroff, *Scholarship Assessed: Evaluation of the Professorate* (San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass, 1997).

A Note on What Counts as Scholarship

"For an activity to be designated as scholarship," argues Lee Shulman, who succeeded Ernest Boyer as President of the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, "it should manifest at least three key characteristics: It should be public, susceptible to critical review and evaluation, and accessible for exchange and use by other members of one's scholarly community."⁶ Following this Carnegie example, ATHE recommends that scholarship in all categories be peer-reviewed, publicly presented or published, and significant to the field.

Scholarship of Discovery

In *Scholarship Reconsidered* Boyer calls most of what was traditionally categorized as "research" the Scholarship of Discovery. The scholarship of discovery is "inquiry that produces the disciplinary and professional knowledge that is at the very heart of academic pursuits."⁷ In *Scholarship Assessed*, an expansion and development of the first study, Glassick, Maeroff and Huber maintain, "The academy holds no tenet in higher regard than the pursuit of knowledge for its own sake, a fierce determination to give free rein to fair and honest inquiry, wherever it may lead. At its best, the scholarship of discovery contributes not only to the stock of human knowledge but also to the intellectual climate of a college or university. The process, the outcomes, and especially the passion of discovery enhance the meaning of the effort and the institution itself."⁸ For our discipline the scholarship of discovery traditionally includes:

- theatre history
- critical theory
- performance studies
- studies of plays, artists and theatrical artifacts
- performance in historical contexts
- dramaturgy
- and dance studies

In these arenas it is possible to use either qualitative or quantitative methodologies, with the usual outcome being publication.

⁶ Lee S. Schulman, "Teaching as Community Property: Putting an End to Pedagogical Solitude," *Change*, Nov./Dec. 1993, 6-7.

⁷ Boyer, *Scholarship Reconsidered*, 17.

⁸ Glassick, Huber, and Maeroff, *Scholarship Assessed*, 9.

Scholarship of Teaching and Learning (SOTL)

Within the Carnegie model, the scholarship of teaching and learning (SOTL) is distinct from the activity of teaching itself. For our discipline, SOTL is *inquiry* that produces knowledge that supports the process of learning the art of Theatre. This scholarly approach fosters the development of educational environments that embrace diverse learning styles, and increasingly, places the focus of education on the learner.⁹

To explain SOTL we should distinguish among *teaching*, *scholarly teaching*, and SOTL. Good *teaching* draws upon the research of scholars in the discipline to provide content---what should be taught. *Scholarly teaching* considers how something should be taught---how students can learn the content and/or skills of the discipline. The scholarly teacher, therefore, is a self-reflective teacher who:

1. identifies a problem related to teaching and learning
2. researches potential solutions
3. tries them out
4. assesses their success

In order to transform this research into the *Scholarship of Teaching and Learning*, the scholarly teacher takes the next step and

5. makes the research public---opening it up to peer review and discussion.¹⁰

Examples of SOTL in theatre might include:

- a study of how participation in theatre may impact student social attitudes
- a study of how acting students' self-evaluations affect their development
- design and assessment of a technology based learning system in theatre
- a study of a new approach to teaching critical thinking in theatre

Scholarship of Engagement

⁹ R. Edgerton, *Higher Education White Paper* (Washington, DC: Pew Charitable Trusts, 1997).

¹⁰ Bob Bain, "Teaching, Scholarly Teaching, Scholarship of Teaching," paper presented at the First Annual Charleston Connections: Innovations in Higher Education Conference, Charleston, SC, 2 June 2001.

Characterizing this form of scholarship, Applegate and Morreale of the National Communication Association have written, "the scholarship of engagement redefines our research and teaching missions to include research that addresses real-world problems and pedagogy that creates involved and committed citizens."¹¹

In *Scholarship Reconsidered*, Boyer refers to this arena of scholarship as the scholarship of application, but as his colleague Mary Taylor Huber explains, "in his last speeches and writings, between 1994 and 1995, Boyer spoke not of the scholarship of application, but instead of the 'scholarship of engagement,' by which he meant those activities within any of the four scholarships which connect the academic with people and places outside the campus and which ultimately direct the work of the academy 'toward larger, more humane ends.'"¹²

In a posthumously published last article, Boyer says that "the scholarship of engagement means connecting the rich resources of the university to our most pressing social, civic, and ethical problems, to our children, to our schools, to our teachers, and to our cities."¹³

Outreach projects, service learning, professional service, review of grant applications, creation and analysis of governmental policy, as well as more traditional forms of applied scholarship have all been successfully used to make promotion and tenure cases when the projects were well-conceived, documented, and peer-reviewed. The American Association for Higher Education has been particularly active in creating publications that assist faculty members in structuring their engagement activities into scholarly formats. (See the resources section for more information.)

Following Boyer's lead, ATHE uses the larger term "engagement" to embrace the scholarship of application, but also to extend to the areas of professional service and civic activism. Examples of this kind of scholarship, when documented and assessed, might include:

¹¹ James L. Applegate and Sherwyn P. Morreale, "Creating Engaged Disciplines: One Association's Efforts to Encourage Community Involvement," *AAHE Bulletin* 53, no. 9 (May 2001): 1.

¹² Huber, "Evaluating Outreach."

¹³ Ernest L. Boyer, "The Scholarship of Engagement," *Journal of Public Service & Outreach* 1, no. 1 (1996): 21.

- applying professional practice to production, such as dramaturgy
- professional service such as editing a journal or organizing a scholarly meeting
- historic preservation
- leadership of scholarly societies
- organizing a young playwrights' festival to achieve a measurable increase in the involvement of young people in the arts

Scholarship of Integration

The Scholarship of Integration involves scholars, working alone or in collaboration, using theories, models, perspectives, and/or methods from one field to address research questions in another field. This type of scholarship is not really new to theatre scholars—we've been doing it for years. Integrative research of this kind can be applied to the other forms of scholarship: discovery, teaching and learning, and engagement.

So why consider Integration a separate category of scholarship? One reason may be that traditional disciplinary lines have sometimes caused such work to fall "between the cracks" when promotion and tenure reviews took place. ATHE advocates for the recognition of interdisciplinary work as an important scholarly endeavor. After all, the formation of disciplines is an historic phenomenon, and the boundaries between disciplines continue to shift.

Another reason for encouraging integrative investigation is that in an era in which specialized knowledge often becomes extremely focused, "an urgent need" arises "to place discoveries in a larger context and create more interdisciplinary conversations."¹⁴ Theories and discoveries in one field may shed new light on research problems in another field, but unless scholars venture beyond disciplinary boundaries, parallel lines of inquiry may be overlooked. Integrative inquiry helps scholars to perceive the "larger picture" and to formulate new questions.

A third reason for theatre scholars to engage in Scholarship of Integration is that our own field comprises a variety of sub-disciplines. Collaborative research among scholars of these sub-disciplines (for example, voice and

¹⁴ Ibid., 17.

movement) may prove a particularly fruitful kind of Scholarship of Integration for us.

Examples of Scholarship of Integration in theatre abound; to suggest just a few:

- the application of cognitive theory by a theatre scholar to illuminate the learning of acting
- a study of rehearsal process conducted by a theatre scholar using ethnographic methods originally developed by anthropologists
- a collaborative investigation by an education scholar and a theatre scholar of how theatrical models and methods might enhance the teaching effectiveness of university professors
- the integration of current scientific theory and dramatic theory by a theatre scholar into an interpretation of postmodernism.

CREATIVE WORK AS SCHOLARSHIP

The creation and production of performance work, central to the activities of many theatre academics, can be considered a form of scholarship within Boyer's model. The Carnegie Foundation categorizes creative work within "scholarship of discovery." They write that scholarship of discovery "comes closest to what academics mean when they speak of research, although we intend that this type of scholarship also include the creative work of faculty in the literary, visual, and performing arts."¹⁵

ATHE can imagine a given creative work, including playwriting, dramaturgy, design, acting, or directing, potentially fitting into any of Boyer's categories. The ultimate determination of the kind of scholarship a performance fulfills will depend on departmental and institutional guidelines, as well as:

1. The artist's initial questions of investigation
2. The form of the artist's documentation of the inquiry
3. The focus of peer evaluation

¹⁵ Glassick, Huber, and Maeroff, *Scholarship Assessed*, 9.

Some Examples of Creative Work in Boyer's Categories:

Scholarship of Discovery

- Writing a new play
- Creating and performing an original performance piece
- Re-conceptualizing and directing a "classic" play

Scholarship of Teaching and Learning

- Directing a production to teach a different acting technique and assessing the students' use of that technique
- Developing, teaching, implementing, and assessing a new design technology

Scholarship of Engagement

- Using a production to make connections with the community
- Acting, directing, dramaturging, or designing a play (as an application of the skills of the theatre artist)

Scholarship of Integration

- Applying theories of kinesthetics developed in biology to movement work in a production
- Researching historical documents to create a performance

Like scholarly work in any of Boyer's categories, production or performance must:

1. Be presented publicly or published
2. Be peer-evaluated
3. Have impact on the field

The assessment of creative work as scholarship will depend on the policies for faculty roles and rewards at each institution. ATHE advocates, however, that colleges and universities create structures by which creative work and performance can be evaluated as scholarship (rather than as teaching or service).

ASSESSMENT

In *Scholarship Assessed*, Glassick, Huber, and Maeroff assert that "to give the four kinds of scholarly activities the weight that each deserves, they all

must be held to the same standards of scholarly performance.”¹⁶ To create a “conceptual framework to guide evaluation,” the authors accumulated materials from dozens of colleges and universities regarding hiring, tenure, and promotion.¹⁷ They queried granting agencies, editors and directors of scholarly journals and university presses regarding their standards for judging the scholarly merit of projects. They synthesized these collected standards for qualitative evaluation into assessment categories. ATHE has identified the following questions from this analysis as germane to the assessment of scholarship in our discipline.

PURPOSE:

Does the theatre scholar describe the purpose of the work clearly as well as articulate important questions in the field?

PREPARATION/BACKGROUND:

Does the theatre scholar demonstrate knowledge of existing scholarship in the field? Does s/he bring the necessary skills to, and have access to resources for, the project?

METHODS:

Does the theatre scholar articulate clearly and convincingly the methodology and its application to the project?

PRESENTATION:

Does the theatre scholar present the work effectively to its intended audiences in forums appropriate to the project?

SIGNIFICANCE TO THE FIELD:

Does the theatre scholar’s work contribute significantly to the field?

REFLECTIVE CRITIQUE:

Does the theatre scholar critically evaluate the project to improve the quality of future work?

When assembling materials for promotion and review consideration, ATHE members need to be aware of increasingly expanding circles of influence—

¹⁶ Ibid., 22.

¹⁷ Ibid., 25.

institutional, local, state, regional, national, and international—and their relative ranking at their institution in the assessment of their work.

In *Scholarship Assessed*, the authors further observe, “The emerging climate at colleges and universities supports the idea that different types of scholarly work merit formal consideration. In experiments across the country, faculty are assembling a wide variety of evidence to demonstrate their achievements in the four areas of scholarship.”¹⁸ For all scholarship, quality will be determined through peer reviews that may take various forms depending on the project under consideration. ATHE supports the establishment and use of rigorous assessment standards and the goal of excellence for all forms of scholarship.

Forms of Documentation

- publications
- presentations at conferences
- invited lectures
- authorship of grant proposals or applications
- publicly presented productions, readings or stagings of original work
- case studies related to teaching-learning
- authorship of accreditation or other comprehensive program reports
- published textbooks or other learning aids, such as CD-Roms, videos, etc.
- development of outcome studies or evaluation/assessment programs
- consultation reports
- products, patents, license copyrights
- peer reviews of practice
- policy papers related to one's discipline
- Dramaturgical or directorial protocols, program notes, outreach materials
- Renderings, models, design portfolios, photographs
- Choreographic evidence, Labanotation
- Video documentation
- Web-based presentations, publications, productions, or archives of pedagogical or research material

¹⁸ Ibid., 23.

Summary

The discussion of expanding concepts of scholarship in the academy, and the revision of faculty recognition and reward systems, has now filtered down to an institution-by-institution, and discipline-by-discipline dialogue. While ATHE recognizes the mission of each institution of higher learning is unique, ATHE strongly affirms recognition of a wider variety of the activities of our members as valuable scholarship. Indeed the perspectives presented in this document suggest that all aspects of our work may offer potential for scholarship, thus encouraging us to conduct them in a spirit of inquiry and with scholarly rigor.

RESOURCES

The following entries are basic sources for information on the scholarships of teaching, engagement and integration. They lead to more specialized sources.

Books:

Boyer, Ernest L. *Scholarship Reconsidered: Priorities of the Professoriate*. Princeton, NJ: Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, 1990.

Cross, K. Patricia, and Mimi Harris Steadman. *Classroom Research: Implementing the Scholarship of Teaching*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass Publishers, 1996.

Diamond, Robert M., and Browyn E. Adam, eds. *The Disciplines Speak: Rewarding the Scholarly, Professional, and Creative Work of Faculty*. Washington, D.C.: American Association for Higher Education, 1995.

Driscoll, Amy, and Ernest A. Lynton. *Making Outreach Visible: A Guide to Documenting Professional Service and Outreach*. Washington, D.C.: American Association for Higher Education, 1999.

Edgerton, R. *Higher education white paper*. Washington, DC: Pew Charitable Trusts, 1997.

Glassick, Charles E., Mary Taylor Huber, and Gene I. Maeroff. *Scholarship Assessed: Evaluation of the Professoriate*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers, 1997.

Hutchings, Pat. *Making Teaching Community Property: A Menu for Peer Collaboration and Peer Review*. Washington, D.C.: American Association for Higher Education, 1996.

-----, ed. *The Course Portfolio: How Faculty Can Examine Their Teaching to Advance Practice and Improve Student Learning*. Washington, D.C.: American Association for Higher Education, 1998.

-----, ed. *Opening Lines: Approaches to the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning*. Menlo Park, CA: The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, 2000.

Lynton, Ernest A. *Making the Case for Professional Service*. Washington, D.C.: American Association for Higher Education, 1995.

Wingspread Group on Higher Education. *An American Imperative: Higher Expectation for Higher Education*. Milwaukee, Wisconsin, The Johnson Foundation, 1993.

Articles:

Bass, Randy. "The Scholarship of Teaching: What's the Problem?" *Inventio* [online journal] 1, no. 1 (1999). 18 Aug. 2000.
<http://www.dojiit.gmu.edu/Archives/feb98/andybass.htm>

Boyer, Ernest L. "The Scholarship of Engagement." *Journal of Public Service and Outreach* 1, no.1 (1996): 11-21.

Cambridge, Barbara. "What Is the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning?" *AAHE Bulletin* 52, no. 4 (1999): PAGES?

Huber, Mary Taylor. "Evaluating Outreach: *Scholarship Assessed's* Approach." Speech published online at:
<http://www.outreach.psu.edu/News/Pubs/Monograph/eval.htm/>

Hutchings, Pat, and Lee S. Schulman. "The Scholarship of Teaching: New Elaborations, New Developments." *Change*, Sept./Oct. 1999, 10-15.

National Office for Arts Accrediting Agencies. *The Work of Arts Faculties in Higher Education*. Reston, VA: National Office for Arts Accrediting Agencies, 1993.

Schulman, Lee S. "Teaching as Community Property: Putting an End to Pedagogical Solitude." *Change*, Nov./Dec. 1993, 6-7.

Websites:

AAHE (American Association for Higher Education):
<http://www.aahe.org>

The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching:
<http://www.carnegiefoundation.org>

George Mason University's *Inventio*, an online journal of the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning: < <http://www.dojiit.gmu.edu/inventio/>>

Acknowledgments:

This paper was prepared by an ATHE task force consisting of Donna Aronson, Suzanne Burgoyne, Kurt Daw, J. Ellen Gainor, Kathleen Perkins, and Stacy Wolf. It revises an earlier ATHE document that was prepared under the editorship of Kurt Daw with contributions from over 70 respondents. This revision was enabled by a grant from the Carnegie Association for the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning (CASTL), which allowed the task force to meet and review the latest materials on the topic of definitions of scholarship. ATHE expresses its sincere appreciation to Pat Hutchings and to CASTL for their generous support.

B. Models for Evaluating Creative Activity: A Supplement to Guidelines for Evaluating Teacher/Artists for Promotion and Tenure.

GUIDELINES FOR EVALUATING TEACHER/ARTISTS
FOR PROMOTION AND TENURE

APPENDIX B.

MODELS FOR EVALUATING CREATIVE ACTIVITY

The following supplemental report defines responsibilities and suggests models for systematic evaluation of various forms of creative activity. Because of the diversity of educational contexts, the theatre program's chief administrator and its faculty will establish the criteria and context for evaluation by peers and outside experts. The following explains how this might be done.

A. Evaluation by the Chair and Faculty Peer

The chief administrative officer [v] should systematically evaluate the creative activities of the faculty member. In addition, a peer evaluation may be performed by a selected senior faculty member who has appropriate expertise to study and evaluate the preparation process as well as the public presentation of a given theatrical event. Minimally, these creative activities should be evaluated in written form annually. For evaluating individual artists, the following models are suggested:

Model One

1. The evaluator attends the meeting(s) of the production team to observe discussions about the production.
2. Within this context, the evaluator meets with the individual being evaluated to learn about the goals of the artist and process the artist will employ in production.
3. The evaluator observes meetings, auditions, and rehearsals as appropriate.
4. The evaluator attends one or more public performances.
5. The evaluator discusses the creative activity with the artist and, if desired, other personnel involved in the process and/or production.
6. The evaluator writes an evaluation of the artist's work in view of the goals specified.

Model Two

1. The evaluator meets individually with the artist and the various production personnel to discuss the goals, creative process and the artistic achievement.
2. After attending a performance, the evaluator writes an evaluation based on the goals, the process, and the production.

Model Three

1. The evaluator meets with the artist and with the appropriate production personnel in a group to discuss the goals, creative process, and the artistic achievement.
2. The evaluator writes an evaluation based on the goals, the process, and the production.

Ordinarily, peer evaluation should follow Model One since it will involve more detailed analysis. Because of time constraints, evaluators will more likely follow Model Two or Model Three.

B. Evaluation by Outside Expert

The outside expert's written evaluation will emphasize the artistic merit of the public presentation. This individual should be one who is qualified by experience and training to render an informed, objective evaluation of theatre artistry. A model format for such evaluations will include:

1. Assessment of overall artistic merit of the production in view of production goals.
2. Analysis of the production elements in view of production goals.
3. Assessment of the extent and quality of the contributions made by the artist being evaluated.
4. Comparison of this presentation with productions of other programs having similar missions and goals.

This document was prepared by Gil Lazier (Chair), Beverly Byers-Pevitts, Sherwood Collins, Wendell Josal, Robert Pevitts, Vera Roberts, Donald L. Rosenberg, James Symons, and Jon Whitmore, assisted by Robert Hall, all of whom acknowledge the assistance of the Association for Communication Administration. Revision dated 12/99.

This document was reviewed and revised by the Task Force on Promotion and Tenure, Professional Development Committee; Anne Fliotsos and Jon Fraser, Co-Chairs; Terry Silver-Alford, Jeannie M. Woods, Michael Wright. April, 2000.

i Boyer, E. (1990) *Scholarship Reconsidered: Priorities for the Professorate*. Princeton, NJ: The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching. Boyer challenged all disciplines to embrace the full scope of academic work, moving beyond an exclusive focus on traditional and narrowly defined research as the only legitimate avenue to further the knowledge of the discipline, and obtaining rewards for professorial performance. He proposed that scholarship involved four areas that are critical to academic work. These are the scholarship of:
...discovery, where new and unique knowledge is generated;
...teaching, where the teacher creatively builds bridges between his or her own understanding and the students' learning;
...application, where the emphasis is on the use of new knowledge in practical arenas; and
...integration, where new relationships among disciplines are discovered.

ii NAST Handbook 1999-2000.

iii Various Focus Groups of ATHE have guidelines on promotion/tenure which may have additional suggestions on documentation and evaluation in a specific discipline. Candidates may wish to consult such documentation when appropriate. Some are available in the *ATHEtalk* archives (www.hawaii.edu/athe/resources/lists/archieve.html).

iv Participants in the Kennedy Center/American College Theatre Festival are reminded that response to productions may not be used for administrative purposes such as tenure and promotion without the clearly expressed permission of the faculty mentioned in the response. (See ACTF Brochure.) Particular attention should be paid to giving collaborators on the production team the opportunity to review the response and excise any material dealing with their work, if they choose. Schools wishing to use a KC/ACTF adjudicator should contract with the adjudicator to write a separate evaluation of the artist/teacher under consideration for promotion and tenure under the guidelines for using an outside evaluator described in this document.

v This assumes that the chief administrative officer has the expertise in theatre to perform this evaluation. In cases where the chief administrative officer does not have such credentials in theatre, he/she should choose a qualified alternate.