

MODELS FOR EVALUATING
CREATIVE ACTIVITY:

A SUPPLEMENT TO
GUIDELINES FOR EVALUATING TEACHER/ARTISTS
FOR PROMOTION AND TENURE

In 1985, the document Guidelines for Evaluating Teacher/Artists for Promotion and Tenure was developed by a special committee of the Chief Administrators Program of the University and College Theatre Association, and subsequently approved by the Association for Theatre in Higher Education and the Association for Communication Administration. 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

The chief administrative officer should systematically evaluate the creative activities of the faculty member. Minimally, these creative activities should be evaluated in written form annually. For evaluating individual artists, the following models are suggested:

Model One

1. The chief administrative officer attends the meeting(s) of the production team to observe discussions of the production concept.
2. Within this context, the chief administrative officer meets with the individual being evaluated to learn about the process the artist will employ to achieve the shared production concept.
3. The chief administrative officer observes meetings, auditions, and rehearsals as appropriate.
4. The chief administrative officer attends one or more public performances.
5. The chief administrative officer discusses the artistic achievement with the artist and, if desired, other personnel involved in the production.
6. The chief administrative officer writes an evaluation of the artist's work.

Model Two

1. Either before or after attending the production, the chief administrative officer meets individually with the artist and the various production personnel to discuss the creative process and the artistic achievement.
2. The chief administrative officer writes an evaluation based on the discussions and on the production.

Model Three

1. Either before or after the production, the chief administrative officer meets with the artist and with the appropriate production personnel in a group.
 2. The chief administrative officer writes an evaluation based on the discussions and on the production.
- B. Evaluation by Faculty Peer

A peer evaluation should be performed by a selected senior faculty who has appropriate expertise to study and evaluate the preparation process as well as the public presentation of a given production. The emphasis of the written evaluation should be on the process leading to the presentation. The following models are suggested:

Model One

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

Model Two

1. Either before or after attending the production, the peer evaluator meets individually with the artist and the various production personnel to discuss the creative process and the artistic achievement.
2. The peer evaluator writes an evaluation based on the discussions and on the production.

Model Three

1. Either before or after attending the production, the peer evaluator meets with the artist and with the appropriate production personnel in a group.
2. The peer evaluator writes an evaluation based on the discussions and on the production.

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

C. 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.
2. Analysis of the production elements.
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.

These models, and the Guidelines upon which they are based, are applicable to all teacher/artists involved in the production of plays. The written evaluations will become part of the creative artist's dossier. In every case, the artist must be given the opportunity to respond in writing to all evaluations. It is understood that evaluations will be accumulated over an extended period of time.

This document was prepared by Gil Lazier (Chair), Beverley Byers-Pevitts, Sherwood Collins, Wendell Josal, Robert Pevitts, Vera Roberts, Donald L. Rosenberg, James Symons, and Jon Whitmore, assisted by Robert Hall. We gratefully acknowledge the assistance of the Association for Communication Administration.