

**NCA PERFORMANCE STUDIES DIVISION:
TENURE AND PROMOTION GUIDELINES FOR
UNDERSTANDING AND EVALUATING CREATIVE ACTIVITY**

I. PREAMBLE

Performance Studies scholarship embraces a wide array of topics, research methods, and modes of presentation and publication. While we consider this diversity of scholarly practice a great strength of our field, it brings with it potential difficulties as well. Notable among these is the complexity of assessing records of scholarship that include elements not easily captured by the typical categories used in tenure, promotion, and merit review.

The Performance Studies Division (PSD) of NCA recognizes, of course, that each case of professional assessment is an internal matter of departments, colleges, and universities with their own evaluative standards. Performance Studies scholars expect to be assessed with the same rigor as their colleagues in other fields. The PSD does not presume this document will supercede procedures at individual institutions; it offers the Division's perspective on the value of scholarly practices that, though distinctive to Performance Studies research, may not be as familiar to scholars and reviewers in other fields.

Additionally, the guidelines do not offer an exhaustive account of arguments for that value. The Division encourages its members and the administrators representing and evaluating them to remain abreast of parallel developments in other arts-related disciplines, as our colleagues have also undertaken similar efforts to articulate the value of their work in engaged institutions. The Broadcast Educator's Association, for example, maintains "Creative work is intellectually demanding in similar ways to that of traditional research, including the collection, analysis, and synthesis of content. The creative process also involves discovery in the development of effective aural and visual forms and provides integration as these forms are united with content to create the final work" (<http://www.beafestival.org/guidelines.html>).

As preamble to the more specific topics addressed below, three broad and highly valued characteristics of Performance Studies scholarship are worth identifying:

1. Performances may have their sources in fieldwork, in archival research, in oral history interviews, or in other arenas that require great effort to secure primary information. This includes direct, extended contact with individuals and communities outside academe, as well as "literature" conventionally construed. This has implications both for the speed with which performance-based scholarship may come to fruition, and for the forms in which research findings are recorded and disseminated.

2. For many in Performance Studies, the mission of performance is to build a link between their research and the wider public-as-audience. In fulfilling this mission, Performance Studies scholars may generate research products that cross the boundary between publication in the narrow sense and service or outreach. Such research outcomes as oral history transcripts, scripts, theatrical performances, installations, street and/or “devised” performances, and festivals are familiar and highly valued in the field. Also, the explosion of electronic media technologies has greatly facilitated the dissemination of performance-based research. Audio and video recordings are becoming ever more available as forms of scholarly publication, and of course the dissemination of research through the internet (e-journals, websites, etc.) is becoming increasingly common in all academic fields. Performance Studies scholars have been active in the scholarly use of all such media.

3. It is the nature of much performance-based research to be collaborative. This is true both in the development and rehearsal processes, and in those forms of research presentation that often require multiple participants (e.g., performances per se, and festivals).

Like scholars in other fields, Performance Studies scholars engage in standard scholarly publication of books, monographs, and articles. However, many also produce work with the above features that, by the accepted standards of the field, are understood as legitimate scholarship worthy of evaluation on the same level as refereed publication. What follows are some general suggestions about how such evaluation might be conducted:

1. The production of performances, installations, festivals, audio recordings, videotapes/films, and digital media works should be seen as evidence of scholarly research and creation, interpretation, and dissemination similar to the production of books, monographs, and articles. This research may be archival; ethnographic, involving field-based interviews and observations; or may involve critical analysis and interpretation of existing texts and materials. Performance-based research should be assessed—similar to peer-reviewed publications—by peers in the field.

2. The Performance Studies Division of the National Communication Association is willing to assist academic institutions in the identification of appropriate faculty and nationally prominent practitioners for the purpose of peer evaluations. See the NRB organizational guidelines at www.psdnrb.org.

3. The assessment of performance-based scholarship is intellectual work of significant service to individuals, institutions, and the profession. Frequently, it requires physical presence at performance events, conducting interviews with participants, etc. As such, this work merits compensation commensurate with other types of reviews with these same logistical and intellectual requirements (i.e., program review).

4. The assessment of performance-based scholarship requires contextual framing to situate the activity within specific institutional mission and goals as well as disciplinary links and traditions. Explicit contextual framing, to be supplied by the researcher and endorsed by the sponsoring institution, should guide the formal assessment of performance-based scholarship. To do so provides the reviewer explicit understandings of how the work is supported and valued at both the institutional and disciplinary levels, the audiences conceived as central to the creation of the scholarship, the balances between process and product as predetermined outcomes, and the relative importance of venue as a category of assessment.

Taking these characteristics and general suggestions into consideration, the Performance Studies Division offers the following specific guidelines for putting these suggestions into practice at various stages of a faculty member's hire, profile development, evaluation, promotion, and retention.

II. THE HIRING PROCESS

Candidates are encouraged to be concrete and specific about their needs and expectations for their own professional development, including such aspects as:

- funding for research, including travel
- space and funding for production work: materials, personnel, and equipment
- support for peer review of production work – invited external peer reviewers, touring productions, etc.
- support for pursuing grants internal and external to the university

These aspects should be negotiated before an offer is accepted.

To the degree appropriate to the institutional context, the letter of offer should explicitly state:

1. the specific duties and responsibilities of the faculty position, including teaching load, reassigned or release time for production work, expectations for student advising and mentoring, service on committees, and the like.
2. the specific resources, support systems and funding negotiated by the candidate.
3. the level and kinds of support that the faculty member can expect from the various levels of the institution as s/he develops a career plan.
4. the process by which the new faculty member develops a career development plan (see establishing the creative profile, below).
5. the step-by-step process by which the faculty will be evaluated for retention, tenure and promotion by all levels of the university.
6. the availability of documents, guidelines and mentoring about retention, tenure and promotion.

Once a new faculty member has been hired, the institution has already made a significant investment in the individual's future success. The position description, as advertised and as refined in interviews, and the new faculty member's background, talent and expertise are seen to be a promising fit, one that advances the mission of the department and the university. It is the responsibility of the department and college to socialize and mentor the new faculty member in the pre-tenure period.

III. THE PRE-TENURE PERIOD

It is imperative that the new faculty member be given access to all documents relevant to the retention, tenure, and promotion process. These documents may reside in different places – e.g., annual review procedures may be in departmental documents, while tenure and promotion criteria and guidelines may be in college or university-level documents. It is the department chair or unit supervisor’s responsibility to ensure that the new faculty member receives all policies that influence how s/he will be evaluated.

It is equally important for the department to review its own criteria and guidelines on a regular basis, to ensure that the procedures for peer review and evaluation adequately represent the creative scholarship its faculty—at all ranks—produce.

It is important to the success of the new faculty member—and the program s/he has been hired to advance—that collaborative relationships within and beyond the department are fostered and supported. Senior faculty, and mid-level faculty whose scholarship and creative research aligns with or complements the new member’s area, are extremely important potential mentors. These mentors can provide institutional history as well as concrete examples of how to access additional institutional resources to support the creative work of the new faculty member. They can also provide history and guidance on successfully navigating the personnel processes that will be forthcoming. Department Chairs and Unit Heads in particular can make sure these introductions are made. Often the Dean’s office provides this service as well.

Establishing the creative profile:

Sometime during the first year, new faculty should meet with the Department Chair or supervisor to develop a scholarly agenda or career plan intended to project over the next 3 years. This plan should be one that develops the individual’s professional profile and also advances the mission and goals of the department and institution. This document should be signed by the faculty member, Department Chair or Unit Head and the Dean, and would become the framework for annual evaluations of the faculty member. Faculty should adapt their agenda annually or at intervals such as every three years, with the revised agenda signed by the faculty member, Chair, and Dean, as appropriate in the specific institution.

Development of and agreement on the faculty member’s creative plans for the immediate future accomplishes the following benefits to the faculty member, the program, and the institution:

- It establishes the relationship of the faculty member’s creative work to the mission and goals of the department and the institution.
- It documents mutual agreement on the relevance and significance of that work to the department and institution, and perhaps the surrounding community.
- It identifies concrete expectations for faculty productivity within the timeline.

- It documents agreement on the institutional support that will be provided to achieve the stated goals – e.g., reassigned or release time for productions, ongoing funding for productions; invited reviewer funding; travel and touring funding; etc.
- It enables a means for establishing collaborations and partnerships within the department and beyond the department as the scholarly agenda is shared publicly.
- It provides a developmental tool for identifying discrepancies between the scholarly agenda and goals, allowing their prompt remedy.
- It provides a means for enhancing departmental communication regarding faculty accomplishments and ongoing projects.

IV. EVALUATION FOR TENURE AND PROMOTION

Given the considerable investment of time and resources by the candidate and the institution over the course of the probationary period, the preparation, submission, and evaluation of the application for tenure—including the dossier and any additional supporting materials as appropriate for a particular institution—ideally constitute the culmination of a process, not the start of one. The same holds true for promotion from Associate to Full Professor. Preparation of the dossier should follow guidelines the department and institution have made available to the candidate from the time of hire throughout the probationary period, with any additional expectations and procedures pertinent to the promotion from Associate to Full professor also made available and “kept in clear view” of all the parties after tenure. As such, the candidate and the institution, as represented by the chair, should have had clear and direct communication about the expectations for the dossier, including its contents and timeline for preparation and evaluation. This includes indicating who is responsible for which aspects of the dossier, when final copies of the various component documents are due, how external reviewers are chosen (and by whom), as well as the criteria used in evaluating the dossier.

As indicated elsewhere, the Performance Studies Division of the National Communication Association does not presume this document will replace or supersede procedures at individual institutions. Instead, these PSD guidelines provide a structure for articulating how and why creative scholarship should be valued as a component in the profile of a successful practitioner of Performance Studies. Additionally, different institutional cultures have different norms for what a candidate must or must not include in the dossier, as well as what the candidate *may* include, should s/he so choose. In any case, the candidate and department must remember to ask two fundamental questions about each item included as supporting material: *What do we hope this item will communicate to external and internal evaluators about our department mission and the candidate’s contributions to it? What does that communication indicate about our perceived relationship toward those evaluators (defensive, instructive, responsive, etc.)?*

Institutional requirements for the dossier vary. These following guidelines are not an exhaustive account of what dossiers must or might include. Instead, they offer a set of concrete suggestions for how candidates for tenure and/or promotion can represent their creative accomplishment. To do so, the candidate should consider the local utility of including elements speaking to the preparation, role, purposes relative to audiences and venues, peer evaluation, and ongoing access to and impacts of their work.

A creative work’s preparation occurs under the auspices of institutional missions.

Just as reviewing the outcomes of creative work can reveal its value, examining its preparation can illuminate a candidate’s (and by extension a department’s) contribution to an institution. The popular association of “creativity” with sudden inspiration and frenzied realization can lead us to overlook potential proofs of an ephemeral work’s fit within established and emerging academic values. Our rhetorical task is to communicate the rigor of that preparation, its length, and its variety of forms in the light of our

department and institution's mission. This may occur more easily in the "research" statement, chair's letters, and/or personnel committee recommendations many institutions require in the dossier than through the addition of ancillary materials. At the very least, it should begin in such statements, letters, and recommendations, making clear reference to any materials judiciously included in the dossier.

Candidates and chairs can speak to preparation as proof of contribution to mission by situating the work relative to the candidate's research program. Some questions to consider:

- How did the work respond to questions raised or found unaddressed by a previous work (or body of work) and/or its critical reception?
- How is this responsiveness to disciplinary and aesthetic conversations demonstrated in materials prepared for programs, audience education materials, artistic statements available at the box office or candidate's website, etc?
- Do these have Works Cited or other bibliographic documents and, if so, how do the documents and citations situate the production in the intellectual context of its primary references?
- How did this research help the candidate articulate research questions for both the content of the production and its commitments to and resistance of particular aesthetic forms, movements, and/or traditions?
- How did the candidate collaborate with scholars or artists in other academic disciplines?
- How did grants, sabbatical/research leaves, or any other forms of mission-related departmental and institutional support facilitate the production's research and creation as a continuation of a program of creative inquiry, in other words, undertaken in broader scholarly and artistic communities?

The candidate and chair should each keep in mind that the goal of this element is not merely to establish that the creative work *was* hard work; each must articulate the ways this work *advanced* recognized institutional missions.

Articulating the singular or multiple roles a candidate has played in the creation of a given work will help evaluators understand and value the depth and breadth of the candidate's achievement.

Whenever the work in the field of Performance Studies is collaborative in nature, a faculty member, at all points in the evaluation process, should clearly articulate the role(s) he or she played in the various stages of the creative project. By the same token, chairs and departments can support the candidate's desire to be clear by recognizing the separate, albeit complementary, demands she or he faces when fulfilling multiple roles. If appropriate, a chair might indicate that the department would view fulfilling each individual role as itself worthy of note and documentation for review. That is, if a department would expect to "count" the work of adapting a novel into a script for a colleague's production, or directing that production, or creating a video for that production each as a contribution to departmental mission in its own right, the candidate

and department can responsibly view adapting a novel, directing that adapted script, and creating the video for one's own production as a multiple, rather than singular, achievement.

Some of the roles a candidate might play include: dramaturge, publicist, performer, director, producer, videographer, sound designer, dancer, writer, graphic designer, adaptor, poster designer, grant writer, etc. Candidate and chair must do more, however, than merely list the role(s) fulfilled. Specifically describing those role(s) in the creative work aides an evaluator's understanding of its contribution to the whole. It is not enough to indicate, for example, that a candidate served as a dramaturge for an original work. Candidate and chair should explain what such a dramaturge actually does, both in general (i.e., the basic work of any dramaturge) and in particular (i.e., the specific demands and achievements of serving as dramaturge for a given production).

Therefore it is crucial that faculty members articulate what multiple acts of discovery and development their role(s) entailed, so that evaluators both within the discipline and far outside it can assess the intellectual rigor, artistic novelty, and creative demands of the faculty member's particular contribution to the collaborative work. Some questions to consider:

- Have the candidate and chair planned the representation of multiple roles in the CV's traditional areas of teaching, research/creative activity, and service? Are their decisions reflected in the presentation of supporting statements/letters in the various sections of the dossier?
- Is this representation coherent, rather than fragmented, so as to minimize or eliminate perceptions of "padding" by reviewers, while at the same time adequately crediting multiple roles?
- If the institution demands a common format for CVs that obscures or breaks up the representation of multiple roles, do the candidate's statement and chair's letter help evaluators "put those pieces back together" in their holistic appraisal of the work?
- Can the chair and candidate identify specialized reviewers who might speak to one or more of the roles—for example, someone who has worked in audio, video, as a dramaturge, etc.—as a specific achievement?
- If the candidate is exploring new media or other artistic forms as part of an interdisciplinary commitment to a "whole art," have the chair and candidate considered representing that particular new role (for example, learning to work with video) as part of professional development rather than asking reviewers to consider it on its own merits using standards more applicable to long-time practitioners of that form?

Representing this element requires chairs and candidates to responsibly differentiate multiple roles, as well as to distinguish between the candidate's professional achievements and professional development toward future achievements.

A creative work's purposes relative to its audience and venues advances an institution's relationships with constituents and the public.

Because institutional missions differ, their views of creative work's purpose also differ, but may not be resistant to education. Broadly speaking, teaching institutions often ask that a candidate's creative work contribute to student learning. At the other end of the spectrum, research-intensive and research-extensive institutions may expect a candidate's research and creative work to be distinct from teaching and service. Such institutions may also, in keeping with Carnegie Commission recommendations, ask that professors share their research, and therefore also their creative activity, with students, incorporating them when and where appropriate as audience for and participants in the process.

Because units and institutions' philosophical perspectives vary greatly, it is extremely important for a candidate's offer letters, creative profiles, annual and other reviews, assignments of responsibility, and the Promotion and Tenure Guidelines through which all of these documents are made relevant to explain whether the institution will view creative work as part of a candidate's teaching, research and/or service assignment, or how flexibly a chair and faculty member may choose to represent it. In some cases, they may apply creative work to more than one assignment area, and that flexibility may allow the most equitable representation of its contribution to multiple aspects of the institutional mission—which also benefits the institution's own ability to document success on multiple objectives in internal and external assessments.

If creative work is part of the candidate's teaching assignment, here are some questions that might be considered:

- How did the audience/venue serve as a laboratory for student learning?
- How is the creative work and its venue positioned relative to the university's available resources?
- How did the creative work serve to educate the university and local communities?
- Did the collaborative process work to allow the candidate to mentor students and/or community members in the creative process and/or research?
- Was the performance presented at regional or national Performance Studies festivals, and if so how was it received?

Some possible evaluators of success:

- Attendance at post-show discussions
- Questionnaire/survey compiled after performances
- Local Reviews (e.g., in local papers)
- Peer Review (See PSD National Review Board Section.)
- Festival Review

If creative work is part of the candidate's service assignment, then here are some questions that might be considered:

- What university or community group did the performance serve?

- What support (financial, artistic, intellectual) did the project receive from other areas in the university or community?
- How did the creative work serve to educate or involve the audience?

Some possible evaluators of success:

- Attendance at post-show discussions
- Questionnaire/survey compiled after performances
- Local Reviews (e.g., in local papers)
- Solicited or Unsolicited letters of support
- Peer Review (See PSD National Review Board Section)

If creative work is part of the candidate's research assignment, then here are some questions that might be considered:

- If the performance was invited, what is the status of the producing organization?
- If the performance was invited, what other performances are or have been in that organization's season?
- What has been said about the performance by objective reviewers (e.g., art critics in newspapers, PSDNRB peer reviewers, etc.)?
- What is the exact nature of the festival invitation or competition? (e.g., for film festivals, what is the festival's acceptance rate? Who judges film entries, using what criteria? For performance festivals, is the selection of performances competitive? Invited? Are the performances/productions at the festival reviewed?)
- If the performance is featured in an on-line journal (e.g., video clips, audio performance), how long has the on-line journal been in existence, what is the journal's status? How many "hits" has it had in the last year?
- Has the creative work received outside financial support (e.g. city, state, national grants, private foundations, etc)?
- If the institution does accept that creative work can involve students, did that work occur beyond classroom teaching assignments? If conducted with release time, is it valued equitably when compared with the evaluation of traditional research ending in publication conducted with a similar course reduction?

Some possible evaluators of national and international visibility:

- State, national or international reviews of performance
- Peer review of performance (See PSD National Review Board Section)
- Festival competition and/or awards
- Invited performances
- Status of venue
- State, national or international grants to support creative projects
- Publication in on-line journals
- Attendance
- Academic or popular press articles referring to the performance or production
- National conference presentations

- Publication of the creative work in its entirety or as excerpts in collections
- Interviews
- Awards
- Rejection rates (e.g., of film festivals)

These evaluative metrics, despite their wide recognition and currency, may not always measure the components of the work most appropriate for its aims. One might also, and in many cases *instead*, adopt criteria used to evaluate print scholarship, such as the appropriateness of the subject matter for those involved and the “intended” audience; evidence, thoroughness, and relevance of research; theoretical/conceptual grounding and rationale, etc. Additionally, some contributions to the advancement of the arts may defy all but the most metaphoric recourse to these criteria. In sum, the candidate and chair should remember that this element has both quantitative and qualitative dimensions, the relative importance of which depends upon the nature of the creative work and its contribution to the institutional mission.

Professional peer review provides outside perspectives on the creative work’s value as a turn in scholarly and artistic conversations.

Research universities ask candidates and their chairs or directors to articulate the “refereed” aspect of their work to the larger university community. In the field of Performance Studies, peer review is often quite rigorous, yet at the same time somewhat invisible. For example, all professional theatres, as well as university environments, have restricted budgets for their arts programming. Typically, an arts director or a selection committee chooses the “season.” Thus, when a professional theatre or a university department invites an artistic company, a particular theatre production, or a solo artist to be featured as part of their season, there is often a refereed component built into that invitation. In selecting and inviting the scholar/artist’s work for presentation, the producing organization expresses their professional judgment that the creative work has value and meaning for its particular constituents.

Similarly, funding organizations have restricted budgets for their arts grants. In general, funding for the arts, particularly at the national level, is highly competitive. In funding a performer, company, or production, funding agencies underscore the creative project’s value for its intended audience.

Reviews occurring post-production extend the process of evaluation in important ways. A substantial appendix to this document outlines the PSD’s National Performance Review Board. This board acts as a clearing house, putting institutions that desire reviews of their faculty’s creative work in touch with certified reviewers who will provide professional evaluations specifically for the purposes of tenure and promotion review.

Although members of the PSD’s review board have demonstrated their commitment to providing rigorous reviews for colleagues, faculty and their chairs should also determine how and to what extent they choose to prepare the reviewer for the production. Some may choose to provide considerable information about its context and roles the faculty member played in its construction and performance. In some situations, it may be

important or desirable to wait until after the production to do so. The chair may also choose to help the reviewer by indicating the local perceptions of the review process and expectations of reviews in terms of coverage and topics, etc., to help avoid inadvertent omission of locally relevant criteria for evaluation the reviewer would otherwise happily address. Reviewer preparation should be deliberately considered and—whatever its final form—the rationale for the given level of preparation should be communicated to the reviewer.

Some institutions may desire, require, or have access to additional and/or alternative avenues for securing reviews. Some possibilities to consider:

- Can the department or candidate identify colleagues in other departments or other institutions with expertise in creative work's subject or aesthetic who might write reviews evaluating the quality of its contributions to discussion of its topic(s) or genre?
- Can the department or candidate identify independent artists, outside the academy, who might review the work or help evaluate its contributions to its genre and media?
- If the creative work has appeared at other institutions, did (or can) faculty members at those institutions write reviews?

The candidate and department should seek a range of reviewers who can speak to the breadth of the work's engagement with and contributions to its subject/topical aspects, its aesthetic/formal commitments, and their synthesis/relationship as a whole.

Ongoing access to a candidate's creative work extends its contributions, providing time for it to make an impact and for others to recognize, debate, and articulate its value.

Unlike a published essay, a performance disappears; often it *must* disappear to participate rigorously within its genre and tradition. This ephemerality may not apply equally to other forms of creative work, but even video and audio do not typically appear in traditional journals. Departments and candidates must articulate their reasoned and informed perspectives on the propriety of documentation within the context of each work's aesthetic commitments. Where appropriate, they should indicate how audiences may continue to access a creative work and how that ongoing access has resulted in impacts proper to the relationship between the work's forms and the institutional mission. If an institutional mission uses a phrase such as "promoting excellence in the arts," it must already recognize that such excellence will show itself in different ways. The institution should also recognize that, given the nature of the arts, standards for such excellence evolve, often resulting in contestatory and contingent evaluations.

The PSD has created and endorsed a variety of means for the preservation and distribution of creative work, when appropriate, for ongoing review and study. These mechanisms, alongside existing and emerging means beyond the division, expand a creative work's contemporary and historical audiences, as well as the ability of those audiences to register, assess, and even dispute the work's impacts over a longer period of

time, one that may well achieve the durational scale of the access provided by a journal. The department and candidate must articulate, then, how the work and its audiences have chosen to make use of these opportunities. Some questions to consider:

- If the candidate elected not to document work, are the poetics and politics of that decision indicated and explained in the appropriate statements, etc.? (Note that this question asks that we do not *presume* faculty will document productions, only that the decision about whether or not to document will be considered, deliberate and communicated to the dossier's audiences.)
- Did the department and candidate make efforts to document the performance with video or other medium as appropriate?
- Did the candidate send the document to the division's archives at Northwestern University in order to make the work accessible to future scholars?
- Did the department encourage and support the candidate's efforts to do so with technological resources for the initial capture and eventual distribution of the document to interested colleagues (much as institutions often support the purchase and distribution of article off prints)? Such documents are often required to secure invitations to perform, particularly in competitive production situations such as certain festivals, dedicated performance art venues, etc. An institution that expects production in such venues but does not provide the resources necessary to attain it is acting in bad faith.
- Successful performances and other creative works often receive multiple invitations for productions, screenings, etc., at a variety of institutions. Have the department and candidate made good use of such letters of invitation to indicate the wide interest in the work, much as reprints of an essay in multiple anthologies demonstrates its enduring value? Can the department and candidate distinguish between the persistence of the work's importance and the persistence of the artist's self-promotion without denigrating the necessity of such promotion to reach wider audiences?
- Has the candidate published the script (where appropriate) or other mediated document of or meditation upon the work in a journal or online? If so, did evaluative essays by other artists and scholars appear alongside it as part of a "forum" or "special section" of the print or online journal? What arguments did those commentators make for the work's value?
- Have other scholars and artists cited the production or one of its documentations in subsequent evaluations, articulations of disciplinary trends, or framing essays/artist's statements situating their own work in the genre? If so, how has this pattern of citation changed or endured over time? What interlocutors have engaged in this citation? What are their disciplinary profiles and reputations? What are the reputations (circulation, sponsoring organization, perceived importance, etc.) of the journals or other works in which the citations appeared?
- Have organizations or other institutions invited the candidate to reprise the work in festivals, screenings, convention programs, etc., devoted to reflecting on the history of a given genre, movement, or the discipline as a whole?
- When making an award to the candidate, has an organization or presenter cited the work as part of the rationale for the award?

- For institutions that recognize a service or teaching component of such work, did it serve its purposes of education, community activism/inspiration, fundraising, and/or pedagogical influence that increased the confidence and aesthetic success of student work?
- Perhaps most tellingly, and bringing the work of the candidate full circle, has the candidate him or herself cited the work in subsequent essays, research plans, grant applications, artist's statements, etc., as an inciting cause or contribution to future work, realized or planned? In other words, has the work contributed to the candidate's own development?

The candidate and chair must work throughout the career to make work available by supporting and seeking its circulation, tracking its citation, and demonstrating its impacts where and as appropriate,

Attention to these elements of preparation, role, purpose, peer review, and access/impacts, will help candidates and their chairs represent the breadth and depth of the candidate's achievements and how these contribute to the institutional mission. The PSD encourages all parties involved in preparing the dossier to approach the rhetorical function of that document with an eye toward the specificity and elaboration required to fairly and rigorously evaluate the creative work candidates for tenure and promotion present as evidence of their success.

V. POST-TENURE

The faculty member emerging successfully from the tenure process or promotion to Full Professor has both benefited from the institution's commitment and returned it in kind. The Associate and Full Professor phases of a career open spaces to continue those mutual commitments, and also to test them critically by taking a fresh look, from a different vantage point, at the life of the artist in the academy. This may mean exploring the freedom, if not the responsibility, to produce the increasingly challenging, aesthetically experimental, and/or politically critical work tenure is designed to foster and protect. It could also entail focused attention on developing new approaches to pedagogy, creating practical methods and philosophical perspectives that synthesize and share the faculty member's developing profile as a "master teacher" in the arts. Additionally, advanced faculty members may take up additional responsibilities as service to on-campus initiatives, local performance companies/venues, and/or disciplinary associations and their journals, increasing the department's visibility and character as part of an engaged college or university. In most cases, Associate and Full professors do some combination of these and other things, building upon the profile established in the earlier phases of their career.

Like their newer colleagues, recently promoted Associate and Full Professors must have access to all documents relevant to the retention and promotion process as it applies to their rank. It is the department chair's or unit supervisor's responsibility to ensure that newly promoted faculty members receive all policies that influence how they will be evaluated. In some institutions this may simply mean a reduction of those policies as pre-tenure predictive reviews "fall away." In other institutions it may mean the introduction and explanation of post-tenure review procedures; shifts in expectations for merit pay; and/or additional teaching expectations to balance with service, research, and creative activity expectations.

When assessing that balance, the chair and faculty member must attend fairly to the recognition of creative contributions when distributing service obligations across the whole faculty. Situations vary, but most faculty engaged in creative production, particularly in departments with performance spaces and seasons, do significant work beyond an institution's standard teaching and service load. In addition to preparing and playing multiple roles in the production of their own creative work, advanced faculty often mentor newer faculty in the arts, whether in their own departments, through interdisciplinary connections with other units, or disciplinary contacts with faculty in other institutions. This typically pro-bono consultancy serves an important function, particularly when performed for an untenured faculty member in the same department. As a result, chairs and advanced faculty must communicate openly about the reach and depth of such commitments, their contributions to institutional mission, and their evaluation relative to departmental peers.

As part of that open communication, newly tenured and promoted faculty should meet with the Department Chair or supervisor to review the scholarly agendas or career plans prepared and revised over the pre-tenure or pre-promotion period. As part of this review,

they should prepare a retention plan that reflects their renewed joint commitments to fulfillment and support of the faculty member's contribution to the department, institution, discipline, and life of the arts. This plan should continue to develop the individual's professional profile and advance the mission and goals of the department and institution. This document should be signed by the faculty member, Department Chair or Unit Head, and the Dean, becoming the framework for continuing annual evaluations of the faculty member, as appropriate in the context of a given institution. Faculty should adapt their agenda as necessary, and—where in keeping with a given institution's policies and flexibility—the faculty member, Chair, Dean, and or other pertinent or alternative administrator who exercises an evaluative role should sign it.

Development of and agreement on the faculty member's creative plans for the immediate future after tenure or promotion accomplishes the following benefits to the faculty member, the program, and the institution:

- It re-establishes and deepens the relationship of the faculty member's creative work to the mission and goals of the department and the institution.
- It documents mutual agreement on the continuing relevance and significance of that work to the department and institution, and perhaps the surrounding community.
- It identifies concrete expectations for continued faculty productivity.
- It documents agreement on increased institutional support provided to achieve the increased expectations of post-tenure faculty – e.g., reassigned or release time for productions, ongoing funding for productions; invited reviewer funding; travel and touring funding; etc.
- It recognizes the value of established collaborations and partnerships within and beyond the department as they share the scholarly agenda publicly.
- It provides a means for enhancing departmental communication regarding faculty accomplishments and ongoing projects.

Post-tenure faculty and their departments share an opportunity to assess the relative costs and rewards—for all parties—that characterize their institution's cultural assumptions and expectations for the promotion to Full Professor. The whole of this document, as well as the operating paper and appendices of the National Review Board designed to implement the PSD's support of rigorous evaluation as a necessary component of evaluation for tenure and promotion, articulates the perspective that creative activity, like traditional research, contributes to the life of the communities, institutions, larger publics, and aesthetic genres in which it occurs. The dossier preparation section above also pertains to the promotion from Associate to Full Professor, and should be reviewed when and if the faculty member and chair begin to consider and prepare for that promotion, which has a more proactive, flexible timeline than the post-probationary review for tenure. We recognize and value that proactive, flexible character for a number of reasons. From a traditional perspective, the promotion to Full Professor is neither mandatory nor assumed, but instead reflects an institutional judgment that a given faculty member has continued to grow in his or her teaching, creative/research work, and service.

From a critical perspective, however, the culture of a given institution—this document notwithstanding—may be such that a given faculty member elects to forgo pursuing promotion to Full. Neither miscreant nor martyr, such an individual may choose that path by virtue of her or his aesthetic and political commitments and still remain a vibrant and contributing member of the institution. In any case, the candor and depth of the faculty member and chair's conversations about this issue provide an opportunity for the institution to reflect responsibly on the commensurability between its stated mission relative to supporting the arts and the policies that may preserve passive oversights and active prejudices that keep it from providing such support. The desire to retain advanced faculty requires that institutions scrutinize their own internal contradictions as carefully as they do a faculty member's goals and activity. These observations are not intended to sanction the faculty member who, after tenure, eases into decline. On the contrary, such a person unduly shifts burdens to younger colleagues working to develop their own profiles and/or to advanced colleagues and tenured peers whose resulting increase in service can stifle their own creative development at the height of its powers. Excusing such a decline as a commitment does nothing to advance the discipline. By contrast, noting that a principled decision to forgo promotion but remain active may have its own situational legitimacy encourages the ongoing discussion of a given institution's assessment of the contributions of its creative faculty to institutional missions, ideally toward the end of responsible recognition of those contributions.

VI. CONCLUSION

Throughout this document, the PSD has stressed the importance of viewing performance and other forms of creative work as a contribution to institutional missions. Because creative work entails a variety of activity, establishing connections between creative work and more traditional forms of scholarship remains an important, and yet welcome, rhetorical task. When we view the career course from hiring, through the pre-tenure period, to the preparation and evaluation of dossiers for tenure and promotion holistically, we reveal the coherence of Performance Studies as a diverse and rigorous practice that requires and rewards commitment over time.

Both candidates and chairs, as representatives of the institution, have a share of responsibility for this commitment. They must communicate expectations and evaluations clearly, linking them to pertinent resources and aspects of their institution's mission. Our college and university structures will differ, and our collective work will exhibit a startling variety in both subject matter and form. For that reason we have developed this document to reflect that diversity, confirm its value, and encourage its rigorous appraisal as an important part of higher education.