

POST-TENURE REVIEW: THE DEPARTMENT OF ART

Preamble

In compliance with the post-tenure review policy passed by the general faculty in the spring of 1998, the Department of Art has agreed on the following processes and procedures for our post-tenure review. The department endorses the philosophies of the American Association of University Professors regarding post-tenure review found in "Post-Tenure Review: An AAUP Response," *Academe*, September-October, 1998, 61-67. A basic premise found in this article is that "Post-tenure review ought to be aimed not at accountability, but at faculty development. Post-tenure review must be developed and carried out by faculty. (AAUP, 1998, 61).

Our post-tenure review process attempts to reduce duplication of effort and paperwork by utilizing processes already in place, the costs of faculty time and energy in their need to maintain even more complete files, and in their role of serving on the evaluation committee. It is our goal to minimize extra efforts, duplication of efforts, and make changes in our annual review forms and processes, if needed, to better fit the annual review of faculty productivity with the language and criteria of the post-tenure review.

We agree that the post-tenure review cannot legitimately be a reevaluation of tenure, nor may it be used to transform the burden of proof for dismissal from the administration into a burden of proof for retaining tenure by the individual faculty member. We have been assured that all current procedures and standards for dismissal for cause remain in place at this university. We support these procedures and have

devised our post-tenure review procedures with full consideration of the assurances that the university procedures for dismissal will be kept in place.

We believe that even if the majority of post-tenure reviews result in appraisals of “satisfactory,” the process itself suggests measures of productivity that may be inappropriate to the spirit of free inquiry. We recognize that faculty who are tenured must be given academic freedom to exercise professional judgment in their selection of research topics, teaching methods, curricula and other matters. One concern of frequent performance reviews is that faculty may select the safe projects that are quick to exhibit or publish, relinquishing the long term projects with larger potential value to minimize the risk of delayed achievement. Accordingly, we have incorporated appropriate cautions in our process of evaluation about the importance of distinguishing between negligent performance of responsibilities and the right of a faculty member to select an unorthodox method of performance, or to undertake a long-term project.

To circumvent the potential for violating basic tenets of collegiality, humanity, and professionalism, we have included within our procedures actions such as developing a plan for action for anyone receiving an unsatisfactory review as an outcome of post-tenure review. We have also provided procedures for faculty appeals of post-tenure review outcomes. It is our intention that the criteria and procedures be both professionally sound and personally humane.

Finally, we believe that any post-tenure review process itself be periodically evaluated. We are prepared to participate in such evaluations at the department and at university-wide levels.

CRITERIA

While the Department of Art recognizes that professorial careers may assume a variety of shapes over time, there is also recognition that every professor at every rank should maintain an overall competence in teaching, scholarship or creative performance, and service. Our standard for appraising faculty members under post-tenure review is the competence and professionalism the duties associated with his or her position are discharged. Our standards for post-tenure review will not exceed our standards for tenure.

1. A Superior Review

A faculty member who for the previous five years has performed at an exemplary level in the combination of teaching, scholarship, and service activities appropriate to his or her position, bringing distinction to the department and the university, will be considered to have a superior record.

2. A Satisfactory Review

a. A faculty member who has performed at an effective level in a combination of teaching, scholarship: research/creative performance, and service activities will be given a satisfactory rating. This category is expected to include the majority of the department: dedicated, caring professionals whose overall work is good. In keeping with the department's policies, a faculty member can receive a satisfactory rating as long as they are rated satisfactory or above in two of the three performance areas.

b. The Department of Art also recognizes that post-tenure review must take into account the changing roles faculty may assume as their careers progress. Assumption of administrative duties, serving as chairs of college and/or university governance committees, and/or the assumption of extra teaching loads may affect a faculty member's performance in one or more performance areas. When such occurs, and is documented, reviews should reflect this fact.

3. An Unsatisfactory Review

A faculty member whose five-year performance falls below the Department of Art's post-tenure review standards of competence in the combination of teaching, research/creative performance, and service activities appropriate for his or her position will be considered to have an unsatisfactory record. This category will be used for faculty whose record indicates serious problems that need correction.

PROCEDURES

1. In accordance with the timetable established by the Office of the Provost and prior to submitting annual reports of faculty activities, the department chair will determine the faculty whose turn it will be for review in the fall, approximately one-sixth of the eligible faculty, beginning with those most senior in tenure. Excluded from review are faculty who notify the chair in writing of intention to retire within three years, faculty who have been reviewed and advanced to or retained in a higher position, such as dean or a chaired professorship, and once the process has begun, those faculty who were reviewed during the previous five-year period.

2. The department chair will notify faculty to be reviewed and will give the list to the Post-Tenure Review Committee (P-TRC).

3. The P-TRC shall be made up of an elected group, with representation from each of the four departmental divisions, selected from the tenured faculty with one member selected at large, from the department's tenured faculty. Members of the P-TRC will elect their own chair. Faculty may not serve on the P-TRC Committee in the year they are reviewed.

4. The departmental chair will also give to the P-TRC the following materials:
 - a. Copies of the department chair's annual review letters will be given to those faculty under post-tenure review for the five years covered by the review. This will include rankings or composite scores given by the chair as an overall evaluation of the colleague's work for the academic year. The chair's evaluations summarize each year's scholarship, service, and teaching evaluations.

 - b. Copies of the annual review of the faculty member completed by the division chair or other tenured member of the division appointed by the department chair and used by the department chair in evaluating faculty performance will be given to the committee. The chairs of divisions are reviewed by a senior faculty member from within the division. The goal of division reviews is to show where special merit is found within faculty activities in discipline-specific endeavors.

c. Copies of annual reports of faculty activities for those faculty under post-tenure review. (These should be the original reports from department files.)

d. Copies of peer reviews of teaching, gathered through peer observation.

(Available only for the years required by department. We have not performed peer reviews as a department since the 1990-1991 academic year and those reviews do not fall into the time period for the post-tenure review. Peer review of teaching is mandated as part of this review process. We will begin within or across divisions in the next semester.)

5. The faculty to be reviewed will prepare a portfolio consisting of:

a. Any written responses to the annual evaluations during the five years and/or an overall summary response to the evaluations prepared for this review (optional).

b. Current vita, which contains externally refereed publications or other reviewed research and creative activity as outlined in the departmental Promotion and Tenure Guidelines may be considered as having been peer-reviewed outside the unit, is to be submitted each year at the time annual reports are due.

c. Personal statement about the work of the past five years (optional for everyone *except* the recipient of a sabbatical during the previous five years, who must comment on the outcomes of that leave.)

d. Material from teaching portfolio, such as syllabi, sample tests, or student papers (optional). Student evaluation and peer review of teaching (see 4d.) are required.

e. Other items the faculty member wishes to include (perhaps a representative article, paper, catalogue, film, script, book, video or audio production, or collection of still photography. Faculty are specifically *not* encouraged to submit all published work, only representative work for the five year period covered by the post-tenure review will be accepted. (optional)

6. The P-TRC will review the combined portfolio of materials from the faculty and from the department chair.

a. Each committee member will review the files, looking for demonstration of appropriate overall competence as a tenured, university faculty member. (See **CRITERIA**, above)

b. The individual committee members' initial findings will be discussed at a meeting of the full P-TRC.

c. After the discussion, final opinions of "superior," "satisfactory," or "unsatisfactory" will be rendered individually and full, written comments offered in justification of the ranking.

- d. The chair of the committee or designee will draft a report based on the discussion and written comments. This letter will be detailed enough for the faculty member to understand precisely what areas of accomplishment are praised by the committee and what areas may have potential for professional growth and development. For these reports, the committee will be charged with the responsibility to be courteous to colleagues, while offering constructive suggestions or criticism when needed, both for the colleague's benefit and for the integrity of the institution.

 - e. The draft report and overall finding of "superior," "satisfactory," or "unsatisfactory" must be approved by the P-TRC by a simple majority vote.

 - f. The P-TRC will send its final report to the faculty member reviewed, with a copy sent to the department chair. The faculty member must submit a written acknowledgment of the receipt of this letter.
7. The department chair will forward a copy of the report to the Dean. Should the chair choose to include comments in a separate letter, these must also be sent to the faculty member being reviewed.
8. The faculty member under review may choose to write a response to either the P-TRC report, comments in the letter from the chair, or both. If the faculty member disagrees with the report and wants to appeal it, the steps outlined in 2.b or 3.a. below must be followed.

9. The committee's report, additional written comments from the chair, the acknowledgment, and any written response from the faculty member will be kept in the faculty member's department personnel file. These files should be secured.

OUTCOMES OF THE REVIEW

1. A Superior Review

Any faculty member receiving a superior review from the P-TRC must be recommended by the department chair for a special merit increase to base pay from the provost or other non-departmental funds (if available), in addition to the annual raise.

2. A Satisfactory Review

a. Any faculty member receiving a satisfactory review will have successfully completed the post-tenure review. Faculty receiving a rating of satisfactory are to be congratulated for their efforts on behalf of the department.

b. Any faculty member who receives a satisfactory review and disagrees with the report may appeal in writing to the department's Tenure and Promotion Committee. For appeals by professors, only tenured full professors may vote; for appeals by associate professors only tenured professors and tenured associate

professors may vote; for appeals by assistant professors all tenured professorial ranks may vote. The members of the Tenure and Promotion Committee review the file and respond by written statement.

3. An Unsatisfactory Review

a. Any faculty member who receives an unsatisfactory review and disagrees with

the report may appeal in writing to the department's Tenure and Promotion Committee, about the review in general or about any particular part of the review. For appeals by professors only tenured full professors may vote; for appeals by associate professors only tenured professors and tenured associate professors may vote; for appeals by assistant professors all tenured professorial ranks may vote. The chair and the Tenure and Promotion Committee will forward to the dean the appeal letter and the findings of the Tenure and Promotion Committee for final determination of the evaluation.

b. The faculty member under post-tenure review who receives an unsatisfactory review based on productivity in the area of scholarship/creative performance may submit the scholarship/creative performance record and documentation for review to evaluators outside of this institution. The reviewers will be chosen by the chair of the P-TRC in consultation with the faculty member and representatives from the division in which the faculty member teaches. On receipt of the letters from the outside reviewers, the P-TRC committee members will review and discuss the content of the evaluations and vote to accept or reject the opinions of the outside

reviewers. The chair of the P-TRC will summarize the committee's response to the outside reviews by written statement that will be signed by each member of the committee. If a member of the P-TRC dissents from the majority decision, he or she may write a separate statement regarding the outside reviews. Letters from outside reviewers and letters from the P-TRC will be forwarded to the dean by the chair, who may add comments in a separate written statement. Copies of all materials will be given to the faculty member under review.

c. If an unsatisfactory review is not appealed, or it is not reversed upon appeal, the department, in consultation with, and with the concurrence of the faculty member, will appoint a Development Committee to assist the faculty member in improving performance.

i. The Development Committee will have three members: One recommended by the faculty member and two appointed by the P-TRC chair in consultation with the department chair. At least one member of the committee must be in the faculty member's division. All members of the committee must be tenured. The committee will elect as chair one of the appointed members.

ii. In consultation with and with the concurrence of the faculty member, the committee will establish a specific developmental plan to assist the faculty member in improving performance. This individualized plan will be based only on the specific areas identified by the post-tenure review as being unsatisfactory. The plan developed by this committee must reflect the awareness that the faculty member's academic freedom should not be

compromised. The written plan will include a reasonable timetable as approved by the Dean for making appropriate progress towards the objectives of overall satisfactory performance.

iii. A copy of the development plan will be forwarded by the development committee, to the dean through the department chair. Copies of unsatisfactory post-tenure reviews and the associated development plans for individual faculty will also be sent to the Provost.

iv. The development plan will form the basis for evaluations of the faculty member under the timetable included.

d. At the next post-tenure review, in addition to the new faculty reviewed, the committee will assess the progress of the faculty member following the steps of the development plan. This progress report will be forwarded to the department chair, who may add additional comments before giving copies to the faculty member and to the department Tenure and Promotion Committee no later than April 15. The faculty member may write a response and may forward that response to the Tenure and Promotion Committee. The committee will review the progress report and will respond in writing in concurrence or dissent in general or with any particular part of the report. The decision will be conveyed to the faculty member by the Tenure and Promotion Chair.

e. The Development Committee's progress report, any response from the faculty

member, and the department Tenure and Promotion Committee's decision will be forwarded by the department chair to the dean for review.

g. At the end of the appeals process and the timetable for the individualized faculty development plan, if the Development Committee, the Tenure and Promotion Committee, the departmental chair, outside reviews (if included in the process) and the dean agree that sufficient progress has not been made by the candidate to improve the unsatisfactory rating, procedures for revoking tenure of the faculty member may be initiated.