

UTRGV COLLEGE OF FINE ARTS
Criteria for Annual Review and
Tenure and Promotion Documents

INTRODUCTION

This document provides an overview of the fundamental requirements for the Annual Review and Tenure and Promotion documents of each academic unit within the College of Fine Arts. It is expected that this document will serve as a reference for:

1. Academic units in the process of developing and/or revising Annual Review and Tenure and Promotion Guidelines;
2. Faculty in the process of compiling Annual Review and Tenure and Promotion dossiers;
3. Tenure and Promotion Review Committees at the academic unit and College level in the process of reviewing faculty dossiers.

The guidelines listed below expand upon some of the policies described in UT System Regents' Rule 31102; UTRGV HOP Policies ADM 06-501, ADM 06-502, ADM 06-504, ADM 06-505, and ADM 06-507; and the UTRGV Annual Faculty Evaluations & Tenure-Track/Tenure and Promotion Reviews Process and Guidelines. The regulations in Regents' Rules and the UTRGV HOP supersede any disparity located within this document or the documents for each academic unit. Additionally, this document recognizes that there are significant differences between the disciplines, and each academic unit is encouraged to draw upon the standards outlined in their discipline-specific accreditation and professional organizations, as follows:

School of Art (and Design)

- National Association for Schools of Art and Design (NASAD)
- College Art Association (CAA)

Creative Writing Program

- Association of Writers and Writing Programs (AWP)

Dance Program

- National Association for Schools of Dance (NASD)
- National Dance Education Organization (NDEO)

School of Music

- National Association for Schools of Music (NASM)

Department of Theatre (and Film)

- National Association for Schools of Theatre (NAST)
- Association for Theatre in Higher Education (ATHE)
- Education Theatre Association (EDTA)
- University Film and Video Association (UFVA)

It is expected that applicable references to the standards of the respective accrediting and professional organizations will be cited in the Tenure and Promotion Documents of the academic unit. This also applies to academic units that do not yet have discipline-specific accreditation.

SUB-DISCIPLINES WITHIN EACH ACADEMIC UNIT

Each of the programs in the College of Fine Arts have distinct standards for professional practice, professional expectations, and pedagogy. Additionally, within each program there are often distinct sub-disciplines that can function quite differently. For example:

School of Art:

- Art Education, Art History, Graphic Design, and Studio Art

School of Music:

- Applied Music, Ensembles and Ensemble Directing, Music Composition, Musicology and Ethnomusicology, Music Theory, and Music Technology

Department of Theatre:

- Costuming, Film and Digital Arts, Stage Design, and Theatre

Dance Program:

- Dance History, Dance Science, Choreography, Dance Pedagogy, World Dance Studies, Dance Philosophy and Criticism

For each sub-discipline that exists, the Tenure and Promotion document should:

1. Outline the expectations for tenure and promotion that are specific to the sub-discipline (as opposed to other expectations which may apply to all faculty in the unit), including the areas of teaching, research/creative work, and service, as appropriate
2. Clearly describe how faculty achievements specific to the sub-discipline will be evaluated

WORKLOAD PERCENTAGES AND DEFINITIONS OF RATINGS

Throughout the Tenure and Promotion document, differing workload percentages should be acknowledged in describing what the unit considers to be “Meets Expectations.”

Typically, if different expectations also exist for each faculty rank, especially Lecturer faculty, these would be individually defined within the Tenure and Promotion document. Faculty with administrative appointments and/or fellowships should clearly outline how their duties are divided between the academic unit and other entities, and how this is reflected in their assigned workload. It is likely that faculty with such appointments will not be evaluated by the academic unit based on a 100% workload, since a portion of their assignment is outside of the academic unit.

Additionally, each unit’s Tenure and Promotion document should specify how ancillary activities will be categorized, weighted, and evaluated, to ensure uniformity within the unit. This may include such things as: advising, mentoring, career counseling, asset building, leadership and professional development, and other contributions across the university and with community, government, business, and non-profit partners, as well as special recognitions, such as fellowships, honors, and election to office in scholarly or professional organizations. (See UTRGV HOP Policy [ADM 06-502](#))

Each academic unit's Tenure and Promotion document must use the following definitions as a baseline for determining the discipline-specific ratings scale (See UTRGV HOP Policy ADM 06-502):

- **Exceeds expectations** reflects a clear and significant level of accomplishment beyond what is normal for the UTRGV, discipline, unit, faculty rank, or any contractual expectations as defined by the unit.
- **Meets expectations** reflects accomplishments commensurate with what is normal for UTRGV, discipline, unit, faculty rank, or any contractual expectations as defined by the unit.
- **Does not meet expectations** indicates a failure as defined by the unit beyond what can be considered the normal range of year-to-year variation in performance, but of a character that appears to be subject to correction.
- **Unsatisfactory** means failing to meet expectations for the faculty member's unit, rank, or contractual obligations in a manner that reflects disregard of previous advice or other efforts to provide remediation or assistance, or involves prima facie professional misconduct, dereliction of duty, or incompetence. The same units that specify the standards for exceeding, meeting, and failing to meet expectations should also specify the criteria for performance that is unsatisfactory.

GUIDELINES FOR TEACHING, RESEARCH & CREATIVE WORK, AND SERVICE

TEACHING

Tenure and Promotion and Annual Review dossiers should include the following:

1. A summary of teaching which includes a comparison to the teaching workload expectations.
2. A summary of specific teaching achievements. The academic unit should define what might be viewed as an achievement in this area (related to the sub-discipline).
3. At least one Peer Observation of Teaching for all tenure-track faculty members per year and at least one Peer Observation of Teaching every three years for all tenured faculty members. (See below for more information on Peer Observation of Teaching guidelines)
4. The Tabular Summary of Teaching Evaluations and Student Comment portion of Teaching Evaluations, as well as a reflective narrative that addresses the faculty member's teaching evaluation scores and comments. If student comments are required, all pertinent comments should be included. Academic Units should provide guidelines addressing the inclusion of comments.

The Peer Observation of Teaching evaluation is an important element of the tenure and promotion, and annual review, process. As indicated by the UTRGV Guidelines for Faculty Peer Observation of Teaching, it is highly recommended that each academic unit develop its own set of guidelines which would typically require:

1. A description of the class visited
2. A description of the interaction between the professor and students
3. An evaluation of the success of the specific techniques used by the professor

4. Collegial advice for improvement

Approved by the Faculty of the College of Fine Arts – November 3, 2020
Approved by the Dean of the College of Fine Arts – November 3, 2020
Approved by the Deputy President & Interim Provost – December 9, 2020

Each academic unit should expand upon these requirements, as necessary. For instance, different requirements might be outlined for applied studio teaching versus lecture-based academic courses, and for online teaching.

EVALUATION OF TEACHING

The Tenure and Promotion document would typically state what is considered “Meets Expectations” for each of the components that are required in the dossier. For example, the standards for Meets Expectations in Teaching might look like:

1. Meeting the expected workload percentage, as reported
2. Teaching achievements that indicate active engagement in the classroom and/or with individual students (as appropriate for the sub-discipline)
3. A positive Peer Observation of Teaching that fulfills the minimum expectations of the academic unit’s requirements
4. A minimum of “X%” and above in the Tabular Summary of Teaching Evaluations and a majority of positive comments

The Tenure and Promotion document should also clarify how achievements that are less than or more than the standards outlined for Meets Expectations will be evaluated in determining an overall rating for the area of Teaching.

RESEARCH & CREATIVE WORK

Tenure and Promotion and Annual Review dossiers typically include the following:

1. A summary of the faculty member’s research and/or creative work which includes a comparison to the workload expectations.
2. A narrative that highlights select achievements in the area of research and/or creative work, describing how these contribute to the faculty member’s professional career goals and/or the UTRGV Strategic Plan. The narrative should also describe the significance of each achievement as defined within the Research & Creative Work Evaluation Guidelines (see below).

EVALUATION OF RESEARCH & CREATIVE WORK

There is no information gained when an evaluation committee or administrator repeats an achievement without providing a context that addresses the quality and relative importance of the achievement. In the evaluation of Research & Creative Work, this context should be presented and addressed at every level.

The Tenure and Promotion document should provide Research & Creative Work Evaluation Guidelines for how faculty achievements in this area will be measured, both individually, and in combination. The following characteristics should be used as the foundation for each unit’s guidelines. It should also be noted that faculty members will follow these same guidelines in describing their activities as they relate to their workload expectations.

The significance of Research & Creative Work is typically evaluated through the combination of the following:

- **Selection Process:** Juried, Invited, Non-Juried; self-publications or publications by vanity presses that publish for a fee will, by definition, hold the least weight in any ranking of Research & Creative Work.
- **Location & Audience:** Local (within the Rio Grande Valley), Regional, National, and International. The classification here should take both location and audience into consideration: for instance, a presentation at a conference in Houston that includes attendees from all over the United States may be considered a National-level presentation, even though it is within the geographic region of UTRGV. Alternatively, an international conference that takes place in the Rio Grande Valley but only includes Rio Grande Valley attendees should likely be considered a local event.
- **Quality and Significance of Venue/Publication/Organization:** This area might address the reputation of the organization, the competitiveness, or its historical significance. In the case of a journal or blog, one should look at whether it is juried or non-juried, the acceptance rate of the journal, the prestige of the editorial board, etc; in other words, information that provides a context for the ranking of the journal in the field. In the case of performances or museum showings, the relative ranking of the museum or importance of the performance venue should be considered.
- **Quality and Significance of Work:** This area might address the scope and or size of the work, and/or the faculty member's percentage of contribution to a collaborative work, article, or performance. Co-authored articles, group exhibitions, shared performances or responsibilities for directing or staging a performance should be given the full weight of the individual achievement in accordance with the quality of the juried or invited event and the event's prominence. In the case of a group exhibition or contest, one might address how many applicants applied and how many were selected.

It may be prudent for each unit to develop its own reference guide for common journals, conferences, venues, etc. in which UTRGV faculty regularly participate. Since it is unlikely that a single chart would be able to cover all Research & Creative Work categories, and all journals and venues, the Research & Creative Work Evaluation Guidelines should clarify that it is up to the faculty member (and the sub-discipline area) to provide the background for rating any Research & Creative Work achievements (as described above).

Additionally, the unit's Tenure and Promotion document should ensure that equivalencies, either stated or unstated, may not be used in determining an overall rating for Research & Creative Work.

When applicable, the standards for Research & Creative Work published by the national organization in the field should be cited and utilized. For instance, in Art, the CAA standards are defined specifically and clearly and should be cited and followed.

In summary, evaluation committees and faculty should be able to use the Research & Creative Work Evaluation Guidelines in the Tenure and Promotion Document to clearly support the achievement of workload expectations and assigned rating of Exceeds Expectations, Meets Expectations, Does Not Meet Expectations, or Unsatisfactory.

Approved by the Faculty of the College of Fine Arts – November 3, 2020
Approved by the Dean of the College of Fine Arts – November 3, 2020
Approved by the Deputy President & Interim Provost – December 9, 2020

SERVICE

Tenure and Promotion and Annual Review dossiers typically include the following:

1. A summary of the faculty member's service which includes a comparison to the workload expectations.
2. A narrative that highlights select achievements in the area of service to the unit, College, university, profession, and/or community, describing how these contribute to the faculty member's professional career goals and/or the UTRGV Strategic Plan.
3. Faculty who also serve in administrative appointments and faculty fellowships should carefully delineate which service activities are within the scope of the academic unit versus another university entity. For instance:
 - a. Associate Deans may engage in service to the unit, but activities that are assigned as part of their role as Associate Deans should not be included in the review by the academic unit.
 - b. A faculty member with a 3-hr course release for a fellowship in another university office is no longer evaluated as 100% within the unit; the percentages for teaching, research, and service should address this and be clearly stated as part of the faculty member's dossier for Tenure and Promotion or annual review.

The changes to the workload percentages should be articulated within the workload meeting.

EVALUATION OF SERVICE

The Tenure and Promotion document should state what is considered "Meets Expectations" for the area of service, including the expectations for different workload percentages and faculty ranks.

In defining the significance and relative weight of service activities, the Tenure and Promotion document should define how service activities will be measured and assessed. Elements that should be considered in these guidelines include:

- Service that is ubiquitous in the academic unit or area
- Committee assignments within the academic unit, college, and university
- Leadership positions within committees and/or professional organizations
- Service to the profession for local, regional, national, or international organizations
- Service to the community

Since many service activities are dependent on faculty votes, nominations, and/or appointments, the absence of service activities should also be addressed within the unit's Tenure and Promotion Document. Faculty should not be excused from service because they "were not asked to serve." In this situation, faculty members would explain the lack of service activities in their narrative, and the evaluating committees should provide justification for any ratings of "Meets" or "Exceeds Expectations."

GUIDELINES FOR OVERALL RATINGS AND COMMITMENT TO PROFESSIONALISM

After rating the areas of Teaching, Research & Creative Work, and Service, review committees will also assign an Overall Rating for each faculty member. The Tenure and Promotion document for each academic unit should define any prioritization of these areas, and how this prioritization will correspond to a faculty member's overall rating. Workload percentages, faculty rank, and exceptions for those with administrative positions and/or fellowships should also be considered in assigning an overall rating. This is especially important for Lecturer faculty, who by workload definition are focused on the area of teaching, yet may still be evaluated regarding service when service is an approved percentage of the workload.

As per the UTRGV HOP, academic units should determine how a faculty member's commitment to professionalism shall be presented and evaluated within the review process. It is recommended that each unit's Tenure and Promotion document provide clear guidelines for this, based on UTRGV HOP Policies ADM 06-502, C.1., C.2. and ADM 06-505, D.1.c., which are guided by the American Association of University Professors (AAUP) Statement on Professional Ethics.