

College of Fine Arts
School of Art

Evaluation Standards and Criteria for Annual Evaluation,
Tenure/Promotion and Post Tenure Review

Introduction

The goal of the promotion process is to provide a thorough and objective review of the substance and merits of each faculty member's performance following customary methods. The review must be sufficient in its depth and character to support action in the best interests of the university, whatever the decision reached. The recommendations at every level reflect the professional judgment of each of those involved.

The following General Guidelines describe the promotion process for tenured and tenure-track candidates and are provided to assist both candidates and committee members with the preparation and review of supporting materials for the promotion process. The evaluation criteria outlined in this document provide guidelines for evaluation of performance within the specialized fields of art history, studio art, and graphic design.

It is the expectation of the School of Art that the faculty shall consist of the most highly qualified persons available. Because annual review and tenure and promotion are directly related, the School of Art applies the same criteria to both tenure promotion and annual review. The information contained in this document is complementary to UTRGV policy especially as delineated in [ADM 06-502, Annual Faculty Evaluation](#); [ADM 06-504, Post-Tenure Review](#); and [ADM 06-505, the UTRGV Handbook of Procedures on Faculty Tenure and Promotion](#).

Evaluation Standards

The School of Art has developed its own evaluation standards and criteria with the goal of developing a distinctive program of research and creative activity that will bring national, as well as state and regional, recognition to UTRGV as an emerging research institution. The future distinction of the School of Art depends in large part upon the quality of the judgment exercised in making tenure decisions and annual review evaluations. For this reason, it is expected that each person awarded tenure will have demonstrated a meritorious level of achievement in the areas of teaching, research/creative activity, and service.

Tenure-track faculty and faculty applicants for tenure and promotion will be evaluated based on accomplishments and contributions in teaching, research/scholarship, and service to UTRGV and external communities. In addition to meritorious accomplishments, successful applicants for promotion or tenure must demonstrate a high potential for continued excellence and effectiveness.

In order to earn promotion or tenure, a faculty member must have a consistent and meritorious record of productivity and achievement in the areas under review. Guidelines

and policies for the evaluation should take into account the interconnectedness of these activities, the fact that the nature of the emphasis of a faculty member's contribution to the mission of UTRGV may shift at appropriate times of the individual's career, and that each of these areas is essential for the success of the institution and for the success of its students.

Meeting these basic evaluation requirements/criteria does not ensure tenure or promotion; however, failure to meet these basic evaluation standards/criteria will result in ineligibility for tenure or promotion consideration.

These UTRGV School of Art guidelines will become effective Fall 2017. Any proposed changes to the Evaluation Standards of the School of Art must be approved by the Tenure Promotion Revision committee. Revisions of a department's basic tenure or promotion evaluation standards/criteria during any tenure-track member's probationary period will not be applicable to that faculty member for two full academic years after official adoption unless that faculty member chooses to be governed by the changes, and affirms that choice in writing to the Director.

CATEGORIES OF EVALUATION STANDARDS

Teaching

Teaching activities shall include, but are not limited to:

1. Classroom, studio, and laboratory instruction
2. Development of new courses and teaching methods
3. Publication of instructional materials
4. Supervision of undergraduate and graduate students
5. Mentoring and advising students
6. Competitive funding for instructional/pedagogical development

Effective teaching is a necessary prerequisite to promotion or tenure. Excellence in research/scholarship/creative activities or service is insufficient grounds for promotion or tenure in the absence of effective teaching. Teaching that meets or exceeds expectations is assessed by multiple indicators including, but not limited to, performance on student evaluations, peer observation of teaching, and pedagogical preparations.

Research/Scholarship/Creative Activities

Research/scholarship/creative activities are characterized by the creation and dissemination of new knowledge or other creative works and activities including, but not limited to:

1. Peer-reviewed publications of the faculty member's research in nationally recognized journals and presses
2. Visual or other artistic contributions in international, national, state, and regional exhibitions
3. Performances in international, national, state, and regional venues
4. Development of intellectual property such as patents and licenses

5. Competitive, external research funding

Tenure-track faculty must be engaged in scholarship/research or creative work by the time they apply for tenure or promotion. Associate professors applying for promotion to professor must have a sustained research program and a substantial body of publications or equivalent works with a demonstrated impact on the field in addition to the work they previously presented for promotion to associate professor. Excellence in research and creative activity is defined by the quantity, quality, and impact of publications and creative works, as judged by peer review. For purposes of this standard, peer review includes review by independent and external nationally and internationally recognized experts in the faculty member's field.

Service/Community Engagement

Service/community engagement activities shall include, but are not limited to:

1. Service to students, colleagues, the department, college, and UTRGV
2. Administrative and committee service within UTRGV
3. Service to the profession, such as holding a leadership role in a national association
4. Professionally-related service to the community, state, nation, and internationally

Tenure-track faculty should demonstrate a willingness to contribute to department and college service. The quality and impact of one's service will be acknowledged and weighed more heavily than the quantity of service commitments. Faculty seeking promotion to professor should demonstrate substantial service beyond the assistant professor level, including university-wide committee work and leadership roles within and outside the university.

Allocation of Effort: Each full-time member of the School of Art faculty is expected to engage in teaching, research, and service. The expectation is that under normal circumstances, each tenured and tenure-track faculty member will adhere to a general research assignment norm of 35% teaching, 45% research, and 20% service allocation of effort. The evaluation of all tenured and tenure track faculty members on a research assignment uses the 35/45/20 allocation of effort that is in keeping with the university's core priority placed on research that impacts the Rio Grande Valley and beyond. By maintaining these percentages, the School of Art recognizes the importance of all three components with an emphasis on research as UTRGV transitions to become an R1 institution.

Workload: In assigning faculty workload, the School of Art follows the policy set by the Regents Rule 31006. Particular attention should be paid to Section 6, in which studio art courses are defined in Section 6.2 as one and a half hours of instruction being equivalent to one semester credit hour (6 contact hours are the equivalent of 4 load credit hours). Other relevant sections include, but are not limited to, Section 6.3 (teaching supervision), 6.5 (thesis supervision), 6.7 (large classes), 6.10 (administrative release for such matters as studio equipment supervision), and 6.11 (load release for new faculty).

<https://www.utsystem.edu/board-of-regents/rules/31006-academic-workload-requirements>

Tenured faculty not on research assignment will adhere to a norm of 40% teaching, 20% research, and 20% service (reserve 20%). If tenured faculty do not provide adequate evidence of their ongoing research and scholarship, the Tenure and Promotion committee should note that research “Does not meet expectations” during the annual review. In this situation, the committee can then recommend that a faculty member be placed on this teaching assignment if not meeting research expectations. This evaluation has a challenge process, and any faculty member who is considered not meeting expectations has the right to provide a written justification, which is to be submitted to the Tenure and Promotion committee and the Dean. If a faculty member seeks to be on a research assignment, they must provide a proposal to the committee and the Dean to receive approval to make this change, and approval of the Dean is required.

Standards for Acceptable Performance for Tenured Faculty

Tenured faculty in the School of Art must maintain a high standard of performance in all areas of responsibility. An annual evaluation rating for an already tenured faculty member of at least “Meets expectations” (on a scale of Exceeds expectations, Meets expectations, Does not meet expectations, or Unsatisfactory) must be achieved to indicate adequate levels of performance. If a tenured faculty member fails to achieve a rating of Meets expectations or higher in teaching, research, or service, the faculty member in conjunction with the Director will develop a plan to address the areas of concern. Continued failure (after tenure) to achieve an acceptable level of performance will result in a review by the Personnel Committee and the forwarding of a recommendation to the Director of the School of Art. HOP 6-502 (Annual Evaluation) states that two consecutive annual evaluations of “Unsatisfactory” may trigger the Post-Tenure Review process.

ANNUAL EVALUATION

Overview: Annual Faculty Evaluation is the regular review process for assessing the work and professional accomplishments of faculty members. Results of Annual Faculty Evaluations are used to inform decisions regarding merit-based salary increases (see page 7). The Personnel Committee will conduct the review. As stated in the HOP 6-502, “All those involved in the annual review process shall adhere to the highest standards of ethical and professional conduct; shall focus on factual information; avoid practices that would conflict with the ability to be fair and unbiased; and shall guard against inaccuracies caused by either undue emphasis or omission of information.”

Each faculty member will submit a portfolio of prescribed materials to the Director on the date indicated in the [Pathways for Review Deadlines](#) found on the Office of the Executive Vice President for Academic Affairs’s website under the Faculty Resources tab.

Annual Faculty Review: All faculty members will prepare an Annual Faculty Report as

detailing all related activities. All relevant achievements should be duly documented in this report as it is the single most important document for Annual Faculty Evaluation. Faculty members are encouraged to include a narrative for each category (Teaching, Research, and Service) describing the most important accomplishments during the time period being evaluated. In addition, faculty members are encouraged to incorporate self-reflection into the narrative in order to define their annual accomplishments qualitatively for those who are not conversant with their respective fields. It is the responsibility of each faculty member to submit materials (including student evaluations) in the Annual Faculty Review.

The Annual Faculty Review will include the following:

- Current CV

Teaching

- Tabular Summary of Teaching Evaluations
- Tabular Summary of Teaching Achievements
- Narrative Summary
- Peer Review/Observations

Research

- Tabular Numeric Summary of Research
- Narrative Summary of Research

Service

- Tabular Numeric Summary
- Narrative Summary

Supporting Documentation/Material

- Teaching (including Course Syllabi and Student Evaluations)
- Research/Scholarship Material
- Service

Each item of the Annual Evaluation Portfolio should be submitted as a single PDF document attached to an email. The file should be labeled with the following title: “LAST NAME, FIRST NAME, Annual Review and Promotion 2017 (add appropriate year).” Faculty members will submit electronic copies of miscellaneous documents they feel are important within this PDF file at the end of the document, and this section should be labeled “Supporting Research Materials.”

The Committee

The Personnel Committee of at least 5 members will endeavor to provide equal representation among the disciplines of Art History and Studio Art and Design. Each member must alternate serving to give equal access to this committee, unless otherwise agreed upon by each member. The faculty should consist of:

2 Art History faculty

2 Studio Art faculty

1 Graphic Design faculty

The committee should also consist of at least 3 tenured professors with the following recommended ratio of Full, Associate, and Assistant Professors:

2 full professors

2 Associate Professors

1 Assistant Professor (who has served 3 years as a tenure-track faculty)

If an Assistant Professor serves on the Personnel Committee, he/she may not participate in the evaluation of dossiers for tenure and promotion, as outlined in the HOP 06-505, which states that the “Tenure and Promotion committee shall have a minimum of three members and will be composed only of tenured faculty members, who are at or above the rank of the faculty member under consideration.” If an Assistant Professor serves on the Personnel Committee, a separate sub-committee will be formed to consider applications for tenure and promotion, as outlined in the HOP 06-505.

When necessary, under the circumstances of promotion, if adequate eligible tenured faculty members do not exist in the same field of expertise of a candidate (for example Art Historians to review an Art Historian’s promotion, or the same for Graphic Design, etc.), then the committee will request qualified faculty outside of the School of Art to serve on the committee. These members outside of the School of Art should demonstrate active publishing and leadership in their field. The professor being considered for tenure and promotion should have input on the selection of these external members of the committee, which will be determined by the Director and the Dean.

Evaluation Report

The Personnel Committee will prepare an evaluation report (ratings, comments) on each respective faculty member. The Director will share individual results with each respective faculty member. The Committee will base the evaluation of each faculty member on criteria defined in this document in the section Criteria for Annual Faculty Evaluation, Progress Toward Tenure Review, and Promotion and Tenure. The School of Art will retain a copy of all Evaluation Reports. The evaluation process will be completed as soon as possible, following the timeline published by the Office of the Executive Vice President for Academic Affairs. The Evaluation Report will include a single rating for each category (Teaching, Research, and Service) according to the following scale:

4 – Exceeds expectations

3 – Meets expectations

2 – Does not meet expectations

1 – Unsatisfactory

Evaluation of each category will consider, on balance, both the quantity and quality of work. An overall evaluation rating will be calculated by using the rating for each category and the percentage weightings for each faculty member’s appointment (usually 35-45-20). Example: for a faculty member achieving ratings of 3, 2, and 4 in Teaching, Research, and Service respectively, the calculation would be $[(3 \times 35) + (2 \times 45) + (4 \times 20)] = 275$ (maximum possible score = 400). There will also be a brief narrative included

in the Evaluation Report for each category, justifying the assigned rating. The Personnel Committee may also choose to include a summary paragraph with suggestions and commendations.

The Evaluation Review will also assess the following for each faculty member in comparison to other faculty members with similar specializations in the field: a) heaviness of teaching load, b) overall quantity and quality of research productivity, and c) overall participation in service obligations. This assessment will identify one of three comparative levels for each category: 1) significantly higher than the median for all faculty, 2) at or about the median for all faculty, or 3) noticeably lower than the median for all faculty.

The Criteria for Annual Review

The criteria for Annual Review and Merit evaluations is the same as the criteria listed for Tenure and Promotion (see page 9).

Outcomes:

An annual evaluation rating for a tenured faculty member of “Meets expectations” must be achieved to indicate an adequate level of performance. All ratings of “4 – Exceeds expectations” and “3 – Meets expectations” (according to the ratings defined above) require no special action or sanction.

A rating of “2 – Does not meet Expectations” or “1 – Unsatisfactory” in any category is considered to be failing to meet academic responsibilities and requires further corrective steps described below. A faculty member will either 1) accept the Evaluation Report, or 2) appeal the results of their individual evaluation. Appeals must be made in writing and submitted to the Director within 10 working days (see *Pathways*) of receiving the Evaluation Report. Appeals must clearly explain the rationale for challenging the determination of the Tenure and Promotion Committee.

Each faculty member is encouraged to meet annually with the Director to discuss his/her productivity, evaluation, and expectations for the future. Such meetings are required for all tenure-track faculty members as part of the annual review process..

Ratings Failing to Meet Academic Responsibilities

Following the procedures outlined in HOP ADM 6-602 (Annual Faculty Evaluation), “if the annual performance evaluation raises concerns about the faculty member’s performance in one or more areas, as indicated by ‘Does not meet expectations’ or ‘Unsatisfactory,’ this may indicate that the faculty member could benefit from additional support...A tenured faculty member whose overall annual performance evaluation is “Unsatisfactory” for two consecutive annual reviews may be additionally be reviewed under the procedures described in HOP ADM 6-504, Post-Tenure Review. The decision to undertake a comprehensive performance evaluation outside of the normal time-frame of six years will be made by the EVPAA in consultation with the Dean of the college.”

The School of Art Director shall consult annually with the Dean, and the Dean shall consult annually with the EVPAA, on the progress of any faculty member who falls within the category of overall failure to meet minimum academic responsibilities.

Merit-Based Salary Increases

Merit funds, when available, will be awarded based on a summative review of the faculty member's previous three years of Annual Evaluation Reviews. This review will be prorated for faculty who have been at the university for less than three years. Faculty receiving "Meets expectations" or "Exceeds expectations" in all areas over a three-year period are eligible for a merit increase.

Peer Observation of Teaching

For faculty members in tenure-track positions, a peer observation of teaching is required every year (tenured faculty need a Peer Observation of Teaching once every three years). Peer Teaching Evaluations will consist of written reports by one tenured colleague chosen by the faculty member in consultation with the Director. Evaluations should address overall effectiveness and organization of the observed instruction. Although there is no prescribed format, reports should include critical and constructive comments, and also clearly identify any concerns of the reviewer. The Director will inform all parties of observation assignments well in advance of deadlines so that reviewers can arrange a mutually agreeable observation time. After the teaching evaluation is submitted to the Director, the observed faculty member will be given the option to submit a statement within one week addressing anything in the report s/he feels is inaccurate or needs clarification. For more information, please refer to the institutional guidelines on [Faculty Peer Observation of Teaching](#).

GENERAL CRITERIA FOR FACULTY EVALUATION, PROGRESS TOWARD TENURE REVIEW, AND PROMOTION AND TENURE

Overview: 4th Year Review, Tenure-Promotion (to Associate Professor), and Promotion (to Full Professor) are all part of the review process (see ADM 06-505) overseen by tenured faculty members. In addition to the responsibility for each tenured faculty member to vote on and evaluate every candidate for tenure-promotion, the tenured faculty elect a Tenure and Promotion Committee to make extensive recommendations on tenure-promotion candidates in a report that is to be submitted to both the Director of the School of Art and the Dean that includes a summation and interpretation of the faculty vote as well as a report of their own considerations and evaluation of each tenure-promotion candidate. Faculty can review the folders of other members of equal rank or those with a rank below their own. Faculty who are below another member of higher rank may not review the folders of these higher ranking individuals.

GENERAL EXPECTATIONS FOR ALL EVALUATIONS, ANNUAL REVIEW AND TENURE-PROMOTION

Recommendations for annual faculty evaluation, progress toward tenure, and promotion

shall be based on the record of the faculty member in teaching, research, and service.

Teaching

Faculty members must demonstrate enthusiasm for teaching, the ability to challenge and inspire students to achieve at their highest level possible, and a genuine interest in student success as exhibited in advising, mentoring, and creating professional and academic opportunities for students. Guidelines on peer review, as outlined on the EVPAA's website in [Guidelines for Faculty Peer Observation of Teaching](#), must be followed:

Research

Research may include any of a wide variety of activities depending upon the field of specialization and the interests of the faculty member. It is expected that each faculty member will pursue research and professional activities appropriate to his or her field of specialization and will achieve national and/or international recognition among his or her peers in one or more such fields of activity.

Service

Service refers to activities that utilize the professional expertise of the faculty member. Each member of the faculty is expected to render appropriate service at various points of the career to the School of Art, the College, the University, the profession, and the public at large.

ADM 06-505 states: "excellence in research/scholarship/creative activities or service is insufficient grounds for promotion or tenure in the absence of effective teaching."

The Criteria for Tenure and Promotion and Annual Review

The guiding principle with respect to research-creative work (and to a lesser extent teaching) for the two primary stages of faculty advancement, tenure and promotion to associate professor and promotion to full professor, should be that of seamless progress in the reputation of the individual. It is not expected that a faculty member will engage in all of the activities listed in the following categories. The quality of the contributions is of greater importance than the quantity. Prestige and/or scope of the publication or art exhibition venue are important contributing factors in determining the significance of research and creative activity.

External Reviewers

External reviewers in a tenure and promotion case serve primarily to evaluate the professional research and creative activity of the candidate, though reviewers are invited to comment on teaching and service activities of the candidate. The selection of external reviewers will follow the procedures and guidelines of the Handbook of Operating Procedures. Please see the [EVPAA's Faculty Resources Website](#) for additional guidance.

THE CRITERIA: ART HISTORY

Faculty being considered for tenure and promotion and evaluated during Annual Review must reach the “Meets Expectations” criteria in all areas (Research, Teaching, Service) every academic year.

The Personnel Committee, making evaluations based on the following criteria, are expected to evoke the appropriate openness and gravitas in determining collectively the relative weight of each contribution. Additionally,

- It is not expected that a faculty member will engage in all of the activities listed under the following categories.
- It is not expected that a faculty member will be equally active in each of the three categories.
- The quality of the contributions is of greater importance than the quantity.
- Prestige and/or scope of the publication or exhibition venue are important contributing factors in determining the significance of research and creative activity.

Criteria for Classifying Major and Minor Accomplishments

In assessing the quality and scope of faculty accomplishments during the annual evaluation process, progress toward tenure review, and the application for promotion and tenure, it is necessary to classify accomplishments that “Meet Expectations” as **major** or **minor**. The following criteria are to assist in making that determination.

Research in an Academic Year

Criteria for Ranking:

Exceeds Expectations:

- Publication of book by a university press or peer-reviewed press
- Editor of anthology (book) published by a university press or peer-reviewed press
- Publication of a scholarly article in a peer reviewed academic journal that is nationally or internationally recognized
- Author of a scholarly essay in an anthology published by a university press or peer-reviewed press
- Curatorial responsibility for an exhibition with a substantial accompanying catalogue at a leading national museum of art, which includes essay by reporting faculty member
- Contribution of an essay in an exhibition catalogue at a leading national museum of art (single authored or co-authored)
- Recipient of a prestigious competitive external grant such as the Fulbright, AAR, CASVA, Andrew Mellon, etc.
- Organizing and/or chairing a conference session at a national conference
- Invited lecturer at a nationally recognized institution and/or professional venue (such as museums and universities)

- Organizing and/or chairing a national conference or lecture series
- Paper or Talk given at a prestigious internationally recognized academic conference, symposium, or lecture series in a national or international venue (outside of Texas)

Meets Expectations:

Major Accomplishments

- Contribution of a catalogue entry or entries in an exhibition catalogue at a leading national museum of art Book review in a peer reviewed academic journal Recipient and/or holder of major (competitive) internal grant or competitive external grant
- Paper or Talk given at an academic conference, symposium, or lecture series in a state venue
- Hard evidence of progress on ongoing major project(s) with momentum on a state level

Minor Accomplishments

- Talks in regional venues (south of San Antonio) or local art museums (local venue defined as a professional space with little or no reach beyond the Rio Grande Valley community including university campus)
- Contribution of a catalogue essay, entry, or entries in an exhibition catalogue at a regional or local museum of art
- Paper or Talk given at an academic conference, symposium, or lecture in a regional or local venue
- Evidence of progress on ongoing project(s) with momentum at a local level

Does Not Meet Expectations:

- Faculty performing at a low level (not receiving any of the above items)
- No evidence of production, publication, or exhibition collaboration
- Talks in local venues only
- Report of ongoing research without compelling evidence

Unsatisfactory:

- Performing unsatisfactorily (not doing the job)
- Participation in projects that cannot produce career momentum
- No publications
- No evidence of ongoing scholarly engagement, grants, or talks of any significance.

Teaching in an Academic Year

Exceeds Expectations:

A combination of at least two of the following:

- Outstanding course evaluation numbers in both graduate seminars and undergraduate level courses
- Curricular innovation: new courses, substantial and demonstrable overhaul of established courses, cross-disciplinary collaboration, innovative use of new technologies
- Supervision of MFA or MAIS graduate students
- Independent study students
- Honors thesis supervision
- Bringing in new majors and graduate advisees

Meets Expectations:

- Solid course evaluation numbers, consistent with class size and level, e.g., higher rankings for graduate seminars (which are usually small), lowest for introductory level courses
- Unusually low numbers should be weighed against circumstances (e.g., new course, mandatory course, previous course evaluation numbers)
- Participation in advising activities for undergraduate and graduate students

Does Not Meet Expectations:

- Evidence of documentable and unexplained lapses in student supervision, e.g., failure to show up for student colloquia or defenses or inadequate supervision of individual instruction students.
- Low or irregular course evaluation numbers that cannot be satisfactorily explained and follow a pattern from previous years
- Little student graduate supervision

Unsatisfactory:

- Faculty member has shown consistent pattern of unresponsiveness to students: missed office hours; failed to respond to email queries; inadequately supervised students enrolled for independent studies, theses, or dissertations
- Extremely low course evaluation numbers for organized courses.

Service in an Academic Year

Exceeds Expectations:

Some combination of the following:

- Demonstrable effectiveness in service at all levels consistent with rank at national and/or state level (outside of the Rio Grande Valley).
- Service at several levels and on multiple committees, not excluding the School of Art.

Meets Expectations:

- Consistent pattern of willingness to take on responsibility (keeping in mind that quality and the level of impact of service outweighs quantity).

- Service on more than one committee or duty (such as library liaison, etc.)

Does Not Meet Expectations (Score Criteria 2):

- Limited amount of service relative to rank
- Inconsistent participation in assigned committees

Unsatisfactory (Score Criteria 1):

- Default on service assignments without clear cause
- Little or no acceptance of service responsibility at any level, following pattern of previous years

THE CRITERIA: STUDIO & DESIGN

Faculty being considered for tenure and promotion and evaluated during Annual Review must reach the “Meets expectations” criteria in all areas (Research, Teaching, Service) every academic year.

The Personnel Committee, making evaluations based on the following criteria, are expected to evoke the appropriate openness and gravitas in determining collectively the relative weight of each contribution. Additionally,

- It is not expected that a faculty member will engage in all of the activities listed under the following categories.
- It is not expected that a faculty member will be equally active in each of the three categories.
- The quality of the contributions is of greater importance than the quantity.
- Prestige and/or scope of the publication or exhibition venue are important contributing factors in determining the significance of research and creative activity.

Criteria for Classifying Major and Minor Accomplishments

In assessing the quality and scope of faculty accomplishments during the annual evaluation process, progress toward tenure review, and the application for promotion and tenure, it is necessary to classify accomplishments that “Meet Expectations” as **major** or **minor**. The following criteria are to assist in making that determination.

Research/Creative Work in an Academic Year

Criteria for Ranking:

Exceeds Expectations:

- One or more solo exhibitions in professional international or internationally recognized venues
- Participation in esteemed international or internationally recognized group exhibition

- Completed a major design project for a prestigious international level client (web design, logo design, publication of high esteem, etc.)
- Recipient of prestigious, competitive external grant such as Joan Mitchell Foundation, Guggenheim fellowship, Fulbright, AAR etc.
- Recipient of international or national recognition (award)
- Entry into significant international or national public/private collections
- Inclusion of artwork in a major publication by a university or nationally recognized press
- Publication of book (authored by the artist) by a university press or peer-reviewed press
- Author of a scholarly essay in an anthology (book) published by a university press or a peer-reviewed journal
- Publication of graphic design work of high esteem in a major international or internationally recognized publication by a professional press or journal
- Invited lecturer at a nationally recognized institution and/or professional venue (such as museums and universities)
- Organizing and/or chairing conference sessions at a national conference or lecture series

Meets Expectations:

Major Accomplishments

- One or more solo exhibitions in professional national venues (such as a gallery or museum)
- Participation in one or more esteemed national group exhibitions
- Completed one or more design projects for a prestigious national level client (web design, logo design, publication, etc.)
- Inclusion of artwork in a professional publication of substantial significance
Curatorial responsibility for an exhibition with a substantial accompanying catalogue at a leading national or state museum of art (outside of the Rio Grande Valley), which includes essay by reporting faculty member
- Authoring a catalogue entry or entries in an exhibition catalogue at a leading national museum of art
- Recipient of state recognition (award)
- Participation in one or more group exhibition(s) in professional state venues
- Recipient and/or holder of major (competitive) internal grant or competitive external grant
- Pattern of exhibiting in spaces that will potentially generate career momentum on the state level
- Organizing & chairing conference sessions or lecture series at a state conference
- Talk given at a state venue including a conference, symposium, lecture series, or art museums (outside of the Rio Grande Valley)
- Hard evidence of progress on ongoing major project(s) with momentum on a state level

Minor Accomplishments

- Solo exhibition in a professional regional venue (south of San Antonio) or local venue (local venue defined as a professional space with little or no reach beyond the Rio Grande Valley community including university campus)
- Participation in at least two group exhibitions in regional or local venues
- Completion of public regional or local commission
- Completed one or more design projects for a regional or local level client (Combination of: web design, logo design, publication, etc.)
- Publication of graphic design work on a local level
- Curatorial responsibility for an exhibition with a substantial accompanying catalogue at a local museum of art, which includes essay by reporting faculty member
- Entry into local or regional collections
- Recipient/holder of regional award, internal or external grant
- Evidence of progress on ongoing project(s) with momentum at a local level
- Talk given at a local conference, symposium, lecture series, or regional art museums
- Evidence of progress on ongoing project(s) with momentum at a local level

Does Not Meet Expectations:

- Faculty performing at a low level (not receiving any of the above items)
- No evidence of production, publication, or exhibition collaboration
- Talks in local venues only
- Report of ongoing research and art production without compelling evidence

Unsatisfactory:

- Performing Unsatisfactorily (not doing the job)
- Participation in projects that cannot produce career momentum
- No publications or exhibitions
- No evidence of ongoing scholarly engagement, grants, or talks of any significance.

Teaching in an Academic Year

Exceeds Expectations:

A combination of at least two of the following:

- Outstanding course evaluation numbers in both graduate seminars and undergraduate level courses
- Curricular innovation: new courses, substantial and demonstrable overhaul of established courses, cross-disciplinary collaboration, innovative use of new technologies
- Supervision of MFA or MAIS graduate students
- Independent study students

- Bringing in new majors and graduate advisees

Meets Expectations:

- Solid course evaluation numbers, consistent with class size and level, e.g., higher rankings for graduate seminars (which are usually small), lowest for introductory level courses
- Unusually low numbers should be weighed against circumstances (e.g., new course, mandatory course, previous course evaluation numbers)
- Participation in advising activities for undergraduate and graduate students

Does Not Meet Expectations:

- Evidence of documentable and unexplained lapses in student supervision, e.g., failure to show up for student colloquia or defenses or inadequate supervision of individual instruction students.
- Low or Irregular course evaluation numbers that cannot be satisfactorily explained and follow a pattern from previous years
- Little student graduate supervision

Unsatisfactory:

- Faculty member has shown consistent pattern of unresponsiveness to students: missed office hours; failed to respond to email queries; inadequately supervised students enrolled for independent studies, theses, or dissertations
- Extremely low course evaluation numbers for organized courses.

Service in an Academic Year

Exceeds Expectations:

Some combination of the following:

- Demonstrable effectiveness in service at all levels consistent with rank at national and/or state level (outside of the Rio Grande Valley).
- Service at several levels and on multiple committees, not excluding the School of Art.

Meets Expectations:

- Consistent pattern of willingness to take on responsibility (keeping in mind that quality and the level of impact of service outweighs quantity).
- Service on more than one committee or duty (such as library liaison, etc.)

Does Not Meet Expectations (Score Criteria 2):

- Limited amount of service relative to rank
- Inconsistent participation in assigned committees

Unsatisfactory (Score Criteria 1):

- Default on service assignments without clear cause

Little or no acceptance of service responsibility at any level, following pattern of previous years

POST-TENURE REVIEW

Post-tenure review functions to provide comprehensive and periodic performance evaluations of tenured faculty to provide guidance for continuing and meaningful faculty development, to assist faculty in enhancing professional skills and goals, and to refocus academic and professional efforts when appropriate. This process will follow the procedures outlined in HOP (ADM 06-504)

A. Review Frequency and Schedule

1. Comprehensive performance evaluations must occur every six years following the award of tenure. When they coincide, the comprehensive review will include the Faculty Annual Evaluation (See ADM 6-502). When they coincide, the information provided for the review of an endowed position (e.g., endowed professor or endowed chair) may be incorporated into the appropriate elements of the comprehensive review.
2. The schedule for the review will follow the “Pathways for Review Deadlines” posted on the website of the Office of the EVPAA.
3. During the Spring semester, and in accordance with the date established in the Pathways for Review Deadlines, the Office of the EVPAA will provide the deans’ offices with the list of their faculty members who are due for post tenure review during the next academic year. The Deans’ offices shall then notify their respective faculty members accordingly.
4. The evaluation may not be waived for any tenured faculty member, but may be deferred in rare circumstances, such as when the review process will coincide with approved leave.
5. No deferral of review of an active faculty member may extend beyond one year from the scheduled review.
6. Periods when a faculty member is on unpaid leave, medical leave, or assigned a full-time administrative position will not be counted toward the six-year period between successive comprehensive performance reviews, within the following guidelines:
 - i. If the total time on leave or assigned to a full-time administrative position is more than four months, the comprehensive performance review will be delayed for one year, unless the dean or Executive Vice President for Academic Affairs (EVPAA) approve a longer delay.
 - ii. If a period of leave of at least three months duration occurs within the six months immediately prior to a scheduled comprehensive performance

review period, the comprehensive performance review will be delayed by at least one year, unless the faculty member requests that the comprehensive performance review not be delayed.

- iii. Other circumstances that might be considered cause for modifying the comprehensive performance review schedule are subject to the approvals of the dean and EVPAA.

B. School of Art Post-Tenure Review Committee

1. Comprehensive performance reviews will be carried out at the department level by a School of Art Review Committee that will include at least three tenured faculty members at an equivalent or higher rank of each of the faculty member(s) undergoing review.
2. When there are fewer than three tenured faculty members at an equivalent or higher rank of the faculty member(s) undergoing review, the School Director, in consultation with the dean, may invite full professors from other departments to participate as members of the School of Art Post-Tenure Review Committee.
3. When the faculty member undergoing review is the Director of the School of Art, that level will be skipped and the file will move to the next level (i.e., the dean).
4. The Post-Tenure Review Committee is elected by the voting members of the School of Art faculty.
5. The chair of the Post-Tenure Review Committee will be elected by the committee members.
6. Faculty members with part-time administrative positions (with the exception of the college's associate deans) are eligible to serve on the School of Art Post-Tenure Review Committee.

C. Comprehensive Performance Review Process

1. Faculty will be evaluated based on the departmental approved criteria and using the evaluation categories described in ADM 6-502, Annual Faculty Evaluation.
2. Information to be submitted for the annual review includes:
 - i. A current curriculum vita
 - ii. Updated tabular summaries (e.g., Summary of Teaching Evaluations, Summary of Teaching Achievement, Summary of Research/Scholarship, Summary of Service) for the review period;
 - iii. Student evaluations of teaching;

- iv. Peer evaluations of teaching as per the School of Art or college and *University Guidelines*
 - v. Any other materials or supporting documentation as per the School of Art or college criteria.
3. Faculty members appointed to part-time administrative positions will be reviewed under this process, with appropriate consideration given to the demands of administrative assignments and their impact on the level of research activity, courses taught, and the extent of service contributions.
 4. The School of Art Post-Tenure Review Committee will review the submitted materials and make a determination concerning the quality of the faculty member's contribution to the mission of the School of Art and college using the criteria developed by the School of Art. The Post-Tenure Review Committee will consider all activities and accomplishments of the faculty member from the previous six years.
 5. If the School of Art Post-Tenure Review Committee concludes that the faculty member "Does not meet expectations" or is "Unsatisfactory" in any category, the committee may ask the faculty member to provide further evidence of contributions or activity in the areas of concern.
 6. The chair of the School of Art Post-Tenure Review Committee will communicate the Review Committee's evaluation and recommendation to the faculty member and the School of Art chair.
 7. The School of Art chair will conduct an independent review of the faculty member and communicate his other recommendation to the faculty member and the dean.
 8. Upon review of the School of Art Post-Tenure Review Committee's and chair's recommendations, the dean will make a decision concerning the results of the comprehensive performance review.
 9. If the dean's decision is "Does not meet expectations" or "Unsatisfactory" in overall, then the dean may appoint, either at the request of the faculty member or if the dean believes one is needed, a college Review Committee to review the case. If a college Review Committee is appointed:
 - i. The faculty member will be given the opportunity to provide further evidence of contributions or activity in the area(s) of concern to the college Review Committee;
 - ii. The college Review Committee will submit its report to the dean; and
 - iii. The dean will then determine results of the comprehensive performance review and, recommend any necessary actions or follow-up.
 10. The Dean will communicate the results of the comprehensive performance review to the EVPAA for review and approval.
 11. Once reviewed and approved by the EVPAA, he or she will communicate the final comprehensive performance review results in writing to the faculty member, the department chair, and the President. The EVPAA is also required

to send a summary of the institutional post-tenure review outcomes to The University of Texas System.

D. Outcome of Comprehensive Performance Evaluation

1. Faculty will be evaluated based on the approved criteria for Tenure and Promotion and Annual Review as articulated in the Tenure and Promotion Criteria beginning on page 9. The evaluation categories described in *Regents' Rule 31102* will also be considered.
2. If the final result of the comprehensive performance review is “Exceeds expectations,” or “Meets expectations,” the faculty member will not undergo another comprehensive performance review for six years unless a comprehensive review is required as a result of subsequent annual reviews.
3. If a faculty member receives a rating of “Does not meet expectations” or “Unsatisfactory” in any of the three evaluation areas, the faculty member must develop an action plan to be reviewed and approved by the chair and dean, to address any weaknesses or concerns and enhance or strengthen the faculty member’s portfolio in the designated area(s). The faculty member’s progress towards meeting the goals of the plan shall be monitored through the annual evaluation process. Failure to meet the goals and benchmarks laid out in the action plan may result in further actions, as outlined below.
4. If a faculty member receives a rating of “Does not meet expectations” on the comprehensive performance, it may indicate that the faculty member could benefit from additional support, such as teaching effectiveness assistance, counseling, mentoring in research issues or service expectations, or adjustment of assigned duties. Such arrangements should be built into the action plan.
5. If the comprehensive performance review is “Unsatisfactory” in any of the areas, the dean in consultation with the School of Art chair may recommend a change in the faculty member’s workload or recommend additional actions to the EVPAA.
6. If the overall result of a comprehensive performance review is an “Unsatisfactory” rating, this may result in an additional review by the EVP for Academic Affairs, or designee to determine if good cause exists for termination under *Regents' Rules 31008 and 31102*.
7. The comprehensive performance review outcome is not subject to resolution outside of this process. The outcome may be appealed through each of the review levels up to the EVPAA, as outlined in the “Pathways for Review Deadlines.” The decision of the EVPAA is final.

Relevant Federal and/or State Statutes, Board of Regents Rule, UTS Policy, and/or Coordinating Board Rule

1. The University of Texas System Board of Regents’ *Rules and Regulations* Rule 31102, Evaluation of Tenured Faculty
2. The University of Texas System Board of Regents’ *Rules and Regulations* Rule 30501, Employee Evaluations

3. The University of Texas System Board of Regents' *Rules and Regulations* Rule 31008, Termination of a Faculty Member
4. Texas Government Code Section 51.942, Performance Evaluation of Tenured Faculty

Document History for Evaluation Standards & Criteria School of Art

FACULTY VOTE IN FAVOR OF THIS DOCUMENT: 11-3-2016

FINAL REVISION DATE WITH MINOR CHANGES APPROVED BY THE TENURE & PROMOTION COMMITTEE: 11-10-2016