Faculty Evaluation Plan, Visual Art Department

PURPOSE: To articulate the standards and procedures for the annual evaluation of faculty within the Visual Art Department

APPLIES TO: Faculty within in the Visual Art Department

I. Introduction

The Department of Visual Art subscribes to the University of Kansas Faculty Code of Rights, Responsibilities, and Conduct, as adopted by the Faculty Senate in 1971 and subsequently amended. Faculty duties are set forth in Article IV Faculty Responsibilities, and the Department of Visual Art expects its faculty to live up to those responsibilities. Within the context of the Faculty Code of Conduct, the duties and expectations of Visual Art faculty and the means by which they are evaluated are presented below. Faculty undergo three kinds of evaluations: [1] an Annual Performance Evaluation (APE) review performed by faculty peers and the Department Chair. An outcome of this evaluation is data for the annual merit salary process (see Appendix B and Appendix C); [2] A Progress Toward Tenure Review (PTTR) carried out by the Department Promotion and Tenure Committee; [3] and a review for Promotion and/or Tenure (P&T). Evaluation criteria are generally the same across the different reviews; administration responsibilities and procedures vary.

II. Statement of Performance Expectations

A. Unit Expectations

Following College of Liberal Arts and Sciences guidelines, all Visual Art faculty are expected to devote approximately 40 percent of their professional endeavors to teaching and advising; 40 percent to scholarly and/or creative activity; and 20 percent to service. Whereas this distribution of time is most common, flexibility exists to allow tenured faculty to reallocate responsibilities to the extent that changes do not undermine the Department’s teaching mission.

B. Standards for Acceptable Performance for All Faculty

1. Teaching and Related Activities

The normal duties of a full-time faculty member on permanent appointment can include, but are not limited to: teaching two courses per semester; working with independent appointment students; advising undergraduate and/or graduate students; serving on and/or chairing Master of Fine Art thesis committees, Master of Art thesis projects, and Master of Art exams; and participating in the annual graduate student reviews and graduate seminar when so assigned.

Quality of both undergraduate and graduate teaching is essential to the mission of the Department of Visual Art; neither can be judged more important than the other. A faculty member's performance as a teacher cannot be evaluated by any single formula, nor can it be easily quantified. In addition, because of the diversity of thought and style in faculty members’ studio practice, there is also great diversity of teaching style and methods.

As a consequence, any evaluation of faculty teaching should be based on many factors. Factors considered in developing an overall evaluation of teaching performance include, but are not limited to (in alphabetical order): [1] advising; [2] development of new courses, updating courses, new and
innovative approaches, and course coordination (multiple sections); [3] engagement with independent study students; [4] outreach (e.g., off-campus, Internet, and correspondence courses); [5] peer reviews; [6] serving on graduate committees; [7] teaching awards, fellowships and grants; and [8] the University’s approved “Student Survey of Teaching” form and addition student comments (Appendix A).

2. Academic Advising

All faculty members in residence are expected to advise undergraduate students during the advising period and throughout the year. All graduate students will be provided an advisor. Each faculty member will allocate open time for advising. Each semester, during the two-week period in the middle of the official college advising period, faculty members will provide specific information about their available advising times and inform their advisees.

3. Scholarly and/or Creative Activity

Research may include any of a wide variety of activities related to the fields within the Department of Visual Art and the interests of the faculty member. It is expected that each faculty member will pursue research or professional activities to achieve regional, national or international recognition among his or her peers.

a. Creative research

Creative research is measured by productivity and regular engagement in studio work. Faculty members who write about art and curate exhibitions are also contributing to their research. The Annual Faculty Exhibition presents an opportunity for faculty to present ongoing research. Each year faculty members submit a list of exhibitions or other outcomes of their studio production for evaluation. Alternative exhibition venues are often essential for presentation of atypical, non-traditional and/or experimental creative research. In addition to gallery and museum spaces, other venues for time-based art may include film screenings or festivals. Community-based art productions may occur in particular public venues as dictated by the nature of the project.

Adjudicated Online venues and publication are also considered. This list will be subjected to evaluation based, in part, on criteria of local, regional, national, and international acceptance of their efforts. The quality of the venue is also evaluated (i.e. for a museum where and at what level of exposure is important). If the venue is a private or university gallery, the reputation of the gallery is important. Acquisitions, commissions, public art projects and other outcomes are subjected to a similar scrutiny. Multi-year research projects may be reported for a maximum of three years and the Faculty Annual Report Form will provide a section to note on-going progress on these major projects.

The exploration and development of new creative form is a force that continues to alter and invigorate our culture. Broad judgment must be exercised in the evaluation of creative activity because faculty research reflects a variety of discourses and the constantly shifting ground of aesthetic judgment.

Quality of artistic effort can be discerned in the individual artist's ability to create various expressions of artistic form. Mastery of skills and mastery of materials and techniques are, of course, important. Each artist’s work is also expected to reflect a conceptual awareness relevant to traditional and/or contemporary practices. The work is related to and influenced by other art and carries within its style and structure the history or ontology of related style and form. Faculty peers must evaluate each other in this regard as a first step. Peer review begins with various levels of public and private exhibition sites, public art commissions, public and community collaborative projects and the sources of support for such activities. Exhibitions may be group or individual,
competitive, invitational, or assembled by a curator. Public art commissions are to a highly competitive process by a selection panel. Film screenings and festivals, are subjected to similar criteria. The acquisition of artwork for public or corporate collections is also considered. Other sources of evaluation for creative activity are grants and awards, critical reviews, exhibition adjudication, manuscript and journal reviewing and editing, participation on panels at professional meetings or similar settings, monographs, exhibition catalogs, art books, major bibliographies etc.

The significance of an artist's creative productivity is normally measured by the artist's accumulated work and its acceptance within the art environment over a long period of time. Artists who develop major reputations can be evaluated for the perceived quality of the body of work within the context of a style and a period, and for their influence upon other practicing artists and the discipline. Therefore, it is important to note that the evaluation of research is different at different career levels.

b. Text-based scholarly research
Research that represents a primarily text based scholarly track is also considered important practice. In evaluation of scholarly research within the Department, primary consideration is placed on the quality and extension of knowledge through publication and presentation. Scholarly activity includes, but is not limited to, the following: publication of original research, commentary, and review of peer scholarship in authored and co-authored books, scholarly journals, edited books, monographs, research reports; presentation of research at professional meetings; editing books and scholarly journals; consulting; and earning grants, awards, and/or fellowships from external sources. The quality of these activities is primarily determined by the prestige of the publisher, publication, professional meeting, or organization. Peer reviewed journals are more highly regarded than journals that are not refereed by an editorial board or do not involve peer reviews. Publications with audiences that are international or national are more highly regarded than publications with regional or local readership.

4. Service

Departmental service, as assigned by the Department Chair, is required of all faculty members including attendance at faculty and Department meetings as well as participation on Department committees. Service to the School of the Arts, College, University, and the profession (locally, nationally, and internationally) is also important in evaluating faculty service. Professional service outside of the university that is related to the mission of the Department or university includes, but is not limited to, participation in community, state, regional, national, and international activities. Participation can encompass activities such as review of external grants and/or promotion & tenure files, serving as an officer in a professional society and board membership.

Acceptable Level of Performance
On the basis of information provided in the Annual Faculty Report (AFR, see Appendix B), the Faculty Evaluation Committee (FEC) will assess each faculty member’s performance in the responsibilities of teaching, research, and service on a scale of: “excellent,” “very good,” “good,” “marginal,” and “poor.”

Evidence of “marginal” or “poor” performance in any of the three areas of responsibility will lead to intervention or will trigger the process for failure to meet academic expectations. Three consecutive years of a marginal or poor rating in any of the categories of teaching/advising, research, or service may lead to the implementation of the University dismissal policy.

C. Differential Allocation of Effort (DAE)
The Department of Visual Art expects faculty to devote equal attention to teaching and research. When evaluating faculty performance, the Department applies the weights of 40 percent for teaching, 40 percent for research, and 20 percent for service to the University, community, and profession. These weights are the same for tenured and non-tenured faculty, although the Department recognizes that the specific contributions of faculty members to the Department’s mission will differ depending on career stage.

Changes in the standards 40/40/20 allocation of effort for a set period of time can be initiated by the tenured faculty member or Department Chair. These changes can be short- or long-term and must correspond to changes in work-load not just evaluation criteria. Reasons for alterations can include short-term items such as funded research or longer term career-stage issues. Faculty members are not allowed to reduce their teaching or research to less than 20 percent on permanent DAE agreements. Departmental needs take precedent over individual needs when making decisions to alter a faculty member’s allocation of effort; such redistribution must be consistent with the best interests of the unit. The most likely occasion for consideration of such changes is in discussion between the Chair and the individual faculty member following annual performance evaluations, or sooner so that appropriate arrangements may be made at the unit level for the coverage of course offerings. Any individualized changes in faculty allocation of effort will be negotiated with the Chair and documented in the faculty member's personnel file.

For temporary DAE agreements (one academic year or less), the DAE is ultimately approved by the Chair of the unit. For permanent DAE agreements (lasting one year or beyond), approval must also be sought from the appropriate contact dean in the College. All Differential Allocation of Efforts are reported annually to the College Dean's Office. For permanent DAEs, the supporting documentation is also provided to the College and the Provost's Offices. Agreements for long-term DAEs must be reviewed every three years.

For additional information, please see the University Policy on Differential Allocation of Effort (DAE)

III. Annual Performance Evaluation (APE) Review

A. Overview

The APE is a special function of the FEC. The committee consists of four full-time tenured or tenure-track faculty members plus the Department Chair. The Chair appoints committee members for a staggered two-year term. Each member will be chosen from a different area of the Department. As committee members rotate off the FEC, a faculty member from an unrepresented area will be appointed to replace them; each of the eight Department areas will be represented on the committee at least one out of every three years. No more than one tenure-track faculty member will serve on the committee at any given time and must have passed the Departmental level PTTR prior to appointment. If for some reason the regular rotation cannot be accomplished, the Chair will appoint a member-at-large for the year.

B. Basis for APE Portfolio or Annual Report Preparation

NOTE: Faculty are responsible for annually maintaining their PRO record, which is also accessed by administration for reports such as the College snapshot of departmental productivity. PRO provides an annual activity report and faculty are advised to view and update their PRO reports before submission of the faculty member’s portfolio to the unit. In classifying your work as major and minor, please bear in mind the definitions in the unit’s Promotion and Tenure Guidelines.

1. Teaching/Advising
The Department of Visual Art puts a high premium on conscientious, concerned, and skillful teaching and advising. The committee considers the candidate's overall record as a teacher. The following are considered: (a) performance in undergraduate classes (spanning beginning to advanced level courses), the development of any special topics classes, and independent hours with advanced undergraduate students, (b) engagement with graduate students, including independent studio or directed readings hours, involvement with graduate seminar, Chairing and/or membership on terminal Masters of Fine Arts (MFA) thesis committees, (c) advising and/or other mentoring in both the undergraduate and graduate arena, and (d) any additional meritorious activities or awards related to teaching activities. The Department looks for teaching competence and improvement along this broad spectrum. Peer and student evaluations will be used. Evidence of other teaching activities inside and outside the University is considered. In all activities, considerations of quality and quantity are taken into account.

2. Research

Faculty members within the Department of Visual Art are engaged in a wide variety of activities that constitute creative and scholarly research. Each specific area within the Department contains certain unique kinds of activity and evaluation is based on related standards; there is no hierarchy established between methodologies.

Faculty creative studio research is measured by productivity and regular engagement in studio work. Mastery of skills and mastery of materials and techniques are, of course, important. Each artist's work is also expected to reflect a conceptual awareness relevant to traditional and/or contemporary practices. The work is related to and influenced by other art and carries within its style and structure the history or ontology of related style and form. Work is subjected to evaluation based on criteria of local, regional, national, and international acceptance of the faculty member’s efforts. Recognition begins with various levels of public and private exhibition sites and the sources of support for such exhibitions. These exhibitions may be group or individual, competitive, invitational, or assembled by a curator. Alternative exhibition venues are often essential for presentation of atypical, non-traditional and/or experimental creative research. In addition to gallery and museum spaces, other venues for time-based art may include film screenings or festivals. Community-based art productions may occur in particular public venues as dictated by the nature of the project. Adjudicated Online venues and publication are also considered.

The quality of the venue is evaluated; the level of exposure is important. In the case of a museum, or a professional gallery, the reputation is considered; if at a non-profit or educational setting, the quality and status of the gallery is also significant. The importance of adjudicated exhibitions is evaluated based on both the reputation of the exhibition as well as the adjudicator. Public art commissions are subjected to a highly competitive process by a selection panel. Film screenings and festivals, are subjected to similar criteria. Solo exhibitions as well as high quality venues at international and national locations are looked upon most favorably. Acquisitions, commissions, public art projects and other outcomes are subjected to a similar evaluation. It is recognized that certain activities and resulting products have different prospects for exposure due to limited opportunities for a specific types of work. These include, but are not limited to: various impediments (size, weight, fragility) for shipping certain artworks (and conversely the potential of increased exposure because of the nature of products within a specific studio practice), limited exposure due to the controversial nature of certain work, and/or because work might be site specific, time based or temporal in nature.

Other sources of evaluation for creative activity include but are not limited to: the acquisition of artwork for both public and private collections, critical reviews, monographs, exhibition catalogs, inclusion in art books, bibliographies, grants and awards, etc. In addition, visual artists are often engaging in related research that is considered a part of their productivity: critical writing, curatorial activities, manuscript and journal reviewing and editing, artist lectures, panel presentations, and adjudicating (all of which enrich the public reputation of the artist, as well as the studio experience).
In evaluation of scholarly research within the Department, primary consideration is placed on the quality and extension of knowledge through publication and presentation. Scholarly activity includes, but is not limited to, the following: publication of original research, commentary, and review of peer scholarship in authored book, scholarly journals, edited books, monographs, research reports; presentation of original research at professional meetings; editing books and scholarly journals; consulting; and earning grants, awards, and/or fellowships from external sources. The quality of these activities is primarily determined by the prestige of the publisher, publication, professional meeting, or organization. Peer reviewed journals are more highly regarded than journals that are not moderated by an editorial board or do not involve peer reviews. Publications whose audiences are international or national are more highly regarded than publications with regional or local readership. The exploration and development of a unique creative voice is a force that continues to alter and invigorate our culture. Faculty research reflects a variety of competing discourses and the constantly shifting ground of aesthetic judgment. The evaluation of creative and scholarly research in the Department of Visual Art requires broad judgment by professionals and peers that reflects the diversity of our practices.

3. Service

Departmental service is required of all faculty members, including, but not limited to, participation on Departmental committees as well as attendance at faculty and Department meetings. Service to the university, college, School of the Arts and the profession (locally, nationally, and/or internationally) is expected. Especially important in evaluating faculty service are the following: (1) University service, including participation on Departmental, College, School of the Arts, or University committees; (2) professional service outside the University that is related to the mission of the Department or University which includes but is not limited to service to the discipline or profession, professionally related public activities, and service at the local, state, national, or international level. Professional service encompasses activities such as review of external grant applications for funding agencies and/or promotion and tenure files, and serving as an officer in a professional society.

The evaluation will result in ratings that follow standard University promotion and/or tenure language of: “excellent,” “very good,” “good,” “marginal,” or “poor” in each of the categories of teaching/advising, research (scholarly and/or creative activity), and service. The FEC records these ratings, together with any written comments, on the APE Form (Appendix C).

C. Evaluation Process

Early in the spring semester (usually in January), the Chair will announce deadlines for submission of materials for the APE. All tenured and tenure-track faculty are required to fill out an AFR (see Appendix B) to provide evidence of effort in teaching/advising, research (scholarly and/or creative activity), and service for the previous calendar year. This report is the only document to be submitted to the FEC to help analyze each faculty member’s record of performance during the previous calendar year. The quality, quantity, significance, and impact of performance are evaluated within the context of the faculty member’s specific academic responsibilities, including consideration of DAE, and discipline expectations and standards.

Each faculty will be assigned the weight of 40/40/20 to the responsibilities of teaching/advising, research (scholarly and/or creative activity), and service respectively for the evaluation. The exception would be for faculty members who have a different DAE that has been negotiated and agreed upon by the faculty member, Chair, and possibly the contact dean. If a faculty member has an official DAE that is different than the normal 40/40/20, those percentages will be used to evaluate the faculty member’s contribution to the University in each performance area and to be used later to calculate the possible awarding of merit. Faculty members on phased retirement are at 50% load as of 2010 (earlier contracts in art are for 60%). Their evaluation should take this difference in expectation and workload into account so that their evaluations are not negatively affected.
If a faculty member fails to submit information for the previous calendar year, that person's performance shall not be evaluated. Furthermore, the recommendation from the evaluation committee to the Chair will be that no merit salary increase should be recommended.

The Department Chair presides over the FEC during this process. The Chair forms two evaluation teams, assigns one half of the Annual Faculty Reports (AFRs) for review by each team, listens to the team reports, and contributes to the discussion.

1. Procedures for the FEC Conducting APEs
   a. Before the first meeting
      At least two weeks before the first meeting, each FEC member is given a copy of all AFRs. At the same time, the two teams are each assigned one half of the reports to read and evaluate by filling out the APE Form (Appendix C). No member evaluates his/her own AFR.
   b. At the first meeting
      Each team member will present his or her findings to the committee as a whole. Evaluators give each faculty member a preliminary assessment in teaching/advising, research, and service using a general rating of H (high), M (medium), or L (low). During these presentations and ensuing discussion, a committee member is asked to leave the room when his/her performance is under consideration (FEC member’s documentation should be considered at the beginning of the meeting).
   c. At the second meeting
      i. The committee briefly considers the evaluations in each of the categories (teaching/advising, research and service) and cross checks them for consistency in ratings. (The four members’ APE forms are not included in the cross checks and are held by the Department Chair.)
      ii. The committee then discusses the rationale for ratings, special considerations, and checks again for reasonable consistency considering all factors involved. The committee takes leaves, sabbaticals, phased retirements, as well as any other special considerations into account, including the breadth and depth of a heavy service load that is not documented ahead as a weighted load. A committee member is asked to leave the room when his/her performance is under consideration for ratings.
      iii. Final ratings are an exercise of balanced judgment that is derived from both the facts presented and rationales that emerge during committee discussion. The committee prepares a final list of ratings in the three performance areas for each faculty member using standard University promotion and/or tenure language. The following language shall be used by the committee for final ratings: “excellent,” “very good,” “good,” “marginal,” and “poor.”
   d.

D. Annual Evaluation Feedback Process

By mid-April the FEC will have completed the APE Form for each tenured or tenure-track faculty member in the Department. The results of each faculty member’s evaluation are then summarized by the Chair in a formal letter to the faculty member based on the quality, quantity, significance and impact of the work in the three areas of responsibility. The ratings and written comments, as well as any information about expectations of the position, progress toward tenure and/or promotion, any suggested strategies for improvement or renewal, etc. are also documented in the letter. In the letter, the tenured faculty is informed of the opportunity to schedule a meeting with the Chair to discuss their annual evaluation. It is required that tenure-track faculty meet with the Chair each year to discuss their evaluation.

In cases where improvement in a faculty member’s performance is warranted, the Chair will indicate, in specific terms, in writing, where the faculty member’s evaluations are unsatisfactory (i.e., “marginal” and “poor”). The faculty member and the Chair will meet to discuss any extenuating circumstances associated with the unsatisfactory evaluation and develop a written plan outlining strategies for improvement or external
intervention and development strategies. A copy of the written evaluation summary is then maintained in the faculty member’s personnel file.

E. Outcomes of the Annual Performance Evaluation

There are several outcomes resulting from the APE process, including: [1] documenting achievements related to Departmental and individual faculty professional goals; [2] personnel decisions (including promotion and/or tenure, non-reappointment, etc.); [3] merit salary allocations.

PTTR: The Department of Visual Art conducts a PTTR in accordance with Faculty Senate Rules and Regulations 6.4.2 Progress Toward Tenure Review: “Approximately midway between a faculty member’s appointment and mandatory review year (usually the third year), under guidelines issued by the provost, a Department, college, or school shall conduct a formal review of a pre-tenure faculty member’s progress toward tenure. The Progress Toward Tenure Review is intended to provide faculty members with a meaningful appraisal of their progress toward tenure and orient them toward basic aspects of the tenure process. Neither the record of the review nor its results shall be included in a faculty member’s promotion and tenure record and recommendations for or against promotion and tenure should not be influenced by favorable or unfavorable results of the progress toward tenure review. This limitation does not prevent consideration, during the promotion and tenure review, of the same documents and information considered for purposes of the progress toward tenure review.”

Additional Departmental information is provided under Faculty Development Initiatives below.

Promotion and Tenure: In all matters, the Department of Visual Art adheres to the policies of the University of Kansas and The College of Liberal Arts and Sciences. All tenure-track faculty members are urged to familiarize themselves with Department guidelines as well as College and University guidelines.

1. Procedures for developing performance improvement plans

If the chair ascertains that a faculty member's performance seems to be failing to meet academic responsibilities, the administrator and the faculty member shall develop a written plan of methods to improve the faculty member's performance. The plan may include appropriate provisions for faculty development, such as campus opportunities for faculty continued renewal and development, or for other appropriate interventions. The chairperson may call upon the University administration for assistance in constructing such a plan, including provision for additional resources, where needed. A faculty member may reject any plan recommended to aid performance levels, but the faculty member must understand that a sustained overall failure to meet academic responsibilities is a basis for dismissal.

2. Procedures for addressing failure to meet academic responsibilities

If a faculty member has been informed that his/her performance fails to meet academic responsibilities, the faculty member may request a review by a faculty committee designated to hear such matters in the College. The review committee will issue a non-binding recommendation on the appropriateness of this conclusion to the unit administrator. The administrator may change the evaluation after receiving the committee's decision, or may choose not to do so. In any event, the report of the committee will become a permanent part of the faculty member's personnel file within the academic unit and shall be available to the faculty member.

Department chairs shall consult annually with the dean, and the dean shall consult annually with the Provost on the progress of any faculty member who fails within this category of failure to meet academic responsibilities.
3. Sustained Failure to Meet Performance Expectations

Based upon the judgment that there has been a sustained failure to meet academic responsibilities, the Dean may recommend to the Provost that a tenured faculty member be dismissed. In making this determination, the Dean shall consider the nature of the failure to meet academic responsibilities, the reason or reasons for this failure, the number of years that the faculty member has failed to meet academic responsibilities, the level of discernible improvement in the faculty member's performance after being notified of any failure in performance, and the extent to which the faculty member has complied with the terms of any plan developed to improve the faculty member's performance. The Provost will review the case and, if the Provost agrees with the Dean's recommendation, the Provost will recommend to the Chancellor that the faculty member be dismissed. If the Chancellor agrees and recommends dismissal, this recommendation will go to the Faculty Rights Board.

Should any recommendation to dismiss be brought against a tenured faculty member based exclusively or in part on grounds of sustained failure to meet academic responsibilities, both the report(s) of the review committee(s), the annual written evaluation(s) of the unit administrator concerning the faculty member, any outside evaluations, and any germane written response by the faculty member to the charges shall be made available to the Faculty Rights Board.

F. Faculty Development Initiatives

- The Department of Visual Art provides guidance and mentoring for new and tenure-track faculty. The purpose of designated mentorship is to provide direction, advice, and information to tenure-track faculty members in the areas of teaching/advising, research, and service. Mentors, in coordination with the Department Chair and Promotion and Tenure Committee, may also help familiarize the tenure-track faculty member with the Department's Faculty Evaluation Plan, Promotion and Tenure Guidelines, and in the use of University resources to support their teaching and research. Mentoring, along with other faculty development initiatives, is also intended to encourage a flow of consistent, responsible information from designated mentors to the Promotion and Tenure Committee and the Chair. The Department strongly encourages the continued use of mentoring as a tenured faculty member continues forward toward promotion in rank to full professor.

- Each APE provides tenure-track faculty with feedback on their progress toward tenure, recognizing their strengths and accomplishments and making specific recommendations for addressing any shortcomings. In addition, tenure-track faculty will meet annually with the Departmental Promotion and Tenure Committee for an additional in depth assessment and recommendations concerning their progress towards tenure. Supplementary materials such as additions to a teaching portfolio and letters from mentors may also be reviewed at this time.

- For all tenure-track faculty members, a PTTR is typically conducted during the faculty member’s third year. This PTTR is to provide an evaluation of the faculty’s teaching/advising, research, and service activities toward fulfilling tenure requirements. As part of the evaluation, the candidate will give a presentation to faculty outlining his/her development in teaching/advising, research and service (echoing the Promotion and Tenure Procedures of the Department). It is the responsibility of the Department Promotion and Tenure Committee to work with the candidate and to prepare the evaluation packet following the guidelines and using the official forms required by the College and University. The Chair will then forward the completed report to the College Committee on Appointments, Promotion, and Tenure. When the official evaluation process is completed, the Chair meets with the tenure-track faculty member to discuss the PTTR. This evaluation should be used by the candidate to guide professional activities as he/she moves towards the formal tenure review.

- As part of the APE process, the Department shall consider the qualifications of all tenured faculty members below the rank of full professor, with a view toward possible promotion in rank during the following academic year. After considering a faculty member’s qualifications, if the Department’s FEC determines that those qualifications may warrant promotion in rank, it shall request that the Chair suggest to the faculty member to initiate procedures for review for promotion.
Other faculty development opportunities include:

- Full or Partial Support with Institutional Funding
- Center for Teaching Excellence
  Offers instructional development support, networking opportunities for professional dialogues on effective learning and innovation in teaching, and encourages collaborative activities emphasizing the scholarship of teaching and research on learning. Faculty will be provided videotaping and instructional consultation services.
- Faculty Travel and International Travel Funds
  Supports the presentation of papers at professional meetings and conferences.
- General Research Fund
  Provides research support on a competitive basis to individual faculty and groups of investigators.
- Hall Center for the Humanities Programs
  Promotes excellence in scholarship through research and creative fellowships, travel support for research and scholarly consultation in the humanities, funding for collaborative projects designed to have a sustained impact on teaching in the humanities, assistance with grant preparation, interdisciplinary study in the humanities through lecture series, forums, research discussion groups, and mini-classes and seminars.
- Humanities Grant Development Office (Hall Center for the Humanities)
  Provides an understanding of the process of proposal development from identifying potential funding sources and developing a concept through the preparation of the narrative and budget development and peer review.
- Information Technology Services
  Conducts workshops and seminars to develop basic skills and knowledge in the use of microcomputers and new directions in technology. Initial and advanced training is provided for the use of graphics software, navigation of the Internet and World-Wide Web, development of Web pages, and electronic mail and discussion lists.
- Keeler IntraUniversity Professorships
  Provides mid-career faculty an opportunity to strengthen their knowledge of an academic specialty, to broaden or achieve greater depth in a defined field of study, or to achieve competence in a new area of scholarly endeavor by spending a semester's residence in another academic department.
- National Fulbright Scholar Program
  Provides an opportunity for faculty to teach or conduct research under the auspices of the Fulbright Scholar Program. To encourage participation, the University provides up to one semester's salary to individual's receiving grants under this program. This incentive supplements the basic stipend provided by the Fulbright Program.
- New Faculty General Research Fund
  Assist new tenure-track faculty in initiating research and developing grant applications to sustain research programs through a mentoring and peer review process.
- Research Intensive Semesters (RIS):
  CLAS offers all junior faculty members in good standing a reduced teaching responsibility at some point during the faculty member’s pretenure employment. Faculty members will be released from classroom teaching duties for up to one semester, depending upon the relevant departmental teaching expectations, and will be expected to concentrate on research intensive activities. Faculty members are eligible for a research intensive semester assignment up to and including the spring semester before their publication dossiers are sent out to external reviewers in June, with the latest possible Research Intensive Semester (RIS) assignment typically being the second semester of the fifth year. Faculty members in good standing who have stopped their tenure clock remain eligible for a RIS assignment. The actual decision of which year/semester the individual is assigned a research intensive semester will be made in consultation with the department chair. Note that paid leaves and fellowships do not take the place of a RIS. Once the chair approves the RIS for the junior faculty member, the details concerning the RIS should be confirmed to the faculty member in writing and documented in their
personnel file. The chair also provides a copy of this authorization to the College Dean’s Office so that RIS data can be tracked. Faculty members who are granted a RIS are expected to continue to meet their usual duties regarding departmental advising and other service activities.

- Sabbatical Leave
- Provides opportunities for faculty development and enhancement activities.
- Non-institutionally Funded
- Leaves without Pay
- Provides the opportunity to pursue unique experiences outside the university on a full-time basis, when such experiences are deemed in the best interest of the university. Through leaves arranged through intergovernmental personnel agreements, faculty are provided opportunities for renewal and expansion research or teaching directions through placement in a federal agency for a specified period.

See Faculty Development Programs for information about additional faculty development opportunities.
IV. Appendices

Appendix A. Student Evaluation of Teaching
Instrument(s) used for the student evaluation of teaching: The Department of Visual Art utilizes the University’s “Student Survey of Teaching” instrument for this purpose. In addition, the department requests additional comments on the back of the “Student Survey of Teaching” form. The department has voted to use these comments in the evaluation process.
Appendix B. Annual Faculty Report (AFR)

Annual Faculty Report (AFR) for the Department of Visual Art
Approved 3-4-2010, no amendments March 7, 2014

Faculty Member’s Name ___________________ Date of Report ___________

Circle the correct title: Professor; Associate Professor; Assistant Professor

Years at KU: ______

This report is an account of your professional activities during the 20__ calendar year. The information provided will be used for performance evaluation and as a record of your contributions and achievements. Please return the completed form to the Art and Design Office by _________________.

I. Teaching
   A. Courses Taught
      List regularly scheduled and special topics classroom courses. If a class is linked, please do not list each level separately. Note releases or sabbatical leaves.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Course Name</th>
<th>Course #</th>
<th>Cr hrs</th>
<th>Required Course? (Y / N)</th>
<th>Contact hrs per week</th>
<th># of Students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Spring</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

B. Appointment students
   List the names of appointment students and course titles.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Student Name</th>
<th>Undergraduate or graduate?</th>
<th>Course # / Title / Credit hrs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Spring</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
C. MFA, MA Students
List the names of all MFA Thesis candidates, MA Thesis projects, MA Exams, on whose committee you serve(d). Indicate if you Chair(ed) the committee.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Spring</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Student Name</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(MFA Thesis, MA Thesis, MA Exam)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fall</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Student Name</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(MFA Thesis, MA Thesis, MA Exam)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

D. Advising and Mentorship
1. Undergraduate
   List number of all official undergraduate advisees.
   Spring: 
   Fall: 
2. Graduate
   List number of all official graduate advisees.
   Spring: 
   Fall: 
3. Other
   List any other activities that fall under special advising or mentoring capacities. This can include but is not limited to letters of reference, support for student grants, teaching supervision.

E. Teaching Initiatives
1. Grants and Awards
2. New course materials or strategies
   List briefly any new instructional strategies, innovative course preparations, and/or recent revisions.
3. Special lectures (on campus)
4. Workshops (on campus)
5. Class trips, student exhibitions, etc.
6. New courses
   Describe any new courses that you taught during the review period or courses for which you are currently preparing.
7. Other

II. Creative and Scholarly Research
A. Exhibitions and curatorial projects - current
List all exhibitions or equivalent activities and curatorial projects that occurred during the 20__ calendar year. Curatorial projects should be listed with the venue, exhibition title, and brief description of the project.
1. Solo or Two Person Exhibitions
   Venue / Title / Location / Date

2. Invitational Group Exhibitions
   Venue / Title / Location / Date / Number of artists (if possible)

3. Juried Exhibitions
   Venue / Title / Location / Date

4. Other Exhibitions
   Venue / Title / Location / Date

5. Curatorial Projects
   Venue / Title / Description / Location / Date

B. Exhibitions and curatorial projects - anticipated
   List future exhibitions for which you are preparing. Large solo exhibitions may be listed for up to three years, including the year of the show. A brief progress report should be included each year.

1. Solo or Two Person Exhibitions
   Venue / Title / Location / Date

2. Group Exhibitions
   Venue / Title / Location / Date / Number of artists (if possible)

3. Other Exhibitions
   Venue / Title / Location / Date

4. Curatorial Projects
   Venue / Title / Description / Location / Date

5. Publications
   List any publications that reference your creative research, including but not limited to books, articles, exhibition catalogues, and reviews.

C. Professional Activities
   List related professional activities, including but not limited to:

1. Residencies
2. Commissions
3. Grants and Awards
4. Acquisitions for public or corporate collections
5. Papers presented / Panel participation
   Title / Organization / Date
6. Workshops / Artists Presentations / Public Lectures (off campus)
7. Interviews
8. Research related presentations
   Off campus; or on campus, including but not limited to, Hall Center, Commons, Spencer Museum
9. Conferences, and professional memberships
10. Other

D. Scholarly Professional Activities - current
1. Books Published
   Title / Publisher / Date

2. Articles Published
   Title / Journal / Date

3. Papers Presented at Professional Meetings
   Title / Organization / Date / Location

4. Other Presentations
   Title / Venue / Date

5. Reviews of Others’ Works

6. Other

E. Scholarly Professional Activities - anticipated
List future Scholarly Professional Activities for which you are preparing. Major Publications may be listed for up to three years, including the year of the publication. A brief progress report should be included each year.
Include: Title / Publisher / Planned publishing date

F. Consulting
G. Recurrent Contributor to Professional Publications
H. Other Professional Activities
   List related professional activities, including but not limited to:
   1. Grants
   2. Lectures
   3. Workshops/presentations (off campus)
   4. Interviews
   5. Conferences, and professional memberships
   6. Other

III. Service
A. University Service
   List all university service (Art Department, School, College, and University level committees, as well as any other university service related projects). Use “(C)” after the committee name to note Chairing a committee. Describe the type and duration of committee activity. Briefly describe your role. Add clarification notes as needed.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Department</th>
<th>Committee or Project Title</th>
<th>Semester</th>
<th>Duration</th>
<th>Committee Type</th>
<th>Role / Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>School of the Arts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College of Liberal Arts &amp; Sciences</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
B. Professional Service

List and describe any service outreach to the community, state, region, nation, and/or the international community related to the mission of the Visual Art Department and/or the University. Use “(C)” after the committee name to note Chairing a committee. Add clarification notes as needed.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Committee or Project Title</th>
<th>Semester</th>
<th>Duration</th>
<th>Committee Type</th>
<th>Role / Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Community (Lawrence and immediate surrounding area)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Committee or Project Title</th>
<th>Semester</th>
<th>Duration</th>
<th>Committee Type</th>
<th>Role / Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**State**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Committee or Project Title</th>
<th>Semester</th>
<th>Duration</th>
<th>Committee Type</th>
<th>Role / Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Regional (Missouri, Nebraska, Colorado, Oklahoma)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Committee or Project Title</th>
<th>Semester</th>
<th>Duration</th>
<th>Committee Type</th>
<th>Role / Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**National**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Committee or Project Title</th>
<th>Semester</th>
<th>Duration</th>
<th>Committee Type</th>
<th>Role / Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**International**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Committee or Project Title</th>
<th>Semester</th>
<th>Duration</th>
<th>Committee Type</th>
<th>Role / Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
First round of ratings: E (excellent), VG (very good), G (good), M (marginal), P (poor)

At the first meeting to review the AFR’s the committee members will present a summary of each reviewed file. Together, committee members will assign a general rating for each category of Teaching (remember that student evaluations are not the only measure of teaching), Research, and Service. The categories will remain separate and will not be averaged together. Below is a rough guideline to establish the rating.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Teaching</th>
<th>Research</th>
<th>Service</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>E (Excellent)</td>
<td>Assessment of teaching may include initiatives, new course preparations, appointment student course load, advising, etc. Student evaluations well above the department numerical average.</td>
<td>There should be considerable and outstanding contributions in areas of Research (e.g. exceptional exhibition record, or scholarly based activities or combination of both).</td>
<td>Very heavy service load beyond the studio area, strong research related service, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VG (Very Good)</td>
<td>Above average factors such as teaching initiatives, appointment student load, thesis committees, advising, should be considered. Teaching evaluations at the department numerical average.</td>
<td>Evidence of above average research contributions reflecting either studio based activities or scholarly based activities.</td>
<td>Above average service contributions at one or more levels of service.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G (Good Teaching)</td>
<td>Meeting expectations in regards to appointment student load, advising and other teaching related activities. Student evaluations somewhat below department numerical average. Research and Service reflect basic evidence of engagement (service mostly in studio area, few exhibitions of quality).</td>
<td>Reflects basic evidence of engagement (service mostly in studio area, few exhibitions of quality).</td>
<td>Reflects basic evidence of engagement (service mostly in studio area, few exhibitions of quality).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M (Marginal)</td>
<td>Few or no teaching initiatives beyond classroom. Student evaluations clearly below the department numerical average.</td>
<td>Little evidence of research.</td>
<td>Little evidence of service.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P (Poor)</td>
<td>Little to no evidence of acceptable activity in the areas being evaluated. If no APE form is turned in by</td>
<td>Little to no evidence of acceptable activity.</td>
<td>Little to no evidence of acceptable activity.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
faculty, as required, it results in poor ratings in all categories with notation ‘no form turned in.’

Notes:
I. Do not penalize someone who has been on leave for sabbatical, sick leave, or has a course release.
II. All AFR’s, comment sheets, and rating sheets will be collected at the end of the last meeting.
III. The department chair’s office will keep one copy for the faculty files and shred the other copies.
IV. The committee comment and rating sheets will be used to assist the department chair in writing the summaries of the process for faculty letters.
V. The committee members will provide short paragraphs on teaching, research and service to the department chair to be included in the evaluation letter that will be sent to individual faculty members.

Department of Visual Art Annual Performance Evaluation
Review of (faculty name) ___________________ calendar year: _____________
Reviewer (name or code): ___________________ Date of Review: _____________
Circle one: tenured; pre-tenure
Circle other factors: new; sabbatical; other leave; course release; phased; Admin. appt.

I. Teaching
A. Regularly scheduled courses
List regularly scheduled courses, including special topics (normal 40% apt load = 2 courses):
Title __________________________ Evaluation Average ______
Title __________________________ Evaluation Average ______
Composite of teaching evaluations (exclude summer & appoint’s): ______ Dept Average: ______

B. Assessment of teaching
Assessment of teaching may include: Appointment student load, Thesis involvement, Advising and Mentorship, Teaching initiatives, grants, awards, graduate seminar participation, other.

C. Notes on Teaching
Preliminary rating
Overall preliminary rating for Teaching (please circle appropriate rating):
Excellent; Very Good; Good; Marginal; Poor

II. Research
A. Assessment of research
Assessment of research may include: Exhibition/Scholarly publication highlights; incl. category (such as solo, curated, etc.), as well as regional, national, international; upcoming opportunities, grants, residencies, awards, presentations, other. Note special circumstances, shifting research interests, related research activities, etc.

B. Notes on Research

C. Preliminary rating
Overall preliminary rating on Research (please circle appropriate rating):
Excellent; Very Good; Good; Marginal; Poor

III. Service
A. Assessment of Service
Assessment of service may include: exceptional service, studio area service, related community service, service to profession (outside evaluator, etc.), Department contributions, SOTA, Univ., faculty meeting participation, faculty exhibition participation, other.

B. Notes on Service

C. Preliminary rating
Overall preliminary rating for Service (please circle appropriate ratings):
Excellent; Very Good; Good; Marginal; Poor
NOTE: Faculty are responsible for annually maintaining their PRO record, which is also accessed by administration for reports such as the College snapshot of departmental productivity. PRO provides an annual activity report and faculty are advised to view and update their PRO reports before submission of the faculty member’s portfolio to the unit. In classifying your work as major and minor, please bear in mind the definitions in the unit’s Promotion and Tenure Guidelines.