

POLICIES ON FACULTY HIRING, RENEWAL, ANNUAL REVIEW, TENURE, AND PROMOTION IN THE SCHOOL OF ART

(Originally adopted October, 2012; current version approved 1/10/19)

INTRODUCTION

This document provides descriptions of School of Art (SOA) faculty, as well as general guidelines for the hiring, renewal, annual review, tenure, and promotion processes for SOA faculty. These are general guidelines only; faculty on review committees still need to make judgments on information provided for review. In addition, faculty should carefully read and become familiar with policies and procedures in the current version of COFS, found on the Provost office web site.

I. DESCRIPTION OF SCHOOL OF ART FACULTY RANKS

Descriptions of all ranks of faculty (instructors, lecturers, professors of practice, and tenure-eligible faculty), as well as NAU requirements and criteria for promotion, can be found in COFS. In addition, the SOA requires that all faculty members hold the following degrees and credentials: in art, the MFA degree; in art education, a Master's degree in art education to hold a non-tenure track position in art education and a doctorate in art education to hold a tenure-track position; and in interior design, an earned NCIDQ certification and, preferably, a terminal degree in Interior Design (Ph.D., M.F.A., M.I.D, or M.Arch) or related field such as architecture. Those currently teaching who do not hold a terminal degree may continue to be hired, so long as there is no break in their employment.

I. A. CRITERIA FOR MOVING AN INSTRUCTOR TO A LECTURER POSITION

COFS states the following: "Units may establish criteria and procedures to move instructors to lecturer ranks after an appropriate period." This policy establishes the criteria and procedures for reassigning an instructor to a lecturer rank.

Criteria:

- The instructor has completed at least three consecutive semesters as a full-time instructor (36 credits) in the School of Art at NAU.
- The Instructor has received a minimum of one continuing NTT annual review with a meritorious or higher ranking on record in Faculty 180 approved by the CAL Dean.
- The instructor has demonstrated experience in service for the department in accordance with unit needs.
- The instructor was hired as a result of a national search that included criteria equivalent to that of a lecturer search.

Procedure:

Instructors who are interested in being reassigned to Lecturer should submit to the Director a letter requesting a reassignment to Lecturer (including rationale for reassignment) after the most recent performance evaluation of Meritorious or higher. Generally, the request should be made as soon as possible following the performance review described above.

The Department Chair/Director will solicit input from the ARC committee as well as from any voting member of the faculty about the decision for reassignment to Lecturer. The Department Chair/Director will forward to the CAL Dean the recommendation and rationale for reassignment from Instructor to Lecturer for those individuals who have secured

departmental approval. The rationale will be based upon the content of the instructor's request, the most recent annual review, department needs, and faculty input. The CAL Dean will review the request in light of the rationale and the available college resources, and, if approved, forward on to the Vice Provost for Academic Personnel for review and approval. If the transition to Lecturer is approved, it will take place at the next contract period. The School of Art and/or College of Arts and Letters will be responsible for supporting any increase in salary that this reclassification would merit.

NOTE: The determination of whether an instructor can be reassigned to Lecturer will be based on performance evaluations (conducted by the Annual Review Committee and the Chair/Director) as well as consideration of department teaching needs and university resources.

II. SOA-SPECIFIC CRITERIA FOR REVIEWING TEACHING AND STUDENT-RELATED ACTIVITY, RESEARCH/CREATIVE ACTIVITY, AND SERVICE

II.A: THE SELF-EVALUATION STATEMENT

Use the **self-evaluation template** found below. Upload your statement in FAAR under Self-Evaluation.

Template for Self-Evaluation Statement:

Use the template below. Do not exceed **three** pages for this report. This is a **summary** of your activities; refer to the materials in FAAR instead of going into detail here. The more clearly **and** concisely the self-evaluation narrative is written, the better the committee members will be able to review your performance. It is not a matter of how much information is provided.

SELF-EVALUATION STATEMENT

A. Teaching

Evidence of teaching quality should be derived from multiple sources with no single source serving as the sole criterion. Quality teaching will be determined by considering the following:

Summarize, comment and/or reflect on the following:

1. Course evaluations on all classes
2. Syllabi for all classes
3. Sample/signature assignments for all classes
4. Scoring rubric for sample/signature assignments for all classes
5. No more than three student examples of the completed sample/signature assignment
6. Information on other student-related activities (capstone committees, student supervision, independent studies, curriculum development, teaching awards, faculty exhibition, etc.)

B. Scholarly Contributions and Creative Productions

Briefly summarize in this narrative your accomplishments and explain their significance. Also, upload evidence and information **to FAAR** for each activity and include the following useful information for the committee as appropriate:

- Explain the importance or significance of the reviewers, jurors, etc.
- Describe the selection process.

- How rare or common was this accomplishment?
- Location, publisher, journal, conference, etc.
- How significant to peers? Provide your reasoning.
- Collaborative work?
- How does this fit into your larger research/creative agenda or plan?

C. Service

Outline your service contributions and explain any details about your work. Upload evidence and information to FAAR.

D. Other

This section is to detail activities for which you have received a course release. Upload evidence and information to FAAR.

Remember to attach documentation for above items separately on FAAR. Do not include in self-evaluation.

II.B: TEACHING AND STUDENT-RELATED ACTIVITIES

Activities that should be reported in this section that evidence high quality teaching including (but are not limited to) the following: teaching regular 3-credit classes, advising and mentoring, independent studies, internship supervision, participation in the SOA faculty exhibition, conducting field trips and study abroad programs, curriculum development, and other similar activities. Program coordinator duties should be reported under “Service.”

Be sure to provide evidence of all activities.

Teaching and Student-Related Criteria:

Reviews will be based on an examination of the items below that faculty will upload to FAAR.

1. All course evaluations for the year are averaged, resulting in 0 – 4 points. Missing evaluations = 0 The committee should also consider student comments.
2. A complete, clear and detailed NAU standard syllabus for each class. Assign 0 – 4 points for each class, then average all classes together, resulting in 0 – 4 points.
3. Sample/signature assignments and scoring rubrics for each class. Assign 0 – 4 points for each class, then average all classes together, resulting in 0 – 4 points.
4. No more than three student examples of the completed sample/signature assignment for each class. Assign 0 – 4 points for each class, then average all classes together, resulting in 0 – 4 points.
5. Other student-related activities (capstone committees, student supervision, independent studies, curriculum development, teaching awards, faculty exhibition, commencement attendance, professional development, etc.). Assign 0 – 8 points for each activity. Examples: faculty exhibit = 1 point; program development = 8 points.

Points from above will be totaled and located on the chart below to determine the rank for this category.

More than 16 points	= Highly Meritorious	= 4
10 - 16 points	= Meritorious	= 3
6 - 9 points	= Satisfactory	= 2
0 - 5 points	= Unsatisfactory	= 1

NOTES: 1) The committee members do not simply look for number of teaching-related materials that have been uploaded to FAAR; they also examine the materials submitted to find evidence of the quality and adequacy of the materials and the teaching under review. 2) If someone has a course release, the average ranking of all classes taught will be used as a substitute ranking for all “missing” classes.

II.C: RESEARCH AND CREATIVE ACTIVITY

It is the expectation that faculty involved in high quality, peer-reviewed research and creative activity will generate a sustained record of productivity of significant knowledge and/or creative works that will demonstrate commitment and achievement in the appropriate field. The faculty’s research and creative activities should be significantly in-depth and reflect a high order of research and creative so as to contribute to, expand, or deepen the field of the professor. Both the number and quality of accomplishments through research and creative activities should demonstrate a consistent pattern of growth from one professional rank to another while upholding quality of content. The faculty will share the findings of that activity with artists, scholars, educators, professional designers, and/or the general public through various peer-reviewed activities. Peer review is, ultimately, the process of evaluating research and creative work by disinterested individuals in the same field in order to maintain or enhance the quality of the work in that field. The SOA recognizes, however, that peer-review comes in many forms for all fields represented by its faculty.

Activities that should be reported in this section include (but are not limited to) the items listed in the criteria below. Program coordinator activities should be reported under “Service” or “Other.” participation in the SOA faculty exhibition should be reported under “Teaching.”

Be sure to provide evidence of all activities.

NOTE: The committee members do not simply look at the number of accomplishments; they also examine the materials submitted to find evidence of the quality and significance of the accomplishments and the work under review.

See chart below for criteria in this category.

Research and Creative Activity Criteria

Level of Significance (points)							
		Centrally (8 +)		Moderately (3-7.9)		Minimally (0 - 2.9)	
		solo peer-review collaborative peer-review		solo peer-review collaborative peer-review		solo peer-review collaborative peer-review	
Book							
Article/Chapter							
Exhibition							
Conference Presentation/Charrette							
Design project implemented							
(Art) Workshop/Demonstration							
Consulting							
Grant awarded							
Fellowship							
Residency							
Publ. about work							
Other							

More than 16 points = Highly Meritorious = 4
 9 - 15.9 points = Meritorious = 3
 5 - 8.9 points = Satisfactory = 2
 0 - 4.9 points = Unsatisfactory = 1

II.D: SERVICE

Service to the school, university, community, and/or profession is expected of all School of Art faculty. Service activity supports the mission of the university, and includes service to our community, participation in school and university committees as an integral part of shared governance, participation in professional organizations, and committees in organizations representing a commitment to the profession as a whole.

Activities that should be reported in this section that evidence high quality service including (but are not limited to) the items listed in the criteria below. Program coordinator activities should be reported in this section, unless course releases are involved (in that case, those activities are reported under "Other" instead of Service). Participation in the SOA faculty exhibition should be reported under "Teaching."

Be sure to provide evidence of all activities.

Service Criteria:

Highly Meritorious service examples (3 + points):

Program coordinator
 Search Committee chair
 FSC/ARC/P&T Committee chair
 CAL or NAU committee chair

Meritorious service examples (2 – 2.9 points):

FSC/ARC/P&T Committee membership
 SOA committee chair
 CAL or NAU committee member

Satisfactory service examples (1 – 1.9 points):

SOA committee member

Unsatisfactory service examples (0 - .9 points):

No service or non-participation in assignments

Other service (0 - 6 points): community or professional service, conducted tours, awards for service, etc. will be considered by the committee. Members will compare the materials attesting to that service to the service listed above and score accordingly.

Points from above will be totaled and located on the chart below to determine the rank for this category.

More than 6 points	=	Highly Meritorious	=	4
2 – 5.9 points	=	Meritorious	=	3
1 - 1.9 points	=	Satisfactory	=	2
0 - .9 points	=	Unsatisfactory	=	1

NOTE: Note that the committee members do not simply look at the number of service assignments; they also examine the materials submitted to find evidence of the quality and adequacy of the work under review.

II.E: OTHER

All activities for which a course release is granted should be reported here. These activities will be evaluated by the director, the dean, or other appropriate person.

Be sure to provide evidence of all activities.

II.F: ANNUAL REVIEW PROCEDURE

1. After submission of annual review materials, if materials are missing, the committee will email the faculty member a request for the missing materials. The Director will return workload forms to faculty so faculty can correct. The committee will allow 72 hours for a response. The 72-hour window is not flexible (except for externally-verified IT problems); no materials will be accepted after the deadline has passed.

2. Each person under review will be reviewed by a team of three members of the FSC/ARC/P&T committee. (In order to have a consistent number of review team members, an alternate may be needed.) Committee members access all the information to be reviewed on FAAR and examines that information closely.
3. Using the SOA-approved criteria and guidelines, as well as evidence provided by the faculty, each team member **independently** reviews each person under review. This is the most time-consuming and most important step. Concise self-evaluation statements and informative materials will help the committee.

NOTES: 1) Any activity reported under the fourth category “Other” (due to one or course releases) will be reviewed later by the Director, Dean, or other appropriate person. However, in order for the committee to complete the review indicating the full effort in all areas the team will use the average score for all other classes taught and use that average for the “missing” class/es in the “Teaching” category. 2) The committee members do not simply look for numbers of materials, accomplishments, or service assignments that have been uploaded to FAAR; they also examine the materials submitted to find evidence of the quality, clarity, and adequacy of the accomplishments and the work under review.

4. Each team member indicates the score of each individual under review in each category reviewed on the review worksheet below. For individuals with an SOE percentage under “Other,” the team leaves that blank empty or writes “N/A.” If needed, discussion between team members may occur at this point.
5. Using the review worksheet below, the team records and adds together the scores in each category and divides by the number of team members to arrive at the average score for each category.

From this point on, it’s all math. No further decisions about points are made. There will be no turning back to adjust the scores above due to the end result.

6. The team must also consider SOE percentages. To arrive at the final SOE-adjusted overall ranking, committee members multiply the score for each category by the SOE percentage for that category, then add the scores for all three ranks to get the final overall score. See examples below for how to do the math for this procedure.
7. A statement from the committee providing a narrative of the committee’s ranking is written by customizing the “Peer Annual Review” form below for each person under review. Informative and helpful suggestions for improvement, if any, should be gathered from all team members and included in the letter. The letter will then be circulated among the team members in order to check for accuracy, spelling, grammar, etc.
8. The letter is signed by all team members and scanned to a PDF-formatted document. With at least one team member present, the committee chair uploads the narrative to FAAR and completes the required review steps there.

NOTE: The following policies will apply to reviews and reviewing activities:

- Faculty do not participate in their own reviews in any way, be it through discussion, negotiation, argument, shouting, threats, bribes, or providing additional information or explanations after the deadline.
- There will be no bargaining, argument, or attempts to persuade other members of the ranking of faculty under review.

- No committee member will divulge to any faculty the results of reviews except through FAAR posting. No faculty will be informed of the result of reviews except through FAAR posting.
- Retaliation or intimidation in any form is unacceptable and against NAU's SWALE policy.
- Insufficient evidence submitted by faculty for any category will result in a lower ranking and no evidence at all will result in a rank of Unsatisfactory.
- If there is anyone with a conflict of interest, or if a member feels as if s/he cannot reasonably fulfill this duty for any reason, inform your committee chair or SOA Director so your review assignment can be changed or other accommodations can be found.

REVIEW WORKSHEET

Faculty reviewed _____ Year/Term _____

	Member 1	Member 2	Member 3	Average
Teaching score	_____	_____	_____	_____
Research/Creative score	_____	_____	_____	_____
Service score	_____	_____	_____	_____

SOE-adjusted overall score and rank (1-4): _____

Use the example formulas below as a guide to determine SOE-adjusted rankings:

SOE of 80-10-10:

$$\begin{array}{rcl}
 \text{Teaching rank} = & 4 \times .8 = & 3.2 \\
 \text{Research/Creative} = & 1 \times .1 = & .1 \\
 \text{Service} = & 4 \times .1 = & .4 \\
 \text{Total} = & & \underline{3.7} = \text{Highly Meritorious}
 \end{array}$$

SOE of 60-30-10:

$$\begin{array}{rcl}
 \text{Teaching rank} = & 3 \times .6 = & 1.8 \\
 \text{Research/Creative} = & 2 \times .3 = & .6 \\
 \text{Service} = & 4 \times .1 = & .4 \\
 \text{Total} = & & \underline{2.8} = \text{Meritorious}
 \end{array}$$

SOE of 60-20-20:

$$\begin{array}{rcl}
 \text{Teaching rank} = & 2 \times .6 = & 1.2 \\
 \text{Research/Creative} = & 1 \times .3 = & .3 \\
 \text{Service} = & 1 \times .1 = & .1 \\
 \text{Total} = & & \underline{1.6} = \text{Satisfactory}
 \end{array}$$

For those with course releases, use the average score for classes actually taught as the scores for "missing" classes.

<u>Rounding up/down:</u>	3.5 >	=	4	HM
	2.6 to 3.4	=	3	M
	1.4 to 2.5	=	2	S
	< 1.4	=	1	U

SCHOOL OF ART**PEER ANNUAL REVIEW**

Name:	Date:
Title:	Review Period: AY

(Edit the text in red below. Write this document as if addressing the Director, not the faculty being reviewed. Don't forget to change font color to black and delete these instructions when you're done! Then upload the letter to FAAR.)

Teaching & Student-Related Ranking (80%): Meritorious

In one paragraph, insert **committee summary comments** about this category. Comment on:

1. Course evaluations: a) scores and b) student comments
2. Teaching portfolio: a) syllabi, b) sample assignments and rubrics, c) sample student work
3. "Other" activities in this category

The committee should provide suggestions as a result of review here.

Research & Creative Activity Ranking (10%): Meritorious

In one paragraph, insert **committee summary comments** about this category. Comments could summarize number, type, location, significance, and scope of accomplishments. Any accomplishment that deserves special note should be acknowledged. The committee should provide suggestions as a result of review here.

Service Activity Ranking (10%): Meritorious

In one paragraph, insert **committee summary comments** about this category. Comments should summarize number, type, and significance of service. The committee should provide suggestions as a result of review here.

Overall Ranking: Meritorious

The committee should provide summary comments here

III. EXEMPLARY PERFORMERS

In order to recommend faculty for Exemplary Performer status, the ARC/FSC committee will forward to the director the names of 15% of faculty earning the highest overall annual review scores (resulting from step 5 of the SOA annual review procedure). The committee shall provide a one-paragraph rationale for each person selected.

IV. DETERMINING SUCCESSFUL RANKING FOR PROMOTION AND/OR TENURE

When a faculty member is evaluated for promotion and/or tenure, the evaluating committee will add the rankings of the annual reviews for the years under consideration, then divide by the number of years to determine the average ranking. In order to gain promotion and/or tenure, that average ranking must equal or exceed the minimum needed to earn the “Meritorious” ranking, as described in the criteria above. In addition to previous evaluations, however, it is important to remember that all administrators and committees reviewing faculty for promotion and/or tenure will examine the **entire** record of the applicant as presented in the dossier, including service at other institutions, if any. As stated in COFS, “Annual evaluations do not cumulate into tenure and/or promotion decisions.” The College of Arts and Letters also has criteria that will be considered.

NOTE: FSC/ARC/P&T committee members should be cognizant of mitigating circumstances that contribute to scores. Such circumstances, when the faculty explains them and provides evidence for them, may be weighed when tallying the final score. If circumstances warrant, scores may be adjusted to reflect the situation.