

UNIT EVALUATION PLAN  
DEPARTMENT OF ART  
April 24, 2009

## **VERSION 6: FINAL**

### **PURPOSE**

This document serves as the Unit Evaluation Plan for the Department of Art. It follows from responsibilities and procedures outlined in the Faculty Contract (7.6) and from the Faculty Appointment and Evaluation Plan of the College of Fine and Performing Arts (1/13/09). The departmental UEP is also designed to be consistent with the new version of the 2009 Faculty Handbook.

The Department of Art includes Art Education, Art History, Design and Studio Areas. Pedagogical practice and research/creative activities vary from discipline to discipline. General principles are set out below. Each area is invited to write an appendix which clarifies elements for reviewers from other areas of the unit.

### **FACULTY DUTIES AND WORKLOAD**

Historically, the average teaching load for probationary and tenured faculty members in the Department of Art is seven classes. New probationary faculty are given a one course load reduction in their first year. Chairs teach one class per quarter. Area coordinators are given a one course load reduction per year.

“The duties of tenured and tenure-track faculty include a combination of teaching, research and/or creative endeavor, and university, college, department and public service. Additional responsibilities include advising students, attending classes as scheduled, participating in department and college committees, maintaining reasonable and posted

office hours, working collaboratively and productively with colleagues, participating in accreditation and program reviews, and occasional special assignments.” (CFPA II 3)

## EVALUATION MILESTONES

There are a number of different types of evaluation milestones covered in this UEP.

- I. First year review
- II. Review of probationary faculty
- III. Review for tenure and promotion to associate professor
- IV. Review for promotion to professor
- V. Professional performance and development review
- VI. Review of limited term faculty
- VII. Review for senior instructor
- VIII. Review for special merit
- IX. Chair review

Each is based on the categories of teaching, research, and service with different weights and standards applied according to the milestone. The review period also varies from category to category as noted below.

### A. TEACHING ACTIVITY overview

Assessment of teaching is based on documentation of teaching and student related activities as well as external evidence in the form of testing center evaluations and peer reviews. Certain elements are common to the evaluation of all faculty whereas other elements pertain uniquely to tenure track/tenure faculty.

### B. SCHOLARSHIP /CREATIVE ACTIVITY overview

Categories of scholarship/creative endeavor include but are not limited to publications, presentations, exhibitions, competitions, published exhibits, projects, curation, performance, internal grants, external grants, proposals, professional commissions, consultantships, and works in progress. Individual dossiers may include a mix of these activities.

Assessment must factor both quantity and quality. Evidence of accomplishment must take into account the wide diversity of professional practice encompassed by the disciplines of art history, art education, design, and studio art. Certain assessment concepts, however, may be applied across the spectrum as reflected in the standards below, intended to differentiate expectations by rank (see Sections III and IV below).

There are no research expectations for limited term faculty beyond the requirements for maintaining currency in the classroom (unless stated in their letter of offer). For tenure track/tenured faculty, the review period for research depends on the milestone.

### C. SERVICE

The quality, quantity and character of service expectations vary according to the review milestone. Service is measured both by the fact of serving on a committee and by the character of the contribution. Chairing a committee is normally recognized as a much greater commitment than serving on one. Variations between committees in time commitment and weight and reach of responsibility need to be considered.

For new tenure track faculty, initial service is normally limited to focused responsibilities within the area and the department. As a candidate approaches tenure, more service is expected beyond the department. It is expected that committee responsibilities increase over time.

There are no service expectations for limited term faculty unless specified in the letter of offer.

Certain kinds of activities such as Service Learning reside in more than one review category.

Advising is both a service activity and an extension of teaching. However, since the direct beneficiaries are students, advising has been included in the teaching category.

### **EXTERNAL LETTERS OF EVALUATION**

“Departments are encouraged to use external letters of evaluation as evidence of evaluating faculty performance. If a department decides to use external letters of evaluation, the procedures for requesting external letters of evaluation and the use of those letters in the evaluation of the candidate’s application shall be specified in the departmental evaluation plan.” (Contract 7.7.2.2.2)

**Procedures: See Appendix I**

## **CATEGORIES OF REVIEW**

### ***I. FIRST YEAR REVIEW***

The First Year Review is completed by March 1 and is done by the Department Chair (7.6.2). The faculty member meets with the chair. A list of annual goals is developed. The chair drafts a letter discussing the candidate’s progress towards departmental standards for tenure.

Preparation of materials mirror the process used for subsequent probationary reviews. The dossier consists of evidence in support of teaching, research and service accomplishments following the format outlined in the college document.

## **II. REVIEW OF PROBATIONARY FACULTY**

### **(Contract 7.6, College Article IV and VII)**

This is an annual review of tenure track faculty intended to provide goals and guidance for the preparation of the dossier for tenure and promotion to Associate Professor. All probationary faculty are reviewed annually until tenure is granted or the faculty member is not reappointed.

Except for the first year, Probationary Reviews require the participation of all tenured faculty. Other probationary members are invited but not required to participate. The candidate submits a file with all of the materials described in section 7.7.2.1. of the contract and more specifically in section 7.02b.ii.2 of the College Unit Plan. The file should demonstrate progress towards tenure as defined in the departmental standards, since the original appointment: departmental standards for Promotion to Associate Professor with tenure are discussed below.

In the weighting of the three categories of review, teaching and scholarship/creative endeavor are generally weighted equally while service is the lesser of the three categories but is an expected component. Service expectations are limited in the first year.

## **III. REVIEW FOR TENURE AND PROMOTION TO ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR**

Normally this review takes place not later than the sixth year of service at Western and can occur prior to the 6<sup>th</sup> year. The Letter of Offer may specify a shorter time frame. An Assistant Professor who is awarded tenure is also promoted to Associate Professor (CFPA IX.9.01).

The review is based on all relevant experience including activities prior to coming to Western. At the same time, all candidates must demonstrate a record of accomplishment at Western Washington University (7.7.1.3).

In the weighting of the three categories of review, teaching and scholarship/creative endeavor are generally weighted equally while service is the lesser of the three categories but is an expected component.

External Letters (as defined in the contract) are recommended as evidence in support of teaching, research, and/or service. If External Letters are used, they should follow the procedures outlined in Appendix A.

## **STANDARDS FOR PROMOTION TO ASSOCIATE TEACHING**

**Evidence of substantial achievement in teaching excellence or improvement towards that goal as demonstrated by:**

### Required

- WWU testing center course evaluations for all courses taught in previous 5 years
- Classroom visit and peer evaluations by two or more faculty members
- One syllabus for each course preparation
- Statements of teaching goals and accomplishments for each class
- Example assignments and examples of student achievement
- Active advisement of students and development of course plans
- Active involvement with curriculum development

### Recommended

- Documentation of alumni accomplishments

## **RESEARCH**

**Evidence of substantial achievement in scholarship/creative activities or progress towards that goal as demonstrated by:**

### Required

- A sustained record of productivity in scholarly and/or creative endeavor
- External recognition of professional accomplishment as measured by a peer review process appropriate to the discipline and rank
- External recognition as measured by prestige of venue as appropriate to discipline. Since venues are likely to be very discipline specific, the candidate must offer clear contextual information for comparison.
- Progressive growth in recognition as reflected in professional accomplishment
- Samples of publications and/or documentation of exhibited work

### Recommended

- External recognition as measured by invited professional activities
- Citations, and critical reviews
- Awards of excellence from professional organizations
- Other forms of professional recognition on local, regional, national and international level
- Evidence of ongoing research in the form of proposals, works in progress
- Outside letters (see CFPA 7.02.b.ii.4)

The importance of particular scholarly/creative endeavor is usually evaluated by peer or referred review of some kind, including but not limited to acceptance through invitational/competitive review or through media adjudication. (CFPA VI 13).

## **SERVICE**

**Evidence of service to the department, institution and community and contribution to academic policy and programs as demonstrated by:**

#### Required

- Active participation in shared Area activities
- Active participation in departmental meetings and committees
- Evidence of contributions to academic policy and program
- Participation in college and university committees

#### Recommended

- Participation in professional organizations
- Outreach to community related to faculty professional activities

### **IV. REVIEW FOR PROMOTION TO FULL PROFESSOR**

This review is based on accomplishments since the time of promotion to Associate Professor. Earlier accomplishments may be documented on the full resume but the decision to promote is based on activities during the time frame of the review.

In the weighting of the three categories of review, teaching and scholarship/creative endeavor are generally weighted equally while service is the lesser of the three categories but is an expected component.

External Letters (as defined in the contract) are recommended as evidence in support of teaching, research, and/or service. If External Letters are used, they should follow the procedures outlined in Appendix A.

### **STANDARDS FOR PROMOTION TO FULL PROFESSOR**

#### **TEACHING**

**Evidence of continued success and sustained excellence in teaching as demonstrated by:**

#### Required

- WWU testing center course evaluations for all courses taught  
In previous 5 years
- Classroom visit and peer evaluations by two or more faculty members
- One syllabus for each course preparation
- Statements of teaching goals and accomplishments for each class
- Example assignments and examples of student achievement
- Active advisement of students and preparation of course plans
- Active involvement with curriculum development

#### Recommended

- Documentation of alumni accomplishments

## **RESEARCH**

### **Evidence of excellence in scholarship/creative activity as demonstrated by:**

#### Required

- A sustained record of excellence in scholarly and/or creative endeavor
- External recognition of professional accomplishment as measured by a peer review process appropriate to the discipline and rank
- External recognition as measured by prestige of venue as appropriate to discipline. Since venues are likely to be very discipline specific, the candidate must offer clear contextual information for comparison.
- Progressive growth in recognition as reflected in professional accomplishment
- Samples of publications and/or documentation of exhibited work

#### Recommended

- External recognition as measured by invited professional activities
- Citations, and critical reviews
- Awards of excellence from professional organizations
- Other forms of professional recognition on local, regional, national and international level
- Evidence of ongoing research in the form of proposals, works in progress
- Outside letters (see CFPA 7.02.b.ii.4)

The importance of particular scholarly/creative endeavor is usually evaluated by peer or referred review of some kind, including but not limited to acceptance through invitational/competitive review or through media adjudication. (CFPA VI 13).

## **SERVICE**

### **Evidence of service to the department, institution and community and significant contribution to academic policy and programs as demonstrated by:**

#### Required

- Significant participation in shared Area activities
- Active participation in departmental meetings and committees
- Significant contribution to academic policy and program
- Participation in college and university committees

#### Recommended

- Leadership in departmental activities
- Significant service to college and university through committee participation
- Significant involvement with professional organizations
- Significant involvement in outreach or community service related to faculty professional activities

## **V. PROFESSIONAL PERFORMANCE AND DEVELOPMENT REVIEW (otherwise called Post Tenure Review) (contract: section 7.8 and CFPA Section VIII).**

Tenured faculty shall be reviewed every five years starting with their most recent promotion. Faculty shall compile an evaluation file with all relevant evidence since their previous review or promotion. Faculty shall be evaluated based on departmental standards for their rank. These departmental standards shall provide for flexibility to allow for fluctuations in the relative emphasis on teaching, scholarship or creative activity, and service across the career life cycle of the individual faculty member (7.8.2). The faculty member's performance shall be judged as unsatisfactory, satisfactory or superior the areas of teaching, scholarship/creative endeavor, and service (7.8.5).

Under new contract language, the performance of the faculty member must be at least satisfactory in all three categories (7.8.6).

### **STANDARDS FOR PPDR APPROPRIATE TO RANK**

For Excellence in this category refer to the description for the respective ranks (Sections III and IV.)

#### **TEACHING**

**A rating of satisfactory requires evidence of sustained engagement in and attention to teaching as evidenced by:**

##### Required

- WWU testing center course evaluations for all courses taught  
In previous 5 years
- Classroom visit and peer evaluations by two or more faculty members
- One syllabi for each course preparation  
with teaching goals and accomplishments for each class
- Example assignments and examples of student achievement
- Active advisement of students and preparation of course plans
- Active involvement with curriculum development

##### Recommended

- Documentation of alumni accomplishments

#### **RESEARCH**

**A rating of satisfactory requires evidence of continued engagement in scholarship/creative activity including some of the following:**

##### Required

- A record of sustained excellence professional research/creative activity

- External recognition of professional accomplishment as measured by a peer review process appropriate to the discipline and rank
- External recognition as measured by prestige of venue as appropriate to discipline. Since venues are likely to be very discipline specific, the candidate must offer clear contextual information for comparison.

Recommended

- External recognition as measured by invited professional activities
- Citations, and critical reviews
- Awards of excellence from professional organizations
- Other forms of professional recognition on local, regional, national and international level
- Evidence of ongoing research in the form of proposals, works in progress
- Outside letters (see CFPA 7.02.b.ii.4)

The importance of particular scholarly/creative endeavor is usually evaluated by peer or referred review of some kind, including but not limited to acceptance through invitational/competitive review or through media adjudication. (CFPA VI 13).

**SERVICE**

**A rating of satisfactory requires evidence of continued engagement in service activities:**

Required

- Active participation in shared Area activities
- Active participation in departmental meetings and committees
- Contribution to departmental program development
- Participation in college and university committees

Recommended

- Participation in professional organizations
- Outreach to community related to faculty professional activities

***VI. REVIEW OF LIMITED TERM FACULTY***

This review is limited to the activities clearly specified in the letter of offer. Usually this review is focused on teaching activities and is not dependent on research or service accomplishments except as specified in the Letter of Offer. This review is conducted annually by the Chair in consultation with the Area Coordinator.

**Evidence of teaching excellence is demonstrated by:**

Required

- WWU testing center course evaluations for all courses taught

- Classroom visit by Chair or Area Coordinator once per year
- One syllabus for each course preparation (which includes course goals and expected outcomes).
- Example assignments

Recommended

- Documentation of student achievement

Materials should be presented in a binder organized by class. Binders are due May 15. “The department chair shall summarize the results of his/her evaluation in a letter. The faculty member shall receive a copy of this letter and have the opportunity to respond before it is submitted to the dean.” (Contract 8.3.1)

“Non-tenure-track faculty shall be reviewed annually.” (Contract 8.3.3).

## **VII. REVIEW FOR SENIOR INSTRUCTOR**

The review is primarily based on excellence in teaching. An instructor with a minimum of five years’ experience at .5 FTE or more with a record of demonstrated excellence in teaching may be appointed Senior Instructor after a performance review.

Eligible instructors write a letter of application describing their contributions to the program in which they teach. The letter, all chair reviews from the past five years, and the following are presented to the chair in a binder:

### **Evidence of teaching excellence is demonstrated by:**

Required

- WWU testing center course evaluations for all courses during the year preceding the review and those available for the previous four years.
- Classroom visit by Chair or Area Coordinator once per year
- One syllabus for each course preparation (which includes course goals and expected outcomes).
- Example assignments

Recommended

- Documentation of student achievement

The binder will be reviewed by tenure/tenure-track faculty in the area. Application binders are due on May 1. “The department chair shall summarize the results of his/her evaluation in a letter. The faculty member shall receive a copy of this letter and have the opportunity to respond before it is submitted to the dean.” (Contract 8.3.1)

“Senior Instructors shall be evaluated once during the period of their appointment.” (Contract 8.3.3)

## ***VIII. REVIEW FOR SPECIAL MERIT***

(9% of faculty as defined in the contract). This is an annual voluntary review. Four awards will be given within the College following a procedure outlined by the Faculty Senate. The 2008-9 deadline to the college is January 6 but the deadline will be earlier on subsequent years. According to the contract, the top 9% of the faculty will be honored by this process. Documented meritorious accomplishments must include teaching, research and service—all three.

Only tenured and tenure track faculty may apply for special merit.

“Successful applicants will register in their materials meritorious work in all three areas (teaching, research/creative endeavor, and service).” In other words, only faculty members judged to be meritorious in all three areas will be eligible to earn awards.

Application materials shall consist of a current curriculum vita (no longer than 5 pages), letter of application (no longer than 8 pages), and a copy of the applicant's most recent evaluation letter from the department chair and/or dean from Western or a previous institution.

Applications are to be submitted by the applicant to the dean's office.”

## ***IX. CHAIR REVIEW***

(Section 16 of Contract)

### 16.1.1

“Department chairs are appointed upon the joint recommendation of the dean and department based on the process as established in the department and college evaluation plans and subject to approval by the Provost. The appointment is for a fixed term set by the college, and includes responsibilities during the summer quarter.”

### 16.2.1

“Based upon input from the department faculty through the process described in the department and college evaluation plans, the dean shall periodically evaluate the chair and meet with the chair to discuss the results of the evaluation. Based on the evaluation, the dean and the department chair jointly develop performance goals. If during the term

of the appointment, the chair fails to fulfill responsibilities outlined in 16.3.1, the dean may remove the chair.”

ARTICLE XXI Department Chair Appointment and Review (CFPA plan)

Quoted below:

1. The dean upon recommendation of the department appoints department chairs.
2. Initial appointment is for four years, with the possibility of an additional four-year term.
3. After consultation with the Provost and department faculty, the dean will prepare a written charge to guide the new chair’s work.
4. The dean will support department chair training and development activities throughout the chair’s term in office.
5. The chair will receive a half-time release from his/her teaching duties.
  - a. The dean will work with the provost to ensure funding to cover the chair’s replacement courses.
6. At the end of the second year, the dean shall conduct a mid-term review according to the process determined collaboratively by the dean and chair.
  - a. The dean shall meet with the chair and department faculty to discuss the results of the evaluation.
  - b. Feedback from the review will be used to inform the ongoing process of chair training and development including the development of performance goals.
  - c. If the chair receives an unsatisfactory mid-term review, the dean will consult with the provost, the chair, and the department faculty to determine whether or not the chair will continue in his/her position.
7. If during the term of the appointment, the chair fails to fulfill responsibilities detailed in Section 16.3.1 of the Faculty Contract, the dean may remove the chair from her/his duties.