

College of Arts and Architecture
Guidelines for AC-40, Five-Year Extended Review of Faculty Performance
And Distinguished Professor Review (AC-10)

In compliance with AC-40, the College of Arts and Architecture has devised guidelines for the periodic review of faculty to supplement the annual review. The Five-Year Extended Review provides for “an in-depth evaluation of a tenured faculty member’s accomplishments, future goals, and progress towards those goals.” Distinguished Professor reviews are conducted as part of the five-year review

I. Who is subject to review?

All tenured faculty will be subject to the extended review. Extended reviews will replace the regular annual review every five years. Any “exceptions to this schedule for individual faculty members require approval by the dean” (AC-40)

II. Procedures:

- a. Faculty to be reviewed under this policy will be informed the previous year at the time of their annual review that such will occur in order to meet the AC-40 requirement of “at least two semesters in advance of the submission deadline.” In the College of Arts and Architecture, materials will be reviewed at the unit level. Unit guidelines specify whether there is a peer committee or not. Either a faculty member or a unit head may request a peer committee evaluation prior to the unit head’s review. Membership of the committee may be the same as the P&T Committee, but it will be reconstituted as the Faculty Development Committee and comprise at least three members. Only persons of the same rank or higher will participate. In those units lacking sufficient faculty of appropriate rank, the unit head will assemble an ad hoc committee of faculty from other units in the college or units with related programs. The committee will have access to the faculty member’s vitae and annual reports and the unit head’s annual evaluations for the evaluation period. The committee will submit a written evaluation to the unit head.
- b. The unit head will review the materials and write an evaluative commentary based on the faculty member’s job assignment, goals for the future, and needs of the program. The unit head will meet with the faculty member to present and discuss the evaluation and goals. Such discussion will include suggestions for changes in direction of the assignments and activities of the faculty member if any are appropriate. If plans to improve performance are warranted, the unit head will work with the faculty member to create a developmental plan.
The unit head will give a copy of the Faculty Development Committee (if applicable) evaluation letter and their evaluation letter to the faculty member being reviewed. The faculty member may respond in writing to the unit head if they desire.
- c. For faculty with budgeted joint appointments, the home budget unit head will consult with the head(s) of the other units where the faculty member has a budgeted appointment.

- d. The unit head will submit to the dean the materials used for the unit review, the Faculty Development Committee's letter (if applicable), the unit head's letter, and the faculty member's written response, if any. The dean will review the materials and provide a separate written evaluation. The evaluation should indicate agreement or disagreement with the previous levels in the review and any recommendations. The dean will provide the faculty member and unit head with a copy of their evaluation.

III. Timetable

The faculty member being reviewed should submit relevant materials to the unit head on or before February 1 of the review year for distribution to the Faculty Development Committee (if applicable). The Faculty Development Committee shall submit its written evaluation to the unit head on or before March 15. The unit head shall forward their letter to the dean and to the faculty member on or before April 30. The dean shall provide the faculty member with a copy of their letter on or before June 30.

IV. Materials to be submitted for Five-Year Extended Review

Each unit should ensure that the materials listed below are provided for the dean's review during the AC-40 Extended Review Process. AC-40 specifies that "narrative statement, CV, performance documentation- and copies of the past annual review letters by the supervising administrator for the evaluation period comprise the evaluation materials."

- 1) Current Curriculum Vitae
- 2) Narrative statement that includes:
 - a. highlights of agreed upon goals and areas of improvement from the most recent extended review and unit head annual reviews covering the period of review;
 - b. demonstrated accomplishment of those goals or adjustment of them agreed to by the faculty member and unit head;
 - c. a report of accomplishments achieved during any sabbaticals or leaves taken during the period. (This should include reasonable expectations for personal leaves. For example, maternity leave provides a full semester teaching of teaching release though service and research expectations continue.)
- 3) Performance documentation with materials since the last extended review, including annual Activity Insight edited reports. If deemed necessary, appropriate supplemental materials (e.g. teaching/creative research portfolio) may be included to support the demonstration of accomplishments.
 - a. SRTEs for the period covered by the review. The unit head's letter should place these in context of comparable unit averages/median for SRTEs.
 - b. A written report from the unit's peer review committee, if applicable.
 - c. If concerns have been raised in annual reviews, supplemental materials along with peer and/or department head observations documenting improvements and the successful addressing of concerns should be included. For example, demonstration of improved SRTEs, methods of instruction, etc., may be appropriate. If annual evaluation letters have raised concerns about insufficient accomplishments in creative research, supplemental materials may be necessary to demonstrate how concerns have been addressed.
- 4) Copies of the annual review letters by the unit head for the evaluation period. All levels of review should refer to these annual evaluations, noting progress (or lack thereof) on goals of the annual review letters and their connection to the goals and accomplishments of the narrative statement, CV, and additional documentation submitted by the faculty member for the extended review.

Approved by A&A faculty January 21, 2000.

Amended July 31, 2000.

Revised for consistency with University Policy HR-40, January 31, 2014.

Updated to reflect HR-40 change to AC-40, January 31, 2019.

Updated October 2019 to include procedures for the Distinguished Professor Reviews.

Attachment A
Distinguished Professor Reviews

From Policy AC-10:

Tenure: Effective August 1, 1999, appointments as Distinguished Professor will be made for a period of five (5) years; renewal of the appointment is dependent upon the Distinguished Professor continuing the same high level of performance evident at the time of initial appointment. The title of Distinguished Professor may be carried until resignation or retirement from the University, subject to the college performance review process at 5-year intervals, or until such time as the holder may be appointed to an endowed faculty position or to a University-level professorship.

The five-year reviews must consider the AC-10 requirements for Distinguished Professors in recommending for continuation of the appointment:

- 1. be current, full-time active members of the faculty holding the rank of Professor.*
- 2. not currently hold an endowed chair, professorship, or faculty fellowship.*
- 3. be acknowledged leaders in their fields of research or creative activity. This national and international leadership would be documented by (a) notable contributions to research published in leading journals and/or books and creative accomplishments widely recognized for excellence; (b) prestigious awards and citations; and (c) a substantial record of invited lectures or performances delivered at prestigious institutions.*
- 4. have demonstrated significant leadership in raising the standards of the University with respect to teaching, research or creative activity, and service.*
- 5. have demonstrated excellent teaching skills and contributed significantly to the education of students who subsequently have achieved recognition of excellence in their fields.*

The five-year review clock will re-start at the beginning or renewal of the Distinguished Professor appointment.

ATTACHMENT B

FACULTY PERFORMANCE WORKSHEET: DISTINGUISHED PROFESSORSHIP REVIEW

Research and Creative Accomplishment					
Criterion	Suggested Indicators	Rating			
Professional Eminence	Demonstrated achievement through international and national recognition from significant publications, performances, productions, designs or exhibitions at top tier venues.	Excellent	Very Good	Satisfactory	Unsatisfactory
Recognition	Recipient of prestigious awards, significant reviews in major art journals, publication citations. Substantial record of invited lectures, curatorships, editorships.				
Leadership	Hold elected or honorary international, national leadership positions.				
Other	Appropriate indicators specific to the candidate under consideration/review.				
Teaching & Learning					
Criterion	Indicator	Rating			
Excellence	Demonstrated evidence of high-performance skills and innovative approaches to teaching.				
Mentorship & Impact	Evidence of impact of teaching. Notable contribution to the success of students who have subsequently achieved success in their careers.				
Other	Appropriate indicators specific to the candidate under consideration/review.				

Service to the University and Profession				
Criterion	Indicator	Rating		
Advocacy	Demonstrated commitment and active participation in school, college and university committee structures and service responsibilities.			
Stewardship	Notable achievement in advancing the cultural and educational role of visual arts in institutional and public settings.			
Other	Appropriate indicators specific to the candidate under consideration/review			