**Post-Tenure Review Policy**

Department of Art

University of Wisconsin Oshkosh

**I. Guiding Principles**

As called for by the Board of Regents and the College of Letters and Science policy, every tenured member of the department must undergo a post-tenure review (PTR) at least every five years. Normally, the reviews will occur every four years and be coincident with merit submissions, so as to eliminate excess paperwork. The American Association of University Professors has set the following guidelines for Post-tenure review, which are expected to be adhered to by the department and apply to the PTR process generally:

 1. respect and protect academic freedom;

 2. involve faculty peers and faculty adjudicating or governance bodies and

procedures;

 3. be kept confidential, barring a request for an open meeting or hearing

 4. permit and respect challenges

 5. be seen as a method, developed and agreed upon by all parties, of improving

faculty performance for the goals of the College and University

**II. Procedures**

A. As described in the COLS post-tenure review policy (III.A.), promotion to the rank of Professor or a Professorial Productivity Award will be considered a favorable post-tenure review and reset the post-tenure review clock by itself without need of going through PTR. Individuals who have declared their intention to retire at the end of an academic year need not go through PTR in that same year.

B. Timing: The Chair of the Department of Art will be notified of anyone up for PTR and will, in turn, inform any individual up for review by mid-November. Faculty portfolios are due in the department office by the first week in February. The department should forward its review to the COLS Promotions Committee, via the Dean’s Office by the end of February.

C. The Department’s Personnel Committee (which consists of all the tenured members of the department), will review PTR files. The person up for review will not vote and unless requesting an open hearing, will not be present during the consideration of the file. PTRs are solely to determine whether a tenured faculty meets expectations in each of three areas: teaching, research/scholarship, and service. Determinations will be reached by majority vote in each separate area, with any tie vote being considered not meeting expectations. The Personnel Committee will convey its determinations and a brief explanation of any failure to meet expectations on the approved of COLS form.

D. Any faculty member found deficient in any area by the Personnel Committee can add a one page Letter of Appeal to the file that is forwarded to the COLSPromotions Committee and the Dean’s Office, and submit any additional evidence that address the concerns of the Personnel Committee.

E. Post-tenure review is a personnel action, and it is one in which confidential performance evaluation data is considered. Consideration of materials, deliberation, and voting will generally be done in closed session under the auspices of Section 19.85 of Wisconsin’s state statutes. Under this same statute, anyone up for PTR may ask that his or her assessment be held in an open meeting or request that there be a separate, open evidentiary hearing.

F. Anyone undergoing PTR and found not to be meeting expectations in one or more areas at the end of the process must develop a Professional Improvement Plan (PIP). This only applies to individuals found to not be meeting expectations in one or more areas by two of the following three entities: the Department Personnel Committee, the COLS Promotions Committee, and the Dean of COLS, who acts as the final arbiter in the case of a disputed result between Personnel and Promotions. Any required PIP should be submitted by the end of the three-week Spring interim period.

**III. Standards of Review—Meeting Expectations**

The definition of solid performer in the Department of Art is someone who “makes a substantial contribution to the program” and tends to “perform in each of the following ways:”

Teaching- They meet all their classes, hold appropriate office hours, attempt to repair defects in their classroom pedagogy and keep up with the literature of the subfield in which they teach.

Research- They maintain familiarity with the latest developments in their disciplinary specialty. Studio faculty should show evidence of working towards creating a body of work for acceptance in regional, national, or international, invitational, group, and solo exhibits that are recognized as juried or peer-reviewed. In addition to exhibition of studio work, Design faculty may show evidence of working towards client-based message making for non-profit or for-profit organizations, as well as local, regional, national and international juried design competitions. Art Education and Art History faculty may attend conferences, research various topics, write up their findings and attempt to publish them as articles and books by a recognized peer-reviewed journal or publisher, or write book and exhibition reviews.

Service- They play a satisfactory role in departmental, college, university, professional group and community life through formal membership on committees, panels, forums, or their equivalent.

Individuals whose summary Student Opinion Survey score consistently falls far below University and College averages will be considered as not meeting expectations in the area of teaching. Art education and art history faculty who do not attend conferences, or write conference papers, or attempt to publish research will be considered as not meeting expectations in the area of research. Studio and design faculty who do not attempt to submit work to be exhibited or accepted by non-profit or for-profit organizations or design competitions will be considered as not meeting expectations in the area of research.Individuals who often fail to attend or participate in departmental meetings, or who have not populated any COLS committees or University committee in the period under review, or who do not participate in University life in other meaningful ways will be considered as not meeting expectations in the area of service.

**IV. Submission Requirements**

The person under review will submit three statements, detailing his or her primary activities in teaching, research, and service during the period under review. No statement should be longer than a page in length. The same statements used for merit calculation may be submitted for PTR. Along with the statements, the individual should submit the following evidence: Student Opinion Scores from 50 % of classes taught in the period under review; or photographs of work in progress; or copies of acceptance letters to exhibitions or organizations, grant offering institutions, affiliations with galleries; or copies of published material or papers submitted to or prepared for conferences or publication in the period under review.

**V. Professional Improvement Plan**

Turning in a Professional Improvement Plan (PIP) is the obligation of anyone found to be not meeting expectations in one or more areas of review by two levels of review. PIPs should only address the area or areas in which expectations are not met. Any PIP must respond directly to the statements on the official form that found the individual’s efforts or results to be deficient. Any PIP required is to be submitted to the Department Chair and Dean by the end of the three week Spring interim period, and is to be kept in the individual’s personnel file.

Teaching: A teaching PIP should include a desired target for average Student Opinion Survey summary scores and a plan for inviting faculty members to observe classes taught at least four times in the two year period before the next review. Invitees should include tenured members of the department but others may be asked as well. Written advice should be solicited from these observers. If basic matters are at issue, such as meeting class regularly, a plan for improvements and a mechanism for accountability should be offered.

Research: A promise of multiple tangible results must be made in any Research PIP, to include such items as notes taken for research, conference paper(s), a draft of a book chapter or a draft of a journal article, photographs of works in progress. Publication, exhibition, or acceptance of research in art, design, art education, and art history venues and organizations will be considered most favorably in subsequent assessments, followed by having viable items submitted or prepared for peer-reviewed/juried publication or exhibiton or inclusion in public and private collections.

Service: If judged not to be meeting expectations in the area of service, the PIP will describe how the individual plans to remedy the delinquency, potentially including targets for attendance at meetings, or a plan for gaining positions on COLS or University-level committees. Testimonials from committee chairs or panel organizers who the individual worked with are encouraged for submission with the subsequent review.

If a faculty member fails to submit a required PIP, he or she will undergo another PTR in the following year (IV.B.III). As outlined in the COLS policy (IV.B.4), “individuals who submit a PIP will undergo another post-tenure review the second year after an initial determination of deficiency, which covers only the area(s) in which he or she was determined to not meet minimum expectations.” The review subsequent to a PIP should specifically address the PIP standards, produce any evidence that shows promised outcomes were met, and explain why any outcomes were not met.

The post-tenure review process itself does not carry the possibility of negative sanctions beyond the determination of not meeting expectations, the possible requirement of a PIP, and the additional reporting the PIP would require. Faculty members should be aware, however, that the COLS Dean may make use of adverse post-tenure determinations to carry out his or her statutorily defined and campus specific prerogatives, provided that he or she does so in accordance with all state and federal statutes, all relevant UW System policies, and the Faculty and Academic Staff Handbook.