

REVISED: 09-08-2023

SCHOOL OF ART BYLAWS

Kathrine G. McGovern College of the Arts
University of Houston

Table of Contents

Section I: Composition of the School

Section II: Meetings

Section III: Officers of the School

Section IV: Committees

Section V: Rules and Guidelines on Personnel Policy

Section VI: Faculty Evaluative Criteria and Procedures

Section VII: Grievance Procedures

Section VIII: Amendment

Section VI: Addendum

1. Annual Performance Review Guidelines

Section I: Composition of the School

The School shall consist of all full-time Professors, Associate Professors, Assistant Professors, Affiliate Artists, and Instructors holding a tenure-track appointment, and all Instructional Faculty holding a Non-Tenure Track appointment in the School of Art.

Section II: Meetings

- A. Meetings of the School Faculty shall be no fewer than one per semester. Either the Director or a majority of the School members in residence at that time shall have authority to call special meetings of the School. The agenda for all meetings (except emergencies, if so designated by the Director) shall be made public at least one week in advance. Minutes of each meeting shall be taken by a staff or faculty member as designated by the Director, and made available as requested by a faculty member.
- B. The Director of the School shall preside over all meetings at which he/she is present. The proceedings will be conducted according to *Robert's Rules of Order*. Proxy vote must be confirmed in writing.
- C. Part-time faculty and visiting full-time faculty in the School shall be invited to meetings, but will have neither vote nor office.

Section III: Officers of the School

- A. The Director of the School is the chief administrative officer of the School whose term shall be three years.
 1. The Director shall:
 - a. Represent the School in its relations with other units of the University;
 - b. Administer the affairs of the School according to the policies determined by the School, College and University;
 - c. Oversee the scheduling of classes, counseling of students, and assignment of graduate assistants and teaching fellows to their duties;
 - d. Manage the operation of the central office of the School;
 - e. Prepare and manage the School budget;
 - f. Review and seek advice from the Executive Committee on the School budget;
 - g. Recommend salary increments to the Dean and recommend promotions in accordance with principles and criteria established by the School;
 - h. Conduct negotiations for the hiring of new faculty members in cooperation with the ad hoc Search Committee;
 - i. Make available to faculty members, upon their appointments, written criteria for tenure and promotion consistent with University and College policies;
 - j. Insure that every tenure-track faculty is reviewed annually through appropriate School procedures, and provide the faculty member with a written summary of the review;
 - k. Preside over School meetings and supervise the writing of School minutes;
 - l. Serve as Chair of the Executive Committee of the School.

2. Evaluation of the Director
 - a. The Faculty Council of the college shall conduct an evaluation of the Director in the spring prior to the final year of the Director's term of office. The results of the evaluation will be made available to the faculty by the School's Faculty Council Representative.
 3. Election of the Director
 - a. The Director is appointed by the Dean of the College. He/She may be recommended for reappointment for another term by a majority vote of the faculty. If the Director is not reappointed or does not wish to serve another term, and an outside search is not possible then an election will be held. Upon timely notification from the Faculty Council Elections Committee or from the Dean of the College of the Arts that a Director must be elected for a new term, the Executive Committee of the School will solicit nominations from eligible faculty. Faculty eligible to propose nominations and to vote shall have tenured or tenure-track appointments. The Executive Committee will prepare a ballot for the faculty of all valid nominations. Polling will then be conducted by the Faculty Council.
- B. The Associate Director shall aid the Director in the administrative duties of the School and shall hold academic rank of Assistant Professor or above. The term shall coincide with that of the Director. The Associate Director shall be appointed by the Director with advice of the Executive Committee. The Associate Director shall be a non-voting member of the Executive Committee.
- C. The Director of Graduate Studies shall be appointed by the Director with the advice of the Executive Committee. The Director of Graduate Studies' term of appointment shall coincide with that of the Director.
1. The Director of Graduate Studies shall:
 - a. Direct and administer the operation of the graduate program;
 - b. Oversee the recruitment of graduate students and promote the visibility of the graduate program;
 - c. Approve applications for admission to the MFA program;
 - d. Oversee the processing of applications for graduate fellowships, assistantships, and scholarships;
 - e. Serve as Chair of the School Graduate Committee;
 - f. Oversee and supervise, with the School of Art Director, the Graduate Advisor in her/his position responsibilities.
- D. Other School officers shall be appointed as needed by the Director with advice of the Executive Committee.

Section IV: Committees

- A. Executive Committee
 1. This Committee shall consist of the Associate Director and six faculty members, (one from each area) holding academic rank who shall be elected by the faculty for two-year terms.
 2. It shall be the duty of the Committee to:
 - a. With the Director, help in the determination of School policy.
 - b. Recommend appointments to ad hoc committees made by the School Director;

- c. Confirm the appointment of the Associate Director of the School;
 - d. Advise the Director on the appointment of part-time help; affiliate artists and designers, lecturers and visiting faculty.
 - e. Maintain oversight of the Director's stewardship of the School Budget.
3. Faculty members not elected to the Executive Committee may attend the Committee meetings except when personnel issues are discussed.

B. Rank and Tenure Committee

1. The committee consists of six members, each member representing one of the six programs in the School of Art (Art History, Graphic Design, IPEF, Painting, PDM and Sculpture). Members are elected by vote of the full-time faculty to serve for three-year terms of office. Only tenured members of the faculty are eligible for election to the Committee. The Director of the School may not be a member of the committee.
 - a. The primary and regular function of the Committee is to undertake a thorough evaluation of those members of the full-time faculty: (1) who are in their third year of full-time rank, to determine their eligibility for continued appointment; (2) who are in their sixth year of full-time appointment, to determine their eligibility for promotion and tenure; (3) who have applied for promotion; and, (4) who may have requested a special review of their promotion status and salary level through the School's Director. In addition, the Committee undertakes an annual rating of the teaching, departmental, scholarly and professional performance of all full-time faculty as a basis for recommending merit salary increases.
 - b. In the event any committee member must be absent, for whatever reason, during the semester of any academic year, a special election will be held to fill the unexpired portion of the member's term of office.
 - c. At its first meeting each year the Committee elects its own Chair.

C. Curriculum Committee

1. The Curriculum Committee shall be comprised of the Director of Graduate Studies, who shall serve as Chair, the Associate Director and and six faculty members, (one from each area) who shall be elected by the faculty for two-year terms.
2. It shall be the duty of the Committee to:
 - a. Oversee and direct the graduate and undergraduate curriculum of the School;
 - b. Review and approve area petitions for revising, expanding, and/or eliminating course offerings;
 - c. Petition the College's Curriculum Committees for all curricular changes in the School;
 - d. Update the course catalogues as needed.

D. Strategic Initiatives Committee

1. The Strategic Initiatives Committee shall consist of six faculty members, each representing one of the six programs in the School of Art, the School Director (ex officio), one graduate student, one undergraduate student, one staff and one alum. Faculty members shall be elected by vote of the full-time faculty to serve two-year terms and will hold the rank of tenured, tenure-track, or non-tenure track. The School Director, with recommendations made by the Executive Committee, shall appoint the graduate, undergraduate, staff and alum representatives to one-year terms. The committee shall elect a faculty chair at the first meeting of the academic year.

2. It shall be the duty of the Committee to:
 - a. encourage curriculum development and other initiatives that promote the achievement of the School of Art's strategic plan;
 - b. recommend best practices for student recruitment and retention;
 - c. monitor School of Art alignment with McGovern College of the Arts Strategic Initiatives Working Group priorities;

Section V: Rules and Guidelines on Personnel Policy

- A. No one will be henceforth appointed to any professional rank without having completed all requirements for the accepted terminal degree.
- B. Promotions shall never be made merely because of length of service and only limited consideration will be given to length of service in making salary increases.
- C. A meaningful salary differential should be maintained among the various academic ranks.
- D. It shall be the responsibility of the School's Director to ensure that salaries and ranks of faculty members are equitable and bear appropriate relationships to one another, given the abilities and performance of the various faculty members.
- E. Good teaching is essential, and it is presumed that poor teachers will not be continued in the employ of the University. For members with tenure, salary increments may be reduced and/or promotions delayed because of poor teaching or neglect of ordinary duties.
- F. A yearly merit review of every full-time faculty member shall be conducted during the Spring semester by the Rank and Tenure Committee. (see Section VI. D)
- G. Up to three years of prior full-time collegiate-level teaching at the rank of assistant professor or above may be credited to the probationary period. A three-year period as an assistant professor is a prerequisite for promotion to associate professor. No specified time in rank is required for promotion from associate to full professor. The rate of promotion depends upon the professional development of the individual faculty member.
- H. All faculty are eligible for (1) course release during the pre-tenure period. Faculty will request and schedule the course release with the cooperation of their Program Coordinator.

Section VI: Faculty Evaluative Criteria and Procedures

- A. Full-time Faculty
 1. Art History faculty are considered to be full-time when they teach four classes per year with each class consisting of three contact hours per week and are available for the additional responsibilities called for below.
 2. Studio faculty are considered to be full-time when they teach five classes per year with each class consisting of six contact hours per week (unless teaching a seminar) and are available for the additional responsibilities hereafter specified.
 3. The time employed by a teacher off campus for the preparation of his/her class, as well as for the correction or evaluation of student work is considered to be implicit to the "contact hour" definition of full-time appointments.
 4. In addition to their teaching assignments, all full-time faculty are expected to be available for contact with their students on an individual basis; and to be available for after class departmental

or other faculty work, for registration, for attendance at all general faculty meetings, and the meeting of any other committee to which they may have been appointed or elected.

5. It is expected that all full-time faculty will be actively engaged off campus in the advancement of their own scholarly or professional discipline as a concomitant requirement of their appointment.
6. Faculty are engaged, unless otherwise specified, for the normal academic year of approximately nine months, which term includes thirty-two weeks of instruction, and sufficient time in the week preceding the beginning of classes in the fall and following the conclusion of classes in the spring to carry out the work of the School.

B. Professional Ranks

1. All criteria defined in one rank are subsumed to the next higher rank, whether repeated or not.
2. The position of instructor designates a responsible teacher of limited experience, who must have earned the MFA in his/her professional field, or its equivalent, if a studio teacher, or have completed their dissertation, if in the field of art history.
3. Promotion Eligible NTT Instructional Faculty: an individual appointed with the title non-tenure-track (NTT) instructional faculty is promotion eligible and is primarily engaged in teaching and/or instructional activities on a full-time basis. In addition to teaching responsibilities, an instructional faculty member also is expected to contribute to: service at the department, college or university level; or to scholarly research in the discipline; or under certain circumstances a combination of both. The appointment letter for each instructional position should specify the role and responsibilities of the position and will be made available to the Rank and Tenure Committee for all reviews. NTT faculty appointments can be made at the assistant, associate or full professor rank.
4. Assistant Professor: An individual appointed to the faculty at the rank of Assistant Professor will have demonstrated promise of creative achievement or research and a commitment to teaching. Once appointed, expectations at the rank of assistant professor include clear evidence of teaching ability, good judgment, and an attitude of responsibility towards his or her students and the aims of the School. Expectations include, furthermore, continued development of scholarly and professional activities, development of substantial course or curriculum materials, and participation in appropriate professional societies or organizations. Such achievements must be reflected in the annual performance review to justify continuing appointment at this rank. On the whole, Assistant Professors should be accumulating a professional record showing that there is every expectation that they will meet the standard for promotion to the rank of Associate Professor with tenure within the time established in their letter of appointment.
5. Associate Professor: In addition to the requirements of an Assistant Professor, the Associate Professor must have demonstrated significant ability as a teacher in the studio or classroom and have a documented record of recent creative achievements or research. An Associate Professor is expected to demonstrate a high degree of scholarly and professional growth; serve as an active member and assume leadership of department, college, or university committees; and assume memberships and committee posts in appropriate professional societies or organizations. Associate Professors should be accumulating a professional record showing that there is every expectation that they will meet the standard for promotion to the rank of professor in due course.

6. Professor: In addition to the requirements of an Associate Professor, the Professor must have received recognition by colleagues and students for excellent teaching in the studio or classroom and will have a commendable record of creative achievements or scholarly research. The Professor shall also be recognized nationally or internationally as a highly competent professional in their field. Professors must maintain a national reputation for excellence that is based on more than seniority or administrative service alone.

C. Categories of Performance

1. Teaching - The primary teaching responsibilities are:
 - a. The preparation and effective presentation of course materials, appropriate to the level and the function of the course in relation to the total other sections of the same course.
 - b. The availability of faculty to meet with students outside of class time.
 - c. Completion of all School and university procedures and regulations regarding the proper enrollment of his/her students.
 - d. The prompt meeting of all scheduled classes.
 - e. The administration of course evaluations according to School guidelines.
2. Professional Activity
 - a. Studio faculty are expected to provide evidence of their continuous professional activity as artists, and designers. (It is recognized that the nature of an individual's creative involvement may preclude an exhibition records, though such work would then be subject to review by the Rank and Tenure Committee.)
 - b. Criteria for professional activity:
 - i. Artists: Exhibitions are ranked in the order of their importance as follows: Invited one person or group museum exhibitions; one-person gallery exhibitions; group gallery (national/regional/local) and/or juried national group exhibitions. Of equal importance to an invited museum exhibition would be the selection by a professional jury to execute a public commission.
 - ii. Designers: Excellence in creative work including professional practice activities, developing a distinguished client list, creative work for juried design exhibitions and/or competitions.
 - iii. Publications: (a) evidence of reviews or critical appraisals appearing in professional journals, newspapers, or catalogs; reviews through any professional organization. (b) published projects or articles in professional journals, other media venues, and emerging means of publication via electronic media.
 - c. Academic: It is expected that all academic faculty shall be engaged in the advancement of their scholarly interests, including:
 - i. The publication (or proven acceptance for publication) of critical, educational, or research materials as books, or articles in anthologies and/or professional journals, and published projects in other media venues and emerging means of publication via electronic media.
 - ii. The presentation of scholarly papers at the meetings of professional organizations.
 - d. Responsibilities to the School: Faculty are expected to:
 - i. Participate actively in the work of any committee to which they have been elected or appointed, or to undertake any individual assignment of a School responsibility made by the Director or by the Executive Committee;

- ii. Be present for all School and Program concentration faculty meetings; and
 - iii. Participate in all of the collective activities of the School.
- 3. College/University Work:
 - a. Faculty will occasionally be involved in committee work at the college or university level, although there is no expected frequency of such an involvement. Nevertheless, if invited, appointed or elected to any college or university committee or other task, notice should always be made by the faculty member on his/her Professional Activity Reporting Form.
- 4. Community Work:
 - a. Service to one's professional organization and professionally related civic, charitable, or other community work should also be reported.

D. Evaluative Policies and Procedures

1. As stated in the preceding section, it is expected that all full-time faculty, as a concomitant of their appointment, will fully execute all of the responsibilities of their teaching assignments, will participate in the work of the School and of the University to the extent they may be requested to do so, and will be actively engaged in their own scholarly and professional advancement.
2. It is the responsibility of the elected Rank and Tenure Committee, and subsequently of the Director of the School, to evaluate the performance of faculty each year.
3. Tenure and advancement in rank are earned. Recommendations for the termination or the continuance of faculty appointment, and for all recommendations for merit pay increases, for advancement in rank and for tenure are based upon the faculty member's satisfactory performance in categories of professional activity.
 - a. The following category weights are typically used in evaluating tenure-track faculty:
 - i. Research: 40%
 - ii. Teaching: 40%
 - iii. Service: 20%
 - b. The following category weights are typically used in evaluating non-tenure track faculty:
 - i. Teaching: 80%
 - ii. Service: 20%
 - c. However, as laid out in the UH Faculty Workload Policy (MAPP12.05.01), individual faculty workload (and hence category weighting) may be differentially distributed.
4. In addition to such periodic reviews, the School, through the Rank and Tenure Committee and the Director, undertake an annual "performance rating" to establish the basis for any and all recommendations for merit increases.
5. Every full-time member of the School's faculty, including the Director, are so rated each year, and the results are reported to the Dean of the College. Such ratings are based upon a review of faculty members' Faculty Reporting Form and teaching evaluations. The annual performance review will be conducted in the following manner:
 - a. All Faculty Reporting Forms are due no later than the first day of the spring semester.
 - b. The Rank and Tenure Committee will review all Faculty Reporting Forms and recommend rankings to the Director no later than February 15.
 - c. The review procedure calls for the assignment of a numerical evaluation for each category of professional activity according to a comparative ranking system set forth in these bylaws under Section VI. Addendum 1. Annual Performance Review Guidelines. Faculty members

are ranked numerically 1–5, with 5 being the highest ranking. A single numerical ranking of the weighted individual category scores synthesizes evaluations of faculty members' performance across the professional domains. To arrive at a single numerical ranking, composite scores of weighted averages equal to X.5 or higher will be rounded up; composite scores of weighted averages equal to X.49 or lower will be rounded down.

- d. The review procedure calls for the committee to submit individual category rankings and a single numerical ranking for each faculty member to the Director.
 - e. Committee members absent themselves from the evaluation to determine their own performance rating.
 - f. The Director will evaluate and write merit ranking letters no later than March 1. Each faculty member will receive a copy of his or her merit letter in writing.
 - g. The Director will establish a one-week period during which any faculty member may appeal the merit ranking.
 - h. The Director will submit final merit ranking results to the Dean after the appeals period.
 - i. If an appeal to the Director is not successful, the merit ranking may be appealed to the Dean within ten days of written notification of final merit rank from the Director. Further appeal, if necessary, may be made to the provost, whose decision is final.
6. It is expected that all faculty will familiarize themselves with the standards of performance, described above, as with the substance and method as the whole evaluative process, both for the School and for the University, as defined in the Faculty Handbook.
 7. Faculty in categories other than TT or NTT promotion eligible will receive an annual evaluation by the Director of the School, with the results of the evaluation communicated in a letter from the Director to the faculty member.

E. Post Tenure Review

1. The comprehensive annual merit review serves as the post-tenure review of tenured faculty members. Faculty are evaluated based on the Categories of Performance detailed in Section VI.C., i.e., professional activity, teaching, and service to the School, college, university and community. The initial merit review is conducted by the elected Rank & Tenure Committee. Since only tenured faculty members may participate in post tenure review, the tenured faculty of the School will vote on an annual basis to designate the Rank & Tenure Committee to function as the post tenure review committee.
2. A tenured faculty member who meets or exceeds the School performance standards (i.e., is evaluated to be satisfactory) remains in the regular review process with the possibility of merit pay raises.
3. When the annual merit review process reveals an apparent performance problem of a tenured faculty member, the Director of the School will proceed to a further evaluation to assess the performance on the basis of the School standards. The Director will evaluate the faculty member's performance for the preceding 36 months. Thus, the Director will consider the materials assembled and already reviewed for the annual merit review and he/she will also review materials from the two preceding years.
4. If a faculty member whose overall performance or his/her teaching performance is judged unsatisfactory for the 36-month review period by the Director, the faculty member is subject to a mandatory Faculty Development Plan (FDP). The Director will communicate this finding in

writing to the faculty member and will include a statement of the performance deficiencies that resulted in the rating of unsatisfactory.

5. At this point, the faculty member has the option of requesting a review by all the tenured faculty in the School. The tenured faculty of the School will review the materials collected for the 36-month period under consideration. The tenured faculty of the School will vote to recommend that (1) the faculty member now be judged satisfactory, or (2) the faculty member is unsatisfactory and subject to an FDP. Neither the Director nor the faculty member in question participate in the vote of the tenured faculty. The Director of the School will communicate in writing the decision of the tenured faculty to the faculty member, and if necessary, will proceed to developing the FDP.
6. A rating of unsatisfactory does not establish a presumption that the faculty member has given “cause” for dismissal.
7. Faculty Development Plan
 - a. The School Director will work with the faculty member to develop and monitor the FDP. After the plan is drawn up, the Director will send the plan forward for approval by the dean and provost.
 - b. The FDP has a maximum duration of two years. The faculty member will receive annual evaluations as normal during the FDP to provide feedback. At the end of the process, the outcome of the FDP shall be determined by the Rank and Tenure Committee on the basis of performance during this period.
 - c. The conclusion of the initial FDP will result in one of three actions:
 - i. Performance has improved sufficiently to be considered satisfactory.
 - ii. Performance has improved sufficiently to provide cause for extension of the FDP for an additional period up to one year.
 - iii. Performance remains unsatisfactory. This will lead to disciplinary action which may include, at the initiation of University administration, dismissal for cause under Board of Regents policy.
 - d. The Director of the School must report annually to the dean the names of the faculty members who are working on FDP’s, the nature of the deficiencies, and the outcomes of those plans. The dean in turn reports to the provost.
8. The performance evaluation process of tenured faculty shall incorporate commonly recognized academic due process rights. Faculty members retain full access to the university grievance process.
9. If an appeal to the Director is not successful, the ranking may be appealed to the Dean within ten days of written notification of final rank from the Director. Further appeal, if necessary, may be made to the provost, whose decision is final.
10. In accord with state law, a faculty member subject to revocation of tenure and dismissal on the basis of performance evaluations has the opportunity for referral of the matter to a non-binding alternative dispute resolution process.

F. Tenure and Promotion

1. The Rank and Tenure Committee conducts the review of all tenure and promotion candidates in accordance with current University Guidelines and Policy.
2. The Rank and Tenure Committee makes an independent judgment, on promotion, and/or tenure review of all faculty and advises the Director of its findings.
3. In the performance of its evaluative duties the committee shall have the right and authority to do any or all of the following:
4. Request of the faculty member under review that evidence of scholarly or other professional work be made available to the committee and the external evaluators for their appraisal.
5. Solicit the written opinion of outside authorities (the number of evaluators and manner of selection to be determined by current University Promotion and Tenure Guidelines – currently four are required);
6. Invite any member of the faculty, staff or student body, or the Director of the School to meet with it in closed session, to present their views or to amplify a written statement previously submitted;
7. Request of the School's Director that a qualified consultant, approved by the committee, be invited to meet with it and submit an opinion concerning the scholarly or other professional attainments of any full-time faculty member then subject to the mandatory review preceding an appointment with tenure;
8. Additionally, the committee can call for letters from the faculty. Only signed letters will be considered by the committee.
9. In all of their faculty assessments, save for those done as part of the standard, annual merit review for the School, the committee will consider as many of the following evaluative materials as can be secured:
 - a. the opinion of the outside evaluators;
 - b. evaluations by faculty from the same and other disciplines;
 - c. teaching evaluations by students and peers;
 - d. previous School merit reviews.
10. When the committee has concluded its deliberations, the committee's views are presented to the Director in writing.
11. Whether the Director concurs or not, he/she may choose to incorporate the committee's view in whole or in part into his own written statement to the faculty member concerned. In any case, the Director makes the final determination of the School recommendation to be reported to the Dean of the College of Arts. The Director will also forward the committee's appraisal and vote to the Dean.
12. In the event termination or non-promotion is recommended, the faculty member concerned has ten (10) working days, upon written notification of the Director's decision not to support tenure, or promotion (with reasons for denial of support not given) to respond with a letter of appeal. The Rank and Tenure Committee reviews the appeal letter and if it chooses not to re-open the case, the committee sends a letter to the Director rejecting the appeal.
13. The faculty member concerned can then request a meeting with the Director of the School to review the appeal rejection. The Director will address the appeal in his/her letter to the Dean. After meeting with the Director, the faculty member can follow the College Personnel committee and Dean's appeal procedures outlines in the Faculty Handbook.

Section VII: Grievance Procedures

- A. For grievances filed in the School that do not pertain to the evaluative proceedings of the Rank and Tenure Committee then the following procedure shall be followed:
1. All grievances should first be submitted to the Director of the School within ten working days of the event.
 2. If necessary, the Director will appoint an Ad Hoc Committee to review the case.
 3. The Committee will report in writing within five working days it's recommendation to the Director.
 4. The Director will inform the aggrieved of the Committee's recommendation and his/her ruling of the matter.
 5. If the aggrieved chooses to appeal the committees' or Director's recommendation, the Director will then meet with the Committee to review the appeal and respond to the aggrieved within ten working days.
 6. The Director will meet with the aggrieved to render a final decision.
 7. At this point, if the aggrieved is still dissatisfied with the result, he/she would follow procedures for filing an appeal in the College as outlined in the Faculty Handbook.

Section VIII: Amendment

- A. These bylaws may be amended at any meeting of the School by a two-thirds majority vote of all members then in residence, provided that 7 days' notice of the proposed action has been given, or by two thirds vote by signed ballots placed in the mailboxes of full time tenured or tenure track faculty members.

Section VI: Addendum

Addendum 1: Annual Performance Review Guidelines

- A. Annual performance evaluations will be appropriate to rank, as follows:
1. Assistant Professor: An individual appointed to the faculty at the rank of Assistant Professor will have demonstrated promise of creative achievement or research and a commitment to teaching. Once appointed, expectations at the rank of assistant professor include clear evidence of teaching ability, good judgment, and an attitude of responsibility towards his or her students and the aims of the School. Expectations include, furthermore, continued development of scholarly and professional activities, development of substantial course or curriculum materials, and participation in appropriate professional societies or organizations. Such achievements must be reflected in the annual performance review to justify continuing appointment at this rank. On the whole, Assistant Professors should be accumulating a professional record showing that there is every expectation that they will meet the standard for promotion to the rank of Associate Professor with tenure within the time established in their letter of appointment.
 2. Associate Professor: In addition to the requirements of an Assistant Professor, the Associate Professor must have demonstrated significant ability as a teacher in the studio or classroom and have a documented record of recent creative achievements or research. An Associate Professor is expected to demonstrate a high degree of scholarly and professional growth; serve as an active

member and assume leadership of department, college, or university committees; and assume memberships and committee posts in appropriate professional societies or organizations. Associate Professors should be accumulating a professional record showing that there is every expectation that they will meet the standard for promotion to the rank of professor in due course.

3. Professor: In addition to the requirements of an Associate Professor, the Professor must have received recognition by colleagues and students for excellent teaching in the studio or classroom and will have a commendable record of creative achievements or scholarly research. The Professor shall also be recognized nationally or internationally as a highly competent professional in their field. Professors must maintain a national reputation for excellence that is based on more than seniority or administrative service alone.
 4. The Dean of the McGovern College will communicate to the department personnel committee the criteria on which the Director of the School will be evaluated.
- B. Four levels of assessment may generally be determined as follows:
1. Does Not Meet Expectations: No activity, insufficient activity, or a preponderance of activity in ranking 1 and 2.
 2. Meets Expectations: A preponderance of activity in ranking 3.
 3. Exceeds Expectations: A preponderance of activity in ranking 4.
 4. Far Exceeds Expectations: An achievement of the highest level of selectivity and impact, or a preponderance of activity in ranking 5.
- C. Ranking Criteria: Research
1. Faculty members who excel in research, scholarship, or creative activities are engaged in creative work appropriate to their area of specialization and their work is respected by their colleagues and peers, both within and outside the university. They are aware of new developments and strive to broaden and deepen their knowledge and understanding of their specialties and, where relevant, related fields.
 2. In the Research category, “Meets Expectations” (ranking 3) is an indication that a faculty member is producing at a satisfactory level. “Exceeds Expectations” (ranking 4) is an assessment that a typical faculty member should strive to receive every several years; it typically marks the completion of a significant project or a period of exceptional achievement. “Far Exceeds Expectations” (ranking 5) is an assessment that might typically be awarded a few times over the entire span of a faculty member’s career to mark accomplishments of a highly prestigious nature.
 3. A successful tenure or promotion application will show, at minimum, typical assessments of “meets expectations” (ranking 3) with an acceptable number of scholarly activities ranked 4 (“exceeds expectations”) or 5 (“far exceeds expectations”) during the pre-tenure period.
 4. For additional information, please consult ranked lists of journals, publishers, venues, and grants, and awards that are attached to this document.
 5. Ranking 1
 - a. Research showing an insignificant level of selectivity, impact, or quality; failure to engage in or maintain a level of research or creative activity that demonstrates the professional excellence and growth expected of a tenured faculty member or a faculty member progressing

toward tenure; publications, research, exhibitions, shows, performances or other research or creative activity-related projects exhibiting the lowest level of involvement, scholarship, or peer-review that are not balanced by research projects of a high level of selectivity.

6. Ranking 2

- a. Research showing a low level of selectivity, impact, or quality; publications, research, exhibitions, shows, performances or other research or creative activity-related projects exhibiting a low level of involvement, scholarship, or peer-review that are not balanced by research projects of a high level of selectivity.

7. Ranking 3

- a. Research of a moderate level of selectivity, impact, and quality. Activities including:

- Presentations
- Publications
- Curatorial Activity
- Editorial Activity
- Peer Reviewed Shows
- Juried Shows
- Curated Shows
- Screenings
- Performances
- Art or Design Fairs
- On-line Exhibitions or Publications
- Commissioned Work
- Gallery Representation
- Client-based Work
- Awards (professional award for scholarship, creative research, or performance excellence)
- Internal University grant award
- External grant award
- Residencies
- Other equivalent items in this ranking, or equivalent credit for ongoing projects, given at the discretion of the Director.

8. Ranking 4

- a. Research of a high level of selectivity, impact, and quality. Activities including:

- Presentations
- Publications
- Curatorial Activity
- Editorial Activity
- Peer Reviewed Shows
- Juried Shows
- Curated Shows
- Screenings
- Performances
- Art or Design Fairs
- On-line Exhibitions or Publications
- Commissioned Work

- Gallery Representation
- Client-based Work
- Awards (professional award for scholarship, creative research, or performance excellence)
- Internal University grant award
- External grant award
- Residencies
- Other equivalent items in this ranking, or equivalent credit for ongoing projects, given at the discretion of the Director.

9. Ranking 5

- a. Research of the highest level of selectivity, impact, and quality. Activities including:
- Presentations (keynote at a highly selective event)
 - Publications
 - Curatorial Activity
 - Editorial Activity
 - Peer Reviewed Shows
 - Juried Shows
 - Curated Shows
 - Screenings
 - Performances
 - Art or Design Fairs
 - On-line Exhibitions or Publications
 - Commissioned Work
 - Gallery Representation
 - Client-based Work
 - Awards (professional award for scholarship, creative research, or performance excellence)
 - Internal University grant award
 - External grant award
 - Residencies
 - Other equivalent items in this ranking, or equivalent credit for ongoing projects, given at the discretion of the Director.

D. Ranking Criteria: Teaching

1. Teaching refers to academic activities that promote learning among individuals or groups with whom a faculty member interacts. Faculty members who excel in teaching exhibit command over the subject matter in classroom discussions or lectures and present material to students in an objective, organized way that promotes the learning process. They present the subject matter with logic and conviction and are able to awaken in students an awareness of the relationship between their subjects and other classes, fields of knowledge, and cultures. They display concern and respect for their students and are recognized by students and university colleagues as teachers who guide and inspire their students. They strive continuously to broaden and deepen their knowledge of their discipline, seek to improve their teaching methods, keep informed about new developments in their field, use appropriate instructional technologies, and prepare educational materials that are up-to-date and well written. Their influence and reputation as teachers may be

- demonstrated by authoring textbooks, by publishing instructional materials such as laboratory manuals and instructional videos, or by significantly contributing to professional associations.
2. All faculty members in the School are expected to be competent, effective teachers. Instructional processes entail a number of elements, all open to evaluation. Some of these elements are formal and tangible in nature:
 - a. Growth and learning in one's instructional area
 - b. Ability to organize a course efficiently and keep it on schedule
 - c. Competence as a lecturer and discussion leader
 - d. Skill and ingenuity in preparing instructional materials and using instructional resources
 - e. Quality of student work; other related student accomplishments or recognitions
 - f. Skill in accurately assessing student performance through examinations, reviews, or critiques of student work
 3. Other elements, of a more subtle and intangible nature, are less easily assessed but are nonetheless critically important for productive teaching:
 - a. Essential knowledge and skills are successfully imparted to the students
 - b. Students are motivated and inspired to stretch their imaginations and produce their best works
 - c. A class environment is created which maximizes the learning process
 - d. Students with career goals are counseled in attaining them
 - e. Students are provided with suitable role models
 4. Instruments for evaluation of teaching
 - a. Teaching may be evaluated, and effective teaching demonstrated, mainly by course structures and student successes, but other means are also available for evaluating teaching and through which faculty members might demonstrate teaching effectiveness; these might include but are not limited to:
 - Student classroom evaluations. The Rank and Tenure Committee may consider student evaluations as one tool in the overall assessment of a faculty member's teaching effort. Committee members should take into consideration the inherent biases of student evaluations.
 - Peer evaluations
 - Self-evaluation
 - Videos (e.g., instructional demonstrations or class recordings)
 - Evaluations of former students or employers
 - Course outlines and syllabi
 - Samples of examinations
 - Samples of student papers
 - Samples of student work
 - Teaching awards or teaching scholarship
 - Learning outcomes, including evidence of independent studies and outcomes thereof
 - Participation on graduate and thesis committees
 5. While these means of evaluation are not expected to be submitted as part of the annual APR process, successful tenure or promotion applications may use some of the tools listed above as evidence that the faculty member "meets or exceeds expectations" in teaching during the pre-tenure period. In all cases, overall merit may be lowered if appropriate teaching and service expectations are not met.

6. Does Not Meet Expectations (ranking 1 or 2):
 - a. Teaching shows lower instructional quality or little evidence of student success.
 - Failure to teach expected course load
 - Ineffective teaching, as evidenced by such measures as negative peer or student evaluations (without explanation); low quality student work; unwillingness to stay abreast of current scholarly, creative, or pedagogical research in the field of study; or course content that is inaccurate, irrelevant, or out-of-date.*
 - Lack of participation in activities in support of teaching, such as mentoring.
 - Other equivalent items in this ranking, determined by the Executive Committee.

7. Meets Expectations (ranking 3)
 - a. Teaching showing instructional quality and solid evidence of student success.
 - Appropriate course load for position.
 - Effective undergraduate or graduate teaching, as evidenced by such measures as strong peer or student evaluations; high-quality student work; and staying abreast of current scholarly, creative, or pedagogical research in the field of study.
 - Development and implementation of new courses or course content to respond to current needs and trends.
 - Strong record of activities in support of teaching, such as mentoring.
 - Participation in outreach and engagement activities related to teaching.
 - Other equivalent items in this ranking, determined by the Executive Committee.

8. Exceeds Expectations (ranking 4)
 - a. Teaching showing high instructional quality and sustained evidence of student success.
 - Excellent undergraduate or graduate teaching, as evidenced by such measures as excellent peer or student evaluations; high-quality student work; or implementation of current scholarly, creative, or pedagogical research in the field of study.
 - Revision of curriculum to respond to current needs and trends.
 - Excellent record of activities in support of teaching, such as mentoring and chairing research committees.
 - Sustained record of student career success, receipt of fellowships, awards, exhibitions, etc.*
 - Competitive UH teaching award.
 - Leadership of outreach and engagement activities related to teaching.
 - Other equivalent items in this ranking, determined by the Executive Committee, including credit for significant course overloads.

9. Far Exceeds Expectations (ranking 5)
 - a. Teaching showing extraordinary instructional quality and sustained evidence of outstanding student success.
 - Outstanding undergraduate or graduate teaching, as evidenced by such measures as superior peer or student evaluations; student work of the highest quality; or development of scholarly, creative, or pedagogical research in the field of study that is adopted or recognized by other colleagues in the discipline.

- Significant development and implementation of new curriculum to respond to current needs and trends.
- Superior record of activities in support of teaching, such as mentoring students whose work is selected for major external presentation or co-writing or co-developing (with students) research or creative activity selected for publication or presentation in highly selective venues.*
- Sustained record of student career success, receipt of fellowships, awards, exhibitions, etc.
- National or international teaching award.*
- National recognition for leadership of outreach and engagement activities related to a research or creative agenda.
- Other equivalent items in this ranking, determined by the Executive Committee.

* To be noted for a single APR cycle, not recurring cycles.

E. Ranking Criteria: Service

1. Faculty members who excel in service approach their participation in committee meetings, reviews, and collaborative work with professionalism and mutual respect, demonstrated by punctuality and timeliness, thorough preparation, and consistent attendance. They strive to contribute to the smooth functioning of the department and avoid inattention that would unfairly contribute to the departmental workload of other faculty members.
2. The Rank and Tenure Committee will consider service to the School, College, University, profession, and community as criteria in assessing a faculty member's service effort. A successful tenure or promotion application will show assessments of "meets expectations" in service during the pre-tenure period. Overall merit may be lowered if appropriate teaching and service expectations are not met.
3. Does Not Meet Expectations (ranking 1 or 2)
 - a. Low level of service to the School, College, University, profession, and community.
 - Lack of participation in activities such as faculty or division meetings and membership on School, College or University committees.
 - Lack of participation in activities that support service, such as recruiting, community outreach, etc.
 - Other activities of comparable merit in this category, determined by the Executive Committee.
4. Meets Expectations (ranking 3)
 - a. Moderate level of service to the School, College, University, profession, and community.
 - Participation in faculty service activities at the School, College, or University levels as a committee member.
 - Active participation in activities that support service, such as recruiting; hosting guest artists, designers, or speakers; adjudicating art or design exhibition events; managing spaces or equipment; etc.
 - Leadership role in student organizations or programs, community outreach projects, study abroad programs.
 - Participation in outreach and engagement activities related to service.

- Other activities of comparable merit in this category, determined by the Executive Committee
5. Exceeds Expectations (4)
- a. High level of service to the School, College, University, profession, and community.
- Participation in faculty service activities at the School, College, or University levels, including serving in leadership roles.
 - Leadership of activities that support service, such as recruiting, hosting guest artists and speakers, curating or adjudicating artistic events, managing spaces or equipment, etc.
 - Leadership role in a professional organization.
 - Leadership of outreach and engagement activities related to service.
 - UH or community awards for service.
 - Serving as an invited juror, adjudicator, or curator of an event of significance to the discipline.
 - Principal investigator of significant outreach project.
 - Other activities of comparable merit in this category, determined by the Executive Committee.
6. Far Exceeds Expectations (5)
- a. Highest level of service to the School, College, University, profession, and community.
- Presidency (or equivalent) role in a major professional organization.*
 - Highly significant external award recognizing service to the profession.
 - Serving as an invited juror, adjudicator, or curator of an event of major significance to the discipline.
 - Organizer of conference, festival, exhibition, or symposium of significance to the profession.
 - National recognition of leadership of outreach and engagement activities related to service.
 - Other activities of comparable merit in this category, determined by the Executive Committee.

*To be noted for a single APR cycle, not recurring cycles.

School of Art

Annual Performance Review Guidelines

Rankings of Venues and Other Discipline-Related Factors

The charts below show representative examples of ratings of venues and other discipline-related factors, from 0 to 5. These assessments are to be used by the Director and Faculty Rank and Tenure Committee in connection with faculty activity reporting as a guide for assessing merit. In recognition of the diverse practices among School of Art faculty, the Director and Faculty Rank and Tenure Committee understand these representative examples may not be applicable to all faculty. Other important factors taken into consideration on a case-by-case basis: location and reach of the venue (local, regional, national, or international), group vs. solo exhibitions, and scope of exhibition.

General Criteria

- 3. Non-selective.
- 4. Average, fairly easy to obtain, typically refereed. Not very selective.
- 5. Good reputation, selective, refereed.
- 6. Highly respected in the field, refereed.
- 7. Outstanding recognition by practitioners in the field, highly prestigious, refereed.

Rank	1	2	3	4	5
Art History			Ranked venues such as: HCP, Diverseworks, Blaffer	Ranked venues such as: MFAH, CAMH, Denver Art Museum Conferences: International Congress for Medieval Studies, Kalamazoo, Renaissance Society of America	Ranked venues such as: Metropolitan Museum of Art, Tate, Art Institute of Chicago Conferences: CAA
Studio			HCP, Diverseworks, Blaffer, AIGA Houston, Lawndale, Museum of Printing History	MFAH, CAMH, Denver Art Museum, AIGA Design Educators, TDC, Design Inquiry	Whitney, Tate, Guggenheim, AIGA National, SEGD, ATypI

School of Art

Annual Performance Review Guidelines

Rankings of Journals and Publishers

The charts below show representative examples of ratings of publishers and journals, both print and electronic, from 0 to 5. These assessments are to be used by the Director and Faculty Rank and Tenure Committee in connection with faculty activity reporting as a guide for assessing merit. In recognition of the diverse practices among School of Art faculty, the Director and Faculty Rank and Tenure Committee understand these representative examples may not be applicable to all faculty. Other important factors taken into consideration on a case-by-case basis: location and breath of readership (local, regional, national and international), length of text, and mention vs. exclusive.

General Criteria

- 8. Non-selective.
- 9. Below average selectivity, not discriminating in articles published. No review process, or style review only. Very few articles by academics.
- 10. Average, fairly easy to publish in, typically refereed. Articles may emphasize description or practical applications rather than theoretical or performance research. Some articles may be reviewed primarily by editorial staff. Not very selective.
- 11. Good reputation, selective in publication, refereed. Includes research articles predominately contributed by scholars. Externally refereed. Few if any articles that are primarily descriptive or position papers.
- 12. Outstanding recognition in the field, highly prestigious, refereed. Recognized as leading journals by scholars in multiple subfields.
- 13.

Rank	1	2	3	4	5
Art History			Ranked venues such as: <i>Art Inquiries</i> <i>Glasstire</i>	Ranked venues such as: <i>Panorama</i> <i>CAA Reviews</i>	Ranked venues such as: <i>Art Bulletin</i> <i>Art History</i> <i>Oxford Art Journal</i>
Studio			<i>Glasstire, Houston Chronicle, Spot, Cite, Houstonia</i>	<i>Brooklyn Rail, Hyperallergic, Cabinet, Design Observer</i>	<i>Art Forum, Art in America, New York Times, EYE, Dialectic, Visible Language, Design Issues, CA (Communication Arts)</i>

School of Art

Annual Performance Review Guidelines

Rankings of Grants and Awards

The charts below show representative examples of ratings of grants and awards, from 0 to 5. These assessments are to be used by the Director and Faculty Rank and Tenure Committee in connection with faculty activity reporting as a guide for assessing merit. In recognition of the diverse practices among School of Art faculty, the Director and Faculty Rank and Tenure Committee understand these representative examples may not be applicable to all faculty. Other important factors taken into consideration on a case-by-case basis: location and reach of the award (local, regional, national and international), and dollar amount of grant.

General Criteria

- 14. Non-selective.
- 15. Average, fairly easy to obtain, typically refereed. Not very selective.
- 16. Good reputation, selective, refereed.
- 17. Highly respected in the field, refereed.
- 18. Outstanding recognition by practitioners in the field, highly prestigious, refereed.
- 19.

Rank	1	2	3	4	5
Art History			Ranked awards and residencies such as: Awards: Internal UH Awards, Texas Humanities, Houston Arts Alliance Residencies: Ransom Center, Amon Carter	Ranked awards and residencies such as: Partial-year Awards: NEH Summer Award, AAUW Partial-year Residencies: Smithsonian, Newberry	Ranked awards and residencies such as: Full-year Awards: NEH Fellow, ACLS Fellow, Mellon Full-year Residencies: Clark academic year, CASVA, Getty, Harvard (Dumbarton, etc.)

Rank	1	2	3	4	5
Studio			Awards: Internal UH Awards, HAA, IdeaFund Residencies: Houston Center for Contemporary Craft	Awards: Andy Warhol, Creative Capital, Pollack Krasner, SEGD, TDC, Design Inquiry, AIGA Residencies: ArtPace, Chinati Foundation, DesignInquiry, Headlands, MacDowell, Yaddo, Whitney ISP	Awards: Guggenheim, MacArthur, NEA, Fulbright, Sappi Ideas that Matter, Icograda Residencies: Rome Prize, Fulbright senior researcher, Jan Van Eyck Academie