1. **Department of Art & general provisions.** In accordance with Article 12 of the UMass-Massachusetts Society of Professors (MSP) Collective Bargaining Agreement (CBA), these bylaws have been adopted by a positive vote of at least two-thirds of the faculty of the Department of Art in the College of Humanities and Fine Arts (HFA) at the University of Massachusetts Amherst (the "University" or "UMass"). Federal and state laws, UMass Trustee policies (including, but not limited to, T76-081, the Academic Personnel Policy, aka the "Red Book"), the CBA, and other established university policies will prevail in instances of conflict with these bylaws. As required by Article 12, these bylaws are subject to review by the Administration and MSP to ensure that the bylaws do not conflict with prevailing laws, policies, and the CBA; such review must occur before the bylaws or their amendments take effect.

2. **Faculty membership, rights, privileges, and responsibilities.** The Department's faculty (the "Faculty") includes all faculty in the Department without regard to bargaining-unit status, tenure status, or full-time equivalency. In general, all members of the Faculty have both the right and duty to participate in governance of the Department, including voting on matters brought before the Faculty, except as specified otherwise below and elsewhere in these Bylaws.
    2.1. *Non-Unit Faculty.* Non-unit faculty (department chair/head, associate deans, deans, and other non-unit administrators) may not participate as voting members in personnel actions governed by the CBA. Such non-unit faculty members may not serve on Departmental Personnel Committees (DPCs) and may not participate as members of the Faculty in promotion and tenure cases. Non-unit faculty may participate in other aspects of academic governance (such as curricular decision-making and faculty searches), provided those faculty do not have separate administrative purview over the same matters.
    2.2. *Access & Voting Rights.* Department Personnel Committees have access to relevant information and may deliberate on all promotion and tenure cases. For consideration of and voting on all reappointment, promotion, tenure cases within the DPC's purview as determined by the CBA, only those Faculty whose rank and tenure status is equal to or greater than that of the proposed personnel action may have access to relevant information and may vote. (For example, only tenured Faculty may vote on applications for tenure.)
    2.3. *Graduate Faculty.* Only Faculty who have been designated Graduate Faculty by the Dean of the Graduate School may deliberate and vote on graduate program and graduate curricular matters.
    2.4. *Part-Time Faculty Appointments Under 50%.* Part-time bargaining-unit non-Graduate Faculty with an FTE less than 50% may have access to relevant information and may deliberate on all non-graduate programmatic and curricular matters but may not vote on such matters.
    2.5. *Faculty Appointments of at least 50%.* Bargaining-unit, non-Graduate Faculty with an FTE of 50% or greater, without regard to tenure status, should have access to relevant information and may deliberate and vote on all non-graduate programmatic and curricular matters.
    2.6. *Duty to Participate in Governance.* Except where the composition of an individual's assigned workload would prohibit such an obligation, all members of the Faculty have a responsibility to participate in governance of the Department and in service to the Department, the School/College, and the University.

2.7. ***Rights and Duties of Faculty on Leave.*** Faculty on leave may participate in governance to the extent permitted by the terms of their leave. Unless the leave is taken in an emergency, faculty on leave must make prior arrangements for students whose grades may be affected by the leave.

3. **Departmental Committees and Academic Leadership Roles:**
   3.1 ***Department Personnel Committee (DPC).***

   3.1.1 <u>DPC Purview</u>. All of the Department's Faculty will be members of the DPC with participation subject to the limitations described in Section 2. The DPC will annually elect a Personnel Subcommittee (PSc) delegated with full authority and responsibility (except as otherwise noted in these Bylaws) to perform on behalf of the DPC the functions assigned to the DPC by the CBA, including reviewing the Annual Faculty Review and Evaluation of every member of the Department's Faculty; preparing and submitting recommendations reflecting the vote and discussion of the DPC on all promotion and tenure applications within the Department; reviewing and making recommendations on all reappointments of tenure-track Faculty within the Department; reviewing and making recommendations on all promotions of non-tenure-system faculty; participating in Periodic Multi-Year Review of Faculty as prescribed by the CBA; reviewing and determining Pool A allocations of merit pay among the Department's eligible Faculty as provided for by the CBA; providing each faculty member with his/her merit scores; reviewing and making recommendations for anomaly adjustments to salaries as provided for by the CBA; leading the review process for potential reappointment of the Chair/Head. Hereinafter, "DPC" shall refer to the full DPC or the PSc acting on its behalf.

   3.1.2 <u>Composition & Eligibility</u>. The PSc will consist of a minimum of four tenure-system (not more than one non-tenured) Faculty. In order to provide continuity from year-to-year, members will normally be elected for a two-year term but with staggered membership so that only half the membership will serve concurrent two-year terms. To maintain such a staggered membership it may be necessary in some years to elect a member for a designated one-year-only term.

   3.1.3 <u>Means of Election</u>. Prior to the end of April of each year, the Department Chair will provide a list of eligible faculty and a list of anticipated actions to come before the DPC and then solicit nominations for service on the PSc from September through August of the ensuing academic year. The Chair will confirm the nominees' eligibility and willingness to serve and will announce the nominees to the Faculty. All of the Department's Faculty except for non-unit Faculty are eligible to vote in electing the PSc. The election should occur within two weeks after announcement of the nominees. The election will be by secret ballot at a Department meeting to be convened by the Department Chair; the then current DPC Chair will preside over the election process portion of the meeting. Eligible Faculty who cannot attend the meeting may vote by e-mail or other absentee ballot to a designated Department Administrator.

   3.1.4 <u>Leadership of the DPC</u>. Once elected, the members of the PSc will select their own committee chair within one week of the election. The chair of the PSc will serve as chair of the DPC.

   3.1.5 <u>Independence of the DPC</u>. On personnel actions for which the CBA identifies independent roles for the DPC and the Chair/Head—such as AFR reviews, reappointment, promotion, tenure, PMYRs, merit-pay allocations, and anomaly

recommendations—the DPC will operate independently, and the Chair/Head must not convene or deliberate with the DPC, nor may the Chair/Head attempt by any means to influence the deliberations or judgment of the members of the DPC.

3.1.6   DPC Meetings and Operations. The DPC should organize and schedule its meetings as necessary to perform its duties and meet the deadlines established by the campus master calendar or by College or Department policies. The DPC, requires a quorum of three quarters of its eligible members in order to conduct official business; in voting and in drafting written materials, the DPC may conduct its business electronically. When addressing confidential personnel matters, DPC meetings will not be open to non-DPC members. The DPC should keep a record of its meetings and transactions, which the Department should retain for five years and should be available to subsequent DPC members; the DPC need not keep meeting minutes.

3.1.7   DPC Responses to the Dean's Queries in RPT Cases. Under the CBA and the Red Book, a dean must consult with the DPC if she/he is considering making a recommendation that differs from the recommendation of the DPC in reappointment, promotion, and tenure cases for tenure-system Faculty. Should the DPC elect to respond, it must do so in writing.

3.1.8   DPC Consideration of Merit Pay. When the CBA authorizes the award of merit pay and authorizes the DPC to recommend or determine the amounts of merit pay to be allocated to individual members of the Faculty, the DPC must adhere to the CBA's terms for eligibility and the basis of evaluation for such allocations. The DPC may not exclude from consideration any merit-eligible member of the Faculty based on tenure status, rank, full-time equivalency, or constraint of assigned duties.

3.2 **Other Department Standing Committees.** The Department maintains a number of standing committees (Curriculum; Visiting Artist). This section describes the generic processes and procedures related to these committees. If at any point one or more of these committees require specific additional consideration beyond this section, the Bylaws should be appropriately revised as per Section 12.

3.2.1   *Committee Membership*. The Department Chair shall annually solicit from the faculty their interest in serving on these committees. The Department Chair will name the members of the committee and appoint the chair.

3.2.2   *Committee Purview*. The Department Chair in consultation with the committee chair shall periodically (no more than every 3 years) review the purview of the committee and make it available to the full faculty.

3.2.3   *Operations and Communications*. The committee will maintain minutes of its meetings making these available to the full faculty in a timely manner. Furthermore the chair of each committee should provide a brief update on the committee's activities at periodic (at least once per semester) faculty meetings.

3.2.4   *Creation and Elimination of Standing Committees*. The Department Chair may, in consultation with the faculty, create new standing committees and or eliminate an existing standing committee. The Faculty, by majority vote, may also create new committees. Should the requirements of a new committee exceed the description of Sections 3.2.1-3, these Bylaws should be revised as per Section 12.

3.3 Curriculum Committee Specifics. The following specific rules shall apply to the activities of the Curriculum Committee:

  3.3.1 <u>*Faculty Vote on Major Actions.*</u> Recognizing the wide rights and responsibilities of the Faculty in academic matters, the Curriculum Committee will bring to the full Faculty for a simple majority vote of approval any major changes (i.e., beyond changes within individual courses, proposals for experimental courses, etc.) to the Department's curriculum before such changes are put into effect or transmitted out of the Department to elsewhere on campus, e.g., to the HFA Curriculum Committee or to the Faculty Senate.

3.4 Ad Hoc Committees. The Department Chair may choose to form Ad Hoc Committees to address specific departmental issues. The Faculty, by majority vote, may also demand the creation of an Ad Hoc Committee for such issues. Such committees will be of short duration, not to exceed two years; any committee anticipated to be in place for a longer duration should be considered a standing committee and created and subsequently eliminated per Section 3.3. The purview of an Ad Hoc Committee should be defined at its creation. Committee membership and its operations and communications procedures should be the same as for standing committees, i.e., as defined in Sections 3.3.1 and 3.3.3 respectively.

3.5 Academic Leadership Positions. Recognizing that, given the small size of the Department, much academic governance is left in the hands of individuals in key Academic Leadership Positions (Undergraduate Program Director(s), Undergraduate Advisors, Graduate Program Director(s), Foundations Director(s)) without a corresponding committee structure, the following shall apply to those roles:

  3.5.1 <u>*Appointment*</u>. The Department Chair will make appointments to these positions. (The Graduate Director(s) appointment must be confirmed by the Dean of HFA and by the Dean of the Graduate School.) Normally such appointments will be for a period of 3 years with possible extension or reappointment.

  3.5.2 <u>*Communication.*</u> In the spirit of transparency, the individual in each of these roles shall provide a brief update on relevant activities at periodic (at least twice per semester) faculty meetings.

  3.5.3 <u>*Faculty Direction*</u>. Recognizing the rights and responsibilities of the Faculty in academic matters, the Faculty may bring to the full faculty meeting, per Section 7.3, agenda items including possible motions and subsequent votes related to the purview of these Academic Leadership Positions. The individuals in these positions shall abide by any motions passed by simple majority of the Faculty.

4. **Tenure-System Faculty Search Committees & Procedures**: The Department will conduct individual tenure-system faculty searches as follows:

   4.1. *Appointment of Search Committees for Tenure-System Faculty*. When the Provost and the Dean of HFA have authorized a search for a tenure-system faculty member, the Chair will solicit from among the faculty interest in serving on the search committee. From this pool of interested faculty, the Chair will appoint the chair and members of the

committee, making sure the composition of the committee represents gender and diversity. The committee will be comprised of tenured and tenure track faculty. Students are not eligible to serve as members of such search committees; however, students should be given opportunities to meet faculty candidates and to provide feedback to the search committee. In selecting members the Chair will attempt to compose a committee that is representative of the Department, that ensures well-qualified consideration of applicants' credentials, that promotes the achievement of the University's diversity goals, and that will achieve efficient execution of the search. Faculty from other departments (UMass or Five-Colleges) may be appointed if their expertise is deemed essential to the search.

4.2. *Purview of Search Committees in Tenure-System Searches*. Committees charged with conducting searches for tenure-system faculty will collaborate with the Chair in developing the position description, advertising/recruitment plan, facilities plan, and other elements of the hiring requisition; will work with the Department's Hiring Manager to fulfill the advertising/recruitment plan; will work with the Office of Equal Opportunity & Diversity with regard to promoting the recruitment of a diverse applicant pool; will receive and screen applications; will conduct initial interviews by phone, by Internet video connection, or at professional meetings (as applicable); will propose a campus-interview list; will make confidentially available to the Faculty the application materials of approved campus interviewees—provided the Faculty individually agree to maintain that confidentiality as described below; will organize campus visits, including public sessions open to all Faculty and students, and will take attendance of Faculty at these events; and will organize a meeting of all of the Department's Faculty after the last campus interview in order to deliberate and vote (by secret ballot) on the selection of the acceptable finalists. The faculty will vote to whom an offer should be made (i.e., their first choice and possibly name an alternate to whom an offer may be made if the first choice does not accept). Should the first choice not accept, the faculty should promptly meet again while the offer to the alternate is underway, and consider the pool of remaining candidate finalists to identify the next alternate if any. Faculty, in order to vote in favor of a particular candidate, must have attended at least two of the events (lecture, faculty meeting with the candidate, etc.) with that candidate. For the faculty vote, the first choice will be that candidate who has the highest percentage vote in favor by those eligible to vote on that candidate, subject to a minimum of half the faculty. During the final faculty meeting, only tenured or tenure stream faculty can vote on tenure-track hires; non-tenure track and tenure-track faculty vote on non-tenure track hires. The search committee will write a recommendation that reflects the Faculty's selection and rationale for that selection and may offer the committee members' independent assessment of the finalists.

4.3. *Access to Confidential Applicant Materials*. The Department will place in a secure online location the application materials of candidates who have been approved for campus interviews. The Department Chair and any Faculty eligible to vote who wish to view applicant materials may do so only after first signing a confidentiality statement that specifies the following:
- She/he will not disclose or distribute the contents of such confidential information to anyone outside the Department's Faculty or academic administration.
- She/he will not disclose or distribute the contents of such confidential information to any of the candidates, including the candidate who may be ultimately employed.

- She/he will not make a physical (including printed) or electronic copy of any of the materials.
- She/he will not contact any of the parties who have provided confidential references.
- She/he will abide by university policies in using the information disclosed in the materials. In particular, she or he will adhere to the university's guidelines on impartiality/objectivity in the university's non-discrimination policy.

Except for applicants' CVs and cover letters, confidential materials should not be made available to students.

4.4. *Role of Faculty in Tenure-System Searches & Selection.* All tenure-system members of the Department's Faculty have a duty to engage in the search and selection process from the beginning of the campus-interview phase through the meeting at which the Faculty rank the acceptable finalists. The Department's non-tenured-system faculty are welcome to similarly engage in the search and selection process but they do not have a duty to do so; they are also welcome to join with the tenure-system faculty in deliberating the selecting of the finalists but may not vote on that selection.

4.5. *Conflicts of Interest.* A real or perceived conflict of interest between an applicant and a Faculty member engaged in the search process must be disclosed and must be managed, mitigated, or eliminated. The principles underlying the above prescription include:

- Neither professional nor personal relationships between applicants and evaluators should influence the selection decision.
- Neither professional nor personal relationships between applicants and evaluators should *appear* to influence the selection decision.
- When such relationships exist, the evaluator must disclose the relationship. Management, mitigation, or elimination of such conflicts should occur as follows:

4.5.1. Search committee members engaged in a *personal* relationship with an applicant must disclose the relationship to others involved in the evaluation of the candidate and must recuse him/herself from any deliberations involving that particular applicant. In most cases, a search committee member with a personal relationship with an applicant who has reached the campus-interview list should recuse him/herself from the committee's work, including deliberations over other applicants. In the case of a member of a search committee having a close personal or professional relationship with a candidate, a tenured or tenure-stream faculty member will be identified as an alternative.

4.5.2. Search committee members engaged in a *close professional* relationship with an applicant must disclose the relationship to others involved in the evaluation of the candidate and must recuse him/herself from any deliberations involving the applicant but may vote along with other department faculty on all applicants.

4.5.3. A search committee member with a *distant* professional relationship (few collaborations or collaborations older than five years) with an applicant who has reached the shortlist need not recuse him/herself from the committee's work but should disclose the relationship to others involved in evaluation of the candidate. The Faculty member may participate in all discussions of that applicant and need not abstain from voting on any applicant.

5. **Non-Tenure-Track (NTT) Faculty Search Committees & Procedures.** The Department will conduct individual non-tenure-track faculty searches using the same procedures as those described above for tenure-system faculty searches with these exceptions:

   5.1. *Committee Composition.* The composition of the committee for non-tenure-track faculty can be tenured, tenure track and full-time lecturers.

   5.2. *Purview of Search Committees in NTT Searches.* The purview of the search committee in NTT faculty searches is the same as that for tenure-system faculty searches except that in lieu of convening to deliberate on the finalists, the committee may solicit feedback from all of the Department's Faculty after the last campus interview. The committee will write a recommendation that reflects the Faculty's feedback, the committee's ranking of the acceptable finalists, and the committee's rationale for that ranking.

   5.3. *NTT Searches Extending into the Summer.* Due to budget constraints, late notices of personnel changes, and other unforeseeable circumstances, it may be necessary to conduct NTT searches late in the academic year well into the summer. In such cases the search committee will inform by email the full Faculty of the search, provide the list of identified finalists, and solicit feedback from the faculty. Recognizing the urgency of the search the period to receive Faculty feedback may be extremely short. Prior to engaging in such a search, Article 21.3 of the CBA will be initiated if applicable.

   5.4. *Urgent NTT Appointments to be Filled by Waiver of Search.* In instances of urgent Departmental need to fill a temporary NTT position, when normal search committee processes are not feasible due to the lack of time, and when a waiver of search can be justified and anticipated, the Department Chair will appoint a committee per section 5.1 to identify one or more qualified candidates for the position. The committee will inform the full Faculty of the search, provide the Faculty with the list of the identified candidate(s), and solicit feedback from the Faculty, recognizing that the urgency of the search may require an extremely short feedback period. The committee will prepare its recommendation, sending it to the PSc for review. Should the PSc endorse an appointment, its recommendation will be forwarded to the Department Chair for execution; if not, the committee will be directed to seek additional candidates.

6. **Representation by Faculty on College and University-Level Committees.** Faculty may volunteer for or may agree to be appointed by the Chair/Head to service on college- and university-level committees and in similar roles. Service on the following committees, however, is by selection as described below:

   6.1. *College Personnel Committee (CPC).* Pursuant to Article 12.5 of the CBA, the College of Humanities and Fine Arts sends out an email asking for volunteers to serve on the CPC. The Dean then selects the members from this pool of volunteers. This is a two-year term appointment.

   6.2. *College Review Committee (CRC).* The CRC reviews the promotion applications of Lecturers and Senior Lecturers and is elected at large across the College by Faculty with any form of the title Lecturer. The Department's Faculty with any form of the title Lecturer will annually nominate from among themselves one person to stand for election to the CRC.

6.3. ***Department Representative to the MSP***. Department representative to the MSP shall be elected on an annual basis at the same Faculty meeting at which the DPC is elected. All MSP bargaining-unit members are entitled to vote in this election.

7. **Department Meetings**.

7.1. *Frequency*. The Chair will schedule and convene five general meetings of the Faculty each semester; such meetings may be cancelled if there is no business to be conducted. The Chair may call and convene additional special meetings as necessary to address urgent business of the Department. The Union may request an opportunity to appear on the agenda of any regularly or specially scheduled department meeting; such requests shall be granted at least once per semester provided that the requests are made at least ten (10) working days in advance of said meeting.

7.2. *Faculty Duty of Participation*. All Faculty of the Department are expected to attend all general and special faculty meetings unless university-related duties or events conflict with faculty meetings.

7.3. *Meeting Agendas*. The Chair will publish the agenda for each regular Department meeting at least 48 hours prior to the meeting if a vote is pending or 24 hours in advance of a meeting where no vote is anticipated. The Chair will publish the agenda for any special meeting at the time of the meeting's announcement. The Chair will include any agenda items requested by at least 20% of the Faculty if the request is received in advance of the relevant agenda timeline.

7.4. ***Rules of Order***. The Department will follow Roberts' Rules of Order in conducting meetings of the Faculty. The Chair will name a parliamentarian from among the faculty as needed.

7.5. *Quorum*. The Department may meet and act on the business of the Department with a quorum consisting of at least half of the Faculty.

7.6. *Voting*. On matters requiring a vote of the Faculty, voting will take place at the meeting. Voice votes on any matter are acceptable unless any individual member of the Faculty requests otherwise, in which case the vote must occur by secret written ballot. Except as otherwise specified in these bylaws, a simple majority vote will suffice to carry a motion. The Chair may propose allowing absentee votes on a case-by-case basis and so indicate on the distributed agenda. The faculty present at the meeting will then vote on whether to accept absentee ballots on the agenda item prior to any discussion of that item. Absentee votes may be given to the Chair in writing or by email at least four hours prior to the meeting. Any such votes will apply only to the motion(s) as described in the agenda; should discussion at the meeting substantively amend the motion, the absentee ballots cannot be accepted.

7.7. *Minutes and Recordkeeping*. The Department's administrative assistant will attend all meetings of the Faculty to take minutes which will be circulated to the Faculty prior to the next meeting whereat the minutes will be reviewed and accepted or corrected. The Department will maintain records of all meetings, including minutes and votes, for at least five years.

8. **Department Specifications for Reappointment, Promotion, and Tenure (RPT).** All standards and most procedures related to reappointment, promotion, and tenure of Faculty are governed by the CBA and the Red Book. The following additional terms do not alter or interpret those standards and procedures but instead set department-level specifications where the CBA and Red Book permit local control.

    8.1. *External Reviews of RPT Cases*. In general, external reviewers are expected to address only the candidate's research/creative activity except professional service to the candidate's discipline may be included. Detailed criteria and other considerations for the evaluation of research/creative activity are included in Appendix A.

        8.1.1. *Personnel Actions Requiring External Reviews*. All promotion and all tenure cases for tenure-system faculty require external reviews (as specified in the Red Book and CBA). Reappointments of tenure-system faculty during their probationary periods do not require external reviews. Neither reappointments nor promotions for non-tenure-system faculty require external reviews; however, as permitted by the CBA's Article 21, Lecturers may request external reviews for promotions to Senior Lecturer.

        8.1.2. *Number of External Reviews.* The Department Chair will make a good-faith effort to secure at least six "arm's-length" external reviews for each tenure case and each promotion case that requires external reviews. The Chair may solicit and add to the file any number of reviews from reviewers "close" to the candidate. Such close reviews are especially helpful in cases where the reviewer can describe the candidate's particular contributions to collaborative work. The candidate must identify to the Chair any relationships with external reviewers that might conflict with the "arm's-length" designation. (Reviewers/scholars are "arm's length" from the candidate when they have not been thesis or post-doctoral advisors, recent collaborators, or personal friend).

        8.1.3. *Identification and Solicitation of External Reviewers.* The CBA charges the Chair with soliciting external reviewers and permits the candidate to suggest external reviewers, some or all of whom shall be solicited by the Chair. The Chair may consult with the DPC or other members of the Faculty in identifying appropriate external reviewers but may not delegate the solicitation process to others. Similarly, the Chair may receive assistance in describing the "standing" of each external reviewer in the candidate's file, but the Chair is ultimately responsible for ensuring that that description clearly and completely makes the case for why each external reviewer is well positioned to perform the review; this description should be crafted for academic audiences who are unfamiliar with the pertinent scholarly field. ("standing" shall include a description of the reviewer's current position, previous relevant positions, major accomplishments/awards, participation in or relationship to the candidate's field, etc.) Under most circumstances, the solicitation of external reviews should occur no later than four months before the candidate's file submission deadline.

        8.1.4. *Qualifications of External Reviewers.* In general, external reviewers should be well-recognized scholars or professionals in the candidate's field, should hold the rank of Professor, should have active scholarly programs, and should be at institutions that are at least peers of UMass. External reviewers who do not meet these criteria such as museum or gallery directors, curators, collectors, publishers, etc. who are not at "academic" institutions may be appropriate and acceptable. Furthermore in some Art disciplines it may be appropriate for established Associate Professors to provide reviews in tenure and/or promotion cases of Assistant

Professors. However, in describing the "standing" of such reviewers, the Chair should carefully explain why such reviewers are appropriate for the task of commenting on the candidate's having met the relevant standards.

8.1.5. _Candidate's Rights Regarding External Reviewers._ Before making such solicitations, the Chair must show the solicitation list and solicitation message to the candidate, who may comment on the list and/or message. The candidate may request removal of one or more reviewer and may request changes to the message; the Chair should consider such requests and the reasoning behind them but is not required to comply with them. The list should include some of the external reviewers suggested by the candidate. The candidate must also identify any possible conflicts of interest with any of the proposed reviewers; if so the Chair should assess whether a true conflict exists and, if one does, should eliminate, mitigate, or manage the conflict.

8.2. *Internal Reviews of RPT Cases.*

8.2.1. *Identification & Solicitation of UMass Faculty & Staff Reviews*. The candidate and the Chair may identify potential reviewers internal to UMass Amherst. Such internal reviews are not required and should not be regarded as substitutes for external letters. Internal letters may be especially helpful in cases where the reviewer can describe the candidate's particular contributions to collaborations within the department or across campus. The Chair must individually solicit such internal reviews for them to be subject to the waiver of access.

8.2.2. *Identification and Solicitation of Student Reviews*. The Department does not currently solicit student reviews. Should the review of the process described in Section 8.5 introduce student reviews, the following language will apply: The Chair may solicit confidential written and signed comments from individual students. Such comments from individual students—especially from those for whom the candidate has served as an advisor, mentor, or collaborator—are especially helpful in identifying the candidate's work outside the classroom. Such reviews should be individually solicited. The Chair may also solicit comments from groups of students; responses to such non-individual solicitations are never protected by the candidate's waiver of access rights, and any "group solicitations" should advise potential respondents that their responses will not be confidential.

8.3. *Waiver of Rights of Access to Review Letters*. A candidate for RPT may waive or decline to waive her/his rights of access to internal and external review letters that have been individually solicited. The decision whether or not to waive those rights belongs exclusively to the candidate, and neither the Chair nor any other member of the Faculty should pressure the candidate to decide one way or another.

8.4. *Participation of Faculty in RPT Cases*. Section 2 above describes the permissible participation of the Faculty beyond the PSc in the consideration of RPT cases.

8.5. *Evaluation for Teaching Effectiveness for RPT*. The CBA's Article 33 requires that every department develop or adopt one or several modes appropriate to the evaluation of teaching in that unit and procedures for the administration of student evaluations of teaching. Recognizing that the University is in the process of reviewing approaches to the evaluation of teaching effectiveness and in the belief that the means for evaluation of the Department's teaching effectiveness may be fairly discipline dependent, the

Department will form an Ad Hoc Faculty committee in consultation with the Chair as described in Section 12 below to review and possibly revise section 8.5 with a vote on any recommendations from this committee to take place by April 1, 2018. In the interim, in order to be in compliance with the requirement of Article 33, the Department temporarily adopts the following

8.5.1. *Student Evaluations of Teaching Effectiveness in Classroom Settings*. All Faculty should use the centrally administered SRTI instrument to solicit and receive student evaluations in every course section taught. Faculty may not themselves administer or collect student evaluations. Individual Faculty may supplement but may not replace the SRTI instrument with other another instrument(s).

8.5.2. *Student Evaluations of Teaching Effectiveness Outside Classroom Settings.* Language to be determined once process is developed.

8.5.3. *Peer & Expert Evaluations of Teaching Effectiveness.* Untenured Faculty in their probationary period and NTT Faculty intending to seek promotion should seek consultation and formative evaluations of their teaching effectiveness from the Institute for Teaching Effectiveness & Faculty Development. Such Faculty plus tenured Faculty expecting to apply for promotion within a year or two are encouraged to solicit evaluations through direct observation of their teaching from peers inside or outside the Department. While peer and expert evaluations are not required of any Faculty member, they help provide valuable evidence in making a case for reappointment, promotion, and/or tenure.

8.5.4. *Contributions to Program & Curriculum Development.* Applications for RPT should include evidence of the candidate's contributions to program and curriculum development (if any).

8.5.5. *Additional materials from Annual Faculty Reports.* Any remaining additional materials related to teaching effectiveness that have been in the candidate's AFRs should be considered in the overall evaluation by the DPC and Chair and, as appropriate, mentioned in the DPC and Chair's recommendations. The Department gives special weight to advances in student creative work, to augment SRTI's documentation of student work and accompanying analysis.

8.6. *Evidence of Effective Service for RPT*. Applications for RPT should include evidence of the candidate's contributions to service. The CBA and Red Book require that all tenure-system Faculty engage in service. NTT faculty are required to engage in service only if it is part of their assigned duties. The CBA requires that service to the faculty union and service outside the Department be considered at the department level as part of any Faculty member's AFR or evaluation for RPT purposes. In general, the consideration of service should be inclusive, acknowledging the contributions that candidates make both inside and outside the Department and inside and outside the university. The extent to which service outside the university is relevant to a case for RPT depends on the pertinence of that service to the individual's professional profile or to advancement of the university's mission. Service may include that provided in governance or management of the Department, the College, the University, or the profession; that representing outreach to extend knowledge beyond the university/professional community; and that intended to promote community engagement as a benefit both to the university community and to the off-campus community. Especially noteworthy is evidence of leadership in making service contributions as should be identified in the DPC's annual review of AFRs (see Section 9).

9. **Annual Faculty Review and Evaluation**. The CBA's Article 33 requires annual review of every member of the faculty; Article 33 also requires use of the bargained AFR form by every member of the Faculty who is 50% FTE or greater. The Department will also use the AFR form for those Faculty at less than 50% FTE. Faculty who fail to timely submit an AFR will not be eligible for merit for the year of the AFR.

   9.1. *Evaluation Process*. The PSc and the Chair should substantively and candidly conduct their evaluations of each Faculty member's AFR

   9.2. *Evaluation Materials*. In general, the evaluation criteria for the AFR are similar to those described for RPT in Section 8 including the research/creative activity considerations presented in Appendix A. However, in order to aid the efficiency and effectiveness of the DPC's evaluations, Faculty are encouraged to include, but are not limited to, the following materials:

      9.2.1. *Research, Creative and Professional Activity*. Solo and group exhibitions with titles, dates, venues, type (invited, juried, competitive, contributed, etc.); conference presentations with titles, dates, venues, type (invited, competitive, contributed, etc.); invited talks at universities and other schools, museums, galleries, etc. with titles, venues, and dates; publications printed and/or online with titles, references, type (invited, contributed, competitive, etc.); published reviews and other publications about the faculty member's work with references; grants and fellowships both applied for and received with dates, funding amounts, etc.; residencies both applied for and received with titles, dates, any related funding, etc.; collaborative work with description and names of collaborators; performances with titles, dates, venues, type (invited, juried, competitive, contributed, etc.); media artworks screened and/or presented online with titles, dates, venues, type (invited, juried, competitive, contributed, etc.); awards both applied for and received with dates, funding amounts, etc.

      9.2.2. *Teaching.* (Note possible future changes to teaching evaluation techniques as discussed in Section 8.5). (Much of this material will be available through the Department office.) SRTI and/or other student feedback; number of students in and the credit hours for each course (the product of which yields the overall student credit hours taught); type of course (general education, major undergraduate, graduate, etc.); documentation and analysis of student work; any new (for the faculty member or the department) courses taught; major course redesigns; chair of or membership on BFA and MFA committees with student names and status; contributions to MFA mid-term and final reviews and outside student events.

      9.2.3. *Service*. Department committee (e.g., DPC, Curriculum committee, Visiting Artist committee, etc.) participation; other departmental service roles (e.g., Undergraduate Program Director, Graduate Program Director, Foundations Director, etc.); College committee (e.g., CPC) participation; Faculty Senate, MSP, and other University-level committees; external professional service; service to the community (as described in Section 8.6); etc. All campus committee participation should include role (chair, member), brief description of key activities of committee, time spent (e.g., number and duration of committee meetings and amount of committee "homework"), etc.

10. **Review of the Department Chair.** If the Chair wishes to be reappointed to another term in that position, the Department's Faculty, led by the DPC, will conduct a review of the Chair during the fall semester of the final year of her/his appointment. The DPC will follow the

procedures prescribed by Senate Document #82-021, beginning the process no later than October 15 during the final year of the Chair's appointment.

10.1. *Self-Evaluation*. As an initial step, the Chair will prepare a written self-evaluation of her/his administrative achievements during the current appointment and will provide that document to the Faculty no later than October 15th. The Chair may elect to provide full copies or selected items from her/his AFR's with the self-evaluation.

10.2. *Survey*. The DPC will prepare and distribute four confidential surveys no later than November 1st: (1) one to departmental staff; (2) one to all undergraduate majors and all graduate students; (3) one to Heads/Chairs of Departments within the College and to those outside of the Department who have interacted with the Chair; and (4) one to the Department's Faculty. Each survey will include specific questions regarding overall performance, both administrative, interpersonal, and management of departmental interactions. These surveys will provide space for extended comments. Raw data and summaries of responses to these surveys will be reviewed by the DPC, will be redacted to protect the identities of all respondents, and will be included with the DPC's report to the dean but will not be available to faculty, staff, or students.

10.3. *Meetings with Constituencies*. The DPC will solicit from staff and students confidential assessments of the Chair's performance. The DPC will offer to meet with employee and student groups to further receive such assessments. Summaries of information gathered will be included with the DPC's report to the Dean but will not be available to faculty, staff, or students.

10.4. *Meeting with the Chair*. After most data collection is complete, the DPC will invite the Chair to meet to discuss the initial findings of the data collection process. The Chair may decline to meet.

10.5. *Draft Report*. No later than December 1st, the DPC will complete and distribute to the Faculty a draft report (excluding raw or other data that could compromise the confidentiality of those contributing to this process), including a summary of findings, an assessment of areas of success and of needed improvement, and a non-binding recommendation regarding whether the Chair/Head should be reappointed. The report should assiduously limit its assessment to areas within the purview and control of the Chair.

10.6. *Concluding Meeting of the Faculty*. Before the end of fall semester, the DPC will convene the Faculty to discuss the draft report and to receive recommendations for revision of the document.

10.7. *Final Report*. The DPC will finalize its report and will then submit it to the Dean, simultaneously providing a copy to the Chair (excluding raw and other confidential data). The Dean may ask to meet with the DPC to discuss the report, but neither the DPC nor the Dean is obliged to meet.

10.8. *Chair's Response*. The Chair may prepare and submit to the Dean a written response to the final report.

11. **Implementation of these bylaws**: By at least a two-thirds' majority vote of the Faculty, these bylaws are adopted and take effect on March 31, 2017. The terms of these bylaws

supersede existing policies or practices of the Department to the extent that they address or conflict the matters addressed by such policies and practices. However, if ongoing processes would be unreasonably disrupted by implementation of these bylaws, individual provisions of these bylaws may be deferred until those processes are complete, provided that such deferral lasts no longer than one year beyond the effective date cited in this paragraph. Deferral of individual provisions will not result in deferral of other provisions.

12. **Amendment of these bylaws**: By majority vote, the Faculty may elect an ad hoc committee to review and propose amendments to these bylaws. Adoption of any such amendments, including their dates of effectiveness, requires a two-thirds' vote of the Faculty.

Appendix A. Criteria and other considerations for evaluating research/creative activity for the Department of Art.

For tenure and promotion cases, a faculty member is expected to have demonstrated professional distinction in scholarly research and to show evidence of continued academic distinction. In the Department of Art, scholarly research includes art practice and scholarship.

A "distinguished" record is prominent and conspicuous by its excellence. To achieve this, a candidate must have produced a body of research or artistic achievement that is openly available, scholarly, creative, and of high quality and significance, and must be recognized and visible within his or her domain of research or artistic practice. Research is not limited to traditional publication but also encompasses activities that lead to the public availability of products, practices, technologies, and ideas that have significance to society. Quality of research or artistic achievement is more important than quantity, but documented productivity must precede other qualitative considerations.

Evidence of excellence in research and/or artistic practice is provided by the candidate's research, performance, and/or publication record. This record is assessed both internally, by the department and the college, and externally, by recognized experts from outside the University, to determine whether it is openly available, scholarly, creative, and of high quality and significance. The evaluation is based on the visibility, productivity, scope, depth, and quality of the candidate's research. The following points guide the assessment of the candidate's record:

1. "Openly available" research or artistic practice implies distribution, which includes traditional and electronic publication as well as other media such as audio and video recording, or publicly available live performance or exhibition.
2. Scholarly publication can take many forms; among these are original research articles and books, book chapters, critical and theoretical writing within the arts, edited collections and anthologies, critical editions, translations, reviews, integrative text books that advance the discipline, and published lectures.
3. Artistic practice also takes many forms; among these are various forms of material and conceptual artistic production, curatorial practice, development of technology, interdisciplinary or collaborative artistic practice, socially engaged

artistic practice/projects, one-person or collaborative/group exhibitions, one-person or ensemble live performance, and production of artist books, audio or video recordings.

4. The Department of Art expects to see growth in creative work over a period of time, with the record documenting an evolution of ideas and artistic development.

5. For academic scholarly written work peer-reviewed publications or works printed by publishers known for their careful review of manuscripts or articles issued in refereed journals will be given more weight than other publications. Publications by eminent presses and those appearing in journals, series, or volumes that have stringent peer review and major disciplinary significance generally receive the most weight.

6. Artistic performance, exhibition, recording, or broadcast at venues, studios, labels and networks with national or international stature generally receive more weight than those at venues with regional or local stature.

7. A written work is considered to be published when it satisfies two standards: it is under contract, and in production. The candidate is asked to produce the actual contract or another form of evidence showing the work has been accepted for publication. A book, journal article, or book chapter will be considered in production when a letter from the director or editor is sent and states that the work: a) has gone through all rounds of reviews; b) all corrections/revisions have been completed; c) the fully completed/revised manuscript is in the hands of the press or journal; d) the press or journal has put it on a production schedule. An artistic production may be considered complete after its first public performance or exhibition.

8. Work under review may be considered; this category receives less weight than published or completed work.

9. Translations, reprints, and citations or reviews of a candidate's work may provide evidence of the visibility, importance, or influence of the work.

10. For all multi-authored or collaborative works, the file must specifically describe the candidate's contribution. It is understood that in some areas of the discipline, multi-authored works are common.

11. While quality is more important than quantity, the candidate must present a substantial body of achievement. At least one public exhibition or performance should have taken place in a major cultural center for art or in a significant national or international venue or publication suitable to presenting the candidate's medium.

Evidence of visibility is chiefly provided through the following (unordered):

1. National or international awards and honors.
2. Presentations at scholarly conferences or major performance or exhibition venues (especially refereed or invited presentations).
3. Service as editor of national or international professional journal.
4. Organization of scholarly conferences or artist's symposia/workshops.

5. Active participation on editorial boards or on national boards of arts organizations.
6. The individual's success in attracting external and internal grants and fellowships.
7. Invited scholarly/artistic presentations.

Evidence of promise of a strong future record is shown through the following:

1. Development of an independent body of significant work beyond the final degree.
2. Sustained and continuous growth in significant research/artistic practice and creative work.