

College of Arts and Architecture
Guidelines for AC 40, Five-year Extended Review of faculty Performance

In compliance with AC 40, the College of Arts and Architecture has devised guidelines for the periodic review of faculty to supplement the annual review.

The Five-Year Extended Review of AC-40 provides for “an in-depth evaluation of a tenured faculty member’s accomplishments, future goals, and progress towards those goals.”

I. Who is subject to review?

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

II. Procedures:

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

The head will give a copy of the Faculty Development Committee (if one is being used at the unit level) evaluation letter and his/her evaluation letter to the faculty member being reviewed. The faculty member may respond in writing to the head if s/he desires.

- c. For faculty with budgeted joint appointments, the home budget head will consult with the head(s) of the other units where the faculty member has a budgeted appointment. For those campus faculty whose assignment is to a campus other than University Park but whose tenure home is University Park, the review will be conducted at the campus location, with input from the appropriate unit head, and the results of the review will be reported to both the dean of the College at University Park and the appropriate tenure officer on their campus.
- d. The unit head will submit to the dean the materials providing the basis for the review, the Faculty Development Committee's letter (if applicable), the head's letter, the faculty members written response, if any. The dean will review the materials and provide a separate written evaluation. The evaluation should indicate agreement or disagreement with the previous levels in the review and any recommendations. The dean will provide the faculty member and unit head with a copy of her/his evaluation.

III. Timetable

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

IV. Materials to be submitted for Five Year Extended Review

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

- 1) Current Curriculum Vitae
- 2) Narrative statement that includes:
 - a. highlights of agreed upon goals and areas of improvement from the most recent extended review and unit head annual reviews covering the period of review ;
 - b. demonstrated accomplishment of those goals or adjustment of them agreed to by the faculty member and unit head;
 - c. a report of accomplishments achieved during any sabbaticals or leaves taken during the period. (This should include reasonable expectations for personal leaves. For example, maternity leave, provides a full semester teaching of teaching release, though service and research expectations continue.)
- 3) Performance documentation with materials since the last extended review, including annual faculty activity reports. Many units prefer to organize this documentation using the University's promotion and tenure dossier format. Others may prefer to organize it around annual faculty activity reports, which may be included here or organizationally, with the annual review letters referred to below. If deemed necessary, appropriate supplemental materials (e.g. teaching/creative research portfolio) may be included to support the demonstration of accomplishments listed on the CV, the narrative statement and/or the activity reports.
 - a. SRTE's for the period covered by the review. The unit head's letter should place these in context of comparable unit averages/median for SRTE's.
 - b. A written report from the unit's peer review committee, if applicable.
 - c. If concerns have been raised in annual reviews, supplemental materials along with peer and/or department head observations documenting improvements and the successful addressing of concerns should be included. For example, demonstration of improved SRTE's, methods of instruction, etc., may be appropriate; if annual evaluation letters have raised concerns about insufficient accomplishments in creative research, supplemental materials may be necessary to demonstrate how concerns have been addressed.

- 4) Copies of the annual review letters by the supervising administrator for the evaluation period. All levels of review should refer to these annual evaluations, noting progress (or lack thereof) on goals of the annual review letters and their connection to the goals and accomplishments of the narrative statement, CV, and additional documentation submitted by the faculty member for the extended review.

Approved by A&A faculty January 21, 2000.

Amended July 31, 2000.

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

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