

**Department of Visual and Performing Arts
Art History**

**College of Letters, Arts and Sciences
University of Colorado Colorado Springs**

**Criteria, Standards and Evidence for Reappointment,
Promotion and Tenure**

July 1, 2020

CRITERIA FOR REAPPOINTMENT AND TENURE ART HISTORY FACULTY DEPARTMENT OF VISUAL AND PERFORMING ARTS

INTRODUCTION:

Standards and processes for reappointment, promotion and tenure of faculty are governed by Article V and Appendix A of the Laws of the Regents. These are further delineated in a series of CU Administrative Policy Statements. Campus guidance is supplied in UCCS Policy # 200-001. These documents require the establishment of departmental criteria which are to be used throughout the review process.

These criteria are to be considered guidelines for the general review of candidates toward reappointment, promotion and tenure in the Department of Visual and Performing Arts at the University of Colorado at Colorado Springs. The criteria are based on appropriate and current standards of professional performance in our discipline. Each candidate's case will be reviewed and judged on its individual merits and circumstances. The department is committed to quality teaching, strong research/creative work, and effective service to the university, the profession, and the community. The evaluation process assumes: possession of an appropriate terminal degree; competent education and training in the discipline(s); conduct which reflects the professional and academic standards for generating, validating, disputing, and transmitting knowledge; and an appreciation of and respect for the rights, duties, and privileges associated with academic freedom and collegial responsibilities. We do not use a Faculty Responsibility Statement in our reappointment, promotion and tenure process. As permitted in APS 1022, the faculty of Art History have voted not to have a vote of the primary unit faculty as a step in the reappointment, promotion, and tenure process. Art history faculty too small for this action to be significant.

In the assessment of research and creative work, the department places greater weight on items which have undergone some form of peer review than those that have not. In cases where an item does not normally undergo peer-review (for instance, essays in exhibition catalogs), such material may be submitted to outside readers for evaluation. Our department encourages collaborative research and so co-authored papers may be considered as equivalent to sole-authored papers if the candidate provides clear evidence of a significant contribution by the candidate to the paper.

When these criteria are applied to faculty who were granted time toward tenure, the work performed during the years granted toward tenure shall be considered equivalent to work performed at UCCS. While a faculty member's career record will be considered in personnel actions described here, the main emphasis of evaluation will be on work performed at UCCS and, in particular, progress since the last review.

These criteria can be amended by majority vote of the department subject to approval by the Dean of the College of Letters, Arts, and Sciences and the Executive Vice-Chancellor for Academic Affairs.

INITIAL REAPPOINTMENT REVIEW:

The candidate's total record, including teaching, research and service, shall be evaluated. No specific rating in each area is required, but the record must show sufficient potential of future

success to justify reappointment. The review may also take into account issues of material bearing such as strategic goals of the department, college and campus.

The candidate must demonstrate sufficient progress toward tenure to justify reappointment. The candidate's record of teaching, research, and service are evaluated separately, indicating whether the candidate is "on track for tenure" and meritorious or excellent in teaching, scholarly/creative work, and leadership and service; "not yet on track for tenure but could meet standards for tenure with appropriate corrections"; or, "not on track for tenure."

TEACHING: The candidate's teaching shall be evaluated by multiple means which will include, but are not limited to, course evaluations (Faculty Course Questionnaires) and two other means of evaluation. (Please see appendix for more information on FCQs and student evaluations).

Examples of other means of evaluation are provided in the appendix to this document. In addition to classroom teaching, the candidate's work with students outside of the classroom as a mentor, research advisor, independent study director, intern supervisor and similar activities shall be considered here. The candidate is expected to show potential for continued development as a teacher. Candidates should demonstrate that their courses are coherently organized and thoughtfully presented. Furthermore, candidates will be expected to demonstrate a commitment to teaching, evidence of which will be good interaction with students, concern with curriculum, and satisfactory development of skills in presenting material. Improvement and innovations in teaching methods and in curriculum development and contribution to the department will be taken into consideration.

RESEARCH: The candidate is expected to present evidence of progress toward the establishment of a scholarly publication record (for a definition of "scholarly" as it pertains to research see the criteria below). Evidence includes published articles or books, acceptance of manuscripts by refereed journals or academic presses, manuscripts under review or revision by refereed journals or academic presses, essays in exhibition catalogs, essays in edited books, scholarly writing in progress, reviews of exhibitions or scholarly books, presentations at scholarly conferences, invited lectures on the candidate's research, the organization or moderation of panels at scholarly conferences, the editing of anthologies or special issues of scholarly journals, submission of grant proposals for research funding, and the award of post-doctoral fellowships and other research grants. In cases where a publication does not undergo traditional peer-review (for instance, essays in exhibition catalogs), such material may be submitted to outside readers for evaluation. The fact that a candidate received a commission to write an essay appearing in an exhibition catalog is, however, already evidence of his or her standing in the field of art history and can be considered a form of peer review if the essay in question is at an intellectual level that cannot be duplicated by others with less expertise.

In the field of art history, curatorial work leading to an exhibition is a form of research that falls somewhere between the categories "Scholarship of Discovery" (traditional research that is shared with others and subject to peer review) and "Scholarship of Application" (a form of

professional practice wherein one's expertise is applied). Although not peer-reviewed in the traditional sense, the fact that a candidate is commissioned to curate an exhibition is already evidence of his or her standing in the field of art history and can be considered a form of peer review as long as the following additional criteria essential to the definition of scholarship are met:

1. The work [or curatorial project] is original and of high quality and intellectual rigor.
2. The work is communicated and disseminated; in the case of a curatorial project it must lead to an actual exhibition at an appropriate, public, venue.
3. The work is evaluated by peers to assure quality and appropriateness; in the case of a curatorial project, the fact that the candidate was commissioned to curate an exhibition is already a sign of his or her stature in the field and can be considered one form of peer review. Reviews of the exhibition or an evaluation by a peer in the field are additional forms of peer review.
4. The work [or curatorial project] must be at an intellectual level that cannot be duplicated by others with less education or expertise.

As in the case of all research that is not peer-reviewed in the traditional sense, it is the obligation of the candidate to explain the impact of such scholarship in terms of its depth, duration, and/or persistence of influence or use, as well as its academic, public and critical recognition and appreciation.

LEADERSHIP AND SERVICE: The department recognizes service to the campus, community and to our profession. At this stage, the candidate is expected to be involved in departmental meetings and activities.

COMPREHENSIVE REAPPOINTMENT REVIEW:

The candidate must demonstrate sufficient progress toward tenure to justify reappointment. The candidate's record of teaching, research, and service are evaluated separately, indicating whether the candidate is "on track for tenure" and meritorious or excellent in teaching, scholarly/creative work, and leadership and service; "not yet on track for tenure but could meet standards for tenure with appropriate corrections"; or, "not on track for tenure."

TEACHING: The candidate will be expected to demonstrate effective teaching evaluated by multiple means which will include, at a minimum, Faculty Course Questionnaires and two other means of evaluation. Examples of other means of evaluation are provided in the appendix to this document. (Please see appendix for more information on FCQs and student evaluations). This evaluation includes contributions to the breadth, depth, and needs of the department and up- dating curriculum and course materials. In addition to classroom teaching, the candidate's work with students outside of the classroom as a mentor, research advisor, independent study director, intern supervisor and similar activities shall be considered here. A rating of meritorious will require student evaluations which are typically at or above the departmental average and evidence of effective teaching. A rating of excellent will require student evaluations which are typically above the departmental average, evidence of effective teaching, and dedication to student learning. In evaluating teaching, course content, level and size will be considered in interpreting student evaluations.

RESEARCH: The candidate is expected to demonstrate evidence of having established a publication and/or curatorial record. Evidence includes at least three publications in refereed

journals in the field of art history or other discipline of the humanities relevant to art history or the completion of a single-authored book-length study pertaining to the candidate's field of expertise (completed, published manuscript, or a publishing contract with a university press is evidence of this requirement). Evidence can also include curatorial projects, article-length essays in exhibition catalogs, edited books and journals, curatorial projects or other museum-related research-oriented work, essays in edited books that are peer-reviewed, papers delivered at conferences, the organization of panels at conferences, and invited lectures. The award of post-doctoral fellowships and other research grants from outside sources, additional manuscripts under review at refereed journals or scholarly presses in art history or other discipline of the humanities relevant to art history, other scholarly or curatorial work in progress, and submission of grant proposals for outside funding is also relevant. A rating of meritorious requires reasonable progress toward tenure as demonstrated by submission of research proposals, professional presentations, publications, and by letters of evaluation of the candidate's work. A rating of excellent requires at least three publications such as refereed journal articles, refereed book chapters, or essays in exhibition catalogs. Receipt of peer-reviewed grants or contracts may be substituted for publications. Exceptional quality of scholarly work may be considered to raise an evaluation in cases where the quantity specified has not been met.

LEADERSHIP AND SERVICE: The department recognizes service to the campus, community and to our profession. A rating of meritorious requires meeting service responsibilities within the department and some service to the college, campus, community or profession. A rating of excellent requires meeting service responsibilities within the department and multiple service contributions to the college, campus, community, or profession. In evaluating service, the quality, time commitment, and quantity of service contributions will be considered.

PROMOTION TO ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR AND/OR AWARDING OF TENURE:

The candidate's record in teaching, research, and service will each be evaluated separately as "below expectations," "meritorious," or "excellent." The candidate must be rated as, at least, meritorious in all three areas and must receive a rating of excellent in either teaching or research. The department will solicit letters from respected scholars in the candidate's field(s) of research, per campus policy.

TEACHING: The candidate will be expected to demonstrate effective teaching evaluated by multiple means which will include, at a minimum, Faculty Course Questionnaires and two other means of evaluation. Examples of other means of evaluation are provided in the appendix to this document. (Please see appendix for more information on FCQs and student evaluations). This evaluation includes contributions to the breadth, depth, and needs of the department and up-dating curriculum and course materials. In addition to classroom teaching, the candidate's work with students outside of the classroom as a mentor, research advisor, independent study director, intern supervisor and similar activities shall be considered here. A rating of meritorious will require student evaluations which are typically at or above the departmental average and evidence of effective teaching. A rating of excellent will require student evaluations which are typically above the departmental average, evidence of effective teaching, and dedication to student learning. In evaluating teaching, course content, level and size will be considered in interpreting student evaluations. A recommendation for tenure based on excellence in teaching shall include multiple measures of teaching evaluation and demonstrated achievement at the campus, local, national, and/or international level which furthers the

practice and/or scholarship of teaching and learning beyond one's immediate instructional setting. In the Department of Visual and Performing Arts, we identify the immediate instructional setting as the place where regular assigned teaching occurs. Thus, any teaching impact at the departmental, campus, or community level demonstrates impacts of teaching and learning beyond the candidate's immediate instructional setting (for more examples of what counts towards demonstrated teaching beyond one's instructional setting, please see the appendix.)

RESEARCH: It is expected that the candidate will have attained national recognition with his or her research and/or curatorial contributions to the field. A rating of meritorious requires at least four peer-reviewed publications which make an original scholarly contribution published or accepted in final form. These may include refereed journal articles, refereed book chapters, or essays in exhibition catalogs. A rating of excellent requires at least five peer-reviewed publications or a book either of which make an original scholarly contribution published or accepted in final form. Exceptional quality of scholarly work may be considered to raise an evaluation in cases where the quantity specified has not been met. Presentations at professional meetings and non-refereed publications may be considered as secondary evidence of ongoing research activity.

LEADERSHIP AND SERVICE: The department recognizes service to the campus, community and to our profession. A rating of meritorious requires meeting service responsibilities within the department and service to the college, campus, community or profession. A rating of excellent requires meeting service responsibilities within the department and multiple service contributions to the college, campus, community, or profession. In evaluating service, the quality, time commitment, and quantity of service contributions will be considered.

PROMOTION TO FULL PROFESSOR

The candidate's record in teaching, research, and service will be evaluated as a whole as below expectations, meritorious, or excellent. Promotion requires "a record that, taken as a whole, is judged to be excellent; a record of significant contribution to both graduate and undergraduate education, unless individual or departmental circumstances require a stronger emphasis or singular focus on one or the other; and a record, since receiving tenure and promotion to associate professor, that indicates substantial, significant, and continued growth, development, and accomplishment in teaching and working with students, research, scholarship or creative work, and service." The department will solicit letters from respected scholars in the candidate's field(s) of research, per campus policy.

TEACHING: The candidate will be expected to demonstrate effective teaching evaluated by multiple means which will include, at a minimum, Faculty Course Questionnaires and two other means of evaluation. Examples of other means of evaluation are provided in the appendix to this document. (Please see appendix for more information on FCQs and student evaluations). This evaluation includes contributions to the breadth, depth, and needs of the department and up-dating curriculum and course materials. In addition to classroom teaching, the candidate's work with students outside of the classroom as a mentor, research advisor, independent study director, intern supervisor and similar activities shall be considered here. In evaluating teaching, course content, level and size will be considered in interpreting student evaluations. Substantial, significant and continued growth, development, and accomplishment as a teacher since tenure must be demonstrated through development of new and revised curriculum, new pedagogical techniques, participation in professional development, work with

students outside the classroom and other areas of teaching such as those in the appendix.

RESEARCH: The department recognizes that scholarship can take many forms. Our department emphasizes fundamental discovery, scholarly work which integrates existing knowledge. We recognize scholarly study of teaching and learning issues in our field as a form of research.

Substantial, significant and continued growth, development, and accomplishment as a researcher since tenure must be demonstrated through refereed publications, peer-reviewed grants and other areas of research such as those in the appendix. Exceptional quality of scholarly work may be considered to raise an evaluation in cases where the quantity is less. Presentations at professional meetings and non-refereed publications may be considered as secondary evidence of ongoing research activity.

LEADERSHIP AND SERVICE: The department recognizes service to the campus, community and to our profession. In evaluating service, the quality, time commitment, and quantity of service contributions will be considered. Substantial, significant and continued growth, development, and accomplishment in service since tenure must be demonstrated through a discussion of service progress in the department, college, campus, university, community and in our profession. We recognize that different faculty at this level will fulfill this requirement very differently. The appendix lists some issues that may be considered.

POST-TENURE REVIEW:

Recognizing the many different ways in which post-tenure faculty contribute to the University, we define “meeting expectations” for purposes of post-tenure review as consisting of three elements, each of which must be met: 1) having achieved a rating of “meeting expectations” or higher on each of the annual merit reviews included in the time period under review, 2) having met the goals of the faculty member’s current professional plan, and 3) having submitted an acceptable professional plan which indicates an ability to achieve “meeting expectations” or higher ratings in the future. If a faculty member is deficient in meeting this standard, the committee shall consider the total record of the faculty member during the review period to determine whether strengths in some time periods or some activities compensate for the deficiency such that a rating of “meeting expectations” is still appropriate. Ratings of “exceeding expectations” or “outstanding” will be awarded for exceeding these standards.

APPENDIX:

Examples of Appropriate Criteria for Faculty Evaluation

Note on teaching evaluations (FCQs):

There is widespread evidence of bias in student evaluation of teaching. In an early article to systematically evaluate some of these biases, Centra and Gaubatz (2000) note a number of possible conditions that effect student scores in standard evaluation surveys. Class size, for instance, is one source of potential bias, in which classes of under 15 students tend to get higher evaluations. Centra and Gaubatz suggest, however, that this statistical tendency is probably a result of how students in smaller classes do, in fact, learn more than those in larger classes due to increased instructor attention. More significantly, Centra and Gaubatz note that the intersection of student and instructor gender has a potential to bias student evaluations, though many of their findings were—as was the case in the years prior to their study—somewhat inconclusive. But we cannot make the same claim today. In the years since Centra and Gaubatz’s article, subsequent studies have found that male students discriminate in favor of male instructors, students rate professors according to gender stereotypes, and that there is no evidence that male professors are better instructors (Boring, 2017). In a co-authored study, Anne Boring and her colleagues found that student evaluations do not measure teaching effectiveness, and that they could even be argued to measure gender biases—and it is not possible to adjust for gender bias in student evaluations (Boring, Ottoboni, and Stark, 2016). Mitchell and Martin (2018) found, through a content analysis of qualitative comments in evaluations, that the language students use to evaluate male professors is significantly different than the language they use to evaluate female professors. Other studies have found that similar questions of bias can be found to discriminate against women and teachers whose first language is not English (Fan et al., 2019), and additionally are biased against persons of color (Chávez and Mitchell, 2020).ⁱ

That being said, metrics of student evaluation of teaching, such as the FCQ scores, should be taken with a grain of salt. While they provide a baseline across the department and university, and thus can be used in a comparative way to make loose judgements, they in no way should be considered as the sole or even primary method to evaluate teaching ability or effectiveness, especially when it comes to professors and instructors who, as evidence indicates, would be privileged by these metrics.

A. TEACHING

- Student Evaluation of Teaching
- Teaching Awards and Other Outstanding Accomplishments in Instruction
- Peer Evaluation of Teaching
- Alumni Evaluation
- Student Advising
- Innovations in Teaching
- Creativity in Teaching
- Participation in Teaching-Related Subject Activities
- Effectiveness of Students in Succeeding Courses and/or in the Pursuit of Graduate Education and/or in Careers
- Student Supervision in Professional Experience Activities, Internships, and/or Independent Studies
- Evaluation of Student Performance in departmental examinations and assessments

- Preparation of Course Material
- Student Development/Encouragement (Centers of Excellence, Library Knowledge, Learning Disability Recognition, Encouragement of Students)
- Course Organization
- Contributions to the VAPA curriculum
- Contributions to the interdisciplinary teaching mission of VAPA
- Creation of on-campus teaching/learning activities for students through visiting artists
- New course development
- Teaching improvement activity undertaken by faculty (workshops, conferences)
- Evidence of student recruitment
- Teaching contribution at any institution in addition to the University of Colorado
- Contributions of teaching to diversity

B. RESEARCH/CREATIVE WORK

- Peer Reviewed Publications
- Papers Prepared for Professional Conferences
- Recognition by other Scholars of Research and Publications
- Creative Work
- Curatorial Work
- Performances
- Readings
- Un-sponsored Research
- Grants and Contracts (Sponsored Research)
- Professional Reputation (Both Inside and Outside University)
- Evidence of Capacity for Future Achievements
- Participation in Development Workshops
- Participation in Career Development Activity (Workshops, Conference, Summer Schools, etc.)
- Papers Presented at Professional Workshops, Conferences
- Long-Term Research Projects
- Expert and Technical Consultation of Research Projects
- Role Modeling and Mentoring of Research on Any Educational Level
- Risk Factor Involved in the Research Venture
- Cultural and societal impact of research
- Contribution to diversity of research
- Patent submissions
- Inclusion of students in non-refereed publications

C. LEADERSHIP AND SERVICE

- Departmental, College, Campus and University Committees
- Administrative Service (such as program director, chair, center director ...)
- Service to the Profession and Discipline (Local, State, National, International Level)
- Consultation and Public Service
- Role Modeling and Mentoring on Any Educational Level
- Reviewing Research Proposals
- Reviewing Books in Scholarly Journals
- Reviewing Grant Proposals
- Refereeing Manuscripts
- Participation at Professional Conferences, Specifically Organizational Activities (Organizational Activities, Local Planning Committees, Site Visit Details, Activities Involved in Local, Regional and National Meetings, etc.)

- Membership In and/or Office-holding in Professional Associations.
- Service Contribution to Education at Any Level and at Any Institution in Addition to the University of Colorado
- Contribution to diversity through service
- Participation in faculty governance

Examples of Appropriate Criteria for Demonstrated Achievement of Furthering the Practice and/or Scholarship of Teaching and Learning Beyond One’s Immediate Instructional Setting:

- Contributions to interdisciplinary teaching
- Doctoral dissertation and Masters’ thesis supervision and Oral Exam Committees
- Student advising and mentoring
- Innovations in teaching outside the classroom
- Participation in teaching-related subject activities beyond the classroom (e.g., field trips and other offsite activities, service-learning projects, participatory action research, field experience courses, etc.)
- Effectiveness of students in the pursuit of graduate education and/or in careers
- Supervision of students in professional experience activities, internships, and/or independent studies. This includes, but is not limited to, bringing students to conferences, teaching them peer review skills, and others at both the undergraduate and graduate levels.
- Evaluation of student performance in departmental examinations and assessments, including portfolio review and capstone projects and others.
- Preparation of teaching workshop material
- Facilitating or teaching a workshop, webinar, seminar, etc. related to teaching techniques
- Participating in teaching improvement activity (e.g., workshops, conferences, seminars, webinars, observations of peers’ classroom techniques, etc.)
- Role modeling and mentoring based on teaching experience on any educational level, including, but not limited to, providing peer teaching evaluations, working with teaching assistants, opening up one’s classroom for observation of teaching techniques, providing pedagogical materials such as syllabi and activities to peers, etc.
- Teaching contribution at any institution in addition to the University of Colorado Colorado Springs
- Authoring textbooks or other instructional materials for public use
- Positive commentary on blogs and instructional videos on YouTube, invitations to guest lecture in other courses or settings, invitations to participate in documentaries, podcasts, newspaper and radio interviews and other media formats where we teach through scholarship
- Participation in various forms of assessment
- Publications on the scholarship of teaching

This is a list of suggestions and is NEITHER all-inclusive nor a list of requirements. Items are not ranked or grouped in any order of importance.

¹Boring, Anne (2017) “Gender Biases in Student Evaluations of Teaching,” *Journal of Public Economics*, 145, 27-41, DOI: 10.1016/j.jpubeco.2016.11.006

Boring, Anne, Kellie Ottoboni, and Philip B. Stark (2016) “Student Evaluations of Teaching (Mostly) Do Not Measure Teaching Effectiveness,” *ScienceOpen Research*, DOI: 10.14293/S2199-1006.1.SOR-EDU.AETBZC.v1

Centra, John A. and Noreen B. Gaubatz (2000) “Is There Gender Bias in Student Evaluations of Teaching?,” *The Journal of Higher Education*, 71:1, 17-33, DOI: 10.1080/00221546.2000.11780814

Chávez, Kerry and Kristina M. W. Mitchell (2020) “Exploring Bias in Student Evaluations: Gender, Race, and Ethnicity,” *PS: Political Science & Politics* 53:2, 270-274, DOI: 10.1017/S1049096519001744

Fan, Y., L. J. Shepherd, E. Slavich, D. Waters, M. Stone, R. Abel, and E. L. Johnston (2019) “Gender and Cultural Bias in Student Evaluations: Why Representation Matters,” *PLOS One*, DOI: 10.1371/journal.pone.0209749

Mitchell, Kristina M. W. and Jonathan Martin (2018) “Gender Bias in Student Evaluations,” *PS: Political Science & Politics*, 51:3, 648-652, DOI: 10.1017/S104909651800001X

College of Letters, Arts, and Sciences
Department of Visual and Performing Arts-Art History RPT
Criteria
Version History

Version 1:

Approved by Art History faculty, 3/8/2020

Approved by Interim Dean Rex Welshon, 4/25/2020

Approved by Provost Tom Christensen, 6/22/2020

Effective Date, 7/1/2020
