

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

College of Letters, Arts and Sciences

May 31, 2009

**CRITERIA FOR REAPPOINTMENT AND TENURE
ART HISTORY FACULTY
DEPARTMENT OF VISUAL AND PERFORMING ARTS
Approved by the Provost: June 4, 2009**

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.

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 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.

TEACHING: The candidate's teaching shall be 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. 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.

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 REVIEW:

The candidate's record in teaching, research, and service will each be evaluated separately as "below expectations", "meritorious", or "excellent." The candidate must demonstrate sufficient progress toward tenure to justify reappointment. This will typically be a rating of at least meritorious in all three areas. The review may also take into account issues of material bearing such as strategic goals of the department, college and campus. 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. 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 book-length study pertaining to the candidate's field of expertise (completed 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.

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 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. 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: 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.

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. 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.

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

A. TEACHING

- Student Evaluation of Teaching
- Teaching Awards and Other Outstanding Accomplishments in Instruction
- Peer Evaluation of Teaching
- Alumni Evaluation
- Quality of Doctoral Dissertation and Master's Thesis Supervision and Graduate Committee Contributions
- 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

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
- Unsponsored 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. 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

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.