Faculty members must consult the College of the Arts Promotion and Tenure Manual. In the event of a conflict between the two documents, the college manual takes precedence.

All materials, discussions, conclusions, and letters that are part of the review process will be held in strictest confidence, and no party to the process, other than the candidate, may divulge any information about it to anyone not directly involved.
I. INTRODUCTION

The purpose of the Promotion and Tenure Guidelines of the Ernest G. Welch School of Art & Design is to function as a supplement to the Promotion and Tenure Manual of the College of the Arts. As such, the entries in this document seek to clarify or focus attention on areas of the P&T process that are germane to disciplines within the School.

All P&T documents within the University are reviewed and revised periodically by appropriate governance bodies to ensure that procedures and guidelines are current and clear in terms of language, focus, and content. Input about revisions is solicited from the tenured and tenure-track faculty.

The School endorses the principles of faculty evaluations as required by the Board of Regents of the University System of Georgia and by Georgia State University. The School recognizes evaluations to be a means to assist the individual faculty member in assessing and further developing positive skills in research/creative activity, teaching, and service, both internal and external to the institution.

II. THE PROMOTION AND TENURE PROCESS IN THE SCHOOL

A. Overview of the Promotion and Tenure Process

Recommendations with regard to P&T begin at the School level. Both the School P&T Committee and the Director provide independent evaluations and make independent recommendations about a candidate to the College’s Promotion and Tenure Committee. The College Committee subsequently makes a recommendation to the Dean. The Dean makes a recommendation to the Provost, who makes a recommendation to the President, and the President makes the final decision.

B. Initiating the Process of Promotion and Tenure within the School

No later than the date specified in the college manual, the Director will remind all faculty in the School who are eligible for promotion and/or tenure that they may so apply. All eligible faculty members who wish to be considered for promotion and/or tenure must state their intention in writing no later than the date specified in the college manual. Those who wish to apply must provide the Director with a list of eight potential external reviewers for research/creative activity. The Director will also provide a list of eight potential reviewers. For details on this process, see the College and University manuals. External reviewers should come from peer or aspirational peer institutions in the United States and have no more than an incidental relationship to the candidate. Exceptions should be clearly justified. In cases involving promotion to Associate Professor, reviewers may be either associate or full professors, though the candidate should give first preference to full professors; in case of promotion to Professor, reviewers must be full professors. The Office of the Dean will secure letters from at least five reviewers, with a guiding principle in the solicitation of external reviewers being to select one-half from the candidate’s list and one-half from the Director’s list.
No later than the date specified in the college manual, the candidate must provide the Director with copies of his or her research/creative activity materials to be sent to the outside evaluators. For details on this process and the nature of the materials to be included, see the college manual.

No later than the date specified in the college manual, the candidate must submit his or her dossier to the Director. The material must be in the format required by the college manual.

The Director will add the letters from the external reviewers to the dossier before the dossier is given to the School P&T Committee. The candidate will not be informed of the identities of the external reviewers and will not see the letters themselves during the P&T process. Portions of the external reviewers’ letters may be quoted in the evaluation letters written by the School Committee and the Director as part of the evaluation process, but the identities of the external reviewers must not be explicitly or implicitly revealed.

C. Committee and Subcommittee Membership

For details on the membership and responsibilities of the School Committee, see the college manual. Within the School, a P&T Subcommittee, made up of at least five members, initially reviews and evaluates each candidate’s credentials. This Subcommittee is appointed by the Director at the beginning of each academic year. Full and Associate Professors serve one-year terms of membership on the Subcommittee. Representation on the Subcommittee should include a variety of perspectives from three or more disciplines within the School (i.e., Applied Design, Art Education, Art History, and Studio Arts). The Subcommittee chair is elected annually by the membership of the committee.

In addition to assisting the P&T evaluation process, the Subcommittee also conducts pre-tenure evaluations of all untenured faculty members. The other major function of the Subcommittee is to periodically review and revise the School's P&T guidelines as necessitated by changes voted upon and approved by the appropriate constituent parties.

D. School Evaluation Procedures

P&T reviews are initially conducted by the School’s P&T Subcommittee and submitted to the Committee as a whole. The methods and findings of the Subcommittee and Committee follow the procedures outlined in this document and in the college manual. Reports generated by the School Committee are submitted solely to the Director who in turn transmits the report to the candidate along with his or her own recommendation regarding promotion and/or tenure.

E. Diversity

Within the School there is significant program diversity that must be taken into consideration by the School Subcommittee and Committee as well as by other University review committees or individuals who represent further stages in the evaluation process. While these guidelines recognize and attempt to respond to program diversity within the School, it is noted here that all faculty candidates under consideration for retention, promotion, and/or tenure should clearly articulate any aspects of their respective discipline or area of expertise which are compellingly
distinctive, unique, or considered difficult to ascertain relative to recognized norms. The committee, thus armed with sufficient and appropriate supplemental information, will be able to conduct a fair assessment of the faculty member's research/creative activity, teaching, and service profile.

NOTE: A candidate must remember that it is his or her responsibility to make the case for his or her promotion and/or tenure, and that he or she is his or her own best advocate. It is the candidate’s duty to demonstrate the quality of 1) his or her research/creative activity trajectory that is resulting in or has already resulted in the establishment of his or her scholarly reputation; 2) the quality of his or her teaching; and 3) the quality of his or her service to the School, the College, Georgia State University, and also to the larger local, regional, national, and international community.

III. EVALUATION OF CANDIDATES

A. RESEARCH/CREATIVE ACTIVITY

Evidence of research/creative activities must be submitted in accordance with the categories for research/creative activity listed in the college manual (section V.E.).

1. Standards for Research/Creative Activity in Applied Design

In applied design, faculty may function, with equal importance, as scholars, as practitioners, and/or as artists. The content, meaning, significance, depth, and scholarship of the research/creative activity are highly important aspects of evaluation. The nature and scope of the research/creative activity as well as the standards for which it was produced will be considered. The following considerations are taken into account in evaluating research/creative activity:

a. Research/creative activity in applied design is constantly evolving and may be evident through a variety of roles and functions. This activity generally falls within, but is not limited to, the following categories:

1.) Scholarship can be defined as research or creative activities making original and innovative contributions to the field, which may result in lectures, panel discussions, or published work.
   i. Scholarship on historical periods or their criticisms; methods and techniques in design, application, or construction; policies; regulations; or perspectives are all acceptable.
   ii. Published work may include, but is not limited to, the writing of books, book chapters, journal articles, reviews, reports, catalogs, editorials, and abstracts. Writings about one’s own work, reviews of others’ work, and published reviews of books about applied design are all acceptable

2.) Practice can be defined as creative work or production of client-based projects, realized either in forms such as print, broadcast, film, motion, or web-distributed communications or in the design of buildings, interior environments, furnishings, or products.
   i. If meaningful, the candidate should explain the competitive or selective process by which the design commissions were secured.
ii. Client satisfaction, as a measure of design success, may be evidenced through
post-occupancy project evaluations, client reviews, and/or commentary.

3.) Artistry can be defined as pursuit of self-directed projects, which may include pure
creative research, experimentation in the field, and any entrepreneurial ventures.

b. Recognition of one’s design work, including offers to print, exhibit, or display one’s design
work, whether scholarship, practice, or artistry, in publications, galleries, or museums, is of
consideration. The scope of the publication or display, the prestige of the publisher or institution,
the stature of the editor, curators, and/or jurors, and the level of critical analysis brought by the
publisher or organizers are considered. Recognition from those entities that are national or
international in range, reach, or scope is generally considered most prestigious.

c. Alternative and non-traditional forms of display or publication (whether self-initiated or
commercially based) are given recognition. The significance of a display or publication is based
upon the reputation of the forum in which it circulates.

d. Juried competitions are also recognized as significant research/creative activities. The scope of
the competition, the prestige of the jurors, and the level of critical analysis brought by the
organizers are considered.

e. Other research/creative activities deserving consideration may include collaboration or
consultation with clients or other designers; collaboration or consultation in curatorial or
exhibition organizational activities; published portfolios of one’s design work; inclusion of one’s
work in trade publications or exhibition catalogs; development of new techniques, methods, or
processes; or the chairing or participation in panels, workshops, or seminars on design topics.

f. Research/creative activity that is innovative or in some way advances the design field will be
considered significant.

g. Research/creative activity that is circulated and critiqued through awards, publications,
reviews, peer-reviewed journals, or professional design publications relevant within the field will
be considered significant.

h. Professional distinction or significance may also be indicated by invitations, such as those to
be a designer-in-residence or to serve as a juror or panelist to assess the work of others, whether
the work be in scholarship, practice, or artistry. The reputation of the group extending the
invitation should be considered; groups having national or international affiliations are generally
considered most significant.

i. Publication in journals recognized as being important in the fields of design and design
research are usually more significant than articles written for more general, non-academic
audiences. While publications that are peer-reviewed, abstracted, and/or indexed and which are
national or international in scope tend to be those with the most central role in presenting
significant academic research, publications read by practicing designers can also have
significance and impact on the field.
j. Presenting papers at scholarly and professional conferences, symposia, workshops, and exhibits is an increasingly important measure of the significance of a faculty member's work.

k. Other indications of professional significance may include grants, fellowships, and awards.

l. Completion of a major creative or scholarly project may well consume a period of years. These projects may include books, extensive design projects, and research fellowships. Thus, other activities, such as those listed above, serve as indicators of immersion in sustained research/creative activity.

In applied design, collaboration as part of the professional output or activity is normal, whether in scholarship, practice, or artistry, and thus performance in a variety of roles is acceptable. Particularly in the works of practice, terms such as “project manager,” “lead designer,” and “art director” have varying interpretations and should be explained by the candidate for clarification.

Activities may be annotated in CVs and P&T dossiers to clarify such factors as significance and the nature and depth of involvement.

Work produced for the University or University System of Georgia is considered under Service. Creative direction or art direction on client-based projects with students receiving course credit for roles in the project will be considered under Teaching (for scheduled class and advisement hours) and Service (for additional outside service hours to the community).

2. Standards for Research/Creative Activity in Art Education

Professional distinction in the area of art education is achieved primarily through the publication of scholarship that exhibits original research in books and journals recognized by peers as being important to the field of art education. Publications that are peer-reviewed, abstracted, and/or indexed and that are national or international in scope are those that have the highest level of scholarly significance. It is recognized that research in art education can be qualitative, quantitative, or mixed method. Original theoretical perspectives dealing with the research of others or secondary sources are also considered valid and will be given credit. An art education faculty member, especially one teaching critical issues, will be given credit for writing and publishing articles and books concerning theoretical issues in art and art education.

While the primary expectation for scholarly achievement in art education rests in publications, other measures of ongoing professional involvement may include the presentation of research papers at professional meetings or conferences, the publication of instructional materials or educational resources through recognized educational sponsors, the presentation of workshops on teaching methodology, publication of reviews of new literature in the field, participation on panels on issues or research in the field, grants awarded in research and artistic production, and contributions to anthologies on educational topics. Conference or workshop participation at the national level carries more weight than parallel involvement in local, state, or regional activities. “Publication” may include authorship of non-print research information such as software or videotapes when such items are reproduced and distributed by recognized, generally off-campus educational media centers or organizations. Since faculty members in art education can remain
active as producers of art, their artistic activities should be evaluated by the same standards noted under the "Studio Arts" section. Personal artistic production as outlined in the Studio Arts section of this document can be credited to the art education faculty member toward tenure and promotion, and may complement substantial scholarly research in art education, but may not substitute for it.

3. Standards for Research/Creative Activity in Art History

The evaluation of a candidate’s research/creative activity is based primarily on the candidate’s publication of important original scholarly research (e.g., articles, chapters, books) along with additional scholarly work significant to the profession (e.g., conference presentations, book reviews, editing and refereeing work). Due to the nature of the discipline of art history, the publication of exhibition catalogs, exhibition catalog essays, substantial exhibition catalog entries, exhibition reviews, and art criticism, as well as curatorial activities, should also be considered. The School of Art and Design sees the peer-review process as a principal determiner of the type of scholarship a candidate has produced in any and all formats. The School also recognizes that the selection and review process for museum-based publications, although not blind, is thorough, as editors and/or curatorial teams that produce exhibition catalogs, and museums’ editorial departments and consultants, carefully evaluate the scholarship contained within. Scholarship and scholarly activities that have not undergone a peer-review process may be considered “significant to the profession,” but they will not weigh as heavily as peer-reviewed projects and publications.

The School recognizes that research/creative activity can take many forms and that individual candidates can pursue a variety of paths to successful careers as scholars in art history. For example, a faculty member who chooses mainly to write articles for refereed journals could be seen as equally successful as another who publishes his or her work in books which undergo comparable peer-review scrutiny. Other candidates will pursue a mixture of publications (e.g., articles, authored or edited books, exhibition catalog essays, and chapters in books). As a consequence, the School committee will make every effort to assess all publications in all venues when determining whether the entire scope of the candidate's scholarly production meets the standards for tenure and promotion.

Due to the variability of peer-review procedures, especially when publishing outside of the United States as some art historians do, it is difficult to establish a uniform hierarchy of scholarly journals and presses within the discipline of art history for the purpose of assessing the quality of scholarship published in them. In addition, due to the interdisciplinarity of art history, many art historians publish in related disciplines, and ranking journals and presses across disciplines can be problematic. In addition, very valuable work that offers innovative approaches, new ideas, or evidence that challenges existing knowledge may not be published in the best-known journals or by the best-known presses. However, within subfields of art history, certain journals and presses are regarded more highly than others. Quality of publications will consequently be assessed on several factors, including the relevance of a publication venue to the specific area of the candidate’s research; the candidate’s explanation of the importance of the work; reviews and/or citations of the work; the external reviewers’ comments; and the School Committee’s independent assessment of the work.
While the School recognizes the central importance of refereed books, book chapters, and journal articles to the profession, it also acknowledges the significant accomplishment represented by having leading scholars in one’s field and/or in related fields invite one to contribute substantive articles and chapters to anthologies, encyclopedias, exhibition publications, and other scholarly works. The particular significance of an individual instance of such scholarship can be weighed, in part, by the presence/absence of a peer-review process, the reputation of the editor(s) of the volume, and the quality of the journal or press in which it is published.

The School also appreciates the increasingly prominent role that on-line publication and other electronic resources play in the production and dissemination of knowledge. It also recognizes that the traditional standards of peer review are sometimes difficult to apply to emerging forms of scholarship. Therefore, if including such materials in their dossiers, candidates should make a case for the quality of the project by briefly outlining its distinctive contribution to disciplinary knowledge and to the candidate’s professional development and by providing evidence of peer review, when applicable.

Obtaining intramural and/or external funding for one’s research is a valued research/creative activity, and success in seeking grant support, particularly from national sources, will weigh as evidence of scholarly reputation in one’s discipline. At the same time, the School recognizes the relative scarcity of external grant support in most art historical areas of specialization and, furthermore, that grant support is a means to the end of producing scholarship, not an end in itself. The candidate should explain how grants he or she has received contributed to the publication of peer-reviewed materials or other significant scholarly research.

Other scholarly activities, such as making presentations at professional meetings, organizing conference sessions, and reviewing, refereeing, and/or editing the scholarly work of others, are also valued and expected activities for any scholar. Although no one type of activity is mandated for promotion and tenure, successful candidates for tenure and promotion will be active in such roles, and these activities will be considered as part of the candidate’s body of scholarly work.

Evaluation of an individual faculty member’s professional development will focus on the entire profile of that individual’s contribution. The School expects that candidates will demonstrate their scholarly productivity through both the quality and quantity of their professional record, noting that several aspects of professional development in art history make a focus on quantity alone troublesome. For many art historians, research is dependent on travel to distant locations, often abroad, and, according to the College Art Association (CAA), there should be clear recognition of the financial and time implications of such travel on a faculty member’s productivity. As the CAA also notes, “the escalating cost of publication rights for photographs or digital media provided by museums, commercial archives, galleries, artists’ estates, and other sources is an additional impediment to art historians who seek to publish the results of their research.”

4. Standards for Research/Creative Activity in Studio Arts
Exhibitions and publications are criteria by which an artist's research/creative work may be measured in the professional world. An ongoing record of public exhibitions in museums, commercial galleries, university galleries, web sites, and other public spaces are considered. The content, meaning, significance, and depth of the research/creative work are highly important aspects of evaluation. Research/creative activity in the studio arts is constantly evolving and may be evident through a variety of roles and functions. The following considerations are taken into account in evaluating research/creative activity:

a. More weight is generally given to solo shows than inclusion in group shows, although an important group exhibition may outweigh a solo exhibition in a less recognized space.

b. Exhibitions held in major galleries or museums in major cities (including Atlanta) are generally considered more important than exhibitions in local or regional galleries. The relative reputation of a gallery or institution, as known to our faculty and external reviewers, is one of the criteria used in evaluating the relative importance of exhibitions. The reputation of the curator or juror of an exhibition is also an indicator of the importance of the activity.

c. Invitational exhibitions and traveling exhibitions, particularly those that are national or international in scope, are generally considered to be more prestigious than juried shows. The exception to this will be an open call exhibition where everyone who submits to an exhibition is exhibited. Juried shows limited to members of specific groups or societies are generally considered less prestigious than national open competitions.

d. Other forms of exhibition, such as public art performances, collaborations with other artists, art installations, and public art commissions are also considered. The significance of an exhibition is based upon the reputation of the organization that hosts the exhibition and the level of critical analysis brought by the organization.

e. Professional credibility may be enhanced by evidence of an artist's recognition by curators, museum directors, and jurors or panelists, particularly by those whose expertise and interest go beyond familiarity with only one artistic medium or style.

f. Alternative and non-traditional spaces (those other than commercial galleries or public institutions) are given recognition; the significance of an exhibition in such a space is based upon the reputation of the organization that operates the space and its record of exhibitions.

g. Variables in the production time for and mobility of various types of work are recognized. Artists who work with large and/or one-of-a-kind pieces generally will be unable to show as frequently as artists whose work is easier to ship or which may be editioned without individual hand-working. Similarly, artists whose work requires complex or on-site installation or performance may not be able to show as frequently as artists who need not be present for the exhibition of their work.

h. Repeated exhibitions of the same work may demonstrate the possible posterity value of a work or works. The expectation is, however, that the artist will also be engaged in continual production of new works. In the event that the over-arching title for a series of works may be
used for a number of exhibitions over an extended period of time, entries on a CV or in a
promotion and tenure dossier regarding exhibitions can be annotated to clarify the dates and
currency of the work exhibited.

i. In general, artistic productions may be documented and critiqued through reviews published by
museum directors, curators, and other professional critics (in addition to and as distinguished
from the evaluations of the external reviewers for promotion and tenure). The informed judgment
of artists and museum personnel may be preferred over that of general newspaper and magazine
critics.

j. Other indications of research/creative achievement may include artist's grants or fellowships
received, exhibition awards, or commissions. Again, awards that are nationally competitive or
competitive across media or disciplines are generally more prestigious than awards limited to
membership groups or societies. While awards that are nationally competitive or competitive
across media or disciplines are highly prestigious, those awards limited to membership groups or
societies might represent high technical competence within a medium, given the focused nature
of the competition, and should be valued as equally significant.

k. Research/creative distinction may be indicated by artist-in-residence awards or invitations,
visiting artist invitations, or invitations to serve as juror or panelist to assess the work of others.
The reputation of the group extending the invitations may be considered; groups having
international, national, or statewide artistic affiliations are generally more significant than local
or regional groups.

l. While exhibitions are generally the main focus of scholarly activity for studio artists, they may
engage in other activities that may deserve equal recognition. Examples of such activities
include, but are not limited to, the publication of scholarly books or articles; publication of
portfolios or artist's books; inclusion in exhibition catalogs; the writing of exhibition or book
reviews; curatorial or exhibition organization activities; research or writing about technical
problems or advancements in the field; development of new equipment or processes;
investigation of historical techniques or perspectives; development of media presentations related
to art; and chairing or participating in panels or seminars on studio art topics. While it is difficult
to rank all permutations of activities in which studio artists are engaged outside of exhibitions, it
is suggested that all activities be annotated in CVs and promotion and tenure dossiers to clarify
the depth of involvement and time required for each project entered.

5. Evaluation of Research/Creative Activity

Based on the evidence submitted, the School Committee will evaluate the candidate as having
met or not having met the required standards in research/creative activity.

   a. Associate Professor

Promotion to and/or tenure at the rank of Associate Professor is available to those candidates
who are judged to be excellent in research/creative activity.
The candidate will be judged as excellent in research/creative activity if the Committee’s assessment is that the candidate has developed a substantial body of work that has already contributed to the advancement of his or her discipline while establishing a national reputation in his or her field. In addition, the successful candidate’s current trajectory in research/creative activity will support successful progress towards the rank of Professor after promotion to Associate Professor with tenure.

b. Professor

Promotion to and/or tenure at the rank of Professor is available to those candidates who are judged to be excellent in research/creative activity.

The candidate will be judged as excellent in research/creative activity if the Committee’s assessment is that the candidate, since his or her last promotion, has produced a substantial body of work that has contributed to the advancement of his or her discipline and has established a national/international reputation in his or her field. In addition, the successful candidate should have a high probability of continued high quality and productive research/creative activity.

B. TEACHING

1. Standards for Teaching

The School of Art and Design regards quality teaching to be fundamental to its mission. Teaching is a major responsibility of the faculty and, as such, the School recognizes instructional effectiveness and student achievement as central in the evaluation of its faculty members. The School expects its faculty members to be engaged in instructional efforts, both at the undergraduate and graduate levels, not only in the classroom setting, but also in directing individual student work.

In accordance with the college manual, evaluation of teaching will be based upon the candidate’s submission of documentation of the following materials (see college manual, section V.F. for details):

1. Courses Taught during the Last Four Academic Years (include summers, if applicable)
2. Student Evaluations (include summers, if applicable)
3. Honors or Special Recognition for Teaching
4. Independent Studies, Practica, Honor’s Theses, Theses, and Dissertations
5. Published Materials
6. Additional Evidence of Teaching Effectiveness
This last category might include the development of new, innovative, and relevant courses at the appropriate levels and the continued improvement and updating of established courses; student advisement; guest lectures in classes; a statement of pedagogical philosophy and/or teaching methodology; and student accomplishments.

The School understands the category of student evaluations to be inclusive of the totality of student perceptions of the instructor’s contribution to the learning environment. Therefore, standardized student evaluations are considered only as one element among many that can be used to evaluate a candidate’s performance under this category. When reviewing the standardized student evaluations, the School Committee should attempt to discern a pattern in student perceptions of the overall pedagogical environment created by the candidate, attending to the scores on all questions as well as further evidence provided by students’ written comments.

In addition, the School Committee should not take the student evaluation percentages at face value alone without also taking into consideration other factors, which may be addressed by the candidate in his or her dossier, during the period of evaluation. The following list of such factors is neither comprehensive nor complete, and not all factors are relevant to all disciplines within the School or to all faculty within a given discipline:

a. the candidate’s total number of students
b. the numbers of:
   i. large (75 or more students) vs. small (25 or fewer students) courses
   ii. required vs. elective courses
   iii. graduate vs. undergraduate courses
   iv. CTW vs. non-CTW courses
   v. WAC vs. non-WAC courses
   vi. core vs. special topics courses
c. the clock times of courses taught
d. the format of courses taught

2. Evaluation of Teaching

The submitted instructional materials will be used to evaluate the candidate’s teaching contribution, with particular attention paid to course content, course development, perception of students, and instructional and mentoring activity beyond the classroom.

Based on the evidence submitted, the School Committee will evaluate the candidate as having met or not having met the required standards in teaching.

a. Associate Professor

Promotion to and/or tenure at the rank of Associate Professor is available to those candidates who are judged to be excellent in teaching.

The candidate will be judged as excellent in teaching if the overall assessment of the School Committee from the evidence submitted is that the candidate’s performance is highly accomplished. Normally, the student evaluation scores might suggest highly effective
performance in the classroom; the course material presented might show impressive preparation; a significant degree of knowledge of the subject matter might be indicated; and/or the candidate might demonstrate a high level of involvement in mentoring students.

b. Professor

Promotion to and/or tenure at the rank of Professor is available to those candidates who are judged to be excellent in teaching.

The candidate will be judged as excellent in Teaching if the overall assessment of the School Committee from the evidence submitted is that the candidate’s performance is highly accomplished. Normally, the student evaluation scores might suggest highly effective performance in the classroom; the course material presented might show impressive preparation and a continuing devotion to improving and updating course content and syllabi, as well as overall curricular reform; the candidate might participate in College, University, or national committees that focus on instructional improvements and issues; a great breadth and depth of knowledge of the subject matter might be indicated; and/or the candidate might demonstrate a high level of involvement in mentoring students.

C. SERVICE

1. Standards for Service

The School of Art and Design is committed to providing discipline-oriented service to the University and local communities and to relevant local, state, national, and international professional organizations. Only those service activities that are related to the candidate’s area of professional competence will be included in an evaluation of his or her service. While the expectations for the quantity and quality of service work will be higher for those seeking promotion to Professor than for those seeking promotion to Associate Professor, collegiality is generally valued in all candidates seeking promotion and tenure in the School.

Appropriate service activities are listed below. Evidence of effective service must be submitted in accordance with the categories for service listed in the college manual (section V.G.). Complete descriptions and dates for any service category must be provided by the candidate along with explanatory documentation, when appropriate. Possible examples of each category of service are provided below.

1. Contributions to the department: Memberships on School committees, chairing School committees, development of programs and activities, participation in major School-sponsored activities.

2. Assistance to Colleagues: Consultations about educational problems and/or student issues, collaborations within the School or with other University departments and programs, review of manuscripts, assistance with exhibitions.
3. Committee Responsibilities at the College, University, or System Level: Committees served on or chaired at the College, University, or System level, serving on the University Senate.

4. Support of Local, State, National, or International Organizations: Consultancies, memberships on advisory boards, offices held. [NOTE: This category refers to services to professional organizations (e.g., treasurer of a learned society, coordinating logistics of conferences) that do not rely predominantly on the scholarly or creative expertise of the candidate. Professional service (e.g., serving on editorial boards, reviewing the promotion materials of faculty at other institutions, etc.), on the other hand, would be counted in Professional Development.]

5. Significant Community Participation: Lectures, speeches, presentations, short courses, hosting conferences.

6. Meritorious Public Service: Assistance to governmental agencies, development of community, state, or national resources.

7. Administrative Contributions to Professional Associations (Intellectual contributions to professional organizations count in the category of research/creative activity.)

2. Evaluation of Service

Based on the evidence submitted, the School Committee will evaluate the candidate as having met or not having met the required standards in service.

a. Associate Professor with Tenure

Promotion to and/or tenure at the rank of Associate Professor with tenure is available to those candidates who are judged to be good in service.

A candidate will be judged as good in Service if the candidate has actively assisted colleagues and responsibly and thoroughly executed assigned School duties and committee responsibilities.

b. Professor

Candidates for promotion to and/or tenure at the rank of Professor are expected to maintain and even exceed the sort of service involvement and accomplishments required for an Associate Professor. Therefore, both the quality and quantity of achievements in the service area are expected to surpass those required for recommendation for promotion to the rank of Associate Professor. Promotion to and/or tenure at the rank of Professor is available to those candidates who are judged to be very good in service.

A candidate will be judged as very good in service if the candidate has actively assisted colleagues, participated in professional organizations, and demonstrated extensive and diligent service and leadership at the School level and at the College [NOTE: For candidates in Art
Education, this is considered to be both the College of Arts and Sciences and the College of Education, including serving on Professional Education Faculty committees] and/or University level(s). Such activities as chairing committees; serving as area coordinator, graduate director, or associate director; or developing links to the community outside the University illustrate leadership.
APPENDIX I:

Ratings Guidelines for Pre-Tenure Review

A. Research/Creative Activity

Poor: The faculty member maintains no program of research/creative activity.

Fair: The faculty member is largely inactive in research/creative activity.

Good: The faculty member is minimally active in maintaining a program of research/creative activity and/or the faculty member's research/creative activity contributions are limited in scope and impact.

Very Good: The faculty member, while maintaining an active program of research/creative activity, has yet to establish a national reputation as an emerging leader in the field; however, there are clear indications that s/he has projects underway that are likely to result in a more prominent creative and/or scholarly profile in the near future.

Excellent: The faculty member has produced a substantial body of creative and/or scholarly work that has contributed to the advancement of his/her discipline. Depending on the faculty member’s discipline, this body of work may include: individual or group exhibitions at the national level; important commissions; significant client-based design projects; a book or comparable body of articles and book chapters; reviews of books and/or exhibitions; editorial/referee/juror activities. Collaborative projects are also significant when the high level and quality of the contribution is documented. Further evidence for a rating of excellent may include documentation directly demonstrating one’s emerging national reputation and/or the securing of fellowships, grants, contracts, and/or awards from internal and external local, regional, national, and/or international agencies; these represent a highly significant professional achievement and testify to the reputation and significance of the faculty member’s output. An evaluation of excellent indicates that the faculty member’s current and imminently forthcoming projects demonstrate an appropriate upward trajectory.

Outstanding: In addition to a substantial body of creative and/or scholarly work, the faculty member has achieved eminence in his/her field. Evidence may include national or international awards, laudatory reviews in major publication outlets, invited lectures in prestigious venues, and significant fellowships or grants.
B. Teaching

**Poor:** The faculty member displays an unacceptable record of teaching as evidenced through inadequate effort as an instructor, ineffective pedagogical techniques, little or no course development, little or no student mentoring, and student evaluations.

**Fair:** The faculty member displays a minimally acceptable record of teaching as evidenced through inadequate effort as an instructor, ineffective pedagogical techniques, little course development, little student mentoring, and student evaluations.

**Good:** The faculty member’s instructional performance is adequate. This faculty member’s supporting materials provide evidence of conscientious preparation and pertinent, valid content, but fail to demonstrate either exceptional pedagogical skill or decisive commitment to the wide ranging institutional and intellectual responsibilities of a full-time university instructor. The learning environment in this faculty member’s classroom, as reflected in student evaluations, achievement, and advancement, is adequate but not distinctly positive.

**Very Good:** The faculty member is a competent teacher whose supporting material includes evidence not only of diligent preparation and instruction but also of some mentoring of students, effective pedagogy, and a commitment to the mission of the department. Class assignments result in proficient student learning. While the faculty member is an effective teacher, his/her teaching record may lack the level and extent of involvement in the supervision of individual student work that is typically expected for a rating of excellent, as described below, and/or the faculty member’s student evaluations show inconsistencies or scores fall regularly below the 4-out-of-5 range.

**Excellent:** The faculty member’s teaching record shows exceptional preparation and delivery, and his/her student evaluation scores will often be in the mid 4-out-of-5 range or higher. The faculty member demonstrates an engagement with teaching beyond simply his/her assigned courses. This includes regular involvement with individual student work, especially the direction of research papers, independent studies, honors theses, and/or master’s theses.

**Outstanding:** In excess of the criteria for a rating of excellent, the faculty member’s student evaluations will consistently be in the high 4-out-of-5 range. Such a faculty member may have been involved in such activities as departmental curricular or programmatic reform efforts, leading workshops, and/or producing pedagogical publications. The faculty member has won a significant teaching award or has been otherwise recognized for superior instruction and/or innovative teaching.
C. Service

Poor: The faculty member fails to assist colleagues and fails to execute assigned departmental duties and committee responsibilities.

Fair: The faculty member ineffectively assists colleagues and ineffectively executes assigned departmental duties and committee responsibilities.

Good: The faculty member actively assists colleagues and responsibly and thoroughly executes assigned departmental duties and committee responsibilities.

Very Good: The faculty member demonstrates extensive, collegial, diligent, and effective service in the department as well as service to either the college, the university, the community, or one or more professional associations.

Excellent: The faculty member demonstrates a sustained track record of effective service and leadership. Such leadership is in addition to the level of service described above as very good.

Outstanding: In addition to the level of service and leadership described above as excellent, the faculty member demonstrates a record of sustained, significant service accomplishments beyond the department.
APPENDIX II:

Ratings Guidelines for Post-Tenure Review

A. Research/Creative Activity

Poor: The faculty member maintains no program of research/creative activity.

Fair: The faculty member is largely inactive in research/creative activity.

Good: The faculty member is minimally active in maintaining a program of research/creative activity and/or the faculty member’s research/creative activity contributions are limited in scope and impact.

Very Good: The faculty member’s research/creative activity record indicates steady creative and/or scholarly development that falls short of completion of major high quality projects.

Excellent: The faculty member has continued to maintain and advance a distinguished national or international reputation as an authority in his/her area(s) of specialization. The faculty member continues to be active in his/her discipline, and has a marked impact on the work of others in the field. The faculty member has produced a significant body of creative and/or scholarly work since his/her last review, which may include: individual or group exhibitions at the national and/or international level; important commissions; significant client-based design projects; a book-length project; a number of book chapters or peer-reviewed articles; reviews of books and/or exhibitions; editorial/referee/juror activities. Collaborative projects are also significant when the high level and quality of the contribution is documented. Further evidence for a rating of excellent may include the securing of fellowships, grants, contracts, and/or awards from internal and external local, regional, national, and/or international agencies.

Outstanding: In addition to a substantial body of creative and/or scholarly work, the faculty member has achieved eminence in his/her field. Evidence may include national or international awards, laudatory reviews in major publication outlets, invited lectures in prestigious venues, and significant fellowships or grants.
B. Teaching

**Poor:** The faculty member displays an unacceptable record of teaching as evidenced through inadequate effort as an instructor, ineffective pedagogical techniques, little or no course development, little or no student mentoring, and student evaluations.

**Fair:** The faculty member displays a minimally acceptable record of teaching as evidenced through inadequate effort as an instructor, ineffective pedagogical techniques, little course development, little student mentoring, and student evaluations.

**Good:** The faculty member’s instructional performance is adequate. This faculty member’s supporting materials provide evidence of conscientious preparation and pertinent, valid content, but fail to demonstrate either exceptional pedagogical skill or decisive commitment to the wide ranging institutional and intellectual responsibilities of a full-time university instructor. The learning environment in this faculty member’s classroom, as reflected in student evaluations, achievement, and advancement, is adequate but not distinctly positive.

**Very Good:** The faculty member is a competent teacher whose supporting material includes evidence not only of diligent preparation and instruction but also of some mentoring of students, effective pedagogy, and a commitment to the mission of the department. Class assignments result in proficient student learning. While the faculty member is an effective teacher, his/her teaching record may lack the level and extent of involvement in the supervision of individual student work that is typically expected for a rating of excellent, as described below, and/or the faculty member’s student evaluations show inconsistencies or scores fall regularly below the 4-out-of-5 range.

**Excellent:** The faculty member’s teaching record shows exceptional preparation and delivery, and his/her student evaluation scores will often be in the mid 4-out-of-5 range or higher. The faculty member demonstrates an engagement with teaching beyond simply his/her assigned courses. This includes regular involvement with individual student work, especially the direction of research papers, independent studies, honors theses, and/or master’s theses. Such a faculty member may have been involved in such activities as departmental curricular or programmatic reform efforts, leading workshops, and/or serving on committees beyond the department that focus on instructional issues.

**Outstanding:** In excess of the criteria for a rating of excellent, the faculty member’s student evaluations will consistently be in the high 4-out-of-5 range. Such a faculty member may have been involved in such activities as departmental curricular or programmatic reform efforts, leading workshops, serving on committees beyond the department that focus on instructional issues, and/or producing pedagogical publications. The faculty member has won a significant teaching award or has been otherwise recognized for superior instruction and/or innovative teaching.
C. Service

Poor: The faculty member fails to assist colleagues and fails to execute assigned departmental duties and committee responsibilities.

Fair: The faculty member ineffectively assists colleagues and ineffectively executes assigned departmental duties and committee responsibilities.

Good: The faculty member actively assists colleagues and responsibly and thoroughly executes assigned departmental duties and committee responsibilities.

Very Good: The faculty member demonstrates extensive, collegial, diligent, and effective service in the department as well as service to either the college, the university, the community, or one or more professional associations.

Excellent: The faculty member demonstrates a sustained track record of effective service and leadership. Such leadership is in addition to the level of service described above as very good.

Outstanding: In addition to the level of service and leadership described above as excellent, the faculty member demonstrates a record of sustained, significant service accomplishments beyond the department.