

Idaho State University
Department of Art
Evaluation Guidelines (*revised May 2022*)

Guidelines for Promotion and Tenure

These departmental guidelines for promotion and tenure are intended to be used in conjunction with the college policy from the College of Arts & Letters and the university policy from Academic Affairs. Both policies and procedures are available on their websites. This document should serve as a guide for the candidate and as a basis for evaluation by the review committee concerning a candidate's eligibility for tenure and promotion in academic rank.

Process

1. Tenure-track faculty members may apply for tenure during their fifth or sixth full academic year at ISU. The faculty member will decide whether to apply in the fifth or sixth year, and will inform the chair of the department of this decision before May 1st of their fourth year. The department chair will then notify the dean.
2. Early during the summer, the candidate must submit a list of at least seven recommended external reviewers to the department chair. These recommendations should be accompanied by brief biographical information supporting the choices as well as certification that there is no significant relationship with the recommended reviewers. The chair may also consider other professionals in the candidate's specific area of expertise as external reviewers. The chair will select at least two reviewers from the candidate's recommended list and solicit an external review from an additional one to four professionals in the candidate's area of expertise. The candidate will refrain from contacting potential external reviewers. The candidate will provide copies of a current vita and other materials chosen by the candidate as appropriate for external review of the candidate's scholarship/research/creative activities.
3. Members of the departmental committee and the committee chair will be appointed by the department chair after consulting with the candidate. The entire department faculty and the dean will be informed of the composition of the committee. The committee will consist of at least five members, as follows:
 - At least one tenured department member
 - One or more untenured, tenure-track department members
 - One tenured outside member (preferably from a related field)
 - One enrolled student (undergraduate or graduate)
4. The student member of the committee must have completed one or more years at ISU, and have completed one or more courses taught by the candidate. In the event of the unavailability of a particular category, such as the lack of tenured department members beyond the department chair, then the department chair may request permission from

the dean to modify the composition of the committee. There must be at least two tenured faculty members on the committee.

5. The committee will review all submitted materials, including the external reviews. At least one member of the committee will conduct an observation of the candidate's teaching. The teaching observation will use the form provided by the Department of Art. The committee can meet as many times as necessary to accomplish their review. The proceedings shall remain confidential at all times. Committee members must vote on each area of professional activities: teaching, scholarship/research/creative activities, and service. The vote tally for each area must be included in the report, as well as the vote tally regarding the committee's recommendation for promotion and tenure. All committee members must sign the report. The committee will submit a report of no more than ten pages in length to the department chair, along with a recommendation either to grant tenure or to deny tenure. Dissenting votes will be reflected in the vote to recommend granting or denying tenure. Where a split evaluation exists, the committee should provide Majority and Minority Reports. A "Minority Report" is a voluntary written statement submitted by committee members indicating reasons for dissenting from the recommendation of the majority of the committee. The department chair will write an independent report on the candidate and submit this, along with a recommendation to grant or deny tenure, to the Dean. The CAL Tenure and Promotion Committee will review the reports submitted by the chair and the departmental committee. The committee may request any additional material needed for its deliberation. The committee chair writes a report to the Dean, reports the committee vote, and makes a recommendation to grant or deny tenure.
6. The Dean will review materials generated by the candidate, the departmental committee, the department chair, and the Tenure and Promotion Committee. The Dean will submit a report to the Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs along with a recommendation to grant or deny tenure.

Candidate's response rights: As reflected in the form specified by Academic Affairs, the candidate may respond to the departmental committee and/or chair report as well as to the college committee and/or dean report. The candidate will be allowed five working days to submit each of these responses as part of the evaluation process.

General Support Materials

Along with the more specific materials that will be requested in the areas of teaching, scholarship/research/creative activity, and service, the candidate must provide the following:

- Current vita (CV)
- Teaching assignments for each semester
- Examples of research/scholarship/creative activities
- At least 20 creative work images for faculty members in studio areas that were created during the review period.
- At least 20 student work images for faculty members in studio areas that

- were created during the review period.
- Artist statement

The department administrative assistant will provide a record of formal student evaluations for the review period and copies of annual faculty evaluations. The chair will provide semester department faculty medians for the formal student evaluations for context.

Teaching

Consistent with the guidelines established by the College of Arts & Letters, the candidate's expertise in teaching will be evaluated and rated as superior, satisfactory, or unsatisfactory. Evaluation of teaching will come by way of an analysis of the candidate's teaching materials and teaching methods. Formal student evaluations must be reviewed, and additional informal student comments may be considered. A teaching observation by at least one committee faculty member must be included.

Scholarship/Research/Creative Activities

Consistent with the guidelines established by the College of Arts & Letters, the candidate's record in scholarship/research/creative activities will be evaluated and rated as superior, satisfactory, or unsatisfactory.

While the submitted materials may establish a framework of sorts for an artist's evaluation, they in no way prepare the various review committees for the many layers and intricacies that reside in the subjective world of art and the recognition of an artist's creative activity. A quantitative evaluation process would do little to explore the true and valued achievements in the artist's research/creative activities; therefore, the review committee would be well advised to take the time to undertake a careful, qualitative approach to the review of the candidate's accomplishments in this area.

As an aid to that end, consider first that an artist's research, their creative activity, should not be synonymous with the exhibition of the resulting work. In many cases, one leads to the other in that this exhibition opportunity is a typical, accepted method of achieving recognition or validation of one's work, but the variety of secondary research activities that may precede or accompany that work of art must also be considered.

Secondary Research Activities

- Exploration of untried or innovative materials and applications
- Study of the history of art and related critical thinking
- Familiarization with current critical theory
- Investigations in areas not directly related to the arts, in so far as such research might provide new or re-evaluated source material which might stimulate or otherwise enrich the creative process or the content of works of art
- Travel which facilitates exposure to the works of art or other manifestations of contemporary research relevant to the creative process

- Investigation of current and historical theory and practice regarding art pedagogy

Regarding the various exhibition formats, the various committees in this process may find themselves on shifting sands. To be sure, there are exhibitions to be found across a broad spectrum of quality levels in each exhibition format. In evaluating the strength or weakness of an exhibition, one will have to consider the exhibition's location, the reputation of the show itself (perhaps reflected in its staying power year after year), the format in which the exhibition is curated (invitational or juried), the scale or scope of the exhibition's region (a number of counties, a number of states, the nation, international), the exhibition's competitiveness, and the participants of the show itself. The committee might also consider that while "The Exhibition" may serve as a tool to measure an artist's willingness/desire to participate or, when viewed qualitatively, as a method of ascertaining the validity or relative merit of the products created, it is still a subjective format affected by the idiosyncrasies and fashions of the art world and its evaluators.

Exhibition Opportunities

- **Invitational Exhibitions** – These exhibitions may occur at museums, art centers, galleries or universities, and are generated by a curator according to a theme. The thematic focus may be related to style, subject matter, medium, etc. The benefit of participation includes the perception that the work will reach an important audience, or perhaps by the perceived significance of the curator's critical status. The value of inclusion in such an exhibition is measured by the selective nature of the format. Invitational exhibitions are frequently curated to feature artists with notable standing in the field of study in order to generate interest in the exhibition. Artists featured in invitational exhibitions are less reliant on applications to juried exhibitions to disseminate research.
- **Juried Exhibitions** – These shows are competitive and national, international, regional, or statewide in scope. They establish that the work of art submitted has received relative recognition, when compared with other works submitted, based on criteria developed by a jury or jurors.
- **Solo exhibition** - These exhibitions allow for the projection of ideas/expressions which might take shape as a result of presentation of a body of work by a single artist. Their significance derives from the fact that the artist is allowed to communicate more dynamically and with greater depth or range. These shows reflect a greater commitment on the part of the artist as well as a substantial commitment to the artist's work by the host institution.
- **Small Group Exhibitions** – These exhibitions can be determined by either juried or invitational one with a group of artists. Small group exhibitions are considered by the number of participants of the exhibition; typically 2-5 artists. Small group exhibitions

often result in a significant commitment from the artist as an increased number of works are required with a limited number of represented artists.

Presentation of Lectures and Workshops

Additional metrics for evaluating personal research include opportunities to present research via lecture and/or workshop formats. Lectures and workshops are presented at museums, universities, art centers and galleries. These opportunities demonstrate the demand for the artist's research in both public and academic sectors, and may serve as a metric to evaluate contributions to the artist's field of study.

Research and Creative Activity Grants

- Juried Artist in Residence (AIR) programs – If the AIR takes place through an open application call process as awarded/endowed residencies, the jurors take into consideration the quality of work and other factors including the project proposal, statement of intent, and education/exhibition/residency experience. Residency awards establish that the artist is selected by a partner organization.
- Fellowship/stipend/honorarium – An artist's fellowship rewards individual artistic excellence. An external funding source for research is designed to reward exceptional talent in art disciplines and provide support and encouragement for the creative achievement of research. A fellowship will reflect the potential to expand aesthetic inquiries.
- External Grants – Creative activity grants (e.g., National Endowment for the Arts) for artists fund specific projects. External grants assist individual artists with the creation of new work, the continuation of existing practice, and supports participation in professional development programs and activities.

To provide the committee with the most complete understanding of the depth and breadth of his or her work and its recognition, the candidate should supply the following:

- An artist's statement
- Digital images of the candidate's work executed within the evaluation period
- Documentation of creative activity by means of brochures, announcements, newspaper articles, write-ups, posters, etc.
- Evidence of the continued recognition of one's work in the area of exhibition or publication
- Complete documentation of exhibition activity to include:
 - Accepted exhibitions
 - Dates and locations of exhibitions
 - Prospectuses from accepted exhibitions
 - Name and title/position of juror or curator
 - Exhibition catalogs, if available

Scope of exhibition: international, national, regional, statewide, or local

Format of Exhibition: juried exhibition, invitational exhibition, solo exhibition or small group exhibition.

Evidence of further research through participation in lectures, symposia, workshops, etc. Describe the activities and their importance to the development of one's creative production.

Promotion and Tenure Guidelines for Assessing Research in Art History and Theory

Promotion and tenure guidelines pertaining to the art history area are designed to cover candidates whose research is either historically or theoretically-oriented. Candidates whose research is in theory typically carry out research that by its nature is of a highly interdisciplinary character as opposed to the more narrowly demarcated focus of standard art historical research. Scholarly achievement in theory may be reflected through research topics and forms of publication that intersect with a number of cognate fields, including, but not restricted to, art history, philosophy, media studies, visual studies, literary studies, religious studies, and critical theory broadly .

In art history or theory, the following serve as **primary evidence** of quality research:

Longer works:

1. Peer-reviewed ^[1] monographs (i.e. single-author books)

Shorter works:

1. Peer-reviewed articles published in professional journals
2. Peer-reviewed book chapters published in edited collections or anthologies
3. Peer-reviewed review essays
4. Framing essay in a peer-reviewed textbook or edited volume (i.e. an editor's introduction)

In art history or theory, the following serve as **secondary evidence** of quality research:

1. Non-peer-reviewed monographs, book chapters, and articles (these include, for example, publications stemming from invitations to publish work by publishers and/or journals)
2. Non-peer-reviewed reviews of publications, exhibitions, or performances
3. Evidence of ongoing research and participation in one's field through conference presentations, conference organizing, guest lectures, and public events
4. Teacher's guides or similar pedagogical materials
5. Applications for internal or external research grants or other competitive awards (even if not awarded)

6. Editorship of scholarly publications

Research Ranking Guidelines for Art History or Theory

Research can be ranked as superior, satisfactory, or unsatisfactory. Below are guidelines for assessing quality in research performance.

Superior

A candidate for tenure/and or promotion or five-year review process will be ranked as **superior** in the area of research if the candidate has, since the time of hire or the last promotion or five-year review process, published or had accepted for publication at least **one longer work** as defined under primary evidence, or published or had accepted for publication at least **four shorter works** as defined under primary evidence, and has participated in at least **three activities** as defined under secondary evidence. (Note that participation in activities listed under secondary evidence need not be three distinct activities, i.e. three of the same activity or three different activities count equally).

Satisfactory

A candidate for tenure/and or promotion or five year review process will be ranked as **satisfactory** in the area of research if the candidate, since the time of hire or the last promotion or five-year review process, published or had accepted for publication at least **two shorter works** as defined under primary evidence and has participated in at least **three activities** as defined under secondary evidence. (Note that participation in activities listed under secondary evidence need not be three distinct activities, i.e. three of the same activity or three different activities count equally).

Unsatisfactory

A candidate for tenure/and promotion or the five-year review process will be ranked as **unsatisfactory** in the area of research if the candidate has, since the time of hire or the last promotion or five-year review process, failed to meet the requirements for a ranking of satisfactory as defined above.

University Service and Professionally Related Activities

Consistent with the guidelines established by the College of Arts & Letters, the candidate's record in departmental, college, and university service, as well as professional service and professionally related community service, will be evaluated and rated as superior, satisfactory, or unsatisfactory. Effectiveness in these areas should be substantiated through documentation of activities and services, as follows:

- A description of the service
- A description of the scope of one's contribution; the value and important of the contribution made by the candidate
- Names of committee chairs, project coordinators or contact persons
- Supporting documentation of service if available/relevant (thank you letters emails, acknowledgement letters, etc.)

Faculty Five Year Review Process

The process for faculty five-year reviews is similar to promotion and tenure, but with important differences. A five-year review is not a re-tenuring process, although an unsatisfactory five-year review can lead to a full-fledged tenure-style review. A five-year review does not ordinarily include external reviews, but the faculty member undergoing the review may request to have them included.

1. For tenured faculty, the department chair will appoint a five-year review committee consisting of at least two tenured faculty members. For lecturers, the review committee may instead contain one tenured and one untenured faculty member.
2. The committee will review all submitted materials. At least one member of the committee will conduct an observation of the candidate's teaching. The committee can meet as many times as necessary to accomplish their review, and then submit a report to the department chair. The proceedings shall remain confidential at all times. Typically, the committee report must be sent to the department chair before the end of the fall semester. All committee members must sign the report.
3. The department chair will then write an additional evaluation. The department chair will provide a copy of the committee report and the chair's report to the faculty member. After allowing five working days for a response, the department chair will send the committee evaluation, chair evaluation, and any responses to the dean. Typically, the deadline for submission is in January.

Candidate's response rights: The candidate may respond to the departmental committee and/or chair report as well as to the college committee and/or dean report. The candidate will be allowed five working days to submit each of these responses as part of the evaluation process.

^[1] Note: The criterion of peer review is typically satisfied by having the article on book (monograph) reviewed by area experts outside the journal's or publisher's editorial board. However, the criterion of peer review can in certain cases be satisfied by the editorial board if the board is comprised of individuals uniquely qualified to review the manuscript.