

By-Laws

Department of Art

University of West Florida

Revised

May 2016

Faculty Members:

John Markowitz, Program Director

Thomas Asmuth

Carrie Fonder

Amy Ruddick

Valerie George

Joseph Herring

Jim Jipson

Barbara Larson

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I. Introduction	
A. Preamble	3
B. Mission Statement	3
II. Governance Structure	
A. Faculty Meetings	4
B. Voting	4
C. Adjuncts, Instructors, and Visiting Faculty	4
D. Committees	
1. Standing and Ad Hoc Committees	5
2. Tenure Mentoring Committees	5
E. Election of the Chairperson	5
F. Recall of the Chair	5
G. Chair's Roles and Responsibilities	
1. General Role	6
2. Chair's Role in Evaluations	6
3. Management of Annual Budget	6
4. Construction of Class Schedules	6
5. Communications and Disclosures	7
H. Departmental Appeals Process	7
III. Standards for Evaluation	
A. General Guidelines	
1. Evaluative Principles and Terminology	8
2. Types of Evaluation	8
3. Professional Standards for Art Faculty	9
B. Teaching	
1. Guidelines for Teaching Evaluations	11
2. Teaching-related Responsibilities	11
3. Teaching Performance Indicators	12
4. Performance levels for Teaching	12
5. Evidence for Teaching Performance	14
C. Scholarly and Creative Activities	
1. Guidelines for Evaluation of Research	15
2. Performance Indicators for Scholarly and Creative Activity	16
3. Performance Levels for Scholarly and Creative Activity	17
4. Evidence for Scholarly and Creative Activity	18
D. Professional Service	
1. Service to the Profession and the Community	19
2. Performance Indicators for Service	19
3. Performance Levels for Service	20
4. Evidence of Professional Service	20
IV. Resources	22

I. INTRODUCTION

I. A. PREAMBLE

This document establishes the governance structure of the Department of Art as it applies to the regular positions of instructor, assistant professor, associate professor and full professor. It also identifies the rights and responsibilities of all faculty members within the department.

I. B. MISSION STATEMENT

The mission of the Department of Art complements that of the University and the College in striving “to empower each individual we serve with knowledge and opportunity to contribute responsibly and creatively to a complex world.”

In addition to that broader mission, the Art Department Faculty seek to:

- Develop curricula that references the most current theoretical, and technical foundations for the creation of works of art, the study of art history, criticism, and visual culture.
- Pursue research and creative activity goals that generates a level of work that is recognized by a body of peers and furthers the contemporary critical discourse.
- Build ties to the larger community and professional organizations through professional service activities.

II. GOVERNANCE STRUCTURE

II. A. FACULTY MEETINGS

Faculty meetings will normally take place twice a semester. Special faculty meetings may be called by the Chair or by any faculty member in consultation with the Chair. Meetings will normally have the following agenda structure:

1. report and announcements by the Chair,
2. ongoing agenda items, and
3. new agenda items.

Agenda items will be developed by the Chair, and/or any member of the Faculty in consultation with the Chair. The proposer of each agenda item will be expected to furnish verbal or written information before or during the meeting, in order to provide substance and direction for an item. It is expected that the Chair and the Faculty will deal with agenda items in an expeditious manner. Whenever possible, the completed agenda will be emailed to the Faculty at least three days prior to a meeting. The Art Department's office manager shall record and retain the summary minutes of each meeting for reference and access by the Faculty as needed.

II. B. VOTING

Votes on all issues will require a simple majority of the Faculty who occupy regular lines: tenured faculty, tenure-earning faculty, and instructors in recurring positions. The Chair will have a vote only to break ties. Secret ballots will be upon demand. Proxy votes will be allowed with formal advanced notice to the office manager.

All proposed changes in academic policies and curricula must be approved by the majority vote of eligible faculty. Such proposed changes in policy must be included in the circulated agenda three days prior to the scheduled faculty meeting. As a general rule, the implementation of any significant policy changes shall occur in the following academic year.

II. C. ADJUNCT AND VISITING FACULTY

Adjuncts and visiting faculty are invited to participate in faculty meetings but are not obligated to do so. They will be non-voting, but their opinions and ideas will be part of the dialogue of the Faculty. On occasion, the Faculty may request volunteers from adjunct faculty and visiting instructors to serve on committees and similar department bodies, because of their particular experience or expertise. Adjuncts and visiting faculty are automatically invited to participate in the Annual Art Faculty Exhibition, if they teach at least one course per regular semester. Faculty with emeritus status will be invited as well.

II. D. COMMITTEES

II. D. 1. Standing and *Ad Hoc* Committees

Members of the Art Department serve together as a "Committee of the Whole" on all major issues. However, the Chair can appoint or request volunteer assistance as necessary. The appointees will serve in an *ad hoc* capacity until the issue is dispatched. All committee findings are subject to discussion and vote by the full voting Faculty before any issue is considered dispatched.

II. D. 2. Tenure Mentoring Committees

The Chair will consult with the new tenure-earning faculty member to select a mentoring committee during the first two years of appointment to that rank. Generally, two tenured Art Faculty members will be appointed to each committee, and ideally a third member from outside the Art Department. At the request of the tenure-earning faculty member, the committee will be enlarged to include another tenured faculty member of his/her choice. The committee will designate one member who will be responsible for convening meetings. The committee will annually confer with the Chair, prior to annual evaluations, for the purpose of advising the Chair of the candidate's "progress toward tenure."

II. E. ELECTION OF THE CHAIR

Every three years in the tenure of a Chair, a vote shall be held concerning the Faculty's recommendation to the Administration to renew, or to not renew, the appointment of the Chair. A person who has served as Chair may be elected for continuous terms without limit, but a Chair may resign from office at any time. Faculty members may nominate themselves or others. A vote will be held on all nominees who accept nominations. All nominees may vote. Two names (if two are available) will be sent as recommendations to the Dean, ranked according to their received vote totals. If no one steps forward to Chair the Department, the Faculty will request permission of the Dean to conduct a national search to fill the vacancy.

II. F. RECALL OF THE CHAIR

The Chair may also be recommended for "recall" during a three-year term by a majority faculty vote of "no confidence" sent to the Dean. Such a decision by the Faculty can only come after complete discussions with the Chair and if the Chair fails to resolve the conflict(s).

II. G. CHAIR'S ROLES AND RESPONSIBILITIES

II. G. 1. General Role

The Chair shall fulfill a “traditional” role, acting primarily as a facilitator and spokesperson on behalf of the Art Faculty. The Chair is expected to provide leadership and vision in all matters pertaining to the departmental “good,” such as excellence of programs, visibility and growth. The Chair will administer the routine functioning of the Department. All issues beyond the routine, such as changes in policy or curricula that might affect the Department, must be brought before the entire Faculty for discussion and vote. Any decisions by the Chair that would commit the Faculty’s time or talents also must be brought forward. The Chair must consult with a faculty member before committing that individual to any new duty.

The Chair is required to give full consideration to the consensus of opinion from the Faculty in all matters. Decisions by the Chair, which run counter to the will of the Faculty, must be brought to the Faculty at the earliest opportunity, along with the Chair’s reasons. In addition, the Chair must be willing to fully discuss the decisions with the entire Faculty. The use of this authority is intended for the protection of individuals in the department and for the preservation of the department’s mission, goals, and development.

II. G. 2. Chair’s Role in Evaluations

The annual evaluation process is an exception to full faculty review. Evaluations shall evolve through consultation between the Chair and the individual faculty member. The UWF “model” for the evaluation process shall be the norm. (See the document on *Promotion, Tenure, Annual Evaluation, and Performance Evaluation*, under Faculty Resources on the webpage of the Office of the Provost.)

II. G. 3. Management of Annual Budget

The Chairperson, with assistance from the office manager, is responsible for managing the department’s annual budget allocation, and other accounts, including Foundation accounts. Funding priorities are generally determined by the Will of the Faculty, with preferential treatment granted to areas of critical need and/or potential growth. It is also the role of the Chair to advocate effectively with the Administration for the support of the department’s programs, both educational and outreach programs.

II. G. 4. Construction of Class Schedules

The Chair will be responsible for presenting to the Faculty an annual (or more extensive projection) proposal for class teaching schedules. The projection should include summer schedules, whenever possible.

Summer schedules and the assignment of summer teaching lines will be built on consideration of three factors: 1) courses which fulfill the greatest programmatic

need; 2) courses which are likely to produce high student credit hours; and 3) courses which guarantee the fair distribution of summer teaching lines. The Chair will have the responsibility for presenting a schedule of summer offerings, taking into account the three variables.

Whenever possible, summer teaching assignments will be distributed among the line faculty according to the number of summer courses each has taught during the last five years. The individual with the fewest number of summer offerings will receive the first opportunity to teach a high priority course for which s/he is qualified. These same guidelines will apply to all other faculty members who wish to teach during a particular summer.

Faculty members who are awarded summer grants will retain their eligibility in the summer course rotation, as long as those grants are not fully funded (thus amounting to overloads). It should be noted, that fully funded research will in effect favor eligibility for a summer teaching assignment in the following year.

II. G. 5. Communications and Disclosure of Decisions

The Chairperson will be responsible for keeping the department informed concerning pertinent College and University issues. The Chairperson will also be responsible for regular and complete disclosures to the Art Faculty of activities and decisions by the Chair. Faculty meetings will be the normal forum for such communications. But, the Chair is responsible for using any appropriate means to keep such information as timely as possible.

II. H. DEPARTMENTAL APPEALS PROCESS

In matters where a faculty member(s) perceives that he or she has suffered a grievous wrong, a departmental appeals process may be initiated. Whenever possible, these matters will be resolved within the department. It is intended that this grievance process will not interfere with any procedures established and recognized by the College or University.

The Department of Art appeals process follows five successive stages:

1. The Chair will discuss the issue with the faculty member(s).
2. The Chair may then decide to hear other opinions.
3. After hearing other opinions, the Chair may carry the issue to the Dean, fully informing the faculty member(s).
4. If the Chair chooses not to take the matter to the Dean, a second round of discussions between the Chair and the faculty member(s) will ensue, in an attempt to resolve the matter jointly.
5. After the second round of discussions, the faculty member(s) can require the Chair to carry the issue to the Dean.

III. STANDARDS FOR FACULTY EVALUATION

III. A. GENERAL GUIDELINES

III. A. 1. Evaluative Principles and Terminology

This document establishes the procedures and criteria for evaluating the performance of the Art Faculty within the general guidelines established by the University in the areas of Teaching, Scholarly and Creative Achievement, and Professional Service. The Department of Art acknowledges UWF's mission as a "regional comprehensive University" by emphasizing excellence in Teaching. Research is deemed essential to original Scholarly and Creative Achievement, which in turn fosters a vital, vibrant learning community. While Professional Service is also acknowledged as important, the service contributions of junior faculty should not eclipse their research efforts during their early careers.

Throughout this document, a distinction may be drawn between those faculty members who are primarily engaged in creative (or studio) activities and those whose focus is directed toward the traditional scholarly pursuits, such as art history, visual culture studies, and museology. While this division is convenient for present purpose, **it is imperative for evaluators to acknowledge that the distinction drawn between the two branches of the Art Faculty is an artificial one**, for creative activities will necessarily involve traditional research and scholarly pursuits will always require a novel (re)interpretation of the facts. This truth is further reflected the different teaching methodologies and service commitments adopted by each member of the Art Faculty. For even amidst such variety, every member of the Art Faculty is united by a common purpose: to further the communication and understanding of visual ideas.

This unified purpose allows for the application of similar terminology to the various contributions made by individual members within their differing specialties. For example, any effort can be deemed greater, based on its intrinsic merit, its audience, and its impact. **Faculty performance is therefore judged according to four standards: scope, quality, impact, and longevity.** *Scope* reflects the ambitiousness of the activity. The judgment of *quality* is based largely on the degree to which the contribution: 1) addresses or challenges the contemporary critical dialogue, and 2) develops or extends artistic and scholarly dialogue. The criterion of *impact* gauges the extent to which the activity finds a public audience, as well as the nature of that audience. Finally, the issue of *longevity* speaks to the effort's potential for making a lasting contribution to the discipline. The interdependence of these four categories requires that critical judgment must be used in the evaluation of Teaching, Scholarly and Creative Activities, and Professional Service.

III. A. 2. Types of Evaluation

Three types of faculty evaluations will be completed within the Department of Art: Third-Year Evaluations, Annual Evaluations, and Comprehensive Evaluations:

Third-Year Evaluations are conducted within the Department during a faculty member's second semester of the third full year. This review is more extensive than the annual "Progress Toward Tenure" report, although both types are generated by the faculty member's Mentoring Committee. While the "Progress Toward Tenure" report becomes part of the faculty member's permanent record in the Dean's Office, the Third-Year Evaluations are intended for the Chair only, as a more detailed report that is accompanied by supporting documents. In either case, the Chair must confer annually with the faculty member regarding his/her progress toward tenure.

Annual Evaluations of all full time faculty members are conducted after the conclusion of each academic year. Faculty members post their annual contributions and achievements online, along with an updated vita. Brief descriptive narratives may be included for each section, and choice examples of supporting materials may also be attached.

Comprehensive Evaluations are concerned with promotion and tenure decisions, as well as the sustained performance evaluation, a process which takes place every 6 years (See Collective Bargaining Agreement, 2014-2017). These comprehensive evaluations are conducted in addition to the briefer annual evaluations, and are expected to fully document a multi-year period of performance.

III. A. 3. Professional Standards for Art Faculty

The disciplines of visual arts, fine arts, studio arts, art history, museology, curatorial studies and other closely related sub-disciplines have transformed significantly over past half century to incorporate many forms that extend beyond "historic" methods (e.g. drawing, painting, sculpture, printmaking, photography, etc.) or into hybrid forms that mix new technologies historic methods and concepts of the discipline of art. In line with any other creative or scholarly field, these changes in form, presentation, methodologies, et al., reflect the academic pursuit of new directions, which build upon foundations and extend the discipline and discourse in the field. This challenge has resulted in blurred distinctions between sub-disciplines, **and** added new opportunities and structures significantly informed by other fields of study that now reside in the domain of the Art, both as theory and praxis.

Over the last thirty years, these evolving discourses have led to widespread (international) discussions at the collegiate level about standards for the profession. A recognized leader in these discussions is the College Art Association (CAA), whose professional membership has established standards for evaluating the performance of visual arts educators in institutions of higher learning. Among the important documents adopted by the CAA Board of Directors is the "Guidelines for Faculty Teaching in New-Media Arts" (collegeart.org/guidelines/newmedia07). The original intent of the 1995 document was to clarify the role of "new media" artists/educators, for whom the emerging digital technology was foremost in their research and teaching. Thirty years later, this once-problematic area of the

profession has become standard, as virtually every **applied practice** and/or **theory course** incorporates aspects of these technologies.

In 1996, the College Art Association also established "Standards for Retention and Tenure of Art Historians." This document has been revised four times, most recently in 2010 (collegeart.org/guidelines/tenure). The subsequent revisions reflect the changing circumstances of art history instruction, as well as the evolving nature of the discipline itself, especially now that the analysis of visual culture and applied practice play more central roles.

The Department of Art recognizes the widespread transformation of methodologies and forms in all areas of the visual arts. Therefore, the Department accepts the standards established in the revised CAA documents (2007 and 2010) as potentially applicable to all artists/art historians/educators. Art faculty members are therefore encouraged to quote these documents, if applicable, when presenting their dossier for evaluation. Furthermore, evaluations of tenure and promotion materials for Department of Art faculty should recognize these expanded methodologies and forms in the critique of scholarly and creative activities as meritorious achievements in the discipline.

Additionally, the Department of Art adopts the language of the Tenure and Promotion Task Force (May 1, 2007 report) to make judgments on the quality of performance for purposes of annual evaluation, as well as tenure, promotion, and sustained performance recommendations:

- **Distinguished:** Exceeds department standards for professional performance. Exceeds the standard for excellence in quality or quantity or both.
- **Excellent:** Meets department standards for professional performance. No areas of weakness exist.
- **Good:** Moderate progress toward long-term professional goals, but one or more minor weaknesses exist.
- **Fair:** Overall performance includes some strengths, but one or more major weaknesses exist.
- **Poor:** Unacceptable level of performance. Major areas of weakness require remediation.

For achieving **TENURE**, a faculty member in the Department of Art must demonstrate excellence in teaching and research, and must receive at least a good rating in service.

For achieving the rank of **ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR**, a faculty member's performance in all three categories must be excellent.

For achieving the rank of **FULL PROFESSOR**, a faculty member must achieve a distinguished level of performance in at least one category, and excellent performance in the other two areas.

III. B. TEACHING

III. B. 1. Guidelines for Teaching Evaluations

While teaching can be considered separately from achievements in Scholarly and Creative Activities or Professional Service, the three areas are necessarily interrelated, especially in the Studio Arts. The simple recognition of the Art Faculty's numerous obligations suggests that this interrelationship is indeed significant. Excellence in research will necessarily impact the quality of university teaching, and both teaching and research can potentially extend beyond the classroom to perform the highest caliber of service.

III. B. 2. Teaching-related responsibilities

Studios: Most fulltime studio faculty members oversee the smooth operation of one or more studios that contain specialized equipment designed for particular discipline within the visual arts. This obligation becomes more burdensome if several courses and different teachers (often adjuncts) share the same facility. Each studio lab has its own level and type of demands, depending on the activity that occurs within it. Production in some media, for example, necessitates the use of gasses and/or chemicals, and the resulting toxic refuse must be discarded according to OSHA laws and regulations. Safety instructions are essential to all artistic activity, but especially as they apply to chemicals and equipment. Chemicals must be properly stored and equipment must be maintained in good working order. For digital art, maintenance of the lab can be highly demanding, especially as computer equipment quickly becomes obsolete.

When the studios are limited or antiquated, student work reflects those negative conditions. A faculty member must advocate for his/her studio's needs, balance the budget allocated, and establish priorities that will maximize the safe and efficient operation of the facility. This responsibility involves dedicating hours weekly to: 1) selecting equipment materials from vendors and scheduling deliveries; 2) training and directing the activities of shop assistants and cleaning crews; and 3) maintaining the safety and functionality of the studio and its equipment for students, who may use the facility both day and night. Furthermore, faculty members in a studio environment are expected to instill in their students a respect for the shared tools and workspace. In some studio labs, students must check out expensive equipment, thus adding yet another teaching-related responsibility for evaluating teaching effectiveness.

Teaching within a studio or lab environment forces unique demands upon the fulltime studio faculty. Therefore, these factors should be considered as an important part of the evaluative process.

Office hours: In keeping with the University's Office Hours Policy, "each instructional faculty member and academic advisor will be responsible for designating office hours when he or she will be available to confer with students. These hours should be on regularly scheduled class days and will be of adequate number and length to assure that students will have reasonable access to their instructors and academic advisors." Members of the Art Faculty will post and maintain a minimum of 3 office hours per week. These hours in the office should be reasonably distributed among days and time blocks to insure a reasonable degree of accessibility.

III. B. 3. Teaching Performance Indicators

The Faculty of Art recognizes that effective teaching resists objective analysis. Nonetheless, many indicators of excellence in teaching can be grouped into four categories, ***Scope, Quality, Impact, and Longevity***:

a. *Scope* measures the quantity and variety of the art faculty member's teaching contributions and responsibilities:

- the number of different course preparations
- full enrollment in sections taught
- the number of new or restructured courses and programs
- the complexity of studio maintained: its size, variety of supplies, and equipment (see explanation in III. B. 2.)
- effective supervision of studio assistants
- the number of students advised/mentored
- strict adherence to the number of required office hours

b. *Quality* teaching is indicated by both class content and the manner of delivery:

- currency of knowledge presented, as reflected in both technology and theory
- completeness of syllabi, tests, handouts, and assignments
- effective classroom critiques
- proven pedagogical approaches
- SLO's embedded in instructional activities
- application of CUTLA recommendations
- attendance at conferences on teaching

c. The *Impact* of teaching/mentoring is measured by student and audience response:

- teaching awards and other public recognition
- consistently positive student evaluations, both in the quantitative scores and in the written comments
- student involvement in faculty research projects
- enforcement of a code of conduct, and respect of shared space and equipment
- growing number of students and majors in specific teaching area
- demonstrated respect for students' rights and diversity of opinion

- demonstrated willingness to freely share expertise with audiences beyond the regular classroom assignments

d. The potential for *Longevity* is based on the projected contribution to the future success of students:

- student success in subsequent courses and capstone courses
- student recognition in art exhibitions, internships, conference papers, and publications
- student success in entering the job market or graduate school

III. B. 4. Performance Levels for Teaching

Distinguished: Demonstrates unusually high degree of quality in teaching as shown by having *achieved or surpassed performance standards on all the four categories of indicators above*, which characterize sound teaching practices. In general, performance at this level exceeds departmental expectations for excellence. Implication: Performance at this level easily justifies favorable tenure and promotion decision.

Excellent: Demonstrates consistent high quality teaching with clear evidence for student learning, by having performed *well on most of the four categories mentioned above*. In general, excellence meets all or almost all the standard expectations for faculty who are successful in tenure and promotion decisions. Implication: Performance at this level justifies favorable tenure and promotion decision.

Good: Demonstrates overall teaching effectiveness but some minor areas for concern, typically reflected only by *a few weaknesses in some of the four categories listed above*. In general, teaching performance is mildly below the norms of excellence for the department. Implication: Performance at this level suggests positive potential, but does not justify tenure or promotion at this stage of development.

Fair: Demonstrates some positive teaching outcomes but produces major areas for concern that have a moderately negative impact on students and their learning. Typically, there are *many weaknesses in the four categories of performance indicators* given above. In general, teaching performance is moderately below the department norms. Implication: Some remediation is necessary. Change will need to be substantial to qualify for tenure and promotion.

Poor: This performance level demonstrates serious problems in attaining success in teaching role as reflected either by *substantial weaknesses in most of the categories listed above, or weaknesses are more pronounced*, producing substantial negative outcomes on students and their learning. In general, teaching performance is well below the department norms. Implication: Requires major remedial work.

III. B. 5. Evidence of Teaching Performance

Faculty members commonly submit student evaluations for the purpose of evaluating teaching (see the Collective Bargaining Agreement for acceptable exclusions). However, student evaluations will never present the entire picture of effective, stimulating teaching. In the evaluative process, the "full dimension of teaching should not be slighted in the desire to arrive at usable data and systematic adjudication" (Department of Art, James Madison University, "Guidelines for Evaluating Teaching"). For this reason, faculty members are encouraged to include other evidentiary materials, besides student evaluations, especially in third-year and comprehensive evaluations. These additional documents may include—but are not limited to—selected examples of the following:

- formal assessments by the Chair and peers
- well-designed syllabi with clear expectations
- unique, current and productive approaches to the subject areas
- design of new classes and programs
- conducting Special Topics Classes, and Independent Direction
- activity that enhances technological fluency for students and instructors
- contributions to academic advisement
- quality of mentoring
- involvement students in faculty research projects
- adherence to office hours policy
- special presentations to classes taught by colleagues
- teaching awards and other recognized accomplishments
- participation in CUTLA activities
- awareness and application of Student Learning Outcomes
- instilling student respect for shared spaces and outcomes
- supervision of studio assistants, slide library assistant, and research assistants
- evidence of student success in subsequent courses;
- evidence of student success in capstone courses, student art exhibitions, and/or the BFA Exit Show
- evidence of student success in entering the job market or graduate school
- outstanding student research, writing, creative work, or projects
- enhancing program and course enrichment
- participating in a workshop or conference to improve delivery of course content
- by engaging and hosting visiting artists, scholars, or critics or by sponsoring student workshops and field trips
- active cultivation of an appreciation and understanding of diverse cultural expressions
- demonstrated respect for students' rights
- teaching Studies Abroad or leading other international student groups
- organizing student forums
- maintaining studios and equipment
- significant changes in studio/lab processes, equipment, or facilities
- offering unique creative or scholarly experiences

III. C. SCHOLARLY AND CREATIVE ACTIVITIES

The Faculty of Art endorses the concept that Scholarly and Creative Activities within a University setting should be directed toward the highest possible aspirations, that of enlarging the current body of knowledge, or redefining the collective vision. It is the belief of the Art Faculty that Scholarly and Creative Activities find their most valuable and successful solutions, when a combination of both study and inspiration is applied.

III. C. 1. Guidelines for Evaluation of Research

Research, as evidenced in Scholarly and Creative Activities, may take several forms. A faculty member whose research crosses disciplines may submit work in several categories.

Thirty years ago, when the CAA first conceived of the need for "Guidelines for Faculty Teaching in New-Media Arts" (collegeart.org/guidelines/newmedia07), most studio faculty remained safely within the boundaries of their traditional media. Today, it should be recognize that any "real or virtual" material is potentially a tool for all visual artists, not just for new media artists. As a consequence of this rapidly changing artistic environment, Creative Achievement among the studio faculty may find expression a variety of forms that resist the traditional classifications of painting, drawing, sculpture, printmaking, photography, and the like. While these media remain viable, new forms have emerged: "animations, blogs, interactive media, design, games, mobile media, desktop interactive works, websites and internet art, time-based pieces, digital installation, performance, sound installations, sculptural works, kiosks, robotics, biological and DNA art, and networked activities." This list was created for the 2007 edition of the afore mentioned CAA "Guidelines". But the authors were quick to add that, "Between the drafting and adoption of this document, the list will have only grown longer." Their prediction has surely proved true, for hybrid forms are emerging constantly.

While it would seem that art history, museum studies, and even art criticism would strike a more conservative pose, those disciplines too have experienced rapid changes in the last three decades. Beauty is dead; long live Meaning!

Additionally, traditional venues—exhibitions, shows, publications, and the like—no longer monopolize the dissemination of creative and scholarly endeavors. New experimental venues have emerged, and are constantly in flux. Even the museum, as a wholly (or holy?) western institution has been called into question. Alternative sites, whether physical or web-based, are often preferable, and even more appropriate for some contemporary expressions. These new circumstances may apply—not only to the studio artist—but to those that study visual culture in general,

including art historians, critics, and museum professionals. Given this variety, it is imperative that enlightened judgment be applied when evaluating Creative and Scholarly performance, and that allowances be granted for all worthy crossover research.

III. C. 2. Performance Indicators for Creative and Scholarly Activity

Many of the qualities that define solid research can be applied equally to Creative or Scholarly Activities. The practitioner of either must be conversant with past contributions on a chosen theme or topic, and consciously reference those earlier statements, whether in visual or written form. Their respective research may consume both time and personal funds, with little to show for it initially. Decisions must be taken as to the appropriate medium and/or form to best complete the experiment or to communicate the intent. Furthermore, a venue must be located to disseminate the final product.

These similarities allow for a comparable approach in assessing all the varied production of the Art Faculty. Evaluation relies on the four metrics used in the section on Teaching: ***Scope, Quality, Impact, and Longevity.***

a. *Scope* addresses the ambitiousness of the faculty member's research project(s). Caution is advised here, for the evaluation of *scope* does not rely strictly on numbers, nor on the magnitude of the final product. A multi-year research project might be completed in a short, experimental performance or a brief article. Truly ambitious projects may require the completion of several works, as in a solo exhibition, or necessitate the slow unfolding of several experimental stages. Book-length manuscripts also demand a long commitment. Thus, the metric of *scope* affords one element for consideration within the evaluative process.

b. The category of *Quality* may be inferred by any one of a number of variables. For the traditional artist or scholar, the reputation of the sponsoring organization can establish the significance of an exhibition or publication for evaluative purposes. Another commonly acknowledged indicator of quality is whether the sponsoring organization is recognized internationally, nationally, regionally or locally. For experimental works, the unique nature of the effort makes it more difficult to evaluate, especially when the venue is an alternative one. In this instance, the work's quality must be assessed on its own terms, as with any other radical rupture of established norms.

c. The impact of the research may be inferred by the size of the audience and the nature of that audience. Works that receive the accolades of experts in the field are deemed more significant than those that garner the polite admiration of an uninformed public. The conditions that may affect merit in this category are infinitely varied. Often a group of peers, however small or select, may be infinitely more knowledgeable about a narrow field than the so-called experts or pompous critics.

d. The potential for longevity is based on the work's projected impact and its estimated contribution to the field. Longevity may be reasonably suggested by significant awards, published or online reviews, and references to accomplishments in publications and websites. For work that has not yet received wide acclaim, longevity may also be demonstrated by a body of work produced over a period of time. Creative and scholarly efforts that combine evidence of high "quality" and broad "impact" should also be deemed meritorious, especially in the case of radically creative approaches that alter informed opinion and conventional views.

III. C. 3. Performance Levels for Creative and Scholarly Activity

Distinguished: Demonstrates *unusually high degree* of skill in design and execution of scholarly and creative research, as demonstrated by *middle or high levels attained in all of the indicators* of performance for scope, quality, impact, or longevity. Overall, this performance *exceeds* department standards for excellence. Implication: Easily qualifies for favorable promotion and tenure decisions.

Excellent: Demonstrates satisfactory execution of scholarship or creative activity agenda as demonstrated by *middle or high levels attained in at least three of the indicators* of performance for scope, quality, impact, or longevity. In general, scholarly and creative projects meet the standards of the department. Implication: Performance at this level facilitates favorable promotion/tenure decisions.

Good: Demonstrates moderate tangible progress in scholarship or creative activity agenda. *Some work may attain acceptable levels in at least two of the indicators* of performance for scope, quality, impact, or longevity, and completed projects suggest the potential for significant, high quality contributions over the candidate's career. Implication: With further improvement, the candidate will most likely attain tenure and promotion.

Fair: Demonstrates only minor tangible progress toward executing a scholarly and/or creative body of work with a defined focus. While there is some progress, scholarly and creative projects are moderately below the department norms, *meeting some, but only the most modest levels outlined* above for scope, quality, impact, or longevity. Implication: No support for tenure/promotion, but shows future productivity promise.

Poor: Demonstrates serious problems in developing a scholarship and creative research agenda, as reflected by a lack of any tangible productivity. In general, scholarly and creative production is well below the department norms. What little work may be produced *fails to meet even the most modest levels expected* in scope, quality, impact, or longevity. Implication: Major remedial work is required. Scholarship and creative projects mentor should be considered.

III. C. 4. Evidence of Creative and Scholarly Activity

For the studio artist, evidence of creative research *may* include, but is not limited to:

- works of art in traditional studio media, such as painting, sculpture, ceramics, printmaking, and so forth
- works of art created in non-traditional or new media
- tangible evidence of research directed towards a long-term goal
- juried exhibitions of works of art, in traditional and non-traditional settings
- reviews of exhibited works, either in print, online, or other forms
- reproductions featured in publications or online
- authored reviews, catalogs, articles
- invited presentations or workshops
- organization of panels at conferences
- inclusion in museum and gallery catalogues
- submission of grants proposals, both internal and external
- organization and presentation of workshops

In the areas of art history, criticism, visual culture, and museology, evidence of scholarly research *may* include, but is not limited to:

- peer-reviewed articles, and invited articles
- book chapters
- books, both authored and edited volumes
- field and library research in process
- reviews of exhibitions and books
- conference and other invited presentations
- organization of conference panels, sessions, or full conferences
- curating exhibitions
- contributions to museum and gallery catalogs
- submission of grants proposals, both internal and external

III. D. PROFESSIONAL SERVICE

III. D. 1. Service to the Profession and the Community

Professional service is an important component of the evaluation process for it brings recognition to the Department, College, and the University. In general, the highest form of service is to one's peers, including *but not limited to* contributions to professional organizations, as juror, editor, officer, organizer, and the like. The significance of these contributions is necessarily mitigated by the reputation of the organization served.

III. D. 2. Performance Indicators for Service

Again, the Department of Art recognizes the variable nature of any contribution in this category, and elects to measure performance based on the four categories addressed earlier: ***Scope, Quality, Impact, and Longevity.***

a. Scope measures the extent and frequency of the contribution(s), as evident in:

- the number of organizations served within the evaluation period
- the office held, or duties performed, within the organization, committee, or board
- the number and size of art shows judged, manuscripts reviewed, proposals evaluated, etc.
- the number of panels/conferences/workshops organized
- the complexity and duration of task(s)
- the extent of effort required to fulfill vision or expectation

b. Quality of service is inferred by the significance of the organization or groups served, which may be measured by:

- the organization served is recognized internationally, nationally, regionally or locally.
- the service is performed at the invitation of organization or group
- specialized knowledge is deemed an essential part of the contribution
- the contribution is acknowledged to be appropriate, timely, and accurate

c. Impact judges the effect made on the profession, the community, and/or the University, and is recognized by:

- service awards and other forms of public recognition
- contribution widely praised by peers
- contribution more than fulfills vision or expectation of group
- number of individuals/organizations affected by the contribution(s) made

d. Longevity is the contribution's potential to have lasting consequences on the individuals or organizations served. Projections are based on the potential to:

- support an organization's long term goals
- address an ongoing need
- empower subsequent artists, researchers, and leaders
- continue to inform and/or inspire others

III. D. 3. Performance Levels for Service

Distinguished: Demonstrates *high degree of skill in service contributions in all four categories above*. In general, service contributions exceed the standards of excellence of the department.

Implication: Performance easily qualifies for favorable tenure and promotion decisions.

Excellent: Demonstrates *high and/or steady level service contributions* as shown by many of the indicators *in at least three of the categories above*. In general, service contributions meet the standards of the department.

Implication: Performance at this level qualifies for favorable promotion/tenure decisions.

Good: Demonstrates *major tangible progress* in relevant service contributions by either 1) fulfilling *modest expectations in most of the categories above*, or 2) achieving *higher expectations in one or two categories above*. In general, service is somewhat below department norms.

Implication: Acceptable performance early in career as potential is demonstrated but expectation is that service excellence is the standard that produces positive personnel decisions.

Fair: Demonstrates *only minor tangible progress in service contributions* as shown by the indicators *in few of the categories above*. In general, service is moderately below department norms.

Implication: No support for tenure/promotion

Poor: Demonstrates serious problems in fulfilling appropriate service role for faculty as shown by *serious weaknesses in all of the categories above*. In general, service is well below the department norms.

Implication: Remedial work is required; May include recommendation to find a context that is a better match to the individual's service values than the substantial service needs relevant to the regional comprehensive context.

III. D. 4. Evidence of Professional Service

For evaluative purposes, service contributions must be professional in nature, and therefore may exclude a faculty member's voluntary activities with organizations that have little to do with one's field of expertise.

Service to the Profession. In general, the evaluation of this category may include—but is not limited to—any of the following:

- election or appointment to a position, due to one's area of expertise;
- serving on committees or boards of recognized professional organizations;
- reviewer of manuscripts and grant proposals;
- other tangible contributions to professional institutions or organizations;
- public/community presentations, if the presentations require the expertise of one's discipline; and
- service as judge for exhibitions held locally, regionally, nationally, and internationally.

•

Service to the University. Members of the Art Faculty are also evaluated on the traditional activities expected as a member of the University community. Some of these include:

- participation in governance councils;
- service on committees;
- recruitment activities, such as participation in Open House and Career Fair;
- attendance at graduation ceremonies, other official functions; and
- similar activities.

Service to the Department and the Community. In addition, there are several other expectations that are unique to the Fine Art Faculty, in order to effectively serve the Art Department's mission. Examples of such specialized service may include, but are not limited to:

- organization of student shows, held on campus and downtown;
- faculty sponsor of Art Club activities;
- special assignments, such as acting as the BFA coordinator;
- attendance at events sponsored by the Art Department;
- attendance at student and community Art exhibitions; and
- representation of the Department through membership and regular participation in art organizations within the region's artistic community.

IV. RESOURCES

College Art Association. "Guidelines for Faculty Teaching in New-Media Arts." *Unanimously adopted by the CAA Board of Directors on October 21, 1995; revised on October 28, 2007.* (collegeart.org/guidelines/newmedia07)

College Art Association. "Standards for Retention and Tenure of Art Historians." *Adopted by the CAA Board of Directors on February 21, 1996; revised in October 2002 and May 2005 and on October 25, 2009, and May 2, 2010.* (collegeart.org/guidelines/tenure)

School of Art, Design and Art History, James Madison University. "SADAH PAC Composition, Process of Election, and Promotion and Tenure Guidelines." *Approved April 29, 2009.* (<http://www.jmu.edu/academic-affairs/documents/import/art-arth-pacprocedures-2013.pdf>)

UWF Tenure and Promotion Task Force. "Tenure and Promotion Task Force Report, May 1, 2007: Recommendations." (<https://nautical.uwf.edu/org/dispdata.cfm?UniqID=5731&OrgUnitID=PROMO TF&Dated=1>)