

Revised & Adopted: October 26, 2018

POLICIES, PROCEDURES AND CRITERIA FOR TENURE AND PROMOTION IN THE SCHOOL OF VISUAL ART AND DESIGN

UCTP Approved April 2019

INTRODUCTION

This document is intended to assist candidates in their preparation for tenure and promotion. Candidates are responsible for familiarizing themselves with the university's regulations regarding tenure and promotion as set forth in the *Faculty Manual* and the UCTP Guidelines for Units: Preparing Criteria and Files, compiled by the University Committee on Promotion and Tenure. The procedures described below are consistent with the *Faculty Manual* in force in October 2018 at the time of the UCTP approval of the unit criteria.

The School of Visual Art and Design of the University of South Carolina is composed of four academic areas: Art Education, Art History, Media Arts, and Studio Art. While standards for evaluating teaching and service are the same in all areas, specific forms of research (scholarship and creative performance) may vary significantly. Faculty seeking promotion or tenure must satisfy school standards in the categories of teaching and service, in addition to area standards for quality research (scholarship and creative performance).

I. ELIGIBILITY FOR TENURE OR PROMOTION

Faculty below the rank of full professor are to be considered annually for promotion and/or tenure. Except for faculty members in their decision year, faculty members may request for reasons such as a recent promotion or the incomplete status of a major project, not to be considered for tenure or promotion. Candidates for promotion to associate professor may elect to be evaluated by the tenure and promotion guidelines in effect at the time they were hired. Candidates who apply for promotion to full professor must use the criteria and standards in effect at the time of their application, as stated in the *Faculty Manual*. By offering themselves for consideration, candidates acknowledge that they have read the requirements for promotion and tenure in the *Faculty Manual* and have satisfied probationary requirements.

What follows are descriptions of rank from the Faculty Manual (2018).

Professor. To be eligible for appointment at the rank of professor, a faculty member must have a record of outstanding or excellent performance usually involving both teaching and research, or creativity or performance in the arts, or recognized professional contributions. The faculty member normally is expected to hold the earned doctor's degree and have at least nine years of effective, relevant experience.

Associate Professor. To be eligible for appointment at the rank of associate professor, a

faculty member must have a record of outstanding or excellent performance usually involving both teaching and research, or creativity or performance in the arts, or recognized professional contributions. The faculty member normally is expected to hold the earned doctor's degree and must possess strong potential for further development as a teacher and scholar.

Assistant Professor. To be eligible for appointment at the rank of assistant professor, a faculty member normally is expected to hold the earned doctor's degree or its equivalent and must possess strong potential for development as a teacher and scholar.

Faculty with joint appointments: Jointly appointed faculty are faculty members whose tenure home is in one unit (the “primary unit”) and who have a part time appointment, with some combination of teaching, research, and service obligations, in one or more unit or program (the “secondary unit”). A joint appointment is formalized by a Memorandum of Understanding or Charter that specifies the responsibilities of the faculty member to the primary and secondary units. See Addendum A.

General Standards for Assessment of Faculty.

Definitions of the terms used to describe faculty performance from the 2018 Faculty Manual are defined below:

Outstanding: The candidate’s performance is far above the minimally effective level. In regard to research and scholarship, output is of very high quality, and a national/international reputation is evident.

Excellent: The candidate significantly exceeds the minimally effective level of performance. In regard to research and scholarship, output is already of high quality, and a national/international reputation is clearly possible, if not likely.

Good: The candidate’s performance is clearly above the minimally effective level. In regard to research and scholarship, he or she shows promise of high quality in the future.

Fair: The candidate meets the minimally effective level of performance.

Unacceptable: The candidate has accomplished less than the minimally effective level of performance.

Criteria for all tenure and promotion decisions shall require a record of accomplishment indicative of continuing development of the faculty member in research, teaching, and service, and appropriate progress toward development of a national or international reputation in a field. Criteria for tenure at any rank must require evidence of consistency and durability of performance.

Unit criteria for promotion to associate professor and for tenure at the rank of associate

professor shall require, at a minimum, evidence of excellence in either research and/or creative activities or teaching, accompanied by a good record in the other areas, and evidence of progress toward establishing a national or international reputation in a field.

Criteria for promotion from associate professor to professor and for tenure at the rank of professor shall require, at a minimum, evidence of excellence in research and/or creative activities and teaching, accompanied by a record in the other area that is at least good, and evidence of national or international stature in a field. (Faculty Manual, 2018)

II. PROCEDURES

A. Notification

1. Faculty below the rank of tenured Professor will be notified of their eligibility for promotion and tenure according to the provost's office tenure and promotion calendars.
2. Within one week after notification, faculty will communicate their intent regarding promotion and/or tenure in writing to the Chair of the School of Visual Art and Design Committee on Tenure and Promotions (SVADCTP hereafter).

B. Membership in the SVADCTP

1. In cases involving tenure, committee membership will consist of all tenured faculty of equal or higher rank than the candidate.
2. In cases involving promotion, committee membership will consist of all tenured faculty of a rank higher than the candidate.
3. The director of the school is an ex-officio member of the SVADCTP but is not eligible to vote at this level. At the invitation of the chair of the SCADCTP the director may attend the meeting(s) at which a case is being considered by the committee, but only as an observer. The director will write a separate evaluative letter that will become part of the candidate's file.
4. Members of the SVADCTP on leave or on sabbatical must notify the SVADCTP chair in writing prior to the first meeting of the Tenure and Promotion Committee if they intend to participate in the review process. Members choosing to participate must participate in all candidates' reviews.

C. Responsibilities of the SVADCTP

1. The SVADCTP will be responsible for administration of the Policies, Procedures, and Criteria for Tenure and Promotion in the School of Visual Art and Design.

D. Files

1. The candidate bears primary responsibility for preparation of the file, and the inclusion of all required materials on which the promotion and tenure decision will be based.

2. The candidate should download T&P forms from the Provost's website and complete them in their entirety.
3. The candidate must submit the file to the director's office by the date published on the university T&P calendar. After the submission of the file, only individuals mentioned in the UCTP Guidelines will have access to the file (pg. 6-7). The Director of SVAD will maintain possession and control of the file. All materials except those placed in the file by the candidate are considered confidential and will not be made available to the candidate.

E. Review

1. External

- a. ———With the exception of full professors who are being considered for tenure, *outside* referees must be at least a rank higher than the candidate, or possess equivalent professional experience if outside of academia. Unit procedures for the evaluation of the research component of the file must require that at least five evaluations of the candidate's research and scholarship be obtained from impartial scholars at peer or aspirant institutions within the field, outside the University of South Carolina. If a person can be shown to be one of the leading scholars in a particular field, that person may be used as an outside evaluator even if he or she is at an institution that is not peer or aspirant. Non-university specialists may be used as outside evaluators if allowed by unit procedures; however, the majority of evaluators normally must be persons with academic affiliations. Persons who have co-authored publications, collaborated on research, or been colleagues or advisors of the applicant normally should be excluded from consideration as outside evaluators. All evaluators must be asked to disclose any relationship or interaction with the applicant. The outside evaluators must be selected by the unit except as provided below for jointly appointed faculty.

The SVADCTP Chair in consultation with members of the SVADCTP will compose a list of *external* referees. In the case of joint appointments, at least one of the outside reviewers must be someone nominated by the secondary unit, unless the MOU with the secondary unit specifies otherwise. From the *Faculty Manual*: "For faculty holding joint appointments, each secondary unit must be given an opportunity to propose outside evaluators and to comment on evaluators proposed by the primary unit. Primary and secondary units should work together to obtain a suitable and representative group of evaluators. An evaluation must be solicited from at least one evaluator nominated or approved by each secondary unit."

- b. The candidate shall have no fewer than 5 *external* referees.
- c. The SVADCTP Chair in collaboration with the director will contact the selected individuals to determine their willingness to serve as *external referees*.
- d. The candidate will prepare sets of materials representative of his or her research, (scholarship, *and/or* creative performance) for the *external* evaluators, and deliver them to the school chair for mailing by an announced date. External evaluators will not have knowledge of the teaching and service activities of the candidate in most cases. Consequently, their primary responsibility will be to evaluate the quality of the candidate's research (scholarship or creative performance).

2. Internal

- a. The Candidate's physical file will be available for review by members of the SVADDCTP by the date specified on the Tenure and Promotion Calendar in a location to be determined by the director of the school. An electronic version of the file will also be made available on a secure platform.
- b. A meeting will be called by the SVADCTP Chair to discuss the candidate's file and vote.

F. Voting and Vote Notification

- 1. Only members of the SVADCTP may vote on a candidate's file. (II.B.)
- 2. Each voting SVADDCTP member will complete a secret ballot for each decision for each candidate, specifying "yes", "no" or "abstain". A majority of "yes" or "no" votes will constitute either a favorable or unfavorable recommendation. Abstentions and absences will not be counted in determining a majority. Each voting SVADDCTP member will also complete a vote justification stating how he or she voted and why. The vote justification will be submitted to the school chair by an announced date. The justification need not be signed.
- 3. The SVADDCTP Chair will tabulate ballots and notify the committee of the results of the vote.
- 4. The SVADDCTP Chair is the only person authorized to notify the candidate of the results of the vote. The Candidate will be told whether or not the vote was favorable or unfavorable. The actual vote count will not be revealed.

5. The school chair will forward to the Dean a list of all candidates and the SVADDCTP's vote, whether favorable or unfavorable, along with the Chair's evaluative letter.
6. Non-favorable action on a candidate by the committee shall not prejudice future consideration.
7. All discussions, votes, and justifications of the SVADDCTP are to be held in the strictest confidence by the committee's members.
8. Definitions of the terms used to describe faculty performance from the 2018 Faculty Manual are defined below:

Outstanding: The candidate's performance is far above the minimally effective level. In regard to research and scholarship, output is of very high quality, and a national/international reputation is evident.

Excellent: The candidate significantly exceeds the minimally effective level of performance. In regard to research and scholarship, output is already of high quality, and a national/international reputation is clearly possible, if not likely.

Good: The candidate's performance is clearly above the minimally effective level. In regard to research and scholarship, he or she shows promise of high quality in the future.

Fair: The candidate meets the minimally effective level of performance.

Unacceptable: The candidate has accomplished less than the minimally effective level of performance.

G. Appeals

1. Candidates receiving a non-favorable vote may request a meeting with the school director for a discussion of the vote justifications, and SVADCTP discussion. An indication of the strength of the vote of the SVADCTP will be given, without attribution.
2. Candidates wishing to appeal the unit's decision should follow procedures outlined in the *Faculty Manual*.

H. Changes to the Policies, Procedures, and Criteria for Tenure and

Promotion in the School of Visual Art and Design may only occur after discussion by the faculty of school and approval by the SVADCTP, the Provost and the UCTP.

III. DEPARTMENTAL CRITERIA FOR PROMOTION AND TENURE

- A. Appointment or promotion to the rank of **Assistant Professor**.
 - 1. To be eligible for this rank the candidate must have earned the highest appropriate degree in his/her field. In Art Education this is, the Ph.D. or Ed.D. In Art History this is the Ph.D. In Media Arts this is the M.F.A., Ed.D., or Ph.D. In Studio Art this is the M.F.A. or possession of commensurate professional experience. Waiver of the M.F.A. requirement for candidates in studio art is only considered when an artist of acknowledged critical acclaim does not possess the academic degree. Any exception to the terminal degree requirement must follow the policy and procedures stated in the ACAF 1.20 “Credential Verification for Instructors of Record.”
 - 2. The candidate must possess strong potential for development in the areas of teaching and research (scholarship and creative performance).

- B. Appointment or promotion to the rank of **Associate Professor**. For this rank, research and teaching are the primary criteria for appointment or promotion, with service being secondary.
 - 1. The candidate must have satisfied all of the requirements for appointment or promotion to Assistant Professor.
 - 2. The candidate must have achieved significant recognition in his/her field. This determination will be based on area criteria and the candidate’s record as evaluated by professionals of higher rank from the School of Visual Art and Design and external referees from the candidate's field. Significant recognition means that the candidate's work is judged as being of high quality when compared with the work of peers in a context that extends beyond South Carolina. The record should also reflect a strong potential for continued professional development.
 - 3. The candidate must, at minimum, be a “good” teacher. Note: The *Faculty Manual* requires a minimum rating of “excellent” in teaching *or* scholarship and a minimum “good” rating in the other areas for promotion to associate professor.

4. To attain the minimum required evaluation of “good” in service, the candidate must have demonstrated a willingness to provide service and effectiveness in its execution to the school and/or the university and/or appropriate professional organizations.
- C. Appointment or promotion to the rank of **Professor**. For this rank, research and teaching are the primary criteria for appointment or promotion, with service being secondary.
1. The candidate must have satisfied all of the requirements for appointment or promotion to Associate Professor.
 2. The candidate must possess a professional record, based on area criteria, that demonstrates a sustained and substantial record of achievement that is judged excellent by professionals of higher rank from the School of Visual Art and Design and external referees. "Excellent" means that the candidate's professional record is equivalent to, or exceeds, that of peers with the same level of experience in the field at comparable institutions. This record should be reviewed in combination with the professional record presented for the last promotion. The whole record will be evaluated, but accomplishments since the last promotion will be given greater weight.
 3. The candidate must be an “excellent” teacher. (See III F.)
 4. To attain the minimum required evaluation of “good” in service, the candidate must have demonstrated a willingness to provide service and effectiveness in its execution to the school and/or the university and/or appropriate professional organizations. (See III G.)
- D. **Tenure.** Candidates for faculty appointments may be recommended for tenure at the time of appointment. In general, the awarding of tenure is viewed as a demonstration of a faculty member’s consistency and durability of overall performance and the expectation of a faculty member's continuing contribution to the school's and university’s community of scholars in all three areas of evaluation: research, teaching, and service. Consequently, tenure is viewed as a separate issue from promotion and requires a commitment by the candidate that exceeds the expectations for promotion. It is expected that candidates will have satisfied the requirements for promotion to Associate Professor prior to or concurrent with the awarding of tenure. It is further expected that the candidate's record of teaching demonstrates involvement beyond regular, daily classroom duties and/or innovation. In the area of service, the candidate must have made a significant contribution to the school, and/or

professional organizations, and/or the university. Time and accomplishments at other educational or professional institutions may be considered in evaluating a candidate for tenure and/or promotion.

- E. Area guidelines.** The quality of research, scholarship and creative performance is determined by outside evaluators and faculty within each area. Work published, exhibited, or performed in an international arena is *generally* judged as superior to national and national arenas are superior to regional, with local arenas considered less important. “International” is defined as having both multinational governance and/or participation. *Projects in process prior to the candidate’s hiring at the University of South Carolina, and on which the candidate continues to work while at USC, will be considered as part of the candidate’s professional production for the assessment of the candidate for tenure.*
- F. School guidelines and criteria for evaluating teaching.** Teaching effectiveness is determined by two evaluative measures: departmental peer review of teaching and the standardized student evaluation scale. Candidates must be viewed as both competent and effective in the classroom and receive a rating of “good” or higher during the past four years on the school peer review of teaching. On *4-point* standardized student evaluation scale, candidates must receive a majority of ratings at **2.5** or higher during the past four years. Other instructional activities documented in the candidate’s file must receive an evaluation of “good” or higher by members of the school.
- a. Electronic student evaluations are provided to all students at the end of the semester. The faculty member and the director of the school receive the analysis of the teaching evaluations. Evaluations for all courses taught during the time covered by the review must be included in the tenure and promotion file.
 - b. A systematic program of peer review of teaching is in place. (See the School of Visual Art and Design Teaching Committee Guidelines: Peer Review of Teaching.) Faculty are observed on a rotating schedule, but can also be observed upon request. The faculty member and the school director receive written documentation of observations. Documentation resulting from peer reviews is placed in the Tenure and Promotion file.
 - c. Outcomes of student evaluations and peer reviews of teaching are available for all members of the Tenure and Promotion Committee to review in the candidate's file. One member of the committee is given the responsibility of creating an overview

of the candidate's student and peer evaluations of teaching, which is presented to members of the Tenure and Promotion Committee during the review of the candidate.

- d. Candidates will provide copies of course materials and syllabi that are used in their courses reflecting the content and rigor of each course taught.
- e. Winning school, college, or university teaching awards will exempt candidates from peer review for a period of three years.

Instructional activities may include but are not limited to the following:

- Developing course materials
- Preparing instructional materials in printed form or computer-based instruction
- Providing instruction that leads to the receipt of teaching awards
- Developing and teaching workshops or seminars
- Receiving artist in residence appointments, visiting teaching appointments and lectureships at post secondary institutions
- Receiving faculty development grants to support teaching innovations
- Developing and/or revising new courses or programs
- Conducting seminars or workshops for academic or professional associations
- Receiving leadership roles in teaching related activities of professional associations
- Chairing graduate committees
- Serving on graduate committees
- Serving as a faculty and/or student mentor
- Serving on comprehensive exam committees

G. School guidelines for evaluating service. Candidates seeking promotion to associate professor should receive a designation of at least “good” for service to the university, school, and/or profession. Candidates seeking promotion to full professor should serve the university, and school as well as demonstrating service and/or leadership outside of the university in a scholarly or professional organization. Candidates will be expected to provide evidence of effective service in some of the following areas:

1. Area, school, college, or university administration.
2. Area, school, college or university committees. Chairing a committee carries more weight than membership.
3. Student advisement.

4. Public service that directly relates to the candidate's field of research (scholarship or creative performance).

1. **Art Education**

Faculty in Art Education are expected to be professional, practicing scholars involved in creating original research. The diverse nature of forms this research may take will vary among individuals. In order to achieve the rating of “excellent” the candidate for promotion in art education is expected to show **evidence of commitment to ideas or themes, creating a body of work and interconnected publications and/or works of art. (this section needs clarification)** Scholarly accomplishments by art educators can be achieved through a variety of activities. Associate Professors should be on a trajectory for national or international distinction and Full Professors should have achieved national or international distinction. The following list offers activities that might be undertaken by faculty, but is not exclusive to other worthwhile endeavors. Scholarship is evaluated by the quality and quantity of the faculty member's productions in areas such as the following:

- a. Creative research through empirical, descriptive, historical ethnographic, and artistic methodologies or combinations of methods that is published, presented, or exhibited.
- b. Publications in scholarly journals. Publication in refereed, scholarly journals will be considered superior to non-refereed or popular journals. (Example of journals include, but are not limited to: Scholarly refereed: Studies in Art Education, Arts and Learning Research, Visual Arts Research, Journal of Aesthetic Education, Canadian Review of Art Education Research, Journal of Multicultural Arts Education, Art Education and Design for Arts in Education. Popular refereed: School Arts and Arts and Activities.
- c. Publication of authored and co-authored books, textbooks, chapters in books and anthologies, and journals (authored is generally considered superior to co-authored, books superior to chapters).
- d. Editorships and editorial board positions are seen as appropriate scholarly activity for Art Education faculty, but editorial work will not substitute for publication of original research.

- e. Applications of original research and writing to create educational materials is a viable avenue for scholarly activity.
- f. Grants for research and development of materials and/or programs in art education may be viewed as evidence of scholarly activity.
- g. Creating and exhibiting works of art in quality, juried exhibitions is viewed as evidence of scholarly activity.
- h. Presenting scholarly work in national and international forums, or in the role of professional consulting is highly regarded, but presentations may not replace publications as evidence of scholarly activity.
- i. Consideration will also be given to interdisciplinary activities and achievements that contribute to the mission of the school and university.

2. **Art History**

In order to be judged as “excellent”, the candidate in Art history is expected to be an active professional scholar. To achieve the rank of Associate Professor, the candidate in Art History is a scholar whose work is on the trajectory for national or international distinction. To achieve the rank of Full Professor, the candidate’s scholarship has achieved national and/or international distinction. Legitimate scholarship in Art History may include:

- a. Book publication (including textbooks): In descending order of merit: authored, co-authored, edited, contributed to. The primary criterion of merit here, as in all areas to be discussed below, is professional critical response. Consideration of merit will also depend in this case on the quality of the publishing house. University press books are generally considered more prestigious than commercial press books, although there will be exceptions. The presses of major universities are generally considered more prestigious than those of smaller or less prestigious universities, although, again, exceptions are to be noted with regard to particular areas of study and specific circumstances.
- b. The organization of exhibitions and/or the writing of catalog materials: Merit here will depend on the prestige of the exhibition venues, on the scope and importance of the exhibition, and on the amount and nature of information provided.
- c. Article publication: In this area refereed scholarly journals are considered more prestigious than non-refereed or popular publications. Authored is considered more prestigious than co-authored. With regard to refereed

journals, there is always at any given moment an unstated although clearly recognized hierarchy within the field of art history and within the sub specialties. Because this hierarchy is not fixed, it would be misleading to try to provide it here. It should be the duty of the tenure and promotion committee members to familiarize themselves with the appropriate hierarchy for individual cases, and the duty of the voting faculty to make that hierarchy explicit on the ballots. The organizing and editing of journal materials is also considered an important area of scholarship and may in certain situations be considered more prestigious than the publication of a journal article.

- d. Book reviews, encyclopedia entries, and the publication of proceedings: Merit here will depend on several interrelated factors, including: the publication venue, the length of the review or entry, and the importance of the topic.
- e. Scholarly lectures and presentations: The presentation of scholarly research at professional forums (conferences and symposia) should be judged by the nature of the forum. Symposia should be judged by the nature of the organizing body and by the quality of its participants. The organization of conferences and symposia or the chairing of specific parts thereof should also be considered scholarly activity and may, in certain circumstances, rank higher than the delivery of a paper therein. Guest lectures may also be considered a legitimate scholarly activity depending on the nature of the talk and the circumstances of its presentation.
- f. The development of software for instructional programs: In this rapidly developing area of professional activity merit would depend on the amount of work involved, the organization for whom the work is done, and the potential educational benefits to be derived.
- g. Grants for research and development: Merit in this area will be judged largely by the prestige of the granting institution and by the amount of the grant.
- h. Professional consultation (paid or unpaid): Merit in this area will depend on the potential educational or scholarly benefits to be derived therefrom.
- i. Consideration will also be given to interdisciplinary activities and achievements that contribute to the mission of the school and university.

- 3. **Media Arts.** In order to achieve a rating of “excellent”, Media Arts faculty are expected to be active scholars and/or artists in their areas of expertise. Associate Professors should be on a trajectory

for national or international distinction and Full Professors should have achieved national or international distinction.

Candidates may select either category “a” scholarly production, or category “b” artistic production, or a combination of both *categories* as their focus. Scholarship centers on faculty publication, while artistic production emphasizes performance and production. Items “c” through “f” are examples of work undertaken by faculty related to both categories “a” and “b,” but are not exclusive to other worthwhile endeavors.

- a. Scholarly Production: The significance of all publications, whatever their nature, number, or length, is the single most important consideration of merit. The successful candidate will demonstrate the significance of the publication through verifiable means, and will clearly define his/her role in the publication, such as author, co-author, or editor. The following items serve as examples of scholarly production: books, *scripts, screenplays, essays*, refereed journal articles, book chapters, and *scholarly, published* reviews of work.
- b. Artistic Achievement: broadcast/exhibition/performance of an original creative production--visual, aural, and/or written. The significance of artistic achievements, whatever their nature, number, or length, is the single most important consideration. The successful candidate will demonstrate the significance of the achievement through verifiable means. The candidate will also clearly define his/her role in the work in terms of whether the activity is a collaboration or solo project, and whether the work is commissioned, invited, or submitted. International and national exposure or circulation is considered more significant than regional and regional more important than local. The following are examples of artistic achievement *in Media Arts: peer-reviewed* publication; juried and/or peer-reviewed production, broadcast, or exhibition; *sale, optioning, or licensing of a media object or method by a significant third party; successful patenting of a significant media object or method.*
- c. Professional presentations, lectures, and/or workshops will be evaluated in terms of their prestige, significance and audience.
- d. Acquiring grants, fellowships, and/or awards for original research or artistic work will be evaluated on the amount received, the prestige of the grants program and the granting agency.

- e. Professional consultation and professional exhibition/production juror (for example, serving as a juror for film/video projects) will be evaluated according to the candidate's role.
- f. Consideration will be given to interdisciplinary activities and achievements that contribute to the mission of the school or university.

4. Studio Art.

In order to achieve the rank of "excellent" Studio Art faculty are expected to be active artists in their areas of expertise. Associate Professors should be on a trajectory for national or international distinction and Full Professors should have achieved national or international distinction.

Faculty in the Studio Arts are expected to be practicing professional artists, pursuing original, creative production and/or scholarly research. Professional artistic productivity may take many forms. Both the evidence and evaluation of that productivity may also take many forms. The following are significant categories of research and creative production generally undertaken by Studio Art faculty. (This list is not exclusive of other worthwhile endeavors; nor does it assume faculty will participate in all of the categories.) Evaluative criteria are listed for each category.

- a. Creation and exhibition of artworks: "Exhibition" means any professional presentation of the artwork, including traditional gallery or museum display, installation, publication, or other art event. "Artworks" include original aesthetic objects, designs, installations, productions, and/or performances, as well as material prepared for reproduction in printed matter. The selection of artworks for exhibition entails an external evaluation by art professionals based on scholarly criteria (and is therefore analogous to the publication of a manuscript). The chief criteria of merit in this category are originality and professional impact. Merit derives from the qualitative status (i.e., professional, artistic, or scholarly reputation) of the exhibiting institution *and the nature of the selection process. The order of exhibition merit is: solo exhibition, two-person exhibition, and group exhibition. In ranking these, international exhibits are **generally** superior to national, national are superior to regional and regional are superior to local.* Other evidence of merit and methods of evaluation include:

- (1) Publication of essays, articles and/or reviews about a faculty member's artwork or an exhibition of it. Merit will depend on the scope of the essay, article or review and the professional reputation of both the publication and author.
 - (2) Reproduction of a faculty member's artwork in a print [or electronic] publication. Selection of an artist's work for publication is significant. Merit will depend on the professional reputation of the publication.
 - (3) Inclusion of a faculty member's artwork in collections: The addition of an artist's work to a collection is significant. Merit will depend on the quality of a collection and whether or not the collection is curated. The order of merit is museum collections, corporate collections, and private collections. There may be exceptions to this ranking based upon the reputation of the collection.
 - (4) Winning of awards, especially in juried shows and competitions. An award-winning artwork carries special significance and in itself represents a qualitative evaluation. Merit will depend on the quality and professional reputation of the award, its institutional sponsor, and/or its juror(s).
- b. Authorship and publication of professionally-related books, articles, and reviews: For books, the evaluative criterion shall be professional critical response. For articles and reviews, merit shall be based on the reputation of the publication.
 - c. Acquisition of fellowships and/or grants for original artistic work or research. The receiving of such awards is an important indication of scholarly achievement. The merit of each award shall be based on the amount of funding received and the prestige of the granting agency.
 - d. Authorship and development of professionally related software: If the software is developed as a work of art, it will be evaluated by the guidelines for artworks and exhibitions. If the software is developed for instruction, it will be evaluated by professional critical response, evidence of its impact

- on instruction, and/or publication/distribution of the software.
- e. Presentation of scholarly papers and lectures: The presentation of scholarly research at professional conferences shall be judged by the nature of the conference. International conferences are considered more prestigious than national, etc. Guest lectures may also be considered a legitimate scholarly activity depending on the nature of the talk and the circumstances of its presentation. The organization of conferences (or the chairing of specific parts of a conference) is considered scholarly activity and may, in certain circumstances, rank higher than the delivery of a paper.
 - f. Contribution of expertise as a visiting artist, exhibition juror, curator, or consultant: Evaluative criteria for this category shall be based on the professional reputation of the inviting institution.
 - g. Interdisciplinary activities and achievements: Consideration shall be given to such activities that contribute to the mission of the school and university.

Addendum A: Process and Procedures for Joint Appointments

The criteria for granting tenure or promotion to a jointly appointed faculty member shall be those of the primary unit. For faculty holding joint appointments, each secondary unit must be given an opportunity to propose outside evaluators and to comment on evaluators proposed by the primary unit. Primary and secondary units should work together to obtain a suitable and representative group of evaluators. An evaluation must be solicited from at least one evaluator nominated or approved by each secondary unit.

Any department or program that is the secondary unit for one or more faculty members with joint appointments must have in effect a written statement of procedures, which must

be approved by the University Committee on Tenure and Promotion, and by which the views of all faculty eligible to participate in evaluation of the candidate will be solicited and provided for inclusion in the candidate's file. In cases in which the secondary unit does not achieve consensus regarding a file, the secondary unit may submit two letters for inclusion in the candidate's file: a majority and a minority report.

Any department or school that is the primary unit for one or more faculty members with joint appointments must include in its criteria processes for (1) involving each secondary department or program in the selection of outside evaluators; (2) making the candidate's file available to eligible faculty of each secondary unit; and (3) obtaining formal input from the eligible faculty of each secondary unit and placing it in the candidate's file at least five working days prior to the unit's vote on the application. Faculty who are members of both the primary and secondary unit can only vote in the primary unit.

A memorandum of understanding (MOU) must be in place for all faculty members holding joint appointments. The MOU should include (1) identification of the tenuring unit; (2) teaching load and split of teaching load between the primary and secondary units; (3) formula and criteria for sharing indirect cost return (IDCR) among the units; and (4) service responsibility load and split between the units. The MOU should include signatures of the jointly appointed faculty member, the unit heads of the primary and secondary units, the deans of the colleges in the units reside, and the provost. The teaching load for a joint appointment should not be greater than for a faculty member of the same rank in the primary unit. The service load for a joint appointment should be comparable to normal service load of a faculty member of the same rank in the primary unit. The MOU should be included in the candidate's file.