

Department of Art

Faculty Evaluation Guidelines
Effective August 1, 2023

Approvals:

Department Chair Deanne Pytkowski Date: 2/2/23

Dean [Signature] Date 2/2/2023

Provost [Signature] Date May 16, 2023



DEFINING FACULTY WORK: VALUES AND GUIDING PRINCIPLES

Faculty work comprises many intersecting roles, chief among them instructor, scholar, and engaged campus & community partner. These roles have been a foundational standard for decades in higher education. However, as faculty respond to the changing needs and expectations of students, colleagues, and others, the nature of these roles has changed and continues to develop.

The College of Letters, Arts and Sciences (CLAS) is a large academic unit that houses the foundation of human knowledge (arts, humanities, and sciences). Furthermore, we value the diversity within our programs and the contributions of each department. As such, it is essential that we establish guiding principles and values that align with and recognize the many ways faculty meet obligations and expectations tied to their roles.

The process for evaluation and review continues to be established, upheld, and governed by the [Faculty Employment Handbook](#). As stated in this handbook, and in accordance with AAUP Guidelines, departments establish discipline-specific standards for teaching; research, scholarship, creative work; and service. Those discipline-specific standards are the fundamental tools used for our peer review and evaluation process.

The guiding principles and values listed below are intended to provide an overarching and aspirational view for faculty work in CLAS. Departments should view their own standards through the lens of these shared values as they continue to develop and enhance their specific quantitative and qualitative disciplinary expectations for faculty work standards.

Teaching & Pedagogy

Faculty in the CLAS deeply value teaching as an essential and deeply valued act, encompassing a significant aspect of their professional identity. CLAS faculty provide the foundation of human knowledge through the arts, humanities, and sciences. Faculty engage students in the learning process through pedagogy that provides a fundamental disciplinary knowledge. Additionally, they often demonstrate connection points and applicability of concepts through an interdisciplinary lens and reframe concepts for contemporary audiences through equity-minded and inclusive practices.

As experts in their respective fields, faculty are evaluated on the effectiveness and impact of their teaching through quantitative and qualitative measures. While those measures are department- and discipline-specific, CLAS faculty strive to include, but are not limited to, several of the following goals and principles in their teaching:

- Well-designed courses that clearly align learning outcomes for the course, degree, program, and general studies category/course outcomes where appropriate;
- Conveying their disciplinary expertise in an engaged teaching style, bringing enthusiasm for knowledge and intellectual inquiry to the learning environment. This is a faculty member's most effective approach to attracting and retaining students to the discipline and institution;

- Clear linkages between content, relevance, application, and practice;
- Intentional alignment between assignments, activities, and experiences to the learning outcomes and purpose of the course;
- Use of proven and effective teaching practices ([High-Impact Practices](#) as one example) when appropriate and effective;
- Developing and enhancing students' ability to demonstrate intellectual competencies and essential skills within and across disciplinary boundaries;
- Broadening disciplinary foci to include diverse perspectives, historically minoritized voices, anti-racist practices, and/or addressing the absence of marginalized populations within historically homogenized primary sources and/or fields;
- Modernizing and enhancing pedagogy with a focus on inclusive and equity-centered practices; use of new and accessible technology; high-quality low- and no-cost options for student materials (OER as one example); and intentionally designed educational experiences as it pertains to course delivery and modality;
- Effective academic guidance and mentorship in the form of availability through regular, consistent office hours and additional connection opportunities (e.g. hallway conversations, before and after class, separate appointments, etc.). Students are then provided an opportunity not only to discuss topics specific to a class, but also major/career aspirations, course recommendations, and post-graduation pathways. This work complements the work of our institution's professional advisors, with each department and/or discipline making determinations on implementation.

The teaching narrative portion of the Promotion, Retention, Tenure, and Post-Tenure review should move beyond the quantitative listing of courses taught, students enrolled, and SRI scores. These metrics, used broadly, can point to overarching themes and trends, but should not necessarily be used as the only indicator of effective teaching.

The narrative presents the opportunity for faculty to reflect on their teaching and report successes; highlight any modification or innovation in their classroom; describe the application of interdisciplinary approaches and connection points for students; or detail enhancements of current materials, experimentation with new approaches, and any tangible impacts the course might have had on the students, including aspects of DEI pedagogy and practice in these areas.

Research, Scholarship, & Creative Work

The creation, acquisition, and dissemination of new knowledge is a hallmark of higher education. CLAS faculty are actively involved in creating new knowledge within their fields, integrating existing knowledge to share with new audiences, and applying disciplinary knowledge and expertise to address contemporary problems. Within a college as large and diverse as CLAS, scholarly and disciplinary impact is vast and constantly developing. The products, venues, and vehicles for distribution of research, scholarship, and creative work vary widely across CLAS.

Despite these necessary distinctions, the overarching foci and scope of research, scholarship, and creative work (RSCW) in CLAS includes **one or more** of the following assumptions:

- Meaningful and recognized intellectual and/or artistic contributions to or across disciplines, typically involving a method of peer review and/or peer recognition through traditional publishing, invitations to prestigious venues, impactful disciplinary gatherings, or new and emerging modalities;
- Development, creation, or establishment of new trends or discoveries within or across disciplines (cross-, multi-, and interdisciplinary), recognized by peers and/or external

audiences for its impact, consequence, and potential to alter, enhance, support, or refute traditional or established assumptions within or across disciplines;

- Interconnectedness between RSCW and the content and/or practice of teaching. This includes, but is not limited to, using RSCW to inform course content, pedagogy, undergraduate research, and attract students to the discipline;
- Demonstrable impact of community-engaged scholarship that improves, enhances, or creates mutually beneficial outcomes for the public good (which may also intersect faculty work in their service category);
- Contributions that elevate the public and intellectual reputation of the institution, college, or department and aligns with the mission, vision, and principles of the institution, college, or department.

The RSCW narrative portion of the Promotion, Retention, Tenure, and Post-Tenure review is an opportunity to provide context for RSCW, not solely list activities. If we are to understand and value our colleagues work through peer review, it is important for the narrative to address the impact of work on a variety of audiences, including those outside MSU Denver; acknowledge academic work that may be forging new trends or ways of thought in our disciplines; recognize promising new mediums and modalities for the distribution of RSCW; and provide overarching reasons why the work is important and worthy of recognition.

Service

Service to the institution and profession is an essential facet of faculty work, it is expected of individuals in faculty roles, and much of service supports the academic institution's foundation of faculty governance. At its most basic level, it ensures that the governance and operational aspects of running an institution are in place and the academy continues to function and thrive. At a more meaningful level, service is how we give back to our students, our colleagues, and our disciplines. Furthermore, building networks, partnerships, and community is a foundational part of faculty work that takes time, care, and reciprocity. Building networks and partnerships through attending and organizing events as well as contributing to a network's communications helps actualize the university and college mission.

For service to be a consequential endeavor, the responsibilities should align with a faculty member's interests and passions whenever possible. It is important to acknowledge that service is not always visible, nor is it always tied to committees. When making service assignments, department chairs should assure that the work is equally distributed and truly valued in the evaluation process.

Service is recognized and evaluated as a **collection** of the following factors:

- **Time Commitment.** Estimate a proportion of time spent in conjunction with the service percentage expectation in a faculty member's workload. This can then be broken down into hours per week, weeks per semester, etc. Acknowledging that most academic work is cyclical, there will be weeks when time commitment for service is great, and weeks when it is far less.
- **Scope.** The nature of faculty governance and service lends itself to hierarchies among work that divides into groups: university, college, department/program; curriculum, policy, events; national, state, local; etc. Department guidelines should address scope of work when assessing service commitments and obligations.

- **Outcome & Impact.** Consider the product or outcome generated from the work and the impact on its intended recipients. Department guidelines should acknowledge impact through the lens of their disciplinary values, purpose, and common good.
- **Role.** Serving as a chair or leader of a committee, project, or engagement effort will typically increase the impact (and sometimes time commitment) of the service obligation for the faculty member. Defining roles on committees and in other service is an important element in establishing efficient, equitable, and meaningful service expectations.
- **Special Project or Task Force.** Serving on an ad-hoc group to solve long-standing or immediate issues beyond the typical role of a service commitment (committee, professional organization, community engagement group) typically increases the impact (and sometimes time commitment) of the service obligation.
- **Student Guidance and Mentorship (non-academic).** CLAS acknowledges that women, faculty of color, LGBTQIA+ faculty, and other historically minoritized faculty groups often find themselves with increased time commitments serving students that identify with them. This work often falls under the category of “Invisible Service.” Due to a need for service across the institution, a faculty member’s entire service component cannot be exclusively dedicated to this type of service. It is, however, an important part of faculty work and should be acknowledged in a manner that best suits the different departments and disciplines in CLAS.

The Service narrative portion of the Promotion, Retention, Tenure, and Post-Tenure review is an opportunity to provide context for faculty work, as well as how it aligns with a faculty member’s overall/future career trajectory and passions. If we are to understand and value our colleagues’ work through peer review, it is important for the narrative to address the complex and varied intersection of service commitments. This will be presented as a collection of service work that can be both quantified and qualified, culminating as an impactful and meaningful part of the faculty portfolio.

Department of Art Guidelines

Revised and voted upon January 2023

Department of Art Mission Statement

The mission of the Department of Art at Metropolitan State University of Denver is to provide a challenging and supportive learning environment for students who aspire to be practitioners in visual art, art education, art history, and design.

To achieve this mission, we:

- Encourage critical thinking through examination and analysis of contemporary and historical modes of cultural production;
- Guide students in expressing their own creative visions through practice-based research in traditional and contemporary media;
- Value and respect the transformative power of creative expression;
- Strive to produce distinctive, significant, and thought-provoking art, design, and research in diverse disciplines;
- Embrace social and cultural diversity to foster an atmosphere of mutual respect;
- Engage in the cultural life of our communities, providing students opportunities for personal growth and professional development;
- Deliver unique art education to Denver and the surrounding communities through programming and exhibitions at the Center for Visual Art and on the Auraria Campus.

Guidelines for Tenure and Promotion

Expectations for Candidates

The candidate will write a narrative that succinctly describes their role as a faculty member. Close attention should be given to descriptive, measurable outcomes in the three evaluative areas of Teaching, Scholarly Activities and Service. As appropriate, the interplay between these three areas may be discussed within the candidate's narrative to produce a holistic pattern of accomplishment. The Department of Art recognizes that a rating of "meets standards" in each of the three evaluative areas is the standard for a positive vote for reappointment and tenure.

General Evaluation Standards

TEACHING

Faculty should consult the Faculty Employment Handbook section II.C.3.a. for current definitions of teaching. Advising is evaluated as a component of teaching.

Guideline to Achieve Tenure:

In their narrative, the tenure candidate will explain their approach to teaching from among the following aspects of teaching: How they 1) integrate their scholarly activities and content expertise into their teaching, 2) Design their courses, 3) Deliver material to facilitate student learning and 4) Use assessment results to improve their courses. The faculty member may also discuss student advising as it relates to one or more areas of evaluation. The tenure candidate should comment on their growth in teaching through the evaluation period. Trends in SRIs (in classes over 5 students) should be addressed in the candidate's narrative.

Observations of the tenure candidate's classes will be conducted in year one (formative), two (formative and summative) and four (optional summative) of the probationary period. These observations will be done by the Department Chair in year one and by tenured faculty in the Department in years two and four. Each of these individuals will observe at least one course for at least one hour. These observations will result in a letter written and signed by the observer and sent to the candidate for inclusion in their portfolio. Letter should be uploaded under "summative peer observations."

Faculty in the Studio Art, Communication Design and Art Education programs must submit samples of student work as part of their portfolio artifacts in support of their application for tenure and promotion. These samples should also have assignment sheets and/or rubrics attached.

Needs Improvement:

No demonstration that courses are regularly updated with information, as consistent with the discipline.

- Attention is not given to instructional design and/or delivery to facilitate student learning nor use of assessment to improve the course.
- The pattern of SRIs remains substantially below the prefix average.
- Classroom observations reveal a pattern of teaching that does not promote effective student learning.
- Faculty member does not maintain regular office hours and makes multiple mistakes when advising students. Faculty makes little to no effort during the probationary period to correct mistakes or improve advising through training.
- Course materials, student artifacts, and narrative statements about pedagogy do not show consistent alignment during the evaluation period.
- Portfolio lacks required peer observations, or the observations do not demonstrate faculty uses sound pedagogy to support student learning.
- Faculty in Studio Art, Communication Design, or Art Education does not submit samples of student work with assignment sheets and rubrics.
- General Studies: If teaching general studies courses, faculty member has not designed the course consistent with the department's and university's expectations or has not done the assessment required by the general studies program.

Meets Standards:

Candidate should indicate in the narrative how s/he/they integrate scholarly activities and knowledge into teaching in order to provide innovative course content. The narrative describes how courses are designed and delivered using multiple approaches to facilitate student learning. Each course is kept current through review of instructional resources and the regular addition of new materials, as appropriate.

- Expectations for student learning and performance are clearly communicated in syllabi and the candidate uses student learning objectives/outcomes to facilitate student learning and assessment.
- Faculty member uses professional expertise along with course and/or program assessment results to improve courses.
- Faculty develops new curriculum when necessary for maintaining currency in the department which they implement and teach.
- Tenure candidate's SRIs are consistently near or above the prefix average for same level course. If below this, they have shown a trend of improvement toward the prefix average for same level courses and the narrative addresses work toward improving student ratings of instruction through shifting instructional content and/or design and/or delivery and incorporating feedback.
- Classroom observations have been used by the candidate to improve teaching
- Faculty member thoroughly and accurately advises students, using professional knowledge and contacts when possible.

- When reviewing student work samples, assignments, rubrics, and/or syllabi, there is consistency and a direct relationship between pedagogy, outcome and assessment.
- General Studies: the tenure candidate designed their course in accordance with the official course syllabus, meeting departmental, college, and student learning outcome expectations. Assessment complies with departmental and college requirements. SRIs are compared to same level course (lower or upper division) within the prefix.

SCHOLARLY ACTIVITIES

Faculty should consult the Faculty Employment Handbook section II. C.3.b. for current definitions of scholarly activities.

Guideline to Achieve Tenure:

Tenure candidate must demonstrate in their narrative and annotated c.v. that they had a regular and intentional professional practice throughout the review period. In their narrative, the candidate should describe how they set professional goals and benchmarks, resulting in one or more work(s) that have been subject to external evaluation such as peer review or acceptance by a jury.

Needs improvement:

During the evaluative period, the faculty member does not engage in a regular and intentional professional practice and/ or has not had disciplinary or pedagogical or creative work accepted and/or made a reasonable attempt to have that work accepted through invited or peer reviewed or juried review at a regional, national or international level.

Meets Standards:

During their probationary period the tenure candidate has had a regular and intentional professional practice. In the narrative, the candidate speaks to the sustained momentum of their practices, addressing the setting of goals and professional benchmarks, and provides evidence of the scholarly merit of their work, including evidence of specific outcomes. This evidence should include, but not be limited to a disciplinary or pedagogical or creative work accepted in a publication, exhibition, major collection, or the disciplinary equivalent. In all cases, the acceptance of the work should be predicated on an external evaluation that critically vets and demonstrates its quality and/or disciplinary merit (i.e. peer review, curatorial invitation, etc.).

Activities in the department to meet standards for review might include:

- The candidate has had their creative works accepted into an exhibition, performance, or publication that is regional*, national, or international in scope. Regardless of where the exhibition, performance, or publication is located, there must have been a selective process for acceptance that has been externally evaluated. *Regional is defined as a

professionally curated exhibition within a museum, non-profit arts center, or commercial art gallery with a national focus.

- The candidate has had their work acquired by a major or special collection, whether public or private.
- The candidate has written a peer-reviewed article or book chapter, or a book in their area of expertise, or an exhibition catalog for a national or international-level exhibition, or a textbook by a commercial publishing house that required a prospectus and review.
- The candidate has performed curatorial work equivalent to the curation of a national-level or traveling exhibition.

SERVICE

Guideline to Achieve Tenure:

Tenure candidate must demonstrate in their narrative that they have participated in shared governance of the institution through their meaningful service. Optionally, the candidate may also have used their disciplinary knowledge to make an unpaid contribution to their relevant professional organizations or the community. Over the course of the review period, the candidate must demonstrate their contribution in a leadership project, initiative, or role of some kind and such leadership should be the result of goal setting and planning that develops over the course of the review period. As a tenure candidate, the individual must have participated in service at the department level and outside the department, whether at the college or university level.

Needs Improvement:

Service work has consisted only of short-term tasks or has not made a significant contribution within the program, department, college, university or disciplinary organization. The candidate's contribution has had no measurable impact on the program, department, college, university or disciplinary organization. Faculty member does not regularly attend meetings or periodically assist at department events.

Meets Standards:

The tenure candidate must demonstrate significant contributions to shared governance first in the department, and secondarily at either the college or university level or within their disciplinary organization or by using their disciplinary expertise in service to the community outside of the university. These contributions must be ongoing and demonstrate measurable outcomes. All faculty are expected to attend meetings in the department and within their degree programs, as well as to periodically assist at department events, but these service activities in themselves do not qualify for tenure or promotion. It is common that a tenure-track faculty member would begin the first year of their probationary period by serving only on one or two committees. By the time of the third year of review, the candidate should include in their narrative plans to take on a leadership initiative, project or role of some kind and identify

goals and action plans that will be successfully developed, matured, and achieved by the tenure year. By the end of the review period, the candidate should have achieved measurable outcomes in a leadership role, task, or initiative. Service contributions often, but not exclusively, take the form of significant committee work. The tenure candidate may alternatively be serving in an administrative capacity without reassigned time or contractual accommodations to their workload. Serving as an area coordinator or Program Coordinator for at least two years is the equivalent to a leadership role.

Guidelines for Post-Tenure Review

Expectations for Candidates

The candidate will write a narrative that succinctly describes their role as a faculty member. Close attention should be given to descriptive, measurable outcomes in the three evaluative areas of Teaching, Scholarly Activities, and Service. As appropriate the interplay between these three areas may be discussed within narratives to provide a holistic pattern of accomplishment. The Department of Art recognizes that a rating of “meets standard” in each of the three evaluative areas is the standard for a positive vote for post-tenure review.

General Evaluation Standards

TEACHING

Faculty should consult the Faculty Employment Handbook section II.C.3.a. for current definitions of teaching. Advising is evaluated as a component of teaching.

Guideline to Achieve Post-Tenure Review:

In their narrative, the tenure candidate will explain their approach to teaching from among the following aspects of teaching: How they 1) Integrate their scholarly activities and content expertise into their teaching, 2) Design their courses, 3) Deliver material to facilitate student learning and 4) Use assessment results to improve their courses. The faculty member may also discuss student advising as it relates to one or more areas of evaluation. The tenure candidate should comment on their growth in teaching through the evaluation period. Trends in SRIs (in classes over 5 students) should be addressed in the candidate’s narrative.

Needs Improvement:

No demonstration that courses are regularly updated with information, as consistent with the discipline.

- Attention is not given to instructional design and/or delivery to facilitate student learning nor use of assessment to improve the course,
- Faculty member does not maintain regular office hours and makes multiple mistakes when advising students.
- Classes are not evaluated using SRIs or the pattern of SRIs remains substantially below the prefix average.

- General Studies: If teaching general studies courses, faculty member has not designed the course consistent with the department's and university's expectations or has not done the assessment required by the general studies program.

Meets Standards:

Each course is kept current through review of instructional resources and the regular addition of new materials, as appropriate.

- Candidate should indicate in the narrative how s/he/ they integrate scholarly activities and knowledge into teaching in order to provide innovative course content.
- Narrative describes how courses are designed and delivered using multiple approaches to facilitate student learning.
- Expectations for student learning and performance are clearly communicated in syllabi and the candidate uses student learning objectives/outcomes to facilitate student learning and assessment.
- Faculty member uses professional expertise along with course and/or program assessment results to improve courses.
- Faculty develops new curriculum when necessary for maintaining currency in the department which s/he/ they implements and teaches.
- SRIs are compared the same level courses (lower or upper division) within the prefix. Candidate's SRIs are consistently near or above the prefix average for same level course. If below this, they have shown a trend of improvement toward the prefix average for same level courses and the narrative addresses work toward improving student ratings of instruction through shifting instructional content and/or design and/or delivery and incorporating feedback from student commentary.
- Faculty member thoroughly and accurately advises students, using professional knowledge and contacts when possible.
- General Studies: For any general studies courses taught, the tenure candidate designed their course in accordance with the official course syllabus, meeting departmental, college, and student learning outcome expectations, Assessment of general studies courses comply with departmental and college requirements.

SCHOLARLY ACTIVITIES

Faculty should consult the Faculty Employment Handbook section II.C.3.b. for current definitions of scholarly activities.

Guideline to Achieve Post-Tenure Review:

The post-tenure candidate must demonstrate in their narrative and annotated c.v. that they have made one or more contributions to their discipline during the evaluation period.

Needs Improvement:

During the period of review, the faculty member does not produce disciplinary or pedagogical or creative work that demonstrates continued engagement with their discipline.

Meets Standards:

During the review period, the candidate produced disciplinary or pedagogical or creative work that demonstrates continued engagement with their discipline.

SERVICE

Faculty should consult the Faculty Employment Handbook section II.C.3.c for current definitions of service.

Guideline to Achieve Post-Tenure Review

Faculty must demonstrate in their narrative that they have participated in shared governance of the institution through their meaningful service. Optionally, the candidate may also have used their disciplinary knowledge to make an unpaid contribution to their relevant professional organizations or the community. As a tenured faculty member, the expectation is that faculty serve at the department level and at least one other level, whether that is at the college, university, community, or professional level.

Needs Improvement:

- Service work has consisted only of short-term tasks or has not made a significant contribution within the program, department, college, university or disciplinary organization.
- The candidate's contribution has had no measurable impact on the program, department, college, university or disciplinary organization.
- Faculty member does not regularly attend meetings or periodically assist at department events.

Meets Standards:

The faculty member must demonstrate ongoing contributions to shared governance of the department as well as their college, university, discipline and/or community. All faculty are expected to attend meetings in the department and within their degree programs, as well as to periodically assist at department events in order to meet standards, but these service activities in themselves do not qualify for a successful post-tenure review. The faculty member must serve at the department level and at least one other level, whether that is at the college, university, community, or professional level. The faculty member may alternatively be serving in an administrative capacity without reassigned time or contractual accommodations to their

workload. Serving as an area coordinator or Program Coordinator for at least two years is the equivalent to a leadership role in service.

Guidelines for Promotion to Professor

Expectations for Candidates

The candidate will write a narrative that succinctly describes their role as a faculty member. Close attention should be given to descriptive, measurable outcomes in the three evaluative areas of Teaching, Scholarly Activities and Service. As appropriate the interplay between these three areas may be explained in the narrative to provide a holistic pattern of accomplishment. The Department of Art recognizes that a rating of “meets standard” in each of the three evaluative areas is the standard for a positive vote for reappointment, tenure, and post-tenure review. For promotion to Professor, a record of significant accomplishment in all three areas is expected.

General Evaluation Standards

TEACHING

Faculty should consult the Faculty Employment Handbook section II.C.3.a. for current definitions of teaching. Advising is evaluated as a component of teaching.

Guideline to Achieve Promotion to Professor:

In their narrative, the tenure candidate will explain their approach to teaching from among the following aspects of teaching: How they 1) Integrate their scholarly activities and content expertise into their teaching, 2) Design their courses, 3) Deliver material to facilitate student learning and 4) Use assessment results to improve their courses. The faculty member may also discuss student advising, linking it with their courses, scholarly activities and professional service, as appropriate. The candidate for promotion should comment on their growth in teaching through the evaluation period. Trends in SRIs (in classes over 5 students) should be addressed in the candidate’s narrative.

Faculty in the Studio Art, Communication Design and Art Education programs must submit samples of student work as part of their portfolio artifacts in support of their application for promotion to professor. These samples should also have assignment sheets and/or rubrics attached.

Needs Improvement:

No demonstration that courses are regularly updated with information, as consistent with the discipline.

- Attention is not given to instructional design and/or delivery to facilitate student learning nor use of assessment to improve the course.

- Classes are not evaluated using SRIs or the pattern of SRIs remains substantially below the prefix average.
- Faculty member does not maintain regular office hours and makes multiple mistakes when advising students. Faculty makes little to no effort over the course of the review period to correct mistakes or improve advising through training.
- General Studies: If teaching general studies courses, faculty member has not designed the course consistent with the department's and university's expectations or has not done the assessment required by the general studies program.

Meets Standards:

Each course is kept current through review of instructional resources and the regular addition of new materials, as appropriate. Candidate should indicate in the narrative how s/he/ they integrates scholarly activities and knowledge into teaching in order to provide innovative course content. Candidate's narrative describes how courses are designed and delivered using multiple approaches to facilitate student learning.

- Expectations for student learning and performance are clearly communicated in syllabi and the candidate uses student learning objectives/outcomes to facilitate student learning and assessment.
- Faculty member uses professional expertise along with course and/or program assessment results to improve courses.
- Faculty develops new curriculum when necessary for maintaining currency in the department which s/he/ they implements and teaches.
- SRIs are compared to same level courses (lower or upper division) within the prefix. Promotional candidate's SRIs are consistently near or above the prefix average for same level course. If below this, they have shown a trend of improvement toward the prefix average for same level courses and the narrative addresses work toward improving student ratings of instruction through shifting instructional content and/or design and/or deliver and incorporating feedback from student commentary.
- General Studies: for any general studies classes taught, the instructor designed their course in accordance with the official course syllabus, meeting departmental and college and student learning outcome expectations. Assessment of general studies courses comply with departmental and college requirements.

SCHOLARLY ACTIVITIES

Faculty should consult the Faculty Employment Handbook section II.C.3.b. for current definitions of scholarly activities.

Guidelines to Achieve Promotion to Professor:

Candidate must demonstrate in their narrative and annotated c.v. that they have engaged in a regular and intentional professional practice. In their narrative, the candidate should describe

how they set professional goals and benchmarks, resulting in one or more work(s) that have been subject to external evaluation such as peer review or acceptance by a jury.

Needs Improvement:

During the evaluative period, the faculty member does not engage in a regular and intentional professional practice and/ or has not had disciplinary or pedagogical or creative work accepted and/or make a reasonable attempt to have that work accepted through invited or peer reviewed or juried review at a regional, national or international level.

Meets Standards:

During the review period the promotional candidate has engaged in regular and intentional professional practice. In the narrative, the candidate speaks to the sustained momentum of their practices, addressing the setting of goals and professional benchmarks, and provides evidence of the scholarly merit of their work, including evidence of specific outcomes. This evidence should include, but not be limited to a disciplinary or pedagogical or creative work accepted in a publication, exhibition, major collection, or the disciplinary equivalent. In all cases, the acceptance of the work should be predicated on an external evaluation that critically vets and demonstrates its quality and/or disciplinary merit (i.e. peer review, curatorial invitation, etc.). Additionally, professional work should demonstrate a sustained and continuous engagement that makes a disciplinary impact (candidates should describe this in their narrative).

Activities in the department to meet standards for review might include:

- The candidate has had their creative works accepted into an exhibition, performance, or publication that is regional*, national, or international in scope. Regardless of where the exhibition, performance, or publication is located, there must have been a selective process for acceptance that has been externally evaluated.
*Regional is defined as a professionally curated exhibition within a museum, non-profit arts center, or commercial art gallery with a national focus.
- The candidate has had their work acquired by a major or special collection, whether public or private.
- The candidate has written a peer-reviewed article or book chapter, or a book in their area of expertise, and exhibition catalog for a national or international-level exhibition, or a textbook by a commercial publishing house that required a prospectus and review.
- The candidate has performed curatorial work equivalent to the curation of a national-level or traveling exhibition.

SERVICE

Faculty should consult the Faculty Employment Handbook section II.C.3.c. for current definitions of service.

Guideline to Achieve Promotion to Professor:

The candidate must demonstrate in their narrative that they have participated in shared governance of the institution through their meaningful service. As a promotional candidate, the individual must have participated in service at the department level and outside the department, whether at the college or university level. Alternatively, in addition to service at the department level, the candidate may have used their disciplinary knowledge to make a significant unpaid contribution to their relevant professional organizations or the community. Over the course of the review period, the candidate must demonstrate their contribution in a leadership project, initiative, or role of some kind and such leadership should be the result of goal setting and planning that develops over the course of the review period.

Needs Improvement:

Service work has consisted only of short-term tasks or has not made a significant contribution within the program, department, college, university or disciplinary organization. The candidate's contribution has had no measurable impact on the program, department, college, university or disciplinary organization. Faculty does not regularly attend meetings or periodically assist at department events.

Meets Standards:

The promotional candidate must demonstrate significant contributions to shared governance first in the department, and secondly at either the college or university level or within their disciplinary organization or by using their disciplinary expertise in service to the community outside of the university. These contributions must be ongoing and demonstrate measurable outcomes. All faculty are expected to attend meetings in the department and within their degree programs, as well as to periodically assist at department events, but these service activities in themselves do not qualify for promotion. Service contributions often, but not exclusively, take the form of significant committee work. The candidate for promotion may alternatively be serving in an administrative capacity without reassigned time or contractual accommodations to their workload. By the end of the review period, the candidate should have achieved measurable outcomes in a leadership initiative, project, or role. Serving as an area coordinator or Program Coordinator for at least two years is the equivalent to a leadership role.

Guidelines for Emeritus Status

To be considered for emeritus status, the Department of Art adheres to the Faculty Employment Handbook requirements of:

- Has completed ten years or more of full-time service at the University;
- Faculty who participate in the transitional retirement program or who continue to teach full-time at the University after retirement are considered to be members of the faculty and therefore are not yet eligible for emeritus status;
- Must be nominated by the department chair or any faculty member in the Department of Art;
- The nomination should be substantiated in terms of length of service, excellence in teaching, and other contributions to the University;
- The nomination must be endorsed by a majority of the tenured members of the Department of Art.

The benefits for an Emeritus Faculty member are outlined in the Faculty Employment Handbook.

Guidelines for Non-Tenure Track Full-Time (Category II) and Adjunct (Category III) Faculty

Category II and Category III faculty are subject to the norms and expectations of academic freedom befitting an institution of higher education. Furthermore, they serve as contingent faculty appointed for definitive terms. Category II faculty are hired most often to teach full-time under contracts of a duration from between one and three years; Adjunct faculty are hired on a per-credit hour basis for specific classes, as needed, usually on a semester-by-semester basis. Category II and Category III are eligible for reappointment at the discretion of the Dean and Department Chair, respectively. Decisions to reappoint are based upon the needs of the department or program and also take into consideration the candidate's qualifications and performance. Performance evaluation, therefore, is done in part to support reappointment decisions and in part to foster improvement among both Category II and Category III faculty members.

Evaluation:

Non-Tenure Track Full-Time (Category II) Faculty

1. Student Ratings of Instruction: Student Ratings of Instruction (SRIs) for courses taught by Category II faculty will be administered consistent with the practice for tenure-line faculty as outlined in the Faculty Employment Handbook.
2. Performance measures in addition to SRIs are warranted to ensure that reappointment decisions are based on multiple appropriate sources of reliable data. They should be included in the narrative statement.
3. Peer Observations:
 - a. Peer Observations may be used for either summative or formative purposes. Only Summative Peer Observations must be included in Portfolios; Formative Peer Observations may be included as an additional artifact if the Category II faculty member chooses to do so.
 - i. All Category II faculty will be observed, at a minimum, once in the first year of their employment as a Category II faculty member.
 - ii. Beyond this requirement, Departments will delineate in their Department Guidelines for Category II Faculty the number, type (summative or formative), and cycle of Peer Observations required for Category II faculty.
4. Category II faculty members, in consultation with their Department Chair, will devote 20% of their effort toward Service, Scholarly Activity, or a combination of both. Consult the Faculty Employment Handbook for definitions of Service and Scholarly Activity.
5. Any Category II faculty member who wishes to be reappointed will undergo a review by submitting a Portfolio to the Department Chair. Portfolios will include the following:
 - a. Cover Sheet
 - i. Published by the Office of the Provost; and

- ii. Used to record recommendations for/against reappointment, promotion, or multi-year contracts.
 - b. Narrative
 - i. Is a statement up to two pages in length, describing how the faculty member has met expectations for assigned duties/responsibilities;
 - ii. Presents a reflective self-assessment, highlights accomplishments, and indicates plans for the future;
 - iii. Should present one's best case to disciplinary colleagues and administrative levels of review; and
 - iv. If seeking promotion to Senior Lecturer or a Multi-year contract, should be noted in the first paragraph of the statement.
 - c. Annotated Curriculum Vitae for a minimum of the past 5 years
 - d. Student Ratings of Instruction
 - e. Peer Observations as delineated above
 - f. Other documents as determined by the Department (course syllabi, exams, assignments, assessments, etc., evidence of scholarly activities or service)
- 6. Portfolios will be submitted using the same tool or format as Category I faculty and in accordance with the Procedural Calendar.
- 7. Reappointment Recommendations
 - a. The Department Chair will evaluate the Portfolio and write a letter – not to exceed two pages—recommending retention or non-retention to the Dean;
 - b. The Dean will evaluate the Portfolio and the Department Chair's recommendation and determine if the Category II faculty member should be reappointed.
 - c. If either the Department Chair or the Dean recommends non-retention, the Portfolio and recommendations will be submitted to the Provost for a final decision regarding retention. All letters and decisions will become part of the Category II faculty member's Portfolio and will be submitted in accordance with the Procedural Calendar.
 - d. Following the first year of employment, subsequent observations(s) may be required if there are indications that they are needed. Such indications may be, but are not limited to, low SRI scores, student comments on SRIs or student comments or concerns brought to the Chair's attention.

EVALUATION STANDARDS FOR TEACHING

Faculty should consult the Faculty Employment Handbook section II.C.3.a. for current definitions of teaching. Advising is evaluated as a component of teaching.

Guideline for reappointment or promotion to senior lecturer:

In their one-page narrative, the faculty member must explain how they have met expectations for assigned duties and responsibilities. It should present a reflective self-assessment that highlights accomplishments and indicates plans for future and present their best case for continuance in their position or promotion to senior lecturer if they are applying. The candidate

should briefly include their approach to teaching from among the following aspects of teaching: 1. How they update their courses integrating current knowledge into their teaching, 2. Design their courses and 3. Deliver material to facilitate student learning and 4. Use assessment results to improve their courses.

The faculty member has SRIs using the approved form per the Faculty Employment Handbook. A single summative peer observation is also required for their first year of employment as a Category II faculty.

Needs Improvement:

This rating simply means the faculty member has not accomplished all of the necessary activities to attain the "Meets Standards".

Minimum requirements and/or standards for content expertise have not been met. Courses do not follow the official course syllabus and/or the faculty member does not adhere to university policies regarding ADA accommodations. No demonstration that courses are regularly updated with new information, as consistent with the discipline. Little attention is given to instructional design and delivery to facilitate student learning nor use of assessment to improve the course. If teaching general studies courses, faculty member has not designed the course consistent with the department's and college's expectations or has not done the assessment required by the general studies program. Classes are not evaluated using SRIs or the pattern of SRIs remains substantially (more than 0.5) below the prefix average. Faculty lacks summative peer observation(s) or the observation does not demonstrate sound pedagogy to support student learning.

Faculty member does not maintain regular office hours and makes multiple mistakes when advising students. Faculty makes little to no effort to correct mistakes or improve advising through training.

Meets Standards:

This performance level demonstrates the minimum required accomplishments for a faculty member.

Courses follow the official course syllabus and the faculty member adheres to university policies regarding ADA accommodations. Each course is kept current through review of instructional resources and the regular addition of new materials, as appropriate. Narrative describes how courses are designed and delivered using multiple approaches to facilitate student learning. Expectations for student learning and performance are clearly communicated in syllabi and the faculty member uses student learning objectives/outcomes to facilitate student learning and assessment. Faculty member uses professional expertise along with course and/or program assessment results to improve courses. For any general studies courses taught, the faculty member designed their course in accordance with the official course syllabus meeting departmental and university expectations including the student learning outcome expectations. Assessment of general studies courses comply with departmental and university requirements.

SRI are compared to same level courses (lower or upper division) within the same prefix. The SRI are consistently near (within 0.5) or above the prefix average for same level course. If below this they have shown a trend of improvement toward the prefix average for same level courses and the narrative addresses work toward improving student ratings of instruction through shifting instructional content and/or design and/or delivery and incorporating feedback from student commentary. Summative peer observation addresses strong pedagogy to facilitate student learning. Faculty member thoroughly and accurately advises students, using professional knowledge and contacts when possible.

EVALUATION STANDARDS FOR SERVICE

Faculty should consult the Faculty Employment Handbook section II.C.3.c. for current definitions of service.

Guideline for reappointment or promotion to senior lecturer:

In their one-page narrative the faculty should briefly summarize their most significant service activities. Additionally, the faculty should include service activities in their annotated c.v.

Needs Improvement:

This rating simply means the faculty member has not accomplished all of the necessary activities to attain the "Meets Standards".

Faculty does not participate in any committee or obstructs the normal functioning of such committee. Furthermore, faculty member makes no contribution to their professional organization or the community outside the university. If serving in an administrative capacity without reassign time, the faculty member ineffectively meets their administrative obligations.

Meet Standards:

The faculty member should prioritize meeting service obligations as required by the department first and should set other service goals in consultation with the department chair or the appropriate program coordinator within the department. The faculty member must demonstrate significant contributions to shared governance in the department, school, college or university or within their disciplinary organization or contributions using their disciplinary expertise to the community outside of the college. Category II faculty may alternatively be serving in an administrative capacity without reassign time.

EVALUATION STANDARDS FOR SCHOLARLY ACTIVITIES

Faculty should consult the Faculty Employment Handbook section II.C.3.b. for current definitions of scholarly activities.

Guideline for reappointment or promotion to senior lecturer:

In their on-page narrative, the faculty member must address how their scholarly activities contribute to their effectiveness in teaching. Additionally, the faculty should include scholarly and creative activities in their annotated c.v.

Needs Improvement:

This rating simply means the faculty member has not accomplished all of the necessary activities to attain the “Meets Standards”.

Faculty member fails to demonstrate the maintaining of currency in the discipline.

Meets Standards:

Faculty maintains currency in the discipline. In addition to research that is incorporated into teaching, the faculty engages in disciplinary, pedagogical, or creative work and presents that work at the local, regional national, or international level.

Promotion: The Lecturer must satisfy the conditions for promotion to Senior Lecturer established in Chapter IV of the Faculty Employment Handbook. Additionally, the lecturer must have taught at least three different courses as a Lecturer and demonstrate that they have implemented pedagogical innovations.

1. The faculty member will make a request for promotion to the Department Chair and submit a Portfolio as described above for comprehensive review;
2. The Department Chair will submit the recommendation for or against promotion to the Dean
3. The Dean will submit a recommendation for or against promotion to the Provost; and
4. The Provost will approve or disapprove the recommendation for promotion.

Adjunct (Category III) Faculty

1. Student Ratings of Instruction: Student Ratings of Instruction (SRIs) for courses taught by Category III faculty will be administered consistent with the practice for tenure-line faculty as outlined in the Faculty Employment Handbook.
2. Performance measures in addition to SRIs are warranted to ensure that reappointment decisions are based on multiple appropriate sources of reliable data. The faculty member should submit all course syllabi and any other materials the department requests.
3. Peer Observations:
 - a. Peer Observations may be used for either summative or formative purposes. Only Summative Peer Observations **must** be included in evaluations.
 - b. All Category III faculty will be observed, at a minimum, once in the first semester of their employment as a Category III faculty member.
 - c. Affiliate faculty will be evaluated using the Peer Observation Form for Studio Art, Communication Design, or Art History, Theory, and Criticism, as adopted and approved by the Department of Art. This involves both a classroom observation and meeting with either the Program Coordinator or Concentration Area Coordinator, as well as the submission of classroom materials, including syllabi,

project handouts, rubrics, and samples of student work This peer observation must be done in the affiliate faculty's first semester, and then in subsequent years as necessary if need for improvement is identified. All affiliate faculty will be observed at least once every three years.