Idaho State University
Department of Art
Evaluation Guidelines (revised April 2019)

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

Process
1. Tenure-track faculty members may apply for tenure during their fifth or sixth full academic year at ISU. The faculty member will decide whether to apply in the fifth or sixth year, and will inform the chair of the department of this decision before May 1st of their fifth year. The department chair will then notify the dean.

2. Early during the summer, the candidate must submit a list of at least seven recommended external reviewers to the department chair. These recommendations should be accompanied by brief biographical information supporting the choices as well as certification that there is no significant relationship with the recommended reviewers. The chair may also consider other professionals in the candidate’s specific area of expertise as external reviewers. The chair will select at least two reviewers from the candidate’s recommended list and solicit external review from an additional one to four professionals in the candidate’s area of expertise. The candidate will refrain from contacting potential external reviewers. The candidate will provide copies of a current vita and other materials chosen by the candidate as appropriate for external review of the candidate’s scholarship/research/creative activities.

3. Members of the departmental committee and the committee chair will be appointed by the department chair after consulting with the candidate. The entire department faculty and the dean will be informed of the composition of the committee. The committee will consist of at least five members, as follows:
   - At least one tenured department member
   - One or more untenured, tenure-track department members
   - One tenured outside member (preferably from a related field)
   - One student (undergraduate or graduate)

4. The student member of the committee must have completed one or more years at ISU, and have completed one or more courses taught by the candidate. In the event of the unavailability of a particular category, such as the lack of tenured department members beyond the department chair, then the department chair may request permission from the dean to modify the composition of the committee. There must be at least two tenured faculty members on the committee.

5. The committee will review all submitted materials, including the external reviews. At least one member of the committee will conduct an observation of the candidate’s teaching. The committee can meet as many times as necessary to accomplish their review, and then submit a report to the department chair in the format required by Academic Affairs. The proceedings shall remain
confidential at all times. Typically, the committee report must be sent to the department chair before December 1.

6. Committee members must vote on each area of professional activities: teaching, scholarship/research/creative activities, and service. The vote tally for each area must be included in the report, as well as the vote tally regarding the committee’s recommendation for promotion and tenure. All committee members must sign the report.

7. The department chair will provide a copy of the committee report to the candidate, who will be given five working days to respond. The department chair will then write an additional evaluation, which will also be given to the candidate. After allowing five working days for a response, the department chair will send the committee evaluation, chair evaluation, and any responses to the dean. Typically, the deadline for submission is at the end of the fall semester.

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

- Current vita (CV)
- General self-assessment
- Teaching assignments for each semester
- Examples of research/scholarship/creative activities
- At least 20 creative work images for faculty members in studio areas
- At least 20 student work images for faculty members in studio areas

The department will provide a record of formal student evaluations for the review period, and copies of annual evaluations.

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

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

While the submitted materials may establish a framework of sorts for an artist’s evaluation, they in no way prepare the various review committees for the many layers and intricacies that reside in the subjective world of art and the recognition of an artist’s creative activity. A quantitative evaluation process would do little to explore the true and valued achievements in the artist’s research/creative activities; therefore, the review committee would be well advised to take the time to undertake a careful, qualitative approach to the review of the candidate’s accomplishments in this area.
As an aid to that end, consider first that an artist’s research, his or her creative activity, should not be synonymous with the exhibition of the resulting work. In many cases, one leads to the other in that this exhibition opportunity is a typical, accepted method of achieving recognition or validation of one’s work, but the variety of secondary research activities that may precede or accompany that work of art must also be considered.

Secondary Research Activities

- Exploration of untried or innovative materials and applications
- Study of the creative process as concept generation independent of any expectation that this inquiry would or should lead to the production of works commonly defined as visual art
- Study of the history of art and related critical thinking
- Familiarization with the current critical theory
- Investigations in areas not directly related to the arts, in so far as such research might provide new or re-evaluated source material which might stimulate or otherwise enrich the creative process or the content of works of art
- Travel which facilitates exposure to the works of art or other manifestations of contemporary research relevant to the creative process
- Investigation of current and historical theory and practice regarding art pedagogy

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

Exhibition Opportunities

- Invitational Exhibitions – These group shows may occur at museums, art centers, galleries or universities, and are sometimes generated by a curator according to a theme. The thematic focus may be related to style, subject matter, medium, etc. The value of participation in such a show might be measured by the artist’s interest in the theme, the perception that the work will reach an important audience, or perhaps by the perceived significance of the curator’s critical status.
- Juried Exhibitions – These shows are competitive and national, international, regional, or statewide in scope. They establish that the work of art submitted has received relative recognition, when compared with other works submitted, based on criteria developed by a juror or jurors.
- Solo or Small Group Exhibitions – These exhibitions allow for the projection of ideas/expressions which might take shape as a result of presentation of a body of work by a single artist. Their significance derives from the fact that the artist is allowed to communicate more dynamically and with greater depth or range. These shows reflect a greater commitment on the part of the artist as well as a substantial commitment to the artist’s work by the host institution.
Research and Creative Activity Grants

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

To provide the committee with the most complete understanding of the depth and breadth of his or her work and its recognition, the candidate should supply the following:
- An artist’s statement that will provide insight to the technical, visual and conceptual content of one’s creative activity, along with its development and progress
- Digital images or actual examples of the candidate’s work executed within the evaluation period
- Documentation of creative activity by means of brochures, announcements, newspaper articles, write-ups, posters, etc.
- Evidence of the continued recognition of one’s work in the area of exhibition or publication
- Complete documentation of exhibition activity to include:
  - Exhibitions entered
  - Exhibitions accepted
  - Dates and locations of exhibitions
  - Prospectuses from accepted exhibitions
  - Name and title/position of juror or curator
  - Exhibition catalogs, if available
  - Exhibition statistics – entries vs. accepted works

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

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

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

Longer works:

1. Peer-reviewed\(^2\) monographs (i.e. single-author books) published by an academic press

---
\(^1\) Promotion and tenure guidelines pertaining to the art history area are designed to cover candidates working in the areas of either art history or theory.

\(^2\) Note: Peer-reviewed publications refer to the publication of monographs (single-author books), book chapters, and articles for which the decision to publish was made on the basis of reviews conducted by individuals outside the publisher’s or journal’s editorial staff.
Shorter works
1. Peer-reviewed articles published in professional journals
2. Peer-reviewed book chapters published in edited collections or anthologies
3. Peer-reviewed review essays
4. Framing essay in a peer-reviewed textbook or edited volume (i.e. an editor’s introduction)

In art history/theory, the following serve as secondary evidence of quality research:
1. Non-peer-reviewed monographs, book chapters, and articles (these include, for example, publications stemming from invitations to publish work by publishers and/or journals)
2. Non-peer-reviewed reviews of publications, exhibitions, or performances relevant to the scholar’s field
3. Evidence of ongoing research and participation in one’s field through conference presentations, conference organizing, guest lectures, and public events
4. Teacher’s guides or similar pedagogical materials
5. Applications for internal or external research grants or other competitive awards (even if not awarded)
6. Editorship of scholarly publications

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

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

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

Unsatisfactory
A candidate for tenure/and or promotion or the five year review process will be ranked as unsatisfactory in the area of research if he/she has, since the time of hire or the last promotion or five year review process, failed to meet the requirements for a ranking of satisfactory as defined above.
University Service and Professionally Related Activities

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

- A description of the service
- A description of the scope of one’s contribution; the value and important of the contribution made by the candidate
- Names of committee chairs, project coordinators or contact persons
- Letters of reference/support from the above persons (The committee may also solicit letters of reference for service activities)

Faculty Five Year Review Process

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

1. For tenured faculty, the department chair will appoint a five year review committee consisting of at least two tenured faculty members. For lecturers, the review committee may instead contain one tenured and one untenured faculty member.

2. The committee will review all submitted materials. At least one member of the committee will conduct an observation of the candidate’s teaching. The committee can meet as many times as necessary to accomplish their review, and then submit a report to the department chair. The proceedings shall remain confidential at all times. Typically, the committee report must be sent to the department chair before the end of the fall semester. All committee members must sign the report.

3. The department chair will provide a copy of the committee report to the faculty member, who will be given five working days to respond. The department chair will then write an additional evaluation, which will also be given to the candidate. After allowing five working days for a response, the department chair will send the committee evaluation, chair evaluation, and any responses to the dean. Typically, the deadline for submission is in January.