# Montana State University

# Roles, Scope, Criteria, Standards and Procedures

## School of Art
(Name of Department/School/College)

## Effective Date: 8/15/2019

| APPROVALS | SIGNATURE | DATE |
|---|---|---|
| Jeffrey Conger | | August 15, 2019 |
| Department Faculty | Chair, Primary Review Committee | |

Vaughan Judge
**Primary Administrative Reviewer**  Department Head/Director

REGINA GEE
Intermediate Review Committee  Chair, Intermediate Review Committee

DEAN ADAMS
Intermediate Administrative Reviewer  College Dean

College Review Committee  Chair, College Review Committee

DAVID J. SINGEL
University Retention, Tenure and Promotion  Chair, University Retention, Tenure and Promotion

Robert L. Mokwa
Provost

**Role and Scope Document**
**School of Art**

*Updated: August 14, 2019*

### Article I.    Role and Scope of Unit

**SCHOOL OF ART ROLE AND SCOPE STATEMENT**

Through the land grant mission at Montana State University, the School of Art educates students, creates knowledge, art, design and serves communities by integrating learning, discovery and engagement in the following ways.

#### Section 1.01    Teaching

Teaching is the set of activities performed by faculty that fosters student learning, critical thinking, problem solving, and creativity. It requires the faculty member to have a command of the subject matter, maintain currency in the discipline, and create and maintain instructional environments that successfully promote learning.

In addition to the instructional responsibilities in the Academic Responsibilities policy, teaching includes incorporation of current pedagogical innovations, new technologies and approaches to learning and assessment, course and curriculum creation and development; thesis and professional project assistance, mentoring, and participation in student projects, theses, and dissertations; supervision of and student interns; academic and career advising of undergraduate and graduate students; graduate teaching and research assistants; and any valuable contributions to the university's instructional enterprise.

Advising is a shared responsibility of all permanent faculty and part of teaching. Advising is based on the following: knowledge of the curriculum, curriculum program planning, career counseling, mentoring, and knowledge of the advising tools and resources offered by the university.

### Section 1.02    Scholarship

Scholarship is the original intellectual work of faculty that includes the discovery, application, and/or assimilation of new knowledge, and the dissemination of that knowledge. This work includes: creating and presenting new works; participating in professional practice activities; including client based work, freelance and other design related activity; conducting research projects; exhibiting creative works; securing and administering grants and contracts; writing, editing and contributing to books, articles, and other research-based material; and developing new clinical practice models.

In addition, the generation of new knowledge in pedagogy and the dissemination of putting into practice of that knowledge, constructing new creative products and experiences through composition, design, production, direction, performance, exhibition, synthesis, or discovery and the presentation of that experience.

### Section 1.03    Service

Service is the contributions through participation and or outreach activities related to the university, as well as service at the local, state, regional, national, and international level. To fulfil service responsibilities faculty shall: engage in service to others on and off-campus by applying their knowledge and expertise, engage in service to their discipline or profession through professional organizations and activities, provide objective appraisals in judging the professional performance and evaluation of colleagues, maintain an active role in the selection of new faculty and members of the administration, and participate in the governance of the university along with the development of goals and plans.

### Section 1.04    Integration

Integration is the creation of synergistic relationships among teaching, scholarship, and service. Contributions by faculty include bringing new discoveries into the classroom, fostering student learning and engaging the wider community with scholarly products or innovations in teaching, or fostering engagement to address community needs.

### Section 1.05    Other Definitions

The definitions explained in the Montana State University Faculty Handbook is a companion document to the Role & Scope document and can be found at:

http://www.montana.edu/policy/faculty_handbook/reviews_definitions.html

**Candidate:** Any tenurable faculty member who is being reviewed for retention, tenure, or promotion.

**Areas of Responsibility** in the context of retention, tenure, and promotion, refers to the components of MSU's mission: teaching; scholarship; service.

**Teaching** is the set of activities performed by faculty that fosters student learning, critical and ethical thinking, problem solving, and creativity.

**Scholarship** is the original intellectual work of faculty. This includes the generation of new creative products and experiences through composition, design, production, direction, performance, exhibition, synthesis, or discovery and the presentation of that experience.

**Effectiveness** is successful performance, appropriate to years of service.

**Accomplishment** is sustained and commendable performance reflected in the quantity, quality, and impact of scholarly activities and products.

**Excellence** is sustained, commendable, and distinguished performance reflected in the quantity, quality, and impact of scholarly activities and products.

**Service** is the contribution of faculty knowledge and expertise to assist and engage individuals and or organizations to meet goals and solve problems.

**Integration** is the creation of synergistic relationships among the teaching, scholarship, and service contributions of faculty.

**Indicators** are the categories of scholarly products and activities used to evaluate performance of the faculty undergoing review.

## Article II.   Appointment and Advancement of Research Faculty

### Section 2.01
At this time the School of Art does not include any Research Faculty lines.

## Article III.   Annual Review Process

### School of Art Annual Review Process:

### Section 3.01
An annual review assesses a faculty member's performance over the preceding calendar year, and is applicable to tenured and tenure track faculty, as well as non-tenurable faculty not part

of the NTT Collective Bargaining Agreement. Faculty will submit materials relevant to their performance over the preceding calendar year based on current assigned responsibilities and percentages of effort in teaching, scholarship, and service by the deadline established by the Director of the School of Art. The vehicle for submission will be Activity Insight, or whichever tool is designated by the Provost's Office. The Director of the School of Art will conduct annual reviews in accordance with the University Faculty Handbook and College of Letters and Science policy.

1. Annual reviews are performed for the preceding calendar year each spring by the Director of the School of Art.
2. Faculty members are required to submit the following materials by the requested date:

    A. Current Curriculum Vitae
    B. Self-assessment narrative referencing individual goals for teaching, scholarship, service and integration aligned with Department, College, and University strategic plans.
    C. Individual goals for teaching, scholarship and service for the upcoming year.
    D. Student evaluation scores for the preceding year should be stated and addressed.
    E. Current Activity Insight database completed.

3. Annual Review Process

    A. The Director of the School of Art reviews the faculty member's performance relative to the faculty member's assigned percentages of effort and current assigned responsibilities. Annual reviews assess the faculty member's performance in each of the major areas of responsibility including teaching, scholarship, service and integration over the preceding calendar year.

    If the faculty member has a split or joint appointment with 20% or more effort assigned to another Department, input from the other Department must be solicited and considered in the evaluation and rating of the faculty member.

    B. The Director of the School of Art rates the performance of each faculty member in the three areas of responsibility and calculates an overall rating for the faculty member's performance for the year, weighted by the assigned percentages of effort using the Annual Review Form approved by the Provost. The faculty member will be given a copy or access to the completed form if created electronically.

C. The faculty member will have the opportunity to meet with the Director of the School of Art to sign in acknowledgement of the annual review.

D. The Director of the School of Art in collaboration with the faculty member will develop goals and assignments for the next calendar year. The goals and assignments for individual members of the faculty will reflect departmental needs and professional opportunities consistent with strategic plans or articulated departmental priorities.

E. If the assigned percentages of effort are inconsistent with the faculty member's current activities and levels of performance, a revision of the assigned percentages of effort should be discussed. If a modification of the assigned percentages of effort is made it will be documented using the Faculty Assigned Percentages of Effort Update form.

F. The faculty member and the Dean of the College of Arts and Architecture will be provided with a copy of or access to the annual review, ratings and any revision of the assigned percentages of effort. Copies of all annual reviews and the performance ratings of each faculty member will be maintained in the faculty member's personnel file in the department. These files shall be kept confidential and maintained as outlined in the Faculty Personnel Files policy.

4. Appeal of Annual Review

A faculty member who disagrees with an annual review or individual rating may appeal by submitting a rationale for their disagreement and forwarding it to the Dean of the College of Arts and Architecture. The rationale must be filed with the Dean within ten (10) days of the receipt of the annual review. The CAA Dean shall consider the appeal and may support or assign a different performance rating in any area of responsibility. The CAA Dean shall notify the faculty member and Director, in writing, of the decision regarding the appeal within ten (10) days of receipt of the request.

5. Faculty Changes in Assigned Percentages

Either the faculty member or the Director of the School of Art can propose changing the faculty member's percentages of effort, but mutual agreement must be reached before the change can be made. The revised percentages of effort might be for a specified term or might reflect a long-term change of focus for the faculty member and the department. If the revised percentages are for a specified term,

the end date will be noted and the percentages of effort will revert back to the assignments and assigned percentages of effort in place before the term.

Changes to a faculty member's assigned percentages of effort are made using a Faculty Assigned Percentages of Effort Update Form. Any changes require approval by the faculty member, Director of the School of Art, and CAA Dean.

### Article IV. Primary Review Committee and Administrator

#### Section 4.01 Primary Review Committee-Composition and Appointment

The primary review committee is to be composed of three tenured faculty members from the School of Art. Normally, at least one-half of the members will have attained the rank of professor. Members will be either elected by faculty or appointed by the Director for a two-year term beginning in January of each year. The School of Art may request approval from the University Retention, Tenure and Promotion Committee (URTPC) Chair to make an alternate tenured faculty appointment. Emeritus faculty members are ineligible to serve on the primary review committee.

The faculty who have completed an in-depth teaching assessment as part of the teaching section of the dossier of the candidate not also serve on the primary review committee. It is recommended that  faculty who have completed a recent teaching assessment of the candidate are not on the primary review committee. If for some reason this is unavoidable, the potential conflict of interest must be addressed in the primary review committee's evaluation.

Before conducting a review, committee members will attend the orientation regarding retention, tenure, and promotion offered by the Provost's Office for the review cycle.

The university encourages diversity in the composition of all review committees. Departments are encouraged to adopt selection procedures for committee members that will promote membership which is inclusive of the categories protected by the university Non-Discrimination Policy.

Committee members and administrative reviewers will take orientation sessions that promote bias-literacy in retention, tenure, and promotion reviews. If possible before conducting a review, they will attend the bias-literacy training offered by the university for the review cycle.

Committees will be available for service throughout the academic year. Faculty on leave will be ineligible for service. Committees will be constituted and their membership reported to the Provost's Office by the date established by the Provost.

### Section 4.02    Primary Review Administrator

The Primary Review Administrator is the current Director of the School of Art. Should the Primary Review Administrator have a conflict of interest with a candidate under review, the Dean of the College of Arts & Architecture will identify an individual to serve as Primary Review Administrator for the case under review.

### Section 4.03    Identification of Responsible Entities

**Review Administrator**

- Establish the Primary Review Committee by facilitating the appointment and confirmation of the members as described.
- Assuring the following materials are included in the Dossier:
    - Applicable Role and Scope Document.

      - Letter of hire, any percentages of effort changes, all annual reviews, and all evaluation letters from prior retention, tenure, and promotion reviews at MSU.

      - Candidate's teaching evaluations from the review period. If the evaluations are not in electronic format, the department will provide evaluation summaries. Upon request by review committees and review administrators, the department will provide access to the original evaluations to review committees and administrators during the review.

- Maintaining copies of all review committee evaluation letters and external review letters after the review.

**Review Committee**

- Select external reviewers and solicit review letters.

- If internal reviews are part of the departments review process, selecting and soliciting internal reviews.

- Assuring the following materials are included in the dossier:
    - Internal and external reviewer letters of solicitation,

- Letters from the reviewers and,
- In the case of external reviewers, their Curriculum Vitae

### Section 4.04    Next Review Level

The next review level after the Primary Review Committee and the Primary Review Administrator is the Intermediate Review Committee and administrator of the College of Arts & Architecture.

## Article V.    Intermediate Review Committee and Administrator

### Section 5.01    Intermediate Review Committee - Composition and Appointment
College of Arts & Architecture Committee, elected annually by peer faculty selected from all four schools, as described in the CAA Role and Scope.

### Section 5.02    Intermediate Review Administrator
The Intermediate Review Administrator is the Dean of the College of Arts & Architecture

### Section 5.03    Level of Review following Intermediate Review Administrator
The next level of review after the Intermediate Review Administrator is the University Retention, Tenure and Promotion Committee.

## Article VI.    Review Materials

Review materials submitted by the candidate shall comply with the University Faculty Handbook document entitled "Annual Review, Retention, Tenure and Promotion," subsection "RTP: Rights and Responsibilities," and the Role and Scope document. Additionally, candidates in the School of Art must follow the requirements below.

### Section 6.01 Materials Submitted by Candidate

Materials for external review must include:
- Comprehensive Curriculum Vitae (CV) documenting teaching, scholarship, and service activities of the candidate.
- Brief statement that identifies the candidate's area of scholarship.
- Articles, publications, creative endeavors, or other evidence from the review period, selected by the candidate, that best represents the candidate's scholarship.

Materials for all dossiers must include:
- Cover sheet obtained from the Provost's office.
- Comprehensive CV documenting teaching, scholarship, and service activities of the candidate.
- Personal Statement that includes a description of the candidate's area of scholarship.
- Separate self-evaluations for teaching, scholarship, service, and integration summarizing the evidence demonstrating that the candidate meets the standards for the attainment of retention, tenure, or promotion, as applicable. Each self-evaluation shall include a summary of activities, selected products or accomplishments, and evidence of recognition, itemized by year over the relevant review period.

### Section 6.02 Documentation of Collaborative Scholarly Contributions

The School of Art recognizes the importance and frequency of collaborative scholarship activity, which may or may not be interdisciplinary in nature. The candidate is responsible for accurately capturing and describing the level and impact of their individual contributions in any collaborative work and place it appropriately in the dossier. The candidate may choose to use a single statement to describe any long-term collaboration that has resulted in multiple publications, grants, exhibitions, and client based work.

Conventions for crediting collaborative work vary greatly among the different disciplines represented in the School of Art. Author order on published work should not be used to infer information about the nature, quantity, or quality of the contribution of any particular author.

### Section 6.03 Peer Review Solicitation Procedure

The process and requirements for soliciting peer review materials are described in the University Faculty Handbook document entitled "Annual Review, Retention, Tenure and Promotion," subsection "RTP: Rights and Responsibilities," Section 6.

External reviewers should be specialists in the candidate's field and familiar with the usual expectations for faculty performance. At least half of the external reviewers must be selected by the Director of the School of Art and/or Department RTP committee; the remainder may come from a list of names submitted by the candidate. The Director of the School of Art and/or Department RTP committee will solicit reviews from among those on the list provided by the candidate, but if those contacted are unable to serve then they will be replaced by other reviewers, not necessarily from the candidate's list. Candidates shall not be informed of the identity of outside evaluators to protect the confidentiality of the review process.

The four external review letters must be requested by the Director of the School of Art and/or Department committee, and must not be solicited by the candidate. The Department report should state clearly how external reviewers were chosen and should include a brief statement of their status in the field. External reviewers should state knowledge of or relationship to the candidate, if either applies.

External reviewers will be sent the School of Art Role and Scope document, a copy of the candidate's CV, a brief statement that identifies the candidate's area of scholarship, and a selection of relevant publications and/or unpublished manuscripts, along with other materials, as appropriate and selected by the candidate. Reviewers will be asked to comment specifically on the quality of the candidate's written scholarship and productivity, as well as the candidate's recognition in the field.

The Director of the School of Art will ensure that each candidate has at least two peer observations of teaching and will select the peer observers in consultation with the tenured faculty whose teaching is most closely related with the candidate's area of teaching expertise.

## Article VII.    Applicable Role and Scope Documents

### Section 7.01    Retention Review
Candidates for retention are reviewed under the standards and indicators in the Role and Scope Documents in effect on the first day of employment in a tenurable position.

### Section 7.02    Tenure and Promotion to Associate Professor Review
Candidates for tenure are reviewed under the standards and indicators in the Role and Scope Documents in effect on the first day of employment in a tenurable position. Candidates may select a more recent, approved Role and Scope Document by notifying the primary review committee.

### Section 7.03    Promotion to Professor Review
The faculty member will be reviewed using standards and indicators in the Role and Scope Documents in effect two (2) years prior to the deadline for notification of intent to apply for promotion.

## Article VIII.   Retention Reviews

The University standards for the retention of probationary faculty members are:

- effectiveness in teaching, scholarship, and service during the review period, and
- integration of no less than two of the following during the review period: teaching, scholarship, and service, and
- satisfactory progress towards meeting the standards for tenure by the candidate's tenure review year.

### Section 8.01   Timing of Retention Review

Faculty are reviewed for retention in the academic year specified in their Letter of Hire, unless extended under the Extending Tenure Review Period policy.

### Section 8.02   University Standard

The standards for the retention of probationary faculty members are:

1.  Effectiveness in teaching, scholarship, and service during the review period, and

2.  Integration of no less than two of the following during the review period: teaching, scholarship, and service, and

3.  Satisfactory progress towards meeting the standards for tenure by the candidate's tenure review year.

### Section 8.03   Performance Indicators and Weighting

Performance indicators are defined in Section 9.03.

**Weighting of Performance Indicators for Retention**

Factors that affect the weight of scholarly products include **quantity, quality, and impact**. It is the responsibility of the candidate to describe the scope of their scholarly work while informing outside reviewers and the subsequent committees the context of their scholarship activity. The candidate should use the list below to demonstrate the weighting of quantity, quality, and impact related to their scholarly activity.

Weighting of performance indicators include:
• Participation in the field.
• Creation in the field.
• Recognition by the field.

In the weighting of performance indicators for **RETENTION** the most important indicator is **participation in the field.** These contributions include activities involving the presentation of one's own research as an active contributing member of the discipline and other peer-to-peer contexts relevant to the field.

The second most important performance indicators for **RETENTION** are those that demonstrate the **creation in the field**. These contributions are defined as new scholarly products that have been peer-reviewed and disseminated in formats relevant to the field.

The third most important performance indicator for **RETENTION** is **recognition by the field.** These contributions includes those activities that define and acknowledge the candidate as an expert in their field.

### Section 8.04   Quantitative and Qualitative Expectations

The qualitative expectation of each performance indicator for effectiveness and evidence of progress towards meeting standards for tenure is its value, influence, impact, and creativity in regards to the curriculum, program, and/or discipline. This must meet the standard of successful performance appropriate to years of service and rank.

The quantitative expectations toward teaching, scholarship, and service are expected to align with the percentages indicated in one's contract. Faculty workload is determined by the Director of the School of Art and agreed upon by the faculty member.

***Effectiveness in Teaching*** *Effectiveness in teaching* is achieved through the candidate's positive contributions to the creation, delivery, and instruction of courses and studios, both in the Department and in other venues. *Effectiveness* is judged primarily from multiple peer reviews conducted by Departmental faculty who observe the candidate in the classroom or studio during the review period. Written reports from peer reviewers document the candidate's teaching performance and serve as evidence to evaluate effectiveness.

***Effectiveness in Scholarship*** *Effectiveness* includes, but is not limited to, establishing a research specialty that is in the candidate's discipline, evidenced by the creation of scholarly products throughout the review period.

*Effectiveness for Service* will be achieved if the candidate demonstrates active participation and competent execution of tasks in any of the areas of service described by the performance indicators. Service is expected to include at least one assignment to a Department, College, or University committee at MSU. Participation in other activities that contribute to the candidate's discipline or profession including task forces or special programs, especially when such participation raises the stature and reputation of the Department or the University in the state, the nation, or internationally.

*Effectiveness in Integration* will be achieved by integrating no fewer than two of the following during the review period: teaching, scholarship, and service.

### Section 8.05    Evidence of Performance Indicators

Evidence of performance indicators are listed in Section 9.05. The same performance indicators and evidence that are used in tenure review are used in retention review, with the addition that *submitted* products are to be documented with a copy of the submitted work along with verification of submission.

### Section 8.06    Status of Scholarly Products

The School of Art recognizes that some creative work occurs in stages and it may be relevant to report on completed partially aspects of some types of scholarly activity that are in process.

For retention review, scholarly products that are submitted, accepted, in press, or published at the time of review will be considered if they are included in the dossier and are appropriately documented according to Section 8.05.

## Article IX.  Tenure Review

### Section 9.01    Timing of Tenure Review
Faculty are normally reviewed or tenure in the academic year specified in their letter of hire, unless extended under the Extending Tenure Review Period policy.

### Section 9.02    University Standard

The University standards for the award of **TENURE** are:

- Sustained effectiveness in teaching and service during the review period, and
- Integration of no less than two of the following during the review period:

teaching, scholarship, and service, and
- Accomplishment in scholarship.

## Section 9.03    Performance Indicators and Weighting

The faculty in the School of Art is comprised of three areas: Studio Art, Graphic Design and Art History, and **performance indicators** are specific to each discipline. It is recommended that each individual candidate select those indicators from the list that are appropriate for their area of expertise and supports their dossier. The following performance indicators are considered in the review to determine if the standards in the previous section are satisfied.

Factors affecting the **weight** of scholarly products include **quantity, quality, and impact**. The candidate should assist the review committees by contextualizing the scholarly products guided by this list. Scholarly products that are partially completed may be included with a description of the status at the time of the submission of the dossier.

### Performance Indicators in Scholarship

Faculty engage in discovery and the advancement of knowledge through scholarship. In fulfilling these responsibilities, faculty shall develop and engage in scholarship activities in a professional manner. The performance indicators that may support the attainment of standards include but are not limited to that listed below. Additional indicators will be considered if consistent with the definition of indicators stated in the Faculty Handbook.

#### Studio Art

The following scholarly activities include:
- Exhibition of artwork
- Public art and or performance
- Placement of work in collections
- Artworks in publications
- Grant proposals submitted and funded
- Adjudicator, curator or consultant
- Creation of pedagogical materials
- Presentation of paper or poster session
- Organization of a symposium or conference
- Creation of programing for a symposium or conference
- Creation of a new publication for conference proceeding
- Lecture, roundtables and keynote address
- Demonstrations or workshops

- Fellowships, residencies and cultural exchanges
- Recognition through nominations and receipt of awards

**Graphic Design**

The following scholarly activities include:
- Creation of client-based or freelance work
- Published work in mass media, popular press, or web-based media
- Grant proposals submitted and grants funded
- Creation of videos, websites, podcasts and other new media
- Exhibition of design work
- Design in publications
- Presentation of paper or poster session
- Lecture, roundtables and keynote address
- Organization of a symposium or conference
- Creation of programing for a symposium or conference
- Creation of a new publication for conference proceeding
- Demonstration or workshop
- Fellowships, residencies and cultural exchanges
- Creation of pedagogical materials
- Public art and or performance
- Placement of work in collections
- Adjudicator, curator or moderator
- Recognition through nominations and receipt of awards

**Art History**

The following scholarly activities include:
- Refereed monographs, journal, articles, book chapters, long-form book reviews and exhibition catalogs
- Curation of exhibitions
- Archives, databases, or other research collections
- Invited talks and lectures
- Invited seminars or colloquia, conference paper or poster session
- Organization of a symposium or conference
- Creation of programming for a symposium or conference
- Creation of a new publication in connection with conference proceeding
- Translations or transcriptions
- Creation of pedagogical materials
- Creation of Videos, websites, podcasts and other new media
- Grant proposals submitted and funded

- Fellowships and visiting scholar appointments
- Recognition through nominations and receipt of awards

**Weighting of Performance Indicators for Tenure**

Factors that affect the **weight** of scholarly products include **quantity, quality, and impact**. It is the responsibility of the candidate to describe the scope of their scholarly work while informing outside reviewers and the subsequent committees the context of their scholarship activity. The candidate should use the list below to demonstrate the weighting of quantity, quality, and impact related to their scholarly activity.

Weighting of performance indicators include:

- Creation in the field
- Participation in the field
- Recognition by the field

In the weighting of performance indicators for **TENURE**, those that demonstrate the **creation in the field** are the most significant. These contributions are defined as new scholarly products that have been peer-reviewed and disseminated in formats relevant to the field.

An equally important performance indicator for **TENURE** is **participation in the field.** These contributions include activities involving the presentation of one's own research as an active contributing member of the discipline and other peer-to-peer contexts relevant to the field.

The second most important performance indicator for **TENURE** is **recognition by the field.** These contributions includes those activities that define and acknowledge the candidate as an expert in their field.

*Performance Indicators in Teaching*
The following is a list of performance indicators applicable to teaching. All indicators listed are considered the activities by which performance in teaching is evaluated.

- Delivering quality instruction in support of the Department's teaching mission
- Development and implementation of new pedagogical methods and/or curriculum materials
- Creation and facilitation of instructional programs.
- Mentorship of undergraduate students
- Supervising undergraduate research

- Supervising independent study projects
- Supervising internships within the profession
- Mentorship of graduate students
- Student evaluations of instruction

It should be noted student evaluations can be vulnerable to various forms of bias. Therefore, evaluation scores and averages should be applied with caution as a measure of teaching effectiveness and supplemented by other evidence.

As additional evidence of performance in teaching, the candidate may choose to include other relevant and appropriate indicators not listed here. The Department RTP Committee will determine the weight of such indicators and will describe this determination in their evaluation letter.

### Performance Indicators in Service

The following is a list of performance indicators applicable to service. All indicators listed are considered the primary activities by which performance in service is evaluated.

- Membership and offices held on Department, College, and University committees.
- Professional service in local, state, national, or international organizations in related disciplines.
- Outreach in related disciplines to local, state, national, or international communities.

Additional evidence of performance in service, the candidate may choose to include other relevant and appropriate indicators not listed here. The Department RTP committee will determine the weight of such indicators.

### Performance Indicators in Integration

As indicated in Section 9.02 candidates are expected to demonstrate integration across at least two of the categories of scholarship, teaching, and service.

The nature and extent of integrated activities will vary depending on the candidate's discipline and areas of specialization. The following list offers examples of potential indicators of integration, with the understanding that integration can take many forms. The candidate must clearly define and describe how integration is achieved in the dossier.

- Integration of scholarship and teaching. For example implementing a research activity within a course or collaborating in research and/or publication with a student.

- Integrating of scholarship and service. For example lending research expertise through consulting or implementing research results in a community setting.
- Integration of teaching and service. For example a service/learning project within the community.

## Section 9.04 Quantitative and Qualitative Expectations

### *Scholarship Expectations*

The School of Art values the act of intellectual discovery and the generation of new knowledge as scholarship related activities.

*Accomplishment in scholarship* is judged primarily by the quality and quantity of scholarly works. *Accomplishment* includes, but is not limited to, an ongoing record of research and or creative activities that has led to a regular production of scholarly products in these areas It is expected that the results of these be represented through exhibitions, installations, client based work, publications, conferences and professional meetings (See Section 9.03 for complete list). A record of seeking funds to support research activities is also expected.

It is expected that scholarship be of high quality, be ongoing throughout the tenure review period, be commensurate with the associated discipline, and result in a substantive record of peer-reviewed products at the time of tenure.

The usual Departmental expectation for scholarly productivity is that tenure candidates average between **1 to 2 significant scholarly products per year** during the review period.

Due to the diverse nature of scholarship within the Department, expectations will vary across disciplines. Regardless of quantity of products, the quality of the candidate's scholarly body of work as documented by External Reviewers is of significant importance. In particular, the quality and reputation of scholarly products, as documented by External Reviewers and disciplinary norms, is considered important in the review process.

In some cases, a relatively small number of products with high impact may be acceptable for satisfying scholarship expectations, while in other cases a large number of products may not be sufficient.

If the number of products is near the average of **1 to 2 significant scholarly products per year**, and one or more of the products are documented by the External Reviewers as having little to no impact in the discipline, then scholarship expectations may not be satisfied. Also, if the candidate's contribution to one or more products is documented as minimal, then it is expected

that the number of scholarly products would need to sufficiently exceed the average to offset the candidate's limited contributions.

A record of seeking funds to support research activities is expected. The scope of the grant work and the reputation of the granting agency are qualitative factors that will influence the weighting of assessment.

### Teaching Expectations

*Effectiveness in teaching* is achieved through the candidate's positive contributions to the creation, delivery, and instruction of courses, both in the Department and in other venues.

*Effectiveness* is judged primarily from multiple peer reviews conducted by Departmental faculty who observe the candidate in the classroom or studio during the review period. Written reports from peer reviewers document the candidate's teaching performance and serve as evidence to evaluate effectiveness.

Course evaluations are intended to provide a measure of how a course meets a student's expectations. The Department expectation is that normally, for each course taught, the overall mean score from the student evaluation instrument is not less than the indicator for "Average."

For example, 3.0 is the average evaluation score for "Overall Effectiveness" on an instrument with 5 categories represented by 1=Poor, 2=Below Average, 3=Average, 4=Above Average, and 5 = Excellent. It is expected that any overall mean score below "Average" will be addressed by the candidate. Similarly, any issues related to teaching noted in the retention review should be addressed prior to tenure review.

Currently graduate advising is integral to the areas of Studio Art and Art History, and all faculty in those areas are expected to contribute to graduate education. At the time of the tenure review, a candidates in Studio Art and Art History is expected to demonstrate evidence of ability to mentor graduate students. Evidence may include chairing or serving on graduate committees, but can also be exhibited through other types of graduate student interactions.

### Service Expectations

*Effectiveness in service* will be achieved if the candidate demonstrates active participation and competent execution of tasks in any of the areas of service described by the performance indicators. Service is expected to include at least one assignment to a Department, College, or University committee at MSU. Participation in other activities that contribute to the candidate's discipline or profession including task forces or special programs is also valued, especially when

such participation raises the stature and reputation of the Department or the University in the state, the nation, or internationally.

**Section 9.05 Evidence of Performance Indicators**

Applicable performance indicators, and **evidence** supporting the candidate's performance for each indicator, will be assessed using the contents of the candidate's dossier.

In addition to the listed evidence of performance indicators, properly documented nominations for and receptions of competitive awards for scholarship, teaching, or service will be considered as evidence of peer recognition.

The list of evidence presented is not exhaustive. Other evidence supplied by the candidate that is related to the performance indicators for scholarship will be considered in the review.

*Evidence of Performance Indicators in Scholarship*

The following are typical categories of evidence for performance indicators in scholarship.

| Performance Indicator | Typical Evidence |
|---|---|
| Exhibitions: | Copy of exhibition catalog or postcard and or photographs of exhibition or installation. |
| Client Based Work: | Either: (1) a URL linking to an online version of the work created; (2) a digital copy of the work created; or (3) a physical copy of the work created. |
| Published materials: | Either: (1) a URL linking to an online version of the work in published form; (2) a digital copy of the work in published form; or (3) a copy of the accepted but unpublished work with verification of acceptance. |
| Grants Funded: | Brief description including title, funding agency and level, primary goals, length, collaborators. |
| Lectures, Talks and Presentations: | Title, venue, date, and level. If available letter of invitation, copy of program, or full citation. |
| Seminars or Colloquia: | Title, venue, date, and level. |
| Reviewer or editor: | Citations including name of book, journal, editorial role and dates of service. |
| Professional consultations: | Brief description of consulting activities, audience, and outcomes. |
| Awards: | Scans or digital documentation of award. |

### *Evidence of Performance Indicators in Teaching*

The following are typical categories of evidence for performance indicators in teaching. The list of evidence is not exhaustive, thus other evidence supplied by the candidate that is related to performance indicators for teaching will be considered in the review.

| Performance Indicator | Typical Evidence |
|---|---|
| Delivering quality instruction in support of the Department's teaching mission: | Written report or letter from peer observer, submitted directly by the observer to the Director of the School of Art and maintained in Department files. The Director of the School of Art may serve as a peer observer. |
| Development and implementation of new pedagogical methods and/or curriculum materials: | Syllabus or other documentation of new methods or materials with evidence supporting innovation. Brief description of the implementation process, audience, and outcomes. |
| Creation and facilitation of instructional programs: | Agenda or other documentation of instructional program's goals and major components. Brief description of audience and outcomes. |
| Mentorship of graduate students: | Brief description including graduate student name, research focus, and progress to date. |
| Mentorship of undergraduate students: | Brief description including undergraduate student name, research focus, and progress to date. |
| Student evaluations of instruction via University-approved instruments: | Student evaluation scores with student comments for all courses taught during the review period. Include a broad description of changes made in response to student feedback. |

### *Evidence of Performance Indicators in Service*

The following are typical categories of evidence for performance indicators in service. The list of evidence is not exhaustive, thus other evidence supplied by the candidate that is related to performance indicators for service will be considered in the review.

| Performance Indicator | Typical Evidence |
|---|---|
| Membership and offices held on Department, College, and University committees: | Name and level of each committee and dates of service. |
| Professional service in local, state, | Name of each organization with description, offices |

| national, or international organizations: | or roles held, dates of service, and notable accomplishments. |
|---|---|
| Outreach to local, state, national, or international communities: | Brief description of outreach activities, audience, and outcomes. |

## Article X.   Promotion to Rank of Associate Professor

### Section 10.01 University Standards

The University standards for promotion to the rank of Associate Professor are the standards for the award of tenure. Appointment at the rank of Associate Professor or Professor does not demonstrate, in and of itself, that standards for tenure have been met.

## Article XI.   Promotion to Rank of Professor

### Section 11.01 Timing of Review

Normally, faculty are reviewed for promotion after the completion of five (5) years of service at the rank of Associate Professor, however, faculty may seek promotion earlier if they can establish that they meet the same standards of effectiveness and accomplishment or excellence used in evaluating candidates after five (5) years in rank.

### Section 11.02 University Standard

The University standards for promotion to the rank of **Professor** are:
- Sustained effectiveness in teaching and service during the review period
- Sustained integration of no less than two of the following areas during the review period: teaching, scholarship, and service
- Excellence in scholarship

### Section 11.03 Performance Indicators and Weighting

The performance indicators and weighting for this review of promotion to the rank of **Professor** are the same as those defined in Section 9.03.

Weighting of performance indicators include:
- Recognition by the field
- Creation in the field
- Participation in the field

For the promotion to the rank of **Professor** the most important performance indicator is **recognition by the field.** These contributions includes those activities that define and acknowledge the candidate as an expert in their field.

Still significant for the promotion to the rank of **Professor** are those indicators that demonstrate **creation in the field** and **participation in the field**. These contributions are defined as products that have been peer-reviewed and disseminated in formats relevant to the field and the presentation of one's work.

**Section 11.04 Quantitative and Qualitative Expectations**

*Scholarship Expectations*
The Department values intellectual discovery and the generation of new knowledge above all other measures of scholarship.

Excellence in scholarship is judged primarily by the quality of exhibitions, client base work, and published works being the most commonly used performance indicator. *Excellence* includes, but is not limited to, **receiving national or international recognition** from peers and colleagues as having made important scholarly contributions to the candidate's discipline. The Department expects that scholarly results will be disseminated through exhibitions, publications and presentations.

It is expected that scholarship be of high quality, be ongoing throughout the review period, be commensurate with the associated discipline, and result in a substantive record of scholarly products that impact the field.

Although the candidate's complete body of work since the tenure review is important, the candidate's scholarship performance will be reviewed primarily on the most recent 5 years of appointment, regardless of the amount of time that has elapsed since the candidate's tenure review.

Regardless of quantity of products, the quality of the candidate's scholarly body of work as documented by External Reviewers is of primary importance. In particular, the quality and reputation of venues and publications, as documented by External Reviewers and disciplinary norms, is considered extremely important in the review process. In some cases, a relatively small number of products with high impact may be acceptable for satisfying scholarship expectations, while in other cases a large number of products may not be sufficient.

A record of seeking extramural funds to support research activities is also expected. As recognition of the intellectual work invested in the early phases of a grant, a candidate who is active as a PI or co-PI on an awarded external grant during the review period may not be

expected to produce as many scholarly products. The scope of the grant work and the reputation of the granting agency are qualitative factors that will determine impact.

Collaborative work is highly valued and the candidate is expected to identify the level of individual contribution to scholarly works (see Section 6.02).

### Teaching Expectations
The expectation for this review is effectiveness in teaching, and the standard is defined in Section 9.04, with the exception that at the time of promotion review an additional weight is placed on mentorship of undergraduate and or graduate students.

### Service Expectations
The expectation for this review is effectiveness in service, and the standard is defined in Section 9.04, with the exception that at the time of promotion review an additional weight is placed on active contributions to Department committees and programs.

## Section 11.05 Evidence of Performance Indicators
Applicable performance indicators, and evidence supporting the candidate's performance for each indicator, will be assessed using the contents of the candidate's dossier. The description of evidence of performance indicators is found in Section 9.05 of this document.

## Article XII.  Procedures for Update and Revision of the Unit Role and Scope Document
Faculty members are entitled to propose changes to Role and Scope Documents of their academic unit. Review committee members or administrators who identify a need for improvement, clarification, or other revision to the Department's Role and Scope may submit the request for changes to the chair of UPTC. The UPTC Chair will forward the recommendations to the Department. Submission to the UPTC chair should occur after the review committee or administrator completes all reviews for the year. Departments will act on any proposed changes received from the UPTC Chair on an annual basis and will undertake a full review of their Document no less than every four years.

## Article XIII.    Approval Process

## Section 13.01 Primary Academic Unit Role and Scope Document
- Tenurable faculty and administrator of the primary academic unit (Department)
- Retention, Tenure, and Promotion review committee and administrator of all associated intermediate units (Usually Colleges)
- University Retention, Tenure, and Promotion Committee (URTPC)
- Provost

### Section 13.02 Intermediate Academic Unit Role and Scope Document
- Promotion and tenure review committee and administrator of the intermediate unit
- University Retention, Tenure, and Promotion Committee (URTPC)
- Provost

### Section 13.03 University Role and Scope Document
- University Retention, Tenure, and Promotion Committee (URTPC)
- Faculty Senate
- Deans' Council
- Provost