

DEPARTMENT OF ART HISTORY

Faculty Promotion and Tenure

Policies and Procedures

Revised Version Approved: 04/05/2016

<http://arts.vcu.edu/faculty/promotion-tenure-guidelines/>

University Faculty Promotion and Tenure Policies and Procedures:

http://www.policy.vcu.edu/sites/default/files/Faculty_Promotion_and_Tenure_Policies_and_Procedures_0.pdf

School of the Arts Faculty Promotion and Tenure Policies and Procedures:

<http://arts.vcu.edu/faculty/promotion-tenure-guidelines/>

Policy Statement and Purpose; current University and School policies, except as supplemented below.

Who Should Know This Policy; current University and School policies

FORMAT for the CURRICULUM VITAE; current School policy, except as supplemented below:

School CV Format, Section 9. Significant Creative or Scholarly Achievements:

The Peer Review Committee places greatest emphasis on peer-reviewed and invited publications, though candidates may include self-initiated publications (e.g., internet or web-based materials) in the application for promotion and tenure. In listing publications on the CV, candidates shall identify each as peer-reviewed, invited, or self-initiated.

For peer-reviewed or invited publications/manuscripts in progress, candidates shall indicate the status of work using the following categories, as defined in the Chicago Manual of Style (14th edition):

- In press: article or book is actually being typeset or printed.
- Forthcoming: article or book is in the process of publication but not yet being typeset or printed. Provide name of publisher and estimated date.
- In revision: author is revising article or book in response to one or more of the following: readers' reports solicited by an editor; copy editing.
- Under review: editor has sent out manuscript to peer reviewers.
- In preparation: work is not yet under peer review.

In listing presentations of research that were delivered in an academic context (i.e., conferences, colleges, universities), the candidates shall characterize presentations as juried or invited, and characterize conferences as international, national, regional or local.

Procedures

1.0 Goal, Objectives and Authority

1.1 Goal; current University and School policies

1.2 Objectives; current University and School policies

1.3 Relationship of Schools and Departments to University Promotion and Tenure Policy; current University and School policies

1.4 Appointing Authority; current University and School policies

2.0 Faculty Ranks and Appointments; current University and School policies

2.1 General Criteria and Criteria Definitions for Tenured, Tenure-eligible, and Term (non-tenure) Faculty Members; current University and School policies

In addition to the policies and procedures set forth in this document, all candidates for promotion and/or tenure should be familiar with the contents of each of the following documents:

- VCU University Faculty Promotion and Tenure Policies and Procedures.
- VCU Policy on Annual Assessment of Faculty Performance.
- VCU Faculty Roles and Rewards Policy.
- School of the Arts Faculty Promotion and Tenure Policies and Procedures.

If the department document is silent on a topic, the school and university documents shall apply.

2.1.1 Application of Criteria and Criteria Ratings for Tenured, Tenure-eligible and Term (Non-tenure) Faculty; current University and School policies

2.1.1. A Ratings for Promotion; current University and School policies

2.1.1. B Basic Criteria for Promotion and Tenure; current University and School policies

2.1.2 Application of Criteria and Criteria Ratings for promotion for Term (Non-tenure) Faculty; current University policy

Evaluation of Term faculty for promotion within the department shall follow all current university and school policies and procedures, and be conducted using the same appropriate department criteria established in section 2.2.

2.2 Departmental Criteria for Tenured, Tenure-eligible and Term (Non-tenure) Faculty Member; current University policy

2.2.1 Appropriate Credentials and Experience

A PhD in Art History or a related field is the standard academic credential for all tenured and tenure eligible positions in the department. Exceptions may be granted only upon recommendation of the Peer Review Committee and the Department Chair, and with approval of the Dean of the School of the Arts. For Term (Non-tenure) faculty members, exceptions may be granted only upon recommendation of the Department Chair, and with approval of the Dean of the School of the Arts.

2.2.2 Continuing Scholarship and Professional Growth

Accomplishments in the area of scholarship generally fall into one of four categories:

- Publications.
- Conference presentations and academic lectures.
- Curated scholarly exhibitions.
- Grants, fellowships, and other awards.

Evaluators should judge all scholarly work according to the general criteria of quality, impact, and relationship to the candidate's research field as a whole. In this regard, peer-reviewed publications are generally more significant than editorially reviewed or invited, and presentations at conferences of national or international organizations more significant than regional and local ones.

The typical path to tenure and promotion, at VCU as at other Art History departments with graduate programs, is a book-length work, published or at least under contract. For promotion to full professor, the typical path is the completion of a second book-length work that is substantially different from the first one. University presses with strong reputations in the candidate's area of specialization carry the greatest weight in tenure and promotion decisions. Non-university academic presses are equally credible venues for scholarly publication. Trade publishers also issue important scholarly books, even if the books are subject to editorial rather than peer review. A series of related peer-reviewed articles may also be sufficient to earn tenure and promotion. These articles should present a sustained and coherent scope of research, equivalent to book-length publications in breadth and depth. Evaluators should judge the importance of a journal itself according to such criteria as the nature of its review process, its acceptance rate, where its contents are indexed, its sponsorship by a recognized scholarly organization, and, for electronic journals, how it is archived. There should ideally be some evidence of the impact of the book and/or articles on the field such as a published book review or documented citations. Chapters or essays contributed to collections shall be evaluated according to their publisher, the importance of the collection, and the substance of the article. Other publications that contribute to scholarship include, but are not limited to, translations, reference works, reference articles, and textbooks.

Publications in teaching methods and approaches that draw upon sustained research and are meant for broad dissemination in the scholarly community may qualify as scholarship or as teaching. Editorial work that includes significant research, results in coherently structured thematic volumes or special issues, and has a significant impact on the scholarly discourse may also be considered as scholarship.

In the event of co-authored or multi-authored work of any kind, a candidate should submit a statement that details his or her individual contributions to the whole. In the humanities, the first author listed is not necessarily the principal contributor.

Although external funding is not ordinarily expected of faculty in the humanities, any awards or external fellowships, grants or residencies a candidate receives do offer evidence of the candidate's impact on the field and excellence of his or her work.

The general criteria for evaluating digital scholarship involve its content, form, audience or purpose, and effective use of media. Consequently, the best way to evaluate a candidate's work in a digital medium is to do so in the medium in which it was produced. Print-outs or other hard

copies are poor substitutes for evaluating web pages online. Digital scholarship, whenever practicable, shall be evaluated according to the same standards as print scholarship. For example, criteria for an electronic journal would include the nature of the peer review process, submission acceptance rates, the stature of the editorial board and/or publisher, and judgments of the journal's quality and its impact or influence on the field.

2.2.3 Teaching

Instruction in the Department of Art History takes various forms: traditional lecture courses; seminars; independent study which involves "one-to-one" interaction between student and teacher in directed research courses, supervising qualifying papers, and directing theses and dissertations. Demonstrated competence in teaching is essential for promotion and tenure. The Peer Review Committee shall provide written assessments of the candidate's teaching, based on in-person class observation, which addresses the criteria listed below. The candidate:

- Has a thorough and appropriate knowledge of the discipline.
- Effectively organizes the course information and curricular ideas.
- Uses appropriate teaching techniques.
- Communicates and imparts knowledge, skills, and processes appropriate to the discipline.
- Remains current in the discipline and relates important advancements in the discipline to students—as appropriate to the level of the class.

Each candidate may supply the Peer Review Committee with a list of student evaluators. The committee, in turn, may also contact students of its own selection. Only the committee can solicit individually written evaluations from students currently enrolled in a class taught by the candidate, or current thesis advisees or assistants, though students may decline to evaluate the candidate. The Peer Review Committee Report shall include department faculty colleagues' assessment of the candidate; only signed evaluations and letters shall be accepted.

2.2.4 Service

Service refers to activities contributing directly or indirectly to the development of the department, school, university, profession, or community. Such activities may be solicited or unsolicited, paid or unpaid. The candidate shall list service activities according to the following four categories:

- Department, school, and university service refers to activities within VCU, such as work on committees, overseeing programs, consulting with committees or peers, presenting lectures, conducting workshops, providing instruction beyond assigned teaching load, and providing other services or assistance. Department service also includes student advising.
- Administrative service refers to those service duties that are normally expected of individuals holding administrative positions such as chairs, directors, or deans.
- Service to the profession refers to undertakings such as participating or holding office in professional associations and societies, professional adjudications and other professional contributions made as a result of professional endeavors. It also includes serving as a conference session chair or discussant, member of a conference planning committee, member of an editorial board, peer reviewer for journals or publishers of academic research, and author of book reviews.
- Community service refers to activities where the candidate applies professional expertise to the broader community, such as work on committees, administering programs, consulting, presenting lectures, conducting workshops, providing instruction, or

providing assistance relating to the candidate's profession. The Peer Review Committee shall not consider or evaluate any non-academic or non-professional civic duty as Service applicable to promotion and tenure.

The candidate shall submit to the chair of the Peer Review Committee a list of names and contact information of persons (within and outside the university) competent to comment on or assess his/her contributions. The candidate shall also provide substantiating documentation for service to the profession.

2.2.5 Ratings for Tenure and Promotion to Associate Professor

Continuing Scholarship and Professional Growth:

Candidates achieving a rating of excellent in this category shall have presented a record of substantial scholarly and publication activity. That work should be of superior quality as judged against accepted standards of the field, and it should have potential for tangible impact on the candidate's field.

Candidates achieving a rating of very good shall have been consistently active in their research, resulting in significant publication and the likelihood of future accomplishments and enhanced professional standing.

Candidates achieving a rating of satisfactory shall have demonstrated an aptitude for scholarship and publication that has attained minimal recognition in terms of publications (either in print or in press).

Teaching:

Candidates achieving a rating of excellent in this category shall have demonstrated a high level of performance in the classroom, effectiveness in supervising independent work (directed research assignments, qualifying papers, theses, and dissertations), and presented evidence of commitment to improving educational practices, such as (though not limited to) updated instructional materials, new course development, web-based teaching, and collaborative engagements.

Candidates achieving a rating of very good shall have demonstrated a clear commitment to and a consistent record of effective performance in the instructional role.

Candidates achieving a rating of satisfactory shall have demonstrated dutiful and effective performance of their teaching responsibilities.

Service:

Candidates achieving a rating of excellent in this category shall present a record of superior performance in and leadership potential for significant service activities in at least two arenas of service—departmental, school, university, professional, and community.

Candidates achieving a rating of very good shall have demonstrated conscientious and effective work in at least two arenas of service—departmental, school, university, professional, and community.

Candidates achieving a rating of satisfactory shall have demonstrated basic competence in the performance of service obligations.

2.2.6 Ratings for Promotion to Full Professor

Typically, evaluation criteria and ratings for promotion and/or tenure from Associate Professor to Professor are assessed cumulatively within each area (Continuing Scholarship and Professional Growth, Teaching and Service). As example, criteria as listed below for a rating of “very good” in Teaching remain in effect along with additional criteria and/or higher standards, as indicated, for a rating of “excellent” in the same area.

Continuing Scholarship and Professional Growth:

Candidates achieving a rating of excellent in this category shall have an extensive record of achievement as manifested in published books, scholarly articles, and other types of scholarly and/or nationally recognized publications and presentations as appropriate to the candidate's field. Candidates should possess a positive reputation in their field. Evidence of such may include citations of the candidate's work, positive published reviews of publications, the favorable opinions of prominent scholars, re-publication in works edited by others, the presentation of papers at major conferences, significant honors and awards, and successful applications for competitive grants.

Candidates achieving a rating of very good shall have a record of achievement as evidenced by published books, scholarly articles and creative works, and other types of scholarly publications and presentations, appropriate to the candidate's field, that indicate significant progress toward the attainment of a positive reputation in their field.

Candidates achieving a rating of satisfactory shall have demonstrated an ongoing commitment to scholarly research.

Teaching:

Candidates achieving a rating of excellent in this category shall have a sustained record of distinguished classroom performance and effectiveness in supervising independent work (directed research assignments, qualifying papers, theses and dissertations). Candidates shall also have a sustained record of effective classroom performance as evidenced by student evaluation results, peer assessments, and contributions toward the ongoing success of the department's instructional mission. In addition, candidates should have a record of successful efforts to support and improve teaching through endeavors such as (though not limited to) updated instructional materials, new course development, web-based teaching, and collaborative engagements.

Candidates achieving a rating of very good in this category shall have a sustained record of effective classroom performance as evidenced by student evaluation results, peer assessments, and contributions toward the ongoing success of the department's instructional mission.

Candidates achieving a rating of satisfactory shall have demonstrated competent, professional, and effective performance of their teaching responsibilities.

Service:

Candidates achieving a rating of excellent in this category shall possess a sustained and superior record of departmental, school, university, professional, and/or community service. It is expected that a candidate shall have been active in serving the professional community, as well as in at least two other arenas—department, school, university, or community.

Candidates achieving a rating of very good shall have an ongoing record of effective service the professional community, as well as in at least two other arenas—department, school, university, or community.

Candidates achieving a rating of satisfactory shall have a record of willing and competent performance of assigned service obligations within the university, and adequate service to the professional community.

3.0 Defining Appointments; current University and School policies

3.1 Tenured Appointments; current University and School policies

3.2 Probationary (tenure-eligible) Appointments; current University and School policies

3.2.1 Alterations of the Typical Probationary Period; current University and School policies

3.2.1.1 Expedited Reviews; current School policy

3.2.2 Extensions of the Initially Agreed Upon Probationary Period; current University and School policies

3.2.3 Evaluation of Probation for Tenure-Eligible Faculty

A third year or interim review of tenure-eligible faculty shall be held to assess the progress of the candidate and to discuss activities relative to their forthcoming review for promotion and tenure. The primary purpose of this review is to provide mentoring of the junior faculty by senior, tenured faculty and the department chair.

For a traditional candidate with a six-year probationary period, this process shall begin in November of the candidate's third year of appointment. For other probationary periods, the review shall begin no earlier than the halfway point of the candidate's probationary period. At this time the candidate shall meet with the Department Chair to review the mid-term review process, and to address the candidate's questions. During this meeting, the candidate can suggest specific members for the review committee.

By January 20th, the candidate shall submit current curriculum vitae, class syllabi, annual work plans, annual reports, and support materials for the areas of Continuing Scholarship and Professional Growth, Teaching, and Service. The candidate shall also provide a narrative review of activities since initial appointment as well as activities intended for the remaining years before tenure review, in the areas of Continuing Scholarship and Professional Growth, Teaching, and Service.

The Department Chair shall charge a committee of three tenured faculty members, which can include a tenured faculty member from a related department as appropriate. This committee shall convene in February to review the candidate's materials. Minutes shall be kept of all meetings associated with the review process.

The committee shall review the materials and meet with the candidate. This meeting shall afford the opportunity to discuss the candidate's work, his/her understanding of the mission of the Department, and to review the candidate's job description. The candidate should be prepared to ask questions relating to his/her progress. The committee should not make prescriptive comments or remarks that could be construed as promises.

The committee shall prepare a final report that is submitted to the Department Chair and to the candidate no later than April 30. The Chair shall use the committee report to advise the candidate and shall write a separate report of that advising meeting.

The committee report and report from the Chair remain in the department as part of the candidate's permanent file.

3.2.3.1 Probationary Review

The candidate shall prepare his/her curriculum vitae according to the format for tenure review required by the School of the Arts, ensuring that no single activity is listed more than one time on the c.v. The candidate shall provide support material for each of the areas of Continuing Scholarship and Professional Growth as described below.

Continuing Scholarship and Professional Growth:

- Submit copies of publications, indicate publications as peer-reviewed or invited,
- For publications/manuscripts in progress, indicate the status of work, and provide documentation where appropriate, using the following categories, as defined in the Chicago Manual of Style (14th edition):
 - In press: article or book is actually being typeset or printed,
 - Forthcoming: article or book is in the process of publication but not yet being typeset or printed. Provide name of publisher and estimated date,
 - In revision: author is revising article or book in response to one or more of the following: readers' reports solicited by an editor; copy editing,
 - Under review: editor has sent out manuscript to peer reviewers,
 - In preparation: work is not yet under peer review.
- Indicate presentations of research that were delivered in an academic context (i.e., conferences, colleges, universities). Characterize presentations as juried or invited, and characterize conferences as international, national, regional or local. Provide documentation (i.e., conference program, letters of invitation/gratitude).
- List grant proposals submitted (VCU and beyond); indicate if proposals were awarded; provide documentation of submission and award, if granted.

Teaching:

- Submit copies of all class syllabi and course evaluations. Use Department of Art History course evaluations for each class.
- Provide a personal narrative that describes teaching philosophy, evaluation processes that ensure fair and impartial assessment, and teaching or curricular innovations.

- Include copies of classroom observation assessments. Two tenured, department faculty members shall conduct classroom observation of candidate during the second semester of the candidate's first and second years of teaching. Faculty observers shall provide a written assessment that addresses the criteria listed below. The candidate:
 - Has a thorough and appropriate knowledge of the discipline.
 - Effectively organizes the course information and curricular ideas.
 - Uses appropriate teaching techniques.
 - Communicates and imparts knowledge, skills, and processes appropriate to the discipline.
 - Remains current in the discipline and relates important advancements in the discipline to students—as appropriate to the level of the class.
- Indicate teaching workshops attended, if applicable.
- List authors, titles, and completion dates (or indicate “in progress”) of MA qualifying papers, theses and dissertations directed.
- List thesis and dissertation authors, titles, completion date (or indicate “in progress”) for which candidate has served as a committee member.
- Provide names of graduate and undergraduate student advisees with whom candidate has met.

Service

- List service activities according to the following four categories:
 - Department, school, and university service refers to activities within VCU, such as work on committees, overseeing programs, consulting with committees or peers, presenting lectures, conducting workshops, providing instruction beyond assigned teaching load, and providing other services or assistance. Department service also includes student advising.
 - Administrative service refers to those service duties that are normally expected of individuals holding administrative positions such as chairs, directors, or deans.
 - Service to the profession refers to undertakings such as participating or holding office in professional associations and societies, professional adjudications and other professional contributions made as a result of professional endeavors. It also includes serving as a conference session chair or discussant, member of a conference planning committee, member of an editorial board, peer reviewer for journals or publishers of academic research, and author of book reviews.
 - Community service refers to activities where the candidate applies professional expertise to the broader community, such as work on committees, administering programs, consulting, presenting lectures, conducting workshops, providing instruction, or providing assistance relating to the candidate's profession. The Peer Review Committee shall not consider or evaluate any non-academic or non-professional civic duty as Service applicable to promotion and tenure.
- Provide substantiating documentation for service to the profession.

3.2.4 Linkage; current University policy

3.3 Transition between Tenure Track Positions and Term Appointments; current University policy

3.4 Continuing Review of Faculty

At the beginning of each academic year every department faculty member, in consultation with the departmental chair, shall determine in writing an individual work plan for the year which sets forth the specific percentages of the faculty member's efforts with regard to Continuing

Scholarship and Professional Growth, Teaching, and Service. At the close of each academic year, each faculty member shall submit a written self-evaluation to the department chair. The department chair shall provide, and discuss with the faculty member, a written evaluation and ranking of the faculty member's performance at the outset of the following academic year. The annual evaluation shall contain a summary rating of "Excellent," "Very Good," "Satisfactory," "Needs Improvement," or "Unsatisfactory." The evaluation shall then become a part of the faculty member's permanent file.

3.5 Honorary Titles; current University policy

3.6 Administrative Titles; current University policy

3.7 Notice of Appointments; current University policy

3.8 Joint Appointments with Non-University Agencies; current University policy

4.0 University Promotion and Tenure Policy Review Committee; current University policy.

4.1 Committee Composition; current University policy.

4.2 Committee Duties; current University policy.

5.0 School of the Arts Promotion and Tenure Committee; current University and School policies.

6.0 University Appeal Committee; current University policy

6.1 Committee Composition; current University policy

6.2 Committee Duties; current University policy

6.3 Committee Training; current University policy

7.0 Academic Review Procedures for Promotion and Tenure for Tenured, Tenure-eligible and Term (Non-tenure) Faculty Members

7.1 Promotion and Tenure Initiated at the Department Level

Set up by the department chair, the Peer Review Committee shall be composed of three tenured faculty members within the Department of Art History, one tenured faculty member from outside the department, and one graduate student majoring in Art History who is not enrolled in any course work with the candidate during the peer review period. The department chair shall appoint the chair of the Peer Review Committee. All members of the committee shall have voting rights. In the event the department does not have three tenured faculty members, more than one tenured faculty member from other departments shall serve on the Peer Review Committee.

After being notified of the composition of the committee, the candidate has the right to challenge any member for just cause. If challenging the composition of the committee, the candidate must submit the challenge in writing within five working days from the date of notification. A faculty member may decline to serve on the committee, if there is a good reason for doing so. If a challenge or self-disqualification is warranted, the department chair shall replace the member. Should the department chair reject the challenge by the candidate, the department chair must communicate in writing to the candidate the reason for doing so. Although it should remain confidential (between the department chair and the candidate) the department chair shall include any communication concerning the challenge of a committee member in the department chair's report.

7.1.1 Peer Evaluation; current University and School policies

External Evaluation

Written external evaluations shall be an integral part of the review process for promotion and/or tenure to Associate Professor or Professor. External Evaluators must be recognized authorities in the candidate's field. The Peer Review Committee shall exclude from consideration as outside evaluators any persons who have co-authored publications, collaborated on research, or been institutional colleagues or academic mentors/advisors of the candidate.

The Peer Review Committee shall select four External Evaluators from two lists, one submitted by the candidate, and one generated by the Peer Review Committee. Each list should contain the names of five potential Evaluators and a brief statement about their qualifications and experience. The Peer Review Committee shall select two potential Evaluators from each list, plus an alternate from each list in the event that someone should decline. The candidate must be notified in writing of the committee's selection. Before the Peer Review Committee contacts External Evaluators, a candidate has the right to object to individual Evaluators appearing on the final list by stating in writing, within five working days from the date of written notification, the reasons why an Evaluator should be disqualified. Only the Peer Review Committee shall communicate directly with the four External Evaluators, and its initial contact with potential External Evaluators should be made by a telephone call or e-mail to ascertain both the evaluators' willingness to participate in the process and their ability to meet the deadlines set by the committee.

7.1.2 Department Chair; current University and School policies.

8.0 Administrative Review Procedures for Academic Personnel Actions; current University and School policies

8.1 The Dean; current University and School policies

8.2 The Provost and the Vice President for Health Sciences; current University and School policies

9.0 Appeal Process; current University and School policies

9.1 Grounds for Appeal; current University policies

9.2 Appeal Process; current University and School policies

10.0 The President and Board of Visitors; current University policy

11.0 Procedure for Termination of Employment of Tenured Faculty Members; current University policy

11.1 Reasons for Dismissal; current University policy

11.2 Post-Tenure Review; current University and School policies

11.2.1 Post-Tenure Review Panel; current University and School policies

11.2.2 Assessment of Annual Evaluation; current University policy

11.2.3 Improvement Plan; current University policy

11.2.4 Assessing the Improvement Plan; current University policy

11.3 Dismissal for Cause Procedures; current University policy

11.4 Dismissal for Financial Emergency; current University policy

11.5 Compensation; current University policy

12.0 Procedures for Review and Amendment of this Document

The Department of Art History Policies and Procedures shall be reviewed at least every six years by a committee appointed by the department chair to consist of faculty who are either tenured or hold tenure track appointments. Any tenured or tenure eligible faculty member in the Department of Art History may propose an amendment to the departmental policies and procedures, which shall be voted upon by the eligible faculty members and passed by a majority vote.

Revision History

Revised by Department, May 2, 2006

Revised by Department, Approved by SOTA P&T Committee, 2013

Revised by Department, April 3, 2016, Approved by SOTA P&T Committee, April 5, 2016