

DEPARTMENT OF ART HISTORY
GUIDELINES FOR PROMOTION AND TENURE

approved by the Provost February 26, 2014

The Department of Art History will follow the University guidelines for promotion and tenure, as contained in the Faculty Handbook: <http://www.udel.edu/provost/fachb/IV-D-I-facpt.html>. This document contains information concerning the dossier that the candidate prepares (see <http://www.udel.edu/provost/fachb/IV-D-9-dossier.html>). The candidate may seek advice about what should be or should not be included in the dossier from members of the faculty, including but not limited to the Chair of the Department's Promotion and Tenure committee, but final decisions concerning the dossier are entirely the rights and responsibilities of the candidate. In this document, the Department offers some specifications and clarifications appropriate to its own character and mission in the form of two appendices herewith attached:

DEPARTMENT OF ART HISTORY APPENDIX I - For Faculty with primary appointments in Art History

I. Composition of the Department Promotion and Tenure Committee, and Procedures.

Promotions (above the rank of instructor and lecturer) will be considered and voted upon by a promotion and tenure committee composed of all members of the departmental faculty who hold ranks equal to or higher than that to which the candidate is seeking promotion. After a faculty member has announced to the Chair, by March 15 of the year preceding the promotion review, his or her intention to seek promotion, the Chair will arrange for the convening of the Department Promotion and Tenure Committee. The committee will elect its own chairperson, who will have the primary responsibility for working with the candidate in the preparation of the dossier.

An important part of the review process is the solicitation and consideration of letters of evaluation by experts in the candidate's area(s) of scholarly specialization. The Department P&T committee chair shall request that the candidate submit a list of no more than six names of scholars whom the candidate deems appropriate as peer reviewers. After receiving this list, the P&T chair will solicit from the Department P& T committee a list of six or more other possible peer reviewers, not on the candidate's list, and will give a copy of this list to the candidate, who may comment upon the names on the Department list, although such comments are not required. The P&T chair and committee will then solicit letters from outside reviewers. At least five letters should be obtained, at least two of which must be from the Department list rather than the candidate list. Both lists of possible reviewers, that provided by the candidate and that provided by the Department (along with the candidate's comments on those latter names, if any) will be included in the dossier, along with copies of the letter requesting outside peer evaluation.

IV. Criteria and Methods of Evaluation

A. Promotion from Assistant Professor to Associate Professor

Since the Department subscribes to the view that the essential nature of a university is to be found in the unique way in which it combines teaching with research, it would not recommend anyone for promotion to the rank of Associate Professor whom it did not consider an effective teacher and who had not demonstrated the ability to expand significantly the horizons of his or her special field of interest through scholarly research and dissemination. A faculty member's skill as an adviser and the participation in interdisciplinary instruction will, if applicable, also be taken into account in the evaluation of teaching. Excellence in teaching and research are therefore considered equally necessary and important. A candidate's continuing and effective service to the department, the university, the community, and the profession will also be taken into account by the department, but it is not anticipated that service will ever be accepted as a substitute for excellence in both teaching and research. Unmistakable evidence of the candidate's growth to date as teacher and scholar, and the prospect of continued future growth, are essential.

The Department will consider all scholarly and service activities performed at another institution at the same rank as properly part of an application for promotion at UD. For evaluation of teaching we will normally consider only information from the University of Delaware as necessary and appropriate; candidates may choose to submit information concerning teaching at other institutions either before coming to UD or while already teaching at UD, but such information is not required and need not be solicited or considered by the Department P&T committee.

1) Expectations and Evidence for Teaching

Excellence in teaching is expressed in the candidate's thorough knowledge of subject matter, ability to organize and present the subject with a high degree of coherence and clarity, and skill in stimulating students' interest and curiosity. It is expected that the candidate will be responsive, insofar as possible, to individual students' academic needs and problems.

Forms of evidence will normally include:

a) Classroom (peer) evaluations that attest to the candidate's ability as a teacher. All members of the promotion and tenure committee, and the department chairperson, may attend, and are encouraged to attend, one or more of the candidate's classes (in accordance with the university and departmental guidelines on faculty visitation).

b) Student evaluations.

The Department of Art History expects that all faculty members will provide an opportunity to the students in every class to produce a written evaluation

of that class. The primary purpose of these written evaluations is to allow the faculty member to assess the reception of the course and to consider what changes might be desirable in future offerings. Faculty members may use any form they wish for these written evaluations (subject to department approval), which will be collected and kept on file in the Chair's office, where they may be consulted by the faculty member and by the Chair in connection with annual evaluations. They will also be considered by the Promotion and Tenure Committee in evaluating performance in teaching.

While several different forms are standard in the department, any form must be approved by the department. These forms may or may not include a numerical-rating component, at the individual faculty member's choice. Accordingly, there is no Departmental statistical standard or mean. Whenever possible, such evaluations will represent the candidate's full term of teaching at the university; emphasis, however, will be placed on recent teaching. The Promotion and Tenure Committee will carefully examine these evaluation forms and will use them as one means of assessing student reactions to the promotion candidate's teaching performance. The Committee will consider not only students' level of satisfaction but also the evidence that written evaluations provide for the success of the instructor in promoting learning.

The Department recognizes that the absence of simple numerical ratings for individual faculty members or for the Department as a whole may make assessment of teaching performance more difficult for subsequent levels of review, from the College Promotion and Tenure Committee to the Provost. However, the Department believes that the most important aspect of written teaching evaluations by students is improvement in instruction. We regard this improvement, the striving toward the achievement of excellence in teaching, as our fundamental goal, and believe that numerical ratings are of less benefit and significance than written comments, which by their nature are unquantifiable. Also, we recognize that both teaching styles and teaching aims naturally and appropriately vary widely across the Department's faculty and range of courses. We teach a range of very large and also of medium-size undergraduate courses serving the College and University general education requirements and mission, a range of smaller Honors courses, advanced seminars for undergraduate and/or graduate students, and know that numerical ratings cannot take into account the varied nature of these courses. In writing its letter of recommendation, the Committee will make a conscientious effort to survey the student evaluations as a whole, quoting a range of what it takes to be fairly representative examples, and seeking to identify any particular patterns (for example, changes positive or negative over time, special strengths or problems with individual courses or levels of teaching). All evaluation forms will be available in the Department Office and will be accessible to any level of promotion review for which those raw forms are needed.

c) Oral and written evaluation by the undergraduate and graduate student advisory committees of the department.

d) As it may happen that members of the student advisory committees might include few with direct experience of the candidate's teaching, oral and written evaluations will also

be solicited by the Chair of the Promotion and Tenure Committee from a representative sample of undergraduate and graduate students who have had such direct experience.

e) Evidence, gathered by the committee, from interviews with representative students, of the candidate's ability as an adviser, both undergraduate and graduate, and as a supervisor of independent studies, as well as honors, M.A., and Ph.D. theses.

2) Evidence and Expectations for Research

During his or her term as assistant professor, the candidate should have engaged actively in research, a substantial portion of which is disseminated to the scholarly community. The forms of this dissemination may vary, but there must be evidence of publication of significant results in media that reflect high scholarly standards. The quality of the candidate's publications, rather than quantity alone, will be given prime consideration, but evidence of continuous and sustained productivity must also be present. For promotion, the candidate's contribution, taken as a whole, including its quality and quantity, must be excellent.

Research in art history may take many forms, and faculty members with special interests in areas such as criticism and museum exhibitions will appropriately offer materials different from those whose interests are primarily historical. Most significant as evidence of productive scholarship, in most cases, are books published by academic or commercial presses, but in the field of art history catalogues of exhibitions may also constitute highly significant achievements and/or contributions to scholarship. Normally, the Department will expect one major publication of the type noted above to be published or accepted for publication as part of a strong case for promotion to the rank of Associate Professor, but this is not an absolute requirement. Similarly, publication of articles in peer-reviewed journals or peer-reviewed volumes of collected articles is very important, and the Department will normally expect several articles published or in press for promotion to the rank of Associate Professor. These articles should demonstrate achievement of a sufficient range to show ongoing productive research at a high level, independent of the doctoral dissertation. It may be that the number, scope, quality, and/or range of these articles will be deemed sufficient to constitute the equivalent of a major book-length publication, or conversely that the publication of several monographic publications (whether books or catalogues) will be acceptable in lieu of a group of articles. In any case, the fundamental requirement is for publications that are sufficient in scope, depth, and quality to indicate that the candidate is both productive and achieving recognition as one of the emergent leading scholars in his or her special area of research. In this regard it is important that a substantial number of publications be subject to a process of peer review and be issued by journals or presses of recognized high quality and stature. The quality of the publication venues is an important criterion for assessing the candidate's scholarship. There is no simple formula whereby journal articles are preferred to conference publications, exhibition catalog essays or book chapters. In all cases, the scope (local, national, or international; sub-field specific, field specific, or interdisciplinary) and scholarly prestige (impact and selectivity, among other factors) will

be specifically addressed by the Department committee's letter of evaluation, referring to or incorporating comments by outside peer reviewers as appropriate.

The Department also places much emphasis upon oral presentations by members of the faculty, whether at learned conferences, specially organized symposia or other significant venues. Candidates for promotion to Associate Professor will normally make several such presentations, which we regard as indications of the candidate's successful efforts to become a known and active scholar, and recognition of the merits of his or her work. Similarly, invitations to participate in conferences that include other noted scholars, and/or organized at significant institutions, provide substantial evidence of the level of achievement expected for promotion to Associate Professor. The award of significant competitive fellowships and grants will also be considered in evaluating the candidate's research.

Scholarly achievements may also include the writing of book reviews or exhibition reviews, catalogue entries for exhibitions organized by other scholars, contributions to reference publications, serving as a consultant, and organizing and serving as chair of sessions at learned conferences.

3) Service

With regard to service, the department requires evidence of continuing and effective service activities within the University as well as outside, most notably in the profession and/or on a state or national level. Such wider service activities will be regarded as part of the candidate's national visibility.

B. Promotion from Associate Professor to Professor

It is expected that the candidate will continue to demonstrate notable skill in teaching, both on the undergraduate and graduate levels. However, because the department is deeply involved in graduate education in art history, it is essential that full professors offer visibility in the profession not only through their teaching but also through their reputations and achievements as creative scholars.

A recommendation for promotion to the rank of Professor is made only when the candidate has demonstrated the qualities expected of that rank. Although it is impossible to quantify these traits, there are certain general expectations of the candidate, which include significant growth and achievement since the last promotion, evidence of having established a national and international reputation for excellence in his or her field; and a substantial record of publications of high quality issued while holding the rank of Associate Professor.

As in the case of promotion to Associate Professor, publications may take many forms, including but not limited to books, exhibition catalogues, scholarly articles, and scholarly lectures. For promotion to the rank of Professor, the Department will normally expect at least one major publication, such as a book or major catalogue, as well as several articles and scholarly lectures, since promotion to Associate Professor. The fundamental expectation is that the candidate will have an established record of achievement at the very highest level, notable in range and quality, and clear indication of continued achievement.

With regard to service, the department requires evidence of distinguished service activities outside, as well as within, the University, most notably in the profession and/or on a state or national level. Such wider service activities will be regarded as part of the candidate's national visibility.

DEPARTMENT OF ART HISTORY APPENDIX II - For Promotion of those with Adjunct or Joint Appointments

Members of the university community who have primary appointments in other parts of the university (administrative positions, appointments in other departments or other units) and adjunct appointments or joint appointments in Art History, may seek promotion through the Art History Department if that promotion cannot be accomplished through their primary appointment. The procedure is the same as that for regular members of this department, but with the following crucial differences:

1. The unit in which the candidate for promotion has his or her primary appointment (i.e., his or her budget line) would be under no obligation to give the candidate the raise in pay which normally accompanies a promotion. Likewise, tenure, which normally accompanies the promotion to Associate Professor, would not be granted to a candidate promoted in this way, nor would he or she automatically lose his or her position if the promotion were denied. It is crucial that the candidate understand these limitations from the beginning of his or her application, and thus it is desirable that he or she include acknowledgement of these conditions in the initial application for promotion.
2. Since a promotion of this sort involves two units of the University (or this Department and some organization outside the university), it is most desirable that the candidate discuss his or her possible promotion first with the person in charge of the unit housing the primary appointment. That person may wish to submit his or her own evaluation of the candidate's performance to the Department P&T committee, which will include it among the confidential materials in the dossier.
3. If teaching is part of the candidate's responsibilities, evaluation of that teaching will follow the pattern of candidates with primary appointments in Art History