

2022-23
Department of Art History
Guidelines and Criteria for Promotion and Tenure

Current Version Approved by Department Faculty May 6, 2022

Updates and Revisions Last Approved by Faculty-
September 25, 2019

Originally Approved by Faculty-September 18, 1997

This is a statement of criteria and expectations concerning promotion and tenure for faculty of the Department of Art History. These departmental guidelines provide an elaboration of the general criteria of the University's Administrative Guidelines for AC-23: Promotion and Tenure Procedures and Regulations and the College of Arts and Architecture Promotion and Tenure Guidelines. This document will clarify the professional responsibilities normally carried by a faculty member that are expected for promotion and tenure and are consistent with the mission of the Department of Art History.

I. PROMOTION AND TENURE COMMITTEE/
PREPARATION OF MATERIALS FOR REVIEW

- A. Every two years (in late Spring), an election will be held for the departmental representative for the College Promotion and Tenure Committee for the coming two academic years. Every Spring, an election will be held for the Departmental Committee for the coming academic year. The Departmental Committee election will occur after the College representative election (if there is one for a particular year). The Departmental Committee will consist of no fewer than three faculty members. Only faculty members who are tenured are eligible to serve as a College representative or on the Departmental Committee. All full-time tenure-track/tenured faculty members may vote in both elections.
- B. Departmental Committee members will serve for one academic year and may be re-elected. If a replacement is required, the Department Head will name a suitable substitute. Before the fall semester, the Committee members will elect a chair.
- C. Preparation of materials for review:
 1. Dossier: It is the responsibility of the Department Head to make sure that the dossier is prepared according to University guidelines. The candidate will prepare all relevant information for the dossier that is to be provided by the candidate according to a schedule established by the Department Head.
 2. Narrative Statement (prepared by candidate). Please see Administrative Guidelines for AC-23
 3. Teaching Portfolio: The teaching portfolio is prepared by the candidate and contains recent examples of course syllabi, handouts, exams, etc., and should contain a statement of candidate's teaching philosophy and goals if these are not covered in the candidate's narrative statement. One copy of the teaching portfolio is to be deposited in 240B Borland Building, for review by the Departmental Committee and Department Head.
 4. Research Portfolio: The research portfolio is prepared by the candidate and

typically contains examples of the candidate's publications, manuscripts accepted for publication and other evidence of research accomplishments (since one's arrival at Penn State or last promotion at Penn State). It can also contain reviews of the candidate's work. This portfolio should be representative, it does not need to be all inclusive. One copy of the research portfolio is to be deposited in 240B Borland Building, for review by the Departmental Committee and Department Chair.

5. Materials for External Evaluators: Materials that will be sent to external evaluators for review will include the candidate's Narrative Statement (see LC.2), curriculum vitae (prepared by candidate), and Research Portfolio (see LC.4).

D. The duties of the Committee are to:

1. familiarize themselves with the guidelines set forth by the University (AC-23), College, and Department
2. conduct colleague reviews of teaching (see II.A.2. of Administrative Guidelines for AC-23.)
3. review candidate's dossier, narrative statement, teaching portfolio and research portfolio
4. deliberate, make judgments, and write an evaluative statement conveying the Committee's assessment and final numerical vote

II. CRITERIA, EXPECTATIONS AND METHODS OF EVALUATION

For the retention of an Assistant Professor, the candidate must show sufficient evidence (for a 2nd- or 4th-year review) of recent ACCOMPLISHMENT and PROMISE for future accomplishment in the three major areas (A, B. & C.) listed below.

For the promotion to the rank of Associate Professor and the awarding of tenure, the candidate must have accomplished SUBSTANTIAL contributions and must have demonstrated the PROMISE of achieving future significant, substantial and sustained contributions in the three major areas (A., B. & C.) listed below.

For the promotion to the rank of Professor, the candidate must have accomplished SIGNIFICANT, SUBSTANTIAL AND SUSTAINED contributions in the three major areas (A, B. & C.) listed below.

A The Scholarship of Teaching and Learning

I, Criteria and Expectations:

- a. A sound knowledge (including an awareness of current scholarship) of the fields in which the candidate teaches and supervises graduate theses.
- b. Ability to teach with scholarly accuracy, and in a well-organized and stimulating manner.
- c. Continual re-evaluation and improvement in content and organization of each of the candidate's courses.
- d. Ability to be an effective teacher and advisor to both undergraduate and graduate students.
- e. Ability to stimulate and guide graduate students in their theses, as well as to transmit to graduate students a knowledge and understanding of the

materials and methods of research in a given area of specialization.

- f Evidence of excellence in teaching (e.g. teaching awards, accomplishments of students for which the candidate has played a significant role in advising).

2. Methods of Evaluation:

- a. By review of the dossier's section on "The Scholarship of Teaching and Learning," according to University and College guidelines.
- b. By review of the candidate's teaching portfolio.
- c. By SRTE scores and a summary of student written evaluations for every course taught since the last evaluation for an Assistant Professor, and by (at least) the last five years of SRTE scores and the last two years of student written evaluations for an Associate Professor. The Department Head establishes a standard form for the department and these evaluations are administered on-line by the University at the end of each semester. SRTE results for "overall quality of this course" and "overall quality of the instructor" will be listed in the dossier. The Department Head will also review the overall SRTE reports and written evaluations. The Head (with the assistance of their administrative assistant) will then produce a concise summary of the written evaluations for each course that will be included in the dossier.
- d. For second- and fourth-year reviews only: By interviews conducted by the Department Head with a representative sample of undergraduate and graduate students who have taken the candidate's courses, been the candidate's advisees, and/or have been graduate Teaching assistants for the candidate. These interviews will be concerned with the candidate's teaching ability and effectiveness. The Head will include a concise summary of these interviews in the dossier.
- e. For tenure and/or promotion reviews only; By written letters from students and alumni concerning the candidate's teaching ability and effectiveness. The Department Head will send an open request for letters to all undergraduate majors and graduate students in art history (who have taken the candidate's courses, been the candidate's advisee, and/or graduate assistant), as well as alumni for whom the candidate had served on their doctoral committee, or where the candidate served as a first or second reader on their Master's Thesis/Paper (if a current address is available). The Head will include a concise summary of the letters.
- f. By one peer review conducted every semester for all tenure-track faculty members. Each review will be conducted by a Committee member selected by the Departmental Committee. The Committee should strive to have a different member conduct the review of a particular faculty member each semester. A review should be based upon at least one observation of a candidate teaching a class and a review of the candidate's teaching portfolio. The peer reviewer should also discuss with the candidate the goals of the course and how they are achieved. To observe a 500-level seminar, the Committee member must obtain the consent of the candidate. For a tenured faculty member being considered for promotion, the Departmental Committee

should conduct three peer reviews by separate members with observations on three different class sessions (hopefully of more than one course).

- g. By the Department Head's observation of at least one class taught by an Assistant Professor every year. If an Associate Professor is going to be considered for promotion in the near future, the Department Head will observe at least one class taught by the candidate.

B. The Scholarship of Research and Creative Accomplishments

I. Criteria and Expectations:

- a. Publication of scholarly works of art and/or architectural history in books, parts of books, museum/gallery catalogues, and/or journals is expected of all faculty members. Much weight will be given to works published by major publishers, museums, and refereed journals.
- b. Presentation of papers at scholarly meetings/symposia and/or invited lectures at universities/museums; organizing/chairing sessions at scholarly meetings and symposia.
- c. Curating museum/gallery exhibitions that some faculty members may pursue.
- d. Awareness of and respect for the candidate's work among peers in the same or related scholarly fields of specialization.
- e. Grants, fellowships, and other funds obtained for research, scholarship, and teaching.
- f. Significant use of the candidate's expertise as consultant (e.g. in matters of publication, exhibitions, expert reports, membership on editorial boards, etc.).
- g. Honors and/or awards for publications, scholarship or professional activity.
- h. Editorial work where the candidate makes a significant scholarly contribution.
- i. Development of innovative new courses or academic programs; development of innovative new approaches to the applications of computers to teaching and scholarship in art history.

2. Methods of Evaluation:

- a. By review of the dossier's section on "The Scholarship of Research and Creative Accomplishments," according to University and College guidelines.
- b. By review of the candidate's research portfolio.
- c. By review of external letters of assessment required for candidates being considered for final tenure review and/or promotion. Letters will be obtained according to the procedures in the University guidelines (III.G of Administrative Guidelines for AC-23).

C. Service and Scholarship of Service to the University, Society, and the Profession

1. Criteria and Expectations:

- a. Active participation in committees and related activities at the Department, College, and University levels is expected of all faculty.
- b. Effective and constructive administrative support work within the University.
- c. Service to society that utilizes the candidate's expertise in art history.
- d. Active and significant service to the profession of art history beyond the University.

2. Methods of Evaluation:

- a. By preparation and review of the dossier's section on "Service and Scholarship of Service to the University, Society, and the Profession," according to University and College guidelines.