APPENDIX B: DEPARTMENT RTP
DOCUMENT APPROVAL TRACKING RECORD

Department:	Art
Starting Year for Department RTP Document:	2018
Intended Length for use of Department RTP Document: (maximum 5 years)	

DEPARTMENT

"This Department RTP Document has been approved by a majority vote of the probationary and tenured faculty in this department."

Department Chair: _RAY KAMPF_ _4/2/18_
Printed Name   Signature   Date

DRTP Chair: _David Hylton_ _04-02-18_
Printed Name   Signature   Date

COLLEGE RTP COMMITTEE:

"The CRTPC has reviewed this Department RTP Document and makes the following recommendation."

1. _X_ Recommend Approval

2. _X_ Recommend Approval, but concerns noted in attached memo

3. _____ Recommend to DENY Approval (explanation must be attached).

CRTPC Chair: _PHILIP PIZEIGILL_ _4/2/2018_
Printed Name   Signature   Date

COLLEGE/SCHOOL DEAN

I have reviewed this Department RTP Document and makes the following recommendation."

1. _X_ Recommend Approval

2. _____ Recommend Approval, but concerns noted in attached memo

3. _____ Recommend to DENY Approval (explanation must be attached).

Dean/Director: _____ _4/12/2018_
Printed Name   Signature   Date

ACADEMIC AFFAIRS

a) _✓_ Approved for the following years _5_ (2018-19 to 2022/2023)
b) _____ Not Approved (explanation attached).

AVP for Faculty Affairs: Martin Sancho-Madriz _08.08.18_
_____
Printed Name   Signature   Date

In cases where the Department RTP Document does not conform to the provisions of the collective bargaining agreement or university policy (in particular, Policy No 1328 or Policy No 1329), those documents take precedence.

Revised 2017-2018

4/2/18

Memo: CRTP Comments for Department of Art RTP Document

The CRTP has reviewed and would recommend the following:

1. On cover page to add academic title "Prof." for Melissa Flicker and David Hylton.
2. Change "Art Department" to "Department of Art" throughout the entire document.
3. The criteria for Studio Arts could be eliminated due to its minor status.

CALIFORNIA STATE POLYTECHNIC UNIVERSITY POMONA

Department of Art

RTP Document 2018-2019

(approval sought for 5 academic years)

(2018-2019 through ~~2023-2024~~)

2022-2023

Drafted by

Associate Professor Melissa Flicker

Dr. Chari Pradel

Professor David Hylton, DRTPC Chair

Table of Contents

Revised 2017-2018

Revised 2017-2018

Overview of Document

General Statement

The purpose of this document is to provide information to assist candidates seeking reappointment, tenure, and promotion (RTP), and to delineate roles and responsibilities of the Department RTP Committee as well as those of the candidate. The department will provide the candidate assistance by answering questions on issues that arise in the RTP process. This document follows guidelines as stated in the University Manual (Policy No. 1328 and Policy No. 1329) and the current Collective Bargaining Agreement. All documents related to RTP and Faculty Evaluation are available on the Faculty Affairs webpage http://www.cpp.edu/~faculty-affairs/index.shtml

Scope of Evaluation

A candidate is evaluated on the basis of teaching performance, scholarly or creative activity, service to the University or Community, and the statement and fulfillment of short-term and long-term goals. The candidate will be evaluated considering the department criteria for his/her reappointment level. For instance, reappointment to a second probationary year is far less rigorous than reappointment with tenure, etc. The candidate must meet Department of Art criteria in all areas to receive a positive recommendation.

Documents used for evaluation include a self-evaluation statement, student evaluations, Peer Evaluation of Classroom Performance (Peer Classroom Visit), and other signed and appropriately acquired documentation. Faculty serving the University in an administrative position or performing service for the university instead of their normal teaching assignment must have department approval and provide a means for evaluation to be reappointed or promoted in the Department.

Faculty on professional leave from the University, such as a sabbatical, fellowship, or as a visiting professor, must provide a means for RTP evaluation to be considered for reappointment or promotion.

Reappointment

The candidate must request reappointment in writing to start the process. If the initial appointment was for one year, the candidate must request reappointment by the published calendar dates at the beginning of the first year. If the initial appointment was for two years, the candidate must request reappointment at the beginning of the second year.

A candidate in the first or second probationary year who is not reappointed will be terminated at the end of that academic year. A candidate in the third, fourth, fifth, or sixth probationary year who is not reappointed or promoted will receive reappointment for one terminal year.

Revised 2017-2018

Tenure

Tenure is a status conferred on the candidate by the University granting continuous, automatic reappointment, with some limitations. Normal tenure is requested at the beginning of the sixth probationary year. Requesting tenure before the sixth probationary year is considered early tenure. Early tenure has far more rigorous criteria than normal tenure. Failure to achieve tenure results in re-appointment for one terminal year.

Promotion

The candidate is recommended for promotion to the next higher rank after having successfully met department criteria for the level sought in the RTP action. The candidate may request promotion at the time he/she is requesting tenure, typically at the beginning of the sixth probationary year. Any request prior to eligibility for tenure is considered early promotion and has considerably more rigorous criteria. Candidates receiving a promotion will begin at the new rank at the start of the next academic year.

The RTP Package

The candidate is required to compile materials documenting accomplishments that support the request for RTP action. The candidate is encouraged to seek counsel from the Department RTP Committee regarding the preparation of the package. For instance, the College and University RTP Committees prefer certain styles of folders, because of the large number of RTP actions.

Department of Art Chair's Responsibilities

The chair of the Department of Art shall ensure that each faculty member has a copy of the current approved RTP document and will keep a copy of the Department of Art RTP Document for reference in the Department of Art Office. The department chair must also have available copies of past approved department RTP criteria for candidates who choose to be evaluated by the criteria current at the time the candidate began the RTP process. Copies of past department criteria shall be made available to the current RTP committee and faculty if requested. The department chair can serve on the Department RTP Committee only if the full-time faculty members vote to allow him/her to serve.

Department RTP Committee

Responsibility

The Department of Art RTP Committee is mandated to insure the integrity of the RTP process at the department level. Its structure and function must conform to the University Manual, Policy No 1328.

Committee Composition

a) The committee shall consist of eligible full-time tenured faculty.

Revised 2017-2018

b) The committee is elected by secret ballot before the end of the fall term for the next RTP cycle.
c) All full-time faculty (including probationary faculty) participate in the selection of the Department RTP Committee and will decide whether the department chair will serve on the committee. It is not the chair's decision to serve if the chair is qualified.
d) If the department chair is not a member of the committee, the RTP Committee shall determine if the department chair shall have the option of writing a separate evaluation of the candidate.

Size of the Committee
The size of the Department RTP committee will be determined as follows:

a) If the Department has seven or fewer eligible faculty members, the minimum committee size is three.
b) If there are eight to seventeen eligible faculty members, the minimum committee size is five.
c) If there are eighteen or more eligible faculty members, the minimum size is seven.
d) The department chair shall notify the dean of the composition of the Department RTP Committee.
e) If the department does not have enough eligible faculty to serve on the RTP committee for all or part of the committee's work, the committee shall consult with the College RTP committee and request faculty from outside the department to serve as is needed.
f) The Department RTP Committee's service shall not end until all matters pertaining to the Committee's recommendations are concluded.

Eligibility
a) Eligible faculty can serve on only one level—department, college, or university--of RTP Committees.
b) Tenured candidates being considered for promotion are not eligible to serve during the RTP evaluation of any candidate requesting tenure or promotion. However, tenured faculty being considered for promotion can serve on an RTP Committee with requests for reappointment.
c) Faculty serving on the RTP Committee must be of a higher rank than the candidates being evaluated.
d) Faculty on professional leave with pay (sabbatical or difference-in-pay leave) may not participate in RTP service. Faculty knowing in advance that they will be on leave should not be nominees for RTP service for the year including the period of the leave.

Department RTP Committee Chair
The Department RTP Committee shall elect a chair. The Department RTP Committee chair is responsible for ensuring that the department RTP policies, as stated in the department RTP document and the University Manual, Policy No: 1328, Policy No: 1329 and the Collective Bargaining

Revised 2017-2018

Agreement are carried out. The department RTP chair shall perform the following duties:

a) Schedule the minimum number of peer evaluations of teaching performance in cooperation with the RTP candidates and other faculty. The schedule of peer evaluations should be provided to all faculty members by the fifth week of the term during which there shall be peer evaluations.

b) Be the official custodian of the candidate's RTP package from the time it is submitted to the Department RTP Committee to the point at which it is forwarded to the college dean.

c) Once it is submitted to the Department RTP Committee, the RTP Committee chair only shall be responsible for any additions and/or changes in the content of the candidate's package.

d) The department RTP chair must notify the appropriate parties if any additions and/or changes have been made to any RTP package.

e) Provide an Approval Tracking Record Form (Appendix B) for inclusion in appendix of each package.

Committee's Duties

a) Ensure that the minimum number of peer evaluations is conducted according to the current Collective Bargaining Agreement, department and university policies.

b) Evaluate each candidate's request for RTP action using approved criteria as stated in the department RTP document, the University Manual, and the current Collective Bargaining Agreement. Post notices that publicize the names of RTP candidates and invite students to participate in the process with written statements that are signed. Notices must be posted in prominent places and contain the following information:

a) Names of the candidates requesting a RTP action.

b) The type of RTP action each candidate is requesting.

c) The name of the person(s) to whom signed comments may be given.

d) Notices are to be posted within one week after the candidate has given written notification, to the department RTP chair, that s/he is requesting RTP action.

e) Signed comments will be accepted up to the time that the Department RTP Committee begins its evaluation process.

Sources of Evaluation

The Department RTP Committee shall evaluate the candidate's request from information gathered from the following sources:

a) Summaries and interpretations of students' evaluations in accordance with the University Manual, Policy No: 1328 and Policy No: 1329.

b) Summaries and interpretations of peer evaluations of teaching performance in accordance with the University Manual, Policy No 1328.

Revised 2017-2018

c) The candidate's self-evaluation and information supporting the candidate's statement.
d) Properly obtained signed materials from students, faculty, and administrators, which were added to the candidate's package in accordance with the University Manual. Materials requested from candidate by the Department RTP Committee that might include clarification, corrections, and/or augmentation of the part of the package that is under question.
e) Any other appropriate written and signed material submitted to the committee before the closing date for such materials.

The RTP Decision Options

The Department RTP Committee can only render one of the following decisions in an RTP action:

a) Reappointment to the next probationary year.
b) Reappointment with tenure.
c) Reappointment with early tenure.
d) Promotion to requested rank.
e) Early promotion to requested rank.
f) Termination (if the candidate is in the first or second probationary year).
g) Reappointment with a terminal year (if the candidate is in the third, fourth, fifth, or sixth probationary year).
h) Deny early tenure.
i) Deny promotion
j) Deny early promotion.

Decisions must be supported by and shall address all applicable approved criteria.

Decisions shall be based on materials supplied by the candidate to the RTP Committee and include any additional material requested from the candidate by the RTP Committee. The Department RTP Committee cannot attach any contingencies to the RTP decision.

The Committee's Recommendation

a) The Department RTP Committee will make its evaluation of the candidate's request in writing on university-approved forms.
b) The chair of the RTP Committee will review the committee's evaluation with the candidate.
c) Following review, the candidate may accept the committee's recommendation or take seven working days to submit a response, rebuttal, or a request for reconsideration (see Policy No 1328 of the University Manual.)
d) The committee cannot refuse a candidate's request for reconsideration.
e) The request for reconsideration must address only the issues raised by the Department RTP Committee.

Revised 2017-2018

f) However, the candidate may introduce new evidence regarding issues raised by the committee.

g) In reconsideration, the candidate must address each relevant issue and show how the RTP Committee's evaluation was in error. Again, new evidence can be brought to bear on issues raised by the RTP Committee.

h) Brevity and clarity is encouraged.

i) If the Department RTP Committee finds unfavorably for the candidate, the candidate has five working days from receipt of notification to appeal to the College RTP Committee. The candidate is not obligated to make an appeal.

j) If the candidate chooses to appeal to the College RTP Committee s/he should consult the University Manual, Policy No 1328.

k) If the candidate refuses to acknowledge the RTP Committee's recommendation, the Department of Art chair will forward the candidate's RTP package with a document explaining that the candidate reviewed the committee's evaluation and recommendation and refused to acknowledge them.

l) If the department chair is not a member of the RTP committee s/he may make a separate recommendation, which will be forwarded with the candidate's package. The candidate will receive a copy of the department chair's recommendation as part of the RTP package.

Student Evaluations

a) The department's student-evaluation policy is the same as the university policy for the number and frequency of student evaluations. Consult the University Manual, Policy No 1329, for any updates to this policy.

b) Compliance with the policy for number and frequency of student evaluations means compliance during the period in which that policy was in effect. For example, if for one of the years under review the policy required only two student evaluations per year, and then the policy changed to evaluation of all courses, the candidate's package cannot be considered lacking if only two student evaluations were procured during the year that two per year was the policy.

c) If the department establishes a policy that differs from the university policy, a record of the department's policy must be posted in the department office with the posting of the current RTP document. The procedure for departmental deviations from university standards is set forth in Policy No 1329.

Peer Evaluations

The university requires a minimum of two peer evaluations per year, in more than one term. The departmental peer-evaluation policy and the approved forms used to conduct the peer evaluation are available in the department office. Candidates will be assigned peer evaluators by the DRTP Committee Chair. Other requirements are as follows:

a) Peer evaluations shall include classroom visitation(s) with enough time to give a fair and honest assessment of the class as a learning environment.
b) A review of the class syllabus and relevant course materials.
c) A written report within two weeks of the classroom visitation.
d) A meeting or email correspondence, as appropriate, shall be conducted with the candidate to present and discuss the evaluation and allow the candidate to correct any factual errors in it. As soon as the evaluator makes any necessary amendments, the candidate and the evaluator must sign two copies of the evaluation.
e) An unsigned copy of the written report shall be emailed to the DRTP Committee chair, and the two signed copies of the report shall go to the department's office for inclusion in the candidate's Personnel Action File (PAF) and to the candidate.
f) When possible, peers should be assigned to review courses within their own area of specialization.
g) When assigning peer evaluators to candidates, the Department RTP Committee Chair shall take into consideration any requirements specific to the disciplinary area (noted later in this document under criteria for each discipline). For example, candidates in art history require at least one peer review from another art historian.

Evaluation of the Candidate

Criteria
The candidate shall be evaluated by criteria stated in this document; no other criteria apply. However, if the Department RTP Committee feels that other criteria are appropriate, those criteria must be agreed upon by the candidate, the University RTP Committee, and the Vice President for Academic Affairs

Criteria and Rank
Criteria for reappointment shall be the criteria that were in effect during the first year of the candidate's probationary service on this campus. Candidates requesting tenure or promotion may use the criteria that were in effect in their first year of probationary service or choose the criteria currently in effect. A candidate must choose a single set of criteria when requesting both tenure and promotion. Once the RTP evaluation process has started, the criteria cannot be changed.

Committee Deliberations
a) The deliberations of the Department RTP Committee shall remain confidential.
b) A simple majority vote shall approve the RTP Committee evaluations and reports.
c) The RTP Committee shall not assign any of its duties to non-committee members, either to a group or an individual.

Revised 2017-2018

Areas of Evaluation

The candidate's performance will be rated in the areas of teaching, scholarship or creative activity, service, and statement and fulfillment of short-term and long-term goals. Teaching is of highest priority to the University and is given the most weight in evaluation of the candidate. Scholarly or creative activity is next in weight, followed by service. The statement and fulfillment of short-term and long-term goals relates to performance in the other three areas.

Criteria for Rating Performance

The DRTP committee will rate the candidate's performance in each of the three categories, using the following rating scale:

Meets the criteria

Does not meet the criteria

The ratings necessary for all reappointment, tenure, and promotion actions for each discipline: graphic design, studio art and art history follow. These necessary ratings are broken into ratings for teaching, a minimum rating for service, and an average of the ratings for the four categories other than teaching. Teaching is considered separately because of its preeminent importance: certain levels of achievement must be met in this single category for each action to be taken. A progressively greater level of service is expected of all candidates for reappointment and tenure. The averaging of the ratings in the four categories other than Teaching recognizes the diversity of the faculty strengths among these categories. A candidate may, for example, have a very strong record in University Service and Scholarly Activities, but have done little in the other categories. The DRTP committee must find that the ratings required for teaching, University Service, and for the average of the four categories have been met or not by the candidate for the action requested to be taken.

Note:

If, at the time of initial appointment, a candidate (on probationary track) does not have the necessary terminal degree for his/her area, and the initial letter of appointment calls for a terminal degree, the candidate must have the terminal degree completed to be eligible for promotion.

For graphic design and studio art, the required terminal degree is a Master of Fine Art (MFA). For art history, the required terminal degree is a Doctor of Philosophy (Ph.D.) in art history or visual studies.

The Candidate's Responsibilities

The RTP Request

The candidate must notify the RTP Committee chair in writing to initiate a request for RTP action. Candidate must follow the RTP calendar available on the Faculty Affairs webpage. Candidates requesting early tenure or promotion must notify the RTP Committee chair, in writing, of the early action.

Prior to the submission of the package, the candidate is invited to seek advice on any of the RTP issues, from any faculty or staff member involved in the RTP process.

Status of the Request

The candidate is strongly encouraged to monitor the progress of his/her RTP request through the various review groups. The DRTP Committee chair, the department chair, and office staff may be able to track the progress of the RTP action. The candidate may withdraw the request for RTP action, without prejudice, at any state or level of the review unless it is a year when RTP action is mandatory for the candidate's continued advancement.

Self-Evaluation

The candidate must explicitly address department criteria pertaining to the RTP action requested. The candidate will use as a guide the University RTP form furnished by the university during the year that RTP action is requested.

The candidate should summarize the information much as possible, with reference to the more complete document source and keep to the length recommended by the university. The more complete information or source information should be organized in an indexed appendix and kept as a separate folder. (See Supplementary Materials)

A candidate requesting reappointment must provide clear and explicit evidence of progress toward tenure. The self-evaluation must clearly address the following items:

Teaching
a) Include an analysis of student and peer evaluations and activities such as advising and/or mentoring.
b) The candidate should address deficiencies pointed out in student and peer evaluations
c) If there were deficiencies or problems pointed out in the previous RTP report, the candidate should address those issues and the steps taken to correct them.

Creative and/or Scholarly Activities
a) Specifically cite peer reviewed publications, art showings, positions of leadership, dates of attendance of all professional meetings, and duties and assignments in professional organizations and document evidence thereof.
b) Cite works in progress and ongoing activities.
c) If there were deficiencies or problems pointed out in the previous RTP report, the candidate should address those issues and the steps taken to correct them.

Assigned and Related Duties (Service)
a) List all committee duties and whether they are at the department, college, or university level. Specify any service to the community beyond Cal Poly Pomona and assistance in a professional capacity to any outside group.
b) If deficiencies or problems were pointed out in the previous RTP review, the candidate is expected to explain the steps taken to correct and/or improve these deficiencies.

Short-Term and Long-Term Goals
a) The candidate shall clearly state attainable goals in the three areas relevant to evaluation. The goals should reflect issues of evaluation and provide a strong case for the granting of reappointment, tenure and/or promotion.
b) The candidate shall realistically discuss the plan of action to be taken to achieve the goals.
c) The short-term goals will be evaluated in the next RTP cycle as to whether or not progress has been made and to assist and encourage the candidate in the ongoing process of setting and achieving his/her goals.
d) After each RTP cycle, the candidate must critically assess whether the goals of the previous cycle need to be altered and note what alterations need to occur.
e) If there were deficiencies or problems pointed out in the previous RTP report, the candidate should address those issues and the steps taken to correct them.

Span of Self-Evaluation
a) The period of time covered by a self-evaluation varies: for reappointment, it is the previous year; for tenure, the period begins with the initial appointment to a probationary position; and, for promotion, the period begins with the last promotion or, in the case of the first promotion, the original probationary appointment.
b) When addressing multiple years, the candidate should organize their self-evaluation by category (Teaching, Scholarly or Creative Activity, Assigned and Related Duties (Service), and Goals), rather than by year. In fact, all

parts of the RTP package should follow this structure: category first, then year.

Supplementary Materials

In addition to the self-evaluation, the candidate must include supplementary material.

a) The candidate shall make available copies of all materials not already accessible in the candidate's Personnel Action File (PAF). Materials not already in the candidate's PAF might include reprints, books, grant proposals, course materials, letters of acknowledgement, contracts, commendations, newspaper articles, manuscripts, artwork, etc.
b) The candidate should include evidence of the work accomplished through documentation such as contracts, exhibition listings, publications, etc.
c) The supplementary material should be organized in an appendix, which must be submitted to the Department RTP Committee with the candidate's RTP package, although it will not be forwarded unless specifically requested by subsequent reviewers: the dean, the vice president, etc.
d) The appendix should have an index, included in the main RTP package, to be forwarded with the candidate's package.

Student Evaluations

a) The department's student-evaluation policy is the same as the university policy for the number and frequency of student evaluations. Consult the University Manual, Policy No 1329, for any updates to this policy.
b) Compliance with the policy for number and frequency of student evaluations means compliance during the period in which that policy was in effect. For example, if for one of the years under review the policy required only two student evaluations per year, and then the policy changed to evaluation of all courses, it is sufficient to provide only two student evaluations for the year during which two per year was the policy.

The department also adheres to the following:

a) If the department should adopt a policy that differs from the university policy, the approved departmental policy must be appended to the department RTP document with its own appendix including the written policy, when it was adopted, and copies of the approved student-evaluation forms. The procedure for departmental deviations from university standards is set forth in Policy No 1329.
b) The candidate is responsible to properly conduct student evaluations, as stated by the department and university policies.
c) The results of all evaluations administered must be included in the RTP package.
d) All faculty members must uphold a high professional standard regarding soliciting student evaluations. A faculty member may not deliberately

solicit individual student evaluations for or against another faculty member or for him/herself.

e) Student evaluations must be administered collectively, in the manner outlined by the University Manual. Only the approved forms for the evaluation of teaching may be used in the RTP package.

Peer Evaluations

Consult Policy No 1328 of the University Manual for policies and procedures of peer evaluation.

a) The candidate must provide convenient times for the DRTP chair to coordinate and schedule the minimum number of peer evaluations. It is the department RTP chair's responsibility to ensure that the evaluations are done. A minimum of one peer evaluation per semester shall be conducted in two different semesters in each academic year. Peer evaluations shall reflect, to the degree possible, the breadth of courses taught. Evaluations must be turned in within two weeks to the candidate with a copy to the DRTP committee.

b) The candidate should have all supportive information available for the faculty evaluator at the time of the evaluation. This includes the syllabus and other relevant teaching materials.

c) Upon review of the evaluation provided (within two weeks of the classroom visit) by the peer evaluator, it is the candidate's responsibility to make the evaluator aware of any factual errors in the evaluation prior to signing the form, and to make him or herself available to meet with the evaluator to discuss the evaluation if email correspondence is insufficient.

d) The candidate and the peer evaluator must sign two copies of the completed evaluation form. By signing the document, the candidate is approving the factual content of the evaluation.

e) The candidate shall receive one of the signed evaluation forms for their records, which he or she must include in their RTP package.

f) The candidate's RTP package must include all peer evaluations conducted.

Revised 2017-2018

Criteria for Visual Communication Design Candidates

Definition of Visual Communication Design
Visual Communication Designers create images that may interpret, inform, instruct, persuade or entertain. This work addresses audience, content and context, while meeting functional communication needs. We are concerned with the physical, cultural, societal, and technological aspects of creating visual work, whether that work is print-based design, interactive media, or environments. The Visual Communication Design program's primary mission is teaching excellence and program quality. As part of the College Environmental Design, the program is dedicated to challenging students with an awareness of the environmental, social, and ethical issues facing today's society. The program is committed to teaching students about these issues through various projects and topic studios.

Criteria for Evaluation of Teaching
Effective teaching is one of the most important factors in the department RTP. The department evaluates teaching performance based on a combination of peer evaluations and student evaluations. The candidate must have high student class evaluations. The typical overall average on student evaluations for all questions below 2.2 is outstanding; 2.5 is good.

Meets

This rating indicates that the candidate has strong peer reviews and excellent teaching, demonstrated by such accomplishments as

- continual updates and improvements to courses;
- use of up-to-date technologies in the classroom; and
- teaching effectiveness

Does Not Meet

This rating indicates an unacceptable level of teaching, as demonstrated by poor student and peer evaluations.

Reappointment to Third Probationary Year
a) The candidate shall have satisfactory student evaluations and two positive peer evaluations conducted in different terms during the academic year. *Satisfactory* means an overall average meeting or exceeding the 3.0 score, which corresponds to the *satisfactory* rating on the student-evaluation form.
b) The candidate shall address deficiencies identified in previous student and peer evaluations. The department encourages the candidate to develop an effective and documented approach to teaching. Teaching strategy and effectiveness is usually, but not always, reflected in satisfactory student evaluations. In addition to student evaluations, peer reviews have a significant weight in evaluating the candidate's teaching effectiveness. The

Revised 2017-2018

candidate may request additional peer evaluations beyond those initiated by the DRTPC. Such requests should be directed to the DRTPC chair, who will select the reviewer in consultation with the Committee.

c) A candidate in graphic design must also include 20 examples as evidence of teaching effectiveness. The material could be provided as hardcopy prints, duplicates, and/or copies of digital files on an electronic drive.

d) Of the 2 required peer reviews per year, at least one must be conducted by a full-time tenured faculty member in Visual Communication Design.

e) The candidate shall include evidence of courses methodology, such as syllabus, handouts or any course material.

f) The candidate must keep assigned office hours and appointments.

g) The candidate is required to be active in academic student advising. Advising assignments are divided among all full-time faculty members. Assignments will take into consideration the candidate's relative newness to the department. The department will provide mentoring in this area if necessary and suggests the candidate keep a record of advising.

h) The candidate must clearly define short-term and long-term goals in the area of teaching.

Reappointment to Fourth Probationary Year

Same as for reappointment to third probationary year with this addition: Any deficiencies noted in the previous year's reviews must be acknowledged in the RTP document and the candidate must clarify steps taken to overcome them.

Reappointment to Fifth Probationary Year

Same as for reappointment to fourth probationary year.

Reappointment to Sixth Probationary Year

Same as for reappointment to fifth probationary year

Promotion to Tenure

Same as for reappointment for fifth probationary year with this addition: Any deficiencies previously noted should have been corrected by this time.

Promotion to Early Tenure

Same as for tenure plus the following:

a) The candidate must attain an average overall score on student evaluations of 2.2 or better.

b) The candidate must serve for two years as the ASA/AIGA faculty advisor and have demonstrated exceptional accomplishments during that time.

c) The candidate must show evidence of effectiveness in helping students gain recognition for or acceptance of their work in juried or professionally peer-reviewed venues.

Promotion to Rank of Associate Professor

Same as for tenure.

Revised 2017-2018

Early Promotion to Rank of Associate Professor
Same as for promotion to early tenure.

Promotion to Full Professor
Same as for tenure plus the candidate must show evidence of mentoring junior faculty in teaching and advising beyond the mandatory peer evaluations.

Early Promotion to Full Professor
a) Same as for promotion to early tenure.
b) Same as for promotion to full professor
c) The candidate must receive an award for outstanding teaching or student advising.

Criteria for Evaluation of Scholarly/Creative Activity
The candidate must have evidence of professional development. This includes activities such as documented commissions, articles, exhibits, and other creative/scholarly activity. The candidate must clearly distinguish between professional work done for the university and professional work done in other contexts, which ranks higher. The candidate shall provide documentation of professional activity for consideration in the RTP process. The department RTP committee will weigh these activities by their significance. For example, a one-person show of work will be considered more significant than a single piece in a group show; presenting a paper in a conference is stronger than simply attending a conference; the development of new work may be more compelling than entering the same work in different venues that are the same level of recognition; showing in a juried show may be considered more significant than showing on one's own website; being published by an outside publisher is more significant than self-publishing, etc.

Meets

A level of scholarly work that establishes the candidate's influence in the profession such as presentation of more than one significant paper at scholarly conferences, organizing a panel or roundtable at a state or national scholarly conference, publication of an article in a peer reviewed journal related to design or of a book chapter, inclusion in exhibitions, or the completion of advanced training in the candidate's curricular specialization, or in a new area of teaching or research.

Work that shows active scholarship may include such activities as presenting a paper at nationally/internationally recognized professional organization, completing training that improves the candidate's use of technology or teaching techniques, and peer reviewing for a major national journal or exhibition.

Attendance at conference and/or attendance at training sessions for faculty is the minimum required for reappointment to the fourth

Revised 2017-2018

probationary year and would indicate the need for substantial improvement in this area for further reappointment.

Does Not Meet

Lack of scholarly/creative activity of the sort recommended above.

Reappointment to Third Probationary Year
The candidate is expected to have evidence of one or two of the following activities or their equivalent: fulfillment of commissions, articles published in peer-reviewed publications, professional presentations, established clientele, participation in conferences, exhibitions, and other professional creative/scholarly activities. These activities will be evaluated in terms of substance and professional significance. As there are many new areas of professional activity with emerging technology, the department does not want to narrowly define this category. However, it is essential that the candidate carefully document his/her activities.

Reappointment to Fourth Probationary Year
Same as for third probationary year.

Reappointment to Fifth Probationary Year
Same as for fourth probationary year.

Reappointment for the Sixth Probationary Year

Same as for reappointment to fifth probationary year

Promotion to Tenure
The candidate must have evidence of four to eight of the above activities or their equivalent. The RTP Committee will rate these activities on the basis of quality and professional significance.

Promotion to Early Tenure
Same as for tenure plus exceptional creative/scholarly accomplishments as demonstrated by an award or recognition as outstanding by a professional peer group/organization.

Promotion to Rank of Associate Professor
Same as for tenure.

Early Promotion to Rank of Associate Professor
Same as for early tenure.

Promotion to Full Professor
Same as for promotion to tenure.

Early Promotion to Full Professor
Same as for promotion to early tenure.

Revised 2017-2018

Criteria for Evaluation of Assigned and Related Duties (Service)

While assigned and related duties are important for reappointment, the candidate's teaching and scholarly/creative activities are more heavily weighted.

The candidate must demonstrate evidence of active participation in assigned and related duties. Assigned and related duties may include participation on committees at the department, college, or university levels; and participation on task forces, the development of programs, or special projects.

Reappointment to Third Probationary Year

The candidate should provide documentation of committee service at the department, college, or university level.

Reappointment to Fourth Probationary Year

The candidate should provide documentation of committee service at the department level and service on a college or university committee. It is strongly suggested that, by tenure, the candidate participate on a university committee or task force, program or project.

Reappointment to Fifth Probationary Year

Same as for reappointment to fourth probationary year.

Reappointment to Sixth Probationary Year

Same as for reappointment to fifth probationary year.

Promotion to Tenure

Same as for reappointment to fifth probationary year. Since their appointment, the candidate should demonstrate evidence of significant service to the department and have served on committees--or task forces, programs or projects--at all levels.

Promotion to Early Tenure

a) Same as for tenure.
b) Evidence of chairing an important department, college, or university committee, task force, or program.

Promotion to Rank of Associate Professor

Same as for tenure.

Early Promotion to the Rank of Associate Professor

Same as for early tenure.

Promotion to Full Professor

a) For each year since promotion to tenure or associate professor, evidence of service on department, college, or university committees, task forces, or programs.

Revised 2017-2018

b) Evidence of chairing at least one operationally vital committee, task force, or program at any level.

Early Promotion to Full Professor
a) Same as for full professor.
b) Evidence of chairing an operationally vital committee, task force, or program at the department level and at either the college or university level.

Criteria for Evaluating Goals

The candidate is required to state, in writing, attainable short-term and long-term goals for teaching, scholarly/creative activity, and assigned and related duties (service). The goals will help the candidate form an individualized plan to progressively improve on his/her teaching performance and to achieve tenure. The candidate is expected to seek advice from other faculty and administrators in generating these goals. The RTP committee shall pay particular attention to the candidate's goals and shall comment upon their appropriateness, evaluate whether or not they are applicable for the granting of the candidate's requested promotion or tenure and provide this feedback to the candidate in their recommendation.

Criteria for Art History Candidates

Definition of Art History

Art history is an academic discipline of the humanities. Its object of study is the art and artifacts of all cultures, regions, and periods. Various methodologies may be applied in the attempt to interpret cultural products and responses to those products with respect to their aesthetic, social, cultural, and political contexts.

Academic art historians most commonly produce scholarship or criticism, but may also curate exhibitions and artists' projects. The appropriate venues for their work vary and depend greatly on the conventions within specific specialties.

In all areas of art history there are trans-disciplinary opportunities. Art history often crosses over into neighboring fields. The most common are history, archaeology, anthropology, sociology, communications and media studies, cultural studies, religious studies, foreign languages, literature studies, philosophy, and area studies.

Criteria for Evaluation of Teaching

Effective teaching is one of the most important factors in the department RTP. The department evaluates teaching performance based on a combination of peer evaluations and student evaluations. The candidate must have high student class evaluations. The typical overall average on student evaluations for all questions below 2.2 is outstanding; 2.5 is good.

Meets

This rating indicates that the candidate has strong peer reviews and excellent teaching, demonstrated by such accomplishments as

- continual updates and improvements to courses
- use of up-to-date technologies in the classroom
- teaching effectiveness

Does Not Meet

This rating indicates an unacceptable level of teaching, as demonstrated in poor student class evaluations and peer reviews.

Reappointment to Third Probationary Year

a) The candidate shall have satisfactory student evaluations and two positive peer evaluations, to be conducted in different terms during the academic year. Satisfactory means an overall average meeting or exceeding the 3.0 score, which corresponds with the satisfactory rating on the student-evaluation form.
b) The candidate shall address deficiencies identified in previous student and peer evaluations. The department encourages the candidate to develop an effective and documented approach to teaching. Teaching strategy and

effectiveness is usually, but not always, reflected in satisfactory student evaluations. In addition to student evaluations, peer reviews have a significant weight in evaluating the candidate's teaching effectiveness. The candidate may request additional peer evaluations beyond those initiated by the DRTPC. Such requests are to be directed to the DRTPC chair, who will select the reviewer in consultation with the Committee.

c) Of the two required peer reviews per year at least one must be conducted by a full-time tenured faculty member in art history

d) The candidate shall include evidence of courses methodology, such as syllabus, handouts or any course material.

e) The candidate must keep assigned office hours and appointments. The department suggests the candidate keep a record of advising.

f) The candidate is required to be active in academic student advising. Advising assignments are divided among all full-time faculty members. Assignments will take into consideration the candidate's relative newness to the department. The department will provide mentoring in this area if necessary.

g) The candidate must state clearly defined short-term and long-term goals in the area of teaching.

Reappointment to Fourth Probationary Year
Same as for reappointment to third probationary year with this addition: Any deficiencies noted in the previous year's reviews must be acknowledged in the RTP document and the candidate must clarify how they are implementing solutions.

Reappointment to Fifth Probationary Year
Same as for reappointment to fourth probationary year.

Reappointment to Sixth Probationary Year
Same as for reappointment to fifth probationary year.

Promotion to Tenure
Same as for reappointment for fifth probationary year with this addition: Any deficiencies previously noted should have been corrected by this time.

Promotion to Early Tenure
Same as for tenure plus the following:

a) The candidate must attain an average overall score on student evaluations of 2.2 or better.

b) The candidate must serve for two years as the faculty advisor of a student organization and have demonstrated exceptional accomplishments during that time.

c) The candidate must show evidence of effectiveness in helping students gain recognition for or acceptance of their work in juried or professionally peer-reviewed venues.

Revised 2017-2018

Promotion to Rank of Associate Professor
Same as for tenure.

Early Promotion to Rank of Associate Professor
Same as for promotion to early tenure.

Promotion to Full Professor
Same as for tenure plus the candidate must show evidence of mentoring junior faculty in
teaching and advising beyond the mandatory peer evaluations or play a significant role in
shaping or assessing the curriculum, either by introducing new courses or assessing the
program learning outcomes."

Early Promotion to Full Professor
a) Same as for promotion to early tenure.
b) Same as for promotion to full professor
c) The candidate must receive an award for outstanding teaching or student
   advising.

Criteria for Evaluation of Scholarly/Creative Activities

The departmental requirements have been established to be consistent with
the "Standards and Guidelines" for retention and tenure of art historians,
established (and updated) by the College Art Association (CAA), the
preeminent professional organization for art historians in the United
States. See CAA's full text at http://www.collegeart.org/standards-and-
guidelines/guidelines/art-history-tenure. The department also
acknowledges that the field of art history has evolved to include digital
scholarship in new formats, including databases, digital reconstruction
projects, and data visualization projects. The department recognizes the
standards for the evaluation of digital art history set by the College Art
Association, in association with the Society of Architectural History, first
published under the title *Guidelines for the Evaluation of Digital
Scholarship in Art and Architectural History* in January 2016.

The department will consider documented evidence of activity in the following
as indication of progress toward retention, tenure, or promotion. The
activities are ranked, as follows, into three categories, with category one
having the highest rank.

Category One

a) Principal author of book manuscript
b) Principal author of book-length catalogue raisonné
c) Principal author of book-length exhibition catalogue
d) Principal author or co-author with a significant scholarly role in the
   production of a work of digital scholarship equivalent to a book in word
   count and substance

Category Two

a) Principal author of peer-reviewed journal article

Revised 2017-2018

b) Principal author of essay in nationally or internationally recognized journal or magazine
c) Principal author of substantial entry or essay in museum collection or exhibition catalogue
d) Principal author of article in book anthology
e) Principal author of unpublished manuscript chapter for project in Area One
f) Conference organizer
g) Book-length anthology editor or co-editor.
h) Exhibition curator
i) Journal editor for a full year
j) Principal author or co-author with a significant scholarly role in the production of a work of digital art history equivalent to a scholarly journal article in word count and substance

Category Three

a) Book reviewer
b) Conference participant (as presenter, discussant or panel organizer)
c) Principal author of article in conference proceedings
d) Editor of journal issue

To qualify as legitimate, the work in all three categories must make a distinct contribution to the field. Also, in all cases, the candidate must include documentation as evidence of work. For manuscripts, a completed manuscript must be accompanied by documentation of acceptance, contract, or contact with publisher. Unpublished manuscripts are evidence of work-in-progress only. In the case of organizing a conference or an exhibition, the candidate must provide complete documentation of the organization process and successful completion of the conference or exhibition.

The ranking system above was developed in light of disciplinary conditions mentioned in the CAA "Standards and Guidelines," pages 5-6, which explain why rankings by other measures, such as citation indexes, are inappropriate for art history. The relevant portion of the CAA guidelines follows:

"CAA advises that qualifications for tenure and promotion in art history cannot be judged purely on the basis of English-language publications and publication venues. Art history is an international discipline, and American art historians routinely publish their work on other continents and often in other languages. As a consequence, the association *strongly recommends against the practice of measuring the value of scholarship in art history by the number of its citations* (as in science), because existing citation indexes do not reliably report citations of works published outside the United States.

Revised 2017-2018

In addition, CAA observes that many journals published outside the United States have selection procedures that do not match the American system of peer review. This is true of even the most highly regarded and prestigious journals and does not by itself suggest that the journal is any less rigorous or selective than its American counterparts. In the absence of homogeneous procedures, it is impossible to rank journals for the purpose of assessing the quality of scholarship published in them. The association *recommends that judgments of the quality of a candidate's publications should be based on the assessment of expert reviewers who have read the work and can compare it to the state of scholarship in the field to which it contributes."*

Owing to the need for expert evaluators, rather than numerical ranking systems, it is necessary that at least one art historian evaluate the RTP application of an art historian. If necessary, the Department RTP Committee could request outside reviewers.

The following are specific criteria by which art historians meet RTP expectations:

Reappointment to Third Probationary Year
Evidence of a substantial work-in-progress in *any of the three categories.*

Reappointment to Fourth Probationary Year
Evidence of a work accepted, green lighted, or under contract in *at least category three.*

Evidence of a new work-in-progress in at least category two.

Reappointment to Fifth Probationary Year
Evidence of a new substantial work-in-progress in *category two.*

Evidence of another work accepted, green lighted, or under contract in *at least category two.* This work could be one completed in a previous cycle.

Reappointment to Sixth Probationary Year
Same as for reappointment to fifth probationary year.

Promotion to Tenure
Evidence of substantial work-in-progress toward Professor rank, exemplified by the following accomplishments, accumulated since the faculty member was appointed at the Assistant Professor rank:

Evidence of at least three works accepted, green lighted, or under contract in at least *category two.*

Evidence of at least one other work accepted, green lighted, or under contract in at least *category three.*

Revised 2017-2018

Promotion to Early Tenure

For early promotion to this rank, the candidate must exceed expectations of
. their current rank by meeting the expectations for "Tenure" (above) plus
earning and showing evidence of at least one award by a professional
peer group.

Promotion to Associate Professor

Same as for tenure.

Early Promotion to Associate Professor

For early promotion to this rank, the candidate must exceed expectations of
their current rank by meeting the expectations for "Promotion to Associate
. Professor" (above) plus earning and showing evidence of at least one
award by a professional peer group.

Promotion to Professor

Evidence of completed manuscript in one work in *category one* or five
accomplishments in *category two.*

It is preferable that works be accepted, green-lighted, or with contract, but this
is not always possible. In case the acceptance, green light for project, or
contract is not available when submitting the material, the candidate must
show evidence he/she sought acceptance, green light, or a contract for all
work completed through correspondence with an appropriate
representative of a publisher, museum, or other relevant organization.

Early Promotion to Professor

For early promotion to this rank, the candidate must exceed expectations of
their current rank by meeting the expectations for "Promotion to Professor"
(above) plus earning and showing evidence of at least one new award by
a professional peer group.

Criteria for Evaluation of Assigned and Related Duties (Service)

While assigned and related duties are important for reappointment, the
candidate's teaching and scholarly/creative activities are more heavily
weighted.

The candidate must demonstrate evidence of active participation in assigned
and related duties. Assigned and related duties may include the following:
participation on committees at the department, college, or university
levels; and participation on task forces, in the development of programs,
or special projects.

Reappointment to Third Probationary Year

The candidate should provide documentation of committee service at the
department, college, or university level.

Revised 2017-2018

Reappointment to Fourth Probationary Year
The candidate should provide documentation of committee service at the
department level and service on a college or university committee. It is
strongly suggested that, by tenure, the candidate participate on a
university committee or task force, program or project.

Reappointment to Fifth Probationary Year
Same as for reappointment to fourth probationary year.

Reappointment to Sixth Probationary Year
Same as for reappointment to fifth probationary year.

Promotion to Tenure
Same as for reappointment to fifth probationary year. Since their appointment,
the candidate should demonstrate evidence of significant service to the
department and have served on committees or task forces, programs or
projects at all levels.

Promotion to Early Tenure
a) Same as for tenure.
b) Evidence of chairing an important department, college, or university
committee, task force, or program.

Promotion to Rank of Associate Professor
Same as for tenure.

Early Promotion to the Rank of Associate Professor
Same as for early tenure.

Promotion to Full Professor
a) For each year since promotion to tenure or associate professor, evidence
of service on department, college, or university committees, task forces, or
programs.
b) Evidence of chairing at least one operationally vital committee, task force,
or program at any level.

Early Promotion to Full Professor
a) Same as for full professor.
b) Evidence of chairing an operationally vital committee, task force, or
program at the department level and at either the college or university
level.

Criteria for Evaluating Goals
The candidate is required to state, in writing, attainable short-term and long-
term goals for teaching, scholarly/creative activity, and assigned and
related duties. The goals will help the candidate form an individualized
plan to progressively improve on his/her teaching performance and to
achieve tenure. The candidate is expected to seek advice from other

Revised 2017-2018

faculty and administrators in generating these goals. The RTP committee shall pay particular attention to the candidate's goals and shall comment upon their appropriateness, evaluate whether or not they are applicable for the granting of the candidate's requested promotion or tenure and provide this feedback to the candidate in their recommendation.

Faculty on Administrative Assignment

The committee must take into account the activities of faculty temporarily on leave from teaching duties for such purposes as sabbatical leave, fellowships, overseas teaching, administrative assignments at the University, and visiting professor/scholar appointments at other institutions. Faculty on leave shall be evaluated using the above stated criteria for teaching, scholarly or creative activity, and service with suitable modifications listed below:

a) For promotion, faculty serving on administrative assignment at the time of an evaluation shall have taught department courses equivalent of 36 WTU's since the last promotion. At least WTU's shall be within the year of the candidate's request. At least 32 of the WTU's must be for courses for which the candidate was the sole instructor. Student evaluations, per department policy, must be included in the RTP package.

b) For reappointment or tenure, the candidate serving on administrative assignment shall have taught equivalent of 12 WTU's for the previous academic year. All 12 WTU's must be for courses given by the department. At least 8 WTU's must be for courses for which the candidate was the sole instructor. Student evaluations, per department policy, must be included in RTP package.

c) For reappointment, tenure, or promotion, faculty serving on administrative assignment shall provide evidence of scholarly or creative activity, and shall be held to the same standard as any other candidate for reappointment or promotion in the department.

d) Faculty serving on administrative assignment shall have their service component satisfied by working on their administrative duties.

e) There can be no deviation of the above requirements for faculty serving on administrative assignment without the written consent of the Department RTP Committee, the dean, and the University RTP Committee. The Vice President for Academic Affairs shall make the final determination on the Acceptability of any deviation from the above requirements.

Faculty Serving in Academic Governance

a) For promotion, faculty serving in academic governance on release time equivalent time to a half time (or greater) appointment shall have taught

department courses equivalent of 36 WTUs since the last promotion. At least 4 WTU's shall be within the year of the candidate's request. At least 32 WTUs must be for courses for which the candidate was the sole instructor. Student evaluations, per department policy, must be included in the RTP package.

b) For reappointment or tenure, the candidate serving in academic governance having release time equivalent to a half time (or greater) appointment shall have taught the equivalent of 12 WTUs for the previous academic year. All 12 WTUs must be for courses taught for the department. At least 8 WTU's must be for courses for which the candidate was the sole instructor. Student evaluations, per department policy, must be included in the RTP package.

c) For reappointment tenure, or promotion, faculty serving in academic governance shall provide evidence of scholarly or creative activity, and shall be held to the same standard as any other candidate for reappointment or promotion in the department.

d) Faculty serving in academic governance shall have their service component satisfied by working on their administrative duties.

e) There can be no deviation of the above requirements for faculty serving in academic governance without the written consent of the Department RTP Committee, the dean, and the University RTP Committee. The Vice President for Academic Affairs shall make the final determination on the acceptability of any deviation from the above requirements.

Faculty on Approved Leave

Faculty who are on leave that has been approved by the President of the University are on approved leave. Normally, this is with pay from this university and thus, for tenure track candidates, the probationary status is still active and next several paragraphs apply. If the approved leave is without pay from the university then the probationary status of the tenure track candidate is inactive ("the clock has stopped") and the next several paragraphs do not apply.

a) For promotion, faculty on approved leave at another institution shall have taught, at this university, department courses equivalent of 36 WTUs since the last promotion. At least 4 WTUs shall be within the year of the candidate request. At least 32 WTUs must be courses for which the candidate was the sole instructor. Student evaluation, per department policy must be included in RTP package. Teaching at another institution does not relieve the candidate of the teaching requirements at this university.

b) For reappointment or tenure, the candidate on approved leave at another institution shall have taught the equivalent of 12 WTUs for the previous academic year. All 12 WTUs must be for courses given by the department

Revised 2017-2018

at this university. At least 8 WTUs must be for courses for which the candidate was the sole Instructor. Student evaluations, per department policy, must be included in the RTP package. Teaching at another institution does not relieve the candidate of the teaching requirements at the University.

c) For reappointment, tenure, or promotion, faculty serving on administrative assignment shall provide evidence of scholarly or creative activity, and shall be held to the same standard as any other candidate for reappointment or promotion in the department. The committee can examine research and scholarly activity done at another institution for the purposes of fulfilling the department's criteria in the area of scholarly or creative activity.

d) Faculty on approved leave shall furnish evidence in their RTP package that they have fulfilled the service requirements specified in the department criteria for the requested RTP action. Visitation to another institution does not relieve the candidate of the service requirements at the university.

There can be no deviation of the above requirements for faculty serving on administrative assignment without the written consent of the Department RTP Committee, the dean, and the University RTP Committee. The Vice President for Academic Affairs shall make the final determination on the acceptability of any deviation from the above requirements.

Appendix A: Post Tenure Review

Post-Tenure Review is not part of RTP actions and requires a separate policy to be listed, as in this appendix, to distinguish it from the normal RTP criteria (University Manual, Policy No 1328, and the Collective Bargaining Agreement: Article 15).

a) Tenured faculty shall be subject to post tenure review at intervals of no greater than five years. A Department Peer Review Committee and the appropriate administrator shall conduct reviews.

b) Post-tenure reviews are to be completed on the forms provided by the department in accordance with department and university guidelines.

c) The tenured faculty that is reviewed shall provide with a copy of the peer committee report of his/her evaluation. The peer committee chair and appropriate administrator shall meet with the tenured faculty to discuss strengths, weaknesses, and suggestions regarding the evaluation.

d) A copy of the post-tenure review shall be placed in the reviewed faculty's Personnel Action File.