

DEPARTMENT OF HISTORY OF ART

CRITERIA AND PROCEDURES FOR APPOINTMENTS, PROMOTION, AND TENURE
(Revised August 2015)
Approved OAA – December 30, 2015

TABLE OF CONTENTS

<u>Section</u>	<u>Page</u>
I PREAMBLE	2
II DEPARTMENT MISSION	2
III DEFINITIONS	3
IV APPOINTMENTS	5
Criteria: Tenure-track faculty	5
Criteria: Auxiliary faculty	6
Criteria: Courtesy appointments	7
Procedures: Tenure-track faculty	7
Procedures: Tenure-track faculty at regional campuses	9
Procedures: Auxiliary faculty	9
Procedures: Courtesy appointments	10
V ANNUAL REVIEWS	10
Procedures: Probationary faculty	11
Procedures: Tenured faculty	12
VI MERIT SALARY INCREASES	13
Criteria	13
Procedures	14
Documentation	14
VII REVIEWS FOR PROMOTION AND TENURE AND FOR PROMOTION	15
Criteria: Promotion rank of associate professor with tenure	16
Criteria: Promotion to rank of professor	18
Criteria: Regional campus faculty	19
Procedures	19
Documentation	23
VIII APPEALS	24
IX SEVENTH YEAR REVIEWS	25
X PROCEDURES FOR STUDENT AND PEER EVALUATION OF TEACHING	25

I PREAMBLE

This document is a supplement to Chapters 6 and 7 of the Rules of the University Faculty (<http://trustees.osu.edu/rules/university-rules.html>); the annually updated procedural guidelines for promotion and tenure reviews in Volume 3 of the Office of Academic Affairs Policy and Procedures Handbook (<http://oaa.osu.edu/handbook.html>) and other policies and procedures of the College and University to which the department and its faculty are subject.

Should those rules and policies change, the department will follow the new rules and policies until it can update this document to reflect the changes. In addition, this document must be reviewed, and either reaffirmed or revised, at least every four years on the appointment or reappointment of the department chair.

This document must be approved by the dean of the College and the Office of Academic Affairs before it may be implemented. It sets forth the department's mission and, in the context of that mission and the missions of the College and University, its criteria and procedures for faculty appointments and promotion and for faculty tenure and rewards, including salary increases. In approving this document, the dean and the Office of Academic Affairs accept the mission and criteria of the department and delegate to it the responsibility to apply high standards in evaluating current faculty and faculty candidates in relation to the departmental mission and criteria.

The faculty and the administration are bound by the principles articulated in Faculty Rule 3335-6-01 (<http://trustees.osu.edu/rules/university-rules.html>) of the Administrative Code. In particular, all faculty members accept the responsibility to participate fully and knowledgeably in review processes; to exercise the standards established in Faculty Rule 3335-6-02 (<http://trustees.osu.edu/rules/university-rules.html>) and other standards specific to this department and college; and to make negative recommendations when these are warranted in order to maintain and improve the quality of the faculty.

Decisions considering appointment, reappointment, and promotion and tenure will be free of discrimination in accordance with the university's policy on equal opportunity (<http://hr.osu.edu/policy/policy110.pdf>).

II DEPARTMENT MISSION

The Department of History of Art seeks to establish and maintain a strong and central presence for art history as a mode of humanistic inquiry within The Ohio State University. This entails:

1. contributing a broad range of introductory courses in archaeology and the history of art (including architecture and film) to the university's general education curriculum;
2. providing an undergraduate major that demands broad competence in global art history as well as the development of focused analytical, research, and writing skills;
3. providing a graduate program that aims at producing scholars capable

of first-rate research and teaching at major research universities, as well as curators with the expertise to stage innovative exhibitions at important venues;

4. fostering a faculty that contributes actively and consequentially to the ongoing intellectual work within the history of art, not only by developing expertise in particular subfields but also by engaging productively in the broad and ever-shifting philosophical, scholarly, and institutional debates that determine the structure and content of the discipline;
5. enriching the overall intellectual and cultural life of the university community and the citizenry of Ohio through a sustained program of outreach and engagement aimed at producing and maintaining a lively dialogue around the visual arts.

The ultimate aim of the department, in pursuing these five goals, is to gain and sustain an international reputation for excellence in the production and dissemination of knowledge in the history of art. In doing so, the department seeks to contribute significantly to the stated goal of the university's Academic Plan, which is to make OSU "one of the world's great public research and teaching universities."

III DEFINITIONS

A. Committee of the Eligible Faculty

1. Tenure Track Faculty

The eligible faculty for appointment reviews of tenure-track faculty consists of all tenure-track faculty whose tenure resides in the department.

The eligible faculty for reappointment, promotion and tenure, and promotion reviews of regular tenure-track faculty consists of all tenured faculty of higher rank than the candidate whose tenure resides in the department (excluding the department chair), the dean and assistant and associate deans of the college, the executive vice president and provost, and the president.

For tenure reviews of probationary professors, eligible faculty are tenured professors whose tenure resides in the department (excluding the department chair), the dean and assistant and associate deans of the college, the executive vice president and provost, and the president.

2. Conflict of Interest

A conflict of interest exists when an eligible faculty member is related to a candidate or has a comparable close interpersonal relationship, has substantive financial ties with the candidate, is dependent in some way on the candidate's services, has a close professional relationship with the candidate (e.g. as dissertation advisor), or has collaborated so extensively with the candidate that an objective review of the candidate's work is not possible. Generally, faculty members who have collaborated with a candidate on at least 50% of the candidate's published work since the last

promotion will be expected to withdraw from a promotion review of that candidate.

3. Minimum Composition

In the event that the department does not have at least three eligible faculty members who can undertake a review, the department chair, after consulting with the dean, will appoint a faculty member from another department within the college.

B. Promotion and Tenure Committee

The department has a Promotion and Tenure Committee that assists the Committee of the Eligible Faculty in promotion and tenure issues. The committee consists of four tenured members of the department faculty, one of whom serves as the Procedures Oversight Designee. The committee's chair and membership are appointed by the department chair. The term of service is one year with, reappointment possible.

C. Quorum

The quorum required to discuss and vote on all personnel decisions is two-thirds of the eligible faculty not on an approved leave of absence. A member of the eligible faculty on Special Assignment may be excluded from the count for the purposes of determining quorum only if the department chair has approved an off-campus assignment.

Faculty members who recuse themselves because of a conflict of interest are not counted when determining quorum.

D. Recommendation from the Committee of the Eligible Faculty

In all votes taken on personnel matters only "yes" and "no" votes are counted. Abstentions are not votes. Faculty members are strongly encouraged to consider whether they are participating fully in the review process when abstaining from a vote on a personnel matter.

Absentee ballots and proxy votes are not permitted.

1. Appointment

A positive recommendation from the eligible faculty for appointment is secured when two-thirds of the votes cast are positive.

2. Reappointment, Promotion and Tenure, Promotion, and Contract Renewal

A positive recommendation from the eligible faculty for reappointment, promotion and tenure, promotion, and contract renewal is secured when a simple majority of the votes cast are positive.

IV APPOINTMENTS

A. CRITERIA

The department is committed to making only faculty appointments that enhance or demonstrate the strong potential for enhancing the overall quality and diversity of the department. Important considerations include the individual's record to date in teaching, research, and service; his or her potential for professional growth in each of these areas; and his or her potential for interacting with colleagues and students both within and outside the unit in ways that will enhance the overall intellectual life of the department and serve to attract other outstanding faculty and students to the program, particularly on the graduate level. No offer will be extended when the search process fails to yield a pool of candidates who meet these criteria; rather, the search will either be cancelled or extended, as appropriate to the circumstances.

1. Tenure-track Faculty

Instructor:

Appointment at the rank of instructor is made only when the offered appointment is that of assistant professor, but requirements for the terminal degree have not been completed by the candidate at the time of appointment. The department will make every effort to avoid such appointments. An appointment at the instructor level is limited to three years. When an instructor has not completed requirements for promotion to the rank of assistant professor by the beginning of the third year of appointment, the third year is the terminal year of employment.

Upon promotion to assistant professor, the faculty member may request prior service credit for time spent as an instructor. This request must be approved by the department's eligible faculty, the department chair, the dean, and the Office of Academic Affairs. Faculty members should carefully consider whether prior service credit is appropriate, since prior service credit cannot be revoked without a formal request for an extension of the probationary period. In addition, all probationary faculty members have the option to be considered for early promotion.

Assistant Professor:

An earned terminal degree is the minimum requirement for appointment at the rank of assistant professor. Evidence of potential for scholarly productivity, high-quality teaching, and high-quality service to the department and the profession is highly desirable. Appointment at the rank of assistant professor is always probationary, with mandatory tenure review occurring in the sixth year of service. Review for tenure prior to the mandatory review year is possible when the Promotion and Tenure Committee determines such a review to be appropriate. The granting of prior service credit, which requires approval of the Office of Academic Affairs, may reduce the

length of the probationary period, but is strongly discouraged as it cannot be revoked once granted.

Associate Professor and Professor:

Appointment at a senior rank requires minimally that the individual meet the department's criteria in teaching, research, and service for promotion to these ranks. Appointment at a senior rank normally entails tenure. A probationary appointment at senior rank is appropriate only under unusual circumstances, e.g., when the candidate has limited prior teaching experience or has taught only in a foreign country. A probationary period of up to four years is possible, on approval of the Office of Academic Affairs, with review for tenure occurring in the final year of the probationary appointment. If tenure is not granted, an additional, i.e. terminal, year of employment is offered. Foreign nationals who lack permanent residency status may be appointed to a senior rank and approved for tenure, if appropriate, but the University does not grant tenure in the absence of permanent residency.

2. Tenure-track Faculty—Regional Campus

As the mission of the regional campuses emphasizes undergraduate instruction, regional campus criteria for appointment at the rank of assistant professor, associate professor, or professor are similar to those for Columbus campus faculty, but give relatively greater emphasis at each rank to teaching experience and quality.

3. Associated Faculty

Associated faculty appointments may be as short as a couple weeks to assist with a focused project, a semester to teach one or more courses, or for up to three years when a longer contract is useful for long-term planning and retention. With the exception of visiting faculty, associated faculty may be reappointed.

Adjunct Assistant Professor, Adjunct Associate Professor, Adjunct

Professor. Adjunct faculty appointments are uncompensated. They are given to individuals who render academic service to the department, such as teaching a course or serving on graduate student committees, for which a faculty title is appropriate. Typically the adjunct faculty rank is determined by applying the criteria for appointment for tenure-track faculty. Adjunct faculty members are eligible for promotion (but not tenure) and the relevant criteria are those for promotion of regular tenure-track faculty.

Lecturer. Appointment as lecturer requires that the individual have, at a minimum, a Master's degree in a field appropriate to the subject matter to be taught. Evidence of ability to provide high-quality instruction is desirable. Lecturers are not eligible for tenure or promotion, but may be promoted to senior lecturer if they meet the criteria for appointment at that rank. The initial appointment for a lecturer should generally not exceed one year, though it can be for up to three years at a time.

Senior Lecturer. Appointment as senior lecturer requires that the individual have, at a

minimum, a doctorate in a field appropriate to the subject matter to be taught, along with evidence of ability to provide high-quality instruction; or a Master's degree and at least five years of teaching experience with documentation of high quality. Senior lecturers are not eligible for tenure or promotion. The initial appointment for a senior lecturer should generally not exceed one year, though it can be for up to three years at a time.

Assistant Professor, Associate Professor, Professor with FTE below

50%. Appointment at regular titles is for individuals at 49% FTE or below, either compensated or uncompensated. The rank of auxiliary faculty with regular titles is determined by applying the criteria for appointment of regular tenure track faculty. Auxiliary faculty members with regular titles are eligible for promotion (but not tenure) and the relevant criteria are those for promotion of regular tenure-track faculty.

Visiting Instructor, Visiting Assistant Professor, Visiting Associate Professor, Visiting Professor. Visiting faculty appointments may either be compensated or not compensated. Visiting faculty members on leave from a regular academic appointment at another institution are appointed at the rank held in that position. The rank at which other (non-regular faculty) individuals are appointed is determined by applying the criteria for appointment of regular tenure track faculty. Visiting faculty members are not eligible for tenure or promotion. They may not be reappointed for more than three consecutive years at 100% FTE.

3. Courtesy Appointments for Regular Faculty

Occasionally the active academic involvement in this department by a regular faculty member from another department at Ohio State warrants the offer of a 0% FTE (courtesy) appointment in this department. Appropriate active involvement includes research collaboration, graduate student advising, teaching some or all of a course from time to time, or a combination of these. A courtesy appointment is made at the individual's current Ohio State rank, with promotion in rank recognized.

B. PROCEDURES:

See the Faculty Policy on Faculty Recruitment and Selection and the Policy on Faculty Appointments in the Office of Academic Affairs [Policies and Procedures Handbook](http://oaa.osu.edu/handbook.html) (<http://oaa.osu.edu/handbook.html>) for information on the following topics:

- Recruitment of Regular Tenure Track, Clinical Track and Research Track Faculty
- Appointments at Senior Rank or with Prior Service Credit
- Hiring Faculty From Other Institutions After April 30
- Appointment of Foreign Nationals
- Letters of Offer

1. Tenure-track faculty

A national search is required to ensure a diverse pool of highly qualified candidates for all tenure-track positions. Exceptions to this policy must be approved by the College and the Office of Academic Affairs. Search procedures must be consistent

with the University policies set forth in the most recent update of *A Guide to Effective Searches* <http://hr.osu.edu/hrpubs/guidesearches.pdf>.

Position requests for permanent, tenure-track faculty hires may arise from long-range planning by the departmental faculty or from special opportunities. Requests are reviewed by the chair, which, after consultation with the entire faculty makes a proposal or proposals to the dean.

When a search for a tenure-track faculty position has been authorized by the dean of the college, the department chair appoints an *ad hoc* search committee for that position, consisting of no fewer than three members of the voting faculty of History of Art, and appoints one of these to chair the committee. The department chair may also appoint faculty from other appropriate units, but ensures that the voting faculty of History of Art constitute a majority of the committee members. The department chair may serve as a non-voting member of the search committee. A faculty member of the committee is appointed "Diversity Advocate," responsible for providing leadership in assuring that vigorous efforts are made to achieve a diverse pool of qualified applicants.

The department chair drafts a description of the position to be filled and circulates it to all members of the voting faculty for comment and amendment. The final description is established by vote in a regular or special meeting of the voting faculty and then approved by the chair for both internal listing in the university Personnel Postings through the Office of Human Resources Employment Services and external advertising in appropriate venues. This announcement will be no more specific than is necessary to accomplish the goals of the search, since an offer cannot be made that is contrary to the content of the announcement with respect to rank, field, credentials, and salary. In addition, timing for the receipt of applications will be stated as a preferred date, not a precise closing date, in order to allow consideration of any applications that arrive before the conclusion of the search. If, as is often the case in History of Art searches, there is a likelihood that the applicant pool will include qualified foreign nationals, the search committee must assure that at least one print or at least one 30-day online advertisement in a national professional journal in a location likely to be read by qualified potential applicants. The university does not grant tenure in the absence of permanent residency ("green card"), and strict U. S. Department of Labor guidelines do not permit sponsorship of foreign nationals for permanent residency unless the search process resulting in their appointment to a tenure-track position included an advertisement in a field-specific nationally circulated print journal.

Dossiers of all the candidates are prepared by the department's administrative staff under the supervision of the chair of the search committee. These dossiers are made available in both print and electronic form to all members of the search committee. All members of the eligible faculty are invited to examine the dossiers and make known to the committee members their views on any or all of the candidates before the search committee meets, except in those cases where a conflict of interest or potential conflict of interest exists.

After screening the pool of applicants and interviewing a number of the most qualified, the search committee invites finalists to campus for additional interviews and presentations that are open to departmental faculty and students as well as to the University community at large. The search committee gathers student input about the finalists subsequent to their visits and convenes a meeting of the entire eligible faculty to discuss the search and vote on the candidates. In the event that more than one candidate receives a two-thirds majority positive vote, members of the eligible faculty will then rank those candidates and submit their recommendations, along with a brief written evaluation of each of the candidates and a detailed account of his or her own participation in the search, to the chair, who makes a final recommendation to the dean.

If the offer involves senior rank, the eligible faculty must vote on the appropriateness of the proposed rank. All offers at the associate professor or professor ranks, with or without tenure, and all offers of prior service credit require the prior approval of the Office of Academic Affairs. Offers to foreign nationals require prior consultation with the Office of International Affairs. The university does not grant tenure in the absence of permanent residency status. The department will therefore be cautious in making such appointments and vigilant in assuring that the appointee seeks residency status promptly and diligently.

2. Tenure-track faculty at regional campuses

The regional campus Dean or Director has primary responsibility for determining the position description for a tenure-track faculty search, but should consult with and seek agreement from the department chair before the search begins. The chair of the department and the regional campus Dean or Director will agree on a single search committee consisting of members from both units. Candidates are interviewed at a minimum by the regional campus Dean/Director, the chair of the department, the search committee, and representatives of both faculties. Candidates will be evaluated on both campuses, with the faculty on the Columbus campus taking primary responsibility for assessing the candidates' scholarly record. At the end of the evaluation process, the search committee makes a recommendation to both faculties, which in turn make a recommendation to the department chair and dean of the regional campus. A decision to hire requires agreement on the part of the chair of the department and the regional campus Dean/Director. Negotiations with a candidate should not begin until such agreement has been reached, and a letter of offer must be signed by the chair of the department and the Dean or Director of the regional campus.

3. Associated faculty

A. Searches and Appointments

Searches for compensated associated faculty may be initiated at the request of individual faculty members or groups of faculty members, or at the recommendation of the Personnel Committee. The chair is responsible for making the appointment of

compensated associated faculty after consultation with the Personnel Committee. Non-salaried associated faculty are appointed by the chair after consultation with the Personnel Committee and, if appropriate, the entire faculty.

Associated appointments can be made for a period of up to three years. All associated appointments expire at the end of the appointment term and must be formally renewed to be continued. Adjunct appointments may be renewed only when the uncompensated academic service for which the appointment was made continues.

B. Reappointment

The chair, in conjunction with the Personnel Committee, will conduct an annual review of all associated faculty to determine whether reappointment is appropriate at the end of the appointment term. The review may consider the scholarly qualifications of the candidate, his or her teaching effectiveness, and the future needs of the department.

C. Promotion

Associated faculty for whom promotion is a possibility follow the promotion guidelines and procedures for regular faculty (see Appointment Criteria above), with the exception that the review does not proceed to the college level if the department chair's recommendation is negative, and does not proceed to the university level if the dean's recommendation is negative.

4. Courtesy Appointments

Any department faculty member may propose a 0% FTE (courtesy) appointment for a regular faculty member from another Ohio State department. A proposal that describes the uncompensated academic service to this department justifying the appointment is considered at a regular faculty meeting. If the proposal is approved by the eligible faculty, the department chair extends an offer of appointment. The department chair reviews all courtesy appointments every three years to determine whether they continue to be justified, and takes recommendations for nonrenewal before the faculty for a vote at a regular meeting.

V. ANNUAL REVIEWS

PROCEDURES

The department follows the requirements for annual reviews as set forth in Faculty Annual Review Policy (<http://oaa.osu.edu/assets/files/documents/annualreview.pdf>).

The annual reviews of every faculty member are based on expected performance in teaching, research, and service as set forth in the department's policy on faculty

duties and Responsibilities; on any additional assignments and goals specific to the individual; and on progress toward promotion where relevant.

The documentation required for the annual performance review of every faculty member is described under MERIT SALARY INCREASES below. **This material must be submitted to the department chair by February 1.**

The department chair is required (per Faculty Rule 3335-3-35 [<http://trustees.osu.edu/rules/university-rules.html>]) to include a reminder in the annual review letter that all faculty have the right (per Faculty Rule 3335-5-04 [<http://trustees.osu.edu/rules/university-rules.html>]) to view their primary personnel file and to provide written comment on any material therein for inclusion in the file.

A. Probationary Tenure-track Faculty

Probationary tenure-track faculty will be reviewed annually. The purpose of this review is to assess the performance of the faculty member in the three areas of research, teaching, and service, and to form the basis for a decision on renewal of the appointment and possible merit salary increments for the upcoming year. The performance of each probationary faculty member is evaluated relative to the department's published criteria for appointment, promotion and tenure. At the beginning of autumn semester, each probationary faculty member is provided by the department chair with a copy of the Office of Academic Affairs dossier outline to be completed using the required OAA platform by the faculty member and submitted to the chair of the Promotion and Tenure Committee by the beginning of spring semester. This document will be reviewed by the Promotion and Tenure Committee, which will also provide for classroom observation and peer evaluation of the faculty member's teaching, including a review of teaching materials and student evaluations. Early in spring semester, the Promotion and Tenure Committee will report the results of its review to the chair, including a vote and recommendation on the reappointment of the faculty member under review.

The chair will then prepare an annual review letter, based both on the evaluation and recommendation by the Promotion and Tenure Committee and on his or her own assessment of the faculty member's performance. This letter, which includes an indication as to whether the faculty member will be reappointed, is provided to the faculty member under review and to the Dean of the College; it also becomes a part of the faculty member's dossier for subsequent annual reviews during the probationary period, including the review for promotion and tenure. Every probationary tenure-track faculty member is reviewed annually by the chair, who meets with the faculty member to discuss his or her performance, future plans, and goals; and prepares a written evaluation that includes a recommendation on whether to renew the probationary appointment.

If either the Promotion and Tenure Committee or the chair recommends non-renewal, the Fourth-Year Review process (per Faculty Rule 335-6-04 [<http://trustees.osu.edu/rules/university-rules.html>]) is invoked: the case is referred to

the full eligible faculty, which considers the case, votes on whether the appointment should be renewed, and prepares a report for the department chair. Following the completion of the comments process, the case is forwarded to the college for review and the dean makes the final decision on renewal or nonrenewal of the probationary appointment.

Probationary Tenure-track Faculty - Regional Campuses

Annual review of the probationary faculty member is first conducted on the regional campus, with a focus on teaching and service. The review then moves to the department and proceeds as described above. In the event of divergence in performance assessment between the regional campus and the department, the department chair discusses the matter with the regional campus dean/director in an effort to clarify and reconcile the divergence, so that the faculty member receives consistent assessment and advice.

Fourth-Year Review

During the fourth year of the probationary period the annual review follows the same procedures as the mandatory tenure review, with the exception that external evaluations are optional and the dean (not the department chair) makes the final decision regarding renewal or nonrenewal of the probationary appointment.

External evaluations are only solicited when either the department chair or the eligible faculty determine that they are necessary to conduct the Fourth-Year Review. This may occur when the candidate's research is in an emergent field, is interdisciplinary, or the eligible faculty do not feel otherwise capable of evaluating the research without outside input.

The eligible faculty conducts a review of the candidate. On completion of the review, the eligible faculty votes by written ballot on whether to renew the probationary appointment.

The eligible faculty forwards a record of the vote and a written performance review to the department chair. The department chair conducts an independent assessment of performance and prepares a written evaluation that includes a recommendation on whether to renew the probationary appointment. At the conclusion of the department review, the formal comments process (per Faculty Rule 3335-6-04 [<http://trustees.osu.edu/rules/university-rules.html>]) is followed and the case is forwarded to the college for review, regardless of whether the department chair recommends renewal or nonrenewal.

Exclusion of Time from the Probationary Period

Faculty Rule 3335-6-03 (D)(<http://trustees.osu.edu/rules/university-rules.html>) sets forth the conditions under which a probationary tenure track faculty member may exclude time from the probationary period. Additional procedures and guidelines can

be found in the Office of Academic Affairs Policies and Procedures Handbook (<http://oaa.osu.edu/handbook.html>).

B. Tenured faculty

On **February 1** of each year, annual activity reports or updated dossiers will be required from all tenured faculty (for details, see below under Merit Salary Increases). This report, together with any other materials provided the chair during the course of the year (such as copies of publications, and required student evaluations of teaching and peer reviews of teaching) will be used for the purposes of an annual review of tenured faculty. Each faculty member must schedule a meeting with the chair to discuss the year's activities and plans for future development. At that meeting, the chair will provide the faculty member with an assessment of his or her performance in the areas of research, teaching and service, and the faculty member will be given the opportunity to respond. The results of this review will be given to the faculty member in writing. Notifications of salary for the upcoming year will be sent out in a separate letter when that information becomes available. The faculty member may provide written comments on the review.

Tenured Faculty - Regional Campuses

Annual review of the tenured faculty member is first conducted on the regional campus, with a focus on teaching and service. The review then moves to the department and proceeds as described above. In the event of divergence in performance assessment between the regional campus and the department, the department chair discusses the matter with the regional campus dean/director in an effort to clarify and reconcile the divergence, so that the faculty member receives consistent assessment and advice.

C. Associated Faculty

Compensated associated faculty members in their initial appointment must be reviewed before reappointment. The department chair, or designee, prepares a written evaluation and meets with the faculty member to discuss his or her performance, future plans, and goals. The department chair's recommendation on renewal of the appointment is final. If the recommendation is to renew, the department chair may extend a multiple year appointment.

Compensated associated faculty members on a multiple year appointment are reviewed annually by the department chair, or designee. The department chair, or designee, prepares a written evaluation and meets with the faculty member to discuss his or her performance, future plans, and goals. No later than October 15 of the final year of the appointment, the chair will decide whether or not to reappoint. The department chair's recommendation on reappointment is final.

VI MERIT SALARY INCREASES

A. Criteria

Except when the university dictates any type of across-the-board salary increase, all funds for annual salary increases are directed toward rewarding meritorious performance and assuring, to the extent possible given financial constraints, that salaries reflect the market and are internally equitable.

On occasion, one-time cash payments or other rewards, such as extra travel funds, are made to recognize non-continuing contributions that justify reward but do not justify permanent salary increases or when larger permanent salary increases are not possible. Such payments/rewards are considered at the time of annual salary recommendations.

The criteria employed for determining recommendations for merit salary increases for History of Art faculty are based on contributions in the areas of teaching, research, and service.

The time frame for assessing performance will be the past 12 months, with attention to patterns of increasing or declining productivity over the past 36 months. Faculty with high-quality performance in all three areas of endeavor and a pattern of consistent professional growth will necessarily be favored. Faculty members whose performance is unsatisfactory in one or more areas are likely to receive minimal or no salary increases.

Faculty who fail to submit the required documentation for an annual review at the required time will receive no salary increase in the year for which documentation was not provided, except in extenuating circumstances, and may not expect to recoup the foregone raise at a later time.

1. Teaching

Merit increases will be given in recognition of excellence in teaching as determined primarily but not exclusively by a review of each faculty member's teaching evaluations; by the number and accomplishments of his or her students and advisees; and by his or her contributions to departmental course development.

2. Research

Merit increases will be given in recognition of excellence in the realm of research as determined primarily but not exclusively by a review of each faculty member's publication record, with particular emphasis being placed on books published by scholarly presses and articles published in major peer-reviewed journals; contributions to major national or international exhibition catalogues; participation in professional conferences and symposia and delivery of invited lectures at prominent cultural and educational institutions; and success at obtaining grants and fellowships in support of his or her research. It is the consensus of the department that merit raises relative to publications will generally occur after actual publication. However, increases for long-term projects might be distributed over more than one year. In the case of book-length manuscripts, some recognition may be given at the time of acceptance as well as at the time of publication.

3. Service

Merit increases will be given in recognition of excellence in the realm of service as determined primarily but not exclusively by a review of the individual's contributions to the administration of the department in the form of committee work. His or her service to the college, University, community, and to the profession at large will also be considered.

B. Procedures

On the Columbus campus, the department chair recommends annual salary increases and other performance rewards to the dean, who may modify these recommendations.

Faculty members who are dissatisfied with their salary increase and wish to discuss it with the department chair should be prepared to explain how their salary (rather than the increase) is inappropriately low, since increases are solely a means to the end of an optimal distribution of salaries.

C. Documentation

The annual performance review of every faculty member requires that all documentation described below, including the two summary documents, be submitted electronically to the department chair no later than February 1.

- An updated CV, which will be posted on the pertinent faculty page of the department's website
- An annual activity report submitted in accordance with the template distributed annually by the chair or an updated Office of Academic Affairs dossier outline, Volume 3 (<http://oaa.osu.edu/handbook.html>)

Under no circumstances should faculty solicit evaluations from any party for purposes of the annual review, as such solicitation places its recipient in an awkward position and produces a result that is unlikely to be candid.

The time period covered by the documentation described below is the prior calendar year.

1 Teaching

Cumulative SEI reports (Student Evaluation of Instruction computer generated summaries prepared by the Office of the University Registrar) for every class taught.

Peer evaluation of teaching reports as required by the department's peer evaluation of teaching program (details provided in section X of this document).

Copies of pedagogical papers, books or other materials published, or accepted for

publication. Material accepted for publication but not yet published must be accompanied by a letter from the publisher stating that the work has been unequivocally accepted and is in final form with no further revisions needed. An accepted but unpublished work submitted for consideration in a given annual review should not be resubmitted after publication for consideration in a future annual review.

Other relevant documentation of teaching as appropriate.

2 Research

Copies of all scholarly papers published or accepted for publication. Papers accepted for publication but not yet published must be accompanied by a letter from the publisher stating that the paper has been unequivocally accepted and is in final form with no further revisions needed.

Documentation of grants and contracts received.

Other relevant documentation of research as appropriate (published reviews including publications where one's work is favorably cited, grants and contract proposals that have been submitted).

3 Service

Any available documentation of the quality of service that enhances the list of service activities in the dossier.

VII REVIEWS FOR PROMOTION AND TENURE AND FOR PROMOTION

A. CRITERIA

Faculty Rule 3335-6-02 (see <http://trustees.osu.edu/rules/university-rules.html>) provides the following context for promotion and tenure and promotion reviews:

In evaluating the candidate's qualifications in teaching, scholarship, and service, reasonable flexibility shall be exercised, balancing, where the case requires, heavier commitments and responsibilities in one area against lighter commitments and responsibilities in another. In addition, as the university enters new fields of endeavor, including interdisciplinary endeavors, and places new emphases on its continuing activities, instances will arise in which the proper work of faculty members may depart from established academic patterns. In such cases care must be taken to apply the criteria with sufficient flexibility. In all instances superior intellectual attainment, in accordance with the criteria set forth in these rules, is an essential qualification for promotion to tenured positions. Clearly, insistence upon this standard for continuing members of the faculty is necessary for maintenance and enhancement of the quality of the university as an institution dedicated to the discovery and transmission of knowledge.

1. Promotion to rank of associate professor with tenure

Faculty Rule 3335-6-02 (<http://trustees.osu.edu/rules/university-rules.html>) provides the following general criteria for promotion to Associate Professor with Tenure:

The awarding of tenure and promotion to the rank of associate professor must be based on convincing evidence that the faculty member has achieved excellence as a teacher, as a scholar, and as one who provides effective service; and can be expected to continue a program of high-quality teaching, scholarship, and service relevant to the mission of the academic unit(s) to which the faculty member is assigned and to the university.

Tenure is not awarded below the rank of Associate Professor at The Ohio State University.

The award of tenure is a commitment of lifetime employment. It is therefore essential to evaluate and judge the probability that faculty, once tenured, will continue to develop professionally and contribute to the department's academic mission at a high level for the duration of their time at the university.

Every candidate is held to a high standard of excellence in all aspects of performance. Accepting weakness in any aspect of performance in making a tenure decision is tantamount to deliberately handicapping the department's ability to perform and to progress academically. Above all, candidates are held to a very high standard of excellence in the areas central to their responsibilities. If a candidate's primary teaching role is and will continue to be undergraduate teaching, then excellence in undergraduate teaching is required. A mediocre performance in this area would not be adequately counterbalanced by excellent performance in another aspect of teaching that is a significantly smaller part of the individual's responsibilities.

Excellence in teaching, scholarship, and service are moreover defined to include professional ethical conduct in each area of responsibility, consistent with the American Association of University Professors' Statement on Professional Ethics (<http://www.aaup.org/AAUP/pubsres/policydocs/contents/statementonprofessionalethics.htm>).

The accomplishments listed below in the areas of teaching, research, and service are expected of faculty for promotion to associate professor with tenure. In the evaluation of untenured associate professors for tenure, the same criteria apply, along with any others established in writing at the time a senior rank appointment without tenure was offered.

Teaching

For promotion to associate professor with tenure, a faculty member is expected to have:

- provided up-to-date content at an appropriate level in every instructional situation and demonstrated continuing growth in subject matter knowledge
- demonstrated the ability to organize and present class material effectively with logic, conviction, and enthusiasm

- demonstrated creativity in the use of various modes of instruction, classroom technology, and other teaching strategies to create an optimal learning environment
- engaged students actively in the learning process and encouraged independent thought, creativity, and appreciation of the knowledge-creation process
- provided appropriate and timely feedback to students throughout the instructional process
- treated students with respect and courtesy
- improved curriculum through revision or new development of courses and/or academic programs
- served as advisor to an appropriate number of graduate students given the department's graduate student/faculty ratio and the faculty member's area(s) of expertise
- engaged in documentable efforts to improve teaching

Research

For promotion to associate professor with tenure, a faculty member is expected to have:

- Published a body of work in high-quality peer-reviewed venues that is thematically focused, contributes substantively to knowledge in the area of focus, and is beginning to be favorably cited or otherwise show evidence of influence on the work of others. The following attributes of the body of work are considered:
 - The inherent quality of the scholarship or research as well as its demonstrated or potential impact on the field
 - Its unique contribution to a line of inquiry or revision of earlier approaches within the field
 - Rigor of the peer-review process and degree of dissemination of the research. Peer-reviewed journals and monographs are weighted more heavily than conference proceedings, published research more than unpublished research, and original works more than edited works.
 - Originality of the research. The candidate's ability to conduct such work and to mentor future researchers is valued over synthetic work at this stage of his or her career
 - Interdisciplinarity/collaborative nature. While collaborative work is encouraged, and indeed is essential to some types of inquiry, the candidate's intellectual contributions to collaborative work must be clearly and fairly described to permit accurate assessment.

- A demonstrated ability to obtain and potential to sustain research program funding. Competitive peer-reviewed funding is weighted more favorably than other types, since it serves as a quality indicator of research programs, and grants requiring the exercise of intellectual creativity are weighted more heavily than those that largely dictate the work to be done. Research funding is a means to an end; funding that has not led to research productivity is disregarded in the review.

A developing national/international reputation in the candidate's field as evidenced by external evaluations, invitations to present at recognized prestigious forums, invitations to review research papers and grant proposals, and a beginning trend of positive citations in other researchers' publications. A reputation based on the quality of the research contribution is distinguished from one based mainly on familiarity through the faculty member's frequent attendance at national and international conferences.

- Demonstrated a high degree of ethics in the conduct of research including, but not limited to, full and timely adherence to all regulations relevant to the research program, and ethical treatment of graduate students, postdoctoral fellows, and collaborators.

Service

For promotion to associate professor with tenure, a faculty member is expected to have:

- made substantive contributions to the governance of the department in a manner that facilitates positive contributions by others
- demonstrated the potential for useful contributions to the profession

Excellence in teaching, research, and service are moreover defined to include professional ethical conduct in each area of responsibility, consistent with the American Association of University Professors' Statement on Professional Ethics (<http://www.aaup.org/AAUP/pubsres/policydocs/contents/statementonprofessionalethics.htm>).

2. Promotion to rank of professor

In accordance with Faculty Rule 3335-6-02 (C)

Promotion to the rank of professor is to be based on convincing evidence that a faculty member has sustained, a record of excellence in teaching; has produced a significant body of scholarship that is recognized nationally or internationally; and has demonstrated leadership in service.

The specific criteria in teaching, research, and service for promotion to professor are similar to those for promotion to associate professor with tenure, with the added expectation of sustained accomplishment and quality of contributions, a record of continuing professional growth, and evidence of established national or international

reputation in the field.

When assessing a candidate's national or international reputation in the field, a national or international reputation for the scholarship of teaching may be counted as either teaching or scholarship.

Promotion to professor typically requires excellence in scholarship. Where a candidate has made truly extraordinary contributions in the areas of teaching or service, that record may warrant promotion in combination with a less extensive, though still strong record of continued productivity in scholarship.

In addition, as further specified by Faculty Rule 3335-6-02, assessment is in relation to specific assigned responsibilities with reasonable flexibility being exercised in order to balance, where the case requires, heavier responsibilities and commitment in one area against lighter ones in another.

In the evaluation of untenured professors for tenure, the same criteria apply, along with any others established in writing at the time a senior rank appointment without tenure was offered.

3. Regional campus faculty

The primary function of the regional campuses is to provide high-quality undergraduate instruction and to serve the academic needs of their communities. With this consideration in mind, in evaluating regional campus faculty for promotion and tenure or promotion, the department will give greater emphasis to the quality of teaching and service relative to research. Recognizing that the character and quantity of research by regional campus faculty may differ from that of Columbus campus faculty, due to the weight of other responsibilities and lack of access to comparable resources, the department nevertheless expects regional campus faculty to establish a program of high-quality scholarly activity.

B. PROCEDURES:

Departmental procedures for promotion and tenure reviews are guided by the provisions of Faculty Rule 3335-6-04 (<http://trustees.osu.edu/rules/university-rules.html>) and by the Office of Academic Affairs annually updated procedural guidelines for promotion and tenure reviews found in Volume 3 of the Policies and Procedures Handbook (<http://oaa.osu.edu/handbook.html>).

During the spring semester, the chair of the department will notify each faculty member who will be undergoing mandatory review the following autumn semester and inform him or her of the nature of the review; the chair will also offer to assist the candidate in the preparation of his or her dossier. At the same time, the Promotion and Tenure Committee is appointed and the major deadlines of the review process are established.

The candidate is responsible for submitting a complete, accurate dossier fully consistent with Office of Academic Affairs guidelines. Candidates should not sign the Office of Academic Affairs Candidate Checklist without ascertaining that they have fully met the requirement set forth in the Office of Academic Affairs core dossier outline, including but not limited to those highlighted on the checklist.

Candidates are also responsible for reviewing the list of potential external evaluators developed by the department chair and the Promotion and Tenure Committee. The candidate may add no more than three additional names, but is not required to do so. The candidate may request the removal of no more than two names, providing the reasons for the request. The department chair decides whether removal is justified. (Also see External Evaluations below.)

At its organizational meeting, held before the autumn semester review begins, the Promotion and Tenure Committee will review all University, College and departmental materials bearing on promotion and tenure policies and procedures.

The Promotion and Tenure Committee is charged with: (a) verifying the completeness and accuracy of the candidate's dossier as well as its consistency with Office of Academic Affairs requirements; (b) obtaining, with the chair of the department, letters of evaluation from external evaluators (i.e. professional peers outside the University who do not have a close personal or professional relationship with the candidate), and from other persons at the University with whom the candidate has had substantial professional involvement; (c) conducting a meeting of eligible faculty to discuss the merits of tenure and/or promotion for the candidate; (d) reporting the results of this meeting to the chair of the department, including a vote of eligible faculty and a summary recommendation. The committee should also assist the candidate in preparing a dossier documenting his or her accomplishments, although it must be emphasized that primary responsibility for the preparation of such a dossier lies with the candidate.

Procedures: Regional Campus Faculty Members

Regional campus faculty are first reviewed by the regional campus faculty according to the process established on that campus and then by the regional campus dean/director. The regional campus review focuses on teaching and service.

The regional campus dean/director forwards the written evaluation and recommendation of the regional campus review to the department chair, from which point the review follows the procedures described for the Columbus campus faculty.

Procedures: Specific to reviews for tenure and promotion to associate professor

The review for tenure and promotion during the final year of the probationary period is mandatory. Prior to that, a faculty member may ask to be considered for non-mandatory promotion and tenure review at any time. However, the department's Promotion and Tenure Committee may decline to place consideration of such a

non-mandatory review before the full faculty if the Committee judges the candidate's accomplishments not to warrant review (See below: Preliminary Screening of Non-mandatory Promotion and Tenure Review). Also, consistent with Office of Academic Affairs policy, only faculty members who are citizens or permanent residents of the United States may be considered for non-mandatory tenure review. The committee must confirm with the department chair that an untenured faculty member seeking non-mandatory tenure review is a U.S. citizen or permanent resident (has a "green card"). Faculty members not eligible for tenure due to lack of citizenship or permanent residency are moreover not considered for promotion by this department.

A candidate may withdraw from review at any stage in the process by making a written request to that effect to the chair of the department. Withdrawal from the mandatory tenure review during the final probationary year means that tenure will not be granted and the ending date of the appointment will be at the end of the succeeding academic year.

Procedures: Specific to reviews for promotion to full professor

Nomination for review for promotion to full professor can come from (1) faculty members of the department, together or individually, or (2) from a faculty member on his own or her own behalf. A candidate may withdraw from the review at any stage in the process by making a written request to that effect to the chair of the department.

Preliminary Screening of Candidates for Non-Mandatory Promotion or Tenure Review

The Promotion and Tenure Committee annually considers requests from faculty members seeking non-mandatory reviews in the following academic year and decides whether it is appropriate for such reviews to take place.

By February 15, a faculty member seeking non-mandatory review in the upcoming year will submit to the Chair of the Promotion and Tenure Committee a complete curriculum vitae and copies of peer and student evaluations of teaching from the period since hire or the most recent promotion or tenure review. The Committee will review these materials, vote, and communicate its decision to the candidate and department chair by April 1. A two-thirds majority of those eligible to vote on a request must vote affirmatively for the review to proceed. Only full professors on the Committee may consider promotion review requests to the rank of professor.

The Committee bases its decision on assessment of the record as presented in the faculty member's CV and on a determination of the availability of all required documentation for a full review (e.g., student and peer evaluations of teaching). Lack of the required documentation is necessary and sufficient grounds on which to deny a non-mandatory review.

A tenured faculty member can only be denied a request for formal review one time per Faculty Rule 3335-6-049 (<http://trustees.osu.edu/rules/university-rules.html>).

A decision by the Committee to permit a review to take place in no way commits the

Promotion and Tenure Committee, the department chair, or any other party to the review to making a positive recommendation during the review itself.

D. EXTERNAL EVALUATIONS

A minimum of five credible and useful external evaluations must be obtained. A credible and useful evaluation:

- a. Is written by a person highly qualified to judge the candidate's research who is not a close personal friend, research collaborator, or former academic advisor or postdoctoral mentor of the candidate. Qualifications are generally judged on the basis of the evaluator's expertise, record of accomplishments, and institutional affiliation. When letters are solicited from full professors *not* on the list submitted by the candidate, the department will ensure that those evaluators are at institutions comparable to Ohio State (and so with comparable expectations for promotion and tenure). In the case of an assistant professor seeking promotion to associate professor with tenure, a minority of the evaluations may come from associate professors.
- b. Provides sufficient analysis of the candidate's performance to add information to the review. A letter's usefulness is defined as the extent to which the letter is analytical as opposed to perfunctory. Under no circumstances will "usefulness" be defined by the perspective taken by an evaluator on the merits of the case.

Since the department cannot control who agrees to write and/or the usefulness of the letters received, at least twice as many letters are sought as are required, and they are solicited no later than the end of the spring semester prior to the review year. This timing allows additional letters to be requested should fewer than five useful letters result from the first round of requests.

As described above, a list of potential evaluators is assembled by the Promotion and Tenure Committee, the department chair, and the candidate. If the evaluators suggested by the candidate meet the criteria for credibility, a letter is requested from at least one of those persons. Faculty Rule 3335-6-04 (<http://trustees.osu.edu/rules/university-rules.html>) requires that no more than half the external evaluation letters in the dossier be written by persons suggested by the candidate. In the event that the person(s) suggested by the candidate do not agree to write, neither the Office of Academic Affairs nor this department requires that the dossier contain letters from evaluators suggested by the candidate.

The department follows the Office of Academic Affairs suggested format, provided at <http://oaa.osu.edu/sampleddocuments.html>, for letters requesting external evaluations.

Under no circumstances may a candidate solicit external evaluations or initiate contact in any way with external evaluators for any purpose related to the promotion review. If an external evaluator should initiate contact with the candidate regarding the review, the candidate must inform the evaluator that such communication is inappropriate and report the occurrence to the department chair, who will decide what, if any, action is

warranted (e.g., requesting permission from the Office of Academic Affairs to exclude that letter from the dossier). It is in the candidate's self-interest to assure that there is no ethical or procedural lapse, or the appearance of such a lapse, in the course of the review process.

All solicited external evaluation letters that are received must be included in the dossier. If concerns arise about any of the letters received, these concerns may be addressed in the department's written evaluations or brought to the attention of the Office of Academic Affairs for advice.

Following the review of candidate dossiers by the faculty, the Chair of the Promotion and Tenure Committee will convene an open meeting of eligible faculty who are on-duty (or, being on leave, nonetheless make themselves available with regard to evaluation of the candidate) to further review the candidate according to the criteria set forth above.

The meeting will review and discuss the candidate's qualifications and make a recommendation by secret ballot to the Chair of the Promotion and Tenure Committee regarding the candidate(s) tenure and/or promotion. The Promotion and Tenure Committee will then provide a detailed written assessment of the faculty member's strengths and weaknesses, reporting and taking into account the discussion and numerical vote of the full voting body of the tenure initiating unit. A simple majority of the eligible faculty (i.e., 51%) will constitute an affirmative vote. Once the report is approved by the voting faculty, it will be submitted to the chair of the department. The chair is required to make his or her own further recommendation, based on his/her assessment of the candidate as well as the recommendation of the eligible faculty, in the form of a letter to the Dean of the College.

Once the Promotion and Tenure Committee report and the chair's letter have been completed, the candidate will be notified in writing of the completion of the department's review and of the availability of these reports. The candidate may then request a copy of the reports and, within ten calendar days of notification of completion of the review, may provide the chair with written comments on the reports for inclusion in the dossier. The Promotion and Tenure Committee and/or chair of the department may provide written responses to the candidate's comments for inclusion in the dossier. Only one opportunity for a candidate to make comments on the departmental level of the review is permitted.

Finally, the chair's recommendation, the report of the Promotion and Tenure Committee, the candidate's dossier and any further comments by the candidate, Promotion and Tenure Committee and chair are sent forward to the Divisional Dean of Arts and Humanities and to the Dean of the College of Arts and Sciences.

E. DOCUMENTATION

The core dossier outline as prepared by the Office of Academic Affairs will serve as the basis for the preparation of a candidate's dossier. As stated therein, documentation is to be presented in the areas of teaching, research, and service.

Teaching:

Evidence of distinction in teaching will emphasize success in developing student interest in the history of art, success in conveying to students the essentials of the subject taught, and a willingness to demand of students clear evidence of intellectual growth. The assessment of teaching excellence will be based on (but need not be limited to) student and peer evaluations, including SEI and departmental evaluations for all courses taught during the candidate's probationary period or for the five years previous to the review; and representative syllabi and other course materials. Moreover, each eligible faculty member will be expected to observe, for a meaningful length of time, the classroom teaching of a candidate for promotion and tenure at least twice during a designated review period. Other measures of success that will be considered include program and course development; involvement in graduate exams, theses, qualifying papers and dissertations and in undergraduate writing and research; interdepartmental teaching; awards and formal recognition for teaching; and the candidate's self-evaluation statement, including strategies for improvement.

Research:

While the department sets no minimum requirements in terms of research for the granting of tenure or promotion, it does insist on a significant record of publication, with the determining factor being the extent of the candidate's contribution to the discipline as a whole. In addition to copies of the candidate's publications, documentation of excellence in research includes evaluations of the quality of his or her publication outlets as well as both internal and external evaluations of the scholarship itself, as well as awards, grants and prizes for research. A description by the candidate of his or her ongoing and future research will also be considered.

Service:

Every member of the faculty is expected to assume a share of responsibility for the governance and functioning of the department, College and University. An appropriate amount of professional and community service is also expected. Evidence of distinction in service includes student advising; administrative support; committee work; participation in professional organizations; organizing colloquia, conferences and exhibitions; lecturing to local lay audiences; and providing advice to local arts organizations. In evaluating service, quality and competence are more important than the number of activities. In order to more clearly assess a candidate's service, the chair and/or Promotion and Tenure Committee may solicit written evaluations from persons who are in a position to assess specific contributions.

VIII APPEALS

Faculty Rule 3335-6-05 (<http://trustees.osu.edu/rules/university-rules.html>) sets forth general criteria for appeals of negative promotion and tenure decisions. Appeals alleging improper evaluation are described in Faculty Rule 3335-5-05

(<http://trustees.osu.edu/rules/university-rules.html>).

Disagreement with a negative decision is not grounds for appeal. In pursuing an appeal, the faculty member is required to document the failure of one or more parties to the review process to follow written policies and procedures.

IX SEVENTH-YEAR REVIEWS

Faculty Rule 3335-6-05 (<http://trustees.osu.edu/rules/university-rules.html>) sets forth the conditions of and procedures for a seventh-year review for a faculty member denied tenure as a result of a sixth-year (mandatory tenure) review.

X PROCEDURES FOR STUDENT- AND PEER-EVALUATION OF TEACHING

The Department of the History of Art requires each faculty member to contribute to all aspects of a curriculum that runs the gamut from courses on the visual arts designed to complement an undergraduate education in the liberal arts to graduate courses aimed at preparing students to assume professional positions within the discipline of Art History or in a range of related fields. The Department also recognizes as teaching a variety of additional activities, including curriculum development, advising, and instruction in continuing education and extension programs.

Departmental Teaching Mission

An education in the History of Art should lead at every level to an increased intellectual mastery of the diverse body of objects, practices, and methods that constitute the discipline. The Department conceives of teaching as both an individual and a collective activity and values the methodological and pedagogical differences represented by its faculty as an important dimension of each student's experience and education. It places a premium on classroom clarity, accessibility to students, and the establishment of standards that are both demanding and realistic. It expects its students to develop a sound knowledge of the methods, materials, and monuments of the History of Art, strong writing skills, and a capacity to reflect cogently on the terms of the discipline and humanistic inquiry more generally.

Evaluation of Teaching

Evaluation of teaching in the Department of History of Art attempts both to assess the degree to which particular teaching activities contribute to the educational mission of the department as a whole and to balance this with the specific instructional goals of individual faculty members as articulated in syllabi and other contractual agreements with students. Effective evaluation should distinguish between the evaluation of a course as such and a more specifically focused assessment of individual instructors and methods; we therefore expect that the most serious and useful evaluative instruments will be tailored to the specific shapes and goals of particular courses.

A. Student Evaluation of Teaching

Use of the online Student Evaluation of Instruction (SEI) form is mandatory for every course offered in this department. Faculty members may also use departmental student evaluation forms or forms of their own design that provide students the opportunity to make narrative comments. Any hard-copy evaluation forms must be distributed and collected by a responsible person (student, faculty, or staff member) other than the instructor of the course. This person will obtain the forms from the instructor or the departmental staff member charged with managing course evaluations and return the filled-out forms to the main office, where a record will be kept of who obtains and returns the forms. The instructor for the course may at no time come into physical contact with the evaluation forms or be in the room while they are being filled out by the students.

Copies of the narrative evaluations will be provided to the faculty member on request by the department after the grades for that particular course have been posted; the original forms will be kept on file. Both SEI and narrative evaluations become part of each faculty member's annual activity report; reports that do not include these evaluations will not be considered.

B. Peer Evaluation of Teaching

1. Review Process

The administration of the peer evaluation process is the responsibility of the Personnel Committee, which can serve as a review committee itself, or appoint such a committee when necessary to accommodate the following guidelines. The evaluation committee should consist of at least two members of the department appointed by the Department Chair, who will also serve *ex officio* on all evaluation committees. Ideally, the evaluators will comprise at least one faculty member in or close to the area of specialty of the person under review and at least one faculty member further outside that area of specialty. Evaluators must not be of lower rank than the person being reviewed. As far as possible, these duties will rotate equitably through the faculty, so that the widest range of faculty suggestions and comments may be obtained.

In general, the review is to be informed by documentation submitted by the faculty member under review, including core dossier and supplemental class materials as specified below. The committee includes in its report an assessment of these materials, including their appropriateness, usefulness, currency, and consistency with the objectives stated in the core dossier as well as the department's mission. An adequate review will also include a pattern of class visitation allowing substantive comment on the teaching of one or more courses and such relevant conversations as may develop as part of this process.

Peer review focuses particularly on aspects of teaching that students are less qualified than faculty to evaluate, such as appropriateness of curricular choices given the goals of the course (survey as opposed to required major course), implicit and explicit goals of instruction, quality and effectiveness of testing tools, and appropriateness of approach relative to current disciplinary knowledge. As part of its evaluation the committee examines copies of the faculty member's SEI summaries from recent

years, and where student opinion is mixed to negative, the committee attempts to ascertain the reasons. In so doing, members are to bear in mind that they have observed only one or a few classes out of the semester, and moreover have a very different level of knowledge compared to students. Consequently their assessment may differ considerably from that of the majority of students.

The evaluation committee will prepare a written report of its findings and recommendations, including a separate assessment of student evaluations. This report should assess teaching in terms responsive to the teaching mission statement, and the terms of evaluation set out above. The report is submitted to the Personnel Committee and Department Chair, who, in consultation with the Personnel Committee and the faculty member under review, drafts a plan to respond to the recommendations, if needed. Such a plan should be revisited as part of the annual reviews as long as is necessary. The faculty member under review may also provide written comments on the report and the committee may respond in writing to those comments if it wishes. All such comments are appended to the report for inclusion in the faculty member's promotion and tenure dossier and/or personnel file, unless the faculty member requests that the comments be excluded.

2. Timing of Review

Probationary tenure-track faculty members are reviewed annually. Professors are reviewed every four years; Associate Professors with tenure are reviewed every two years. In addition, faculty members not scheduled for review may be reviewed at the request of the chair. Such reviews are normally triggered by low or declining student evaluations or other evidence of the need to provide assistance in the improvement of teaching. Individual faculty members may also request a review of teaching from the chair in any year for an anticipated promotion review, for teaching development, or for other purposes. These voluntary reviews are considered formative only, with the report being given only to the faculty member who requested the review.

All faculty scheduled for review will be informed of this fact during spring semester of the year preceding the review. Required documentation should be made available to the Personnel Committee at the beginning of the semester in which the review is scheduled to take place. The review itself will be scheduled in such a way as to allow adequate opportunity for classroom observation.

2. Required Documentation.

Faculty being reviewed will prepare and submit documentation following the prescribed core dossier format for promotion, tenure, and the evaluation of probationary faculty (only those sections pertaining to teaching) specified by the Office of Academic Affairs. In addition, faculty should submit the most recent syllabus, sample examinations, student evaluations and any other course materials for the most recent offering of each course taught by that faculty member during the previous five years.

Evaluation of teaching for Regional Campus faculty is performed by peer faculty at that campus.

