

**DEPARTMENT OF THE HISTORY OF ART & ARCHITECTURE:
PROMOTION AND TENURE POLICIES**

This policy applies to all represented faculty and is intended to comply with all provisions of Article 20 of the CBA. In the event of any discrepancies or inconsistencies, the CBA language applies for represented faculty. This policy also applies to all unrepresented faculty, unless a university-wide policy exists that contradicts the terms of this policy.

This policy is focused primarily on the criteria by which faculty are evaluated. Detailed descriptions of the processes by which reviews are conducted are presented in Article 20 of the Collective Bargaining Agreement and in relevant UO policies for unrepresented faculty. Procedures specific to the Department of the History of Art and Architecture are presented below. This document will be made available in the department or unit (as well as on the Academic Affairs website).

PART I. TEACHING, SCHOLARSHIP, AND SERVICE: Guidelines

The Department of the History of Art & Architecture values excellence in both teaching and scholarship. Excellence in one area alone may strengthen a case, but by itself is not sufficient to guarantee a recommendation for indefinite tenure and/or promotion. No set number of publications, of students taught or theses directed, or of committee assignments can be applied equally to every candidate for Promotion or Tenure.

These guidelines outline the criteria for promotion and tenure in the Department of the History of Art and Architecture. They provide a specific departmental context within the general university framework for promotion and tenure of faculty. The following criteria are based on faculty performance in teaching, research and service, which are allotted proportional weights of 40 : 40 : 20, respectively.

A. Teaching (40%)

The Department of the History of Art & Architecture values excellent teaching at both the undergraduate and graduate levels. The department expects that tenured and untenured faculty will share equally in departmental responsibilities for classes taught at all levels.

In assessing teaching quality, the department relies on a variety of sources, including numerical data compiled from student course evaluations, signed comments on student evaluations, and regular classroom visits and review of teaching materials by colleagues. Documentation of teaching is important: candidates should keep copies of syllabi and other course materials for inclusion in a teaching portfolio. The department may solicit letters from graduate students who have worked directly with the candidate and/ or from undergraduates with whom the candidate has worked closely.

The candidate's personal statement should include a section describing her or his teaching program, indicating courses taught and developed, pedagogical objectives, the integration of research and teaching, and any future plans for course development. The statement should also address the candidate's role in

student advising and the supervision of graduate theses.

B. Scholarship (40%)

Since the department offers both M.A. and Ph.D. degrees, faculty members are expected to maintain an ongoing record of research and publication. The candidate's statement should describe the development, future direction, and significance of her or his scholarly program.

The Department of the History of Art & Architecture expects a candidate for tenure and promotion to Associate Professor to have attracted local, regional, and national attention through juried or invited papers at symposia and professional meetings. In addition, the candidate will have published or have had accepted a number of substantial scholarly articles, most of which are in peer-reviewed or refereed journals. These journals may be broadly based, such as those published by the discipline's professional organizations; specific to various fields of art and architectural history; or cross-disciplinary. Essays published in major exhibition catalogues are another important outlet for scholarship. The mix of articles and conference papers will vary as each candidate chooses venues having the greatest scholarly impact on his or her field. Normally, the candidate's work will be building toward a book with a university press or other appropriate academic publisher; however, it should be noted that art history is one of those fields in which research and the publication of articles and books often takes longer (and is more expensive) than in some other fields because of the need for travel to view objects and the use of extensive illustration. The cost of reproducing images in books often requires subventions (themselves competitive) to aid in the acquisition of photographs and copyright permissions. Based on the department's past experience and record, a published book at the time of preparation of a tenure case is not always the norm. Given the costs of publication and the smaller number of refereed sources for publication, the department is concerned more with quality than quantity; nonetheless, the department expects that the candidate's publications will have made significant contributions to scholarship in the judgment of outside referees in the candidate's field and will have laid a solid foundation that ensures continued scholarly development beyond the granting of indefinite tenure.

Promotion from Associate to Full Professor, which is based on accomplishments since the previous promotion, recognizes the achievement of national and international recognition in an individual's field of expertise. It is expected that this high level of recognition will be based on one or more major books or exhibition catalogues in addition to other evidence of continued scholarly productivity, such as a constantly lengthening list of significant articles in refereed journals. Again, quality is valued over quantity.

C. Service (20%)

1. Promotion from Assistant to Associate Professor.

The department expects its untenured members to participate responsibly and cooperatively when called upon for service within the department and to a more limited extent within the AAA school. Service at the

university level is not expected and should be undertaken only on a very limited basis when it serves the development of the faculty member's research and teaching and is appropriate to the experience and expertise of the faculty member. No untenured faculty member will be penalized for declining to serve on committees outside the department. Service to the profession is also evaluated favorably, but in general, service counts less in consideration for tenure than either teaching or scholarship.

2. Promotion from Associate to Full Professor

In the case of promotion from Associate to Full Professor, service is weighed heavily, and the candidate should normally have made important contributions to the department, school, and university. Senior faculty members are expected to carry the burden of major committee service within the school and university. Significant service to the profession will also be evaluated favorably as an indication that the faculty member has the esteem of his or her professional peers. The relative weight accorded to these two kinds of service will vary from case to case.

PART II. EVALUATION: Procedures

Evaluation at the University of Oregon takes a variety of forms as you move through various stages of your academic career:

- Annual Review
- Third-Year or Mid-Term Review
- Promotion and Tenure Review
- Post-Tenure Reviews

Annual Reviews - Spring of years 1, 2, & 4

Each tenure-track faculty member who has not received tenure and is not in the process of a tenure review will have an annual review conducted by the department head, usually in mid-April. These annual reviews are written with input from the senior colleagues of the candidate's division, and are forwarded to the College. The review is based on the candidate's annual report, which should include the following: (1) a CV, lists of publications and grants, and lists (by year and term) of their courses and committees to date; (2) a narrative description of the candidate's progress during the past year in research, teaching, and service (a brief paragraph for each area will suffice); and (3) a brief description of goals and plans for next year and beyond.

Third-Year Review - Spring of year 3

The candidate's report, containing the items described in Article 20 of the Collective Bargaining

Agreement and in relevant UO policies for unrepresented faculty, will be reviewed by Personnel Committee, which will provide a report to the department head. A department vote is held on whether or not to recommend renewal of the contract. Afterwards, a report is written by the department head and provided to the candidate. The file, including any responsive material provided by the candidate within ten days of receipt of the report, is then forwarded for review by the dean and then the provost or designee. A fully satisfactory review indicating that the faculty member is on track towards promotion and tenure will lead to a contract extension up through the tenure and promotion year. If the contract renewal process determines that the faculty member's record is not satisfactory and that promotion and tenure are not likely, the faculty member will be given a one-year, terminal contract. A faculty member may also be given a renewable contract that does not extend to the promotion and tenure year if there are questions as to whether the faculty member will have a record meriting promotion at the end of the tenure and promotion period. In such cases, the faculty member will be required to go through another contract renewal process prior to the promotion and tenure review in order to determine if the faculty member has been able to remedy the shortcomings in the record identified in the contract renewal process.

Promotion and Tenure Review - Spring of year 5 until May 1 of year 6

These guidelines outline the criteria for promotion and tenure in the Department of the History of Art and Architecture. They provide a specific departmental context within the general university framework for promotion and tenure of faculty. The following criteria are based on faculty performance in teaching, research and service, which are allotted proportional weights of 40 : 40 : 20, respectively.

Post-Tenure Review

1. Third-Year Post-Tenure Review

Primary responsibility for the third-year PTR process lies with the department head. The third-year PTR should be commenced by the department head no later than during the Winter term, in order to allow it to be concluded before the end of the candidate's third-year post-tenure. The department head will contact the faculty member and request a CV and personal statement, including a discussion of contributions to institutional equity and inclusion. The department head will add to the evaluative file copies of the faculty member's teaching evaluations received during the period under review, including quantitative summary sheets and signed written evaluations, as well as any peer evaluations of teaching conducted during the review period. Consistent with department policy and practice, the file will be reviewed first by a committee, which will provide a written report to the department head that may be used as received or placed in additional written context by the department head. For associate professors, the report will specifically present an honest appraisal of progress toward a successful review for promotion to full professor. If the faculty member has undergone an earlier sixth-year PTR that resulted in creation of a development plan due to unsatisfactory performance (see discussion of sixth-year PTR, below), the faculty member's success in addressing concerns will be discussed. The report will be signed and dated by the department head and shared with the faculty member, who will also sign and date the report to signify its receipt. The faculty member may provide a written response if they desire within 10 days of receipt of the PTR report; an extension may be granted by mutual agreement between the faculty member

and the department head. The report and, if provided, response from the faculty member, will be placed in the faculty member's personnel file as maintained at the unit level.

2. Sixth-Year Post-Tenure Review

The process of the review is described in the Collective Bargaining Agreement, Article 20, or in parallel University policy for unrepresented faculty members. Since the sixth-year PTR is expected to be a deeper review of the faculty member's scholarship, teaching, and service, the Department of the History of Art and Architecture expects the candidate to provide a portfolio of publications (or documentation of other scholarship activities) and information regarding service contributions, in addition to the materials called for by CBA/UO policy.

A development plan is required for faculty who are not achieving a satisfactory level of performance. The plan will be developed with appropriate consultation and discussion among the faculty member, the department head, and the dean. Ideally, there will be consensus regarding the development plan, but if consensus is not possible, a plan receiving the dean's approval will be forwarded to the Provost or designee for review and approval.

If a sixth-year PTR results in creation of a professional development plan, future PTR for the faculty member will include consideration of the extent to which the terms of the development plan have been met. However, progress toward meeting the goals of such a development plan need not and should not be evaluated solely within the context of the PTR process.