

# **CRITERIA FOR RETENTION, TENURE, AND PROMOTION IN THE SCHOOL OF ART**

Fall 2015

Provost Approved May 2016

The requirements and criteria for retention, tenure, and promotion as set out in a series of policies adopted by the Academic Senate and approved by the President are divided into three areas:

- I. Teaching Effectiveness,
- II. Professional Achievement and Growth, and
- III. Contributions to Campus and Community

As required by University Policy on Retention and Tenure (Policy #F11-241), all faculty members in the School of Art who are being considered for retention, tenure, and promotion will be evaluated in each of those categories.

The guidelines and criteria described here clarify the expectations of the School of Art in relation to the University's criteria for the determination of retention, tenure and promotion as specified in the Faculty Manual and the relevant Senate policies (see above). The goal of these criteria is to ensure that there is a clear understanding of how the School interprets and applies Retention, Tenure and Promotion criteria to the benefit of its faculty across all programmatic areas: art history, theory and criticism; curatorial practices and gallery management; museum studies; and studio art.

The School's Retention, Tenure, and Promotions Committee, along with the Director of the School, will consider and evaluate all of the achievements of a candidate for tenure and promotion according to the criteria listed below. Following University policy, "achievements in the current rank should demonstrate promise of meritorious activities comparable to the achievements and services expected of all faculty who serve at the rank to which the individual is to be promoted."

The School of Art is committed to challenging the theory-practice divide, and thus we encourage faculty to forge connections among teaching, research, and service, and to demonstrate this integrated approach in their activities. Degrees in the School of Art are focused on the production of future generations of socially engaged artists, curators, scholars, and gallery and museum professionals who understand that individual and collaborative contributions to culture and heritage institutions are paramount to their practice as scholars and educators. With the alignment of Museum Studies and the School of Art, the School of Art will always include the Director of Museum Studies on the RTP Committee when faculty identified as Museum Studies undergo review for promotion and tenure.

Documentation and Preparation of the Working Personnel Action File:

The candidate should follow the guidelines set out in the "Preparing for Tenure and Promotion Handbook" available at

<http://facaffairs.sfsu.edu/sites/sites7.sfsu.edu.facaffairs/files/PrepT&POldPoliciesFall2014.pdf>

#### Professional Education and/or Equivalency:

The terminal degree or its equivalent is necessary for tenure or promotion in the School of Art. The PhD is required for faculty teaching in Art History and is highly desirable for Museum Studies, the MFA is the terminal degree required for faculty teaching studio courses. The Dean establishes equivalency for a faculty member hired without the terminal degree at the time of hire.

### **I. TEACHING EFFECTIVENESS**

Teaching effectiveness is required for every year of probation, as well as for tenure and promotion. To be considered for retention, tenure or promotion, regardless of qualifications in other categories, candidates must meet the standards of excellence in teaching, including maintenance of high academic standards and a scholarly level of instruction. Effective teaching is exhibited in the classroom, studio, gallery, museum, or in the community. It is demonstrated when faculty join with students to develop knowledge and skills through classroom experiences, scholarly research, creative activities, and community service. Staying up to date in one's field, revising courses, and continuous improvement of the teaching and learning process is expected of all faculty in the department. To merit tenure and/or promotion all candidates must meet the standard of excellence normally expected of faculty and required by the University. Following in this tradition, the School of Art takes teaching effectiveness very seriously. The following are expected activities and modes of assessment for teaching effectiveness:

#### A. The following are standards for judging Teaching Effectiveness:

- 1) Range and Breadth. Faculty in the School of Art are expected to teach a range and breadth of courses, from lower-division undergraduate and General Education courses to upper-division courses, School lecture series, and graduate-level courses. It is recognized that some faculty may have graduate level only assignments.
- 2) Course materials. Syllabi are expected to be explicit and intentional about campus values and expectations for learning and emphasize coherence across the key curricular levels of courses and programs, in accordance with university policy. Course learning objectives should be aligned with their specific School of Art program and should make explicit how the course relates to the program mission and learning outcomes.  
(<http://senate.sfsu.edu/content/proposed-academic-senate-policy-course-syllabi>) Selected bibliographies, course readers and so forth should be exemplary in form and structure, and their purposes in meeting learning outcomes clearly defined.
- 3) Student evaluations. Student evaluations are an important component of assessing teaching effectiveness because they provide a large representative sample of student reactions. Tenured and tenure-track faculty are required to submit evaluations for all courses that were evaluated for each semester.

These evaluations contain both quantitative and qualitative evidence of effective teaching, to which the committee gives equal weight.

The RTP Committee uses this information to identify elements of strength and any possible weaknesses as well as provide helpful feedback either informally or through written performance reviews. When considering retention for untenured faculty, the Committee will consider the overall average for courses in each School of Art program taking into account factors such as response rate and course enrollment. The School of Art average generally falls between 1.43 and 1.50, and we expect all faculty to receive mean scores that fall between 1.0 and 1.8 for each course taught, regardless of the modes of instruction or tenure status. Quantitative SETEs scores for newer, untenured faculty are expected to be slightly better than the average as they adjust to a new situation. For tenure and promotion, SETE scores are expected to be consistently closer to the School of Art average. For promotion to full professor, SETE scores should be consistent, and better than the School average. In all cases, the Committee will take into account any change in scores over time since hiring, and will give due consideration to circumstances that tend to influence average scores such as the difficulty or popularity of particular courses, or any recent efforts in course development. Scores of 1.5 or better suggest highly effective teaching. In instances where scores are 1.8 or worse, the RTP Committee will examine course scores over time and closely analyze the percentage of ratings that comprise each category in the evaluation. Faculty will be mentored to address the issues that emerge.

- 4) Signed written comments from students are considered, but because they usually represent a small sample and are not anonymous, they are not regarded as highly as classroom surveys.
- 5) Peer class observations. Classroom observations (including a review of course materials) by fellow faculty members are vital for assessing the level of the faculty member's expectations, style of classroom, studio and gallery presentation, and method of engagement with students. These visits serve as a separate and distinct assessment of a candidate's teaching effectiveness, as well as a check on student evaluations, which can be affected by students' grade concerns, prejudices, and workloads. Non-tenured faculty members and associate professors receive at least two observations each year, one from the chair and one from an RTP committee member or designee. The faculty member will receive a written report, ideally within a month of the observation.

Curricular innovations. Curricular and/or programmatic innovations in the discipline, across disciplines, or for the benefit of General Education qualify as Teaching Effectiveness. Such activities may include the development of original academic programs, new courses or course content, and new

disciplinary and/or pedagogical approaches, and applications of technology.

- 6) Internships. Developing, implementing and supervising professionally based internships are a particularly important demonstration of Teaching Effectiveness for certain programs in the School of Art, especially Museum Studies. Lists of internships developed by faculty, samples of faculty interactions in developing internships, and samples of written evaluations of internships completed by students to meet internship requirements all qualify as evidence of Teaching Effectiveness.

- 7) Supervision of MA and MFA Thesis and/or Culminating Experiences. Supervising MA and MFA thesis or culminating experience projects as a Chair or committee member are an important aspect of every School of Art faculty member's contribution to teaching effectiveness.

Supervising theses and culminating experience projects involves meeting with students regularly over the course of multiple semesters to give feedback on the development of the project and to ensure that appropriate progress is taking place and that milestones (such as abstracts, outlines, and drafts) are being met. It also involves reading and providing feedback on drafts of the written thesis/thesis report and evaluating the final version. For the MFA thesis, it also involves a final meeting with the student and the student's entire thesis committee during which the creative work and thesis report are discussed and assessed. Written material serving as guidance and distributed to students to support culminating experience work is evidence of teaching effectiveness, as is any written material developed by faculty for CE-related advising. The chair of the thesis committee plays a primary role in overseeing and scheduling these activities with the thesis candidate.

In Museum Studies, candidates are expected to support the development of topics for theses and creative work projects for all students. Candidates serving on committees are expected to regularly meet with or communicate with students to review drafts of sections of theses and creative work projects until they are satisfied that the content, grammar, organization, and style are suitable for final submission to the Graduate School. The chair of the thesis committee will make the final assessment when the thesis or CWP is considered suitable for submission to the Graduate School.

- 8) Advising. The candidate must be effective in advising, which may be documented by descriptions of the nature and extent of advising activities, student letters and interviews, and descriptions of work with graduate students.

- B. The RTP review process shall take into account previous reviews at SFSU and build upon them. Any suggestions for improvement, recommended actions and expressions of concern in earlier reviews will be reexamined in later reviews. The reexamination should include indications of whether previous concerns have been successfully resolved or clearly define what further steps might be desirable. Although student Evaluation Scores are suggestive of whether or not a faculty member is an effective teacher, the final recommendation will be based evaluations of all of the above factors,
- C. For promotion from Associate to Full Professor, candidates should demonstrate continuing efforts to improve their teaching in the above-mentioned areas. In addition, they must demonstrate leadership in developing more broadly by contributing, for example, in mentoring junior faculty and lecturers through classroom observation and sharing of teaching techniques; leading program development and evaluation; ongoing curriculum innovation and development.

## **II. PROFESSIONAL ACHIEVEMENT AND GROWTH**

The University and the School of Art maintain that faculty professional achievements and intellectual growth enhance the lives of students, the department, and the university itself. Thus, the School of Art expects that the pattern of intellectual activity and growth established during the probationary period will extend beyond tenure.

Scholarship and creative research practices and professional activities vary widely among the artists, curators, scholars, and gallery and museum professionals who teach in the School of Art. In the first semester of hire, the RTP Committee will arrange a meeting with each candidate to establish how best to align the various evaluation practices in the field, research goals of the candidate, and the School of Art RTP Criteria. The candidate and the RTP Committee will complete a brief (1-2 pages) written statement to document this conversation. This document should be reviewed annually, and amended if necessary at the end of each academic year. The document, which becomes a part of the candidate's file, should serve as an interpretation of the more general criteria listed here, as well as a template for the faculty member at various stages of the retention, tenure and promotion process over time.

Opportunities for publication and forms of presentation of research vary within the fields of studio practice, art history and museum studies, and it is not possible to produce a truly exhaustive list of worthy professional achievement, which may vary by subfield. Above all, the School through its RTP Committee, expects a candidate for tenure or promotion to make significant contributions to the field.

### **PEER REVIEW**

Peer review is an important component of measuring and evaluating the quality and impact of Professional Growth and Achievement in the creative, scholarly and professional fields represented within the School of Art. The key to determining the significance of professional activity is the review process, the reputation of the institution or individuals providing the review, and the critical reception by the

discipline. Please see Appendix I for detailed information about peer review in the disciplines practiced in the School of Art.

Our School evaluates scholarship according to its quality and impact, not according to quantitative measures of productivity alone. The School of Art expects that all faculty will be actively engaged in the production of an original body of creative, curatorial, professional and/or scholarly work within their field(s) of expertise.

Because certain types of research and scholarship in the School of Art can require extensive time, we expect some important projects to take a number of years from inception to publication. Consequently, in weighting merit for tenure and/or promotion, the School may adjust the quantitative measure of scholarly output employed below to take into consideration the depth of research associated with a project, or the project's impact on the field. The School's RTP Committee will offer explicit justifications for such a determination, in consultation with external referees.

A. The following are standards for judging Professional Achievement and Growth:

- 1) Retention. The School of Art expects candidates for retention to exhibit a pattern of professional achievement and scholarly growth during their probationary period. Unless otherwise specified at the time of hiring, this means that probationary (untenured) faculty members are expected to make a significant scholarly contribution to the field and to continue to grow intellectually within their given areas of expertise, demonstrating clear progress toward meeting the standards for tenure and promotion.
- 2) Tenure and Promotion to Associate Professor. By the end of the probationary period, the School expects the sustained production, relevant to the candidate's defined goals, of multiple works over time that include: major peer-reviewed activities. For candidates whose research centers on creative practices this can include exhibits in on - or off - campus gallery or museum settings; curatorial or preservation projects; guides to or studies of collections, and similar activities. For candidates for whom research, writing and publication are the primary mode of professional activity, this includes published work in peer-reviewed, professional settings or publications.

This work should reflect the candidate's engagements with questions central to the field(s) of their expertise. This body of work should represent significant mastery and research and would typically be expected to entail the production of exhibited works of art; curatorial projects; the results of professional museum work in preservation, exhibition, outreach, or other areas of professional practice; and/or a published monograph or series of scholarly articles, usually linked by a common area of artistic or professional practice, research, method, or line of inquiry. Such work will also usually be the result of and/or in dialogue with non-peer reviewed exhibits, publications, presentations, and other achievements. For those working in interdisciplinary

areas of knowledge production, each candidate's publications and professional activities in her/his respective field of expertise are valued.

3) Promotion to Full Professor:

The recommendation for promotion to Professor should be based on a record of sustained achievement at an increasing level of sophistication, which expands on the candidate's work and research. The candidate's work is recognized as contributing to h/h field of expertise, or with an increasing display of international recognition at the rank of Professor. The School expects the candidate will have developed into a mature scholar or artist, and merit will be accorded to both published and exhibited works based largely on original research or creative work and those that synthesize and integrate knowledge, revealing new patterns of meaning and new relationships between the parts and the whole. Consequently, a textbook offering original insights, or a critical edition or annotated translation, or an edited anthology may carry the same weight as a monograph. Overall, a sustained record of scholarly achievement will have been demonstrated.

B. Evidence of Professional Achievement and Growth in the School of Art  
Four areas, in order of value or weight, constitute evidence of Professional Achievement and Growth. The efforts listed under each of the four areas below represent a repertoire from which the candidate can present the body of work that best represents the candidate's professional achievement and growth. Peer-reviewed works and activities are given greater weight than non-peer-reviewed works.

1) Major Works - Peer-Reviewed (A list of journals is in Appendix I)

- A major exhibit in on - or off - campus gallery or museum settings, including exhibit development, design, implementation, and curation of materials to be exhibited (see also Section C below).
- Exhibition of creative works that address contemporary issues in the discipline and which push the leading edge in concept, form, presentation and response.
- A major curatorial or preservation project and/or guide to or study of collections, resulting in a book or monograph published or accepted for publication by a scholarly press.
- Book or monograph published or accepted for publication by a scholarly press.
- Major single articles published in journals or peer-reviewed anthologies, including academic studies from the candidate's field of expertise (see Appendix 1).
- Peer-reviewed foundation, state and federal grants awarded.

2) Collaborative, or Co-created Peer-Reviewed Works (Important but not major activities)

- Peer-reviewed presentations at meetings of academic or professional associations (because Museum Studies is a relatively new discipline)
- Collaborative (co-created) works exhibited in professional venues, including collaborations with non-profit organizations, curatorial and preservation projects, books and articles are considered significant publications. Because of the inherently collaborative nature of work in Museum Studies, in the museum profession, and in museum-related disciplines, co-created peer-reviewed works are common; as a result, collaborative (co-created) peer-reviewed works consisting of single articles or chapters in peer reviewed anthologies are also considered to be a major activity in Museum Studies, and candidates are encouraged to outline their contributions to such efforts."
- Editing (or co-editing) volumes, special issues of journals and books.
- Peer-reviewed foundation, state and federal grants awarded.

### 3) Non-Peer Reviewed Works

- Other articles (such as contributions to anthologies, chapters in books, conference proceedings, articles for popular audiences derived from one's area of specialization)
- Developing, implementing, and presenting museum-related workshops directly relevant to the professional expertise of the candidate as a scholar-practitioner.
- Unpublished manuscripts that have been reviewed and commented upon by outside reviewers
- Translations, introductions, responses to works of other artists, curator projects or exhibits in on- or off-campus gallery or museum settings, and scholarship in one's area of specialization.
- Art criticism and reviews, including exhibition and book reviews, encyclopedia entries

### 4) Presentations (oral, written, and/or visual)

- Invited presentations at galleries, museums, other universities and professional meetings (i.e., conferences).
- Non-peer reviewed presentations of work at international, national, regional and local conferences and exhibitions.
- Moderating or chairing conference sessions.
- Developing, implementing, and presenting professional workshops

### 5) Other Achievements

- Grants, stipends, and other competitively awarded funding.
- Recognition of professional achievements in the form of awards and honors.

## C. Other Considerations in Professional Achievement and Growth.

As outlined above in Section B.1, note that Peer-Reviewed works may include a major exhibit in on - or off - campus gallery or museum settings, including exhibit

development, design, implementation, and curation of materials to be exhibited. *Curation* is defined here as performing research to identify and document the history of the materials to be exhibited; organizing and preparing materials to be exhibited; developing interpretive material for items to be exhibited; and contributing to programs and educational materials associated with exhibits.

Curation is time-intensive because it typically requires extensive time for research on associated materials prior to their appearance in an exhibit, and because curation requires specialized knowledge of scholarly developments associated with the topic to be exhibited. Curation also involves the production of new scholarship on materials, which typically appears in the form of the actual exhibit. Finally, curation contributes to the advancement of the body of knowledge in a specialized field and within the museum profession as a whole.

Evaluation of a major exhibit will be conducted by external reviewers utilizing the process outlined in Section D and according to criteria outlined in Appendix II.

Note that the Director and Chief Curator of the Global Museum may be a faculty member from the School of the Art. In these situations, the School of Art considers the activities of the Director and Chief Curator to fall primarily within Professional Growth and Achievement, as outlined in Appendix III.

#### D. External Letters

The School of Art requires external reviews of a faculty member's professional achievement and growth work as part of the tenure and promotion process. External letters function as peer review, and as such, are to focus only on professional work and thus not teaching effectiveness or service. The candidate will work in consultation with the Director to identify a list of potential reviewers. Guidelines for the process are as follow:

Candidates may propose up to seven outside reviewers. The School in consultation with the RTP Committee may add up to seven additional outside reviewers. The candidate and the RTP Committee will discuss the list of fourteen possible reviewers to arrive at a final list of eight to ten potential reviewers. During this stage of the process all parties have the right to veto suggested reviewers while maintaining a balance between the two lists. If there is substantial disagreement, the School Director will select and rank reviewers from the final list making an effort to maintain a balance between the candidate's list and the RTP Committee's list. This process shall take place in the spring of the academic year preceding the academic year in which the candidate's WPAF is due.

- Reviewers shall not have been the candidate's graduate thesis/dissertation chair or committee member.
- Reviewers shall not be [close] colleagues within SFSU.
- Academic reviewers shall be from CSU comparable institutions or higher, and hold a higher rank than the candidate being reviewed.

- The School of Art acknowledges the collaborative nature of professional work in Art and in Museum Studies. As such, for the evaluation of professional work, the candidate and RTP Committee may identify a list of established professionals with whom the candidate may have collaborated and are able to evaluate the quality, value and uniqueness of the candidate's professional work and contributions to the field. Local, national and international museum practitioners may be invited to participate in peer review of candidate exhibitions and/or writing using guidelines appropriate to the profession.
- In cases where a list includes both academic and professional reviewers, the candidate and RTP Committee will work collaboratively to insure a balance between both groups of reviewers.
- Candidates shall provide to the RTP Committee the following materials to be sent to reviewers by June 1 before the fall semester in which the candidate's file is due:
  - Personal statement
  - Current CV
  - Works of art, articles or books, book chapters and so forth, from the candidate's professional work made during the period under review.
- The School Director will begin the invitation process, track the process of securing the external reviews, answer questions from the reviewers, receive review letters, and place letters in the candidate's WPAF.
  - Reviewers will be asked to include a description of their relationship to the candidate and potential conflicts of interest they might have in doing the review.
  - Reviewers will be informed that candidates have access to their letters.

### **III. CONTRIBUTIONS TO CAMPUS AND COMMUNITY**

The School of Art expects all candidates for retention, tenure and promotion to offer service to the campus and community.

Collegiality is an important aspect of service. It is defined as the candidate's record of building cooperative working relationships with other members of the faculty, with university staff, and/or with personnel in community and professional organizations. Collegiality is evidenced in part by a candidate's election to standing committees as defined by School of Art by-laws. Service should contribute to the School's larger mission and goals, but when assessing all types of service to campus and community the RTP Committee and Director will take "collegiality" into account based on evidence in the file.

- A. The following are standards for judging Contributions to Campus and Community:
- 1) Retention. The primary emphasis for tenure track faculty will be placed on the candidate's active participation and involvement in service to the School of Art, but with time, expectations will grow inclusive of service to the college or larger campus community.

- 2) Tenure and Promotion to Associate. A candidate must show a record of consistent committee service in the department and college. Evidence can include evaluative letters that describe the nature and quality of service from faculty with whom the candidate has served.
  
- 3) Promotion to Full. It is expected that the candidate's contribution to campus and community include significant service to the School of Art by having assumed leadership roles such as chairing standing committees, contributing to initiatives that have a significant, positive affect on the student experience beyond a candidate's area of teaching and research expertise, and coordinator positions. For those areas of School of Art operation where facilities-related service is relevant, leadership in improving facilities and their management. In addition, the candidate should have in-depth participation in areas of service beyond the campus as outlined below.

B. Evidence of significant contributions to campus and community should be documented in the candidate's WPAF. Examples include letters from committee chairs documenting a candidate's service, event programs identifying participation, consulting contracts outlining the scope of work performed, letters/emails from professional organizations and/or journals documenting contributions, etc.

C. Contributions to Campus and Community in the School of Art can be drawn from the following:

1) Service to School of Art:

- Active participation on departmental committees
- Facilities and equipment management
- Special advising roles (GE, undergraduate advisor, graduate advisor, etc.)
- Special assignments for program development (grant writing, assessment, etc.)
- Facilitating extracurricular events
- Mentoring junior colleagues
- Taking leadership roles (chairing committees, coordinating lecture series, etc.)

2) Service to College and/or University:

- Service on committees for the College of Liberal and Creative Arts
- Service on university-wide committees
- Interdisciplinary program development or involvement
- Sponsoring or mentoring student organizations
- Planning and/or participating in on-campus events

3) Service to the Professional Community

- Service on a non-profit board or program committee
- Peer reviewing articles and other activities
- Providing continuing education presentations
- Held elected office in a local, state or national arts, non-profit or museum organization
- Serve as a paid consultant/trainer for another institution
- Review of work in professional journals or other relevant venues.
- Development and maintenance of web sites for academic and professional audiences.

#### D. Community Service

The School of Art values service to the university's wider communities. Such work may include service to the profession or to municipal, local, state, national, and/or global organizations and communities. The School recognizes that service takes a range of forms and occurs at various sites both inside and outside the academy, and may be documented differently. Faculty should judiciously select service commitments. The School of Art has a commitment to challenging the theory-practice divide, and thus we encourage faculty to forge connections among teaching, research, and service. Tenure-track faculty are encouraged to seek out service opportunities that meaningfully connect their research and teaching interests to communities beyond SFSU.

1. Evidence of community service may drawn from, but is not limited to, the following:
  - Organizing community or professional workshops or events
  - Responding to requests by museums or non-profits for professional guidance
  - Working with cultural groups on enhancing museum-community relations
  - Contributing to media (newspapers, radio, TV, blogging, etc.)
  - Consulting with and/or serving community colleges, high schools, or other education-related organizations
  - Consulting with or serving other community organizations or government agencies
  - Serving on editorial, organizational or executive boards
  - Participating in professional associations in leadership roles
  - Reading manuscripts for academic journals and presses
  - Cross-campus scholarly collaborations
  - Serving on editorial boards for academic journals
  - Serving as an external reviewer for departments on other campuses
  - Serving as an external evaluator for museums or non-profits
  - Developing partnerships with museums for internships
  - Responding to requests from the general public

## **Appendix I – Peer Review and Journals**

### **Creative Works**

Peer review of creative works can take many forms and are ranked by prestige and visibility. Highly competitive and visible juried exhibitions and publications are part of all creative practices. Juried opportunities include solo or group shows, public presentations, and in some cases, gallery representation. Inclusion in publications on topics relevant to a candidate's research is another form of peer review. Peer-reviewed activities are more heavily weighted than non-peer reviewed works and activities.

### **Art History**

Art history is an interdisciplinary field and art historians are known to publish broadly in and outside their discipline. Art historical research and art criticism take a variety of forms beyond traditional academic research and publishing of books and articles, which can be published in scholarly journals following conventional peer-review. Certain well-respected art magazines within the art world and essays published in exhibition catalogues published by museums are among the primary forms of scholarship in the field of Contemporary Art History. While not officially “peer-reviewed” since they are not published by academic presses, these forms of writing are considered an integral and vital part of professional identity and work, which signifies a substantial degree of authority, recognition, and achievement in the field. Writing exhibition reviews, as an art critic in art history must be distinguished from writing book reviews in other academic fields because it constitutes an important original contribution to the field, based in the production and expression of aesthetic judgment and critical/theoretical knowledge. While distinct from academic scholarship and writing, a substantial and sustained body of art criticism published in art magazines and/or exhibition catalogues constitutes a level of professional achievement that can, under certain circumstances, be considered on par with publishing in peer-reviewed journals. Publication of art history and art criticism can also be included in journals dedicated to the subjects of history, culture, and society.

#### **List of Peer-Reviewed Journals in Art History**

(Generally any journal published by a university press is peer-reviewed.)

Better-known and respected journals include:

*October, Grey Room, Third Text, Art Journal, Art History, Oxford Art Journal, Art Margins, Asian Diasporic Visual Cultures and the Americas, The International Journal of Islamic Architecture (IJIA), Art Bulletin, Journal of Architectural Historians*

#### **Art Magazines and Journals in Contemporary Art Criticism**

In general, these publications do not accept unsolicited articles, and are comprised of articles solicited from contemporary art historians and critics. Though the process is different than traditional academic peer review, writers and reviewers are selected based on previous writing and scholarship, which constitutes a form a peer review.

*Artforum, Frieze, Art in America*

### **Museum Studies and Related Disciplines**

Because Museum Studies is a relatively new discipline, a brief list of scholarly journals that employs a rigorous process of peer review is supplied below for guidance. The list does not cover all areas of specialization in Museum Studies and not all peer-reviewed journals in the field.

In general, journals that employ a rigorous process of peer review in Museum Studies can be divided into the following two categories:

- International: Top journals with an international readership and reputation: *Curator, Museum Management and Curatorship, Museum International, International Journal of Arts Management, International Journal of Cultural Property, Journal of Cultural Heritage Management and Sustainable Development, Journal of Cultural Heritage, Heritage and Society, International Journal of Heritage Studies*, and others.
- National: Excellent journals of national scope: *Collections, Exhibitionist, Journal of Museum Education, Journal of the History of Collections, Visitor Studies, Museum History Journal, Museums and Social Issues*, and others.

Because of the multi-disciplinary nature of museum work, publishing in areas relevant to specific academic fields such as Art History, Anthropology, History, Classics, or the Natural Sciences is also possible. Rather than supplying a list here, candidates engaged in this type of work must publish in scholarly journals that employ a rigorous process of peer review in the relevant academic discipline.

For example, journals that employ a rigorous process of peer review in the areas of Pre-Columbian Art History and in Archaeology can be divided into the following three categories:

- International: Top journals with an international readership and reputation: *Latin American Antiquity, American Antiquity, American Anthropologist, Journal of Archaeological Science, Cambridge Archaeological Journal, Current Anthropology, Anales del Instituto de Investigaciones Estéticas (UNAM), Art Bulletin, Art Journal, Getty Research Journal*.
- National: Excellent journals of national scope: *Journal of Island and Coastal Archaeology, North American Archaeologist, American Indian Quarterly, Latin American Studies Association Bulletin*.
- Regional: Excellent journals with a regional focus. These are far more important in Pre-Columbian art history and in archaeology than in other fields; research is

often data rich and has a strong place-based orientation: *California Archaeology*; *Journal of California and Great Basin Anthropology*, *Ancient Mesoamerica*.

The list of scholarly journals is not intended to be restricted to publications using paper and ink; the key to determining the significance of an article is not the medium of publication, but the review process, the scholarly reputation of the journal or other publisher, and the critical reception of the article by the discipline. One example of a Museum Studies journal that employs a rigorous peer review process is *Museum and Society*.

### **Evaluation of a Major Exhibit**

External reviewers will conduct evaluation of a major exhibit so that written peer review can take place. Reviewers who agree to evaluate the exhibit should visit the exhibit on a day that it is open to the public, and submit a written evaluation of the exhibit within six weeks of the visit. The candidate may supply the RTP Committee with supplemental material that can include bibliographies; relevant proposals; evidence of exhibition development, design and implementation; and information about the curation of materials to be exhibited, in a form that can be shared with the reviewer.

Reviewers will be asked to assess the general impact of the exhibit, and will be supplied with the following information. High Quality exhibits often possess some of the characteristic listed below: the exhibit demonstrates an awareness of audiences; audiences are involved in developing or evaluating the exhibit; content is thoroughly researched and vetted for accuracy, relevance to exhibition theme/s, and the current state of topic knowledge; the selection and presentation of objects furthers the intellectual content of the exhibition; the information/message of the exhibition is clear and coherent; the selection, design, and production of interpretive media effectively and engagingly communicate content; and the exhibition is designed such that the experience of the visitor is taken into account.

If a specific exhibit is still in development during a period of time when a candidate is to be evaluated, material related to the exhibit can be substituted instead, such as exhibit briefs, grant proposals, time lines, curatorial assessments, and other material.

### **Appendix III**

A University Museum, through its curatorial activities, is the place where the academy meets other scholars, students, and the public. The Director of such an organization employs both a scholarly or academic skill set through his or her *Curatorial* activities, as well as through the application of a professional skill set, in the area of *Management*.

In some cases, the Director and Chief Curator of the Global Museum may be a faculty member from the School of the Art. In these situations, the School of Art considers their activities to fall primarily within *Professional Growth and Achievement*, and specifically in two areas, *Curation* and *Management*, as outlined below.

*Curation:* In evaluating the Professional Growth and Achievement activities of Art faculty serving as a Director of the Global Museum, the School of Art may rely on the definition of a Curator in the *Code of Ethics for Curators* (2009) from the American Alliance of Museums:

Curators are highly knowledgeable, experienced, or educated in a discipline relevant to the museum's purpose or mission...and may do or all of some of the following:

- Remain current in the scholarly developments within their field(s); conduct original research and develop new scholarship that contributes to the advancement of the body of knowledge within their field(s) and within the museum profession as a whole.
- Make recommendations for acquiring and de-accessioning objects in the museum collection
- Assume responsibility for the overall care and development of the collection, which may include artifacts, fine art, specimens, historic structures, and intellectual property.
- Advocate for and participate in the formulation of institutional policies and procedures for the care of the collection that are based on accepted professional standards and best practices as defined by professional organizations
- Perform research to identify materials in the collection and to document their history.
- Interpret the objects belonging or loaned to the museum.
- Develop and organize exhibitions.
- Contribute to programs and educational materials.
- Advocate and provide for public use of the collection.
- Develop or contribute to monographs, essays, research papers, and other products of original thought.
- Represent their institution in the media, at public gatherings, and at professional conferences and seminars.
- Remain current on all state, national, and international laws as they pertain to objects in the museum collection.

*Management:* In evaluating the *Professional Growth and Achievement* activities of Art faculty serving as the Director of the Global Museum, the School of Art may rely on the definition of key professional duties outlined for Museum Directors, based on the work of leading museum professionals Lord and Lord (2009):

- Management and Leadership (applying professional standards and working effectively with staff and board)
- Planning (collections, buildings, people, and funds, including budget and fundraising)
- Policy Formulation (collections, conservation, documentation, access, education, exhibition, information management, research, security, visitors)
- Approval of Procedures (emergency, cataloging, accessioning/legal issues, security, visitors)
- Developing and Maintaining Relationships with (other units) or institutions (other museums, campus units, government, non-profits, communities of interest)

Candidates for review who serve as both as faculty in the School of Art and as Director of the Global Museum can supply selected evidence from the two areas listed above to demonstrate their Curatorial and Management activities in evaluating Professional Growth and Achievement. In addition to the material list in Professional Growth and Achievement in the main body of these criteria, material in the form of technical reports reviewed by relevant museum professionals can be presented.