

Kean University

Tenure and Promotion Guidelines for Professorial Rank Faculty: Department Expectations for Scholarship, Teaching, and Service

Department of Fine Arts (Art History)
College of Liberal Arts

Table of Contents

Table of Contents	1
PURPOSE	2
APPLIES TO.....	2
CAMPUS.....	2
ORIGINS OF THESE CRITERIA	2
MISSION OF THE DEPARTMENT	3
CONTEXT.....	3
Departmental Expectations for Scholarship.....	4
Tenure and/or promotion to the rank of Assistant Professor.	9
Indicators of Scholarly Performance:	10
Promotion to the rank of Associate Professor with Tenure.	11
Promotion to the rank of Full Professor.	14
Departmental Expectations for Teaching	17
Tenure and/or promotion to the rank of associate professor.....	17
Tenure and/or promotion to the rank of professor.....	17
Departmental Expectations for Service	17
Tenure and/or promotion to the rank of associate professor.....	17
Tenure and/or promotion to the rank of professor.....	17
DEPARTMENT PROCEDURES.....	17
ARTP Ratings for Performance.....	17

PURPOSE

To articulate the standards and procedures for promotion and/or tenure for the **Department of Fine Arts: Art History Program**

APPLIES TO

Art History Tenure-Track Faculty within the Department of Fine Arts

CAMPUS

KU

ORIGINS OF THESE CRITERIA

In the development of these criteria, the Art History Program was guided by the following:

- The College Art Association (the major governing body for the field of art and art history), [Standards For Retention And Tenure Of Art Historians](#), last revised in 2021.
- The NSF-funded [Faculty Workload and Rewards Project](#) that surveyed 51 departments at 20 public universities, 2015-2020. Their data-driven findings can be found in this [report](#); most useful are the charts on pp. 36-37. This resource was given by the Kean College of Liberal Art research committee chairs and ad hoc committee chair Chris Bellitto as a useful model for thinking about criteria for evaluating scholarship. The standards listed on pp. 36-37 are specifically for course loads of 4.5-5.5 courses per year. This standard was adjusted below to the traditional course load at Kean of 8 courses per year (not counting possible independent studies as overloads). Given below in the section “Relative weighted measurements of types of scholarly work,” there is a chart for 4/4 course load, as well as a mathematical equation for adjusting course loads that fall below 4/4 for particular faculty in particular semesters, as applicable, including RTR and sabbatical.
- A large part of the verbiage and organization of this document was modeled after Marquette University’s Promotion and Tenure Document, College of Communication, for its clarity, approved by their Provost in 2022.
- Listed below in the section “Tenure and Promotions Expectations” is reference and link to [The College Art Association’s Guidelines for Evaluating Digital Scholarship in Art and Architectural History](#)

In case the links above do not open, here are the full urls in order:

- <https://www.collegeart.org/standards-and-guidelines/guidelines/art-history-tenure>
- <https://advance.umd.edu/fwrp/home#:~:text=The%20Faculty%20Workload%20and%20Rewards%20Project%20is%20an%20NSF%20ADVANCE,up%2C%20assigned%2C%20and%20rewarded.>
- <https://www.acenet.edu/Documents/Equity-Minded-Faculty-Workloads.pdf>
- <https://www.collegeart.org/pdf/evaluating-digital-scholarship-in-art-and-architectural-history.pdf>

MISSION OF THE DEPARTMENT

The criteria presented within this document are designed to promote the fulfillment of the Art History Program within the Fine Art Department's mission.

The mission of the Department of Fine Arts is centered around three interrelated goals: first, to provide exemplary undergraduate and graduate programs of instruction in the studio arts and crafts, art education and art history; second, to encourage the student's creativity and scholarship in these programs and third, to serve the University and the surrounding community through educational and cultural activities.

Goals

- To provide an intellectual and physical environment in which undergraduate and graduate students can learn, explore their creativity, and prepare themselves for lifetime involvement in the arts
- To provide graduate and undergraduate art history and art education programs which are consistent with the professional requirements of those disciplines
- To serve the surrounding community as a resource in the arts

Objectives

- To provide an undergraduate liberal arts art history program (Minor in Art History, and GE courses in Art History).
- To provide professional training in the undergraduate art history program with coursework consistent with the professional needs of those disciplines
- To provide an undergraduate minor in art history
- To provide opportunities for students, across the University, to enroll in courses which meet their general education and free elective degree requirements
- To provide a variety of activities which enrich the cultural life of the University and the surrounding community

CONTEXT

The Art History Program teaches undergraduate art history minors, and undergraduates of other majors, especially in fine art (BA in Fine Art and BFA in Fine Art) and design, and offers two Humanities Option courses in the general education program: AH 1700, and AH 1701.

Departmental Expectations for Scholarship

In the following sections, the procedures and standards for scholarship in the Art History Program are provided for tenure-track faculty seeking tenure and/or promotion to the rank of associate or full professor.

It is the candidate's responsibility to provide information that will assist reviewers in determining a classification of their work.

All art historians will be involved in scholarly/professional activity that is peer-reviewed or otherwise professionally recognized, such as museum curating and public scholarship. Art historians demonstrate this involvement through publications, conference presentations and other public speaking, exhibition curating, consulting, acting as a reviewer, grant-writing, and/or other forms of scholarship and community engagement as listed below under "indicators of scholarly performance."

The Program recognizes that scholarly activities in art history and its related fields are highly competitive with several revisions being the norm before publication, and thus take a great deal of time to bring to fruition, often three years for an article publication from conception through writing, submitting, editing, and revising even under the conditions of course loads lighter than 4/4. For this reason, works in progress will be considered in evaluating a candidate's scholarly activities.

Regarding the qualification of journals as "top ranked":

The Program recognizes that there are few Q1 and Q2 journals specific to Art History; for instance, the most widely-read and highest profile journal in Art History, *The Art Bulletin*, published by the College Art Association (CAA), the national professional association for art historians, has been ranked through the years between Q2 and Q3. The *Art Journal*, CAA's journal of contemporary art, is also ranked between Q2 and Q3. *The Art Bulletin* publishes just eight to nine articles four times a year from the entire field from prehistoric through contemporary art, so access is exceptionally limited. Subfields within art history generally have specific journals devoted to that area, but some do not, meaning publication on these topics may take place in venues outside art history. For instance, publications in Byzantine art history find audiences in journals specific to Byzantine Studies. The audiences for such interdisciplinary topic-specific journals are generally focused, and as such have a smaller number or record of citations – such as Scimago relies upon for their rating system. Because of this, the most highly influential articles in art history do not appear in journals with a large number of citations and the Scimago rating system may not reflect their importance in their respective fields. The quality of such topic-specific journals is appropriately judged according to whether or not they are peer-reviewed and according to the specific university departments or programs with which they are associated. For instance, the prestigious *Byzantine and Modern Greek Studies* is housed at Cambridge University with peer review, and the *International Journal of Surrealism Studies* is the definitive journal in interdisciplinary surrealist studies. Both are

discipline-shaping and yet have a focused readership. These two examples represent the standard for publication and influence in art history. In order to support evaluation, the individual faculty member should give background on the journals in which they are published and their assessment should be regarded before the broader tool of Scimago which is less representative of focused, impactful publications. Art History Program faculty will judge the esteem and high quality of the journal or university/academic/trade publisher. The Program recommends that faculty engage academia.org to share their scholarship, while recognizing the limited function of academia.org as many publishers do not allow the public share of work under contract and as pieces may be posted there which are not peer-reviewed.

Regarding the expectation outlined below of one unit of scholarship per year (which may be met in various ways and not just through a single article publication), the Program recognizes that article publications in art history come out at a slower speed than in different disciplines. For instance, in the sciences articles come out relatively fast with limited content/length and often multiple authors. In contrast, published articles in the humanities are generally more complex in content and longer in length, and are generally by single authors. In art history, in particular, the necessity of acquiring multiple image reproduction rights is regularly cumbersome, expensive, and time-consuming; and because the objects of study are of aesthetic value, the research requires first-hand examination necessitating lengthy travel time often across various continents. This real quality and quantity difference should be taken into account when weighing publications across disciplines against each other. Accordingly, publications in different fields should not all be held to the same schedule. In order to negotiate these very real differences across disciplines, the standard outlined below – of one unit per academic year to meet expectations in research – is by design not geared toward a published article a year, but rather is geared toward a unit of scholarship that may include a combination of other types of work.

Applying the general expectation of one unit of scholarship per year, this is to take effect beginning in 2024, when these standards were implemented. The Program recognizes that in years past at Kean, scholarship was rarely supported and even discouraged; accordingly, those years before 2024 should not be held to the current standard.

Furthermore, as per the 2005 Standards for Retention and Tenure of Art Historians subcommittee recommendations, it is important for programs, departments, and institutions to recognize the “crisis” in book publishing that includes: the shrinking of book publishing opportunities in most areas of the field; the exorbitant and prohibitive prices of images and reproduction fees that can limit the publication of a book; and the move away from commercially unpopular titles by university presses and other conditional factors. In addition, the recent (2020s) difficulty in finding reviewers for article and monograph completion should be taken into consideration. Accordingly, books must not be required for promotion where scholarly article publications are present. A scale for weighing different types of scholarly work is listed below.

The Program recognizes the essential relationship between financial support and the bringing of research to fruition. Therefore, if less or more institutional support has been granted, the

expectations for research and publications should be reduced or increased accordingly. Institutional support may include funds for travel, research, publication and reproduction fees, and course release, among other forms of support of funds and time. In the case where little institutional or external support is present, the expected time to complete a scholarly work should be considered at least twice in length as situations with support.

For those art historians whose research is dependent on travel, especially travel abroad, there should be clear recognition of the financial and time implications of such travel on the faculty member's productivity, especially if self-funded. In these cases, the faculty should identify either the need for research travel in order to yield publication outcomes or the limiting effect that any absence of travel has on publication opportunities. In cases in which the lack of travel detrimentally affects publication outcomes, the faculty should be evaluated more heavily according to other types of scholarly work, such as conference presentations, community-engaged scholarship, public-facing scholarship, pedagogical scholarship, editorial activities such as editing a book or a journal, grant writing, exhibition curating, or exhibition catalog writing or editing, among other "indicators of scholarly performance" as listed below.

For those art historians whose research is intended for the public or a specific community rather than primarily an academic audience, there should be a clear recognition of the time and effort that the individual has put in as well as clear expectations articulated in Program's standards and guidelines for the evaluation of public and community-based scholarship. Examples of public and community-based scholarship may encompass a range of activities, including though not limited to curating exhibitions, conducting oral art history projects, participating in Indigenous ceremonies, writing policy, participating in community forums, engaging in public art projects, and negotiating repatriation cases. As public and community-based scholarship are often ephemeral, the Program's standards should also include clear criteria for the evaluation and documentation of public and community-based research. Modes of documentation and impact may, for example, include a research portfolio, letters from community members documenting the research project's impact on or benefit to the members of a community, and grants acquired.

For those art historians working in collaborations and/or in digital scholarship, there should be clear recognition of the time and effort that the individual candidate has put in as well as clear expectations articulated by the Program in relation to the recognition of digital scholarship (see [College Art Association's Guidelines for Evaluating Digital Scholarship in Art and Architectural History](#)).

Should outside referees or reviewers be consulted as part of the decision process of promotion and tenure, they must be informed of both the institution's and the program's standards and expectations, including the relative weight accorded research, service, and teaching.

The standards outlined below reflect expectations consistent with a 4-4 course load. The current, normal 4-4 course load requires a weekly minimum of 12 hours in the classroom and 12 hours of preparation and grading. This is in addition to 5 office hours weekly for student advisement., and at least 3-6 hours of expected service. Thus teaching and advising demand a

minimum of a total of about 29 hours a week. As faculty are contracted for 35 hours a week, this leaves 6 hours a week which faculty may devote to research; these 6 hours must also be shared by service and are not wholly reserved for research. Accordingly, most or all of the time dedicated to research may likely reach beyond these contracted 35 hours a week, relegating much of the research time dependent upon institutional or external support of time or funds. The Program recognizes that a normal scenario may be that out of a 35 hour work week, after a requisite 29 hours of teaching, class prep, grading, and student advising, a possible 3 hours a week may be dedicated to service (a conservative estimate) and a possible 3 hours a week dedicated to research, writing, publication, presenting, and curating. Accordingly, 3 out of 35 hours is roughly 8-9%. As such, research and publication should be worth no more than 8-9% in any evaluation of faculty for tenure and promotion who carries a 4-4 course load. In cases of a different course load, that percentage should vary accordingly. For instance, in the case of a 3-3 course load, research and publications should account for roughly 33% (based on an expected weekly hours spent in the classroom 9 hours, on course prep and grading 9 hours, 5 office hours, with a remaining of 12 hours for research and publication, out of 35 hours total a week). The Program recognizes the following weighted measurements for evaluating faculty for tenure and promotion, and the listed “quantitative standards” and “qualitative standards” as specific to the discipline of art history.

Relative weighted measurements of types of scholarly work:

The Program has created these weighted measurements using a journal article as the standard unit of measurement merely for the purposes of weighing different types of scholarly work against each other. No specific combination of scholarly works is required and there is no specific “tiers” of types of scholarly work; rather, the work as a whole (as a combination of different types of work) should be considered together. These weighted units should be taken only as a loose guideline, and not as a hard and fast standard, which must shift in accordance to individual faculty profiles. These units roughly correspond to the “indicators of scholarly performance” as listed below in each section.

1/3 unit: organization of a research panel at an academic conference

1/3 unit: participation in academic discussion panels, symposia, workshops, or other presentations (aside from conference presentations)

1/2 unit: an academic conference paper presentation

2/3 unit: the keynote address at an academic conference

1/2 unit: a written grant, whether or not successfully awarded

1/2 unit: public-facing scholarship such as podcasts, websites, community engaged research, and public talks (other than at academic conferences), important as they bridge between Kean and other communities.

1/2 unit: encyclopedia entries

2/3 unit: an edited journal without written contribution within the issue, for each volume

2/3: published book reviews and exhibition reviews

1 unit: a peer-reviewed journal article, invited article, book chapter, or essay in an off-campus museum catalog (The assumption here is that the editor in chief responsible for the invitation or book chapter or museum catalog is the source of peer-review; this is normal in art history and

only established scholars of merit are recipients of such invitations.) No distinction is to be made between print and digital media.

1 unit: an exhibition curated on campus with a hardcopy or digital or web-based exhibition catalog of student entries edited by the faculty

3 units: an off-campus exhibition curated in toto with a catalog edited by the faculty

4 units: an off-campus exhibition curated in toto with a catalog written (not just edited) (Exhibition catalogs are not peer-reviewed in the same way as are journal articles, but nonetheless their scholarly merit is guaranteed by the museum or gallery curatorial staff.)

3 units: an edited book volume in press at the proofs stage

3 units: a textbook, or e-textbook in press at the proofs stage

3 units: a single-author monograph book manuscript under publisher review and at the stage of revision; though a book manuscript in review and revision is not at the stage of accomplishment as a book in press, it is a strong documentation of on-going research at the advanced stage in which the work is being recognized by outside professional peers such that a press commits to the growth of that work. Any units earned by a book manuscript in revision will be wholly replaced once the book is published, according to the units below.

4 units: a single-author monograph book in press at the proofs stage. In art history, single book chapters are usually equal to or longer than a normal article, and most books contain at least 5 chapters; thus a book normally represents more work than 4 articles.

Within evaluations for promotion, the level of expectations for advancement will increase through the ranks. The number of “units” should be accumulative throughout an entire career and not since the last annual appointment, acquisition of tenure, or promotion. Only when taken cumulatively, can the following standards apply. These unit standards are based on a 4/4 course load, which is the traditional course load at Kean University across all disciplines.

For course load reduction:

For each single 3-hour/1 course reduction, add 1/8 units the expectation in the chart below.

This number of 1/8 is arrived at by: $1 \div \frac{1}{8} = \frac{1}{8}$

- 1 = number of units per year to meet expectations with Kean’s traditional 4/4 course load
- $\frac{1}{8}$ = 1 out of 8 courses in a 4/4 course load over 2 semesters
- $\frac{1}{8}$ units = the value of 1 course in a 4/4 course load

In accordance with the amount of time needed to produce one unit worth of scholarship (the equivalent of 1 article) specific to practices in the field of art history, the addition of 1/8 unit should be used to adjust for a single course reduction in any one semester. For instance, if a faculty received a full year sabbatical, that would equal an 8-course reduction (over 2 semesters) times 1/8 units (for each course reduction) to equal 1 scholarship units. Translated into scholarly work units, 1 unit, for instance, may equal the production of a published peer-reviewed article (worth one unit), or alternatively, an academic conference paper presentation (worth $\frac{1}{2}$ units) with a public-facing scholarly podcast ($\frac{1}{2}$ units).

The units given below should be adjusted for course load reduction.

The faculty should state their achievements in terms of these units for clarity.

EXPECTATIONS BASED ON A 4/4 COURSE LOAD Use the math formula above to adjust for other course loads.	EMERGING EXPECTATIONS	MEETS EXPECTATIONS	EXCEEDS EXPECTATIONS
Annual appointment before tenure	0 - 1/3 unit per year	1/2 - 1 unit per year	>1 1/3 unit per year
Acquisition of tenure	2 - 2 2/3 units cumulative	3 units cumulative	>3 1/3 units cumulative
Promotion to associate professor	5 - 5 2/3 units cumulative	6 units cumulative	>6 1/3 units cumulative
Promotion to full professor	8 - 8 2/3 units cumulative	9 units cumulative	>9 1/3 units cumulative

Should program, departmental, or institutional standards or requirements for research, service, or teaching substantially change during the probationary period of a faculty member, the candidate should either be allowed to continue to serve under the standards in force at the time of initial appointment or be given an appropriate amount of time (normally three additional years) to meet the new standards. This would be especially important regarding any clock for tenure.

Annual Appointment and Acquisition of Tenure

The Art Historian will provide evidence of engagement in scholarly activities that have the potential for peer-review, as well as non-peer-reviewed scholarship including invited essays and chapters, curating, and public facing scholarship such as podcasts, websites, professional social media sites, and public talks. This is a satisfactory level of scholarly activity. During the early years as Assistant Professor, the art historian should be building a record of such recognized scholarly activities.

For continuing annual appointments, one would expect presentations of scholarly work at regional, national, or international conferences, articles written and being submitted for publication, and other evidence of scholarly activities. By the year before the tenure application, some of this work should have reached fruition and received positive peer-review, i.e., acceptance for presentations or publications.

Tenure and/or promotion to the rank of Assistant Professor.

In the Art History Program, the following scholarship expectations to meet University standards apply for the award of tenure.

Indicators of Scholarly Performance:

- peer reviewed journal articles, equally including hardcopy, digital, and open access
- invited articles
- book chapters
- community-engaged scholarship
- encyclopedia entries
- service as editor or guest editor of a journal without written contribution within the issue
- research presentations at academic conferences, keynote speakers at academic conference; organizing panels at academic conferences
- participation in academic panels, symposia, workshops, or other presentations (aside from conference paper presentations)
- public facing scholarship: podcasts, websites, community engaged research, public talks
- textbooks and e-textbooks in the candidate's area of research; not merely under contract, but in-press at the proofs stage; an accepted manuscript in the revision stage (but not yet in press) should be considered as a partial fulfillment of this accomplishment.
- exhibition catalogs,¹ both edited and written
- exhibition curating or co-curating, both on and off campus
- grant writing
- creation of new courses and significant program development

Quantitative Standards:

Refer to section above "Relative weighted measurements of types of scholarly work."

Qualitative Standards:

Standard evidence of the quality journal is typically shown by the fact that it follows a refereed, masked peer-review process. The candidate will provide evidence of the ranking, impact factor, acceptance rate, review process, publication reputation, and any other relevant information about the nature of the venue to establish that they are publishing in high quality outlets. The Scimago rating system misses nuances of discipline-specific conditions and in this way is not a reliable indicator for art history. By "scholarship," the Program considers the scholarship of pedagogy to be included, equally weighted as other types of scholarship, and equally judged according to the peer-review standards of journal publications and academic conferences.

Typical Indicators of Research Quality:

¹ Museum exhibition and collection catalogs are not, by and large, peer-reviewed in the traditional sense. The long lead times required for blind peer review do not accommodate the tight schedules of most exhibition catalogs, which must appear when shows open. Yet exhibition catalogs do undergo a form of peer review. Though not blind, it is thorough, as the collaborative curatorial teams that produce exhibition catalogs, as well as museums' editorial departments and consultants, carefully evaluate the scholarship contained within, striving to ensure that it is accurate and of the highest possible quality. Museum publications are often recognized for their significant contributions to the advancement of scholarship.

- External evaluations solicited by the dossier preparer providing assessments of the candidate's published scholarly work, taking into account its depth and breadth, its contribution to theory and practice, its methodological rigor, and its originality.
- Citation search data that demonstrate the impact of the candidate's work on the field.
- Acquisition of internal or external grant funding for scholarly projects.
- Any research honors, awards, or fellowships.
- Community-engaged scholarship demonstrates evidence of a reciprocal relationship with communities and organizations that yields innovations and documented results that can be replicated and are professionally and/or peer-reviewed and have evidence of impact.

Promotion to the rank of Associate Professor with Tenure.

In the Art History Program, the following expectations to meet University standards apply for the promotion to the rank of professor.

The Art Historian should be able to demonstrate achievement at a satisfactory level of scholarly contributions while an Assistant Professor through a combination of presentations, publications, awards, grants, and/or other peer-reviewed or public-facing scholarly activities. For example, a combination of regional, national, or international presentations with publications and other scholarly activities would meet the satisfactory criteria. However, other means of demonstrating scholarly work is acceptable. Meeting or exceeding this level of scholarly activity for a sustained period will be considered satisfactory for promotion to Associate Professor.

The criteria outlined below are supplementary to those given in the university promotion and tenure document.

Candidates going up for promotion to associate professor are normally expected to have produced an average of one scholarly work every two years, based on candidates having a 4-4 teaching load. What counts as "scholarly works" is defined below, and can include scholarly books (as author or editor), textbooks and e-textbooks, peer reviewed journal articles, invited articles, book chapters, community-engaged scholarship, encyclopedia entries, service as editor or guest editor of a journal without written contribution within the issue, research presentations at academic conferences, academic panels, symposia, keynotes, workshops, or other presentations (aside from conference paper presentations), textbooks in the candidate's area of research, websites in the candidate's area of research, podcasts in the candidate's area of research, and the creation of new courses. Works that are in-press count toward promotion, but the candidate must include a confirmation from the editor indicating that the work has been

accepted. Peer-reviewed work published in electronic format carries equal scholarly weight to one in hardcopy. By “scholarship,” the Program considers the scholarship of pedagogy to be included, equally weighted as other types of scholarship, and equally judged according to the peer-review standards of journal publications and academic conferences.

Indicators of Scholarly Performance:

- scholarly books (as author or editor);
- not merely under contract, but in-press at the proofs stage; an accepted manuscript in the revision stage (but not yet in press) should be considered as a partial fulfillment of this accomplishment.
- peer reviewed journal articles, equally including hardcopy, digital, and open access
- invited articles
- book chapters
- community-engaged scholarship
- encyclopedia entries
- service as editor or guest editor of a journal without written contribution within the issue
- research presentations at academic conferences, keynote speakers at academic conference; organizing panels at academic conferences
- participation in academic panels, symposia, workshops, or other presentations (aside from conference paper presentations)
- public facing scholarship: podcasts, websites, community engaged research, public talks
- published reviews of the candidate’s scholarly work
- textbooks and e-textbooks in the candidate’s area of research; not merely under contract, but in-press at the proofs stage; an accepted manuscript in the revision stage (but not yet in press) should be considered as a partial fulfillment of this accomplishment.
- exhibition catalogs² both edited and written
- exhibition curating or co-curating, both on and off campus
- grant writing
- creation of new courses and significant program development

Work published in electronic format carries equal scholarly weight to one in hardcopy.

Works that are in-press count toward promotion, but the candidate must include a confirmation from the editor indicating that the work has been accepted.

Quantitative Standards:

- Refer to section above “Relative weighted measurements of types of scholarly work.”

² Museum exhibition and collection catalogs are not, by and large, peer-reviewed in the traditional sense. The long lead times required for blind peer review do not accommodate the tight schedules of most exhibition catalogs, which must appear when shows open. Yet exhibition catalogs do undergo a form of peer review. Though not blind, it is thorough, as the collaborative curatorial teams that produce exhibition catalogs, as well as museums’ editorial departments and consultants, carefully evaluate the scholarship contained within, striving to ensure that it is accurate and of the highest possible quality. Museum publications are often recognized for their significant contributions to the advancement of scholarship.

- Generally, at least half of the candidate's research output should be research articles in blind, peer-reviewed publications. Normally, at least one third of the candidate's peer-reviewed publications should be sole or first authored.
- When candidates have co-authored publications, the college committee will weigh the candidate's contribution relative to that of their co-authors. Candidates should provide a chart indicating the approximate percentage of their contribution to co-authored work.

Qualitative Standards:

- A candidate's body of scholarly work will be evaluated on the basis of its originality, its depth and breadth, its contribution to theory and practice, its methodological rigor, and its placement in high quality outlets. Reviews of the candidate's work – either as published reviews or by blind reviewers from the publishing house's peer-review system or a journal's peer-review system – may be used to estimate the quality of work when supplied by the candidate. Outside, invited reviewers may be used to evaluate the quality of the candidate's work; candidates should invite reviewers or submit names of reviewers.
- Standard evidence of the quality journal is typically shown by the fact that it follows a refereed, masked peer-review process. The candidate will provide evidence of the ranking, impact factor, acceptance rate, review process, publication reputation, and any other relevant information about the nature of the venue to establish that they are publishing in high quality outlets. The Scimago rating system misses nuances of discipline-specific conditions and in this way is not a reliable indicator at least for art history.

Typical Indicators of Research Quality:

- External evaluations solicited by the dossier preparer providing assessments of the candidate's published scholarly work, taking into account its depth and breadth, its contribution to theory and practice, its methodological rigor, and its originality.
- Citation search data that demonstrate the impact of the candidate's work on the field.
- Acquisition of internal or external grant funding for scholarly projects.
- Any research honors, awards, or fellowships.
- Community-engaged scholarship demonstrates evidence of a reciprocal relationship with communities and organizations that yields innovations and documented results that can be replicated and are professionally and/or peer-reviewed and have evidence of impact.

Promotion to the rank of Full Professor.

In Art History, both the cumulative record and work that was done while an Associate Professor is considered. Promotion to Full Professor requires a sustained, substantive level of scholarly activities, at the regional, national, or international levels. Promotion to Full Professor requires a satisfactory level of scholarly activity combined with a satisfactory level of teaching and service. For illustration, a combination of presentations (regional, national, or international conferences, and/or the scholarly programming associated with exhibition curating) with major publications (such as a scholarly monograph, a major text, an exhibition catalog, or a series of peer-reviewed articles or invited chapters) would constitute a satisfactory level in scholarship for promotion to Full Professor. However, other means of demonstrating a satisfactory level in scholarly activities are also acceptable. Digital publications are considered equal in scholarly status to those in print. By “scholarship,” the Program considers the scholarship of pedagogy to be included, equally weighted as other types of scholarship, and equally judged according to the peer-review standards of journal publications and academic conferences. Meeting or exceeding this level of scholarly activity for a sustained period will be considered satisfactory for promotion to Full Professor.

The criteria outlined below are supplementary to those given in the university promotion and tenure document.

Candidates going up for promotion to full professor are normally expected to have produced an average of one scholarly work every two years, based on a 4-4 teaching load. What counts as scholarly works is defined below in “INDICATORS OF SCHOLARLY PERFORMANCE.”

Indicators of Scholarly Performance:

- scholarly books (as author or editor); not merely under contract, but in-press at the proofs stage; an accepted manuscript in the revision stage (but not yet in press) should be considered as a partial fulfillment of this accomplishment.
- peer reviewed journal articles, equally including hardcopy, digital, and open access
- invited articles
- book chapters
- community-engaged scholarship
- encyclopedia entries
- service as editor or guest editor of a journal without written contribution within the issue
- research presentations at academic conferences, keynote speakers at academic conference; organizing panels at academic conferences
- participation in academic panels, symposia, workshops, or other presentations (aside from conference paper presentations)
- public facing scholarship: podcasts, websites, community engaged research, public talks
- published reviews of the candidate’s scholarly work
- textbooks and e-textbooks in the candidate’s area of research; not merely under contract, but in-press at the proofs stage; an accepted manuscript in the revision stage (but not yet in press) should be considered as a partial fulfillment of this accomplishment.

- exhibition catalogs³ both edited and written
- exhibition curating or co-curating both on and off campus
- grant writing
- creation of new courses and significant program development

Work published in electronic format carries equal scholarly weight to one in hardcopy.

Works that are in-press count toward promotion, but the candidate must include a confirmation from the editor indicating that the work has been accepted.

Quantitative Standards:

- Refer to section above “Relative weighted measurements of types of scholarly work.”
- At least one-third of published articles should be in peer-reviewed, national or international journals.
- Research venues, publishing houses, and academic conferences should have a national or international audience.
- Candidates for promotion to professor are normally expected to have at least half of their scholarly work as sole or first author.
- Publications can include invited scholarly publications up to one half of their output.
- Scholarly books count 3, 4, or 5 times more than one scholarly article, depending on the type, length, and quality of the book. (See the section above “Relative weighted measurements of types of scholarly work.”) By scholarly book, the Program means a book in-press at the proofs stage and not merely under contract; an accepted manuscript in the revision stage (but not yet in press) should be considered as a partial fulfillment of this accomplishment.
- When candidates have co-authored publications, the college committee will weigh the candidate’s contribution relative to that of their co-authors. Candidates should provide a chart indicating the approximate percentage of their contribution to co-authored work.
- Works published or disseminated in electronic forms count equal to those in hardcopy.

Qualitative Standards:

- A candidate’s body of scholarly work will be evaluated on the basis of its originality, its depth

³ Museum exhibition and collection catalogs are not, by and large, peer-reviewed in the traditional sense. The long lead times required for blind peer review do not accommodate the tight schedules of most exhibition catalogs, which must appear when shows open. Yet exhibition catalogs do undergo a form of peer review. Though not blind, it is thorough, as the collaborative curatorial teams that produce exhibition catalogs, as well as museums’ editorial departments and consultants, carefully evaluate the scholarship contained within, striving to ensure that it is accurate and of the highest possible quality. Museum publications are often recognized for their significant contributions to the advancement of scholarship.

and breadth, its contribution to theory and practice, and its methodological rigor. Reviews of the candidate's work – either as published reviews or by blind reviewers from the publishing house's peer-review system or a journal's peer-review system – may be used to estimate the quality of work when supplied by the candidate. Outside, invited reviewers may be used to evaluate the quality of the candidate's work; candidates should invite reviewers or submit names of reviewers.

- Standard evidence of the quality of a top-tier journal is typically shown by the fact that it follows a refereed, masked peer-review process. The candidate will provide evidence of the ranking, impact factor, acceptance rate, review process, publication reputation, and any other relevant information about the nature of the venue to establish that they are publishing in high quality outlets. The Scimago rating system misses nuances of discipline-specific conditions and in this way is not a reliable indicator for art history.

Indicators of National and International Reputation:

The candidate should also provide evidence that their work has had a significant impact on the field and that they have established an international and national reputation as a scholar.

This can be demonstrated by, for example:

- Publication in prestigious journals with competitive acceptance rates and/or high impact factors
- Citation data showing the candidate is widely cited in their field
- Invitations to publish, contribute or present research
- The acquisition of exterior grants and awards
- Receipt of research awards and recognitions
- Service as editors or guest editors of scholarly publication
- Memberships on editorial boards
- Letters from scholars in their field attesting to the importance of their contributions

Departmental Expectations for Teaching

The Department of Fine Arts/Art History follows the General University Guidelines for Teaching.

Tenure and/or promotion to the rank of associate professor.

The Department of Fine Arts/Art History follows the General University Guidelines for tenure/promotion to Associate Professor in the area of Teaching.

Tenure and/or promotion to the rank of professor.

The Department of Fine Arts/Art History follows the General University Guidelines for promotion to Full Professor in the area of Teaching.

Departmental Expectations for Service

The Department of Fine Arts/Art History follows the General University Guidelines for Service.]

Tenure and/or promotion to the rank of associate professor.

The Department of Fine Arts/Art History follows the General University Guidelines for tenure/promotion to Associate Professor in the area of service.

Tenure and/or promotion to the rank of professor.

The Department of Fine Arts/Art History follows the General University Guidelines for promotion to Full Professor in the area of service.

DEPARTMENT PROCEDURES

ARTP Ratings for Performance

Using the criteria described above, the candidate's performance in the areas of teaching, scholarship, and service will be rated using the terms "exceeds", "meets", or "needs improvement", defined as follows:

1. "Exceeds" means the candidate exceeds expectations for tenure and/or promotion to this rank.
2. "Meets" means the candidate meets expectations for tenure and/or promotion to this rank.

3. “Needs Improvement” means the candidate falls below expectations for tenure and/or promotion to this rank.

Absent exceptional circumstances, no candidate may be recommended for promotion or tenure without meeting standards in all applicable areas of performance, and strong candidates are likely to exceed expectations in one or more categories.

APPROVED BY:

The Art History Program.

APPROVED ON:

2/3/25

**Tenure and Promotion Guidelines for Professorial Rank Faculty:
Department Expectations for Scholarship, Teaching and Service
Department of Fine Arts (Art History)
College of Liberal Arts**

The aforementioned disciplinary expectations detailed have been developed reviewed and approved by the departmental faculty, the College Dean, and the Provost.

NOTE: For candidates for reappointment, the disciplinary standards in effect during a faculty member's first year of employment are used for reappointment and tenure decisions. Candidates for promotion use the disciplinary standards in effect in the year in which they apply for promotion.

_____	11/11/25
Department Chair	Date
_____	_____
College Dean	Date
_____	_____
Provost	Date

Review and Approval:

Effective Date: September 1, 2026

Policy Review Cycle: Years ending in 0 and 5 or as needed

This document may be amended by a two-thirds vote of the department's tenured and tenure-earning faculty. After an amendment, it must be approved by the Offices of the Dean and Provost.

Change History:

