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The Department of Art Faculty Development and Evaluation Manual supplements and complements the Auburn University Faculty Handbook and College of Liberal Arts guidelines. Since the basic and fundamental review of faculty takes place within the department, the purpose of these guidelines is to describe and elaborate upon the criteria and guidelines for faculty assignments, faculty evaluation, and promotion and tenure at the departmental level. Department guidelines are intended to conform to those of the Auburn University Faculty Handbook (revised 6/17/11) and the College of Liberal Arts. Therefore, it is important for faculty to study carefully the criteria, requirements, and procedures outlined in these guidelines and in the University and College documents. In event of conflict among documents, their precedence is University, College, Department. Any reference to the Faculty Handbook in this document refers to the current version.

The Art department’s faculty evaluation process is intended to guide faculty toward enhanced success; clarify faculty goals; inform annual assignments that reflect the short and long-term vision of the department; include faculty in discussions and decisions; and provide consistent and clear criteria for promotion and tenure recommendations, as applicable.

The faculty evaluation process in the College of Liberal Arts includes several components, among them the letter of appointment, annual workload assignment, and annual performance reviews and feedback. Tenure track and Clinical track positions include provision for promotion review. Tenure track faculty are subject to a third-year review to determine the extent to which the individual is making clear progress toward tenure. Failure to demonstrate clear progress in teaching, research, outreach, and service (as applicable to the faculty member’s assignment) may lead to the issuance of a letter of non-continuance at any time before tenure. The focus of the third-year review for clinical track faculty is the faculty member’s progress toward achieving promotion to associate clinical professor, yet still recognizing that clinical faculty are on continuing appointments that necessitate annual contract renewal. Failure to demonstrate clear progress in assigned areas of performance (such as clinical teaching, clinical outreach, service, scholarship, professional development) may lead to the issuance of a letter of non-continuance, effective at the conclusion of the annual contract in force.

Reference to “Tenure track” faculty in this document includes tenured faculty, unless otherwise noted.

The Appointment Letter

The appointment letter defines broad expectations of the position, including percentages of the assignment allocated to teaching, research, outreach, and service. Examples of appointment letters may be found at the following URL:
https://sites.auburn.edu/academic/COLA/CLA_Dean/cladeptguidelines/SitePages/Home.aspx

Annual Workload Assignment

Annual faculty assignments reflect that faculty members working in various disciplines contribute in different ways. Annual assignment plans reflect collaborative discussion between faculty and department chair. They provide opportunity to review progress, set goals, guide faculty toward success, and clarify metrics of evaluation. All Tenure track, Clinical track, and Non-Tenure track faculty should participate in formalized annual assignment planning and feedback. Instructors and Lecturers will normally participate in this process.

The College of Liberal Arts Workload Guidelines state:

Initial workload assignments for tenure-track faculty (TTF) are negotiated upon hire, and are distributed across all areas of responsibility; teaching, research/creative scholarly works, outreach, extension and service. Occasionally, administrative duties may also be included as a percent of a faculty member’s workload if it is part of their normal assignment. Workload assignments may be adjusted on an annual basis during the annual review process to reflect any changes in a faculty member’s assignment for the following year. The department head/chair meets with each faculty member during the faculty annual
review process to discuss and negotiate anticipated workload changes. The faculty member signs the annual review which includes the stated workload assignment for the following year to assure that every faculty member is aware of his/her responsibilities. The original signed annual review is to be kept in the departmental personnel file. Three copies are to be submitted to the Office of the Dean (one copy will be kept on file in the Dean’s Office, one copy will be placed in the CLA’s faculty personnel file and one copy will be delivered to the Office of the Provost).

Description of Types of Faculty Positions

Tenure Track Faculty (TTF)
The “typical” annual teaching assignment for “research active” TTF is 5 courses\(^1\) (or department FTE equivalent) equaling 62.5% per year. Consistent with university guidelines, all research active TTF are assigned a minimum 25% research/creative/scholarly outreach\(^2\) workload for promotion and tenure purposes. The annual teaching assignment for “highly productive” research TTF is 4 courses\(^3\) (or department FTE equivalent) equaling 50% per year. The status of highly productive research TTF requires the approval of the Dean. In situations where a tenured associate professor or professor is not fulfilling a 25% requirement for scholarly activity, the department chair will provide a memorandum of understanding (MOU) to ensure that a tenured faculty member has a 100% workload. In this case, the faculty member would be assigned a differential workload with a minimum of 10% research, in order to stay current in the field for teaching purposes. It is expected that the faculty member will receive an increase in the teaching load, with the understanding that he/she cannot be promoted just on teaching. Research productivity will be considered over a 3 year period. If a faculty member is not research productive for 3 years, then there will be an increase in the teaching load proportionally. During that 3-year period, if he/she does becomes productive and demonstrates that he/she can be productive for 3 years in research, then there will be a reduction in the teaching load to acknowledge the increase in research.

Clinical Track Faculty (CTF)
CTF are generally assigned teaching loads ranging from 5-8 courses a year (or department FTE equivalent). There is not a minimum research workload requirement. According to AU guidelines\(^4\) the clinician title series is a professional series for appointment of appropriately qualified individuals who contribute to the university’s academic mission by participation in activities which (1) predominantly involve clinical practice, (2) are of contractually specified duration, and (3) operate under contracts, grants, generated income, or other designated funds. Note, however, that CTF are expected to teach in the clinical setting.

Instructors/Lecturers
Instructors and Lecturers will be assigned 100% teaching loads of 8 courses per year. Any exceptions will need approval by the Dean. In addition to the definition of teaching stated in the Faculty Handbook, teaching in CLA includes: holding regular office hours, mentoring and advising students, keeping current in the field, attendance of departmental meetings relevant to teaching, participating in departmental life and the engagement of students.

Non-Tenure-Track Faculty (NTTF – as designated by HR)
NTTF may be assigned some teaching; but it cannot exceed one course per semester and three courses per year.

Appendix 1 outlines the university’s expectations for teaching, research, outreach, and service.

---

1 A course is defined as a 3 contact hour course.
2 “In terms of your questions, it is my understanding that the former Provost said that a tenure track faculty member on hire must have a minimum of 25% research, scholarship of pedagogy or outreach, or creative activity. Therefore, I will continue that tradition.” - Email from Dr. Mazey sent to Paula Bobrowski 5/10/2009.
3 Ibid.
4 http://www.auburn.edu/academic/provost/clinician_positions.html#appointment
Workload adjustment for sabbaticals and leaves. Faculty on sabbatical or professional development leave related to teaching would normally be evaluated as a temporary 100% teaching appointment for leave extending across the evaluation period. Faculty on sabbatical or professional development leave related to research would normally be evaluated as a temporary 100% research appointment for leave extending across the evaluation period. A similar allocation may apply for other types of leave. In any case, the evaluation metrics must add up to 100% and factor in the faculty member's regular appointment during the portion of the review period not on leave.

See Appendix 2 for Departmental Workload Guidelines.

Annual Performance Reviews and Feedback

The annual review serves as a tool for faculty development at all ranks, regardless of tenure status.

All faculty receive annual evaluations. All Tenure track faculty, Clinical track faculty, Non-Tenure track faculty, Instructors, and Lecturers should participate in formalized annual assignment planning and feedback.

Performance Descriptors. The annual review of performance in each area to which one is assigned will be assessed a performance score of 4 - Exemplary (characterizing performance of high merit), 3 - Exceeds Expectations (characterizing performance of merit), 2 - Meets Expectations (characterizing performance sufficient to justify continuation but, for areas of expected significant contribution, not sufficient to justify promotion or tenure), 1 – Marginal (characterizing performance that may not be sufficient to justify continuation) or 0 – Unacceptable (characterizing performance not sufficient to justify continuation).

See Appendix 3 for Workload Distribution and Performance Review Chart.

The annual review normally covers performance for the preceding calendar year. Research productivity will be considered over a 3-year period. Evaluative statements from previous years will be consulted to determine response to previous suggestions for improvement and to determine the extent to which the individual is making progress toward promotion and tenure, if applicable, to their appointment.

See Appendix 4 for Departmental Annual Review Guidelines.

Written evaluation report

The AU Faculty Handbook states:

The unit head shall prepare a written report summarizing the major points of the conference. A copy of the report shall be provided to the faculty member within a month of the conference. If there are no objections, the faculty member shall be asked to sign it as confirmation of having seen it. If the faculty member does not agree with the material in the report, he or she may write a response to be appended to the report. A copy of the signed report and response, if there is one, is to be retained for the faculty member's departmental personnel file; another copy is to be given to the faculty member; a third copy is sent to the Office of the Provost. To the extent permitted by law, the report is to remain confidential, available only for the use of the concerned faculty member and any University officials who have supervisory power over the faculty member.

Third-Year Review

The AU Faculty Handbook states:

Each department shall conduct a third year review of all its probationary faculty members. This shall take place no later than 32 months after initial appointment, normally before April 30 of the faculty member's third year. The head shall request a current vita and any supporting material the head or the faculty member deems appropriate prior to the review. The particular focus of this review is the faculty member’s progress toward achieving tenure. The review therefore must address the criteria for tenure set forth in
this document. To be maximally useful to the candidate and the department, the review shall involve the entire tenured faculty. In order for it to accurately reveal the judgment of tenured faculty, it shall conclude with a vote on whether or not, in the judgment of the tenured faculty, the candidate is making appropriate progress toward tenure. The result of the vote shall be announced at the meeting. Faculty should understand that this vote is not a commitment to grant or deny tenure in the future.

The head shall prepare a written report covering the findings of the review, and characterizing the nature of the vote. The procedure described above for the report on the yearly conference shall be followed, with the difference that this report may be consulted by the tenured faculty when the faculty member is a candidate for tenure; otherwise, the report is to remain confidential [to the extent allowable by law].

See Appendix 5 for Departmental Third-Year Review Guidelines.

Promotion and Tenure Review

The AU Faculty Handbook states:

Promotion is based on merit. A candidate for promotion should have acceptable achievements in the areas of 1) teaching and/or outreach and 2) research/creative work. He or she is further expected to demonstrate over a sustained period distinctive achievement in one of these areas or achievement in both areas comparable to that of successful candidates in the discipline in the past five years. In addition, he or she is expected to have contributed some service to the University. Candidates covered by Provost approved departmental promotion and tenure guidelines will be evaluated accordingly. For candidates not covered by Provost approved departmental promotion and tenure guidelines, the criteria for teaching, research/creative work, and outreach described below [see Appendix 1] shall be considered by the faculty in the evaluation of a candidate's performance and achievement. The candidate's employment conditions and academic assignments shall determine which criteria are most emphasized, and standards for promotion are based on the weights of each performance area as described in the letter of offer and subsequent annual evaluations. Credit shall also be given for contributions above and beyond specifically assigned duties.

Appendix 1 outlines the university's expectations for teaching, research, outreach, and service.

Regarding tenure, the AU Faculty Handbook states:

Auburn University nurtures and defends the concept of academic tenure which assures each faculty member freedom, without jeopardy at the department, college or school, or University level, to criticize and advocate changes in existing theories, beliefs, programs, policies, and institutions and guarantees faculty members the right to support, without jeopardy, any colleague whose academic freedom is threatened. Tenure establishes an environment in which truth can be sought and expressed in one's teaching, research/creative work, outreach work, and service. In addition to demonstrating quality in the areas of 1) teaching, 2) research/creative work, 3) outreach and 4) service as described above under Promotion Criteria and, where applicable, in approved departmental guidelines, the candidate for tenure must also demonstrate potential to contribute as a productive and collegial member of the academic unit in all relevant areas.

Candidates for promotion and tenure should carefully read the Promotion and Tenure policies found in the AU Faculty Handbook. A timeline for the candidate's submission of materials for evaluation for promotion and tenure will be established each year by the Office of the Provost.

See Appendix 6 for Departmental Promotion and Tenure Guidelines.

Post-Tenure Review

Tenured faculty at Auburn are subject to post-tenure review as outlined on the Provost's website at the following URL: http://www.auburn.edu/academic/provost/policies/2009-11_post-tenured-review-policy.pdf
Appendix 1

Auburn University’s Expectations for Teaching, Research, Outreach, and Service

Teaching
The AU Faculty Handbook states:
Since a primary activity of the University is the instruction of students, careful evaluation of teaching is essential. Because of the difficulty of evaluating teaching effectiveness, faculty members are urged to consider as many relevant measures as possible in appraising the candidate. These include consideration of the candidate's knowledge of the subject and his or her professional growth in the field of specialization; the candidate's own statement of his or her teaching philosophy; the quality of the candidate's teaching as indicated by peer and student evaluations and teaching awards; performance of the candidate's students on standardized tests or in subsequent classes; the candidate's contributions to the academic advising of students; the candidate's development of new courses and curricula; the quality of the candidate's direction of dissertations, theses, independent study projects, etc.; and the quality of pedagogical material published by the candidate.

Research/Creative Work
The AU Faculty Handbook states:
A faculty member engaged in research/creative work has an obligation to contribute to his or her discipline through applied and/or basic research, through creative endeavors, or through interpretive scholarship. To a large extent, each discipline and each department must determine how much and what quality of research/creative work is appropriate for promotion (and/or tenure) and judge its candidates accordingly. In appraising the candidate's work, faculty members should consider the quality and significance of the work, the quality of the outlet for publication or exhibition, and, in cases of collaborative work, the role of the candidate.

Research and creative work ordinarily can be documented by a candidate's publications or performances/exhibitions. Publication subjected to critical review by other scholars as a condition of publication should carry more weight than publication that is not refereed. Nevertheless, all forms of publication, including articles intended for a non-academic audience, should be considered provided they are of high quality in relation to the purpose intended. Scholarly papers subjected to peer review and delivered at a regional or national conference and creative work subjected to peer review and performed or exhibited on a regional or national level should carry more weight than work done only on a local level.
Successful efforts in obtaining extramural support for research/creative work (as well as for teaching and outreach programs) should also be positively considered in evaluation of the candidate.

Outreach
The AU Faculty Handbook states:
Outreach refers to the function of applying academic expertise to the direct benefit of external audiences in support of university and unit missions. A faculty endeavor may be regarded as outreach scholarship for purposes of tenure and promotion if all the following conditions are met: 1) there is a substantive link with significant human needs and societal problems, issues or concerns; 2) there is a direct application of knowledge to significant human needs and societal problems, issues, or concerns; 3) there is utilization of the faculty member's academic and professional expertise; 4) the ultimate purpose is for the public or common good; 5) new knowledge is generated for the discipline and/or the audience or clientele; and 6) there is a clear link/relationship between the program/activities and an appropriate academic unit's mission. Outreach is not expected
of all faculty. Participation in this function varies from major, continuing commitments, as
is the case with the Alabama Cooperative Extension System, through intermittent
engagement for individual faculty as needs and opportunities for a particular expertise
arise, to no involvement at all.

The commitment of faculty time to outreach is a decision to be made by the faculty
member with the approval of the department in which the faculty member will seek tenure
and/or promotion. It may be accomplished in the initial appointment, as is typically the
case for Extension faculty, in annual work plans, or during the year in response to
unexpected needs. In any case, this decision should be made with due consideration to
the professional development of the faculty member, the expected public benefits of the
outreach activities, and mission of the department and/or other supporting units.
Departmental approval carries a commitment to assess and appropriately weigh outreach
ccontributions in salary, tenure, and promotion recommendations.

Demands for quality in outreach are the same as in teaching and research/creative work;
however, outreach activities are different in nature from other activities and must be
evaluated accordingly. See Appendix 1 of Faculty Participation in Outreach Scholarship:
An Assessment Model, which is available along with other publications on the
assessment of outreach under "Outreach Publications" on the University web site.
Department heads should request any material necessary from the candidate to facilitate
faculty assessment of the type, quality, and effectiveness of the candidate's involvement
in extension activities and evaluation of any resulting publications.

**Service**

The AU Faculty Handbook states:

University service includes participating in departmental, college or school, and University
governance and committee work, assisting in the recruitment of new faculty, and
developing and assisting in the implementation of new academic programs. Faculty
should note particularly distinctive contributions to University life on the part of the
candidate, including service to the candidate's profession, such as offices held and
committee assignments performed for professional associations and learned societies;
and editorships and the refereeing of manuscripts.
Appendix 2

Departmental Workload Guidelines for Tenure-Track Faculty

Department of Art normal teaching load is:
5 courses studio art
4 courses art history *This reduction is due the writing intensive nature of the courses.

Teaching 70% (62.5% teaching, 5% advising, 2.5% senior project committee or art history capstone)
Research 25%
Service 5%
Outreach (optional, negotiated)

Percentage assignments may be renegotiated during Annual Reviews and adjusted to reflect research and outreach efforts. The negotiation will be between the faculty member and the Department Chair. Annual Review results for next year and thus raises, if there are any, will be a function of the negotiated percentage assignment. A minimum of twenty-five percent research is required for promotion.

Other example percentage assignments:

A Fine Arts faculty member who is engaged in minimal creative/research but who wishes to continue with this level of research would teach 7 courses per year with the following percentage assignment.
Teaching 87.5%
Research 10%
Service 2.5%
Outreach (optional, negotiated)

An Art Historian faculty member who is engaged in minimal creative/research but who wishes to continue with this level of research would teach 6 courses per year with the following percentage assignment.
Teaching 87.5%
Research 10%
Service 2.5%
Outreach (optional, negotiated)

Faculty holding the rank of Associate Professor who negotiate a reduced research percentage will be notified in writing by the Department Chair that this will impede progress toward promotion to Professor.
## Appendix 3

**Workload Distribution and Performance Review Chart**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Faculty</th>
<th>Instruction</th>
<th>Research</th>
<th>Outreach</th>
<th>Service</th>
<th>Administrative</th>
<th>TOTAL SCORE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dr. X</td>
<td>0.63</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Performance Score/Criteria**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>Unacceptable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Marginal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Meets expectations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Exceeds expectations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Exemplary</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 4: Annual Review Guidelines
Department of Art

1. Introduction: Like its peers, Auburn University’s Department of Art seeks excellence from its faculty. It recognizes the need to identify guidelines and expectations for quality in teaching, research, service, outreach, and administration. This document is meant to clarify departmental standards and expectations and will be revised and amended on a regular cycle or whenever faculty see the need to do so. Like faculty in the sciences or humanities, the art faculty are actively engaged in scholarship and creative activity. However, unlike the sciences or humanities, the outputs of scholarship in the Department of Art may take forms other than publication. For example, in the disciplines of studio art, peer-reviewed commissions and art exhibitions are viewed as significant as a peer-reviewed journal article.

2. Review Period

2.1. The review period will consist of the preceding three years (January in year 1 through December 31 in year 3). This will allow individuals to count research activities occurring from January through December during the three years of the review period. This will also allow individuals to include teaching evaluations from Spring year 1, Fall year 1, Spring year 2, Fall year 2, Spring year 3 and Fall year 3 (and any summer courses taught during that period).

2.2. Faculty who have joined the department less than three years prior to their review should include all activities from the start of their appointment, but may include earlier items from other academic institutions.

3. Evaluation Procedure: Performance evaluations of all full-time faculty members are required and conducted annually by the department head in accordance with the Faculty Handbook and the Department of Art Guidelines. An unfavorable annual review for tenure-track faculty may lead to the issuance of a letter of non-continuation at any time prior to tenure.

3.1. Timeline: By January 10 of each year, each faculty member must submit to the head in writing a comprehensive year-end report, to be placed on permanent file, that details the individual’s work in the areas of teaching, research, service, outreach, and, when appropriate, administration.

3.2. Head and faculty performance evaluation meeting: Within one month of receipt of the faculty member’s report, the head will meet individually with him or her. The performance evaluation meeting will consist of:
- Discussion of the faculty member’s year-end report, including its strengths and weaknesses.
- Development of a plan for the next academic year geared toward achieving new and continuing research and teaching goals for the faculty member.

3.3. Written performance evaluation: Within one month of meeting with each faculty member, the head will provide him or her with a written report, to be placed in their permanent file, that:
- Summarizes discussion from the performance evaluation meeting.
- Classifies the faculty member’s performance in each area of evaluation as specified below.
- Reports the departmental average, median, and distribution of scores (high and low scores) within each area of evaluation. Small deviations from the median are to be expected.

3.4. Provision for Appeal: Within one month of the receipt of the written performance evaluation, faculty may submit appeals in writing to the Department Head. A meeting between the faculty
member and the Department Head should be held within two weeks of the submission of the appeal.

4. Percentage Assignments

4.1. The faculty member and the head will mutually agree upon the percentage assignments for research, teaching, service, outreach, and administration during the previous year's review. Changes in percentage assignment must be justified by a corresponding change in activities within that area (e.g. research grants, substantial curricular changes, etc.). Workload assignments will be governed by the Department of Art Workload Guidelines. (Appendix 2). Under ordinary circumstances, the expectation is that tenured and untenured, tenure-track faculty will have a research assignment of 25%. However, in extraordinary circumstances, it is understood that faculty may deviate from these assignments to pursue significant, unexpected opportunities. For faculty with outreach assignments, the combination of outreach and research assignments will ordinarily be 25%.

4.2. Medical or family leaves will not be included in the review process.

4.3. Professional leaves:
   - Untenured, tenure-track faculty are expected to continue to contribute service and appropriate administrative activity during semester releases granted by the College of Liberal Arts.
   - Tenured faculty will be considered 100% research while on professional leave granted by the College of Liberal Arts.

4.4. Extra-departmental assignments (e.g. administrative assignments for the College of Liberal Arts) are evaluated by the faculty member's extra-departmental supervisor and will be included in departmental annual reviews.

5. Calculation of numerical ratings

5.1. As part of their evaluation, the department head will assign to each faculty member a rating of their overall performance as well as their specific performance in the categories of Instruction, Research, Outreach, Service, and Administration. Ratings used will be Exemplary, Exceeds Expectations, Meets Expectations, Marginal, or Unacceptable.

5.2. Each of the ratings in the annual review will be based on a scale of 0 to 4 according to the following guidelines.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Scaled Rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Exemplary</td>
<td>3.50 – 4.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exceeds expectations</td>
<td>2.50 – 3.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meets expectations</td>
<td>1.50 – 2.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marginal</td>
<td>0.50 – 1.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unacceptable</td>
<td>0.00 – 0.49</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These evaluation scores will be then weighted using the faculty member's percentage assignments. For example, if a faculty member received ratings of 4.00 for teaching, 3.20 for research, and 2.80 for service, his or her weighted score would be calculated as follows:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assignment</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Appointment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching</td>
<td>70 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research</td>
<td>25 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outreach</td>
<td>0 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service</td>
<td>5 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Score</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assignment</th>
<th>Evaluation rating</th>
<th>Raw weighted score (Raw weighted score X 25)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teaching</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>2.80 (Raw weighted score X 25) 70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research</td>
<td>3.20</td>
<td>0.80 (Raw weighted score X 25) 20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outreach</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA (Raw weighted score X 25) NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service</td>
<td>2.80</td>
<td>0.14 (Raw weighted score X 25) 3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA (Raw weighted score X 25) NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Score</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.74 (Raw weighted score X 25) 93.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6. Use of evaluations

6.1. The annual review is separate and distinct from the third-year review process and tenure and promotion decisions. Promotion requires a sustained record of accomplishment in at least two areas of research, teaching, outreach or service. (see Appendices 6 and 7).

7. Teaching Criteria: Because of Auburn University’s “concern for good teaching” (AU Faculty Handbook (Chap. 4.1)), teaching effectiveness is an important consideration in the review process. In recognition of the complexity of evaluating the quality of instruction, evidence will be based on multiple instruments including peer, chair, and student evaluations. More than marginal teaching is expected.

7.1. Teaching activities may include but are not limited to:

- Number, type of courses taught, and enrollment over last three years: including lectures, seminars, studios, and independent studies. (Number of course preparations should be understood in relationship to departmental needs and curricular demands.)

- Course effectiveness: Demonstrated by aggregate student evaluations from the previous 3 years. Faculty may choose evaluations from one class per year during that 3-year period. Ideally and whenever possible, faculty should select evaluations from different courses.

- Course syllabi and assignments

- Student advising:
  - Identify number of students per semester
  - Student internships
  - Student organizations

- Senior project committee: Number of students and position on committee (e.g. Chair), excepting faculty ineligible for this committee.

- Honors program: students directed

- Papers and Conference Participation
  - Presentation of paper at international conference
  - Presentation of paper at national conference
  - Presentation of paper at regional conference
  - Organize panel for international or national conference
  - Organize panel for regional conference
  - Chair or provide comment for a panel at conference

- Teaching innovations:
  - Special topics courses developed
  - Revision of existing course material
  - Incorporation of new technology and/or techniques
  - Software / technical / workshop training
  - Distance learning

- Collaboration with other disciplines, universities, museums, institutions and clients

- Teaching awards and grants
• Organization of student exhibitions, exhibitions of the students of art education students, or student symposia

• Student outcomes: Evidenced by student performance on papers, projects, exams, and/or in subsequent classes. (For example, for projects, external jury member comments about the work may be cited.)

• Integration of scholarly activity into teaching: Cite and document (syllabus, class assignments, etc.) examples where scholarly work was incorporated into class materials.

• Student field trips

• Unassigned or voluntary activities that enhance learning experiences and advance the educational mission of the department.

7.2. Use of Student evaluations: When reviewing student evaluations the following considerations will be taken into account by the department head. Note: the criteria set forth below will be used until new teaching evaluations are fully implemented at which time the criteria will be re-examined.

• Level and type of course. e.g. courses for art majors in their major field.

• Enrollment population. e.g., art majors vs. non-majors in art history survey courses (required as part of core) or elementary school art (required for education majors).

• Number of enrolled students

• Grade breakdown per class

7.3. Exemplary teaching is the highest level of teaching performance. This level is assigned to faculty members who regularly teach full loads in relation to their work assignment and departmental practice; regularly include substantive and methodological renewal in classes and/or receive teaching awards; regularly advise students, supervise and/or serve on senior project committees; and regularly receive course evaluations among the best in the department (defined as above the departmental median or 2.5 on a scale of 4.0, whichever is lower).

7.4. Faculty whose teaching exceeds expectations regularly teach full loads in relation to their work assignment and departmental practice; regularly include substantive and methodological renewal in classes and/or receive teaching awards; regularly advise students, supervise and/or serve on senior project committees; and regularly receive good course evaluations (defined as above the departmental median or 2.5 on a scale of 4.0, whichever is lower).

7.5. Faculty whose teaching meets expectations regularly teach full loads in relation to their work assignment and departmental practice; periodically include substantive and methodological renewal in classes; regularly advise students, supervise and/or serve on senior project committees; and regularly receive average / satisfactory course evaluations (defined as near the departmental median or 2.5 on a scale of 4.0, whichever is lower).

7.6. Marginal teaching is close to the lower limit of qualification or acceptability. This level is assigned to faculty members who do not consistently teach full loads in relation to their work assignment and departmental practice; seldom include substantive and methodological renewal in classes; provide poor or no student advising; seldom supervise and/or serve on senior project committees; and receive average/ marginal course evaluations (defined as well below the departmental median or 2.0 on a scale of 4.0, whichever is lower). Consistent positive evaluations do not equate to the meeting of promotion and tenure standards.

7.7. Unacceptable teaching consistently fails to meet established expectations. This level is assigned to faculty members who do not teach full loads in relation to their work assignment and departmental practice; include no substantive and methodological renewal in classes; provide poor or no student advising; do not supervise and/or serve on senior project committees; and receive poor course evaluations (defined as well below the departmental median or below 1.5 on a scale of 4.0, whichever is lower).
8. **Research Criteria**: The Department of Art recognizes that there are important and inherent differences among the disciplines of art history, art education, and studio art. Moreover, the Department values and promotes a diversity of practices within each of those areas in accord with its mission to educate students about the full breadth of the worlds of art and art education. Therefore, guidelines have been established for each respective area without prescribing or mandating general types of research/creative activity. The Department of Art has also deliberately refrained from establishing a specific quantity of research activity which faculty must have. Rather, the Department of Art considers the quality of faculty work and their entire record.

8.1. **Art History**:

8.1.1. In Art History, research and publication are the major fields of scholarly activity. It is expected that faculty are able to present evidence of substantial, sustained scholarly activity over an extended period of time.

8.1.2. Research activities include but are not limited to

- **Publication**:
  - Book, in print (scholarly, general readership, textbook, etc.)
  - Editor of volume of essays, in print
  - Editor of museum catalogue, in print
  - Curate major museum exhibition
  - Book under contract
  - Article in juried, national or international scholarly journal, in print
  - Article in juried regional scholarly journal, in print
  - Article in non-refereed journal or book, in print
  - Article in juried, national or international scholarly journal, under contract
  - Article in juried regional scholarly journal, under contract
  - Article in non-refereed journal or book, under contract
  - Article in juried, national or international scholarly journal, submitted
  - Article in juried regional scholarly journal, submitted for review
  - Article in non-refereed journal or book, submitted for review
  - Published book review

- **Awards and Grants**
  - Research grant from international granting agency
  - Research grant from national granting agency
  - Research grant from regional granting agency

- **Editorial Work**
  - Member of editorial board for scholarly journal
  - Outside reader/juror for journal or publishing house

- **Papers and Conference Participation**
  - Presentation of paper at international conference
  - Presentation of paper at national conference
  - Presentation of paper at regional conference
  - Organize panel for international or national conference
  - Organize panel for regional conference
  - Chair or provide comment for a panel at conference

- **Invited Lectures**
  - Invited lecture outside University
  - Invited lecture within University

8.1.3. Generally, research for an art historian can be gauged by the quality and quantity of scholarly publications and activities. The quality of scholarly research, in particular, can be evaluated by the intersection of the columns/hierarchies listed in the following table:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stature of Venue/Press/Journal/ Professional Organization by rank of importance</th>
<th>Publications</th>
<th>Scholarly/Professional Contributions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>International</td>
<td>Book (scholarly)</td>
<td>Papers and Conference Presentations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National</td>
<td>Sole author</td>
<td>Paper presentation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional</td>
<td>Editor</td>
<td>Organize panel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local</td>
<td>Multiple authors</td>
<td>Chair/Commenter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Article (juried/peer-reviewed)</td>
<td>Invited Lectures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sole author</td>
<td>Editorial Work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Multiple authors</td>
<td>Member of editorial board for scholarly organization, journal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Outside reader/juror for scholarly press, journal</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

8.2. **Art Education**

8.2.1. Workshops, panels, lectures, pre-teaching experiences, publications and the creative activity inherent in Studio Arts are viable forms of research in Art Education. It is expected that faculty are able to present evidence of substantial, sustained scholarly activity over an extended period of time.

8.2.2. Research activities in Art Education may include but are not limited to:

- **Workshops**
  - Visiting Artist/Art Educator presentations
  - Invited Workshops and demonstrations outside University
  - Invited Workshops and demonstrations within University
- **Professional/Community Consulting (Specify local, regional, national, international):**
- **Conference panels**
  - Organize panel for international or national conference
  - Organize panel for regional conference
  - Chair or discussant for a panel at conference
  - Presentation of paper at international conference
  - Presentation of paper at national conference
  - Presentation of paper at regional conference
- **Lectures**
  - Visiting Artist presentations
  - Invited lecture outside University
  - Invited lecture within University
- **Juror / curator of exhibitions**
  - Professional competitions
  - Collegiate competitions
  - Community youth competitions
- **Grants and / or fellowships (pending, funded, non-funded)**
  - Research grant from international granting agency
  - Research grant from national granting agency
- Research grant from regional granting agency
- Grants and fellowships for research/creativity (studio arts)

- Awards received for research/creativity
  - Awards associated with exhibitions
  - Commissions
  - Interactive courseware
  - Original designs in print, film, video, online, CD or DVD.

- Adjudicated exhibitions: (Specify local, regional, national, international):
  - Competitive juried exhibitions
  - Invitational exhibitions
  - Media events
  - Art fairs (specify stature of fair and acceptance rates, as well as whether gallery fair or individual artist fair)
  - Online exhibitions and publications

- Publications
  - Book under contract
  - Illustrations
  - Creative work reproduced in textbooks, journals, and online publications
  - Articles, essays or books published or in progress

- Representation
  - Gallery
  - Museum
  - University
  - Corporate
  - Notable private collections

8.2.3. Generally, research can be gauged by the quality and quantity of activities. Specifically, the quality of activities can be evaluated by considering the reputation of the institution, the geographical range (i.e., local, state, regional, national, international), the acceptance rate, awards received by the candidate, reviews of the candidate’s work by qualified critics, scholars, etc. Generally speaking, the quality of the activity should be determined by the intersection of the columns / hierarchies listed on the following table:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Venue by rank of importance</th>
<th>Statute of Organization/Institution/Juror/Curator</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>International</td>
<td>International</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National</td>
<td>National</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional</td>
<td>Regional</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local</td>
<td>Local</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This table is intended to provide a rough guideline only.

8.3. Studio Art

8.3.1. In the studio arts, creative activity is the major form of research. Creative activity and commissioned work, in particular, are considered equivalent to extramurally-funded research in other fields. It is expected that faculty are able to present evidence of substantial, sustained creative activity over an extended period of time.

8.3.2. Research activities in the studio arts may include but are not limited to:

- Adjudicated exhibitions (Specify local, regional, national, international):
  - Competitive juried exhibitions
  - Curated exhibitions
  - Invitational exhibitions
  - Competitive art fairs (specify stature of fair and acceptance rates, as well as
whether gallery fair or individual artist fair) 
- Competitive online exhibitions and publications
- Awards received for research/creativity
  - Awards associated with exhibitions
  - Grants and fellowships for research/creativity
- Visiting Artist presentations
  - Workshops and demonstrations
  - Lectures
  - Panel presentations
- Juror / curator of exhibitions
  - Professional competitions
  - Collegiate competitions
- Commissions
- Gallery representation (For some, the commercial gallery may not be a suitable venue for exhibition or indicator of excellence.)
- Representation in museum, university, corporate and notable private collections
- Creative work reproduced in textbooks, journals, and online publications
- Review of creative works in journals, newspapers and other publications
- Articles, essays or books published or in progress
- Representation of original works in databases and/or slide collections

8.3.3. Generally, creative research can be gauged by the quality and quantity of activities. Specifically, the quality of exhibitions can be evaluated by considering the reputation of the jurors, the reputation of the exhibiting institution, the nature of the show (i.e., all media, limited to one discipline or theme, etc.), the geographical range (i.e., local, state, regional, national, international), the acceptance rate, prizes received by the candidate, reviews of the candidate’s work by qualified critics, scholars, etc. Generally speaking, the quality of the activity should be determined by the intersection of the columns / hierarchies listed on the following table:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stature of Venue/Press/Journal/Professional Organization by rank of importance</th>
<th>Exhibitions</th>
<th>Publications</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>International</td>
<td>Solo Invitational / Curated</td>
<td>Book</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National</td>
<td>Two-person Invitational / Curated</td>
<td>• Sole author</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional</td>
<td>Group Invitational / Curated</td>
<td>• Editor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local</td>
<td>• Media specific</td>
<td>• Multiple authors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• All-media</td>
<td>Article</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Juried</td>
<td>• Sole author</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Media specific</td>
<td>• Multiple authors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• All-media</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This table is intended to provide a rough guideline only. It is understood that some work is not amenable to gallery or commercial settings (e.g. ephemeral art, environmental art, some installations, etc.).
8.3.4. *Regional* is defined by exhibitions, reviews and venues where the work is juried or selected from a regional pool of artists and the audience is principally regional in scope, whereas a *national* exhibition is selected from a pool of artists having either a national audience or national reach through the reputation of the venue or through publications. This can be true even when the exhibition is held in the region. In the case of juried competitions, the level and scope of the competition, as evidenced by such data as the number and geographic range of applicants, are factors that a candidate can use to document the status of a particular venue. Part of the definition of establishing a national record is participation in exhibitions outside of the Southeast, and in venues that have been selected by nationally recognized jurors or curators and/or held at reputable private galleries, university galleries, art centers or museums across the country as recognized by experts in the field of specialization. An *international* exhibition is selected from an international pool of artists and has an international audience even when the venue takes place in the United States. Part of the definition of establishing an international record is regularly participating in exhibitions outside of the country, and in venues that have been selected by internationally recognized jurors or curators and/or held at reputable galleries, art centers or museums abroad.

8.3.5. Grants for creative work, commissions and all other creative projects may also be categorized as regional, national, or international depending on the client, location and process of selection. Reviews, catalogue reproductions, articles and books of an artist’s work are also part of the evidence used to judge the stature of a candidate’s work as an artist. Papers delivered at regional, national, or international conferences, artist residencies, visiting artist lectures and other public presentations will also be considered as part of the candidate’s evidence of recognition. The expected number of art exhibitions may vary depending on medium. The scale of a particular artist’s work or the nature of the materials should also be taken into consideration when judging the record and number of shows. Solo exhibitions or closely curated smaller group shows should also be given more weight if they are at reputable and established regional, national, and international venues.

8.3.6. For some studio faculty, critical and historical writing about studio art, as it relates to art disciplines, may also be presented as evidence of research. In the case of publications, the quality of the publication, the type of journal, the reputation of the publisher, acceptance rates, whether the publication is co-authored or the work of the candidate alone, reviews of the publications, and so forth will be used to determine the quality of the contribution.

8.4. Exemplary research is the highest level of research performance and is deserving of merit. This level is assigned to faculty members who consistently publish/disseminate scholarship (books, journal articles, creative works, technical reports, conference presentations, etc.) through well-ranked international/national sources; consistently engage in research activities listed above; and/or consistently receive externally funded grants, taking into account different levels of funding available across disciplines; and/or receive international/national awards for research/creative activity.

8.5. Research that exceeds expectations is deserving of merit and assigned to faculty members who consistently publish/disseminate scholarship (books, journal articles, creative works, technical reports, conference presentations, etc.) through well-ranked national/regional sources; consistently engage in research activities listed above; and/or consistently receive externally funded grants, taking into account different levels of funding available across disciplines; and/or receive national/regional awards for research/creative activity.

8.6. Research that meets expectations is deserving of merit and assigned to faculty members who occasionally publish/disseminate scholarship (books, journal articles, creative works, technical reports, conference presentations, etc.) through well-ranked national/regional sources; occasionally engage in research activities listed above; and/or occasionally receive externally funded grants, taking into account different levels of funding available across disciplines.
8.7. Marginal research is assigned to faculty members who demonstrate some progress in research and/or writing but do not publish/disseminate scholarship (books, journal articles, creative works, technical reports, conference presentations, etc.) through well-ranked national/regional sources or engage in the research activities listed above.

8.8. Unacceptable research is assigned to faculty members who provide no evidence of progress in research and writing; consistently fail to meet established expectations; fail to publish/disseminate scholarship (books, journal articles, creative works, technical reports, conference presentations, etc.) through well-ranked national/regional sources; fail to engage in research activities listed above; and/or fail to receive externally funded grants, taking into account different levels of funding available across disciplines.

9. Outreach

9.1. Definition: Outreach can be defined as the function of applying academic expertise to the direct benefit of external audiences in support of university and unit missions. Faculty should consult the Auburn University Faculty Handbook for specific guidelines of what constitutes outreach for promotion and tenure consideration.

9.2. Outreach activities in the arts may include but are not limited to:
   9.2.1. Alumni outreach
   9.2.2. Civic engagement
   9.2.3. Collaboration with community groups and arts organizations related to the mission of the Department, School and University
   9.2.4. Membership on art-related civic/community boards, committees, etc.
   9.2.5. Participation in the Alabama Prison Arts and Education Project
   9.2.6. Other off-campus activities (e.g. Auburn City Kids)

9.3. Faculty should present evidence of the type, quality, and effectiveness of their involvement in outreach activities. This evidence may include but is not limited to:
   9.3.1. Description of the activity or program
   9.3.2. Summaries of primary contributions, communication to users
   9.3.3. Significance and scope of use, impact, and benefits
   9.3.4. Evidence of commercial and/or societal value
   9.3.5. Evidence of acceptance and adoption by peers
   9.3.6. Evidence of leadership and team contributions

9.4. Demands for quality in outreach are the same as in teaching and research / creative work; however, outreach activities are different in nature from other activities and must be evaluated accordingly. Generally, outreach can be evaluated using criteria similar to those laid out by the Committee on Assessment of Outreach (August 2000):
   9.4.1. Objectives: Specific objectives accomplished
   9.4.2. Methodology employed in the activity
   9.4.3. Contribution: Uniqueness of the activity. Value to wider audiences.
   9.4.4. Mode of the activity: Report submitted to the audience, a live presentation or telecast, a video, or other means of communicating the intended knowledge.
   9.4.5. Individual’s contribution to activity. Role of other involved parties.
   9.4.6. Expertise: Specificity of activity to the discipline. Relationship of activity to training and / or research.
9.4.7. Physical: Location of work performed and university-supported physical resources used.

9.4.8. Funding: Source and purpose of funding for the activity.

9.4.9. Unit and disciplinary compatibility: Compatibility of activity with the university unit (i.e., department, college/school mission) and the discipline. Its contribution, if any, to the teaching and research missions of the unit and societal/human problems. New knowledge generated for the discipline and/or audience.

9.4.10. Nature of the audience and impact of the activity.

9.4.11. Quantitative Results:

9.4.11.1. Direct Beneficiaries (client): Short-term (less than 1 year) quantitative impact on the client. Long-term (more than 1 year) impact on the client.

9.4.11.2. Indirect beneficiaries: Groups that will indirectly benefit from the activity.

9.4.12. Qualitative Results

9.4.12.1. Direct beneficiaries: Qualitative benefits that accrue to the client.

9.4.12.2. Indirect beneficiaries: Evidence of favorable local public response, national or international impact, or indirect benefit to other groups.

9.5. Exemplary outreach is the highest level of outreach and is deserving of merit. This level is assigned to faculty members who provide documentation for multiple or complex projects that are compatible with the discipline, accomplish specific objectives, clearly document individual contributions and expertise, obtain significant funding, and demonstrate significant quantitative and qualitative results on agency or audiences.

9.6. Outreach that exceeds expectations is deserving of merit and assigned to faculty members who document significant work on project(s) that are compatible with the discipline, accomplish specific objectives, clearly document individual contributions and expertise, obtain significant funding, and demonstrate significant quantitative and qualitative results on agency or audiences.

9.7. Outreach that meets expectations is deserving of merit and is assigned to faculty members who provide documented work on an existing project; and evidence of efforts to expand the reach of the project or create new one(s). Such projects will be compatible with the discipline, accomplish specific objectives, clearly document individual contributions and expertise, obtain funding, and demonstrate quantitative and qualitative results on agency or audiences.

9.8. Marginal outreach is assigned to faculty members who demonstrate some work on a project or with agency but little/no documented progress or impact.

9.9. Unacceptable outreach is assigned to faculty members who provide no evidence of activity.

10. Service:

10.1. Types of activities include but are not limited to the following:

10.1.1. Departmental

- Committees (The time commitments of committee work should be weighted to account for demanding appointments, such as search committees.) Indicate whether acted as committee chair or held other position.
- Area coordinators
- Student recruiting (e.g. portfolio reviews, tours, parents met, etc.)
- Public relations presentations
- Participating in departmental special programs
- Unassigned or voluntary activities that advance the educational mission and/or support the functioning and administration of the department.

10.1.2. College
• Committees (Specify volunteered, assigned, elected, invited, ad hoc). Indicate whether acted as committee chair or held other position.

10.1.3. University
• University committees and subcommittees. Specify volunteered, assigned, elected, invited, ad hoc. Indicate whether acted as committee chair or held other position.
• University faculty senate.
• University special programs

10.1.4. Professional
• Officer in professional organization
• Membership and participation in professional organizations
• Participation in professional workshops, conferences and conventions
• Other professional service appropriate for the faculty member in the department

10.1.5. Supervision/Maintenance of area/facility

10.1.6. Design work for committee/office/organization

10.1.7. Mentoring
• Junior faculty
• Staff
• Students

10.2. Exemplary service is the highest level of service performance. This level is deserving of merit and is assigned to faculty members who demonstrate exceptional contributions, through quality and effort, to the profession, state, university, department and/or community.

10.3. Service that exceeds expectations is deserving of merit and is assigned to faculty members who contribute broadly, with quality and effort, to the profession, state, university, department and/or community.

10.4. Service that meets expectations is deserving of merit and is assigned to faculty members who contribute, with quality and effort, to the profession, state, university, department and/or community.

10.5. Marginal service is assigned to faculty members who contribute minimally, in quality and effort, to the profession, state, university, department and/or community.

10.6. Unacceptable service is assigned to faculty members who do not contribute to the profession, state, university, department and/or community.

11. Administrative:

11.1. Types of activities include but are not limited to the following:

11.1.1. Budget management
• Projecting of budget
• Effective budget management
• Reporting of budget

11.1.2. Exhibitions and lectures planning and scheduling
• Solicit exhibitions and lecturers
• Propose exhibitions and lecturers to Exhibition and Lectures Committee

11.1.3. Exhibitions
• Initial and follow-up correspondence with artists
• Arrange for and facilitate arrival and return shipment of artwork
• Arrange for insurance of artwork
• Design of exhibition
• Installation and de-installation of exhibition
• Plan for receptions
• Maintain exhibitions and lectures schedule
• Facilitate gallery maintenance and upkeep

11.1.4. Lectures
• Facilitate payment procedures with visiting lecturers
• Arrange for travel and accommodations for lecturers
• Arrange venue for lecturer
• Prepare itinerary for lecturer

11.1.5. Public relations
• Facilitate the promotion of exhibitions and lectures

11.1.6. Student worker management
• Schedule and work with student employees
• Gallery publications designer
• Gallery assistants

11.2. Generally, administrative performance is gauged by the quality and quantity of activities. Specifically, the quality of exhibitions and lecturers can be evaluated by considering the reputation of the exhibition or lecturer, the geographical range represented by the exhibition or lecturer, and the fulfillment of goals to bring conceptually and materially diverse artwork to campus and to support the mission and vision of the department.

11.3. Exemplary administration is the highest level of administrative performance. This level is deserving of merit and is assigned to faculty members who contribute exceptionally, both in quality and quantity, to the exhibition and lecture program by bringing internationally / nationally recognized artists, scholars and a diverse range of quality artwork to campus.

11.4. Administration that exceeds expectations is deserving of merit and is assigned to faculty members who contribute significantly, both in quality and quantity, to the exhibition and lecture program by bringing nationally / regionally recognized artists, scholars and a diverse range of quality artwork to campus.

11.5. Administration that meets expectations is deserving of merit and is assigned to faculty members who contribute to the exhibition and lecture program by bringing nationally / regionally recognized artists, scholars and quality artwork to campus.

11.6. Marginal administration is assigned to faculty members who contribute minimally to the exhibition and lecture program.

11.7. Unsatisfactory administration is assigned to faculty members who fail to contribute to a quality exhibition and lecture program.

Revised Fall 2009. Next revision Fall 2012.
12. Format of Annual Faculty Performance Review:

Name:
Date of appointment:
Rank:
Date of appointment to current rank:
Percent Allocation for current year:
   • Teaching: %
   • Research: %
   • Outreach: %
   • Service: %
   • Administrative: %

Review Period: January 20__ through December 20__

• Please note that under each item below, you should list your activities over a three-year span in reverse chronological order.
• Refer to the Guidelines for Annual Faculty Reviews document for a specific listing of the types of teaching, research (for your area), outreach, and service activities that may be included in your report. Please follow the sequence of these lists.
• Faculty who joined the department less than three years ago should include all activities from the start of their appointment, but may include earlier items from other institutions if they wish.

1. Teaching
   • Activities for three-year review period

2. Research/Creative Activity
   • Activities for three-year review period

3. Outreach (if applicable)
   • Activities for three-year review period

4. Service
   • Activities for three-year review period

5. Administrative (if applicable)
   • Activities for three-year review period

6. Comments on last year’s plan for this year (Philosophy and self-evaluation, as appropriate, are highly recommended for untenured, tenure-track faculty and faculty preparing for promotion)
   • Teaching
   • Research
   • Service
   • Outreach (if applicable)
   • Administrative (if applicable)

7. Plans for next year
   • Teaching
   • Research
• Service
• Outreach (if applicable)
• Administrative (if applicable)

8. Proposed Percentage Allocation for next year and justification
Appendix 5
Departmental Third-Year Review Guidelines

The Third-Year Review Guidelines of the Department of Art follow the guidelines and procedures set forth in the Faculty Handbook. It is highly recommended that the third-year review dossier follow the Promotion and Tenure format contained in the Faculty Handbook.

An unfavorable third-year review may result in the issuance of a letter of non-continuation; however, a letter of non-continuation may be issued at any time prior to tenure.
Appendix 6

Departmental Promotion and Tenure Guidelines

A. Statement of Purpose

Like its peers, Auburn University’s Department of Art seeks excellence from its faculty. It recognizes the need to identify guidelines and expectations for the promotion and tenure of its faculty. This document outlines the criteria and procedures to be used in the Department of Art for promotion and tenure of faculty. The standards described, while specific to the disciplines, are intended to be consistent with, and supportive of, both the University’s tenure and promotion guidelines (see Auburn University Faculty Handbook, Chapter 3, section 11 and those of the College of Liberal Arts). These guidelines will be reviewed periodically and revised/updated as the department sees necessary.

The Department of Art has three areas of instruction and research: studio art, art history, and art education, and these areas have inherent differences. Moreover, the Department values and promotes a diversity of practices within each of those areas in accord with its mission to educate students about the full breadth of the art world. Therefore, guidelines have been established for research in each respective area. In Art History, peer-reviewed publications are the primary and most-highly valued means of disseminating research. In the disciplines of studio art, peer-reviewed design commissions and exhibitions of creative works are the primary means of measuring research productivity. For Art Education, peer-reviewed publications, stemming from scholarship and outreach endeavors, are the primary research goals. In all three disciplines, peer-reviewed conference presentations as well as invited lectures are also significant evidence of research, but are not valued as highly.

B. General Guidelines for Academic Rank

1. Appointment As Assistant Professor

It is expected that the appointee shall hold a recognized terminal degree in a field of specialization. In the areas of studio arts the recognized terminal degree is the M.F.A. In art history and art education the recognized terminal degree is the Ph.D.

The appointee is expected to show potential for excellence in the areas of teaching, creative work and research, outreach, and service and should demonstrate superior achievement in at least one of these areas. An Assistant Professor is expected to possess or be in the process of building, an outstanding reputation in the state through vigorous professional activity on campus and on a statewide level.

2. Promotion To Associate Professor

Faculty should consult the Faculty Handbook for requirements of time in service. Probationary faculty who do not have prior service at another institution of higher education generally come up for promotion and tenure review in their fifth year at Auburn. Although this is not a requirement and faculty may seek tenure and promotion at any time before their sixth year if they have met departmental promotion and tenure standards, they must come up for tenure and promotion by their sixth year of appointment (except in the case of documented FMLA leave or leave without pay, as described in the Faculty Handbook).
Appointment or promotion to the rank of Associate Professor is predicated on a record of sustained and progressive professional development in the areas of teaching, creative work and research, outreach and service, with a record of superior accomplishment in at least two of these areas, and the demonstration of a candidate’s potential for further accomplishment.

The candidate for Associate Professor must also demonstrate evidence of an emerging national reputation in the area of specialization. Evidence of emerging national recognition for research in the form of publications such as a book, exhibition or book reviews, and articles in regional, national and international journals; a critic’s review of work in an exhibition; invitations to publish or speak; papers presented at conferences on the regional, national, and international level; organization of regional, national, and international conferences; participation as session chair for such conferences; citations, awards, grants, and other evidence of the candidate’s research and growing reputation must convincingly document his or her level of achievement.

3. Promotion To Full Professor

Appointment or promotion to the rank of Professor is predicated on fulfillment of all qualifications at the rank of Associate Professor, qualities of leadership and further significant contributions in a candidate’s area of specialization, a distinguished record of achievement in each of the areas of teaching, research and creative work, outreach, and service, and vigorous professional activity of high quality over a sustained period of time.

The candidate for Full Professor must also demonstrate evidence of an established national reputation in the area of specialization. Evidence of an established national recognition for research in the form of publications such as a book, exhibition or book reviews, and articles in national and international journals; a critic’s review of work in an exhibition; invitations to publish or speak; papers presented at conferences on the national and international level; organization of national and international conferences; participation as session chair for such conferences; citations, awards, grants, and other evidence of the candidate’s research and established reputation must convincingly document his or her level of achievement.

4. University Guidelines

Auburn University’s complete tenure and promotion guidelines can be found in Chapter 3 of the Faculty Handbook located at: http://www.auburn.edu/academic/provost/handbook.html

Each faculty member’s scholarship will be reviewed for promotion and tenure on the basis of (1) teaching; (2) research/creative activity; (3) outreach; and (4) service, according to the percentage appointment of each faculty member. [Outreach is an option for faculty scholarship. Outreach is not required of all faculty, but is required of faculty who have a portion of their time allocated to outreach efforts. Outreach activities must be documented regarding significance and contribution.]

Meeting the research criteria does not in and of itself guarantee promotion and tenure. Candidates must present evidence of balanced professional development in the other areas of activity: teaching, service and/or outreach.

5. Tenure Decisions

The criteria for attainment of tenured status are described in the Faculty Handbook. Candidates for tenure in the Department of Art are normally considered at the same time for promotion to the rank of associate professor; the recommendations are linked, in that favorable recommendation for tenure, with its more extensive requirements, presumes favorable recommendation for promotion to the rank of associate professor.
The candidate should work in a collaborative and cooperative manner with other faculty in the areas of teaching, research and service to advance the mission of the department, college and university.

C. Department of Art Criteria for Tenure and Promotion

1. Relationship between the Dept. of Art Annual Review Guidelines and Promotion and Tenure Guidelines

The Department of Art's Annual Review Guidelines lists and ranks the broad range of possible research activities a faculty member will engage in from year to year. While all research endeavors are valuable, for tenure and promotion, the candidate needs to produce a portfolio work that adheres to the following requirements and guidelines. These P & T guidelines, specific to each field of research in the Department, emphasize high-quality endeavors, and refer to the highly-ranked items in the Annual Review Guidelines, such as peer-reviewed exhibitions and publications. Candidates who fail to produce highly-ranked research, and instead focus on research activities that are less valued, will not achieve tenure and/or promotion. For instance, a candidate may present ten different papers at peer-reviewed conferences as a means of trying out new ideas and disseminating new research, but until those papers are published as peer-reviewed articles, they have little value for P & T. Or, an artist might participate in several local exhibitions as a step along the way to increase his/her profile and achieve national exhibitions, but these local shows have little value for P & T.

2. For Promotion to Associate Professor

A. Teaching

Because of Auburn University's "concern for good teaching" (AU Faculty Handbook (Chap. 4.1)), teaching effectiveness is an important consideration in the promotion and tenure process. More than adequate teaching is expected. Faculty members should develop a teaching portfolio as part of their dossier submitted for annual and third-year review (see the Annual Review Guidelines), and abbreviated version of this is submitted for Promotion and Tenure decisions, according to University guidelines.

Continued commitment to teaching is an important component of the Department of Art’s criteria for promotion and tenure. Teaching includes not only formal classroom instruction but also advising and mentoring of students. Teaching environments within the Department include large lecture halls, studio spaces, traditional classroom settings and field experiences in the community; these differences should be considered when evaluating teaching.

The faculty under review should develop a teaching philosophy, and address how they integrate their research and scholarship into the classroom. Course syllabi should demonstrate a logical organization and progression of course content. Course content should reflect the level of the class, and become progressively more demanding for upper-division courses. Faculty should showcase any teaching innovations they employ in the classroom, such as use of technology, organizing field trips or special events, and so forth. Effectiveness in teaching is reflected by student learning and improvements in the learning environment and curriculum. On the basis of peer reviews, student ratings, letters from alumni, awards, participation in departmental and/or college or university activities related to teaching, and pedagogical conferences and workshops, the candidate must show clear excellence and effectiveness as a teacher in the classroom or studio, in student advisement, and in other forms of instruction involving students.

Candidates whose record reflects difficulty in teaching must document the steps that they have taken to address these problems, and the record of peer evaluations and student ratings should reflect improvement.
The candidate should work in a collaborative and cooperative manner with other faculty in the area of teaching to advance the mission of the department, college and university.

B. Research

Research, scholarly or artistic activities are those activities that lead to the production of new knowledge; to increased problem-solving capabilities, including design and analysis; to original critical or historical theory and interpretation; or to the production of art or artistic performance.

Merit in the activities of this category should be documented by the record of accomplishment, including publications, commissions, inventions and works of art; the record of recognition, including awards, prizes, honors from professional societies, exhibitions and critical reviews of publications, artistic production and research proposals; and the considered opinions of outstanding experts in the candidate's field, both inside and outside the University.

The candidate should work in a collaborative and cooperative manner with other faculty in the area of research/creative activity to advance the mission of the department, college and university.

1. Studio Art

A studio artist is expected to present significant evidence of accomplishment in creative work in his or her discipline. The primary means by which this work is evaluated for tenure and promotion consideration is its acceptance into solo or group exhibitions of recognized quality at the regional and national level. Regional is defined by exhibitions, reviews and venues where the work is juried or selected from a regional pool of artists and the audience is principally regional in scope, whereas a national exhibition is selected from a pool of artists having either a national audience or national reach through the reputation of the venue or through publications. This can be true even when the exhibition is held in the region. In the case of juried competitions, the level and scope of the competition is evidenced by such data as the number and geographic range of applicants. Part of the definition of establishing a national record is participation in exhibitions outside of the Southeast, and in venues that have been selected by nationally recognized jurors or curators and/or held at well-regarded private galleries, university galleries, art centers or museums across the country as recognized by experts in the field of specialization.

Grants for creative work, commissions and other creative projects may also be categorized as either regional or national depending on the client, location and process of selection. Reviews, catalogue reproductions, articles and books addressing an artist’s work are also part of the evidence used to judge the stature of a candidate’s work. Papers delivered at regional and national conferences, artist residencies, visiting artist lectures and other public presentations will also be considered as part of the candidate’s evidence of recognition.

The expected number of art exhibitions may vary depending on the artist’s medium, the scale and complexity of the work, and the number of works included in each exhibition. For the rank of associate professor, a studio faculty member should demonstrate a record of consistency and growth that indicates an emerging stature at the regional or national level. A candidate for associate professor would normally be expected to have had approximately:

An average of 2-3 group exhibitions per year or 12-15 exhibitions at the regional and national level to qualify for promotion and tenure. At least 6 would be expected to be at the national level.

2 solo exhibitions at the regional or national level at an art center, university gallery, private gallery or museum.
As indicated above, these are normal expectations; the particular nature of the candidate’s work will influence expectations of its production and presentation, and no single requirement can be seen as universal. The tenured faculty will have the discretion to make judgments on the basis of quality over quantity when the particular research records warrants such an exception.

In addition, grants, commissions, selected artist residencies and/or special projects at the regional or national level; ongoing recognition through published reviews, citations, catalogues and/or published catalogue/book reproductions of the candidate’s work, and inclusion in public and private collections; and visiting artist lectures and papers/lectures presented at regional or national conferences, will all be considered as part of the documentation of the candidate’s research. In addition to exhibiting art, studio careers may also encompass curatorial projects, refereed publications, web projects, consultancies, and collaborative projects with other artists, architects, designers, critics, and historians, among others.

2. Art History

Because peer-reviewed publications are the standards in the field of art history for promotion, substantial, high quality and well-placed publications are the research goals for the art history candidate.

Book publication is the most important means by which art historians present the results of research. Acceptance for publication of a first book by a rigorously refereed press, university, academic or commercial, is, therefore, an important benchmark on the road to promotion and tenure. Ideally, a candidate coming up for promotion would have a book in print, but at minimum a candidate should be able to present proof that his or her book manuscript is in the publication schedule of a reputable press. This could be demonstrated by a contract to publish, based on outside reviews of the entire drafted manuscript. In such cases, the department shall request copies of the reader’s reports on the manuscript as well as the candidate’s responses to the reports; the candidate will also make the full manuscript available for review within the department. Letters of intent to publish and preliminary book contracts, based on less than the full manuscript, do not satisfy this requirement.

Publishing houses considered in the field to be “vanity presses” are not acceptable outlets for publication. In cases when there may be dispute about the press, its referee process, etc., the tenured faculty shall designate one or more scholars in the candidate’s field to evaluate the quality of the publication and the reputation of the candidate’s scholarship.

When overwhelming evidence of the significance of research is demonstrable, several substantial and peer-reviewed articles in major journals in one’s field, museum catalogues, or edited volumes may be substituted for book publication.

Usually editing a collection of articles or a museum catalogue or co-authoring book will not be considered equivalent to a single-authored book, although these endeavors count more than a single article. If the candidate has edited a volume or catalogue or co-authored a book, s/he would need to have also published a few substantial and peer-reviewed articles in major journals, museum catalogues, or edited volumes to meet the publication requirement.

In rare cases, however, a particularly influential edited work or catalogue that required extensive research, analysis, and writing might be considered as equally meritorious as a monograph.

Professional honors and awards, grants, invitations to lecture or publish, and regional, national, and international conference papers can demonstrate the scope of the candidate’s reputation.

3. Art Education

A faculty member in Art Education may choose to maintain a research agenda that comprises both writing for publication and creative activity for exhibitions, or may emphasize publications only. In either case, an art educator must present evidence of a growing body of scholarly work and publish several articles in peer-reviewed books, refereed journals in the discipline, and
other recognized scholarly publications. An Art Educator can also demonstrate their research through published book or exhibition reviews, editorships, regular or frequent columns contributed to appropriate professional publications, publications in conference proceedings, reviews of books or exhibitions. Scholarly papers presented, workshops led at professional conferences, and consultancies also serve as research activities, but are not as heavily weighted as publications. Online publication may be viewed equally with more traditional venues if these online locations have achieved national recognition and are refereed or juried.

Because the duties of faculty in Art Education often involve Outreach activities (see below), faculty in this area are encouraged to present their peer-reviewed publications, scholarship, curricula, and reports related to their Outreach activities under “Research,” as detailed in the University’s “Guide for Faculty Outreach”, p. 3. In addition, organizing and curating of exhibitions appropriate to the concerns of art education should be recognized as scholarly activity (which often, though not always, results in the publication of a catalogue or brochure to accompany the exhibition).

Guidelines for creative activities would be similar to those for faculty in studio arts: an exhibition record that includes several competitions, invitational exhibitions, representation by commercial galleries, one-person exhibitions, group exhibitions, significant commissions, and representation in major public and/or private collections. The faculty member should document the type of exhibition in which she/he participated (whether local, regional, national, or international in scope; jurors; and awards given).

When research activities take place in educational or clinical settings, distinctions between research and professional service may be more difficult to determine. In such instances, it is incumbent upon the faculty member to explain the research/service relationship.

C. Outreach

Outreach refers to the function of applying academic expertise to the direct benefit of external audiences in support of university and unit mission. Faculty should consult the Faculty Handbook for specific guidelines of what constitutes outreach for promotion and tenure consideration.

Examples of outreach include, but are not limited to the following: Community and regional based class projects; Participation on community advisory boards/groups; Expert advice to city/state/non-profits; Supervision and/or participation in community projects and/or organizations; Training of professionals in specialized skills/knowledge; Provision of continuing education credit; Organization of a state, regional, national or international conference.

Faculty with a portion of their appointment allocated to outreach (as determined in the annual meeting with the Department Head) need to document their outreach activities in their dossier as detailed in the Faculty Handbook.

Auburn University’s Office of the Vice President for University Outreach defines Outreach Scholarship as “The dissemination or application of knowledge [gained] through outreach activities. This includes authoring articles, book chapters, reports or other publication reflecting one’s outreach experience, the development of curricula informed by outreach activities, etc.” Such scholarship that stems from outreach can thus be assessed under “Research.”

The candidate should work in a collaborative and cooperative manner with other faculty in the area of outreach to advance the mission of the department, college and university.

D. Service
All faculty are expected to contribute service to the University as prescribed in the Faculty Handbook. Additionally, faculty may contribute to their professions beyond the University, for instance in professional associations or by completing editorial work for journals and publishers.

Successful candidates for promotion to associate professor and/or for tenure are expected to attend departmental meetings, and to complete area specific service, including shared maintenance of teaching resources, curriculum development, and evaluation of area and departmental objectives and direction. It is the understanding that Assistant Professor should complete service on the departmental level, and begin to engage in service outside the dept., such as in interdisciplinary committees or committees on the College and University level that are not deemed too controversial for pre-tenure faculty.

Within the University service activities can include: Departmental, College and University committees and activities; Organizing, coordinating, administering, or maintaining curricular programs, academic departments, campus organizations, or university/events; Recruiting and mentoring new faculty and students; Developing new academic programs; Identifying and writing grant proposals and fundraising for department activities. Beyond the University, service can include: Leadership positions in professional associations; Committee work for professional associations; Organizing, coordinating, or administering professional presentations, projects, or events; Professional writing and/or editing of journals, newsletters, etc; Serving on committees, task forces, review and advisory boards, councils; Identifying and writing grant proposals and fundraising for professional association activities; Consulting.

Faculty should identify their service activities in their dossier, making note of “distinctive contributions” in accordance with the Faculty Handbook. Documentation of the service activity would generally include: Description and records of the service activity; How service activity was compatible with University, College, and Department mission; Role of faculty member in service activity; Impact, Evaluation, Recognition of activity; Activities and Products; Documents generated as a result of committee assignments; Appointment papers to leadership positions – professional organizations; Letters, memoranda from colleagues.

The candidate should work in a collaborative and cooperative manner with other faculty in the area of service to advance the mission of the department, college and university.

3. For Promotion from Associate Professor to Professor

   A. Teaching

   For promotion to full professor, candidates must demonstrate a continued commitment to good teaching, as outlined above. Candidates are expected to continue to integrate teaching innovations into the classroom, develop curricula in their respective areas, and provide sound advisement to students.

   The candidate should work in a collaborative and cooperative manner with other faculty in the area of teaching to advance the mission of the department, college and university.

   B. Research

   The candidate should work in a collaborative and cooperative manner with other faculty in the area of research/creative activity to advance the mission of the department, college and university.

   1. Studio Art

   A studio artist is expected to present significant evidence of involvement in creative work in his
or her discipline. The primary means by which this work is evaluated for tenure and promotion considerations is its acceptance into solo or group exhibitions of recognized quality at the national level. National is defined by exhibitions, reviews and venues where the work is juried or selected from a national pool of artists and the audience is principally national in scope. The level and scope of the competition based on such data as the number and geographic range of applicants is one way in which a candidate can document the status of a particular venue. Part of the definition of establishing a national record is regularly participating in exhibitions outside of the Southeast, and in venues that have been selected by nationally recognized jurors or curators and/or held at reputable galleries, art centers or museums across the country as recognized by peers in the field of specialization.

Grants for creative work, commissions and all other creative projects may also be categorized as national depending on the client, location and process of selection. Reviews, catalogue reproductions, articles and books of an artist’s work are also part of the evidence used to judge the stature of a candidate’s work as an artist and/or designer. Papers delivered at national and international conferences, inclusion in public and private collections, artist residencies, visiting artist lectures and other public presentations will also be considered as part of the candidate’s evidence of recognition. The expected number of art exhibitions may vary depending on the artist’s medium, the scale and complexity of the work, and the number of works included in each exhibition. Solo exhibitions or smaller group shows should also be given more weight and a candidate seeking full professor should demonstrate clear evidence of the creation of significant bodies of work through closely curated exhibitions of multiple works.

A studio faculty candidate for full professor must present convincing evidence of high levels of attainment at the national level in the area of their assignments. For the rank of professor a studio faculty member must show convincing evidence of their stature through significant exhibitions, critical reviews and/or grants and professional honors. A candidate for full professor would normally be expected to have the following:

A record of 15-25 exhibitions since the last promotion and 3 solo exhibitions at the national or international level at an art center, university gallery, private gallery or museum.

These are normal expectations; the particular nature of the candidate’s work will influence expectations of its production and presentation, and no single requirement can be seen as universal. The full professors on the art faculty will have the discretion to make judgments on the basis of quality over quantity when the particular research records warrants such an exception.

Professional honors and awards, grants, commissions, selected artist residencies and/or special projects at the national or international level will also be considered as evidence of attainment, as will published reviews, and catalogues and/or catalogue reproductions of the candidate’s work, visiting artist lectures, and papers/lectures presented at regional or national conferences. In addition to exhibiting art, studio careers may also encompass curatorial projects, refereed publications, web projects, consultancies, and collaborative projects with other artists, architects, designers, critics, and historians, among others.

2. Art History

A second book, or a comparable combination of several co-authored books, edited volumes or museum catalogues, and/or peer-reviewed articles in major journals, edited volumes, or museum catalogues constitute the basic research credentials for promotion to Full Professor.

Professional honors and awards, grants, invitations to lecture or publish, and national and international conference papers can demonstrate the scope of the candidate’s reputation.

3. Art Education

A faculty member in Art Education may choose to maintain a research agenda that comprises
both writing for publication and creative activity for exhibitions, or may emphasize publications only. In either case, an art education candidate for Full Professor must present evidence of a growing body of scholarly work and publish several more articles, beyond those published for advancement to Associate Professor, in peer-reviewed books, refereed journals in the discipline, and other recognized scholarly publications. An Art Educator can also demonstrate their research through published book or exhibition reviews, editorships, regular or frequent columns contributed to appropriate professional publications, publications in conference proceedings, reviews of books or exhibitions. Scholarly papers presented, workshops led at professional conferences, and consultancies also serve as research activities, but are not as heavily weighted as publications.

Guidelines for creative activities would be similar to those for faculty in studio arts: an exhibition record that includes several competitions, invitational exhibitions, representation by commercial galleries, one-person exhibitions, group exhibitions, significant commissions, and representation in major public and/or private collections. The faculty member should document the type of exhibition in which she/he participated (whether local, regional, national, or international in scope; jurors; and awards given).

When research activities take place in educational or clinical settings, distinctions between research and professional service may be more difficult to determine. In such instances, it is incumbent upon the faculty member to explain the research/service relationship.

C. Outreach

Candidate for promotion to Professor who have Outreach as part of their allocation are expected to further develop their outreach endeavors (as outlined above). Publications, curricula, and reports related to Outreach can be assessed under “research.”

The candidate should work in a collaborative and cooperative manner with other faculty in the area of outreach to advance the mission of the department, college and university.

D. Service

Successful candidates for promotion to professor are expected to attend departmental meetings, and to complete area specific service, including shared maintenance of teaching resources, curriculum development, and evaluation of area and departmental objectives and direction. They will also have taken on further responsibilities in terms of work on Departmental, College and/or University standing and ad hoc committees. Leadership in professional organizations helps meet the service criteria contributing to the discipline on a regional, national and/or international level.

The candidate should work in a collaborative and cooperative manner with other faculty in the area of service to advance the mission of the department, college and university.

D. Procedures for Tenure and Promotion

1. Tenure Dossier

All faculty candidates for tenure and/or promotion must submit a dossier complete with the information requested in the Faculty Handbook (Ch. 3.11.C. 2). Faculty who come to Auburn University from another university or professional practice can have prior peer-reviewed scholarship and creative activity count toward promotion and tenure as prescribed in the Faculty Handbook.
2. External Peer Review

External peer review of scholarship, along with Department Head and faculty review, is the suggested method for assessing achievement. The external peer review process should follow College and Provost guidelines found at:

http://cla-web.auburn.edu/cla/index.cfm/faculty/promotion-and-tenure
http://www.auburn.edu/academic/provost/guidelines.html

E. Timeline

Each year, the Provost’s Office establishes the Timeline for Applications for Tenure and Promotion.