

## **CRITERIA FOR TENURE AND PROMOTION**

### ***Faculty of Fine Arts, York University***

#### **File Preparation:**

The File Preparation Committee (FPC) consisting of three members, one named by the candidate, one elected by the unit and one drawn from the Faculty Adjudicating Committee (AC), shall prepare all files. The FPC member chosen by the candidate will not also serve on the Adjudicating Committee. The FPC shall provide a written contextualizing report when forwarding the file but will not render judgment. The file must bear evidence on all three areas of assessment: teaching, professional contribution and standing, and service to the university.

#### **File Adjudication:**

The Faculty Adjudication Committee (AC) shall consist of a maximum of eight faculty, the majority of whom shall be tenured. Normally it will include two students. Each academic unit shall provide one member to the AC, and the elected member to the FPC will come forward with each file.

The task of the AC is to review the materials compiled by the FPC and on that basis decide whether to recommend, delay, or deny tenure and promotion. The AC report shall contain a decision to recommend tenure and promotion, tenure without promotion, promotion (in the case where a candidate already has tenure), delay or rejection, with detailed reasons for the decision. The AC report is mailed to the candidate, who is then entitled to a fifteen day period to either add material to the file or request reconsideration. The candidate may waive the fifteen day period. The AC report is added to the file and the file is then transmitted to the Dean, who in turn adds a letter of concurrence or dissent. At this time the candidate is again entitled to a fifteen day period to add information to the file or request reconsideration. The candidate may waive the fifteen day period.

The complete file is forwarded to the York Senate Committee on Tenure and Promotions.

### Minimum Criteria for Tenure and Promotion to Associate Professor

<b>Criterion - Areas</b>	<b>Teaching</b>	<b>Professional Contribution And Standing</b>	<b>Service</b>
Scenerio 1	Competence	Excellence	Competence Not demonstrated
Scenerio 2	Excellence	Competence	Competence Not demonstrated
Scenerio 3	Competence	Competence	Excellence
Scenerio 4	High Competence	High Competence	High Competence

#### Preamble

The Faculty of Fine Arts' mission is diverse in that our scholarly realm encompasses both studies and studio. The service, teaching and professional contributions of the faculty reflect a broad-ranging constituency. Some faculty choose to see their contributions to research, teaching and service as interconnected, while others consider these areas as separate. We strive to have our tenure and promotion criteria recognize and value diverse contributions to the Fine Arts. We also recognize and value academic freedom for each candidate to define his or her scholarly/creative pursuits and commitments, within the broad parameters appropriate to his or her field.

While specific criteria are articulated below, there is an expectation that decisions made will also take into consideration "the total contribution the person has made to the University." It is the intent of this criteria document to avoid a reductionist approach that applies the criteria in too rigid or formulaic a fashion. We must assess each person on her/his own merits, but with an eye to the fullness of an individual's presence in the University.

These guidelines are therefore designed to give faculty a sense of Faculty of Fine Arts expectations in conjunction with York University criteria for tenure and promotion, and to be responsive to the unique features of each case. For each of the following assessment categories, teaching, professional contribution and service, not all criteria may be applicable for a given candidate.

#### TEACHING:

##### General considerations

Teaching will be evaluated in terms of scores on student course evaluations, evidence of curriculum development, appraisal letters from classroom visitation referees, and letters of reference from undergraduate and graduate students. In situations where the normal enrollment size is small and/or in individual instruction courses where evaluations are not solicited in order to preserve student confidentiality, the classroom visitation referees

will attend the classes and submit their report to the File Preparation Committee. In assessing classroom teaching performance, consideration will be given to the type of courses taught (including but not limited to these factors: core versus elective, graduate versus undergraduate, studio versus studies, or differences due to class size and year level), the complexity of materials, implementation of innovative practices in teaching such as the introduction of appropriate new technologies, and the candidate's performance relative to others who have taught the same or similar courses. Note that supervision of student productions is a facet of teaching that should be noted in the file. If the file shows anomalies in teaching evaluations or other factors, the File Preparation Committee provides the contextualizing information and Adjudication Committee assesses it.

The guideline given for competence is a base line, and must be surpassed to achieve an assessment of high competence or excellence

### **Competence**

A ranking of competence will be warranted in the situation where the following is in evidence:

- teaching evaluations from most courses are near or at the department mean, or teaching evaluations show significant improvement
- the candidate teaches existing courses with little or no involvement in curriculum planning or course development
- letters from collegial referees and students document clearly satisfactory teaching practices
- there is limited participation on graduate committees and/or advising.

### **High Competence**

A ranking of high competence will be warranted in the situation where the following is in evidence:

- teaching evaluations from all levels of courses are consistently around the department mean
- active involvement in curriculum planning and/or course development is demonstrated
- supporting letters from colleagues and students document strength in teaching, including innovative content and structure
- there is active involvement on graduate committees and/or advising, including principal supervision.

**Excellence**

A ranking of excellence will be warranted in the situation where the following is demonstrated:

- teaching evaluations from all levels of courses are significantly above the department mean
- the candidate plays a leading role in curriculum planning and/or course development, and/or new degree or program initiatives
- outstanding letters from colleagues and students document strength in teaching, including innovative course content and structure
- there is exceptional participation on graduate committees and/or advising, including a number of principal supervisions
- research on teaching pedagogy is in evidence.

**PROFESSIONAL CONTRIBUTION AND STANDING****Definitions:****Scholarly work:**

Publish or present outputs such as, but not limited to: article in refereed journal, chapter in book, paper in conference proceedings, catalogue essay, film or media programming, exhibition or event curating, CD/DVD publication. A major output such as authoring a book, editing an anthology or editing a journal is the equivalent of several outputs from the preceding list.

**Creative work:**

Perform or display outputs such as, but not limited to: graphic design, juried competitions, group or solo art exhibition (which can be in a range of venues, whether art gallery, public site, or the web), key involvement in short theatrical/music/dance performance, short film or video. A major output such as a full-length theatrical work, large solo exhibition, long film/video, original composition or choreography is the equivalent of several outputs from the preceding list.

**General considerations:**

Research within the Faculty of Fine Arts takes many forms, in both creative work and scholarship. In many ways it is unique among the Faculties at York University. The Adjudicating Committee's assessment of the quality and significance of the candidate's professional contribution and standing is particularly important in light of the fact that many research areas in Fine Arts defy "one size fits all" definitions of excellence. In Fine Arts research, scholarly and creative features inform each other and are often interwoven, whether in the publishing activities of scholars in our studies programs, the practice-based activities of artists and designers in our studio programs, or areas that

traverse the two such as curatorial practice, performance studies, or publishing in new media environments such as the web. It would not be unusual for a faculty member to meet the ranking guidelines by a combination of scholarly and creative criteria.

Peer review is fundamental to the assessment of each type of activity, scholarly or creative, and is evident in a variety of ways in addition to the established peer review process for journal publication. For creative work, peer recognition often takes the form of an invitation from a curator, festival programmer or artistic director to present in a prestigious venue. A scholar might be invited by a university or other public institution to lecture about artistic practices, a creative practitioner to lecture about his/her own work; and either might be invited by an editor to submit a review article or book chapter for publication. A significant form of peer recognition in many areas of the Fine Arts is the securing of a professional contract, for example, in a performance-based field or design production.

As well, our research output often involves the general public as audience and participants. Various forms of dissemination to the general public are relevant to the tenure and promotion process because they reflect the candidate's position at the University and, in general, have a bearing on the candidate's program of scholarly/creative research. Outputs including, but not limited to, performances, concerts, recitals, master classes, workshops and industry contracts, as well as staging, recording or exhibiting of existing work (one's own or another's), are deemed to be relevant for the assessment of tenure and promotion through the candidate's clarification of how they are integral to his/her ongoing research. The FPC should encourage and enable the candidate to convey the quality of her/his research outputs by giving concise descriptions of their significance and impact, and by adding contextualizing information via summary letters when it is not evident in the file. The Adjudicating Committee assesses and discusses anomalies.

Please note that: all outputs should be assessed according to the quality of the venue, and "national or international" can describe a local venue or event that has visibility and stature beyond the local; and, where there is crossover between scholarly and creative work, the nature of such hybrid practice should be addressed in the file.

The guideline given for competence is a base line, and must be surpassed to achieve an assessment of high competence or excellence.

**Competence:**

A ranking of competence will be warranted in the situation where the following is demonstrated:

- active involvement in scholarly/creative research and able to articulate a clear and coherent research program
- output that is small, but with evidence of peer recognition and promise of ongoing commitment in future work

- pursuit of internal or external research funding, where appropriate to the candidate's program of scholarly/creative research.

**High Competence:**

A ranking of high competence will be warranted in the situation where the following is demonstrated:

- an active research program that is evident in a record of publishing, exhibiting or performing significant scholarly/creative works
- scholarly or creative work is well-respected within the candidate's field, including evidence of peer recognition
- internal research funding is secured, where appropriate to the candidate's program of scholarly/creative research
- external research funding is pursued, where appropriate to the candidate's program of scholarly/creative research.

**Excellence:**

A ranking of excellence will be warranted in the situation where the following is demonstrated:

- a substantial record of publishing, exhibiting or performing scholarly/creative works at a national or international level
- scholarly or creative work is recognized as innovative or groundbreaking in the field, and is published, performed or displayed in high quality venues
- there is promise of substantial commitment and impact in future work
- substantial external research funding is secured, where appropriate to the candidate's program of scholarly/creative research.

**SERVICE****General considerations:**

The main focus for the Faculty of Fine Arts assessment of service is service to the University, whether it is at the unit, Faculty or Senate level. Senate guidelines note that the work of some committees is routine and deserves no special weight, while service on committees relevant to the making of academic policy or chairing of committees deserves greater consideration. Contributions to campus organizations or events beyond regular teaching responsibilities will also be recognized, as well as outreach to the wider community where applicable.

The Adjudicating Committee will weigh a number of different factors before making a determination of excellence, high competence, competence or competence not

demonstrated: number of, level of involvement in, and degree of difficulty of committees on which the candidate has served, and letters from colleagues. The following serve as flexible guidelines rather than mandatory requirements. The criteria in this category are described in a way that is cumulative, so that an assessment of high competence or excellence is achieved by satisfying the additional criteria for each successive level of ranking.

**Competence:**

A ranking of competence will be warranted in the situation where the candidate demonstrates the following factors, which would have to be corroborated with letters from colleagues/Associate Dean associated with the relevant committees:

- regularly attends area, unit and Faculty meetings
- is an active member on one unit committee
- participates in student recruitment and incoming undergraduate and/or graduate student evaluations
- contributes to a co-operative and collegial working environment
- works as a team player.

**High Competence:**

A ranking of high competence will be warranted in the situation where, in addition to the criteria of competence, the candidate demonstrates the following factors -- which would have to be explicitly documented by colleagues/Associate Deans associated with the relevant committees:

- assumes a leadership role in an area, unit or Faculty committee, for example, serves as committee chair
- fosters leadership in enhancing collegiality
- demonstrates pertinent service responsibilities to the community external to York (i.e. juries, judging, serving on boards)
- takes initiative with other administrative responsibilities in relation to area, unit or Faculty with demonstrable outcome.

**Excellence:**

A ranking of excellence will be warranted in the situation where, in addition to the criteria of high competence, the candidate demonstrates the following factors -- which would have to be explicitly documented by colleagues/Associate Deans associated with the relevant committees:

- serves as chair to a committee at the Faculty level or serves on at least one university-wide committee (i.e. YUFA, Senate, FGS)
- contributes to unit initiatives in promoting the discipline within the unit and to the wider community
- assumes exceptional leadership responsibilities in the community external to York (i.e. organizing conference, or teaching at the outreach level)