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STANDARDS FOR PROMOTION AND TENURE, AND ANNUAL MERIT EVALUATION

1. PROMOTION AND TENURE PROCEDURES

Years of appointment as a probationary instructor (see Section C12, University Handbook, Kansas State University) may be credited as part of a probationary period for gaining tenure if stipulated in the individual’s contract. Service in a term appointment at the rank of assistant professor or above may count as part of a probationary period for gaining tenure if stipulated in the individual’s contract and subject to University Handbook, Section C73.

For persons appointed at the rank of assistant professor, the maximum probationary period for gaining tenure and promotion to associate professor consist of six (6) regular annual appointments at K-State at a probationary rank. In these cases, decisions of tenure must be made before or during the sixth year of probationary service. Candidates not approved for tenure during the sixth year of service will be notified by the appropriate dean that the seventh year of service will constitute the terminal year of appointment.

For persons appointed at the rank of associate professor or professor, the maximum probationary period for gaining tenure consist of five (5) regular annual appointments at K-State at probationary ranks. Tenure decisions must be made before or during the fifth year of probationary service. Candidates not approved for tenure during the fifth year of service will be notified by the appropriate dean that the sixth year of service will constitute the terminal year of appointment.

Faculty members on probationary appointments who have met the criteria and standards for tenure prior to the above maximum times may be granted tenure. Because candidates may be considered for tenure at any time during their probationary period, no time credit shall be granted for tenure at any time during their probationary period, and no time credit shall be granted for service prior to employment at K-State.

2. REAPPOINTMENT

Probationary faculty shall be reviewed for yearly reappointment. A timetable set by the department head based on university deadlines will be given to the candidate well in advance. The candidate shall assemble all required information and make it available to the department head. Required information related to the current evaluation period will be highlighted and consist of the following:

- Student evaluations of all courses taught at K-State during the probationary period. Other supplementary evidence shall be presented (visual documentation, syllabi, class assignments, etc.)
- Evidence of quality research activity (exhibitions, commissions, books, articles, published papers, etc.)
- Evidence of service (department or university governing bodies, contributions to the profession, etc.)
The candidate’s materials will be placed in the department office for evaluation by tenured faculty members. A meeting of the tenured faculty members will be initiated to discuss the candidate’s progress and professional development prior to voting. Tenured faculty members will be asked to forward a positive or negative recommendation along with written comments to the department head, who will submit a recommendation to the dean. The department head will share in writing a redacted version (summarizing tenured faculty members’ comments, but maintaining their confidentiality) of his/her recommendation to the dean with the candidate.

3. MID-TENURE REVIEW

3.1 Procedures for Mid-Tenure Review

The mid-tenure review (MTR) will be conducted at the latest during the second semester of the probationary faculty member's third full year at K-State. This review is intended to provide tenure-track faculty members with assessments of their performance by the tenured faculty members in the areas of teaching, research and/or creative activities, and service; for the tenured faculty members to comment on the probationary faculty member's long-range plans; to determine if the accomplishments and goals of the probationary faculty member are consistent with the missions and expectations of the department.

At the beginning of the academic year in which the review is to occur the department head will inform the candidate of the review and of his/her responsibilities concerning the review. The candidate should access “Guidelines for the Organization and Format of Mid-Tenure Review Documentation” located at the Office of Academic Personnel website (http://www.k-state.edu/academicpersonnel/forms/) and complete the MTR documentation packet no later than January 15th. Outside letters of evaluation will not be sought.

The MTR documentation packet, along with the department head’s description of the faculty member’s responsibilities and a current vita, are made available for review by the tenured faculty members.

In addition to the MTR documentation packet, candidates may also request to make an optional presentation in support of their candidacy. This option provides candidates with a more direct forum to demonstrate the strength of their application.

Tenured faculty members will be asked to forward a positive or negative recommendation along with written comments regarding the candidate’s activities toward the pursuit of promotion and tenure to the department head, who in turn will submit a recommendation to the dean.

The department head will share in writing a redacted version (summarizing tenured faculty member’s comments, but maintaining confidentiality) of his/her recommendation to the dean with the candidate. The MTR document, the faculty vote and summary of comments, and the department head's recommendation will be forwarded to the dean of the college by the first week of March.
If tenured faculty members should recommend that the probationary faculty member should not be reappointed, then the probationary faculty member may use the appeal procedure that is used in the case of denial of promotion and/or tenure. All appeals must follow the procedures found in the University Handbook, C45.3.

3.2 Standard

It is expected that the candidate should be able to demonstrate an ability to teach a variety of courses at both undergraduate and graduate levels, to show a high level of accomplishment in scholarship and/or creative activities, which indicate a potential for meeting the standard for tenure and promotion by the time the candidate applies for tenure and promotion, and participate in, and contribute to the committees and affairs of the Art Department.

3.3. Criteria

The criteria used for this review are the same as for tenure and promotion adjusted for the time in rank.

4. Tenure and Promotion to Associate Professor and Promotion to Full Professor

4.1 Procedures

Before the end of the spring semester in the year prior to application: (this time chosen prior to summer break to assure that contact remains with each faculty holding the candidate’s desired rank)

- Candidate submits the names of five people, holding the desired rank or higher at peer or aspirational Departments of Art, to serve as outside referees.
- Appropriate faculty, holding that candidate’s desired rank or higher, are notified of the candidate’s intention to apply for promotion. Each eligible faculty member is asked to provide one name, address and phone number of an outside reviewer at the desired rank or higher of the candidate, at a peer or aspirational Department of Art.
- Department head acquires an agreement from five outside people, with at least two from the candidate’s list, to serve as referees.

Middle of August, Candidate submits the following:

The candidate for tenure and/or promotion will submit a complete “dossier” in electronic and printed format, in accordance with formats and procedures provided by the provost and dean (see “Guidelines for the Organization and Format Tenure and Promotion Documentation” found at: http://www.k-state.edu/academicpersonnel/forms/).

On 5 DVDs, sets of 20 digital images of creative work and/or samples of digital/video/motion work, (studio faculty) and/or other documentation of research accomplishment, and digital copy of complete curriculum vitae.
One hard copy dossier of 20 printed images of creative work, and/or a DVD of digital/video/motion work samples (studio faculty) and documentation of research accomplishment, and hard copy of complete curriculum vitae.

Material organized and mailed to five outside reviewers. Each external reviewer will be requested to: (1) evaluate the candidate's research work and accomplishments, and (2) compare the candidate with others in the same general area of research and/or creative activity who are at a comparable career level.

**Early October:**

- Outside reviewers return written evaluations.
- Candidates materials made available for review to faculty members holding desired rank or higher
- Memo to faculty members holding desired rank or higher requesting review of candidate’s materials.

**Mid-October:**

- Meeting called of all faculty members holding the desired rank or higher to discuss the application and then vote on the candidate’s tenure and/or promotion.

A day or two prior to materials going to the dean:

- Head meeting with candidate to review materials and results of faculty and outside referee’s recommendation.

**End of October:**

- Candidates’ materials are provided to the dean

### 4.2 Standards for Tenure and Promotion to Associate Professor and Promotion to Full Professor

Individuals have to meet the requirements for associate professor in order to be tenured. Please review the University Handbook for rights and responsibilities that are common to all who are seeking promotion at K-State (see Sections C70-C116.2 for tenure and Sections C120-C156.2 for promotion).

This document sets forth a set of standards for the range of subfields within art. In developing these standards, we recognize that there is not a simple list of accomplishments that, when achieved, guarantees that a faculty member will obtain tenure and promotion. Tenure and promotion is not a right accorded to every faculty member, nor is it granted simply as a result of a candidate’s routinely meeting assigned duties.

Quality teaching and service are defined in the merit section of this document. In general, a candidate should have “meets expectations” in teaching and service for most annual merit
evaluations. A faculty member cannot obtain associate professor or full professor status unless he or she spends the necessary time and energy to nurture and develop the intellectual and creative talents of our students and provide appropriate levels of service to the department, university and/or state given his or her current status as an assistant or associate professor.

In research, a candidate for promotion and tenure to associate professor should demonstrate that he/she is acquiring national achievement in an appropriate subfield of art, including art history, art critique, art theory, studio arts, and/or graphic design. A candidate for promotion to full professor must demonstrate that he or she has acquired national or international achievement in one or more of these subfields. The judgment regarding whether these thresholds have been met will be made by the tenured faculty who are at that level or higher in rank of the status being sought, along with the advice of faculty in the candidate’s general subfield and external referees.

In Section 5, ANNUAL MERIT: RESEARCH provides a summary of the types of creative and scholarly activities that the department and our peers consider highly core, core, and supporting. APPENDIX A provides definitions for peer evaluated exhibits, scholarship, etc., while APPENDIX B defines terms commonly used within subfields of art. The numbers of each type of activities accumulated by faculty members seeking tenure and promotion to associate professor or promotion to professor are difficult to precisely enumerate. Quality, through high core creative and scholarly activities, is the department’s primary concern, however, not its sole concern. A candidate’s record of scholarly and/or creative accomplishment should be at least similar in number and quality of others who are, or were at, a similar state in their careers, working in equivalent subfields and at institutions with an equivalent or aspirational standing to K-State’s Department of Art. In making these comparisons, the eligible faculty members will use their own judgments and seek the advice, and value the opinions of external referees.
5. ANNUAL MERIT EVALUATION

The faculty of the Department of Art has defined its responsibilities and procedures for Merit Evaluation in the categories: Teaching, Research, and Service and/or Administration. Performance in these related areas also provides the bases for evaluation decisions involving reappointment, promotion and tenure, as well as yearly merit salary increases. The weight of each area of job responsibility is suggested by the amount of time assigned to each area and written on the performance goals done by each faculty at the beginning of each evaluation period. (For example, in 2013 an ordinary full-time assignment would include no more than 1/10 time on service, with the balance of time divided equally between research and teaching.) Please refer to University Handbook Section C46.2 for details regarding merit salary increases.

A. EVALUATION OF FACULTY ON PHASED RETIREMENT

Standards for ranking faculty on less than full time assignment will be determined by the department head. Expectations are proportional to appointment responsibility distribution and FTE, i.e. faculty on phased retirement with a half time assignment would enter the categories requiring half the accumulated activity in each range.

B. UNCLASSIFIED PROFESSIONALS

Non-tenured/tenure track Unclassified Professionals will be evaluated by the department head annually, in consultation with the Personnel Chair* and appropriate committee chairs, and seek input from faculty. For example, in the case of the Undergraduate Advisor, the committee chair would be Director of Undergraduate Studies. (In 2013, the Advisor is currently the only Unclassified Professional position in the department.) If there is teaching by the staff member in the position, TEVALs will be submitted, and other evidence of productivity relative to job appointment or effort distribution. For example, the Advisor will also include the student advising evaluation administered by the university.

* The Personnel Committee and all Department Standing Committees consists of minimum of four tenure-track and tenured faculty members, for three year term.

C. PERFORMANCE CATEGORIES

The following appraisal nomenclature is designed to contribute to faculty professional development and to facilitate making recommendations concerning merit evaluation. Teaching, research, and service are weighted to indicate department priorities and reflect time/effort distribution, and to remain consistent with guidelines from the University Handbook. Due to the nature of contemporary art practice, research accomplishment may be multi-disciplinary and cross mediums/ disciplines. Performance is evaluated according to the following categories for research:

Exceeds Expectations
Meets Expectations (upper range)
Meets Expectations (middle range)
Meets Expectations (lower range)
Fallen Below minimum-acceptable levels of productivity

Performance is evaluated according to the following categories for teaching and service:
Exceeds Expectations
Meets Expectations
Fallen Below minimum-acceptable levels of productivity

5.1 ANNUAL MERIT: TEACHING

5.1.1 Guidelines for Evaluation of Teaching for Art History Faculty

Annual merit evaluation of art history faculty in the area of teaching will result in one of four designations based on the following criteria:

I. Exceeds Expectations

A faculty member will receive the designation of "exceeds expectations" if his or her activities: 1) fulfill the general criteria for the designation "meets expectations" and 2) exceed these criteria either by exceeding the limits for any or all of the activities listed under "meets expectations" or by accomplishing any other activities that the faculty member, faculty evaluators and department head mutually agree to be teaching related.¹

A designation of "exceeds expectations" will be understood to indicate that a faculty member has met the ordinary obligations for a professor of art history in this department and engaged in teaching-related activities in excess of those obligations.²

II. Meets Expectations

To achieve the designation "meets expectations" the faculty member must have 1) met the following "Essential Criteria" and 2) engaged in 2 or more of the activities listed as "Other Criteria."

1. Essential Criteria

- The faculty member has taught all regularly assigned courses during the spring and fall semesters: ordinarily 5 courses a year but fewer during periods of leave, sabbatical or service as associate head or Director of Graduate Studies. (Teaching more than 5 courses during the spring and fall semesters combined shall be considered in excess of expected activity).

- The faculty member has been an effective teacher. It is expected that the faculty member will achieve an adjusted score of at least 2.5 for the category "overall effectiveness as a teacher," this score being obtained by averaging the results from all
TEVALs over the evaluation period. (An average adjusted score of 4.5 or higher shall be considered in excess of expected activity).

2. Other Criteria

- The faculty member has supervised from 1 to 4 undergraduate or graduate students enrolled in independent-study units or students participating in the Developing Scholars program. This ordinarily involves directing the research and writing of a student paper or an activity of comparable nature. (Supervision of 5 or more such students constitutes an excess of expected faculty activity).

- The faculty member has served on 1 to 3 graduate student committees in the art department or other departments of the university. (Service on 4 or more graduate student committees constitutes an excess of expected activity).

- The faculty member has improved existing courses. Up to 15 hours of such activity (3 hours per course) annually is considered to be within normal expectations for art history faculty. It is the faculty member's responsibility to provide evidence of the work and time involved if called upon to do so. (Modification of courses amounting to more than 15 hours of work annually constitutes an excess of expected activity).

- The faculty member has made progress in the preparation of new courses. This includes research of course content, writing of lecture notes, and preparation of images, course syllabi, outlines, study guides and exams. Activity resulting in the introduction of a new lecture course every five years falls within the parameters of normal expectations for art history faculty. Therefore, up to 60 hours of such preparation or the production of 10,000 words of lecture notes annually is considered to be part of the faculty member's ordinary obligations. It is the faculty member's responsibility to provide evidence of course preparation work if called upon to do so. This evidence will be in the form of the lecture notes themselves or a written record indicating the types of activity, the dates and the specific amounts of time involved. (Preparation of courses amounting to more than 60 hours of work or the production of more than 10,000 words of lecture notes annually constitutes an excess of expected activity).

- The faculty member is expected to provide advice to students, aid them in the preparation of application materials for graduate school or employment and write letters of reference when required. Activity in this area, regardless of the number of students for which it is performed, is considered to be part of the faculty member's ordinary obligations and cannot be used to achieve the designation "exceeds expectations."

III. Fallen Below Minimum-Acceptable Levels of Productivity

An art history faculty member will receive the designation "fails to meet expectations" if any of the following occur.
1. The faculty member fails to teach his or her regularly assigned courses during the spring and fall semesters and to meet all assigned classes for the scheduled number of contact hours.

2. The faculty member fails to obtain an adjusted score of at least 2.5 for the category "overall effectiveness as a teacher," this score being obtained by averaging the results from all TEVALs over the evaluation period.

3. The faculty member engages in fewer than 2 activities listed above as "other criteria"

NOTES

1) These teaching-related activities include but are not limited to: attendance of teaching workshops, leading student trips, participating in online courses, serving as adviser to the Art History Association, receiving grants specific to teaching, lecturing in other departments of the university, and receiving teaching awards.

An exception is summer teaching, which although in excess of ordinary teaching duties, is not considered a criterion for the designation "exceeds expectations." Coordination of summer study abroad trips can be taken into consideration as activity that exceeds expectations, but only to the degree that the work involved exceeds the work of teaching an ordinary 3 credit-hour summer course at the university. It will be the faculty member's responsibility to provide evidence of this extra work if called upon to do so.

2) The relative value of the activities designated as exceeding expectations can only be determined through comparison with the activities of other faculty in the department who have exceeded expectations. The designation "exceeds expectations" does not in itself indicate that the faculty member's overall teaching activities are more substantial, equal to or less substantial than the teaching activities of other faculty in the department. Such relative value will be assessed by the department head and eligible faculty evaluators during the merit evaluation process.

5.1.2 Guidelines for Evaluation of Teaching for Studio/Graphic Design Faculty

Annual merit evaluation of studio faculty in the area of teaching will result in one designation based on the following criteria:

I. Exceeds Expectations

A designation of "exceeds expectations" will be understood to indicate that a faculty member has met the ordinary obligations for a faculty member in this department and engaged in teaching-related activities in excess of those obligations.

A faculty member will receive the designation of "exceeds expectations" if his or her activities: 1) fulfilled the general criteria for the designation "meets expectations" and 2) exceeded these criteria either by exceeding the limits for any or all of the activities listed under "meets
expectations" or by achieving the upper limit of the "met expectations" criteria for any 3 of the below listed "other criteria." (For example, a faculty member who supervised 3 graduate students who were enrolled in independent study will have achieved the upper limit of the "meets expectations" criteria for supervising graduate students and a faculty member who spent nearly 25 hours improving existing courses can make a case for having achieved the upper limit of the "meets expectations" rating for supervising graduate students, and so on.)

The relative value of the activities designated as exceeding expectations can only be determined through comparison with the activities of other faculty in the department who have exceeded expectations. The designation "exceeds expectations" does not in itself indicate that the faculty member's overall teaching activities were more substantial, equal to or less substantial than the teaching activities of other faculty in the department. The department head and the eligible faculty evaluators will assess the relative value during the merit evaluation process.

II. Meets Expectations

To achieve the designation "meets expectations" the faculty member must have: 1) met the following "Essential Criteria" and 2) engaged in 2 or more of the activities listed as "Other Criteria."

1. Essential Criteria

The faculty member has taught all regularly assigned courses during the spring and fall semesters: ordinarily 5 courses a year but fewer during periods of leave, sabbatical or administrative appointment as associate head, director of Graduate Studies, or director of Undergraduate Studies. (Teaching more than 5 courses during the spring and fall semesters combined shall be considered in excess of expected activity).

The faculty member has been an effective teacher. It is expected that the faculty member will achieve a score of at least 2.5 for the category "overall effectiveness as a teacher," this score being obtained by averaging the results from all TEVALs annually. (An average score of 4.5 or higher shall be considered in excess of expected activity.) A faculty member whose average score for "overall effectiveness as a teacher" is below 2.5 may submit examples of student work completed in the relevant courses, a teaching portfolio, or alternative forms of teaching evaluation as a means of demonstrating acceptable performance in the classroom. The eligible faculty evaluators will examine these materials during the merit assessment process to determine whether the faculty member has met expectations in teaching regardless of TEVAL results.

2. Other Criteria

- The faculty member has supervised undergraduate students enrolled in independent-study units or students participating in the Developing Scholars program.
- The faculty member has supervised from 1 to 3 graduate students enrolled in independent-study units. (Supervision of 4 or more graduate students constitutes an excess of expected activity).
- The faculty member has served on 1 to 3 graduate student committees in the art department or other departments of the university. (Participation on 4 or more graduate student committees constitutes an excess of expected activity).
• The faculty member has improved existing courses. Up to 25 hours of such activity (5 hours per course) annually is considered to be within normal expectations. It is the faculty member's responsibility to provide evidence of the work and time involved if called upon to do so. (Modification of courses amounting to more than 25 hours of work annually constitutes an excess of expected activity).

• The faculty member has made progress in the preparation of new courses. This includes research of course content, writing of lecture notes, and preparation of images, course syllabi, outlines, study guides and exams. Activity resulting in the introduction of a new lecture course every five years falls within the parameters of normal expectations. Therefore, up to 60 hours of such preparation is considered to be part of the faculty member's ordinary obligations. It is the faculty member's responsibility to provide evidence of course preparation work if called upon to do so. (Preparation of courses amounting to more than 60 hours of work annually constitutes an excess of expected activity).

• The faculty member is expected to provide advice to students, aid them in the preparation of application materials for graduate school or employment and write letters of reference when required. Activity in this area, regardless of the number of students for which it is performed, is considered to be part of the faculty member's ordinary obligations and cannot be used to achieve the designation "exceeds expectations."

• The faculty member has supervised from 1 to 5 student internships. (Supervision of 6 or more internships constitutes an excess of expected activity).

• The faculty member has led a study-abroad trip. Coordination of summer study abroad trips can be taken into consideration as activity that exceeds expectations to the degree that the work involved exceeds the work of teaching an ordinary 3 credit-hour summer course at the university (which is not counted in merit evaluation for teaching). It will be the faculty member's responsibility to provide a description of this extra work.

• The faculty member has mentored 1 to 3 graduate teaching assistants. (Mentoring 4 or more graduate teaching assistants constitutes an excess of expected activity).

• The faculty member has served as area coordinator.

• The faculty member has performed other teaching related activities comparable to the above. These teaching-related activities include but are not limited to: attendance of teaching workshops, leading student trips, participating in online courses, serving as adviser to student organizations, receiving grants specific to teaching, lecturing in other departments of the university, and receiving teaching awards.

III. Fallen Below Minimum-Acceptable Levels of Productivity

A faculty member will receive the designation "Fallen Below Minimum-Accepted Levels of Productivity" if he or she:

1) fails to teach his or her regularly assigned courses during the spring and fall semesters and to meet all assigned classes for the scheduled number of contact hours.

2) fails three out of five years, to obtain an adjusted score of at least 2.5 for the category
"overall effectiveness as a teacher," this score being obtained by averaging the results from all TEVALs annually.

5.2 ANNUAL MERIT: SERVICE

5.2.1 Guidelines for Evaluation of Service

Annual merit evaluation of faculty in the area of service will result in one of four designations based on the following criteria:

I. Exceeds Expectations

A faculty member will receive the designation of "exceeds expectations" if his or her annual service activities amount to or exceed the equivalent of service on four standard (as defined in Section 5.2.2 below) departmental committees.

A designation of "exceeds expectations" will be understood to indicate that a faculty member has met the ordinary obligations for a faculty member in this department and engaged in service activity in excess of routine obligations at the department head’s discretion due to special assignment.

Service to the college, university, and profession is also valuable, but at least one fourth of a faculty member's service activity should be within the department.

While service is a key responsibility of faculty members, excessive service, because of its infringement upon time and energy for teaching and research, should not be considered desirable on a regular basis.

II. Meets Expectation

A faculty member will receive the designation of "meets expectations" if his or her service activities amount to or exceed the equivalent of service on two standard (as defined in Section 5.2 below) departmental committee.

III. Fallen Below Minimum-Acceptable Levels of Productivity

A faculty member will receive this designation if the faculty member is not designated as “Meets Expectations” for service for two consecutive years, or two out of three years.

5.2.2 Definitions and Equivalencies

Standard Departmental Committees and Rigorous Departmental Committees

A standard committee shall be defined as a committee that meets once or twice a semester and is charged with completing a routine (i.e., consistent from year to year) amount of work. Examples include the exhibitions committee, search committees (as a member only), scholarship committee, etc. However, under some circumstances a standard committee may involve an unusual amount of work and should be valued accordingly as a rigorous committee.

A rigorous committee shall be defined as a committee that meets more than twice a semester...
and/or demands a considerable amount of work outside of committee meetings. The Department Committee on Planning (DCOP) is ordinarily considered a rigorous committee. In cases when a standard committee requires work equivalent to service on a rigorous committee, committee members shall describe the unusual activity in their merit reports to establish its comparability.

**Equivalencies**

For purposes of evaluating relative amounts of service work the following equivalencies shall apply:

Serving on two Standard Committees, chairing one Standard Committee, or completing a comparable amount of other service work shall be considered equivalent to serving on one rigorous committee.

Chairing one rigorous committee or chairing a search committee shall be considered equivalent to serving on two Rigorous Committees.
5.3 ANNUAL MERIT: RESEARCH

**Art History Annual Merit Research Guidelines**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Exceeds Expectations:</th>
<th>1 High Core or 4 Core Activities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Meets Expectations (upper range):</td>
<td>3 Core Activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meets Expectations (middle range):</td>
<td>2 Core Activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meets Expectations (lower range):</td>
<td>1 Core Activity or 2 Supporting Activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fallen Below Minimum-Acceptable Levels of Productivity:</td>
<td>1 Supporting Activity</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For those on the tenure-track, at least 1 Core Activity per year must be a tangible research outcome.

**High Core Activities**
- Publication of a book
- External research award
- Curatorial work for mid-level or larger museum leading to exhibition and/or catalogue
- Major extramural research grant ($10,000 or more)

**Core Level Activities**
- Progress towards a book (per 10,000 words)
- Publication of a peer-reviewed article (any length)
- Publication of a book chapter in an anthology (any length)
- Other national or international publications in professional venues (per 6,000 words)
- Presenting a lecture or chairing a panel at an international or national conference or professional venue (museum, university)
- Intramural grant

**Supporting Level Activities**
- Curatorial work for local museum or gallery
- Presentation in local or minor venue
- Publication in local venue
- Peer-reviewer of article or book manuscript
- Art appraisals
## Integrated Studio Arts/Fibers Annual Merit Research Guidelines

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Exceeds Expectations:</th>
<th>4 Core Activities, 1 High Level Core Activity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Meets Expectations (upper range):</td>
<td>4 Core Activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meets Expectations (middle range):</td>
<td>2-3 Core Activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meets Expectations (lower range):</td>
<td>1 Core Activity OR 2 Supporting Activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fallen Below Minimum-Acceptable Levels of Productivity:</td>
<td>0 Core Activities OR 1 Supporting Activity</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- An individual case can be made for high amount of supporting activities, or high amount of lower core activities in regards to merit, but for confidence towards promotion and tenure High Core Activities should be the goal.

### High Core Activities
- 1 Large Scale Sculpture in International or National Group Exhibition
- National or International Solo Exhibition
- International Juried/Invited Group Exhibition
- Invited Curator/Juror in Major Venues
- Awards in International Competition/Juried Exhibition
- International or Major National Grant
- International or National Awards/Honors
- Featured in Presentation in International or National Conference
- Featured or Reviewed in Major Art Publication
- Authored Book or Article in Major Art Publication
- National or International Major Publication
- National or International Major Commission
- Work Included in Museum or Major Collection

### Core Level Activities
- Regional or Minor National Solo Exhibition
- National or Regional Group Exhibition
- Curator/Juror National or Regional Exhibition/Competition
- Awards in National or Regional Competition/Juried Exhibition
- Regional or University Small Grant
- Regional Awards/Honors
Visiting Artist Presentation, Lecture, Demo in Regional Level or Above
Panel, Minor Talk in National Conference
Artist Residency in Major Venue National or International
Mentioned in Major Art Publication
Authored Article in National Publication
Regional Public Commission
Work Included in Minor Collection

Supporting Activities
Local Group Show
Faculty Show
Juror Local Competition
Online Exhibition
Local Minor Grant
Local or University Awards/Honors
Presentation, Lecture, Demo in Local Level
Mentioned in Regional Publication, Catalogue
Authored Article in Minor or Regional Publication
Minor Commission: Private, Commercial, Events
### Graphic Design Annual Merit Research Guidelines

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Exceeds Expectations:*</th>
<th>2+ High Core Activities, OR 6 Core Activities, OR 1 High Core Activity and 4 Core Activities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Meets Expectations (upper range):**</td>
<td>5 Core Activities and 1 Supporting Activity, OR 1 High Core Activity and 3 Core Activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meets Expectations (middle range):</td>
<td>1 High Core Activity, OR 2 Core Activities, OR 1 core and 2 Supporting Activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meets Expectations (lower range):***</td>
<td>1 Core Activity, OR 2 Supporting Activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fallen Below Minimum-Acceptable Levels of Productivity:</td>
<td>0 Core Activities, OR 0-1 Supporting Activity</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*An individual case can be made for exceptional activities not listed on the main core or activities that cannot be quantified due to the scope of the project. For example, working on a book or a large branding campaign could meet/exceed activity expectations for the year.

** An individual case can be made for high amount of supporting activities, or high amount of lower core activities with regard to merit, but for confidence towards promotion and tenure, normal Core Activities should be the goal. For confidence towards promotion and tenure, Tenure Track faculty should aim to have at least 1-2 High Core activities, along with some national peer level research activity within their tenure timeframe, though this is not a requirement for achieving tenure. ***A case can be made for local events in major venues to count as core activity if appropriate.

### High Core Activities
- Exhibition (Solo, National Major Venue)
- Exhibition (Solo, International Respected Venue)
- Exhibition (Group) in Major Museum/Venue
- Exhibition (Group, International)
- International screening (or national, prestigious venue)
- International festival (or national, prestigious venue)
- Consultation/Design of Large/Prestigious scope and/or Major Client
- Work Included in Prestigious Permanent/Public Collections (International/National)
- Honors/Awards/Recognition for Art Direction (Major)
- Major Residency
- Awards/Recognition (National/International Major)
- Publication (article, book, conference, proceedings, magazine) International
- Presentation, Lecture, Talk (International)
- Workshop/Panel/ Major International
Design Projects/Consulting International and National (Major)
Publishing a book
Exhibition Curation (Major Venue)
External Grants

Core Level Activities
Publication (article, book, conference, proceedings, magazine) National
Published Article Online (Prestigious Editorship)
Minor Solo Exhibition
Publication of Design Work Minor
Presentation, Lecture, Talk (National)
Conference Session Chair (National)
Workshop/Panel Minor
Design Projects/Consulting Regional
Exhibition (Group, Regional/National Minor Venue)
Screening (regional, national respected venue)
Festival (regional, national respected venue)
Presentation, Lecture, Talk (regional)
Research Poster Presentation (Conference)
Paper Reviewer (National)
Workshop/Panel: Regional
Awards/Recognition: Regional/National (Minor)
Invitational Portfolio Exchange
Work Included in Minor Permanent/Public Collections (Regional/National)
Design Projects/Consulting: Regional/National (Minor)
Minor Residency
Publication Review: Local
Mentions in Newspaper, Publication (Not Local)
Grants (Internal)
Exhibition Curation (Regional/National Minor Venue)
Prestigious Curated Online Exhibition

Supporting Level Activities
Exhibition: Faculty (Non-curated)
Exhibition Solo at K-State
Exhibition: Local
Design Projects/Consulting: Local or University
Lecture/Talk/Panel: Local
Juror (Local Exhibition)
Guest Critique: Regional/Local
Publication/Article: Local
Mentioned in Bibliographies
Open Portfolio Exchange
Consulting (Non-peer Reviewed)
Workshop: Local
Curation: Local
An individual case can be made for high amount of supporting activities, or high amount of core activities in regards to merit, but for confidence towards promotion and tenure, a combination of some High Core, Core, and Supporting Activities should be the goal.

A Ceramics faculty may only have two High Core activities in a five-year period and still meet the Minimum High Confidence threshold. This would require more Core level activities (seven +) during the years of no High Level activities.

Ceramics faculty should aim for two or more High Core activities every five years.

An example of a tenure candidate in Ceramics:

Major National Solo Exhibition (The Clay Studio of Philadelphia), Visiting Artist at National venue (Ohio University Art Department.), Mentioned in Minor Art Publication Review (Newspaper or Blog), and a National Group Exhibition.

OR

Lecture at National Conference, Regional/University Grant (USRG/FDA), 5 National Group Exhibitions, and a Regional Group Exhibition.

OR

Authored Publication (Article in Ceramics Monthly), Major National Solo Exhibition, Work Included in Minor National Collection, National Artist Residency (Arrowmont), Artist’s Talk/workshop/visiting artist national venue.

High Core Activities

Solo International Exhibition
1 Large Scale Sculpture in International Group Exhibition  
Major National Solo Exhibition  
Personal Domain Changing Research Exploration Resulting in Major International or National Award  
Authored Publication  
Public Commission  
Monumental Sculpture in Exhibition  
National Grant

**Core Level Activities**  
Regional or National Group Exhibition (4 works, juried or invitational)  
Regional Minor Solo  
Regional/University Grant  
Artist’s Talk/Workshop/Visiting Artist International Venue  
International Group Exhibition (1-3 works, juried or invitational)  
National Artist Residency  
Artist’s Talk/Workshop/Visiting Artist National Venue  
National Group Exhibition (1-3 works, juried or invitational)  
Lecture at National Conference  
Curating/Jurying National Exhibition  
Mentioned in Minor Art Publication Review (Newspaper, Minor Journal)  
Group Exhibition at the Beach Museum (other than faculty show)  
Minor National Collection  
1 Large Scale Sculpture In National Group Exhibition  
Major National or International Collection  
Minor National Solo Exhibition  
Solo Exhibition at the Beach Museum  
1 Large Scale Sculpture in Regional Group Exhibition  
Artist Residency, International  
Performance in National Venue  
Reviewed in Major Art Publication  
Curating/Jurying International Exhibitions

**Supporting Level Activities**  
Regional Group Exhibition (1-3 works, juried or invitational)  
Collaboration with University or Outside Entities  
Artist’s Talk/Workshop/Visiting Artist Regional Venue  
Best of Show Award at Regional or Above Group Exhibition  
Award at Regional or Award Group Exhibition (other than best of show)  
Catalogs and Folios  
Work Included in Minor Collection
**Digital/New Media Annual Merit Research Guidelines**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Expectations</th>
<th>Activities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Exceeds Expectations</td>
<td>2-3 High Core OR 7+ Core Activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meets Expectations (upper range):</td>
<td>3-6 Core Activities (if 3, at least 1 must be High Core)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meets Expectations (middle range):</td>
<td>2-3 Core Activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meets Expectations (lower range):</td>
<td>1-2 Core Activities OR 3 Supporting Activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fallen Below Minimum-Acceptable Levels of Productivity:</td>
<td>0 Core Activities OR 2 Supporting Activities</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- An individual case can be made for high amount of supporting activities, or high amount of lower core activities in regards to merit, but for confidence towards promotion and tenure High Core Activities should be the goal.

**High Core Activities**
- International Solo exhibit
- Artist’s Talk or Technical Demo (at major National or International Conference or University)
- Major Public Art commission
- National Solo exhibit
- International Group exhibit
- International screening
- International Festival
- International Conference Presentation/talk/workshop
- International Publication
- Residency (National or International)
- Outside Grants
- International Media coverage
- International Performance

**Core Activities**
- National screening
- National festival
- National juried group exhibit
- National invitational group exhibit
- Regional solo exhibit
National presentation/talk/workshop
National Publication
Local Residency
National Grants
National Media coverage
Media coverage
National performance
Community performance
Critical Review
Commissions
University Grants
Works Cited
Regional Residency
University Grants

Supporting Activities
Regional festival
Local Solo Show
Local performance
Local Publication
Local festival
Local group exhibit/screening
Local presentation/talk/workshop
Maintain regularly updated web portfolio
Faculty Show
Authored Article in Minor local Publication
Minor Commission: Private, Commercial, Events
### Metals Annual Merit Research Guidelines

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Exceeds Expectations:</th>
<th>4 Core Activities AND 1 High Core Activity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Meets Expectations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(upper range):</td>
<td>4 Core activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meets Expectations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(middle range):</td>
<td>2-3 Core activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meets Expectations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(lower range):</td>
<td>1 Core activity OR 2 supporting activities</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Fallen Below Minimum-Acceptable Levels of Productivity: | 0 Core activity OR 1 supporting activity |

- An individual case can be made for high amount of supporting activities, or high amount of lower core activities in regards to merit, but for confidence towards promotion and tenure, High Core Activities should be the goal.

#### High Core Activities
- National or International Solo Exhibition
- International Juried/Invited Group Exhibition
- Invited Curator/Juror in Major Venues
- Awards in International Competition/Juried Exhibition
- International or Major National Grant
- International or National Awards/Honors
- Featured in Presentation in International or National Conference
- Featured or Reviewed in Major Art Publication
- Authored Book or Article in Major Art Publication
- National or International Major Publication
- National or International Major Commission
- Work Included in Museum or Major Collection

#### Core Level Activities
- Regional or Minor National Solo Exhibition
- National or Regional Group Exhibition
- Curator/Juror National or Regional Exhibition/Competition
- Awards in National or Regional Competition/Juried Exhibition
- Regional or University Small Grant
- Regional Awards/Honors
- Visiting Artist Presentation, Lecture, Demo in Regional Level or Above
- Panel, Minor Talk in National Conference
Artist Residency in Major Venue National or International
Mentioned in Major Art Publication
Authored Article in National Publication
Regional Public Commission
Work Included in Minor Collection

Supporting Activities
Local Group Show
Faculty Show
Juror Local Competition
Online Exhibition
Local Minor Grant
Local or University Awards/Honors
Presentation, Lecture, Demo in Local Level
Mentioned in Regional Publication, Catalogue
Authored Article in Minor or Regional Publication
Minor Commission: Private, Commercial, Events
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Painting and Drawing Annual Merit Research Guidelines</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Exceeds Expectations:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 or more High Core Activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AND 2 Core Activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meets Expectations (upper range):</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-5 Core Activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OR 1 High Core Activity + 2 Core Activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OR Combination of 1 High Core Activity, 1 Core Activity and 2 Core or more Supporting Activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meets Expectations (middle range):</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-3 Core Activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meets Expectations (lower range):</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Core Activity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OR 2 Supporting Activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fallen Below Minimum-Acceptable Levels of Productivity:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0 Core activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AND 1 Supporting Activity</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- An individual case can be made for high number of Core Activities, or combination of Core and Supporting Activities with regard to merit. But for confidence towards Promotion and Tenure, Core and High Core Activities should be the goal, **with a recommended total of 5 Core/High Core Activities per year. In addition, it is recommended that 3 or more of these activities be solo exhibitions, achieved at some point during the 5 years on tenure track.**
- It is appropriate that faculty pursue national peer level research activity. Regional level research only, will weaken the candidate’s tenure/promotion prospects.
- Start of a long-range studio research project that may affect dissemination of research during the merit cycle only available to faculty who have successfully met or exceeded expectations in the preceding year.

**High Core Activities**

- Competitive or Invitational Exhibition (venue/or curator/juror of considerable national achievement)
- Competitive or Invitational Exhibition-in-Print (venue/or curator/juror of considerable national achievement)
- National or International Collection
- Solo Exhibition (National or International venue)
- Residency (National or International)
- Grant (Non-university)
- Featured in Art Publication (with editor and national or international circulation)
- Artist’s Talk or Technical Demo (at National or International Conference or University)
- Exhibition Curator (National or International Venue and/or Artists of National or International Reputation)
Show Awards (National or International)
Purchase Award (National or International)

**Core Level Activities**
Competitive or Invitational Group Exhibition (venue/or curator/juror of national or regional reputation)
Competitive or Invitational Exhibition-in-Print (venue/or curator/juror of considerable national achievement)
Regional Collection
Solo Exhibition (Regional venue)
Residency (Regional)
Grant (University)
Featured in Minor Art Related Publication; or National/International Art Related Blog (such as Two Coats of Paint)
Regional Artist’s Talk or Technical Demo
Exhibition Curator (Regional Venue and/or Artists of Regional Reputation)
Secure Contract for Solo National or International Exhibition
Prepare & Submit Major Grant Application (National or International)
Acceptance into Competitive or Invitational Artist Registry or Flat Files
Conference Demo/Panel/Exhibition (General Academic Conference)
Show Awards (Regional)
Purchase Award (Regional)

**Supporting Level Activities**
Present Local/Community Artist’s Talk, Demo, Art-Related Panel or Active Participant in Art-Related Event
Prepare and Submit Minor Grant Application (Non-K-State University)
Community Demo or Event
Conference Attendance
Local Solo Exhibition
Local Group Exhibition
Curator/Juror of Undergrad Student Exhibition
Featured in Minor Art Related Blog or local newspaper (general)
Local Artist’s Talk or Demo
Maintain Regularly, Updated Web Portfolio
Gallery Contract or Representation
Maintain Flat File Presence/update Work in Gallery
Exhibition Catalog
### Photography Annual Merit Research Guidelines

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Exceeds Expectations:</th>
<th>6 Core Activities OR 1 High Level Core Activity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Meets Expectations (upper range):</td>
<td>4-5 Core Activities OR 5 Supporting Activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meets Expectations (middle range):</td>
<td>2-3 Core Activities OR 4 Supporting Activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meets Expectations (lower range):</td>
<td>1 Core Activity OR 3 Supporting Activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fallen Below Minimum-Acceptable Levels of Productivity:</td>
<td>2 Supporting Activities</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- The number of national or regional solo exhibitions (which could be expected as a frequent activity) should be considered in relation to the increased opportunities available in bigger city/metropolitan areas.

### High Core Activities
- International Solo/Two Person/Collaborative Exhibition
- Major National Solo Exhibition
- Traveling Exhibition (International Venues)
- Curating/Jurying Exhibitions (Major National and International Venue)
- Major Grant (National/International)
- Major International or National Award (International Juried Exhibition)
- Major Artist’s Talk/Workshop/Conference/Panel/National or International Venues
- International/Major National Collection (Reputable University, Museum, or Special Collection)
- Publication of Work (Major National, International)
- Reviewed in International Art Publication
- Major Residency

### Core Level Activities
- National Group Exhibition (1-3 works, juried or invitational)
- International Group Exhibition (1-3 works, juried or invitational)
- Traveling Exhibition (National Venues)
- Minor National Solo Exhibition
- Two Person, Collaborative Exhibition/Installation (National Venues)
- Curating/Jurying Exhibitions (Minor National and International Venue)
- Regional/University/Minor Grant
Minor National Award
Award at National Juried Exhibition
Minor Artist’s Talk/Workshop/ National Venue
Minor National Collection
Publication of Work (Minor National)
Reviewed in Minor Art Publication (newspaper, minor journal)
Minor Artist Residency

Supporting Level Activities
Regional Group Exhibition (1-3 works, juried or invitational)
Major Regional Solo Exhibition
Collaboration With Regional Entities (Academic/Other)
Benefit, Fundraiser Exhibitions (Regional)
Best of Show Award at Regional or Above Group Exhibition
Artist’s Talk/Workshop/Regional Venue
Catalogs Regional Collection
Publication of Work (Local)
Review of Work (Local)
Minor Collection (Invitational Regional Venue)
Printmaking Annual Merit Research Guidelines

Exceeds Expectations: 4 Core Activities (2 of 4 High Level Core Activity)

Meets Expectations (upper range): 3 Core Activities (1 of 3 High Level Core Activity)

Meets Expectations (middle range): 2-3 Core Activities

Meets Expectations (lower range): 1 Core Activity

OR 2 supporting Activities

Fallen Below Minimum-Acceptable Levels of Productivity: 0 Core activities

OR 1 supporting Activity

- An individual case can be made for high amount of supporting activities, or high amount of lower core activities in regards to merit, but for confidence towards promotion and tenure High Core Activities should be the goal.

High Core Activities

- Major Print Conference Demo/Panel/Exhibition
- Major Competitive or Invitational Exhibition (IPCNY, Boston Printmakers, Penang Print, etc.)
- Major Print Portfolio
- Major Works on Paper Collection (reputable University, Museum, or Special collection)
- Solo Exhibition at reputable University or Gallery
- Major Residency (e.g. Franz Masreel, Belgium.)
- Curator or Portfolio Organizer for Major Exhibition/Portfolio
- Major Grant
- Featured in Major Publication in Print Field (Printmaker’s Today, Graphic Impressions, etc.)
- Major Artist Talk or Technical Demo (at Major Conference or National University)
- Major Gallery Contract

Core Level Activities

- Minor Conference Demo/Panel/Exhibition (general academic conference)
- Minor Competitive or Invitational Exhibition (all media, etc.)
- Minor Print Portfolio
- Minor Regional Print Collection (based on reputation and prestige)
- Kansas Solo Exhibition
- Minor Residency
- Curator or Regional Minor Portfolio or Exhibition
- University Small Grant
Featured in Minor Print Related publication
Minor/Regional Artist Talk or Demonstration
Commercial Gallery Contract (and activity with the year)
Secure Contract for Solo National or International Print Exhibit following year

Supporting Level Activities
Community Print Demo or Event
Print Conference Attendance
Open Portfolio Participation
Local/Regional All Media Juried Exhibit
Local/Regional Print Collection
Local Solo Exhibition
Local Group Invitational Exhibition
Curator or Undergrad Student Print Exchange
Featured on Artist Blog
Local Artist Talk or Demo
Maintain Regularly Updated Web Portfolio
Sculpture Annual Merit Research Guidelines

Exceeds Expectations:  5+ Core Activities (at least 2 of which must be High Core)

Meets Expectation
(upper range):  3-4 Core Activities (any combination of High and Core)

Meets Expectations
(middle range):  2-3 Core Activities

Meets Expectations
(lower range):  1 Core Activity
OR  2 Supporting Activities

Fallen Below Minimum-Acceptable
Levels of Productivity:  0 Core Activity
OR  1 Supporting Activity

- An individual case can be made for high amount of supporting activities, or high amount of lower core activities in regards to merit, but for confidence towards promotion and tenure High Core Activities should be the goal.

High Core Activities
- Major Solo exhibition
- International publications
- International or National Conference Presentation/Performance
- International Artist’s Talk
- Major Collections (Reputable University, Museum, or Private Collection)
- National Grant
- Public Commissions
- Outdoor Sculpture Competitions (Extended Loan Period)
- International Residency
- Solo Exhibition at Reputable University, Museum, Gallery, or Art Center
- International/National Group Exhibitions
- Major Regional Exhibition
- Visiting Artist’s Talk/Demonstration
- Major Grant
- Site Specific Sculpture/Installation
- National Residency
- Major Exhibition Curated/Juried
- Honors/Awards
- Featured Article/Review
- Major Gallery Contract
Core Level Activities
- Secure Contract for Solo National or International Exhibition
- University Grants
- Minor Regional Exhibition/Performance
- Regional Residency
- Minor Exhibition Curated/Juried
- Minor Publication, Work Sited/Catalogs
- Regional Conference Presentation/Performance
- Minor Collection/Private Collection
- Private Commissions
- Kansas Solo Exhibition
- Minor Regional Artist’s Talk/Demonstration
- Commercial Gallery Contract
- Secure Contract for Solo National or International Sculpture Exhibit
- Regional Grant

Supporting Level Activities
- Local/Faculty Exhibitions
- Local Publications
- Local Talks/Demonstrations/Performances
- Local Exhibitions Curated/Juried
- Local/Regional All Media Juried Exhibits
- Local Solo Exhibition
- Local Group Invitational Exhibition
- Curator Undergrad Student Exhibition
- Featured on Artist’s Blog
- Maintain Regularly Updated Web Portfolio
SECTION 6: CHRONIC LOW ACHIEVEMENT

If an Art Department tenured faculty member receives a “Fallen below minimum-acceptable levels of productivity” in a critical area that affects the mission of the Department of Art (teaching, research, service) for two successive years or a total of three overall evaluations in any five-year period, the following review process would take place. Steps 1, 2, and 3 will not occur if affected faculty member declines peer input.

1. Prior to forwarding this evaluation to the appropriate dean, all tenured faculty members would review the particular case.
2. Affected faculty member would have the option of presenting his/her case to the Personnel Committee in person or by the submission of pertinent evaluation materials.
3. Following the review, the majority opinion of the faculty will be reported to the department head. The department head will review the report and may revise the evaluation.
4. A final report will be submitted to the Dean of Arts & Sciences if the faculty member remains in Performance Category #4, the fallen below minimum-acceptable level of productivity.

Please refer to University handbook Sections C31.5-C31.8 for details regarding chronic low achievement. If tenure is revoked, the faculty member would have the current university grievance procedures available, please see the University Handbook.

SECTION 7: PROFESSORIAL PERFORMANCE AWARD

1. CRITERIA
   - The candidate must be a full-time professor and have been in rank at least six years since the last promotion or Professional Performance Award.
   - The candidate must show evidence of sustained productivity in at least the last six years before the performance review; and
   - The candidate’s productivity and performance must be of a quality comparable to that which would merit promotion to professor according to current approved departmental standards.

2. PROCEDURES
The procedures for determining awardees will follow a timeline consistent with the activities associated with the annual evaluation review process. Eligible candidates will complete and submit a file that documents professional accomplishments for the previous six years in accordance with the criteria, standards, and guidelines established by the department. The department head, after consultation with all other full professors in the department, will evaluate the materials and prepare a written evaluation of the candidate’s material in terms of the criteria, standards, and guidelines established, along with a recommendation for or against the award. This recommendation and the supporting documentation will be forwarded to the dean at the same time annual evaluations are forwarded to the dean. The dean will forward his or her recommendation along with the documentation to the Provost’s office at the same time annual evaluations are forwarded. Please review the University Handbook Sections C49.1-C49.14 for policy and other details regarding the process.
SECTION 8: POST-TENURE REVIEW (MAY 2, 2014)

The purpose of post-tenure review at Kansas State University is to enhance the continued professional development of tenured faculty. The process is intended to encourage intellectual vitality and professional proficiency for all members of the faculty throughout their careers, so they may more effectively fulfill the mission of the university. It is also designed to enhance public trust in the University by ensuring that the faculty community undertakes regular and rigorous efforts to hold all of its members accountable for high professional standards.

Kansas State University recognizes that the granting of tenure for university faculty is a vital protection of free inquiry and open intellectual debate. It is expressly recognized that nothing in this policy alters or amends the university’s policies regarding removal of tenured faculty members for cause (which are stipulated in the University Handbook). This policy and any actions taken under it are separate from and have no bearing on the chronic low achievement or annual evaluation policies and processes.

The Department of Art policy on post-tenure review follows the overarching purpose, principles, objectives, and procedures in the university policy on post-tenure review (see University Handbook, Appendix W), which was approved by Faculty Senate on February 11, 2014. Any promotion or substantial award (such as Professorial Performance Award or University Distinguished Professor) restarts the six-year clock for post-tenure review.

Review Procedures:

Materials compiled for Post-Tenure Review
1. Six previous annual evaluation letters drawn from the faculty member’s personnel file.
2. A brief synopsis drawn directly from the six evaluation letters and compiled by the department head, of evaluations: typically teaching, creative/research, and service activity.
3. A reflective statement by the faculty member, not to exceed two pages, giving a summary of their activities and accomplishments over the previous six-year time frame.
4. A one-page goals statement that outlines the faculty member’s short and long-term goals.

Review Oversight
The department head oversees the review and meets with the faculty member to review the materials submitted. If necessary, the department head may consult with the chair of the Personnel Committee or other faculty members in the art, art history or design discipline at an equivalent or higher rank, to understand special circumstances or contributions specific to that discipline.

Outcomes
If all six annual reviews Meet or Exceed Expectations in the three areas of evaluation, the post-tenure review meeting can be waived as this indicates that the faculty member is making an “appropriate contribution to the university.” If there are areas of evaluation where there are concerns, the department head will indicate these in writing, in advance of the meeting, and the faculty member and the department head will discuss specific ways to address these concerns.
The Head and faculty member will meet at the end of the following semester to review progress on the concerns and progress towards goals indicated by the faculty member.

All materials compiled for post-tenure review by the faculty member will be included in the faculty member’s personnel file, with the department head’s synopsis and any follow-up if applicable. The outcomes of the review will be submitted to the dean.
APPENDIX A
CRITERIA FOR DETERMINING PEER LEVEL REVIEW

Should there be a question as to whether a venue or exhibition is considered “peer level,” the faculty member will be asked to supply material outlining existence of the below criteria as related to that venue or exhibition.

1. ART HISTORY FACULTY RESEARCH

1.1. Research will be considered to be “Peer Level” as defined by any of the following criteria:

- Publications, conference papers and public lectures, grant applications, or other scholarly activities have been subject to blind peer review.
- Publications, conference papers and public lectures, grant applications, or other scholarly activities have been evaluated by someone whose scholarly expertise is comparable to that of university faculty or above.

2. STUDIO FACULTY RESEARCH

2.1. Research will be considered to be “Peer Level” as defined by any of the following criteria:

- Prestige of the venue’s permanent collection.
- Prestige of the venue as evidenced through exhibition review(s) in a national level art journal, or exhibition(s) review in a regional publication with a regular art critic.
- Reputation of other artists who have exhibited in the venue.
- Juror/curator’s experience and/or position being at a level comparable to that of university level faculty or above.
- Juror/curator possesses a national or international reputation as an artist, curator, critic or scholar in any of the visual arts fields.
- Opportunity for participation in a venue is competitive and offered by any representative of a professional art organization, members of whom are at the university faculty level or above.
- Opportunity is competitive and awarded by a granting agency, comparable to a state university or above.

3. GRAPHIC DESIGN FACULTY RESEARCH

3.1. Activities will be considered to be “Peer Level” Research in the following cases:

- There has been peer selection and/or an evaluation process conducted by someone whose art/design expertise is comparable to that of university faculty or above (for non-consulting activities).
- Client work is done in collaboration with, or commissioned by an Art Director, Project Manager or Marketing/Communication Specialist.
• If consulting, all criteria listed in Definitions must be met, and selection must be conducted by someone whose expertise is comparable to that of university faculty or above.

• May also include exhibitions and grants -- see also STUDIO FACULTY RESEARCH PEER LEVEL DEFINITIONS described above.
APPENDIX B
DEFINITION OF TERMS

1. GEOGRAPHIC SCOPE OF VENUE
   Juried and invitational group exhibitions shall be defined by prospectus and/or reputation of juror or venue, rather than location. Juried or invitational web exhibitions shall fall under minor solo or group categories. A museum of national caliber (i.e., has national level collection/exhibitions) shall be considered a national venue, even if located in the state of Kansas or surrounding region. The Beach Museum shall be considered a regional institution except for group faculty shows, which are minor, local group shows.

2. EXHIBITIONS

2.1. International Solo Exhibition
   A one-person exhibition held outside the United States at a public institution such as a national gallery, a national museum, a public gallery, an internationally recognized private gallery, a commercial gallery of peer level, a peer-level not-for-profit gallery, a peer-level alternative space, or a university art museum of international standing.

2.2. International Group Exhibition
   An exhibition consisting of work by two or more artists, designated by the prospectus as being international in scope at a public institution such as a national gallery or museum, a commercial gallery of peer level, a peer-level not-for-profit gallery, a peer-level alternative space, a public gallery or museum, an internationally recognized private gallery, a university art museum, or an exhibition selected by a juror/curator of international reputation.

2.3. National Solo Exhibition
   A one-person exhibition held in the United States beyond Colorado, Oklahoma, Nebraska, Kansas or Missouri at a public gallery or museum, a nationally recognized private gallery, a commercial gallery of peer level, a peer-level not-for-profit gallery, a peer-level alternative space, or a university art museum of national standing.

2.4. National Group Exhibition
   An exhibition consisting of work by two or more artists held in the United States, designated by the prospectus as being national in scope at a public institution such as a gallery or museum, a commercial gallery of peer level, a peer-level not-for-profit gallery, a peer-level alternative space, a public gallery or museum, a nationally recognized private gallery, a university art museum, or an exhibition selected by a juror/curator of national reputation.

2.5. Regional Solo Exhibition
   A one-person exhibition held in Colorado, Oklahoma, Nebraska, Kansas, or Missouri at a public gallery or museum, a regionally recognized private gallery, a commercial gallery of peer level, a peer-level not-for-profit gallery, a peer-level alternative space, or a university art museum of regional standing.
2.6. Regional Group Exhibition
An exhibition consisting of work by two or more artists held in the United States, designated by the prospectus as being regional in scope at a public institution such as a gallery or museum, a commercial gallery of peer level, a peer-level not-for-profit gallery, a peer-level alternative space, a public gallery or museum, a regionally recognized private gallery, a university art museum, or an exhibition selected by a juror/curator of regional reputation.

3. PUBLICATIONS AND REVIEW OF WORK

3.1. Review in “MINOR” Art Publication (Exhibition Review or Feature Article)
“Minor” publication is defined as a newspaper with staff art critic, or a peer-level art publication with regional circulation. Review may be of a group or solo exhibition, or a feature article.

3.2. Reviewed in “MAJOR” Art Publication (Exhibition Review or Feature Article)
“Major” publication is defined as an art publication of national or international reputation/circulation. Review may be of a group or solo exhibition, or a feature article.

3.3. Exhibition Catalog and Gallery Folio
In general, catalogs and folios accompanying an exhibition shall be credited as the lowest, peer level activity. A catalog is a printed, bound or loose-leaf artifact that includes images of work by artists in the show, as well as a statement or essay from the juror/curator, or other art writer. A folio is at least a 2-sided, printed artifact that contains images from the show and text such as curatorial comments, biographical information on the artists in the show, etc.

3.4. Large Scale Work
Work that fulfills any of the following:
- is of a scale that significantly pushes the definition of “portable”
- is of a scale that significantly pushes the feasibility or limits of media or process
- is of a scale that is significantly larger than common practice in discipline or form

3.5. Lectures & Presentations (Research related)
Conferences, Visiting Artists talks, panels, etc.

3.6. Publication of written work
Peer-reviewed books, articles, essays, reviews, etc.

3.7. Publication of aesthetic work
Includes having digital art, graphic design, and/or illustration work published and featured as such, in books, magazines, newspapers, or respected, relevant public websites. Work is featured as an aesthetic piece of prominence in the field, rather than as design or art for a publication. Distribution of publication determines which geographic category it falls into. Gallery and home page promotion don't count.
3.8. Residencies
Participation for a specified length of time, in an established, peer level program wherein
dedicated space is provided in support of creative endeavor and there was competitive
review process.

3.9. Awards/Grants
Those where there has been a competitive-peer-review process.

3.10. Commissioned/Client Work
Any digital art, graphic design, and/or illustration work done for, and commissioned by a
peer knowledgeable in design for client, paid or unpaid. Includes work published in
magazines, newspapers, books, or respected, relevant public websites, etc., that is used as
art or design for said publication. Distribution of publication determines which
geographic category it falls into. Gallery and home page promotion don't count.

3.11. Consulting
The scope of the project is considerable, and involvement as consultant provides
significant expertise, rather than acting merely in an advisory position. The involvement
of time and expertise must be multifaceted and in line with the University's guidelines.
APPENDIX C
DEPARTMENT OF ART MISSION STATEMENT

The mission of the Art Department is based on the recognition of the universal human need for visual expression, the necessity of the visual arts and visual communication in contemporary society, and the importance of cultural diversity provided for by exposure to the arts.

Central to the mission is a commitment to high quality undergraduate and graduate education in the visual arts. Quality teaching is enhanced by the creative research endeavors of the faculty who work closely with students to stimulate aesthetic and intellectual inquiry in both theory and application. Art and visual communication students are prepared to become practicing artists who are visually literate, culturally aware, skilled in creative problem solving and aesthetically sensitive. The curriculum provides a balance of art and visual communication history (including art and visual communication theory and craft), studio experiences, and preparation for future study or entry into a career.

The mission of the Art Department includes professional and public service contributions. The expertise unique to the professional artist/designer and teacher serves varied clientele, agencies, and associations in the community, state of Kansas, and the national and international community.

The Art Department at Kansas State University is a part of the College of Arts and Sciences. The mission of the College is fourfold: to take the lead in providing a high quality liberal arts foundation for all Kansas State University students; to promote graduate education and scholarly/research activities; to promote high quality undergraduate programs for its own majors; and to provide service to the disciplines, state and nation. The Department mission follows these College mission objectives very closely.