

During the Academic Year 2013-2014, the College P&B Subcommittee on Faculty Scholarship felt that the current scholarship document which was revised February 15, 2011 inadvertently prioritized faculty scholarship as a whole, without really taking into consideration the vast differences of individual discipline and program scholarship priorities. For instance, it is suggested in the document that creative works can, “also **help to** show evidence of growth in one’s field;” there needs to be an understanding that in certain “creative” disciplines, creative works **are the sole** evidence of growth in one’s field. Meanwhile, in the professional programs, there is a greater emphasis on scholarship of application, scholarship of integration, and scholarship of teaching and learning than is reflected in the document as it stands.

The subcommittee is recommending that all Departments and Programs create a Faculty Scholarly and/or Creative and Professional Activity set of guidelines that would help guide other Chairs in understanding the priorities and the types of scholarship within the various fields. What follows is a document which I put together for the Department of Performing and Fine Arts defining scholarly activity within the various disciplines under the Department’s umbrella.

~Timothy J. Amrhien

YORK College



School of Arts and Sciences
The City University of New York

**PFA Faculty Scholarship/Creative Activities
Guidelines**

June, 2013

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Preface	3
Departmental Disciplines	
1. Communications Technology.....	4
2. Studio Arts.....	8
3. Art History.....	11
4. Music.....	13
5. Speech Communication.....	15
6. Theatre Arts.....	17
Terminal Degrees	19

Preface

The York College Department of Performing and Fine Arts has adopted a standard for assessing faculty “scholarly activity” based upon standard criteria used in a majority of performing, visual and media arts departments. A “distinguished” record is prominent and conspicuous by its excellence. To achieve this, a candidate must have produced a body of research and/or artistic achievement that is openly available, scholarly, creative, and of high quality and significance, and must be recognized and visible within his or her domain of research or artistic practice. In the performing, visual and media arts research is not limited to traditional publication but also encompasses activities that lead to the public availability of products, practices, technologies, and ideas that have significance to society. Quality of research or artistic achievement is more important than quantity, and innovation, effective interdisciplinary and collaborative research and praxis, and the ability to create new directions or significant experimentation within the field is highly valued.

Artistic/Creative Endeavor refers to the result of the production of creative work by faculty. Creative endeavor is most easily identified when associated with the performing arts (theater, music, dance), the fine arts (two- and three-dimensional art) and media arts (digital art, computer graphics, computer animation, virtual art, Internet art, interactive art, video games). It is also most appropriate to apply it in the area of applied arts (architecture, graphics and printing, design, decorating). Creative endeavor involves not only the creation of a tangible product, but the subjection of that creative piece to judgment by public and peers through the vehicle of performance, show, publication, display, or exhibit.

Creative/performance research must include significant creative/performance achievements presented in significant venues, media, or publications appropriate to the nature of the subject of the creative/performance work, and, as appropriate, the development or dissemination by other means of new technology or creative/performance procedures resulting in innovative creative/performance works, excellence in disciplinary, interdisciplinary or collaborative practices, and ideas of significance and value to society. Distinguished performance scholarship used in creating and performing the art of theatre and dance will receive consideration equivalent to that accorded to distinction attained in the more traditional research concerning the historical and theoretical interpretations of performance.

What follows is an outline of scholarly/artistic guidelines for the various disciplines housed under the Department of Performing and Fine Arts. This is a basis for how the Department assesses its faculty in the disciplines of Communications Technology, Studio Art, Art History, Music, Speech Communication and Theatre Arts.

Document created and submitted by,



Timothy J. Amrhein
Chair, Department of Performing and Fine Arts
Associate Professor of Theatre
School of Arts and Sciences

Discipline Specific Scholarship Guidelines for Communications Technology

Digital media are transforming literacy, scholarship, teaching, and service, as well as providing new venues for research, communication, and the creation of networked academic communities. Information technology is an integral part of the intellectual environment for all humanities faculty members, but for those working closely in new media it creates special challenges and opportunities. Digital media have expanded the objects and forms of inquiry of modern language departments to include images, sounds, data, kinetic attributes like animation, and new kinds of engagement with textual representation and analysis.

User-generated content produces a wealth of new critical publications, applied scholarship, pedagogical models, curricular innovations, and redefinitions of author, text, and reader. Academic work in digital media must be evaluated in the light of these rapidly changing technological, institutional, and professional contexts, and departments should recognize that many traditional notions of scholarship, teaching, and service are being redefined.

1. Fundamentals for Initial Review:

The work must be evaluated in the medium in which it was produced and published. If it's a website, that means viewing it in a browser with the appropriate plug-ins necessary for the site to work. If it's a virtual simulation model, that may mean going to a laboratory outfitted with the necessary software and projection systems to view the model. Work that is time based—like videos—will often be represented by stills, but reviewers also need to devote attention to clips in order to fully evaluate the work. The same can be said for interface development, since still images cannot fully demonstrate the interactive nature of interface research. Authors of digital works should provide a list of system requirements (both hardware and software, including compatible browsers, versions, and plug-ins) for viewing the work. It is incumbent upon academic personnel offices to verify that the appropriate technologies are available and installed on the systems that will be used by the reviewers before they evaluate the digital work.

2. Crediting

Digital projects are often collaborative in nature, involving teams of scholars who work together in different venues over various periods of time. Authors of digital works should provide a clear articulation of the role or roles that they have played in the genesis, development, and execution of the digital project. It is impractical—if not impossible—to separate out every micro-contribution made by team members since digital projects are often synergistic, iterative, experimental, and even dynamically generated through ongoing collaborations. Nevertheless, authors should indicate the roles that they played (and time commitments) at each phase of the project development. Who conceptualized the project and designed the initial specifications (functional and technical)? Who created the mock-ups? Who wrote the grants or secured the funding that supported the project? What role did each contributor play in the development and execution of the project? Who authored the content? Who

decided how that content would be accessed, displayed, and stored? What is the "public face" of the project and who represents it and how?

3. Intellectual Rigor

Digital projects vary tremendously and may not "look" like traditional academic scholarship; at the same time, scholarly rigor must be assessed by examining how the work contributes to and advances the state of knowledge of a given field or fields. What is the nature of the new knowledge created? What is the methodology used to create this knowledge? It is important for review committees to recognize that new knowledge is not just new content but also new ways of organizing, classifying, and interacting with content. This means that part of the intellectual contribution of a digital project is the design of the interface, the database, and the code, all of which govern the form of the content. Digital scholars are not only in the position of doing original research but also of inventing new scholarly platforms after 500+ years of print so fully naturalized the "look" of knowledge that it may be difficult for reviewers to understand these new forms of documentation and the intellectual effort that goes into developing them. This is the dual burden—and the dual opportunity—for creativity in the digital domain.

4. Crossing Research, Teaching, and Service

Digital projects almost always have multiple applications and uses that enhance—at the same time—research, teaching, and service. Digital research projects can make transformative contributions in the classroom and sometimes even have an impact on the public-at-large. This ripple effect should not be diminished. Review committees need to be attentive to colleagues who dismiss the research contributions of digital work by cavalierly characterizing it as a mere "tool" for teaching or service. Tools shape knowledge, and knowledge shapes tools. But it is also important that review committees focus on the research contributions of the digital work by asking questions such as the following: How is the work engaged with a problem specific to a scholarly discipline or group of disciplines? How does the work reframe that problem or contribute a new way of understanding the problem? How does the work advance an argument through both the content and the way the content is presented? How is the design of the platform an argument? To answer this last question, review committees might ask for documentation describing the development process and design of the platform or software, such as database schema, interface designs, modules of code (and explanations of what they do), as well as sample data types. If the project is, in fact, primarily for teaching, how has it transformed the learning environment? What contributions has it made to learning and how have these contributions been assessed?

5. Peer Review

Digital projects should be peer reviewed by scholars in fields who are able to assess the project's contribution to knowledge and situate it within the relevant intellectual landscape. Peer review can happen formally through letters of solicitation but also be assessed through online forums, citations and discussions in scholarly venues, grants received from foundations and other sources of funding, and public presentations of the

project at conferences and symposia. Has the project given rise to publications in peer-reviewed journals or won prizes by professional associations? How does it measure up to comparable projects in the field that use or develop similar technologies or similar kinds of data? Finally, grants received are often significant indicators of peer review. It is important that reviewers familiarize themselves with grant organizations across schools and disciplines, including the Humanities, the Social Sciences, the Arts, Information Studies and Library Sciences, and the Natural Sciences, since these are indicators of prestige and impact.

6. Impact

Digital projects can have an impact on numerous fields in the academy as well as across institutions and even the general public. They often cross the divide between research, teaching, and service in innovative ways that should be remarked. Impact can be measured in many ways, including the following: support by granting agencies or foundations, number of viewers or contributors to a site and what they contribute, citations in both traditional literature and online (blogs, social media, links, and trackbacks), use or adoption of the project by other scholars and institutions, conferences and symposia featuring the project, and resonance in public and community outreach (such as museum exhibitions, impact on public policy, adoption in curricula, and so forth).

7. Approximating Equivalencies

Is a digital research project "equivalent" to a book published by a university press, an edited volume, a research article, or something else? These sorts of questions are often misguided since they are predicated on comparing fundamentally different knowledge artifacts and, perhaps more problematically, consider print publications as the norm and benchmark from which to measure all other work. Reviewers should be able to assess the significance of the digital work based on a number of factors: the quality and quantity of the research that contributed to the project; the length of time spent and the kind of intellectual investment of the creators and contributors; the range, depth, and forms of the content types and the ways in which this content is presented; and the nature of the authorship and publication process. Large-scale projects with major funding, multiple collaborators, and a wide-range of scholarly outputs may justifiably be given more weight in the review and promotion process than smaller scale or short-term projects.

8. Development Cycles, Sustainability, and Ethics

It is important that review committees recognize the iterative nature of digital projects, which may entail multiple reviews over several review cycles, as projects grow, change, and mature. Given that academic review cycles are generally several years apart (while digital advances occur more rapidly), reviewers should consider individual projects in their specific contexts. At what "stage" is the project in its current form? Is it considered "complete" by the creators, or will it continue in new iterations, perhaps through spinoff projects and further development? Has the project followed the best practices, as they

have been established in the field, in terms of data collection and content production, the use of standards, and appropriate documentation? How will the project "live" and be accessible in the future, and what sort of infrastructure will be necessary to support it? Here, project specific needs and institutional obligations come together at the highest levels and should be discussed openly with Deans and Provosts, Library and IT staff, and project leaders. Finally, digital projects may raise critical ethical issues about the nature and value of cultural preservation, public history, participatory culture and accessibility, digital diversity, and collection curation, which should be thoughtfully considered by project leaders and review committees.

9. Experimentation and Risk-Taking

Digital projects in the Humanities, Social Sciences, and Arts share with experimental practices in the Sciences a willingness to be open about iteration and negative results. As such, experimentation and trial-and-error are inherent parts of digital research and must be recognized to carry risk. The processes of experimentation can be documented and prove to be essential in the long-term development process of an idea or project. White papers, sets of best practices, new design environments, and publications can result from such projects and these should be considered in the review process. Experimentation and risk-taking in scholarship represent the best of what the university, in all its many disciplines, has to offer society. To treat scholarship that takes on risk and the challenge of experimentation as an activity of secondary (or no) value for promotion and advancement, can only serve to reduce innovation, reward mediocrity, and retard the development of research.

September 2011

This document was authored by Todd Presner, with contributions, feedback, and language provided by John Dagenais, Johanna Drucker, Diane Favro, Peter Lunenfeld, and Willeke Wendrich.

Discipline Specific Scholarship Guidelines for Studio Art

In studio art disciplines, exhibition of creative work is considered the equivalent of publication in other fields. The studio art discipline at York College expects that tenure track and contingent faculty be practicing and exhibiting artists, and expects that tenured and tenure track faculty be striving to produce and exhibit at the highest level possible given the circumstances of their teaching and administrative loads. At the time of tenure, we expect faculty to show evidence of significant contribution to their area of interest. Faculty who are ready to be promoted to full professor will carry significantly more community service work than those members approaching tenure, and they will continue to be active in their field.

Each of the creative and exhibition activities can be ranked as international, national, regional and local and should be weighted in descending order. External reviews by recognized experts in the candidate's discipline of production or exhibits occurring at York College shall qualify as peer reviewed measures of professional activity. External review or critical review that results in broader exposure by recognized experts could increase the relative merit of local exhibitions.

International activities constitute exhibitions with international exposure usually happening outside of the country but could include international juried exhibitions within the country. National refers to exhibition or professional creative activity that occurs in a venue with a national level of prominence, which is competitive and is open to participation to any living artist. Nationally recognized institutions and exhibitions that happen to be located outside of major urban art centers such as national juried exhibitions, galleries, or other exhibition venues with national or international prominence will carry the merit of national status. Regional art venues are those which take place in larger cities in the Northeast and exhibitions that happen in regional art centers across the country. Local can be defined as New York, New Jersey and Connecticut. Local exhibitions should be considered community service as well as scholarship.

There are specific considerations for each art genre that fall outside of these general guidelines. The quantity of exhibitions may vary from discipline to discipline due to the logistics of shipping and transporting various art objects materials and the size weight, etc. Disciplines that employ aspects of mechanical reproduction such as photography, printmaking, and book arts will inherently have more extensive exhibition records due to the fact that multiple editions of work can be exhibited in many places at once. This work tends to lend itself to being exhibited with less effort and expense. These fields also tend to have extensive exhibition networks, which allow more opportunities for artist working in these disciplines. The quality of the exhibitions should be considered above quantity. The quality of exhibition venues can be judged by the quality and reputation of the institution hosting the exhibition, the reputation of the juror/curator, and the reputation of other participants in the show. These should all be considered and addressed explicitly, by candidates for tenure and promotion.

3-D artistic exhibition has expanded to include a wide range of practices and possible configurations, not limited to: large-scale public commissions, installation based practice, the production of discreet objects, performative work, and environmentally and/or socially based practice. While each of these categories may bring to mind specific output and/or objects, it is important to note that they are neither mutually exclusive nor comprehensive in describing

contemporary 3-D artistic production. A nexus of theoretical positions and concerns often interdependently informs work. It would not be uncommon for an individual artist's oeuvre to manifest itself in ways that fit one or several of the above descriptions. Each sculptural format presents a different set of challenges related to ephemerality, scale, shipping, cost, collectability, etc., that an individual would be incumbent to articulate as they make their case for professional engagement.

As a discipline, New Genres stresses innovation in terms of content, concept, production practices, distribution, and critical reception. In many ways, terms such as Digital / New Genres / New Media / Experimental Media are used as a large tent to allow for creative practices and research that might not fall under more traditional modes of artistic inquiry. Many New Genres practitioners currently maintain an online presence, which should be examined as part of the review process. New Genres artists may show their work in screenings like filmmakers, galleries or public spaces like sculptors or painters, or publish books like novelists or poets. They may work on social projects like a political activist or start entrepreneurial projects like a corporate agency. New Genres artists may spend time and energy helping to establish new venues or publications to disseminate and review their work, instead of attempting to fit that work into more traditional galleries, books, or magazines. Established means of review and critical reception are often questioned, sidestepped, and re-configured to accommodate new cutting-edge practices. As these innovations are instigated, it is in large part the responsibility of New Genres artists and educators to articulate the value of that work.

Artist in Residencies	May be local, national, international--the selection process varies.
Critical reviews	Exhibition review or mention of work exhibited in a group exhibition is an indication of presence within the field. The more noteworthy the venue and critic, the more weight this would carry.
Collections	Reputation of the collection and the reputation of the collector or institution can be considered.
Commissions	This category could be weighted on the location, whether it is local, national, or international, and competitiveness of selection process
Conferences	Participation in the form of panel discussions, lectures, demonstrations, or exhibitions associated with the conference.
Exhibitions	Ranked in order of importance: one person shows, competitively juried shows, group invitational show, group show.
Exhibition Venues	Museums --reputation of the institution and the quality of the collection should be considered.

Not for profit alternative exhibition/workspaces/On Line Publications --Often artists working in modes that do not fit in traditional exhibition settings, artists with political aversion to market driven exhibition spaces will exhibit in alternative exhibition workspaces. Often some of the most challenging work is exhibited in these venues. With consideration of location, level of exposure and reputation of the institution, these should be taken as seriously as other exhibition venues.

Galleries--Long-term affiliation with a gallery would carry significant weight depending on the reputation of the gallery. Galleries range from purely commercial decorative galleries to serious high-end galleries that are connected to the museum-gallery complex and would ensure exposure at the highest level of the art world.

College and University Galleries and Museums--the schools ranking and the reputation of the institution can be a measure of the relative weight these exhibitions might carry.

Fellowships/Grants

Local, national, international, level of competitive of selection process and the reputation of the institution or foundation granting the fellowship will indicate the relative weight.

Publications

Contributions to Art Journals with high editorial standards, local, national, international

Professional organizations

Membership and participation in the professional organization affiliated with the field or discipline would demonstrate participation at a high level. Presentation and participation in the governance of the organization would carry more weight than membership alone.

Workshops Presented

Artists may conduct workshops in coordination with a show of one's work. Artists may demonstrate as a technician, and this would be considered somewhere between teaching and professional activities.

Discipline Specific Scholarship Guidelines for Art History

Candidates in **Art History** may produce scholarship in one or multiple of the following capacities:

1. Publications

A candidate for tenure should have published in a journal that practices some form of peer review. For promotion, similarly, a candidate should have published in peer-reviewed journals. Candidates are also encouraged to publish a book during the period between tenure and promotion to professor, but a book should not be required for promotion.

Publication of articles or book chapters in edited collections of thematically related essays or exhibition catalogs are also desirable and usually meet the standard of peer review expected in the publication of individual articles. Other forms of publication, such as commissioned dictionary and encyclopedia articles, book reviews, and other pieces are desirable and should be recognized, but do not take the place of peer-reviewed work.

2. Exhibitions, Curatorial and Consulting Activities

Exhibitions, catalog entries and other curatorial activities also demonstrate important instances of successful peer review and engagement with fields related to art history and visual culture. Such activities might include but are not limited to assessing, evaluating, and selecting works for display or exhibition during a museum or gallery show, film or media festival, etc. Consulting done for the purposes of evaluating the historical and/or artistic significance of works of art or visual culture for museums or galleries is another form of recognition within a professional setting.

Regular contribution to on-campus exhibitions (in the York College Gallery and other venues) is expected of Art History faculty. The Art History faculty has unique access to demonstrate their scholarship to their peers and students. On-campus exhibitions/publications demand professional time and energy. In some cases, on-campus exhibitions may be considered part of scholarly activity for Art History faculty if they meet requirements for a formal, external peer-review process. In such cases, the candidate must specify details about the peer-review evaluation and include any relevant information and materials.

3. Papers presented at annual meetings of professional organizations and conferences

Candidates for tenure or promotion will normally have presented their work at the meetings of professional organizations to which they belong as members. The chief organization for Art History faculty is the College Art Association. Other national organizations, such as the American Studies Association; Cultural Studies Association; Society for Cinema and Media Studies; Association for Asian Studies; American Council

for Southern Asian Art; the German Studies Association; Foundations in Art: Theory and Education, are also appropriate venues. (The preceding list is not exhaustive, nor does the order in which the fields are listed have any significance.)

4. National Grants and Fellowships

Fellowships and awards demonstrate important examples of successful peer review.

Discipline Specific Scholarship Guidelines for Music

Scholarly/artistic activity in music consists of a spectrum in which "performance" is on one pole and "publication" is on the other. Activity on either side is considered equal. Therefore, evidence of professional activity in music may take a variety of forms and may also evolve according to professional skill and interest.

1. Scholarly Activity/Publication

Scholarship includes research, writing, and publication. To this end, books (and/or chapters therein), music editions, articles, reviews in journals (both scholar- and performer-oriented), and authoring music computer programs fulfill this goal.

With regard to books and articles, blind peer-review, common in many fields, has only limited importance in music scholarship; the fields are small, anonymity almost impossible. Because the fields are so small *and* sub-specialized there are too many peer-reviewed journals to name here. That said, the most prestigious and competitive venues include the *American Musicological Society* for music history and the *Journal of Music Theory* (Yale/Duke) for that discipline. Other examples include *Strings* magazine or *The Strad* magazine (for string players); each family of instruments has similar prestigious publication venues. Candidates for tenure and/or promotion may want to discuss the prestige/nature of publication venues with departmental colleagues. The first name in an author list is most commonly the first author of an article. Publishing houses vary in their review processes; most often two or three chapters from a book manuscript are sent to one or two outside reviewers, and the author sometimes suggests those reviewers.

With regard to music editions (that is, an author editing a composer's music), *first editions* or *first critical editions* are the most demanding, indicating that the author has brought music from a composer's manuscript(s) to an engraved, critical, playable edition for the first time; these are the equivalent of one *or more* peer-reviewed article(s), depending on the length of the composition; for example, editing a single song could be the equivalent of one peer-reviewed article whereas editing a four-movement string quartet could be the equivalent of four peer-reviewed articles. While publishing houses generally do not send these editions to outside readers, an in-house senior editor reviews them, so these are, in essence, in-house-peer-reviewed. *Modern editions* are the next most demanding because they require re-engraving and significant editing and are, again, in-house-peer-reviewed; these are the equivalent of one or two peer-reviewed articles, depending on the length of the composition. *Reprint editions* are the least demanding and should not be viewed as the equivalent of publishing a peer-reviewed article, but more at the level of chairing a panel at a conference. The first name in the author list is most commonly the first author of the edition.

Public lectures and significant participation (papers given, offices held) in national/international societies are considered professional activity for a scholar/artist, but not enough in and of themselves for tenure or promotion. Projects such as consulting, peer review, musical transcription, etc. that support and advance the musical/academic growth of the scholar him/herself are also included, but not enough in and of themselves.

By the time of tenure review, non-performers must have published in peer-reviewed journals and/or have published a book/chapters/music editions. A blend of performance(s) and publication(s) is common as well; in this case, the candidate should follow the above protocols for each. For promotion to professor, a *consistent* record since the awarding of tenure of the types of professional activity described above should be evident.

2. Performance/Composition

Performance includes directing and/or coaching musical ensembles for public concerts; performing as a member of a professional ensemble; individual solo or chamber public performances (on campus, off campus, at festivals, at conventions), and commercial recordings. Music composition includes composing or arranging music, publication of said works, and/or public performance and/or recording of those works. It is unreasonable to expect a music critic to review all performances; if critical reviews are published, they should be provided to the Faculty Personnel Committee. If critical reviews are not published, the candidate should provide recordings of performances, *both on-campus and off-campus*, to an external reviewer of the candidate's and Chair's choice who is a recognized expert in the candidate's field; that external reviewer should subsequently provide to the Faculty Personnel Committee a written review of those performances, which will then qualify those performances as peer-reviewed. In the materials the candidate submits to the Faculty Personnel Committee, the candidate should clearly explain the mechanics of each performance: when the performance took place; where; whether invited or self-promoted; whether reviewed by a music critic; whether reviewed by an external person.

By the time of the tenure review, a performer/composer who opts for *performance-only* is expected to have presented several concerts on campus *and* regionally/nationally/internationally. York-only performance is not in itself sufficient; nor is off-campus performance in itself sufficient. A blend of both is necessary by the time of tenure review and by the time of further promotion. Venues for performances will most often be other educational institutions or national conferences because the expense of renting even a small public hall is prohibitive for a solo or chamber performance.

Discipline Specific Scholarship Guidelines for Speech Communication

Speech Communication is a diverse area of study and hence each candidate's scholarship and/or creative work will and should follow different trajectories. Some candidates will demonstrate a breadth of intellectual engagement and others will focus and develop a specific area of scholarship. Our department focuses on qualitative research and so publications engaging in critical analyses of the production, history, culture and theory of rhetoric and media and/or creative works featured in refereed or juried venues should be the primary focus of a department member's research; quantitative research should not be the primary focus, although it is not discouraged.

1. Peer Reviewed Publications and Exhibitions

For both rhetoric and media oriented scholars, such peer reviewed items should appear in appropriate refereed journals, as monographs, as chapters in books for which the submissions are refereed or in refereed or juried exhibitions or festivals.

2. Peer Reviewed Publications in Related Areas

Peer Reviewed publications and exhibitions outside of specific disciplinary venues should be given full consideration so long as they are related to the candidate's specific areas of expertise. Peer Reviewed publications and exhibitions outside a candidate's areas of expertise should be considered for their scholarly or artistic merit but shall count less than those within their expertise.

3. Non-Peer Reviewed Publications

Non-Peer reviewed publications with scholarly or artistic merit are one means of augmenting a candidate's professional activity. These may be self-published works, debate materials such as evidence packets and topic analyses, papers submitted to conferences that do not use peer review, or essays written for venues serving the larger public. While not peer reviewed, these publications should be reviewed by department members to determine their merit as scholarship for the purposes of assessment of the candidate's work. ***Scholarly or artistic merit shall be defined as contributing to the intellectual understanding of communication-rhetoric-argument-media theory as demonstrated by clear relationships with scholarly or artistic concepts and thinkers.***

4. Instruction Oriented Publications

Publications in instruction oriented publications are another venue for contributing to a candidate's professional activity. Such instructional materials should be reviewed by other departmental members for their scholarly merit; actual instruction materials or course/program outlines or descriptions would not be eligible. If a candidate's scholarship emphasizes instruction, such as someone who has an emphasis in educational rhetoric, that candidate's peer reviewed educational rhetoric scholarship should be counted as peer reviewed publication.

5. Noteworthy Performances or Exhibitions

Performances and exhibitions that are neither refereed nor juried may count toward professional activity when such events demonstrate scholarly or artistic merit. Presentation of a candidate's film, a rhetorical analysis, engagement in a debate, particularly in the candidate's field of study, would count when it demonstrates scholarly or artistic merit.

6. Participation at Professional Meeting and Conferences

Attendance at professional conferences is encouraged but mere attendance shall not be considered as evidence of professional activity or scholarship. To count as professional activity, candidates should submit papers or creative works, including those with student co-authors, serve as panel chairs, and/or attend business meetings at appropriate conferences. Service in the organization can include, for example, serving as a chair of a panel, journal editor, and leader of an association project.

7. Writing and Submitting External Grant Proposals

The writing and submission of proposals for external grants is encouraged and should be considered scholarship in the same way that non-peer reviewed work is; it should be reviewed by departmental members or by refereed panels for its scholarly or artistic merit.

Discipline Specific Scholarship Guidelines for Theatre Arts

Candidates in **Theatre Arts** may produce performance scholarship in one or multiple of the following capacities:

- a. creator or principal collaborator in the creation of an original produced work (e.g., playwright, performance artist);
- b. creator of a significant portion of an interpreted theatre (e.g., stage director, actor, costume, scenic or lighting designer);
- c. curator or participant of an exhibit of artifacts from the creative performance, such as scenic/costume design.

Because theatre performance scholarship is centered in live performance, valid evaluation of this scholarship must include viewing the live performance. The evaluation will be based on the following criteria:

- a. appropriateness of the artistic contribution of the artist to the production;
- b. synthesis of the production contribution with other collaborative artists involved in the performance;
- c. uniqueness of the artistic choices based on variables of live performance (e.g., limitation of theatre space, budget, rehearsal time).

Evidence of excellence in research and/or artistic practice is provided by the candidate's research, performance, exhibition, and/or publication record. This record is assessed both internally, by the Department and the College, and externally, by a panel of recognized experts from outside the College, to determine whether it is openly available, scholarly, creative, and of high quality and significance. The following points guide the assessment of the candidate's record:

1. "Openly available" research or artistic practice implies distribution, which includes traditional and electronic publication as well as other media such as audio and video recording, or publicly available live performance or exhibition.
2. Scholarly publication can take many forms; among these are original research articles, monographs, books, book chapters, edited collections and anthologies, critical editions, translations, reviews, and published lectures. Books, monographs, and articles that examine theatre and dance production and production management strategies are included, as are works that are original and innovative in pedagogical approach to the teaching of the creative/performance and interpretive theatre/dance artist and make an original contribution to the field.

3. Artistic practice also takes many forms; among these are development of new works, curatorial practice, one-person or collaborative or interdisciplinary group exhibitions and productions, stage director, choreographer, designer, and production of audio or video recordings.
4. Artistic performance, exhibition, recording, or broadcast at venues, studios, labels and networks with national or international stature or reputation generally receive more weight than those at venues with regional or local stature. However, significance of venues is also evaluated in terms of the correspondence between the venue and the type of work presented by the artist. Similarly, the stature or reputation of collaborators on the project may be used in judging the distinction of a contribution.
5. Peer review of live performance in accordance with departmental procedures is required. Published reviews of the artistic work are supportive evidence of the artist's contribution but are not a substitute for peer review, required through the practice of substantial external evaluation of faculty dossiers.
6. Selection for membership in professional unions and organizations that are not service oriented (e.g., United Scenic Artists of America, Actors' Equity Association, Screen Actors Guild, Society of State Directors and Choreographers).

Terminal Degrees

The master of fine arts (MFA) degree in art and/or design is the recognized terminal degree in the performing and visual arts. It is considered by Association for Theatre in Higher Education, the National Association of Schools of Art and Design (NASAD), and the vast majority of institutions of higher education in the United States to be equivalent to terminal degrees in other fields, such as the PhD or EdD.

The MFA or equivalent professional achievement should be regarded as the appropriate qualification for appointment to professional rank, promotion, or tenure. Degrees in education and related fields shall not be required except for faculty appointed specifically to teach courses in education. Degree requirements for tenure and promotion must be made clear at the time of appointment; expectations cannot change during an individual's probationary period.