

# **Local Assessment of Evaluation and Reward Systems for Arts Faculties in Higher Education**

**Landscape Architectural Accreditation Board  
National Architectural Accrediting Board  
National Association of Schools of Art and Design  
National Association of Schools of Dance  
National Association of Schools of Music  
National Association of Schools of Theatre**

***Consultant:* University Film and Video Association**

**October 1994  
(Revised February 2009)**

### **Disclaimer**

This text is analytical and consultative only. Although produced by organizations that accredit, *it is not a statement of accreditation standards, policies, or processes, and must not be referenced as such.*

Official accreditation documents are available from the separate accreditation associations for architecture, art and design, dance, landscape architecture, music, and theatre.

### **Downloads, Copies, Extracts**

*Local Assessment of Evaluation and Reward Systems for Arts Faculties in Higher Education* is available free for download in Adobe Acrobat (.pdf) format from the “Publications” sections of the four arts accreditation Web sites at [www.arts-accredit.org](http://www.arts-accredit.org).

This document is not copyrighted. It may be reproduced in whole or in part, either printed or electronically, in the interest of education and cultural development. Any organization or institution may reproduce the document in quantities sufficient for its own use, but not for sale. Notice of credit should appear on all copies.

Institutions and organizations are invited to use extracts from this document to develop or revise their own statements regarding the work of arts faculties.

## TO CONTACT PARTICIPATING ORGANIZATIONS

### *For Art and Design, Dance, Film/Video, Music, and Theatre:*

National Office for Arts Accreditation  
11250 Roger Bacon Drive, Suite 21  
Reston, VA 22090

[info@arts-accredit.org](mailto:info@arts-accredit.org)  
Telephone: 703-437-0700  
Fax: 703-437-6312  
<http://www.arts-accredit.org>

*(The National Office will provide current information for contacting the University Film and Video Association.)*

### *For Architecture:*

National Architectural Accrediting Board  
1735 New York Avenue, N.W.  
Washington, DC 20006

[info@naab.org](mailto:info@naab.org)  
Telephone: 202-783-2007  
Fax: 202-783-2822  
<http://www.naab.org>

### *For Landscape Architecture:*

American Society of Landscape Architects  
636 Eye Street, N.W.  
Washington, DC 20001-3736

[rleighton@asla.org](mailto:rleighton@asla.org)  
Telephone: 202-898-2444  
Fax: 202-898-1185  
<http://www.asla.org/AccreditationLAAB.aspx>

## PREFACE

This document is designed to assist institutions, programs, and individuals making local assessments regarding arts faculty evaluation and reward systems for the purpose of:

- A. Examining the Viability of Current Systems
- B. Planning for the Improvement of Current Systems
- C. Assessing the Need for New Systems
- D. Planning New Systems

The document also assists users to develop a comprehensive understanding of issues concerning evaluation and reward systems for arts faculties both in and among institutions of higher education in the United States. While the text reflects attention to issues and concerns expressed by the sponsoring organizations, it is not presented as a policy position of any or all of the sponsoring organizations. It is intended only as a resource document for those involved with efforts to develop and improve the work of the arts in higher education.

The document helps users consider the following fundamental questions and issues at the local level:

- How are faculty evaluation and reward systems correlated with applicable missions, goals, and objectives?
- How do the content and purposes of faculty work in the arts at the institution relate to specific features of the evaluation and reward system?
- What are the basic elements of a faculty evaluation system and how are these elements best integrated to achieve applicable missions, goals, and objectives?
- How can faculty work in the arts be best documented in local circumstances—what documentation policies are appropriate in light of applicable purposes?
- What overarching policy issues should be considered and monitored as faculty evaluation and reward systems evolve?
- How can all influences, conditions, mechanisms, and aspirations best be integrated to support a positive and productive evaluation and reward system for arts faculty?

**Local Assessment of Evaluation and Reward Systems for  
Arts Faculties in Higher Education**

**TABLE OF CONTENTS**

<b>Introduction</b> .....	1
<b>Using the Assessment Document</b> .....	1
<b>Terminology</b> .....	2
<b>A Twenty-Point Assessment</b> .....	3
<b>A Comprehensive Assessment</b> .....	5
<b>I. Mission, Goals, and Objectives of Institutions and Arts Units</b> .....	5
Written Statements .....	5
Operational Expressions of Mission, Goals, and Objectives .....	5
The Institutional/Individual Relationship .....	6
Definitions .....	6
Identity .....	6
External Influences .....	6
Policy Changes .....	7
Futures .....	7
Correlations, Synergies, and Issues .....	7
<b>II. Content and Characteristics Profiles</b> .....	8
Work <i>In</i> and <i>About</i> Art .....	8
Approaches and Perspectives .....	8
Philosophical and Policy Considerations .....	9
Correlations, Synergies, and Issues .....	9
<b>III. Faculty Evaluation</b> .....	10
Priorities .....	10
Responsibilities .....	10
Complex Work .....	11
Definitions of Merit .....	11
Opportunities .....	12
The Internal Integrity of Criteria .....	12
Innovation .....	12
Equivalencies .....	13
Evaluation Technique .....	13
Reviewers' Expertise .....	13
Correlations, Synergies, and Issues .....	14

<b>IV. Content and Documentation of Faculty Work</b> .....	14
Policy Context .....	14
Considerations for Documentation Policy Development .....	14
Correlations, Synergies, and Issues .....	15
<b>V. Policy Questions and Issues</b> .....	15
Broad Issues .....	15
Review Process Issues .....	15
Administrative Questions .....	16
Personal, Institutional, and Unit Risk Issues .....	16
Hiring Issues .....	16
Consultation and Mentoring .....	17
Work Loads .....	17
<b>VI. Summary: Comprehensive Correlations, Synergies, and Issues</b> .....	17
Correlations .....	17
Synergies .....	17
Issues.....	17
 <b>Acknowledgements</b> .....	 18
 <b>Members of the Interdisciplinary Task Force</b> .....	 19

# Local Assessment of Evaluation and Reward Systems for Arts Faculties in Higher Education

## INTRODUCTION

The success of any institution of higher education depends on many factors. It is clear, however, that the faculty constitute a central resource. Arts programs in American higher education could not have received the worldwide renown they enjoy without the continuing dedication and expertise of thousands of individuals who teach, create, perform, pursue research, and serve their institutions, their professions, and the community.

In recent years, issues have been raised concerning the roles, responsibilities, and contributions of faculty. These policy questions are being addressed from many perspectives, including interrelationships among teaching, creative work and research, and service. The result has been a new level of deliberation about the nature of intellectual work and the definitions of basic terms such as scholarship—for example, are such terms being defined either too narrowly or too broadly in specific situations? Are different definitions appropriate for different times, places, and situations? While issues can never be settled in detail for the nation as a whole, they can be reexplored in the context of each institution's mission, goals, and objectives. In local settings, overarching questions can be illuminated, analyzed, and answered without destroying the diversity that is so central to the success of our nation's higher education system.

This assessment document is a resource for those engaged in this large discussion. It evolved from a project begun in the summer of 1992 which brought together the arts disciplines in higher education for the purpose of explaining in fundamental terms the variety of tasks accomplished by arts faculty members. The resulting booklet, *The Work of Arts Faculties in Higher Education*, should be used in conjunction with this present document, which suggests analytical paths into many issues addressed previously.

As institutions and units within them review policies and procedures concerning faculty, there is a need to determine and focus on critical issues, and simultaneously to compare what is being done or contemplated with aspirations and realities. The purpose of this document is to provide a foundation, or perhaps a springboard for such considerations at institutional and programmatic levels: basic sets of questions address comprehensive sets of issues and focus action on content rather than on evaluation technique. We affirm this focus because we realize that the issues are complex and that the stakes are high for individuals, arts units, institutions, and the future of our nation's cultural life.

Although the document embraces logic and orderly reviews of issues, the Task Force has no illusions about creating a science. Too many of the important problems cannot be quantified; too many conditions are unique to specific institutions and programs. We know that, overall, arts programs in American higher education represent a world of vast scope and incredible richness. In and of themselves, the arts disciplines constitute vast bodies of knowledge and skill. The various arts also exhibit multiple connections with all other disciplines. Each institution, program, and individual thus undertakes only a portion of what is possible. This document has been developed with recognition of the fact that no two institutions or arts programs are exactly alike. It follows, therefore, that no two evaluation and reward systems should be exactly alike. Thus, we eschew aspirations for national standardization, and seek a more modest objective: to provide a resource for applications of local expertise to local concerns. The following text is intended to facilitate analysis prior to action, recognizing that the depth, scope, and effectiveness of such analysis will have significant influence on the quality of the result.

## USING THE ASSESSMENT DOCUMENT

Two sets of questions are provided as assessment frameworks. The first develops an overview. The second deals with issues in detail.

This document is structured so that sets of questions about each topic can be used alone. The entire set of questions can also be used comprehensively either in the order presented or in some other order. Although the text contains many useful questions, it does not purport to contain every question pertinent to every institution or program, nor will every question be relevant to every situation. Often, similar topics are approached from different perspectives. Individuals wishing to utilize the document comprehensively will want to be judicious in eliminating or emphasizing multiple perspectives on similar questions, depending on the nature and scope of their project.

Much successful work in the arts relies on inspiration born partially from vast reservoirs of knowledge, skill, and experience. The rationalized approach presented does not intend to replace intuition and inspiration with procedure, but rather to provide a better basis for intuitive thinking.

Although this assessment is based on a series of questions, *the questions posed have no standard answers*. The best answer for one institution or arts unit may be quite different from the best answer for another. The questions do push users in the direction of consistency among various policies and practices. They continue to ask to what extent what is being done or proposed will meet expectations, aspirations, and declared purposes. This approach to consistency should not be confused with advocacy for standardization, nor with pursuit of consistency for its own sake. Considerations about consistency should help produce approaches and systems where parts contribute to wholes and where there is some protection from unintended effects that often result from even the best laid plans.

## TERMINOLOGY

For purposes of this document, the term **arts** normally refers to all of the arts and arts-related disciplines and their subdisciplines. The term **unit** is used to designate the entire program in a particular arts discipline; thus, in specific cases, *unit* refers both to free-standing institutions and to departments or schools which are part of larger institutions. **Entity** refers to an institution, unit, or individual.

**Making art** indicates the creation of an entirely new work of art or the creative process applied to performance. These activities may be mixed in a single effort, and they may be collaborative or individual. Our use of *making art* always indicates applications of knowledge, skills, and intellectual technique.

The word **work** is used in title and text because it provides an umbrella for the different types of faculty activities essential to the arts in higher education. This umbrella is necessary because definitions of such terms as creative activity, research, scholarship, teaching, and service can be narrow or broad. For example, when broadly defined, research can include the process of making a work of art: a search for the new is involved. When more narrow definitions based on science or humanities methodologies are applied, making art is not research, although research of scientific or humanistic types may be involved in the total art-making process. The word *work* enables respect and use of both narrow and broad definitions as institutions, organizations, and individuals may determine in specific circumstances. Whether broad or narrow, our use of *work* always indicates intense use of mind.

Standard descriptions of faculty work mention three areas. Two of these areas—teaching and service—seem to have common use throughout higher education. The third area, involving each faculty member’s individual and collaborative work in one or more fields, is more problematic. Across the nation, various terminologies cover various concepts without much title/content consistency. The project task force struggled with this issue from numerous perspectives. As a result, the text uses **creative work and research** to name the third area. This formulation, while not perfect, has utility, especially if it is understood to express interrelationships rather than polarities. Creative work is an element of research; research is an element of creative work. Thus, making art and studying about art are both deeply intellectual. Our use of the word **intellectual** covers both of these activities.

Approaching the process of making art means approaching a realm that, whether simple or complex, is open-ended, often without empirical objectives, and frequently expressed in terms that are neither verbal nor mathematical. Creation, interpretation, and performance all involve communicating via the medium of an art form to produce a work. This is **work in art**. Each work, whether new or recreated, is a small universe of meaning with its own internal logics and mechanisms, whether standing alone or used in juxtaposition with other works, events, and functions. Each work also reflects and produces multiple universes of meaning as it relates to the external world where it is produced, received, and studied.

The study of art involves a vast complex of functions, purposes, and efforts. Each art form has its own history and body of analytical technique. Each has rich connections with general history and culture and with the analytical techniques of the sciences and the humanities. The arts as a group can be studied through disciplines ranging from aesthetics to management. This is **work about art**.

**Profile** refers to a weighting of priorities or emphases developed through comparative analysis.



## A TWENTY-POINT ASSESSMENT

**The following twenty points provide one format for basic assessment of faculty evaluation and reward systems in an institution or its administrative units.**

### **Mission, Goals, and Objectives of Institutions and Arts Units**

- i. What are the mission, goals, and objectives of the entity being considered, and to what extent are they expressed in written statements and demonstrated in practice? What is the correlation of written and operational expressions of mission, goals, and objectives with faculty evaluation and reward systems?
- ii. What internal or external factors and considerations are critical in establishing or changing the entity's mission, goals, and objectives, or in defining its sense of identity? How does this identity and the process of defining it affect faculty assessment?
- iii. How will issues of stability or change affect formulation, operation, and adjustments to the faculty evaluation and reward system?
- iv. What comparisons between units within an institution, or between a unit and the institution as a whole, may be made by asking the foregoing questions with regard to other units or to the institution as a whole? How do these comparisons relate to the respective missions and content being addressed?

### **Content and Characteristics Profile**

- v. What approaches and perspectives for work *in* and *about* art are present in the entity to be considered? What are the relative weightings or priorities among them? (*This presence may be in terms of written literature, past and present practice, aspirations, plans, etc.*)
- vi. What values, philosophies, or criteria are present with regard to concepts and issues such as originality, experimentation, simplicity and complexity, interdisciplinary work, faculty development, and collaboration?
- vii. What do comparisons among findings thus far (*i-vi*) reveal about the logic, values, and futures issues associated with faculty evaluation and reward systems? (*The answers provide a context for the next questions.*)

### **Faculty Evaluation**

- viii. What are the stated or operational priorities with regard to various aspects of faculty work (i.e., teaching, creative work and research, and service)? To what extent does the faculty evaluation system consider the relationship between priorities and the resources needed to address them?
- ix. How are faculty responsibilities and workloads defined and established? To what extent are there logical relationships among workloads, definitions of productivity, and expectations regarding teaching, creative work and research, and service? To what extent is consistency from faculty member to faculty member, or from unit to unit, a goal?

- x. Are the evaluation mechanisms able to deal adequately with the complexity of work in the arts? For example, the complex and subjective nature of new work, the distinctions and interrelationships between work *in* art and work *about* art, the need to work with the arts both in their own terms and in terms common to other disciplines.
- xi. How is merit defined, determined, and indicated? To what extent is merit within the unit dependent upon and/or correlated to the mission, goals, and objectives of the institution as a whole, other units, or specific individuals?
- xii. What opportunities are available to faculty in terms of support, time, and peer review?
- xiii. What criteria are used to judge faculty work? Are these criteria safe against the influence of image-making techniques that may mask issues of merit? To what extent is public or professional image deemed important to the fulfillment of mission, goals, and objectives?
- xiv. Is the evaluation mechanism able to deal adequately with the values, priorities, and complexities that surround "innovation"?
- xv. What priorities do evaluation mechanisms express regarding equivalency, consistency, and diversity among various kinds of work and among disciplines and faculty members? What do the processes of forming, evolving, and operating evaluation and reward systems reveal about institutional values concerning standardization, evaluation techniques, and expertise?
- xvi. To what extent do the purposes, values, philosophies, and approaches discovered thus far reveal effective synergies within the institution as a whole, various units of the institution, search committees, and promotion and tenure committees?
- xvii. What are the issues to be considered in developing documentation policy? (For example: values, protocols, nature of the work to be documented, standards of measure, types of documentation.)

### **Policy Questions and Issues**

- xviii. What issues of context and capability should be addressed by institutions and units reviewing or contemplating change in faculty evaluation and reward systems? What philosophical, financial, and positioning issues and risks must be considered?
- xix. What procedural, political, and communication issues need to be addressed to ensure understanding and support, fairness and feasibility for faculty and administrators in and beyond the unit? What personnel, work load, and security issues and risks must be considered?

### **Summary: Comprehensive Correlations, Synergies, and Issues**

- xx. How can all policies, perspectives, priorities, characteristics, influences, conditions, mechanisms, and aspirations (*discovered in i–xix*) best be integrated to support a positive and productive evaluation and reward system?

## A COMPREHENSIVE ASSESSMENT

**The following text provides one way of expanding the Twenty-Point Assessment by providing a detailed series of questions for each major area of concern. The Twenty-Point Assessment is inserted throughout in boxed italics as a point of reference. Following each box are questions that extend review of the issues considered in the box.**

### I. MISSION, GOALS, AND OBJECTIVES OF INSTITUTIONS AND ARTS UNITS

In American higher education, each institution and unit within it is expected to have a formal declaration of mission, goals, and objectives.

Definitions and policies concerning the work of the faculty are best developed and applied in terms of the specific mission, goals, and objectives present at each institution. Specific goals and objectives of various disciplinary programs may create a multiplicity of unique approaches and needs on a single campus. The following information and analysis should be used only in the contexts of and in relation to specific purposes, programs, and resources.

Since statements of mission, goals, and objectives are expected to provide the foundation for all decisions, they are a critical factor in assessing faculty evaluation and reward systems. However, the concept of mission, goals, and objectives should be considered beyond the written formulations that appear in publications and studies because all institutions work with their mission, goals, and objectives in contexts beyond their immediate control. Also, multipurpose institutions often embrace varying sets of missions, goals, and objectives; thus, multiple influences create evolving overall definitions of institutional identity and self-concept.

The set of questions provided below opens the complex issue of mission, goals, and objectives, and relates it to faculty evaluation and reward systems. A primary goal is to determine the degree of internal correlation on fundamental questions.

While these questions are useful in looking at a single entity—the institution as a whole or a specific unit such as a college, school, or department—most users will find utility in asking this set of questions about the institution and at least one other unit so that responses can be compared. These comparisons often provide the most revealing information.

*i. What are the mission, goals, and objectives of the entity being considered, and to what extent are they expressed in written statements and demonstrated in practice? What is the correlation of written and operational expressions of mission, goals, and objectives with faculty evaluation and reward systems?*

#### A. Written Statements

1. What is the content of written statements concerning mission, goals, and objectives for the entity (institution, arts unit, department, program, etc.) being considered?
2. What do these texts state or imply with respect to faculty evaluation and reward systems?

#### B. Operational Expressions of Mission, Goals, and Objectives

1. In observing the daily work of the entity being considered, how are mission, goals, and objectives expressed in terms of: (a) values, including those concerning practice in the arts disciplines and curriculum content, (b) scope of disciplinary effort, (c) content, (d) artistic and intellectual climate, (e) policy and operational structures, (f) practices, (g) results, (h) overall reward systems, and (i) resource availabilities and utilizations?
2. What do single or multiple operational expressions of mission, goals, and objectives state or imply with respect to faculty evaluation and reward systems? For example, if the institution values arts study as part of the core curriculum for all undergraduates, what are the implications for its reward system?
3. What is the internal consistency among expressions of mission, goals, and objectives determined in B.1. above? For example, how consistent and mutually supportive are (a) values, content, artistic

and intellectual climate, and results; (b) disciplinary scope and resource availabilities and utilizations; etc.?

4. To what extent is there consistency between written statements of mission, goals, and objectives determined in A.1. above, and operational evidence determined in B.1. above?
5. What does the degree of consistency discovered in B.3. and B.4. imply for faculty evaluation and reward systems?

### C. The Institutional/Individual Relationship

1. To what extent does the entity being considered regard faculty as means for achieving highly specified, institutionally determined ends? For example, some faculty members must teach basic courses.
2. To what extent does the entity being considered regard itself as a place for faculty to set and pursue individual agendas? For example, many faculty have a highly personalized program of creative and research work.
3. How do the answers to C.1. and C.2. relate to the entity's statements of faculty responsibilities in such areas as teaching, creative work and research, and service? *See also II.A.*
4. To what extent are there internal consistencies among answers discovered in items I.A., I.B., and I.C. above? For example, do written statements of mission, goals, and objectives, deductions about these matters from observations of actual practice, and the institutional/individual relationship seem to fit together as a workable conceptual and operational unit?

### D. Definitions

1. How does the entity being considered define terms and concepts basic to faculty evaluation and reward systems? For example, what meanings are assigned to scholarship, research, teaching, service, assessment, creation, discovery, originality, analysis, interpretation, integration, synthesis, application, evaluation, workload, etc.?
2. What does this set of definitions reveal about the mission, goals, and objectives of the entity?
3. What do these definitions imply for faculty evaluation and reward systems? If applicable, how do they compare with those of other entities or the institution as a whole?
4. To what extent is there consistency among answers discovered in I.A., I.B., I.C., and I.D. above?

ii. *What internal or external factors and considerations are critical in establishing or changing the entity's mission, goals, and objectives, or in defining its sense of identity? How does this identity and the process of defining it affect faculty assessment?*

### E. Identity

1. What factors and considerations seem to be most powerful in defining the entity's sense of identity? For example, to what extent does the entity focus on its own aspirations, and to what extent does it compete with other entities? Another example, how does the entity define its peers and competitors beyond the institution? To what extent is identity obtained or enhanced by real or imagined imitation of other models? If applicable, how appropriate are these other models? To what extent is identity affected by external and/or institutional limitations that influence definitions of identity?
2. To what extent are issues of identity related to or controlled by any or all of the indicators regarding mission, goals, and objectives identified in I.A., I.B., I.C., and I.D. above?
3. How does the entity's means of defining its identity relate to faculty evaluation and reward systems?

### F. External Influences

1. What major change factors can influence the development of the entity's mission, goals, and objectives? For example: ideas/values; information; knowledge; economic conditions; technology; demographics; political climate; religious climate; institutional climate; cultural climate; governance patterns in education and culture; availability of facilities and resources; presence, will, and commitment of visionaries; etc.
2. What major change mechanisms can influence the development of the entity's mission, goals, and objectives? For example: funding patterns; reward systems; legislation/regulation; governance/administrative systems; standards-setting mechanisms; policy analysis/development mechanisms; consultant/advisory systems; industry decisions; technological applications; advertising; publications/ study/research reports; content presented by electronic media; content of formal education, path-breaking conceptual work in the field, etc.

- Given the entity's mission, goals, and objectives as expressed in written and operational terms, to what extent are these external influences having an impact on decisions about and within the faculty evaluation and reward system?

### G. Policy Changes

- What various individual or organizational powers have significant influence on or ability to change the mission, goals, and objectives of the entity under consideration? To what extent is the entity itself in control? This question can be extended by considering powers to change various perspectives on mission, goals, and objectives outlined in items I.A., I.B., I.C., and I.D. above.
- What forces can generate the necessity for a review of mission, goals, and objectives? To what extent are the missions, goals, and objectives represented by these forces adjudged to be consonant with those of the entity being considered?
- How do facts and analyses about powers to change or forces that can generate the necessity for review affect faculty evaluation and reward systems?

*iii. How will issues of stability or change affect formulation, operation, and adjustments to the faculty evaluation and reward system?*

### H. Futures

- What is the projected stability of the set of mission, goals, and objectives developed thus far? What conditions are expected to change and by how much over what time period? What is not expected to change in the foreseeable future?
- To what extent does the issue of stability have an impact on the achievement of current mission, goals, and objectives? For example, to what extent is there fear of, or desire for change?
- How will issues of stability or change affect formulation, operation, and adjustments to the faculty evaluation and reward system?

*iv. What comparisons between units within an institution, or between a unit and the institution as a whole, may be made by asking the foregoing questions with regard to other units or to the institution as a whole? How do these comparisons relate to the respective missions and content being addressed?*

### J. Correlations, Synergies, and Issues

When more than one entity has been reviewed using the questions above, the following questions should assist in making comparisons, for example, between the institution as a whole and various units within it, or among several units. The ability to make comparisons facilitates decisions about the extent to which similar or dissimilar approaches are based on clear understandings about mission, goals, objectives, and the natures of the various tasks at hand.

- To what extent is there correlation and/or synergy among the various conditions regarding mission, goals, and objectives of the entities being compared? For example, do the college of engineering and the college of the arts have similar approaches to identity; to the definition of research; do similar external influences affect the evolution of their missions, goals, and objectives?
- To what extent do various aspects of and conditions related to mission, goals, and objectives have an impact on the faculty evaluation and reward systems used or contemplated by the entities being compared?
- Are there any risks or problems associated with the findings in questions J.1. or J.2. above? What is the nature of the risk or problem and how can it be addressed? For example, is the concern centered in the mission, goals, and objectives themselves, in interpretations of them, in practices derived from them, etc.? Is the concern centered in the written statement of mission, goals, and objectives or rather in the definitions deduced from observing operations, experiencing the corporate–individual relationship, or seeing operational definitions manifested in various decisions?
- To what extent are issues of correlation and synergy related to matters of identity, external influences such as change factors and change mechanisms, and futures considerations?
- To what extent do the findings above explain the current experience of the arts entity doing this study with respect to the extant faculty evaluation and reward system?
- What are the most important issues to be addressed in priority order about the relationship of (a) missions, goals, and objectives to (b) the faculty evaluation and reward system?

## II. CONTENT AND CHARACTERISTICS PROFILES

Work in the arts disciplines, broadly considered, covers the entire range of intellectual activity. Work in the arts in higher education encompasses a broad range of efforts to create and perform works of art, to understand how art functions, to develop comprehensive knowledge and fluency with a body of work, to trace and understand the history and development of one or more art forms, and to understand the various connections between the arts and other areas of study. Each institutional or individual arts effort will exhibit a certain profile that demonstrates priorities with respect to basic content, characteristics, and functions. Answers to the questions posed should reveal these profiles. In terms of faculty evaluation and reward systems, each institution and unit thereof makes determinations about the extent to which it will reward intellectual and creative work of all kinds, the extent to which it will reward intellectual work only of certain specific kinds, the extent to which it will reward intellectual work manifested in certain ways, or the extent to which it will reward intellectual work presented only in certain formats. Decisions about these matters should be consistent with the mission, goals, and objectives of the institution or the unit under consideration.

In order to address the following set of questions most productively, users need to make decisions about the subject of analysis. For example, will the questions be answered with respect to (a) one or more arts programs as a whole; (b) a unit, school, or department; (c) a curriculum; (d) a basic subdiscipline area, for example, analysis, history; or (e) a specific studio or performance area? Or will the study focus on the aggregate work of the entire faculty, faculty by subdiscipline group, or individual faculty? Will the questions below be asked in relationship to institutional or individual goals and objectives for teaching, creative work and research, or service?

Please note that it is possible to use all or only some of the subjects of analysis and goals and objectives mentioned above, depending on the type or scope of the profile one wishes to create. In complex situations, several different profiles can be created and compared.

v. *What approaches and perspectives for work in and about art are present in the entity to be considered? What are the relative weightings or priorities among them?*

### A. Work *In* and *About* Art

1. To what extent is the subject of analysis (individual, group, course, curriculum, department, unit, institution, etc.) focused on work *in* art—the process of creating, performing, directing, and presenting works in one of the arts disciplines?
2. To what extent is the subject of analysis concerned with work *about* art—the study of works of art, areas and aspects of the arts disciplines, the impact of the arts on culture and history, the impact of historical and cultural factors on the arts, and the relationship of the arts to other disciplines?
3. To what extent is there a mixture or interrelationship of work *in* and *about* art in the subject of analysis? What is the relative weight of each in the mixture? What is the nature of the interrelationship? To what extent are work *in* and work *about* art serving each other? To what extent are they integrated?
4. How do the answers for items A.1., A.2., and A.3. above relate to values, policies, criteria, and procedures in the faculty evaluation and reward system? For example, to what extent do criteria used by the system address work *in* and *about* art?

### B. Approaches and Perspectives

There are many perspectives for studying art. Singly, or in combination, these perspectives address how things work, what happened, what things mean, and provide means of gaining competence for creating new things. Several of the most common perspectives are:

- *Art as Process* — compilation, integration, and synthesis of (a) medium; (b) technical, historical, and analytical knowledge and skills; (c) inspiration and aspiration; and (d) ideas that result in a work of art.
- *Art as Product* — involvement with completed works presented, performed, or available for study from various perspectives; and the multiple interrelationships and influences of completed work.
- *Art as an Educative Force* — development of knowledge and skills in the arts, including mental and physical discipline gained from the study of art as process; and historical/cultural/analytical understanding gained from the study of completed work.
- *Art as Communication* — use of arts media and techniques to convey ideas and information for various purposes.
- *Art as a Psychological Phenomenon* — the impact of arts media on human behavior.
- *Art as a Physiological Phenomenon* — the impact of arts media on the human body.
- *Art as Therapeutics* — applications ranging from entertainment to psychology and psychiatry.

- *Art as Social Expression* — correlations of artistic modes, products, and perceptions with specific groups.
- *Art as Heritage* — correlations of artistic activity with cultures and times.
- *Art as Subject Matter for Other Disciplines* — use of points of view, methodologies, and contexts of the humanities, sciences, and social sciences to consider the impacts of art processes and products on intellectual, social, political, and other developments.

Many other perspectives or different ways of describing perspectives may be evident depending on the discipline or subject and applicable goals and objectives for their pursuit within the institution. Each analytical process should develop its own set of applicable perspectives. The ten perspectives given above provide a springboard for such development.

1. Which of the set of perspectives identified are evident in the subject of analysis?
2. What weightings or priorities do these perspectives have? What is the nature of the mixture, interrelationship, or integration of these perspectives? For example, which perspectives are primary and which are secondary; how are the various perspectives serving each other in the subject of analysis?
3. How do the answers for items B.1. and B.2. above relate to values, policies, criteria, and procedures in the faculty evaluation and reward system? For example, to what extent does the system seem predisposed to favor one or more perspectives? To what extent are any perceived general or specific predispositions correlated with missions, goals, and objectives?

vi. *What values, philosophies, or criteria are present with regard to concepts and issues such as originality, experimentation, simplicity and complexity, interdisciplinary work, faculty development, and collaboration?*

### C. Philosophical and Policy Considerations

1. What values, philosophies, or criteria are present regarding invention and authenticity in the institution, arts unit, or other entity that is the subject of analysis? What goals and priorities exist along the range from experimentation that produces radical departures to applications of originality in a variety of standard formats? To what extent do goals and objectives exist with respect to newness and uniqueness on one hand and work within aesthetic, temporal, financial, equipment, or spatial limits on the other?

2. What values, philosophies, or criteria are present regarding simplicity and complexity in the subject of analysis? To what extent are these considerations a factor in determining the merit of work or the success of a specific enterprise? What are the connections between concepts of simplicity and complexity and values, philosophies, or criteria concerning the presence or integrity of intellectual application?
3. What relationships are evident with the work of other disciplines in the subject of analysis? For example, do relationships exist with technology and applied science, historical and cultural studies, philosophy, etc.? To what extent are these relationships systemic or *ad hoc*?
4. What values, philosophies, and benchmarks define growth (artistic/intellectual, professional, personal, etc.) in the subject of analysis? To what extent are these values, philosophies, and benchmarks consistent with applicable missions, goals, and objectives, and with the results expected of the subject of analysis?
5. To what extent is the work expected of the subject of analysis individual or collaborative? If collaboration is a feature, what is its nature? How do the collaborators involved serve each other intellectually and artistically? What approaches and perspectives concerning the arts and other disciplines are involved in the collaboration? To what extent can individual contributions to the collaboration be determined?
6. How do the answers for items C.1., C.2., C.3., C.4., and C.5. above relate to values, policies, criteria, and procedures in the faculty evaluation and reward system?

vii. *What do comparisons among findings thus far reveal about the logic, values, and futures issues associated with faculty evaluation and reward systems? (The answers provide a context for the next questions.)*

### D. Correlations, Synergies, and Issues

When more than one subject of analysis has been reviewed using the questions above, the following questions should assist in making comparisons among them. Comparisons facilitate clear decisions about conformity and difference as appropriate to specific conditions and tasks.

1. To what extent is there correlation and/or synergy among the various content and characteristics

profiles of the subjects of analysis being compared?

2. To what extent do various aspects and conditions regarding content and characteristics profiles have an impact on faculty evaluation and reward systems that affect or may affect the subjects of analysis being compared?
3. Are there any risks or problems associated with the findings in questions D.1. or D.2. above? What is the nature of the risk or problem and how can it be addressed? For example, is the concern centered (a) in the content and characteristics profiles themselves, (b) in interpretations of the profiles, (c) in practices derived from them, (d) in the relationship of mission, goals, and objectives to content and characteristics profiles, or (e) in analyses made from observing operations, experiencing the corporate/individual relationship, or seeing the operational definitions manifested in various decisions that relate to or are influenced by conditions that produce the content and characteristics profiles?
4. To what extent are issues of correlation and synergy regarding content and characteristics related to matters of identity, external influences such as change factors and change mechanisms, and futures considerations?
5. To what extent do the findings above explain the current experience of the arts entity doing this study with respect to the extant faculty evaluation and reward system?
6. What are the most important issues to be addressed in priority order about the relationship of (a) content and characteristics profiles and (b) the faculty evaluation and reward system?

### III. FACULTY EVALUATION

Issues concerning faculty evaluation are addressed at a variety of levels: the institution as a whole, the various units of the institution, search committees of the institution and its units, and promotion and tenure committees of the institution and its units.

A major question is the extent to which values, philosophies, and approaches to the following issues are consistent among the various entities that interact in the faculty evaluation and reward system.

viii. *What are the stated or operational priorities with regard to various aspects of faculty work (i.e., teaching, creative work and research, and service)? To what extent does the faculty evaluation system consider the relationship between priorities and the resources needed to address them?*

#### A. Priorities

1. What priorities about evaluation can be derived from the mission/goals/objectives analysis and from the content/characteristics profile undertaken in section II above?
2. How do these evaluation priorities relate to the various areas and types of faculty work needed to accomplish the aspirations inherent in these priorities?
3. How do these work needs relate (a) to basic responsibilities of teaching, creative work and research, and service; (b) to the content and characteristics inherent in efforts to fulfill these responsibilities?
4. To what extent does the faculty evaluation and reward system consider or correlate the relationship between the entity's priorities and the range of faculty resources needed to address them?
5. What impressions and benchmarks are created by extant published statements regarding values, policies, criteria, and procedures in the faculty evaluation and rewards system? What impressions and benchmarks are created by the operational results of these policies? What are the relationships of these sets of impressions and benchmarks to the acquisition of tangible resources and/or in the maintenance or development of intangible resources such as prestige, cohesiveness, will to excel, etc.?

ix. *How are faculty responsibilities and workloads defined and established? To what extent are there logical relationships among workloads, definitions of productivity, and expectations regarding teaching, creative work and research, and service? To what extent is consistency from faculty member to faculty member, or from unit to unit, a goal?*

#### B. Responsibilities

1. At what level of detail are specific responsibilities and expectations defined for individual faculty? To what extent are these sets of responsibilities tailored to the assignments of specific faculty members?



2. To what extent is fulfillment of some responsibilities more important than others to the faculty evaluation and rewards system? What are the forces shaping these decisions about priorities? To what extent is consistency from faculty member to faculty member a goal?
3. To what extent are distinctions made among responsibilities (a) central to the education of students such as teaching basic courses; (b) critical to the viability of the institution or unit, such as providing education opportunities for students in performance; (c) vital to the advancement of work in one or more disciplines; (d) important for political, economic, or public relations reasons; (e) essential for community support and productive citizenship, etc? To what extent is there a correlation between what is essential for basic fulfillment of mission and goals and what is valued?
4. How are workloads defined in the unit, institution, discipline? To what extent are workloads equivalent throughout the unit or institution? To what extent are there logical relationships among workloads, definitions of productivity, and expectations regarding teaching, creative work and research, and service?
5. To what extent does the system address or distinguish between responsibilities for tangible and intangible results? For example, if faculty members have a responsibility for maintaining the artistic and intellectual climate of the institution or the unit, how is this evaluated?

x. *Are the evaluation mechanisms able to deal adequately with the complexity of work in the arts? For example, the complex and subjective nature of new work, the distinctions and interrelationships between work in art and work about art, the need to work with the arts both in their own terms and in terms common to other disciplines.*

### C. Complex Work

1. To what extent is creation of new work and/or discovery of new knowledge critical in the set of mission, goals, and objectives being considered?
2. Based on the answer to item C.1. above, to what extent are evaluation mechanisms capable of dealing with the complexities inherent in experimental work that is often subjective? How do evaluation mechanisms deal with the juxtapositions of perspective, technical competence, and inspiration that appear as creation and discovery are pursued in the arts disciplines?

xi. *How is merit defined, determined, and indicated? To what extent is merit within the unit dependent upon and/or correlated to the mission, goals, and objectives of the institution as a whole, other units, or specific individuals?*

### D. Definitions of Merit

1. What range of forces is contributing to evolving definitions of merit? To what extent are these forces internal or external to the entity being analyzed? Assess the relative power and influence of these forces.
2. What are the primary indicators of merit with respect to (a) teaching, (b) creative work and research, and (c) service?
3. To what extent are these indicators correlated with (a) mission, goals, objectives, priorities, and resources; (b) the content and characteristics associated with fulfilling specific missions, goals, and objectives at various institutional and individual levels?
4. What perspectives are critical in determining merit with respect to various teaching, creative work and research, and service functions? For example, for given situations, what is the relative weight given to perspectives of (a) the institution; (b) the arts unit; (c) other units in the sciences, humanities, and

- social sciences; (d) the discipline as understood inside/outside the unit and institution; (e) students, individual administrators or faculty members, etc.?
5. To what extent are values, policies, criteria, and procedures concerning determination of merit articulated at the time of faculty appointment?
  6. To what extent do specific definitions of excellence or merit for the institution as a whole, or units within the institution, act to support or restrict various approaches to advanced work? In what ways do these specific definitions promote or restrict creativity in (a) teaching, (b) creative work and research, and (c) service?
  7. What weight does technical prowess have in determination of quality and excellence? For example, to what extent is technical prowess a criterion for rewards with respect to research, scholarship, and creative work, but not for teaching and service?
  8. To what extent can the evaluation and reward system accommodate visionaries and pioneers? To what extent can it “gamble” on individuals?

*xii. What opportunities are available to faculty in terms of support, time, and peer review?*

#### **E. Opportunities**

1. What opportunities are available for faculty to receive support for creative work, research, and scholarship associated with teaching, individual contributions to the discipline, and service?
2. To what extent do work load policies consider the time required to meet institutional expectations?
3. If applicable to the institution’s purposes, to what extent are there opportunities for peer review from inside or outside the institution, especially when work cannot be distributed and studied in print form?

*xiii. What criteria are used to judge faculty work? Are these criteria safe against the influence of image-making techniques that may mask issues of merit? To what extent is public or professional image deemed important to the fulfillment of mission, goals, and objectives?*

#### **F. The Internal Integrity of Criteria**

1. What criteria are used to judge specific aspects of faculty work in the evaluation and reward system?

2. What are the fundamental elements of these criteria and what are their priorities in specific circumstances? For example, to what extent does the evaluation and reward system consider distinctions that may exist between (a) fame and achievement, (b) source or place of presentation and quality, and (c) technical production features and content?
3. To what extent is the system designed to protect itself from public relations-based image-making techniques able to mask the issue of merit? Reciprocally, what kinds of public relations-based images are important in the evaluation and reward system? What images are essential to fulfillment of applicable mission, goals, and objectives?
4. To what extent is there integrity and clarity in the use of such terms as “world class,” “national reputation,” “cutting edge,” etc., when referring to research, scholarship, and creative work?

*xiv. Is the evaluation mechanism able to deal adequately with the values, priorities, and complexities that surround “innovation”?*

#### **G. Innovation**

1. To what extent is innovation a criterion in the evaluation and reward system?
2. If innovation has high priority, to what extent are mechanisms available to address potential distinctions between genuine and apparent innovation, new knowledge and new jargon, fad initiation and aesthetic or intellectual advancement? Do such distinctions matter?
3. To what extent are the specific concepts of innovation in use consistent with various extant or projected missions, goals, and objectives? How is this matter addressed with respect to various purposes of (a) a specific arts unit, (b) other disciplinary units, and (c) the institution as a whole?
4. What relationships exist between (a) the entity’s policies concerning “adventurous scholarship” and other adventurous intellectual work in the realm of artistic creation and performance and (b) its values and policies with respect to short-term accountability and long-term results?

xv. *What priorities do evaluation mechanisms express regarding equivalency, consistency, and diversity among various kinds of work and among disciplines and faculty members? What do the processes of forming, evolving, and operating evaluation and reward systems reveal about institutional values concerning standardization, evaluation techniques, and expertise?*

## H. Equivalencies

1. To what extent does the faculty evaluation and reward system make a distinction between (a) consistency of treatment and (b) equivalency? For example, to what extent are values, evaluation techniques, criteria, and intellectual approaches of one or several disciplines used as the basis for evaluations about other disciplines?
2. To what extent are the nature, approach, intellectual content, and presentation formats of various disciplines and subdisciplines considered in the evaluation and reward system?
3. To what extent are there correlations between (a) evaluation criteria and procedures and (b) work assignments and expectations of individuals?
4. To what extent does the significance given to various aspects of individual work by evaluation criteria correlate to actual work assignments?
5. What are the politics of forming, evolving, and operating evaluation and reward systems that represent the points of view implied by applicable missions, goals, and objectives and the content and characteristics profiles associated with fulfilling them?
6. What powers and forces are forming, evolving, and operating evaluation and reward systems in the institution? To what extent is there respect for the diversity of disciplinary perspectives, modes of action, and artistic heritages that may be present, and for different points of view within and across disciplines? What factors most influence the level of respect present?
7. What values, philosophies, and safeguards are in place to monitor relationships between standardization and quality, and also the management of standardization (bureaucracy) to quality? To what extent does the operation of the system reveal the belief that quality is the result of bureaucratic management? Reciprocally, to what extent does it reveal that quality is the result of individual pursuit of excellence? What balances are evident? To what extent are these balances consistent with applicable missions, goals, and objectives?

## J. Evaluation Technique

1. To what extent do specific evaluation techniques and the aggregate of all evaluation techniques used in the faculty evaluation and reward system create (a) a holistic picture of an individual's work; (b) a comparison of an individual's work against departmental, school, or institutional missions, goals, and objectives?
2. To what extent does the evaluation and reward system use techniques that assess in terms that are easy to discuss irrespective of expertise? For example, what weight is given to numbers of different types of achievements?
3. To what extent are safeguards in place that ensure the faculty evaluation and reward system is using techniques that fit specific problems and issues rather than defining problems and issues in terms of available or favored techniques?
4. To what extent is standardization the goal of faculty evaluation technique? Reciprocally, to what extent is technique used selectively in relationship to specific purposes and results?
5. To what extent are the procedures for internal and/or external evaluation of work *in the arts* (studio work, performance, etc.) appropriate to the nature of the task and consistent in scope and depth if not in kind to the evaluation of scholarly work? For example, to what extent are peer reviewers equivalent in numbers and expertise?

## K. Reviewers' Expertise

1. To what extent does specific disciplinary expertise in the field of the faculty member being evaluated have (a) influence and (b) control over faculty evaluation and reward systems for faculty in that discipline?
2. To what extent and at what levels can evaluation and rewards issues be handled by those making decisions at various stages in the process (a) procedurally, (b) operationally, (c) in terms of content, and (d) philosophically?
3. To the extent that experts and non-experts review work in a given field, how do they separate and/or interrelate technique and content? How do they agree on the basis for reaching consensus?

*xvi. To what extent do the purposes, values, philosophies, and approaches discovered thus far reveal effective synergies within the institution as a whole, various units of the institution, search committees, and promotion and tenure committees?*

#### **L. Correlations, Synergies, and Issues**

1. To what extent is there correlation and/or synergy among the various elements of the faculty evaluation system reviewed with the previous questions?
2. To what extent is there correlation and/or synergy between the findings in item L.1. and similar findings about (a) missions, goals, and objectives and (b) content and characteristics?
3. To what extent are issues of correlation and/or synergy regarding the elements of faculty evaluation related to (a) matters of identity, (b) external influences such as change factors (I.F.1.) and change mechanisms (I.F.2.), and (c) future considerations?
4. To what extent do the findings above explain the current experience of the arts entity doing this study with respect to the extant faculty evaluation and reward system?
5. What are the most important issues in priority order to be addressed about the elements of the evaluation and reward system just reviewed?

#### **IV. CONTENT AND DOCUMENTATION OF FACULTY WORK**

*xvii. What are the issues to be considered in developing documentation policy? (For example: values, protocols, nature of the policy to be documented, standards of measure, types of documentation.)*

##### **A. Policy Context**

1. Review each item previously covered in this assessment document, along with the answers developed therefore, and consider both in light of their meaning for documentation of faculty work for the evaluation and reward system you are addressing or developing. For example, how do issues of institutional and/or unit identity influence the values context for decisions about documentation?
2. To what extent are specific types of work their own documentation? For example, does a product expressed in words or numbers document itself, while products expressed in other terms do not, thus requiring documentation in words or numbers?

3. What standards of measure are fundamental? How are these standards related to or derived from the functions of teaching, creative work and research, and service? For example, is there a single standard of measure such as articles or books to which other things are made equivalent; or are standards of measure correlated with the nature and purpose of specific tasks?
4. To what extent does the system facilitate documenting different uses and concepts of time applied to various tasks? For example, to what extent are documentation protocols able to deal with intellectually based work that synthesizes, integrates, and evaluates from moment to moment in the formation of a work of art, a rehearsal, or a performance?
5. What role does talent—both student and faculty—play in evaluation and documentation? To what extent does the reward system treat student/ faculty talent as a bi-directional relationship in terms of the impact of talent on results?

##### **B. Considerations for Documentation Policy Development**

1. What sets of missions, goals, and objectives (institution, unit, department, individual) are applicable to the subject of analysis (an individual faculty member, a faculty group by discipline or administrative unit, or some other grouping)?
2. What values, criteria, policies, and procedures are applicable to documentation of work either toward or in fulfillment of applicable missions, goals, and objectives?
3. To what extent will individuals be expected to document specific features of unique projects or composite bodies of work such as (a) orientation(s) toward teaching, creative work and research, service; (b) purposes—i.e., goals and objectives; (c) scope; (d) characteristics; (e) content; (f) technical expression; (g) impact; (h) fulfillment of purposes?
4. To what extent do documentation policies address presentational issues such as (a) formats—i.e., student evaluations, peer reviews, specific work products associated with teaching, creative work and research, and service, etc.— and the relative importance of documentation in these formats; (b) media—i.e., images, numbers, sounds, and words? To what extent are some media more valued than others?

- For items B.1., B.2., B.3., and B.4. above, how are specific content issues integrated with procedural and policy issues? Examples: (a) work *in* and *about* art; (b) approaches to art as process, product, educative force, communication, psychological phenomenon, physiological phenomenon, therapeutics, social expression, heritage, subject matter for other disciplines, etc.; (c) intellectual processes utilized—i.e., creation, discovery, analysis, interpretation, integration, synthesis, application, compilation, evaluation, etc.

### C. Correlations, Synergies, and Issues

- To what extent is there correlation and/or synergy among the various elements of the content and documentation system reviewed with the previous questions?
- To what extent is there correlation and/or synergy between the findings in item IV.C.1. and similar findings about (a) missions, goals, and objectives— I.J.1.; (b) content and characteristics— II.D.1.; and (c) elements of the faculty evaluation system— III.L.1.?
- To what extent are issues of correlation and/or synergy regarding content and documentation related to (a) matters of identity, (b) external influences such as change factors and change mechanisms, and (c) future considerations?
- To what extent do the findings above explain the current experience of the arts entity doing this study with respect to the extant faculty evaluation and reward system?
- What are the most important issues to be addressed in priority order about the content and documentation system just reviewed?

## V. POLICY QUESTIONS AND ISSUES

Institutions and units contemplating review and possible change in faculty evaluation and reward systems can anticipate the need to address a variety of questions and policy issues. A few of these are provided below.

*xviii. What issues of context and capability should be addressed by institutions and units reviewing or contemplating change in faculty evaluation and reward systems? What philosophical, financial, and positioning issues and risks must be considered?*

### A. Broad Issues

- If our institution or unit creates a system that seems right for us but that is inconsistent with evaluation and reward systems in other institutions or units, where does that leave us in terms

of communication and image? What levels and kinds of risk are associated with specific degrees of uniqueness?

- What will technological capabilities for creating and sharing information and product do to the concept of “publishing” work? What will these changes mean for values, criteria, policies, and procedures of evaluation and reward systems throughout higher education?
- To what extent can we introduce multi- and interdisciplinary work into institutional and/or unit approaches? How do we reconcile differing definitions of and standards for faculty work with individual careers that cross disciplinary boundaries? To what extent can multidisciplinary work be evaluated and rewarded when institutions focus on accountability at the unit level?
- To what extent can evaluation and reward systems be changed when there are fewer and fewer dollars available for rewards? Are there meaningful, describable rewards other than dollars? What are they? How do they relate to fulfillment of applicable institutional and individual goals and objectives?
- To what extent are concerns about adjusting reward systems a passing fad in academe? Conversely, to what extent are there external pressures creating the basis for fundamental change at a significant number of institutions? What pressures are evident or possible for the institution or unit under consideration?
- To what extent will forces external to the institution support or oppose prospective proposals for change? For example, how will unions, professional societies, legislatures, coordinating boards, accrediting agencies, students, and the public react?

### B. Review Process Issues

- Considering applicable sets of missions, goals, and objectives, to what extent should the current or prospective system promote common values, criteria, policies, and procedures across disciplines and subdisciplines?
- How does the current or prospective system deal with relationships between value and trendiness; for example, careers started on trends that become passé, but that have produced a body of work that transcends the trend?

3. How does the current or prospective system take into account resource variables in the results of teaching, creative work and research, and service?
4. To what extent can the current or prospective system be sensitive to the limitations of using quantitative means to address qualitative issues? How can the system be accountable to various constituencies and yet avoid embracing the scoreboard mentality?
5. Under what conditions should the institution rely on disciplinary expertise rather than nondisciplinary expertise in the reward system? To what extent can experts and non-experts reviewing work in a given field separate and/or interrelate such elements as public relations image, process, technique and content?

*xix. What procedural, political, and communication issues need to be addressed to ensure understanding and support, fairness and feasibility for faculty and administrators in and beyond the unit? What personnel, work load, and security issues and risks must be considered?*

### C. Administrative Questions

1. To what extent can common understanding of applicable missions, goals, and objectives be developed among all administrators involved— disciplinary and institutional? How can common understanding be developed, maintained, or enhanced?
2. How can the faculty evaluation and reward system be sensitive to the diversity of disciplinary perspectives, modes of action, and departmental priorities that may be present?
3. To what extent is every faculty member's function regarded as being the same? If not the same, to what extent are there different expectations for different faculty? To what extent does the evaluation and reward system treat individuals as though they were all engaged in the same set of functions, when perhaps they are not all so engaged?
4. To what extent can prospective changes to the evaluation and reward system be administered fairly and effectively?
5. To what extent do more specific definitions by discipline and by mission/goals/objectives within disciplines create changes of values, philosophy, process, and control?
6. What leverage is available to promote change in specific directions? What risks are associated with using this leverage (a) in specific time frames, or (b) at all?

7. To what extent and through what means can we formulate and enact policies reflecting distinctive missions, goals, and objectives, especially in a competitive environment?

### D. Personal, Institutional, and Unit Risk Issues

1. To what extent can junior faculty afford to take the risks associated with current or prospective systems? If an entity wishes to expand the kinds of work rewarded, is it possible that two systems are needed, a more traditional one for non-tenured faculty and a more open one for tenured faculty?
2. How can faculty members trust that mission, goals, and objectives will not change during the time that they are working toward tenure or some other reward, especially given the rapid turnover of top administrators in many institutions, and continuous adjustments to missions, goals, and objectives in planning processes for higher education?
3. To what extent will securing promotion and tenure with institution-unique or department-unique credentials at one institution limit faculty mobility?
4. How can nontraditional intellectually based work be rewarded in systems that focus on accountability for accepted activities, or on short-term rather than long-term results?
5. How can faculty evaluation and reward systems be perceived as being fair in a climate of advocacy?

### E. Hiring Issues

1. To what extent does the institution and/or unit define a set of hiring criteria related to (a) mission, goals, and objectives and (b) to the specific responsibilities the faculty member is expected to undertake? To what extent are there in-depth assessments of qualifications and orientations most likely to succeed in specific positions? What policies, procedures, or philosophies exist with respect to absolute prerequisites for anyone to be considered for the position?
2. To what extent are hiring decisions based upon projections about individual aspirations and capabilities for (a) teaching in the context of the applicable missions, goals, and objectives; (b) developing a high level of professional work in the area of specialization; and (c) providing services consistent with applicable missions, goals, and objectives? What criteria are used to make these judgments? For example, does the hiring process take into account projections about the individual's ability to be successful in the evaluation and reward system of the institution?

3. To what extent are individual hiring decisions made in relation to the capabilities and orientations of faculty already present?
4. What is the rank order of importance accorded to the various elements and criteria in the hiring process and how does this rank order relate to applicable missions, goals, and objectives?
5. To what extent are individual interviews and assessments structured to determine suitability with respect to applicable missions, goals, and objectives?

#### **F. Consultation and Mentoring**

1. What are the criteria for identifying (a) potential consultants and mentors and (b) less experienced faculty who may benefit from a consultant or from a mentoring relationship? How are consultants and mentors identified? Should selection be left up to the individual(s) concerned? If so, how will the relationship come about? Should consultants and mentors be older? Is individual productivity necessary for mentorship? For example, in order to be generous with one's time or talents, must one have a great deal to give?
2. What benefits may accrue to either or both parties? Are these benefits unidirectional? To what extent should there be reciprocity; should it be "in kind" (e.g., team teaching, joint authorship, concurrent performances, guest producers); should work be differentiated?
3. What is the appropriate type of long-term interaction for such a relationship? Should it be monitored by a third party? When should it end? How? Is there potentially a "new" kind of interaction following the consultancies and mentorship?
4. What are the relationships of issues addressed in F.1., F.2., and F.3. above to the faculty evaluation and rewards system? For example, to what extent does the system provide advantages to each party in a consultant or mentor relationship?

#### **G. Work Loads**

1. How will prospective changes to faculty evaluation and reward systems affect work loads in terms of (a) expectations and (b) distributions?
2. To what extent are there or will there be logical relationships among work loads, definitions of productivity, and expectations regarding teaching, creative work and research, and service?

## **VI. SUMMARY: COMPREHENSIVE CORRELATIONS, SYNERGIES, AND ISSUES**

*xx. How can all policies, perspectives, priorities, characteristics, influences, conditions, mechanisms, and aspirations best be integrated to support a positive and productive evaluation and reward system?*

#### **A. Correlations**

1. To what extent are there correlations among the findings in various segments of the assessment?
2. Is there an obvious rank order (i.e., most correlated to least correlated) for the items produced in A.1. above?

#### **B. Synergies**

1. To what extent is synergy produced by interaction of the various elements of the faculty evaluation and reward system reviewed by the assessment?
2. To what extent is the level of synergy discovered positive for accomplishing the missions, goals, and objectives of the arts unit(s) doing the study?

#### **C. Issues**

1. What short- or long-term opportunities are associated with findings in A.1. and A.2. and B.1. and B.2. above? How can these opportunities best be analyzed and/or addressed?
2. What short- or long-term risks or problems are associated with findings in A.1. and A.2. and B.1. and B.2. above? How can these risks or problems be addressed?
3. What are the primary issues in priority order revealed by a comprehensive study of the findings? To what extent are these issues associated individually or as a group with strategic concerns such as (a) missions, goals, objectives; (b) image; (c) values; (d) policies; (e) criteria; and (f) procedures?
4. To what extent is change desirable and/or feasible? To what extent does the assessment reveal that the institution or unit is in a good position to deal with critical issues?

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The cooperation and support of all institutions and individuals holding memberships in the sponsoring and consultant organizations were essential to the development of *Local Assessment of Evaluation and Reward Systems for Arts Faculties in Higher Education* and its predecessor, *The Work of Arts Faculties in Higher Education*.

In 1992, Syracuse University and Assistant Vice Chancellor Robert Diamond convened a national project to expand definitions of scholarship in American higher education. Syracuse University was the first among equals in a consortium of seven institutions, each of which contributed to a project on the importance of undergraduate teaching. This present text, along with efforts in other disciplines, emerged from the original project. We acknowledge this vision and impetus with thanks.

The Interdisciplinary Task Force that developed the initial draft and reviewed subsequent drafts made the project credible in content and pleasurable in its development. *Members of the Task Force are identified on the following page.*

Special appreciation is expressed to the staff members of the sponsoring organizations. Willa Shaffer of the National Office for Arts Accreditation prepared various drafts and the final text for publication. Samuel Hope was the principal author and Catherine Sentman Anderson was the principal editor of the text.

A final word of appreciation is forwarded to the hundreds of individual administrators and faculty members who do the work of the arts in colleges, conservatories, and universities. Without their dedicated efforts, neither this document nor the vital contributions made to the arts by higher education would be possible.



## Local Assessment of Evaluation and Reward Systems for Arts Faculties in Higher Education

### MEMBERS OF THE INTERDISCIPLINARY TASK FORCE

#### Co-Chair:

Donald M. Lantz  
Dean, College of Visual and Performing Arts  
Syracuse University

#### Co-Chair:

Bruce Abbey  
Dean, School of Architecture  
Syracuse University

#### Architecture

Robert M. Beckley, FAIA  
Dean, College of Architecture and Urban Planning  
University of Michigan

Marvin Malecha, AIA  
Dean, College of Environmental Design  
California State Polytechnic

#### Music

Marilyn Taft Thomas  
Head, Department of Music  
Carnegie Mellon University

Kenneth A. Keeling  
Head, Department of Music  
University of Tennessee

#### Art and Design

Robert Arnold  
Associate Provost for Curriculum and Instruction  
The Ohio State University

Larry Walker  
Director, School of Art and Design  
Georgia State University

#### Theatre

James L. Steffensen  
Chair, Department of Drama  
Dartmouth College

Carole W. Singleton  
Department of Theatre Arts  
Howard University

#### Dance

Nancy Smith Fichter  
Chairperson, Department of Dance  
Florida State University

Ann Wagner  
Chair, Department of Dance  
Saint Olaf College

#### Staff

Samuel Hope  
Executive Director  
National Office for Arts Accreditation

John M. Maudlin-Jeronimo  
Executive Director  
National Architectural Accrediting Board

Karen P. Moynahan  
Associate Director  
National Office for Arts Accreditation

Karen L. Niles  
Staff Vice President, Planning and Programs  
Landscape Architectural Accreditation Board

#### Film and Video

Ben Levin  
Department of Radio, Television, and Film  
University of North Texas

#### Landscape Architecture

Sally Schauman, FASLA  
Chair, Department of Landscape Architecture  
University of Washington

Mark Lindhult, ASLA  
Department of Landscape Architecture and Regional  
Planning  
University of Massachusetts

Catherine Sentman  
Projects Consultant  
National Office for Arts Accreditation