

F41

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA, BERKELEY

file - Evaluating Arts

BERKELEY • DAVIS • IRVINE • LOS ANGELES • MERCED • RIVERSIDE • SAN DIEGO • SAN FRANCISCO



SANTA BARBARA • SANTA CRUZ

DEPARTMENT OF THEATER, DANCE, AND PERFORMANCE STUDIES
101 DWINELLE ANNEX
BERKELEY, CA 94720-2560
PHONE: 510-642-1677 / FAX: 510-643-9956

April 5, 2006

Professor Russell Jones, Budget Committee, Chair
Professor Anthony Cascardi, Interim Dean of Arts and Humanities

Dear Chair Jones and Dean Cascardi:

Enclosed please find the document composed by dean's ad-hoc committee on Evaluating Arts Faculty. The document entitled "Evaluating Faculty Artwork as Research" seeks to provide general guidelines and principles for gauging faculty distinction in this domain while also providing an enabling rubric for what are often quite different art practices on this campus.

The committee was composed of faculty who represent different arts disciplines and with varying levels and types of experience in the domain of art-making and art research: Kate van Orden (Music, professional musician and musicologist), Loren Partridge (chair, Art Practice and also in Art History), Ken Goldberg (Industrial Engineering; director of Art Media and Technology colloquium), Linda Williams (Film, Rhetoric, current BC member), Renee Chow (chair, Architecture), and myself (Rhetoric, incoming chair of Theater, Dance, and Performance Studies; director of Townsend strategic working group "When Is Art Research?"). We also incorporated input from other chairs of art departments on campus.

Many thanks for the opportunity to reflect upon this important issue.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Shannon Jackson", written over a horizontal line.

Shannon Jackson
Professor

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA, BERKELEY

BERKELEY • DAVIS • IRVINE • LOS ANGELES • MERCED • RIVERSIDE • SAN DIEGO • SAN FRANCISCO



SANTA BARBARA • SANTA CRUZ

OFFICE OF THE DEANS
UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA, BERKELEY
COLLEGE OF LETTERS & SCIENCE
BERKELEY, CALIFORNIA 94720-2920

PHONE: 510-642-5396
FAX: 510-642-7578
E-MAIL: AJCASCARDI@BERKELEY.EDU

January 26, 2006

Professor Linda Williams (Film Studies; Rhetoric, L&S; Budget Committee)
Professor Kate van Orden (Music, L&S)
Professor Shannon Jackson (Theatre, Dance and Performance Studies; Rhetoric, L&S)
Professor Loren Partridge (Art History; Chair of Art Practice, L&S)
Professor Ken Goldberg (IEOR, College of Engineering)
Professor Rene Chow (Architecture, CED)

Dear Colleagues:

We are asking you to serve on a campus-wide committee to help clarify and improve conditions for advancement among faculty in the arts or whose work involves some significant creative dimension. Our concern is to develop guidelines for faculty, administrators, and senate committees for the evaluation of the work of arts faculty and to offer advice about the forms in which creative work is best presented for review. We use the term "creative work" knowing full well that some of the most challenging issues we face may have to do with the very question of what constitutes such work. Broadly speaking, we are concerned with the kinds of work that faculty in the arts tend to present for evaluation in the course of their Berkeley careers. Our hope is to help develop a conscientious, encouraging, and hospitable environment for the evaluation of work in the arts and to help faculty overcome some of the obstacles that can be encountered in an environment where the terms of "scholarship" and "research" are pervasive.

We would ask you to consider the following questions in the course of your deliberations:

- How can creative work best be evaluated in an environment where the standards of scholarship often set the norm?
- What are appropriate standards, measures, and mechanisms for judging the excellence and importance of creative work?
- What are the terms by which creative work should be expected (or not) to meet the criteria set for "research"?
- How is creative work best documented, archived, and made available for review?
- What can be done to help arts faculty manage the demands imposed by professional obligations that may come from outside the campus (e.g., making, displaying, performing, and engaging with new works)?

If you have other concerns you think it would be helpful to address in this context, we would be grateful to hear them. Please feel free to consult with faculty colleagues and administrators on campus and to draw on any documentation that the Division of Arts and Humanities and the Budget Committee can provide. Our goal is to create a productive environment for arts faculty at Berkeley, and we appreciate your help in doing so. We would appreciate receiving your report by March 27, 2006.

Sincerely,

Anthony J. Cascardi
Interim Dean of Arts and Humanities
College of Letters & Science

Russell L. Jones, Chair
Committee on Budget and Interdepartmental Relations,
Academic Senate

cc: Jan de Vries, Paul Gray, Chancellor Birgeneau, V-P Cathy Koshland

Evaluating Artwork as Research

In certain fields, such as art, architecture, dance, music, film/video and literature, distinguished creation should be evaluated much the way distinction in research is evaluated. However, departments, deans and the Budget Committee need specific guidelines for how to achieve parity between scholarly and creative distinction for purposes of hiring, promotion, and merit increase. The following is an attempt to extend the understanding of the criteria for evaluation of research into analogous standards for the evaluation of creative work. [Each department should create an internal document setting general criteria for each arts discipline. While such criteria may vary with the field, such a document should generally quantify productivity in one or three-year cycles (performances, exhibits, films, compositions, poems) and offer a general metric for gauging the distinction (prestige, size, location, juried) of the contexts in which faculty artworks and performances appear. There are three important parts in the review of a faculty members' creative work: 1) the candidate's presentation of work to his/her department or unit at the time of review and 2) the department and chair's presentation of the candidate's work to the Dean and central administration for further review. Finally, there are instances where 3) the evaluation of art-making sometimes depends upon the evaluation of a faculty members' teaching and service responsibilities. All of these elements need clear criteria for evaluation.

1. The candidate should provide materials at the time of review that will help his/her department best understand and present the case. These include the following:

Explication of the artwork: Just as a department may require a scholar to present a self-statement about the aims of their scholarship so a department about to evaluate a member's creative work should require a similar self statement about the nature and aims of this work. The candidate should describe the artwork and discuss its context: how does the work contribute to the candidate's distinctive profile as an artist, and how does it augment or challenge the art field in general? What are the significant innovations of this work? While it is not standard practice for all artists in all arts fields, artists who do write critically about their work or the work of others should also include these publications. Candidates should also include a discussion of works in progress. This document will be presented before the case is sent to external reviewers in the instances of promotions or to an internal ad hoc or department chair in the instance merits.

Dissemination/exhibition: For scholars, dissemination will usually be a matter of publication, copies of which can be summarized and sent forth as part of the case. For artists who do not work in print, the work must be represented through alternate means. Photos, slides, written accounts, videos or DVDs, audiotapes or CDs should be submitted as documentation in a well-organized and easily viewable/hearable format. A clear account of how the work has been disseminated, exhibited and received will be crucial. While documentation is generally gauged in terms of its thoroughness, dissemination in terms of its national and international reach, and exhibition/presentation in terms of its

quantity, particular art practices may be inappropriately understood within these terms. In such cases, a clear conceptual articulation about the artwork's goals and challenges is even more necessary. Candidates should include supporting documents such as reviews, catalogue statements, programs, scholarly essays or lectures that include the artist's work, on-line publications, and other materials related to documentation, exhibition/presentation, and dissemination.

Authorship: Just as published work or conference proceedings will stipulate who is the principle investigator or author of an article, or what portions of a co-authored anthology or book were written by the faculty member to be evaluated, so here it will be important to stipulate what precise part the person under review played in the creation of the work. Certain art forms are by their very nature more collaborative than others and thus are inappropriately analogized to the singly-authored book. Additionally, art practices that participate in historical reconstruction—eg. performing the past work of choreographers or composers—are inappropriately understood as acts of “original” authorship. Because the upper administration evaluating a candidate may not know what it means, for example, to be director of an independent film, the author of a play, the dramaturg of a play, the designer of a building, the designer of a building's landscape, the conductor or performer of a musical work etc. the nature of the creative participation must be explained. This kind of background information will be necessary in order for Deans and the Budget Committee to properly evaluate what exactly has been created.

2. It is expected that the Department and/or Dean will evaluate, not just enumerate the following at the time of the review.

Advances: Just as scholarship is often judged by how an article or book has advanced the field, so here accounts will be solicited by letters from internal ad hoc committees and outside evaluators of how the work in question has advanced the “field” of artmaking, film production, building design, musical composition, etc. Evaluators will be asked to judge what is genuinely innovative or significant about this work or performance. Outside of the university, artists and artworks regularly undergo peer-review processes of selection and evaluation for public and private arts organizations; similarly, the external and internal evaluation process within the university will evaluate the artist in relation to his or her peers and with the art field's standards for gauging innovation and advancement. It is the responsibility of the department chair or relevant dean to establish as clearly as possible the role of the candidate in the art project and in the arts field, especially in the case of collaborative projects and performances.

Evaluation of advances: How has the work submitted for review already been evaluated at the time of its original appearance or dissemination? How is it evaluated now? Has a work been selected for exhibition through peer review or other processes of invitation to perform or exhibit? What claims have been made, implicitly or explicitly, for the innovation or distinction of this particular creative work? Again, it is the responsibility of the department and/or dean to detail the type and quality of the creative activity expected in the candidate's field so that the merits of the case will be clear.

3. In cases where faculty art-making and departmental teaching and service are intimately combined OR physically irreconcilable, standard criteria for assessing research, teaching, and service must be clearly defined or modified in advance of and as part of the process of promotion review. Redefinition or modification does not alter the expectation that teaching and service are integral to promotions and merits.

Art Research and Coordination: Different art practices require different kinds of infrastructure and different levels of time/space coordination. Because of the variability of these factors, the coordination of art research with a regular departmental schedule of teaching and service needs to be carefully monitored and its principles of evaluation articulated both by the department and in the dean/department's statement to the budget committee.

Art Research Coordination separated from/combined with Teaching and Service: The creation of some art forms can occur within the four walls of a campus office; however, others require off-campus studios, site visits, daily and nightly rehearsals, fieldwork, lab-space, and/or on-location filming. While some art practices produce forms that are discrete objects that can be packaged or mailed, others such as musical, dance, or theatrical performance require the presence of the faculty artist in the space of art exhibition/presentation. For some faculty, such factors mean that they will be less able to pursue a nationally and internationally distinguished career as an artist without some adjustment to the university's regularized semester teaching and service schedule. For other faculty, such factors mean that they will choose to integrate their activities as teachers with their own activity as artists (student choral conducting, choreographing new pieces, experimenting with new plays, organizing a community art project), thereby allowing them to remain on-campus regularly. Similar trade-offs are involved in the service profile of a candidate who or may or may not be director of a major wing of the department's activities—Head graduate advisor, director of dance, head of design, coordinator of film production. Because strong teaching and service contributions are essential for advancement, in these and similar cases, the department should put together a careful calendar in semester, one-year, and three-year cycles that allow the candidate to create a strong profile of creative work *and* a strong profile in teaching and in service. The department should state clearly how the relation between art research, teaching, and service should be evaluated and how the faculty members' contribution to service and teaching should be judged.