

Assessing Creative Accomplishment

March 2013

A. Introduction.

The Academic Personnel Manual (APM) provides a general framework for academic personnel review at all campuses of the University of California (UC). The APM clearly assumes that the research records of some faculty members can be expected to include creative accomplishment. It equally clearly assumes that all research records must be carefully assessed in order to determine whether they manifest the candidate's "superior intellectual attainment" (APM 210-1.d), but it offers only very general guidance about assessing research records that include creative accomplishment:

"In certain fields such as art, architecture, dance, music, literature, and drama, distinguished creation should receive consideration equivalent to that accorded to distinction attained in research. In evaluating artistic creativity, an attempt should be made to define the candidate's merit in the light of such criteria as originality, scope, richness, and depth of creative expression. It should be recognized that in music, drama, and dance, distinguished performance, including conducting and directing, is evidence of a candidate's creativity." (APM 210-1.d.2)

The present policy statement is intended to guide academic units at Berkeley in providing rigorous and fair assessment of research records that include creative accomplishment, typically in artistic or design fields. This statement is not intended to provide guidelines for assessing records of expert or professional practice in other fields.

B. Basic standard of assessment.

The APM indicates that creative accomplishment, like all research accomplishment, should manifest faculty members' superior intellectual attainment and their fitness to serve the University's mission of discovering and transmitting knowledge (APM 210-1.d). There are, of course, other ways of evaluating creative accomplishment, but this is the basic standard of assessment set by the UC as a research university.

This standard entails that all faculty members, including those engaged in creative activity, are expected to carry out work that (1) has made a substantial contribution to inquiry and discovery, and (2) is made available in ways that permit informed response, including peer review.

C. Statements of discipline-specific norms for assessing creative accomplishment.

The basic standard of assessment can and should be articulated in different ways within different disciplines. At Berkeley, responsibility for articulating discipline-specific norms lies with the relevant academic units. These may be departments, schools, divisions, or colleges. In all cases, the deans of relevant academic units are responsible for ensuring the following:

1. Each relevant unit will draft a statement of its normative expectations concerning creative accomplishment using the guidelines below.
2. The faculty within the unit will discuss and vote upon its draft.
3. The draft statements will be submitted to the Vice Provost for the Faculty, reviewed by the Budget Committee, and approved by the Vice Provost.
4. The approved statements will be provided to all faculty members within the unit.
5. As part of the unit's program of mentoring, the approved statements will be discussed with individual faculty members, especially assistant professors. Care will be taken to help each faculty member understand how the statement of normative expectations applies to his or her particular research plans.
6. The units will conduct academic reviews and appraisals of faculty members in light of the normative expectations set forth in the approved statement.
7. If the faculty member's research record spans both creative accomplishment and research or scholarly accomplishment, such a dual portfolio will receive especially careful articulation of the expectations that are to be communicated both to the candidate and to reviewers at all levels.
 - (a) If the unit has a dual expectation when it hires a new faculty member, this should be clearly communicated to the faculty member at the time of hire and clearly stated in each of the unit's written reviews and appraisals of the faculty member's record.
 - (b) In preparing materials for reviews and appraisals, faculty members who present dual portfolios should be encouraged to explain how the achievements under review constitute creative, research, and/or scholarly accomplishments.
 - (c) Circumstances may call for a significant change in the balance of a dual portfolio, and in that case, the faculty member and the chair or dean should discuss the change and the reasons for it. A written memorandum of their discussion should be placed in the faculty member's file, and it should be included in cases for review or appraisal.
 - (d) The faculty member's unit will identify the expertise needed by internal and external reviewers and establish the appropriate roles for these experts in assessing the merits of different aspects of the portfolio.

D. Guidelines for development of statements of discipline-specific norms.

1. The normative statements must apply the basic standard of assessment in (B) above to the kinds of research work that faculty members do in the unit. The statements should indicate how the work is expected to constitute a contribution to inquiry and discovery within a field of creative accomplishment and how it is to be made available as a subject for informed response, including peer review. Examples of the ways in which work might be appropriately made

available might include presentations at conferences, public interviews, public performances, gallery exhibitions, publication of plans or photographs, published essays by the faculty member, published fiction or poetry, or published essays by others writing about the faculty member's work.

2. The normative statements must explain how to differentiate between records that meet standards of excellence and those that do not. They should indicate how "distinction" is to be discerned, including distinction in "performance," as well as such qualities as "originality, scope, richness, and depth of creative expression" (APM 210-1.d.2). In doing this, the statements should provide examples of appropriate indicators of excellence, such as important awards, commissions, grants, exhibition venues, press coverage, or reviews. The role of peer review should be carefully delineated.

3. The normative statements should take particular care in explaining the nature of "distinction" for faculty members whose research opportunities are constrained by factors that are not under their control. Examples might include directors or conductors whose time and mobility are constrained by responsibility for student performances; architects whose designs are constrained by regulatory and economic exigencies; journalists whose media platforms are evolving rapidly; or practitioners whose outside activity may be limited by university regulations.

4. If it is possible to state general expectations for rates of productivity, these should be provided. If this is not possible, particular care should be taken to ensure that each faculty member receives advice about the expectations within his or her realm of endeavor.

5. Statements of discipline-specific norms should articulate expectations for the role of writing and publication in the portfolio of a candidate. When writing is expected, the statement should indicate what forms it should take, what kinds of venues would be appropriate, and what kinds of peer review should be possible.