

UCLA School of the Arts and Architecture
Guidelines for Evaluating Community-Engaged Artmaking
In Academic Personnel Review
In relation to the and building upon the Division of Social Sciences Document
adopted by that Division's Chairs, May 2, 2023¹

Prepared by
The SOAA Faculty Executive Committee (FEC) with assistance
from the departments of ART, AUD, DMA, & WACD
This document was unanimously approved by the SOAA FEC on
January 10, 2025

Background:

In AY 2021-22, the Council on Academic Personnel (CAP) recognized the importance of establishing criteria to evaluate excellence and impact of community-engaged scholarship. In doing so, CAP communicated that it understood that community-engaged scholarship in diverse fields will be expressed through a diverse range of work products in relation to diverse public partners. For this reason, CAP invited deans to organize working groups to establish criteria for evaluating community- engaged scholarship applicable to their individual school/division. This document originated with Dean Brett Steele and was completed under Interim Dean Lionel Popkin of the School of the Arts and Architecture, building on the pilot document authored in the division of Social Sciences. To that effort we add 'community-engaged artmaking' to the discussion, as creative work has already been established as a viable output for faculty within the University of California.

Purpose:

The purpose of this document is to establish transparent criteria within the School of the Arts and Architecture so that community-engaged artists know how their work will be evaluated and that departmental peers, the dean, and the Council on Academic Personnel will have a common frame of reference for rigorously evaluating community-engaged research and teaching when it appears in faculty dossiers for academic personnel review.

Rationale:

The document from the Division of Social Sciences correctly frames the many needs for an evaluative document to exist, including, but not limited to:

- The false historic distinction between professional artists and artists who engage with community participants with intentionality and ethical clarity.
The endemic difficulty of evaluating community engaged artmaking by those unfamiliar with its process.

¹ Thanks to the Social Science document for providing this reference. To help with a cohesive conversation, this document borrows much of its framing and structure from that existing document.

- The propensity of minoritized and historically underrepresented individuals to disproportionately undertake projects which utilize the techniques within community engaged artmaking.
- The inherent inequity in the transposition of evaluative structures from more historically privileged forms of artistic production onto this more recent form of artistic endeavor.
- The embodiment of ethical relationality within an artistic process is integrally linked not only to its thematic focus, but also to its generative and administrative stewardship.
- Current models of research have integrated modes of research, teaching, and service in ways which blur those categories from previous modes of creation.
- Community engaged research is relational and as such a time commitment to building those relationships is part of the process that must be taken into consideration when evaluating timelines and productivity.

Particular to the School of the Arts and Architecture, additional contexts and observations are necessary to engage on this topic:

- Artmaking is an exercise in creating primary knowledge. While all epistemological systems exist in relation to other modes of learning, artmaking has traditionally been inherently a thing in and of itself as a site which generates its own discourse.
- The definition of an artist as a solitary genius is no longer valid. Instead, artists are increasingly in the world they live in, activating and catalyzing changes in thought, belief, action, and perception. Artists have become people who enable action as well as makers of objects.
- As notions of artmaking have expanded, so has the conception of where and how artmaking can exist. Gone are the days of only major institutions providing their stamp of approval. Many artmakers are seeking peer validation from the communities with whom they engage and/or the participants they impact.
- Artmaking as a social practice has a different evaluative mode than traditional artmaking modalities.
- Institutional critique within artmaking has grown dramatically in recent years, as the material being created takes on a direct critical engagement with existing structures.
- Artmaking has become increasingly inter/multidisciplinary with few artists creating within a singular medium and within a singular evaluative framework.
- Similarly, artmaking has become increasingly collaborative with shared authorship becoming increasingly prevalent.
- Some believe that peer-review within the arts is most evident in non-trade publications such as daily newspapers or popular periodicals. With the demise of print media, these outlets have steadily dwindled. Simultaneously, the rise of Performance Studies (and all its related fields of inquiry) has shifted the locus of the peer-review process to artistic and academic peers.

Within the above frames, community engaged artmaking raises a distinct set of issues particular to how creative activities exist within the academy which the current guidelines within the Call are insufficient to address. As such we offer the below set of evaluative criteria for community engaged artmaking. An additional goal within this document is to also allow for artists working in more relational and reciprocal models within a community context to fully engage in their work and no longer be asked to undertake a second set of creative actions by translating their more 'non-traditional' artmaking into the historically favored and recognized outputs within the academy.

Criteria and indicators for evaluating community-engaged Artmaking

We recommend the following as the criteria for evaluating community-engaged Artmaking, mindful of the variation in contexts, the breadth of faculty work, and departmental promotion and tenure guidelines. We note that these *criteria* are meant to be enabling for community-engaged faculty, not onerous. The indicators are intended to be expansive and inclusive so that faculty dossiers can be prepared and read with appropriate context. Faculty would not be expected to meet all the indicators in each area. Many of the criteria overlap with the document from the Social Science Division's document, which has been amended to include language specific to fields in the arts.

Criteria	Indicators
<p data-bbox="240 747 686 821">1. Clear Academic & Community Change Goals</p> <p data-bbox="240 867 480 898">Objectives defined</p> <p data-bbox="240 951 683 982">Clear purpose and focus of inquiry</p>	<p data-bbox="862 762 1333 835"><i>The artist provides evidence of clear goals such as—</i></p> <ul data-bbox="883 848 1370 1843" style="list-style-type: none"><li data-bbox="883 848 1370 993">• Clearly stating the basic purpose of the work and its value for the discipline(s) AND the public good<li data-bbox="883 1003 1370 1188">• Documenting the alignment between the Artmaking and the artist's role, departmental priorities, and university mission<li data-bbox="883 1199 1370 1266">• Defining goals and objectives that are realistic and achievable<li data-bbox="883 1276 1370 1570">• Identifying significant intellectual questions in the discipline AND for the community/external stakeholders with whom the artist is partnered<li data-bbox="883 1581 1370 1692">• Articulating a coherent program of research and objectives<li data-bbox="883 1703 1370 1843">• Articulating pedagogical lessons to utilize for teaching and student learning.

<p>2. Adequate Preparation in Content Area and Grounding in the Community</p> <p>Preparation and knowledge about developments in the field of study and relevant community context</p>	<p><i>The artist provides evidence of adequate preparation and grounding in community partnerships such as—</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Investing time and effort in developing reciprocal and mutual relationships with community partnerships • Bringing appropriate skills to the collaboration • Participating in training and professional development that builds skills and competencies in community-engaged Artmaking • Understanding the norms and expectations of high-quality collaboration and partnership
<p>3. Appropriate Methods: Rigor and Community Engagement</p> <p>Rigor is evident in project design, interpretation, and reporting of results.</p> <p>Rigor is maintained, or even enhanced, through community-engaged approaches.</p>	<p><i>The artist provides evidence of artistic rigor informed/enriched by engagement such as—</i></p> <p>Refining a research question, or confirming its validity, through collaboration or co-generation with community/external partner(s)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Using methods appropriate to the goals, questions, and context of the work and provides rationale for election of methods

- | | |
|--|---|
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none">● Modifying procedures in response to changing circumstances● Engaging the community/external partner as a partner/collaborator(s) in developing and/or improving the artistic project● Extending and broadening the dissemination of study findings through partnership with community members and organizations● Enhancing curriculum by incorporating updated and real- world information from community members critical to student learning of course material● Deepening and contextualizing the learning experience in a course by involving community experts in design and implementation● Revising curriculum and community placement with community partner based on student feedback and community partner observation |
|--|---|

**4. Significant Results:
Impact on the
Discipline/Field and
the Community**

Beneficial impact in the communities in which the Artmaking is conducted.

Development of ongoing and reciprocal relationships with community partners is a concrete impact.

Assessment of knowledge created (in field, discipline, community).

The artist provides evidence of significant results/impact such as—

- Achieving the intended or notable goals, impact, or change consistent with the purpose and target of the work over a period of time
- Contributing to new knowledge in the field/discipline through publication in curated venues, peer-reviewed journals, other artistic outlets, and other non-traditional forms

- | | |
|--|---|
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Contributing to and benefiting the community/ external partner• Making progress towards social equity and/or systemic change that promote the public good• Securing increased funding for additional research, program implementation, and/or community partners• Increasing capacity of community members/organizations to advocate for themselves• Adding consequentially to the discipline on issues that matter to the external partners and the community• Opening up additional areas for further exploration, inquiry, and/or collaboration• Ability of the work, in various venues or formats, to stimulate intellectual conversation that advances the discipline or field• Ability of the work, in various venues and formats relevant for the community partners, to stimulate conversation within a community or general public• Advancing knowledge/understanding for the community in which the work is situated, and discussing its generalizability/transferability to other populations or as a model that can be further investigated in other settings |
|--|---|

5. Effective Presentation and Communication to Artistic and Community Audiences

Artists effectively communicate with appropriate audiences and subject their ideas to independent review.

The artist provides evidence of effective presentation and dissemination such as—

- Communicating with/disseminating to appropriate artistic and public audiences consistent with the mission of the institution
 - Presenting the work in appropriate venues with significant curatorial practices, publishing research results or teaching innovations in peer-reviewed, practitioner, professional journals, and other non-traditional forms/venues
- Using appropriate forums and presenting information and materials in forms that community stakeholders and external partners find accessible and understandable
 - Disseminating information through media used/read by community members
 - Producing documents directed towards service providers, policymakers, or legislators
 - Creating and inspiring new conversations (e.g., write-ups, references, etc.) in BOTH public and

artistic spheres

- Communicating outcomes of community engaged work in collaboration with community/external partners. Acknowledging that in many contexts this may involve a significant output not in English and recognizing that this is not a simple act of translation, but an ethical approach of access to a non-English speaking community.
- Presenting community-based exhibitions in forms consistent within a particular community. This may include group exhibits or events by community members or other non-traditional forms and outputs.

Presenting information with clarity and integrity

<p>6. Reflective Critique: Lessons Learned to Improve the Artmaking and Community Engagement</p> <p>Reflective critique of community partnerships. Evaluation of partnership successes and failures.</p>	<p><i>The artist provides evidence of reflective critique such as—</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">● Critically evaluating the work with appropriate evidence● Seeking evaluations from community members and using those evaluations to learn from and direct future work● Changing project/course design or line of inquiry based on feedback and lessons learned● Being involved in a local, state, national, or international dialogue related to the work● Engaging in personal reflection concerning, for example, issues of privilege or racism

<p>7. Collaborative Leadership and Personal Contribution</p> <p>The artist’s work has earned a reputation for rigor, impact, relevance, and the capacity to advance the discipline or community agenda.</p>	<p><i>The artist provides evidence of leadership and personal contribution such as—</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">● Describing how the work has been recognized, used, or built on by peers● Describing how the work has been recognized, used, or built upon by community members, practitioners, professionals in the field, and external experts, including positively impacting the university’s relationship with community and stakeholder groups● Providing comments or reviews (solicited/unsolicited, formal/informal) from academic and non-academic colleagues, peers, and experts● Receiving awards or letters of appreciation from community-based organizations for contributions to the community● Receiving invitations to present to professional society meetings and conferences, to present to community audiences, to testify before legislative bodies, to appear in the media, or to serve on advisory or policymaking committees● Mentoring students, early career faculty, and community partners

8. Socially and Ethically Responsible Conduct of Research and Teaching

The work is conducted with honesty and integrity.

Artist's work is conducted in a way that fosters respectful relationships with students, community participants, external partners, and peers.

The artist provides evidence of consistently ethical behavior such as—

- Socially responsible conduct of research, teaching, and outreach in creative activity, writings, discourse, approach to artmaking, and nature of collaboration. Cultivating the conduct of sound research techniques, creativity, and appropriate engaged pedagogies that result in meaningful and beneficial contributions to communities
- Approaching communities as mutual partners to foster trusting, equitable relationships
- Engaging communities in a respectful manner
- Recognizing and valuing community knowledge systems and incorporating them into the research process and courses as appropriate
- Appropriately involving community/external partners in writing and reviewing products and acknowledging their work