

# Department of Architecture

## Faculty Evaluation Plan

Faculty Approved, 10/26/2018

### INTRODUCTION

The traditional goals of higher education are the generation of knowledge through research, the transmission of knowledge through teaching, and the use of knowledge through service. The primary goal of the Architecture Department in the School of Architecture and Design is the education of students who will receive a National Architectural Accrediting Board (NAAB) accredited professional degree in architecture. Faculty members in the department have responsibilities not only to the mission of the University, but also to their associated academic and professional constituencies. Consideration for appointment to the Architecture Faculty will include a combination of advanced degrees, professional experience, academic expertise, and professional registration. It is recognized that for members of the faculty who contribute primarily to the NAAB-accredited curriculum, professional experience is an important consideration for appointment in a tenure-track position, and preference will be given to those candidates who are licensed professionals and who hold a post-professional master's degree in architecture. For members of the faculty who contribute primarily to specialized areas within the curriculum and in areas that support the research and graduate missions of the University and the Department, preference will be given to candidates who hold doctorates and have demonstrated capabilities in those specialized fields of architectural knowledge.

### SECTION 1

#### STATEMENT OF PERFORMANCE EXPECTATIONS

##### Unit Expectations

Faculty members in the Department of Architecture must engage in the three traditional areas of academic endeavor: teaching, scholarship/creative/professional work, and service. A primary function of the department is to provide an outstanding education to its students. Each faculty member is therefore expected to conduct classes wherein deep understanding and emergent knowledge are conveyed in clear and engaging ways, but also to supervise student inquiry, mentor and advise students, and engage in other teaching-related activities outside of the classroom. Scholarship encompasses not only traditional academic research and publication, but also the creation of works of architecture and any other products or activities accepted by the academic discipline or profession as reflecting performance for purposes of promotion and tenure. Service includes scholarly service to the discipline or profession, service within the university, and public service at the local, state, national, or international level.

## **Standards for Acceptable Performance for Tenured Faculty**

As stated in the Faculty Handbook, “the University is committed to the principles of academic freedom and, within those principles, to the system of tenure. Tenure is an important part of academic freedom, but does not accord freedom from accountability.” As such, once a faculty member has been awarded tenure, it is expected that s/he will continue to engage in teaching, scholarship/creative/professional work, and service and to do so in a manner that is aligned with the mission of the Department, the School, and the University. The following have been established as defining the substandard level of performance in regard to teaching, scholarship, and service, any one of which will initiate the process for failure to meet academic responsibilities.

### **Teaching**

Threshold levels that indicate substandard performance in teaching include the following:

1. Refusal by the faculty member to negotiate a teaching assignment in any given semester.
2. Failure to attend the regularly scheduled class periods or have multiple unexcused absences from assigned classes. It is the responsibility of the faculty member to inform the Department Office in the event of the inability to attend classes and failure to make such notification will be defined as an unexcused absence.
3. Failure to meet acceptable levels of teaching performance in a calendar year as demonstrated through performance measures. These measures may include:
  - a. Instruction Evaluation Reports for courses.
  - b. Perceptions of advisees, recent alumni, and faculty peers. Peer evaluations are an important component of the assessment of faculty teaching.
  - c. Other evidence, including peer evaluation of course syllabi, experimental teaching formats, the development of model teaching techniques, and similar activities.
  - d. Peer analysis of student work as to its fulfilling the course objectives, especially with regard to the NAAB criteria assigned to the course.

### **Scholarship/Creative/Professional Work**

Threshold levels that indicate substandard performance in scholarship/creative/professional work include the following:

1. Refusal and/or failure by the faculty member to engage in a specific, ongoing program of scholarship/creative/professional work.
2. Failure by the faculty member to have her/his scholarship/creative/professional work accepted or acknowledged through external review at least once every three years.
3. Failure to meet one of the indices of scholarly/creative/professional competence as defined in Appendix B, Section 3 in any given calendar year.

### **Service**

Threshold levels that indicate substandard performance in service include the following:

1. Refusal by the faculty member to engage in any form of service as defined in Appendix B: Criteria and Procedures for Tenure, Promotion and Reappointment.
2. Failure to perform negotiated service duties in any given calendar year.

### **Differential Allocation of Effort**

Recognizing that not all faculty members are the same, the department permits the crafting of one's workload and the pursuit of one's strengths in a way that is aligned with the mission and needs of the department and in accordance with School and University policy. The Department recognizes its role as part of the State of Kansas' flagship research university, but also places high value on the quality of instruction and on the provision of service. The following paragraphs seek to guide faculty and administration in achieving the larger mission of the department while recognizing faculty individuality and promoting faculty excellence.

Differential allocation of workload may be negotiated at each annual review. Both teaching and scholarship components may not be negotiated to less than 20% of allocation and service may be no less than 10% and no more than 40% (except as described in Appendix B, Section 5). As the University of Kansas Faculty Senate Rules and Regulations states, "Teaching and scholarship should normally be given primary consideration, but the particular weight to be accorded each component of a faculty member's activities depends upon the responsibilities of the faculty member." In promotion decisions, the weighting of teaching, scholarship and service shall be proportional to the faculty member's workload allocation.

In addition to teaching in the accredited professional degree program, faculty could be assigned to teaching and advising in independent study, graduate study and doctoral study courses in architecture and in interdisciplinary programs. The following is a documentation of the policies on how these efforts are to be counted toward the fulfillment of an individual faculty member's teaching obligation.

### **Advisement of Undergraduate Projects, Master's Theses, and Doctoral Dissertations**

Whereas all faculty members are expected to advise students taking their classes, mentoring independent projects, theses, and dissertations constitutes a greater time commitment than typical extracurricular interaction. Such mentoring should include disciplinary expectations for scholarly excellence. Doctoral advisement further includes mentoring teaching, as well as expectations for professional involvement in scholarly associations. The Department acknowledges the extra time commitment of individual mentoring, and the advanced complexity of graduate work is recognized as requiring greater faculty commitment than undergraduate advising.

### **Extra-Departmental Collaboration**

Departments function when faculty members dedicate their time and energy to the core mission, but disciplines grow and evolve by pushing the limits of inquiry into new realms within the profession and beyond traditional disciplinary boundaries. This department does not require but acknowledges and values faculty participation in extra-departmental efforts, such as contribution to interdisciplinary

research, creative productivity, and teaching. Individual faculty members hold responsibility for indicating the extent and workload of extra-departmental efforts.

The department is also open to negotiating offset loads wherein the instructional load of a faculty member may be higher in one semester than another. Faculty can bank their course loads in consecutive years to meet their usual course load required every two academic years. In any negotiation of offset load, the higher instructional loads shall be met in the earlier semesters, except in exceptional circumstances. As with workload reallocation, offset loads will only be negotiated in keeping with the mission and needs of the department.

## **SECTION 2 ANNUAL EVALUATION SYSTEM**

For annual evaluation, the Department of Architecture utilizes the Statements of Performance Expectations outlined in Appendix B: Criteria and Procedures for Tenure, Promotion and Reappointment.

Annual evaluations of faculty performance will be made on behalf of the department by the Chair. Assessments of faculty performance in each of the three areas of teaching, scholarship and service will be based on evaluations from multiple information sources and using diverse methods as outlined in Sections 2, 3, and 4 of Appendix B: Criteria and Procedures for Tenure, Promotion and Reappointment. The purpose of this diversity of evaluation methods is to ensure a balanced and comprehensive view of the individual's contribution to the mission of the Department, School, the University, and the larger community. The annual evaluation process has multiple outcomes including establishing goals and allocation of effort for the following year, providing data for merit salary decisions, and developing plans for faculty development.

Each faculty member will, in negotiation with the Department Chair, establish on an annual basis the relative degrees of emphasis he or she will place on the three areas of teaching, scholarship and service.

Annual evaluations are conducted on the basis of a calendar year, and thus cover the spring semester of one academic year and the autumn semester of the subsequent year (as well as summer if the faculty member is on appointment). The Chair is responsible for disseminating to faculty the annual report form by the end of the fall semester of the calendar year being evaluated. Faculty are to submit complete annual reports to the Chair by February 1st of the subsequent year. The Chair is to disseminate draft versions of evaluations to faculty no later than April 1st. All tenure-track faculty must meet with the Chair to discuss the evaluation. Tenured faculty have the right to request a meeting to discuss the evaluation with the Chair.

### **Annual Report Preparation**

The annual faculty review process is viewed as an opportunity for the faculty member to update and clarify his/her academic career objectives, and data collected as part of the annual review should become part of the member's cumulative academic record that will be used in the promotion and tenure process. Faculty Annual Reports include a completed annual report form along with an updated curriculum vitae and all course syllabi. Evidence appropriate to inform the annual evaluation is from the

evaluation calendar year only. Guidance for submission of evidence relevant to the evaluation of teaching is available at: <http://www.cte.ku.edu/documenting/evaluating/index.shtml>.

Faculty members do not need to submit the results of Student Surveys of Teaching.

### **Annual Report Evaluation**

The Chair is to review all relevant evidence in regard to the performance of each faculty member in regard to teaching, scholarship and service. Each area of effort shall receive its own assessment and the overall evaluation of faculty annual performance shall be based on a weighting of those three assessments according to the faculty member's allocation of effort for that year. A "poor" evaluation in any area of effort shall automatically result in a report from the Chair to the faculty member that suggests ways to correct this substandard level of performance for the subsequent calendar year. The Standards for Acceptable Performance for Tenured Faculty above identify the thresholds for substandard performance and therein identify the definition of "poor performance" within each area of effort.

### **Teaching**

Teaching shall be evaluated in regard to the indices of teaching competence identified in Appendix B: Criteria and Procedures for Tenure, Promotion and Reappointment. In addition, the Chair shall endeavor to assess the degree of alignment between departmentally identified learning outcomes and NAAB curricular requirements and the evidence of teaching submitted by the faculty member as well as consider the results of Student Surveys of Teaching distributed to the department. The Chair may consider mediating variables such as teaching overloads, status of first-time course offerings, alignment of teaching load to faculty expertise and the like in the assessment of teaching.

### **Scholarship/Creative/Professional Work**

The Chair shall evaluate scholarship/creative/professional work in regard to the indices of competence identified in Appendix B: Criteria and Procedures for Tenure, Promotion and Reappointment. Of particular value is scholarship/creative/professional work that adds to the body of knowledge in the field, work that is disseminated in externally reviewed venues and those that bring recognition to the School and University.

### **Service**

The Chair shall evaluate service in regard to the indices of competence identified in Appendix B: Criteria and Procedures for Tenure, Promotion and Reappointment. It is expected that tenured faculty members will serve the University at multiple levels and in addition engage in service to the community and/or profession at local, national or international levels. It should be noted that membership in an organization is not the same as providing service to an organization.

### **Annual Evaluation Feedback Process**

The Chair is to disseminate draft written summaries to the faculty by the date specified above. This summary shall note: the allocation of effort for the year evaluated, and suggest an allocation of effort

for the following year; an assessment of performance in regard to each area of effort, an overall assessment of performance, and expectations for the subsequent year. Suggestions regarding progress toward promotion and/or tenure, and/or strategies for improvement/renewal are to be provided as deemed necessary. The written summary must inform the faculty member of the opportunity to discuss the evaluation. Tenure track faculty must discuss the evaluation with the Chair. A copy of the written summary shall be retained by the Office of the Chair.

### **Conflict Resolution Process**

In the event that a faculty member disagrees with the Department Chair's annual evaluation and subsequent discussions between the Chair and faculty member do not resolve the issues, the faculty member may request an administrative review by the Department Promotion and Tenure Committee. At that time, the faculty member may provide additional information to the Committee for its consideration. This committee shall issue a non-binding recommendation to the Chair along with any additional information submitted by the faculty member relevant to their decision. Regardless of the Chair's decision to retain or change the evaluation, the report of the Department Committee shall become part of the faculty member's official file. If the faculty member is dissatisfied with the result at the Department level, s/he may appeal at the School level according to the By-laws of the School of Architecture, Design and Planning. Similarly, recommendations for dismissal may also be appealed at the School level according to the By-laws of the School.

### **Outcomes of the Annual Performance Evaluation**

The Department of Architecture views the annual faculty evaluation process as a comprehensive process yielding multiple outcomes. These outcomes include, but are not limited to, the initiation of discussions influencing a faculty member's career and departmental planning, identification of faculty development or renewal activities, data for merit salary determination, documentation for special recognitions, and cumulative data supporting personnel decisions, such as progress toward tenure or promotion, reassignment of responsibilities, and risk for failing to meet performance expectations.

If a faculty member is evaluated as failing to meet performance expectations in an annual evaluation, the written evaluation shall be specific in describing those areas and ways for improving performance in each such area, or, based upon the performance trajectory of the faculty member, the Chair may propose differential allocation of effort away from problem areas to areas where performance is more satisfactory, subject to the necessity for the unit to meet its teaching, scholarship/creative/professional work and service obligations and the need for all faculty members to contribute appropriately.

If a faculty member is evaluated as failing to meet performance expectations in any area of effort for two consecutive years, the Chair, in consultation with the faculty member, shall develop a written Plan for Academic Performance to improve the faculty member's performance. The Chair shall give the faculty member 20 days to respond to the first draft of the plan, and seven days to any subsequent plan draft. Failure of the faculty member to consult with the Chair within those timeframes shall constitute a default acceptance of the proposed plan. The plan may include appropriate provisions for faculty development, such as campus opportunities for faculty continued renewal and development, or for other appropriate interventions, such as counseling, medical leave, or a change in teaching assignments.

The plan shall present specific benchmarks and timeframes aimed at improving the faculty member's performance. Failure to meet any benchmark within its assigned time frame shall represent a failure to meet performance expectations and shall be reported as such in the appropriate annual evaluation.

If a faculty member is evaluated by the Chair as failing to meet the performance expectations of a Plan for Academic Performance, subsequent to having previously been assessed as performing below the threshold of substandard performance for two consecutive years, this shall by definition constitute a sustained substandard performance.

Sustained substandard performance is a pattern of substandard performance for two consecutive years that has not been remedied by a faculty member in spite of a subsequent program for corrective action initiated by the Chair and conforming to guidelines established by the Office of the Provost.

After the Department Chair determines that a faculty member has a sustained level of substandard performance, the Chair must inform the faculty member of this decision. The Chair will then offer to meet with the faculty member and the Dean to allow the faculty member an opportunity to offer an explanation. If still convinced of sustained substandard performance, the Department Chair will then submit a report to the School Promotion and Tenure Committee. The Committee will then assess the report and provide a written recommendation to the Dean of the School of Architecture, Design and Planning.

If the School Promotion and Tenure Committee and the Dean agree that the faculty member has sustained substandard performance, then proceedings to dismiss the faculty member shall be commenced during the subsequent academic year.

### **SECTION 3 FACULTY DEVELOPMENT INITIATIVES**

Faculty development is defined as a continuous process in which the School, the University, and the individual faculty member work together to insure that the personal goals of the member and the missions of the School and University complement and enrich one another. Faculty development begins with the first academic appointment through the assignment by the Department Chair of a mentor to assist the new faculty member during the latter's preparation for promotion and tenure. Faculty development continues throughout the member's career through such institutions and programs as sabbatical leaves, leaves without pay, faculty exchanges, scholarly travel and research/creative activities, and teaching innovation and development funds and workshops. In addition, the Department Chair will make opportunities available (on a semester-by-semester basis) to the faculty member through reduced teaching, research/creative activities, or service loads in order to allow the member time to develop his/her academic career or address specific performance deficiencies. These opportunities will be subject to current resource availability and will be made at the discretion of the Department Chair. It will be the responsibility of the Department Chair to apprise the faculty member of development opportunities, while the faculty member will be responsible for initiating and completing the requirements of the various development programs to further and/or improve his/her academic effectiveness.

**APPENDIX A****Instrument Used for the Student Evaluation of Teaching**

The Department of Architecture utilizes the most recent Student Survey of Teaching made available to departments by the University or a department-approved alternative.

## APPENDIX B

### Criteria and Procedures for Tenure, Promotion and Reappointment

#### SECTION 1

##### Introduction

Any evaluation of a faculty member's performance will take into account the negotiated distribution of responsibilities in teaching, scholarship/creative/professional work, and service. These criteria and procedures are to be used in conjunction with the School of Architecture, Design and Planning By-Laws, University Handbook of Faculty and Other Unclassified Staff, and the Senate Rules and Regulations governing issues of evaluation. In all instances, University and Regents rules and procedures shall take precedence over guidelines outlined in this section. Special attention is drawn to the following regulations, goals and strategic initiatives:

Article VI of the KU Faculty Handbook (Promotion and Tenure)

<https://documents.ku.edu/policies/governance/FSRR.htm#ArticleVI>

KU Intellectual Property Guidelines

<https://documents.ku.edu/policies/provost/IntellectualPropertyPolicy.htm>

KU Consulting Activities

<http://www.provost.ku.edu/policy/faculty/handbook1986/d.shtml#28>

KU Faculty Appeal Procedures

<https://documents.ku.edu/policies/governance/FRBProceduresforAppealsPandT.htm>

KU Strategic Plan

<http://provost.ku.edu/sites/provost.drupal.ku.edu/files/docs/strategic-plan-20110914.pdf>

In Architecture, it is natural for faculty to seek ways in which to pursue integrated scholarship/creative/professional work involving their efforts in instruction and/or service. This is particularly true of studio instruction. In so doing, the faculty member must adhere to the intentions of academic integrity and particularly the principles of attribution. In general, awards won by student(s) for work completed in a course would reflect upon the teaching skills of the instructing faculty member and would be credited as an index of teaching performance.

In special circumstances, where the faculty member plays a substantial leadership role and the award is externally-reviewed and of significant professional stature, the faculty member may legitimately claim credit for achievement in scholarship/creative/professional work equivalent to a publication, the value of which will be commensurate with the prestige of the award. In all cases, proper attribution of credit to students as design collaborators shall be adhered to.

Given the mission of the department, service-learning is a valued pedagogy, particularly when engaged by tenured faculty. Architecture should certainly be viewed through the lens of environmental justice and thus service-learning activities designed to serve marginalized populations or groups are particularly valued. While service-learning is of great value, it does not meet the definition of scholarship/creative/professional work unless it includes the other components that define this work (e.g., clear goals, adequate preparation, appropriate methods, significant results, effective presentation,

reflective critique, rigor, and external review). Recognizing the significant amount of time and effort such service-learning activities demand, tenured faculty are advised to work closely with the Chair to negotiate a reallocation of workload so as to offset a reduction in the traditional scholarship/creative/professional work expectation with an increase in teaching and service commitments more reflective of the time dedicated in the service-learning endeavor.

## **SECTION 2**

### **Statements of Performance Expectations for Teaching**

Teaching refers to classroom instructional activities or to individual or small-group activities directly related to classroom instruction. At the graduate level, instructional activities must be extended to include supervision of theses, supervision of individual studies, and evaluation of activities such as preparation of written examinations and participation in oral examinations, both preliminary and final. Also included in teaching performance is academic advising.

### **Indices of Teaching Competence**

1. National, University, or School awards for teaching excellence, including awards and competitions won by students under the direct supervision of the faculty member.
2. Assessment of student opinions relating to an individual faculty member's instructional performance. Assessment will be made using the instrument approved by the School of Architecture, Design, and Planning.
3. Solicited or unsolicited statements regarding teaching by students and alumni.
4. Statements by peers (both inside and external to the School of Architecture, Design, and Planning) relating to an individual faculty member's instructional performance, her/his depth of understanding in the field of specialization, and her/his ability to relate it to other areas
5. Statements by the candidate's Department Chair regarding her/his instructional competency.
6. Participation on undergraduate thesis and/or project committees and graduate thesis, dissertation and examination committees.
7. Evidence of student work as fulfilling of established and approved course syllabi, particularly with regard to the NAAB SPC assigned to courses in the professional degree program.
8. Developing and evaluating experimental teaching formats, teaching techniques, and similar activities.
9. Fulfilling an academic advising role in a positive way (as assigned and/or informal) as evidenced by peer, student, staff and/or administrator feedback.

## **Evaluation of Teaching**

It is recognized that teaching can be measured effectively only through the evaluation of a number of indices. It is imperative that a variety of indices of teaching performance be considered. Documented student assessments and peer statements are both essential parts of this evaluation process. External statements (peer and alumni) and formal recognition of the candidate's teaching (such as internal or external teaching awards) shall be assessed on the basis of their number, significance and rigor of the selection process and degree of premiation in the case of awards. The degree to which the candidate has fulfilled the curricular mission of the Department, School and University, based upon the evidence of student work, shall be part of the evaluation of the candidate's teaching.

### **SECTION 3**

#### **Statements of Performance Expectations for Scholarship/Creative/Professional Work**

Scholarship/Creative/Professional Work is that which contributes to the generation of knowledge. The faculty member shares her/his work with her/his professional peers and in so doing subjects these to external evaluation and criticism. The faculty member extends both her/his own knowledge and the knowledge of others.

The profession of architecture focuses on the creation and stewardship of the entire human habitat, including the adaptation of the natural environment. The extensive body of knowledge required for this purpose may be developed by investigating diverse questions, irrespective of the spatial scale and geographical locus, following varied theoretical and methodological perspectives, based on collaborative and multidisciplinary approaches, and disseminated through a wide variety of venues and methods. The form of architectural scholarship is, therefore, inherently diverse and may include, but is not limited to, creative design work (could also include designed, but unbuilt/unrealized work), publications, engaged scholarship, and technological innovations. The scholarship of architecture may be demonstrated through a collective body of assorted work and/or in the form of integrative, summative work.

All scholarship/creative/professional work shares common characteristics including: clear goals, study of the problem through methods and interpretation appropriate to disciplinary standards, significant results with implications for practice, public communication of results, and external review. Particularly given the diversity described above, it is essential to rely upon external review for assessment for the quality of work produced, its theoretical underpinnings and the methodology and interpretation employed. Scholarship/creative/professional work is to be shared on a regular basis with appropriate professional peers and/or to those who will benefit from the work and, in so doing, subjects them to external evaluation and criticism.

#### **Indices of Scholarship/Creative/Professional Competence**

1. National, regional, local or University awards and competitions won for excellence for scholarship/creative/professional work.
2. Dissemination of scholarship/creative/professional work results in juried and/or externally-reviewed publication.

3. Award of funds to conduct scholarship/creative/professional work.
4. Establishment of a reputation as an international or national authority in a recognized area of scholarship/creative/professional work that contributes to the knowledge base in that field.
5. Reviews of scholarship/creative/professional work by recognized authorities in the faculty member's field of specialization.
6. Contribution to the knowledge base in the faculty member's field of specialization through invited and/or externally-reviewed presentations.
7. Evidence of significant contributions to the design and/or execution of built or un-built professional work whether as a sole practitioner or in the context of a professional practice.
8. Externally juried/editorially reviewed exhibits/presentations/publication of creative work related to the field of Architecture.
9. Submission of scholarship/creative/professional work for external review for possible exhibit/presentation/publication or as competition entry shall be acknowledged as an index of competence. Submission of a proposal for funds to support scholarship/creative/professional work shall be acknowledged as an index of competence for purposes of the Annual Review process. The indices of competence identified in this paragraph shall be considered as minor indices of performance for purposes of the Promotion and Tenure process.

The evaluation and relative weighting of the indices of scholarship/creative/professional performance shall be as defined in "Evaluation of Scholarly/Creative/Professional Work" below.

### **Evaluation of Scholarly/Creative/Professional Work**

Quality and dissemination of knowledge are primary concerns. In all evaluations, a sustained body of work over a period of time is measured by both quantity and quality so that different combinations of effort can be measured equally. The use of the term "authorship" below shall cover responsibility for any of the following types of work: scholarly, creative, professional.

#### **Publications**

1. The prestige and review process of a journal, a book, or other media will be considered. Publications with a national or international readership will be viewed as more important than publications with local or state readerships.
2. Publications about the candidate's work, including book reviews and citations, will be considered measures of significance and evaluated as in #1 above.
3. Submissions of scholarly/creative/professional work for review and criticism by an editorial board is viewed as a means of subjecting one's work to criticism and evaluation by peers.

4. Joint authorship work shall receive full publication credit. In the case of joint-authored work, the candidate will provide evidence of contribution, participation or significance. However, unless the candidate is a co-author, providing illustrations or photographs for another's publication will be considered only if evaluated and reviewed separately.
5. For projects that require long periods of time to complete, considerations will be given to the importance of the work and to the demonstration of reasonable progress which has been made at the time of evaluation for promotion.

### **Grants, Fellowships and Commissions**

1. The prestige of the grantor, client or agency will be considered.
2. The selectivity and evaluation standards of the grantor, client or agency will be considered.
3. The funding and tenure of the stipend will be considered.
4. As with publications, grantors, clients or agencies of a national and international stature will be considered more important than those at the local or state level.

### **Awards, Competitions, Presentations and Exhibits**

1. The prestige of the grantor, agency or venue will be considered.
2. The selectivity and evaluation process of the grantor, agency or venue will be considered.
3. The degree of premiation (grand prize, second place, honorable mention, etc.) will be considered as well as the amount of any money, if applicable.
5. In the case of exhibits, the length of time will be considered.
6. As with publications, national and international stature will be considered more important than local or state level.

## **SECTION 4**

### **Statements of Performance Expectation for Service**

Service includes all forms of activities which are of benefit to the School of Architecture, Design and Planning, the University, the community of scholars, and the state, national or local communities, but which cannot be properly defined as teaching, research or creative activity. All faculty members are expected to perform such service.

### **Indices of Service Competence**

1. Involvement in national, University, and School committees that contribute to the faculty member's academic and/or professional discipline.
2. Leadership in service organizations and committees that contribute to the faculty member's academic and/or professional discipline.
3. Participation through presentations, editorial boards, grant review boards and/ or active membership in service organizations that help to disseminate new knowledge in the faculty member's academic and/or professional discipline.
4. Participation in organizations that contribute to the enhancement and promotion of the built environment in the larger society.
5. Establishment of programs and formal structures that promote the missions of The University and the School.

### **Evaluation of Service**

In all evaluations of service, the degree to which the faculty member contributes to the missions of the University and the School is the primary consideration. Information concerning remunerated as well as unremunerated service activities will be reported to the University as specified by the guidelines established by the Provost.

## **SECTION 5**

### **Statement of Performance Expectations for Administration/Service**

It is recognized that some faculty members are employed to work primarily in an administration/service area. For promotion in academic rank of persons whose primary assignments are in an administration/service area, the determination must be made on the same basis and criteria as those used for persons who are engaged in normal teaching assignments. However, scholarly/creative/professional work productivity should be considered and evaluated in accordance with the amount of time allowed for such activity. This assumes that all persons holding academic rank, including administrators, have at least a minimal teaching assignment.

## **SECTION 6**

### **Evaluation Procedures**

All procedures and guidelines for promotion and tenure established by the School of Architecture, Design and Planning shall conform to the various provisions outlined in the latest edition of the University Handbook for Faculty and Other Unclassified Staff and the Faculty Senate Rules and Regulations. The procedures used by the Department of Architecture in promotion and tenure evaluations shall be in accordance with the promotion and tenure procedures defined outlined in the most recently enacted School of Architecture, Design and Planning By-Laws, Article IV. Section 3.

### **Expectations for Promotion to Associate Professor**

Faculty being considered for promotion to the rank of Associate Professor will be evaluated on the three areas of teaching, service and scholarship/creative/professional work. The candidate for promotion to the rank of Associate Professor must demonstrate the ability to teach effectively, perform valuable service to the Department, School, the University, and the larger community and his/her professional constituency, and generate knowledge through a program of scholarship/creative/professional work that is indicative of a recognized and continuing trajectory of professional performance as evaluated through external review processes. The candidate's record needs to demonstrate a regional, national, or international reputation. Promotion to the rank of Associate Professor will be based on a body of work weighted forty percent in the area of teaching, forty percent in the area of scholarship, and twenty percent in the area of service.

### **Expectations for Promotion to Professor**

Faculty being considered for promotion to the rank of Professor will be evaluated in a manner that recognizes the strengths of the faculty member and his/her ability to contribute effectively to the missions of the School, the University, and the larger professional community. The candidate for promotion to Professor must demonstrate: a) the ability to teach effectively and mastery of subject matter in their area of expertise, and exhibit an ongoing commitment to student learning; b) an established career in scholarship/creative/professional work, as reflected in such factors as a substantial and ongoing pattern of publication, research, creative or professional work, external reviews of the candidate's work by eminent scholars or practitioners in the field, the candidate's national or international reputation, and other evidence of an active and productive career in scholarship/creative/professional work; and c) an ongoing pattern of service reflecting substantial contributions to the University, School and, to the discipline or profession, and to the local, state, national, or international communities.

## **SECTION 7**

### **Reappointment of Professors of the Practice and Multi-year Lecturers**

"Professors of the Practice" are non-tenure track faculty who possess the expertise and achievements to provide professional instruction in a manner that brings distinction to the Department, the School and the University. Responsibilities of Professors of the Practice include teaching, engaging in service both within and outside the university, maintaining professional credentials and continuing activity in the profession, and/or other duties that the appointing dean determines are consistent with this definition. A Professor of the Practice shall hold the terminal professional degree and licensing/certification in the field, with the additional requirement of significant experience and a distinguished and contemporary record of achievement in the architectural profession. The Department of Architecture does not use ranks with this appointment as the intent of the position is to bring active, distinguished professionals onto the faculty that would merit appointment as a Professor of the Practice.

The Chair, both annually as well as in the final year of their contract term, evaluates Professors of the Practice. The University responsibilities of the position include both teaching and service and thus the performance expectations outlined in Sections 2 and 4 will apply equally to Professors of the Practice with the exception that Professors of the Practice may neither serve on committees nor participate in faculty votes pertaining to tenure issues (e.g. hiring, promotion and tenure). Additionally, a continued record of achievement in the profession meritorious for the title is requisite for reappointment.

As distinct from Professors of the Practice, the University responsibility of Lecturer is limited to the area of teaching and there is no expectation for continuous engagement in the profession. As such, there is an expectation that Lecturers will demonstrate above-average outcomes in their teaching responsibilities. Multi-year Lecturers are evaluated annually by the Chair using the performance expectations outlined in Section 2.

In the case of both Professors of the Practice and Lecturers, several conditions apply. First, both shall adhere to the faculty codes of rights, responsibilities and conduct. Second, there is no automatic renewal implied at the end of a contract term. Third, either may be dismissed at any time for poor performance, misconduct, budgetary reasons, program changes, enrollment declines, or because the department determines that the position would be better filled by another individual.