

DEPARTMENT OF ARCHITECTURE
School of Architecture & Allied Arts
University of Oregon
May 11, 2017

Guidelines and Criteria for Promotion and Tenure

This policy applies to all represented faculty and is intended to comply with all provisions of Article 20 of the CBA. In the event of any discrepancies or inconsistencies, the CBA language applies for represented faculty. This policy also applies to all unrepresented faculty, unless a university-wide policy exists that contradicts the terms of this policy.

This policy is focused primarily on the criteria by which faculty are evaluated. Detailed descriptions of the processes by which reviews are conducted are presented in Article 20 of the Collective Bargaining Agreement and in relevant UO policies for unrepresented faculty. Procedures specific to the Department of Architecture are presented below. This document will be made available in the department or unit (as well as on the Academic Affairs website).

A. Introduction

The Department of Architecture is an accredited professional and academic unit of the University offering undergraduate and graduate programs in architecture, interior architecture and historic preservation. The Department has an enrollment of approximately 600 full-time professional majors.

Department criteria for promotion and tenure acknowledge that architecture is a creative, multi-disciplinary profession founded in traditions of art, technology and the humanities. Excellence in the profession is not easily or quickly achieved and professional growth and achievement is dependent on sustained, long term commitments that often take much time to develop and advance.

Faculty in the Department are evaluated to University standards and measures of academic performance and merit. At the same time, the Department, its curriculum and faculty are obligated to the national standards and measures of a licensed and regulated profession. While academic and professional standards and measures are not necessarily in conflict, neither are they necessarily the same.

Diversity of professional expertise is valued, and the Department encourages specialization within an integrative and comprehensive understanding of architecture and design. The work of candidates for promotion and tenure will vary in emphasis between teaching and professional activity as will the measures and evidence of quality and exploration.

B. Annual Reviews

Each tenure-track faculty member who has not received tenure and is not in the process of a tenure review

will have an annual review conducted by the department head, usually in mid-April. These annual reviews are written with input from the senior colleagues of the candidate's division, and are forwarded to the College. The review is based on the candidate's annual report, which should include the following: (1) a CV, lists of publications and grants, and lists (by year and term) of their courses and committees to date; (2) a narrative description of the candidate's progress during the past year in research, teaching, and service (a brief paragraph for each area will suffice); and (3) a brief description of goals and plans for next year and beyond.

C. Contract Renewal / Third-Year Review

The candidate's report, containing the items described in Article 20 of the Collective Bargaining Agreement and in relevant UO policies for unrepresented faculty, will be reviewed by Personnel Committee, which will provide a report to the department head. A department vote is held on whether or not to recommend renewal of the contract. Afterwards, a report is written by the department head and provided to the candidate. The file, including any responsive material provided by the candidate within ten days of receipt of the report, is then forwarded for review by the dean and then the provost or designee. A fully satisfactory review indicating that the faculty member is on track towards promotion and tenure will lead to a contract extension up through the tenure and promotion year. If the contract renewal process determines that the faculty member's record is not satisfactory and that promotion and tenure are not likely, the faculty member will be given a one-year, terminal contract. A faculty member may also be given a renewable contract that does not extend to the promotion and tenure year if there are questions as to whether the faculty member will have a record meriting promotion at the end of the tenure and promotion period. In such cases, the faculty member will be required to go through another contract renewal process prior to the promotion and tenure review in order to determine if the faculty member has been able to remedy the shortcomings in the record identified in the contract renewal process.

D. Review for Promotion and Tenure

These guidelines outline the criteria for promotion and tenure in the Department of Architecture. They provide a specific departmental context within the general university framework for promotion and tenure of faculty. The following criteria are based on faculty performance in teaching, research and service, which are allotted proportional weights of 40 : 40 : 20, respectively.

E. Teaching (40%)

Teaching of architecture depends upon knowledge in design and a diversity of specialized subjects. Faculty are expected to be both effective design teachers, able to integrate a range of subjects, and effective specialists, well founded in the knowledge of a particular curricular area. Most faculty teach both design and a subject area.

At the core of the program are the studio courses, in which faculty teach design through a particular design problem defined by the faculty member each term. These courses are taught like tutorials.

Faculty members work directly with an individual student to develop a comprehensive design solution to this problem. Subject courses cover a range of curricular areas within the profession and are conducted in a variety of formats, lectures, labs and seminars, common to the University.

Within this structure, teaching loads are substantial. Design studios are 6-8 credit courses and meet 12 hours a week. Subject courses are 3-4 credits, equivalent to University norms in contact time and preparation requirements. In addition, faculty advise and direct a variety of independent studies and master's theses.

Candidates for promotion to Associate Professor rank with tenure are expected to have demonstrated effectiveness in teaching comprehensiveness and integration in design. In subject teaching, candidates are expected to have demonstrated creative and effective teaching of their subject, developing its content to make connections to the design program and to enhance the curricular area of which it is a part. In addition, candidates for promotion at Professor rank are expected to have demonstrated leadership in a curricular area.

Evidence of teaching quality can be found in both peer and student review. In design studio, the work of students is reviewed directly by faculty peers and professional peers outside the University several times a term. In the subject curriculum, opportunities for direct observation and contact by peers are common through shared lectures and collaborative ventures. Peers also evaluate the quality of teaching by reviewing course materials and examples of student work. Evaluation of quality in teaching is based on letters from students and former students who have entered the profession and standardized course evaluations.

F. Research, Scholarship and Creative Practice (40%)

Department criteria for promotion and tenure recognize applications of knowledge through architectural works as well as creation of knowledge through traditional research and scholarship. Architectural works considered for promotion and tenure include built and unbuilt projects completed for professional commissions, competitions or exhibition. These works are customarily commissioned or defined by a sponsor and, depending on their size and complexity, may take two years or more to develop. A candidate's contribution to an architectural work will often be in collaboration with other professionals. The nature of this work will vary with expertise and may include consultation in specialized areas as well as design. In all instances, a candidate's specific contribution to a work will be defined and evaluated accordingly.

Creative work, research and scholarship considered for promotion and tenure can include a range of publications, studies or demonstrations. Candidates are expected to have made vigorous, effective effort to advance and communicate the state of knowledge or practice in their area of expertise. Evidence can include recognition by peers, sponsors and the community; awards; publication in refereed journals; books; exhibitions; awards of competitive grants and external funding; and, invitations to lecture or consult. Quality of achievement will be measured as the significance or influence of the work for the discipline.

Candidates for promotion to Associate Professor rank with tenure are expected to have demonstrated achievement and promise in their area of research, scholarship or professional expertise. There must be evidence that a candidate's work will provide a foundation for further growth subsequent to tenure and promotion. Candidates for promotion to Professor rank are expected to have demonstrated leadership and achieved national or international stature in their area of research, scholarship or professional expertise.

G. Academic and Administrative Service, Service and Activities on Behalf of the Larger Community (20%)

The Department maintains a tradition of self-governance and administration dependent on effective, regular faculty participation. All faculty serve on department committees. In addition, faculty manage the professional programs of the Department. This commitment can be substantial and includes regular review and development of the curriculum; maintenance of archival records of student work; preparation for accreditation; evaluation of admissions files; and, student advising.

Service contributions on behalf of the public interest through national, professional and community organizations are encouraged and recognized as important to the mission and reputation of the Department and University.

Candidates for promotion and tenure are expected to share the service commitments and responsibilities borne by all faculty. Candidates for promotion to Associate Professor rank with tenure are expected to have demonstrated a service contribution to the department. Tenured faculty are expected to have demonstrated a service and leadership contribution to the School, University, profession and / or community.

In some instances, the service contributions of a candidate for promotion to Professor rank can be extraordinary and should be recognized as supplementary to their achievements in research, scholarship and creative practice. These kinds of service contributions are those where research, scholarship or creative practice expertise has been demonstrated in the formulation of goals and policies for national, professional or community bodies.

H. Post-Tenure Review

1. Third-Year Post-Tenure Review

Primary responsibility for the third-year PTR process lies with the department head. The third-year PTR should be commenced by the department head no later than during the Winter term, in order to allow it to be concluded before the end of the candidate's third-year post-tenure. The department head will contact the faculty member and request a CV and personal statement, including a discussion of contributions to institutional equity and inclusion. The department head will add to the evaluative file copies of the faculty member's teaching evaluations received during the period under review, including quantitative summary sheets and signed written evaluations, as well as any peer evaluations of teaching conducted during the review period. Consistent with department policy and practice, the file will be reviewed first by a

committee, which will provide a written report to the department head that may be used as received or placed in additional written context by the department head. For associate professors, the report will specifically present an honest appraisal of progress toward a successful review for promotion to full professor. If the faculty member has undergone an earlier sixth-year PTR that resulted in creation of a development plan due to unsatisfactory performance (see discussion of sixth-year PTR, below), the faculty member's success in addressing concerns will be discussed. The report will be signed and dated by the department head and shared with the faculty member, who will also sign and date the report to signify its receipt. The faculty member may provide a written response if they desire within 10 days of receipt of the PTR report; an extension may be granted by mutual agreement between the faculty member and the department head. The report and, if provided, response from the faculty member, will be placed in the faculty member's personnel file as maintained at the unit level.

2. Sixth-Year Post-Tenure Review

The process of the review is described in the Collective Bargaining Agreement, Article 20, or in parallel University policy for unrepresented faculty members. Since the sixth-year PTR is expected to be a deeper review of the faculty member's scholarship, teaching, and service, the Department of Architecture expects the candidate to provide a portfolio of publications (or documentation of other scholarship activities) and information regarding service contributions, in addition to the materials called for by CBA/UO policy.

A development plan is required for faculty who are not achieving a satisfactory level of performance. The plan will be developed with appropriate consultation and discussion among the faculty member, the department head, and the dean. Ideally, there will be consensus regarding the development plan, but if consensus is not possible, a plan receiving the dean's approval will be forwarded to the Provost or designee for review and approval.

If a sixth-year PTR results in creation of a professional development plan, future PTR for the faculty member will include consideration of the extent to which the terms of the development plan have been met. However, progress toward meeting the goals of such a development plan need not and should not be evaluated solely within the context of the PTR process.