

**Standards of Performance  
Historic Preservation Program  
School of Architecture & Allied Arts University of Oregon**

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 Historic Preservation Program are presented below. This document will be made available in the program or unit (as well as on the Academic Affairs website).

Historic preservation combines theory and practice for the purpose of maintaining and preserving the historic environment. This historic environment is recognized in districts, sites, buildings, structures, objects and landscapes. Maintained and preserved environments are interpreted in relationship to their significance to history, architecture, archeology, engineering, and culture. Besides the field of Historic Preservation itself, multiple fields and disciplines inform historic preservation. These include, but are not limited to Architecture, Landscape Architecture, Interior Architecture, Folklore, American Studies, Popular Culture, Political Science, History, Art History, Arts Administration, Cultural Resource Management, Planning, Sociology, Anthropology, Archeology, Engineering, Geography, the Earth Sciences, and the Biological Sciences.

Initiated in 1980, The Historic Preservation Program at the University of Oregon is an interdisciplinary program within the School of Architecture and Allied Arts. Faculty associated with the program oversees all aspects of the program's mission and operation. Faculty must have a clear sense of the role of this professional program within the School of Architecture and Allied Arts and the university. Faculty teach graduate and undergraduate courses in historic preservation as well as advise graduate and undergraduate students within the program. It is expected that faculty maintain a research agenda, participate in professional organizations, and serves on school and university committees.

**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 program 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.

**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 program head. A program vote is held on whether or not to

recommend renewal of the contract. Afterwards, a report is written by the program 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.

### **Review for Promotion and Tenure**

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

The standards of performance required for tenure and promotion in the Historic Preservation Program mirror criteria defined for teaching-faculty evaluation as presented in the University of Oregon Handbook. Promotion and tenure is predicated on demonstrating continued professional development and scholarly contributions; an integration of effort among the areas of teaching, research and service is expected. The following criteria are used to assess faculty for promotion or promotion with tenure.

- I. Scholarship, creative work, and professional growth (40%):
  - A. Research and/or creative work of significance and quality documented in regional, national, and international journals and forums related to historic preservation and the fields and disciplines that inform it;
  - B. Research and/or creative work in progress and substantially planned future work;
  - C. participation in conferences, conventions, seminars, exhibits, and professional meetings;
  - D. attendance at conferences, conventions, seminars and professional meetings;
  - E. awareness of current developments in historic preservation;
  - F. association with organizations and groups that will result in professional improvement of the participant and bring recognition to the university;
  - G. professional consultation;
  - H. regular and constructive use of sabbaticals or leaves of absence;
  - I. recognized evidence of scholarship such as special awards, scholarly citations, and the re-publication of work;

- J. scope and depth of scholarship as revealed in public lectures, symposia, exhibits, and book reviews.

II. The quality of teaching (40%):

- A. classroom instruction, including careful presentation of course materials, student requirements, and effectiveness of presentation;
- B. academic advising, consultation and informal teaching;
- C. stimulation of student interest in doing high-quality work;
- D. supervision of student research;
- E. revision of courses to keep them updated;
- F. maintenance of appropriate standards of student performance;
- G. evaluation of student performance;
- H. interest in effective teaching techniques;
- I. defining educational objectives and developing teaching and evaluative materials reflecting current scholarship in Historic Preservation, related fields and disciplines, and in educational theory.

III. Leadership in academic and administrative service (20%):

- A. program administration and curriculum, personnel, and policy committees or activities;
- B. school administration and committees or activities;
- C. university or state system administration and committees or activities.
- D. Service and activities on behalf of the larger academic and related professional communities of historic preservation (local, state, national, and international bodies):
  - 1. academic contributions to activities related to the academic and professional disciplines of historic preservation and related fields and disciplines;
  - 2. academic service on behalf of public bodies such as boards of directors, culture councils, advisory groups, editorial boards, and professional juries.

**IV. Post-Tenure Review**

- A. Third-Year Post-Tenure Review

Primary responsibility for the third-year PTR process lies with the program head. The third-year PTR should be commenced by the program 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 program head will contact the faculty member and request a CV and personal statement, including a discussion of contributions to institutional equity and inclusion. The program 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 program policy and practice, the file will be reviewed first by a committee, which will provide a written report to the program head that may be used as received or placed in additional written context by the program 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 program 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 program 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.

#### B. 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 Historic Preservation Program 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/VO 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 program 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.