

# UO DEPARTMENT OF LANDSCAPE ARCHITECTURE MERIT EVALUATION POLICY

As amended and approved by AAA Dean 5/30/2014

## **PREAMBLE**

Whereas, as faculty in the Dept. of Landscape Architecture, we strive to provide a stimulating, challenging, and effective education that instills a love of learning, a commitment to landscape stewardship and professionalism; to create for each student seminal educational moments that can be memorable and life changing; and to advance the theory and practice of landscape architecture through education, research, creative work, field studies and service to the profession and communities. We seek to embody these core values, recognizing that the foundation of our community is its members – faculty, students, and staff – and their motivation to learn from and respect each other. We work to sustain a community of learning and discovery that is collegial and open, where all students, staff and faculty feel equally valued, respected and fairly accommodated while encouraging and recognizing meritorious achievements; and we believe that the open and equitable discussion of critical issues is founded on reason rather than status. We affirm that these shared goals, which we have adopted as part of our mission statement, are as important in the execution and evaluation of our professional responsibilities as are our individual measurable achievements.

We also make note of the diversity of our department's teaching, research and creative enterprise in accord with the scope, rapid change and diversity of landscape architecture. We have faculty members who pursue teaching and creative scholarship in the arts, natural sciences, humanities, social sciences, communication, and professional practice. This entails an unusually broad scope for meritorious faculty achievement; and makes the articulation of complete and rigorous performance criteria challenging, and subject to adaptive interpretation and periodic revision. Judgments while applying the merit evaluation criteria found in this policy must be made with an understanding of these contingencies and an awareness of the different modes of instruction and inquiry found across our intentionally diverse individual faculty members.

Given the above, the use of transparent, evidence-based and well-defined criteria to account for the achievement of job duties and responsibilities is important, in part because it offers all concerned a clear idea of what is expected of faculty and how their efforts will be credited during performance evaluations.

## **PURPOSE**

This policy outlines the Department's procedures for annual evaluations, and determining and assigning merit raises, when available.

### **1. Full Inclusion**

All Faculty members who are eligible for inclusion in a given merit process will receive an evaluation and will be given full consideration and opportunity to demonstrate individual merit. In applying criteria, assessments of the quality of work, merit considerations, and final merit decisions will be done similarly for all individuals irrespective of their FTE. The quantity of achievement will be considered differently depending on an individual's FTE so as to consider what can reasonably be expected given the hours the individual is contracted to work for the department. Neither an individual's FTE nor type of appointment will limit a faculty member's ability to demonstrate the highest possible merit score nor will it limit or cap a faculty member's maximum possible merit increase.

In applying merit evaluation criteria, the department head shall account for individual faculty members' rank and time of service to the extent as these are reasonably expected to increase one's productive capacities and potential achievements over time.

## **2. Merit Differentiation**

It is understood that all faculty are valuable members of the department and each faculty member plays a key role in achieving departmental goals. Merit Differentiation is used strictly as a means to differentiate between varying degrees of excellence within the department. It is noted that although the Merit Differentiation criteria are similar, and in some cases parallel, to the Promotion and Tenure criteria, the processes themselves are separate and distinct. Furthermore, the rigor applied during the Merit Differentiation process is far less than the rigor applied during the Promotion and Tenure process, and therefore, ratings received as part of Merit Differentiation are not necessarily indicative measures of how an individual faculty member will fare during Promotion and Tenure review.

Differentiation is established through an evaluation via Dept. Head comparison of self-evaluation materials submitted by faculty members against criteria provided in this policy. Those criteria should not be viewed as exhaustive in defining meritorious achievements in the sense that faculty members' creative enterprise might "invent" forms of excellence not contemplated by the criteria.

## **3. Comparative Evaluation**

Comparative evaluation is performed by deriving and assigning a FINAL OVERALL MERIT TIER level to each faculty member. This is done by reference to the department's PERFORMANCE EVALUATION FORM. The form lists the areas of work performance applicable to the corresponding faculty member's terms of appointment (i.e. teaching, research and service) and, within each of these work areas, applicable categories of sub-criteria.

Each faculty member will fill in and sign this form with self-evaluations, assigning themselves MERIT TIERS for all items on the form and within every performance category that applies to their terms of employment, but not a FINAL OVERALL MERIT TIER. The faculty member will support these various self-evaluations by appropriate means, as described further in Section 4: (1) by written explanations; (2) by providing lists of evidence to support claims, such as citations, teaching evaluation results, service accomplishments, etc.; and (3) by providing arguments, to the extent they see fit, as to how and why particular achievements warrant a MERIT TIER based upon the criteria in THE LANDSCAPE ARCHITECTURE MERIT CRITERIA or how they differ from those that were assigned a MERIT TIER in past evaluation precedents.

The department head may then either affirm the faculty member's self-evaluations, by signature upon the form without revisions, or revise it in according to their own judgment before signing. The department head will then assign a FINAL OVERALL MERIT TIER and indicate it on the signed form.

## **4. Faculty Self-Assessment and Submissions**

The following documents will be submitted and/or completed by designated parties. Except for reasons of legitimate and unavoidable extenuating circumstances, the following annual self evaluation documents must be completed, and failure to do so may negatively impact merit scores.

- 4.1. An updated CV will be submitted, covering at least the period since joining the UO and including all new and appropriate items attributable to the time period of the annual and/or merit evaluation.

- 4.2. The department's PERFORMANCE EVALUATION FORM will be completed, signed and submitted, including written explanations on the form.
- 4.3. An activity report that lists and briefly describes achievements organized by the same categories found on the PERFORMANCE EVALUATION FORM. For selected items an argument should also be provided, as necessary, as to why it qualifies as meeting, not meeting, exceeding, or highly exceeding expectations, as described by the criteria found in Section 9. These arguments need not be long but will be required when a faculty member claims that a particular achievement warrants an evaluation different than that suggested by the criteria lists in THE LANDSCAPE ARCHITECTURE MERIT CRITERIA or that they expect it might receive based upon past precedents in other faculty members' or their own past evaluations. These arguments may supplement, or stand in for, explanations written on the PERFORMANCE EVALUATION FORM required in item 4.2.
- 4.4. In submitting these reports, faculty members are not discouraged from describing the kinds of beneficial "small" or cumulative "good deeds" or activities that "went the extra mile" which they accomplished and which taken by themselves do not obviously measure up to the items named in the lists of metrics found in THE LANDSCAPE ARCHITECTURE MERIT CRITERIA.

## 5. Criteria and Factors

The criteria are described in THE LANDSCAPE ARCHITECTURE MERIT CRITERIA. These provide the main basis for evaluating faculty members' performance. The performance indicators listed in those criteria are to assist faculty members' self-evaluations and the Head's assignment of MERIT TIERS. Those lists are provided as an aid to the faculty in understanding the kinds of achievements that may earn various levels of credit in merit evaluations. Those lists are to be considered guideposts for careful and adaptive interpretation in light of the nuanced context and details of each particular accomplishment. They are not to be construed as an exhaustive and precise list.

- 5.1. Tenure Track Faculty – The merit criteria are found below in THE LANDSCAPE ARCHITECTURE MERIT CRITERIA. The factors are provided in the indicator lists for different MERIT TIERS in THE LANDSCAPE ARCHITECTURE MERIT CRITERIA for all three work area categories.
- 5.2. Non-Tenure Track Faculty – Criteria are found below in THE LANDSCAPE ARCHITECTURE MERIT CRITERIA. The factors are found in the indicator lists for different MERIT TIERS and are the same as for tenure-track faculty except that research criteria are not to be applied. Service criteria are only to be applied to faculty members with terms of employment that include the performance of service work.
- 5.3. Research Faculty – Criteria are found below in THE LANDSCAPE ARCHITECTURE MERIT CRITERIA. The factors are provided in the indicator lists for different MERIT TIERS in THE LANDSCAPE ARCHITECTURE MERIT CRITERIA and are the same as for tenure track faculty except that teaching and service criteria are not to be applied unless such a faculty member has terms of employment that include teaching and/or service work.

## 6. Consideration of Individual Professional Responsibilities and Contributions

Consideration of Individual Professional Responsibilities and Contributions is provided for by differentiated merit criteria for different position types as described in Section 5. The evaluation of accomplishments in different work areas (by teaching, research and service as appropriate) and subcategories of criteria within those areas, will be assigned MERIT TIERS, as found on the

PERFORMANCE EVALUATION FORM. These will be weighted by the department head, in consultation with a designee appointed from the senior faculty, based on an individual's terms of employment and, in terms of teaching; research, scholarship and/or creative activities; and service to arrive at a final OVERALL MERIT TIER.

## **7. Evaluation of Accomplishments**

**7.1. Clarity and Transparency:** Merit Criteria definitions and indicator lists provide clear and unambiguous criteria and/or types of evidence by which faculty members can demonstrate meritorious contribution to the department. The faculty rely upon the academic judgment of the Department Head, Associate Department Head, and/or designee to evaluate specific accomplishments and contributions and to assign an appropriate overall rating in each merit category based off of the preponderance of accomplishments or contributions in that merit category. The Department Head, Associate Department Head, and/or designee recognize the necessity to honor the trust and authority placed in him or her by operating in good faith in a collegial manner, and adhering to the guiding principles of equity, parity, and inclusiveness in performing these evaluations. A weighted average of MERIT TIERS in each work category of Teaching, Research/Creative Work, and Service, relative to the prominence of each work area category in a faculty member's terms of employment, is then used to substantially determine a faculty member's final OVERALL MERIT TIER assignment.

**7.1.1.** The way that TIERS are classified and applied to determine MERIT TIERS by work area, based upon faculty member's status and FTE, is described in the PERFORMANCE EVALUATION FORM.

## **7.2. Collegial and Consultative**

**7.2.1. Evaluators:** The Department Head and the Associate Department Head, or other designee, as described above, are responsible for performing merit evaluations using the PERFORMANCE EVALUATION FORM.

**7.2.2. Selection of Merit Tiers:** The Department Head, in consultation with the Associate Head or designee, will evaluate MERIT TIERS for each work area and then combine these with reasonable interpretation and judgment to determine an OVERALL MERIT TIER from the work areas applicable to an individual. All individuals with ratified MERIT TIERS on their own PERFORMANCE EVALUATION FORM within the same ranges will receive the same consideration in assigning final OVERALL MERIT TIERS. Those with similar combinations of MERIT ACHIEVEMENTS on their own PERFORMANCE EVALUATION FORM will receive the same consideration in assigning OVERALL MERIT TIERS, subject to differences in work areas assigned by their terms of employment, or the relative emphasis on different work areas found in their terms of employment. Faculty members with the same OVERALL MERIT TIERS will receive the same consideration for merit increases.

**7.2.3. Final Assignment of Tier Increases:** The Department Head, in consultation with the Associate Head or designee and using guidance provided by the Associate Dean for Finance, will determine appropriate increases (which may be awarded as raise percentages or dollar amounts or a combination of these methods) to be applied to each overall evaluation tier, and submit those increases as recommendations to the AAA Dean. The AAA Dean will consider those recommendations in determining the final merit increase amounts for each tier.

## 8. Review Periods

Unless otherwise established by the requirements of a specific merit process, the following standard review periods will be used in evaluating Teaching, Research, and Service:

Teaching: The 12 months directly preceding the merit process, as specified in the call for self-evaluation reports.

Research: The 12 months directly preceding the merit process, as specified in the call for self-evaluation reports.

Service: The 12 months directly preceding the merit process, as specified in the call for self-evaluation reports.

At the department head's discretion in special circumstances or upon post-tenure reviews, any or all of these periods may be extended to include up to a maximum of 60 months in order to establish, assess, and account for a documented significant body of work, with emphasis given to work that has been active within the prior 24 month period directly preceding the merit evaluation process.

## 9. Merit Tiers

The MERIT TIERS found on any PERFORMANCE EVALUATION FORM and among the final OVERALL MERIT TIERS classified across the faculty are expected to assume a minimum of two Merit Tier levels. These may include any of the following:

Does Not Meet Expectations (1.0-1.9): Has not demonstrated the minimum standards required to qualify as Meets Expectations. There is no mandate for a minimum number of faculty members to be classified into this Merit Tier. Classification into this Merit Tier qualifies as "Does Not Meet" per the Collective Bargaining Agreement. All Faculty classified into this Merit Tier are ineligible to receive a merit increase.

Meets Expectations (2.0-3.4): Has clearly demonstrated standards required to qualify as Meets Expectations, but has not demonstrated a level of meritorious contribution high enough to qualify for Exceeds Expectations. Classification into this Merit Tier qualifies as "Meets Expectations" per the Collective Bargaining Agreement. All Faculty classified into this Merit Tier will receive a merit increase.

Exceeds Expectations (3.5-4.4): Has clearly demonstrated standards required to qualify as Exceeds Expectations, but has not demonstrated a level of meritorious contribution high enough to qualify for Highest Expectations. Classification into this Merit Tier qualifies as "Exceeds Expectations" per the Collective Bargaining Agreement. All Faculty classified into this Merit Tier will receive a merit increase.

Highest Expectations (4.5-5.0): Has clearly demonstrated standards required to qualify as Highest Expectations. Classification into this Merit Tier qualifies as "Exceeds Expectations" per the Collective Bargaining Agreement. All Faculty classified into this Merit Tier will receive a merit increase.

Further general guidance in the definition of these MERIT TIERS is found in the Merit Criteria Sheet.

**10. Notification and Documentation**

10.1. **Notification** - All Faculty eligible for inclusion in a merit process will be notified of their new salary within one month of the closing and final acceptance of a given merit process.

Notification will be provided electronically through email.

10.2. **Documentation** – The department will maintain the following electronic records for a period of 24 months subsequent to a given merit process:

10.2.1. Each faculty member’s final score sheet, indicating the faculty member’s blended average merit score, individual component scores (Teaching, Research, Service), component weights, final merit tier assignment, and merit increase.

10.2.2. The complete final merit allocation for each merit pool, including the amount allocated to each member of faculty in those pools.

## UO DEPARTMENT OF LANDSCAPE ARCHITECTURE MERIT CRITERIA

These definitions are the primary basis for to the determination of tiers on the PERFORMANCE EVALUATION FORM, both in faculty members' self-evaluations and the department head's final evaluations. In cases where disagreements about final TIER assignments are negotiated or arbitrated, the definitions below shall serve as the basis for negotiations and deliberations.

It is important to note that the definitions below are progressively nested. In any evaluation period a faculty member must first meet the definition of "Meets Expectations" in any work area as a precondition to achieving an "Exceeds Expectations" or "Highest Expectation" TIER. This requirement is intended to stipulate that a faculty member who applies most or all their time and effort to just producing outstanding achievements while ignoring their basic responsibilities to the department and students can not be assured of being assigned a final OVERALL MERIT TIER of "Exceeds Expectations" or "Highest Expectations".

### **TEACHING**

**Does Not Meet Expectations** – Faculty members receiving Does Not Meet Expectations ratings for teaching fail to show evidence of an acceptable minimum standard of teaching expertise and application. Evidence of such performance includes, but is not limited to, the following types of indicators:

#### DEMONSTRATED TEACHING SUCCESS

- Consistent and pervasive, or frequent majority of, negative student evaluations;
- Consistent or frequent, low enrollment in courses or studios relative to peer courses or studios considering the available pool of students at the UO, AAA or department level as appropriate;
- Poor peer reviews of students' work products presented at class reviews and/or pin-ups;
- Poor peer reviews of teaching, when these periodically occur.

#### DEMONSTRATED CURRICULUM DEVELOPMENT

- Failure to regularly update courses' form and content in light of new knowledge, methods and student needs;
- Regular or frequent lack of attention to and adherence to UO policies and standards, or other such specific guidance as provided by the Provost, Dean, Department Head, or Designee.

#### DEMONSTRATED COURSE QUALITY

- Non-attendance at classes one is assigned to teach with failure to recruit substitute instructors or equivalent instructional experiences;
- Failure to post correct and updated course information and materials on class syllabi and web sites;
- Unwillingness or inability to coordinate studio or class schedules and review times with other faculty members when required to avoid or minimize conflicts between classes (e.g. studio field trips that overlap with other class' meetings or exams and studio reviews on the same day);

- Regular or frequent poor course organization.

#### DEMONSTRATED STUDENT ACCESSIBILITY

- Fails to hold regular office hours and/or regularly unwilling or unable to make and keep advising or mentoring appointments with students;
- Regular non-attendance at assigned studio reviews or desk-crits and/or class pin up appointments with failure to recruit substitute reviewers when absent;
- Unwilling to serve on any project or thesis committees for graduate or undergraduate students or unable to effectively or successfully do so.

**Meets Expectations** – Faculty members receiving Meets Expectations ratings for teaching show reliable evidence of an acceptable minimum standard of teaching expertise. Evidence of such performance includes, but is not limited to, the following types of indicators:

#### DEMONSTRATED TEACHING SUCCESS

- Consistent or frequent, or a frequent majority of, neutral or positive student evaluations;
- Consistent or frequent, expected or high enrollment in courses or studios relative to peer courses or studios considering the available pool of students at the UO, AAA or department level as appropriate;
- Good peer reviews of students' work products presented at class reviews and/or pin-ups;
- Regular service on project or thesis committees for graduate or undergraduate students and able to effectively and successfully do so;
- Fair to good peer reviews of teaching, when these periodically occur.

#### DEMONSTRATED CURRICULUM DEVELOPMENT

- Regularly updated form and content of classes in light of new knowledge, methods and student needs;
- Regular or frequent due attention to and adherence to UO policies and standards, or other such specific guidance as provided by the Provost, Dean, Department Head, or Designee.

#### DEMONSTRATED COURSE QUALITY

- Regular or frequent good course organization;
- Attends classes and recruits replacement instructors and experiences when needed;
- Regular attendance at assigned studio reviews or desk-crits and class pin up appointments with recruitment substitute reviewers when needed;
- Maintenance of current and updated course information and materials on class syllabi and web sites;
- Reliably well coordinated studio or class schedules and review times as needed with other studios and classes;
- Good maintenance of teaching facilities and equipment that the faculty member is responsible for.

#### DEMONSTRATED STUDENT ACCESSIBILITY



- Reliably holds regular and posted office hours and/or is readily accessible by appointment while in Eugene.

**Exceeds Expectations** – Faculty members receiving Exceeds Expectations ratings for teaching show reliable evidence of an acceptable minimum standard of teaching expertise, as described above for meeting expectations. In addition, they may achieve a few of these kinds of indicators of strong teaching:

#### DEMONSTRATED TEACHING SUCCESS

- Consistently well above department average teaching evaluations;
- Consistently strong peer reviews of student work products derived from other faculty members' participation in studio reviews and class presentations;
- Chairs more than a fair share of graduate projects, theses or dissertations;
- Consistently very good peer reviews of teaching, when these periodically occur;
- Very reliable high enrollment in courses or studios usually with unfulfilled waiting lists.

#### DEMONSTRATED CURRICULUM DEVELOPMENT

- Receipt of a UO funding award to develop new or improved curricular content;
- Instructs an unusually-intensive class, e.g. a design-build studio, large, non-studio service learning class, a required laboratory or field-intensive course that is also made available to large numbers of non-majors, or a long and well-enrolled field class;
- Development of wholly new and innovative classes or curricular programs;
- Intensive coordination of classes or curricula with several faculty or units outside the department;
- Development and application of unusually intensive data sets, expert networks and/or funding to support classes;
- Class form and content formally recognized by experts, organizations or academic publications as notably innovative, up-to-date, timely, effective, valuable, etc.;
- Effective expansion and enhancement of teaching facilities and equipment that the faculty member is responsible for;
- For non-tenure-track faculty, research and creative activity achievements that contribute significantly to the quality of their teaching and curriculum development.

#### DEMONSTRATED COURSE QUALITY

- Student(s) win a lesser (i.e. UO or local) design competition or other award for mentored work;
- Mentored student(s) work is a finalist in a regional or national design competition or other student achievement award;
- Invited lecture delivered at another university or college.

**Highest Expectations** – Faculty members receiving Highest Expectations ratings for teaching show reliable evidence of an acceptable minimum standard of teaching expertise, as described above for meeting expectations. In addition, they may achieve a few of these kinds of indicators of outstanding teaching:

#### DEMONSTRATED TEACHING SUCCESS

- Receipt of a UO, regional or national award for teaching quality;
- Invited course delivered at another university or college;
- Successfully chairs many more than a fair share of graduate projects or theses.

#### DEMONSTRATED CURRICULUM DEVELOPMENT

- Development and delivery of a highly original, first-of-its-kind timely and innovative class or curricular program;
- Leadership in the development of new curricular programs involving intensive coordination of classes and curricula with units outside the department and/or of UO;
- Class form, content or products strongly recognized by the national or regional media as remarkably innovative, up-to-date, timely, effective, valuable, etc.;
- For non-tenure-track faculty, research and creative activity achievements that are published or exhibited and contribute very substantially to the quality of their teaching and curriculum development.

#### DEMONSTRATED COURSE QUALITY

- Student(s) win a national design competition or other award for mentored work;
- Student(s) are finalists in a notably prestigious and highly competitive national design competition or other award for mentored work.

### SERVICE

**Does Not Meet Expectations** – Faculty members receiving Does Not Meet Expectations ratings for service fail to show evidence of an acceptable minimum standard of service achievements. Evidence of such performance includes, but is not limited to, the following types of indicators:

#### PARTICIPATION

- Consistent, pervasive or frequent non-attendance at committee and faculty meetings;
- Consistent, pervasive or frequent inattention to executing assigned service duties and tasks.

#### LEADERSHIP

- Unwilling or unable to effectively assume committee chair roles when requested or assigned by the Head.

#### COMMITTEE SERVICE

- Regular or frequent poor quality of service tasks, reports and duties;
- Regular or frequent lack of attention to and adherence to UO policies and standards, or other such specific guidance as provided by the Provost, Dean, Department Head, or Designee;
- The unwillingness of the department head or committee chairs to assign a fair share of service work duties and tasks to an individual because they cannot expect adequate performance.

#### STUDENT ADVISING

- Is frequently unavailable to advise students or provides them with incorrect or out-of-date information about curricular requirements or department policies.

#### PROFESSIONAL AND COMMUNITY

- Does not engage in any service to landscape professionals or community groups and/or citizens requesting advice or assistance with landscape design or planning problems;
- Does not engage in any service to UO units outside the department and/or other academic institutions.

**Meets Expectations** – Faculty members receiving Meets Expectations ratings for service to show evidence of an acceptable minimum standard of service achievements. Evidence of such performance include, but are not limited to, the following types of indicators:

#### PARTICIPATION

- Consistent and reliable attendance at committee and faculty meetings;
- Shows up for appointments with the Head and other faculty members;
- Regular and reliable attention to and adherence to UO policies and standards, or other such specific guidance as provided by the Provost, Dean, Department Head, or Designee.

#### LEADERSHIP

- Serves as chair of at least one departmental committee.

#### COMMITTEE SERVICE

- Consistent and reliable attention to executing assigned service duties and tasks;
- Regular and reliable good quality of service tasks, reports and duties;
- Willingness of the department head or committee chairs to assign a fair share of service work duties and tasks to an individual because they can be expected to perform them adequately.

#### STUDENT ADVISING

- Is regularly available to advise students and typically provides them with correct and up-to-date information about curricular requirements and department policies.

#### PROFESSIONAL AND COMMUNITY

- Serves as a reviewer for a few submissions to peer-reviewed journals or other scholarly publications;
- Performs at least occasional pro-bono consulting and instructional activities for local and regional landscape architects, artists, policy-makers, planners, etc.

**Exceeds Expectations** – Faculty members receiving Exceeds Expectations ratings for service show reliable evidence of an acceptable minimum standard of administrative expertise, as described above for meeting expectations. In addition, they must achieve more than one of the kinds of indicators of strong service suggested by the following:

#### PARTICIPATION

- Serves on more than a fair share of departmental committees.

#### LEADERSHIP

- Serves as chair of more than one departmental committee;
- Assumes a leadership role in an academic or professional organization;
- Provides strong leadership in advancement of a major departmental or AAA initiative or goal;
- Serves as director of an institute, center or program outside the department.

#### COMMITTEE SERVICE

- Serves effectively on a major UO committee, i.e. graduate council or senate;
- Provides intensive departmental service as the primary author of critical departmental initiative(s), such as documentation of curricula, accreditation and self-evaluations or curricular handbooks or other documentation of degree programs;
- For non-tenure-track and research faculty, freely given and voluntary contributions to departmental service activities beyond a faculty member's terms of employment;
- Curates or otherwise leads the organization of a local or UO exhibition of creative works or design competition.

#### STUDENT ADVISING

- Serves as advisor to a student-organized group, activity, internal conference, event, etc.;
- Serves as the advisor to all students pursuing a degree, certificate, minor, etc.

#### PROFESSIONAL AND COMMUNITY

- Performs at least occasional pro-bono consulting and instructional activities for local and regional landscape architects, artists, policy-makers, planners, conservation groups, etc.;
- Serves as a reviewer for an unusually large number of submissions to peer-reviewed journals or other scholarly publications;
- Serves on an editorial board of a journal, technical series or other important dissemination activity by an academic or professional organization;
- Serves as an external reviewer for promotion and tenure cases at other universities or colleges;
- Serves on a jury for a design competition or award program.

**Highest Expectations** – Faculty members receiving Highest Expectations ratings for service show reliable evidence of an acceptable minimum standard of administrative expertise, as described above for meeting expectations. In addition, they achieve the kinds of indicators of exceptionally strong service suggested by the following:

#### LEADERSHIP

- Serves as chair or president of a major UO committee, i.e. graduate council or senate;
- Provides strong leadership in advancement of a major/critical UO initiative or goal;
- Successfully serves part-time in a major AAA or UO administrative position.

#### COMMITTEE SERVICE

- Chairs a sub-committee a major UO committee, i.e. graduate council or senate;
- For non-tenure-track and research faculty, freely given and voluntary leadership of committees outside the department;
- Curates or otherwise leads the organization of a national or international exhibition or tour of UO produced creative works or designs.

#### STUDENT ADVISING

- Chairs a very large number of graduate theses or projects across the University;

#### PROFESSIONAL AND COMMUNITY

- Serves as an editor of a journal, technical series or other important dissemination activity by an academic or professional organization;
- Curates or otherwise leads the organization of a major regional or national exhibition of creative works or design competition;
- Provides strong leadership in advancement of a major/critical initiative or goal of an important regional or national academic or professional organization.

#### **RESEARCH, SCHOLARSHIP AND CREATIVE ACTIVITY**

**Does Not Meet Expectations** – Faculty members receiving Does Not Meet Expectations ratings for creative works or scholarship and fails to show evidence of an acceptable minimum standard of scholarly creative work achievements. Evidence of such performance include, but are not limited to, the following types of indicators:

##### **RESEARCH ACCOMPLISHMENTS**

- Consistent or pervasive inattention to collaborating with, consulting with or advising faculty colleagues, students and/or professionals in their works of research, scholarship or creative activity.

##### **CREATIVE ACCOMPLISHMENTS**

- Consistent non-participation in professional activities related to the development and execution of landscape design, art or planning projects or studies.

##### **GRANTS AND OTHER FUNDING**

- Does not consult with or advise professionals or clients outside of the department nor attempt to recruit opportunities or resources for research, consulting or other creative projects.

##### **CONFERENCES AND PRESENTATIONS**

- Consistent non-participation in academic or high-quality professional conferences, workshops, publications, web sites or other knowledge-transfer events and venues.

##### **PUBLISHED WORK**

- Consistent or pervasive inattention to producing, exhibiting and/or disseminating original works of research, scholarship or creative activity.

**Meets Expectations** – Faculty members receiving Meets Expectations ratings for creative scholarship show evidence of an acceptable minimum standard of creative scholarship achievements. Evidence of such performance include, but are not limited to, the following types of indicators:

**RESEARCH ACCOMPLISHMENTS**

- Consistent production, exhibiting and/or disseminating of original works of research, scholarship or professional activity;
- At least occasional dissemination of creative scholarly products that are peer-reviewed prior to publication;
- At least occasional publication of non-peer-reviewed articles, chapters, manuals or reports in various print and/or on-line venues;
- Consistent attention to collaborating with, consulting with or advising faculty colleagues, students and/or professionals in their works of research, scholarship or creative activity;
- Consistent ongoing, effective, reflective and instructional participation in professional activities as a meaningful consultant or lead player in the development and execution of landscape design or planning projects or studies, with dissemination of lessons learned.

**CREATIVE ACCOMPLISHMENTS**

- Ongoing active participation in professional design practice that substantially advises clients and/or produces design concepts or plans of value to clients and that contributes to the effective teaching and/or employment of students for pay or credit;
- Consistent public exhibition and/or self-publication of creative and/or professional design or artistic products.

**GRANTS AND OTHER FUNDING**

- Active work as a Principal Investigator on ongoing research or consulting grants;
- Active work as a Co-principal Investigator on an ongoing research, consulting or creative inquiry grant that contributes to the production of research or creative products;
- Submission of grant applications to support research, consulting or creative inquiry;
- Receipt of a new external grant to support research, consulting, or creative inquiry;
- Regularly consults with or advises professionals or clients outside of the department and/or attempts to recruit opportunities or resources for research, consulting or other creative projects.

**AWARDS AND COMPETITIONS**

- Received an internal UO research developmental grant or UO recognition award for research or creative works;
- Nominated or submitted an entry to a design competition or other award program.

**CONFERENCES AND PRESENTATIONS**

- Consistent attendance or participation in academic or professional conferences, workshops, publications, web sites or other knowledge-transfer events and venues;
- Presented a paper at a professional or academic conference;
- Local or regional gallery or other venue exhibited creative works;

- Presented creative or research works on a significant web site, blog or the like.

#### **PUBLISHED WORK**

- Published a peer-reviewed article in a journal, edited volume or series;
- Self-published a chapter in a book or other volume;
- Published a chapter in a book or other volume issued by a minor or vanity publisher;
- Contributed to a book proposal accepted by a major publisher;
- Authored an article or chapter in a technical document published by a government agency, professional organization, non-governmental organization, corporation, design firm, etc.;
- Authored a non-peer-reviewed article in a conference proceedings;
- Authored a peer-reviewed article in a minor conference proceedings;
- Self-published a blog or web site related to landscape architecture;
- Contributed substantially to a blog or web site related to landscape architecture.

**Exceeds Expectations** – Faculty members receiving Exceeds Expectations ratings for creative scholarship show reliable evidence of an acceptable minimum standard of scholarly and creative expertise, as described above for meeting expectations. In addition, they achieve indicators of strong creative scholarship. Evidence of such performance include, but are not limited to, the following types of indicators:

#### **RESEARCH ACCOMPLISHMENTS**

- Consistent dissemination of creative scholarly products that are peer-reviewed prior to publication and/or evidently have a significant impact upon professional practice, the evolution of landscapes in the Pacific Northwest, or other scholars within the same area of specialized research;
- Citation rates for recent articles or other publications are evidently notably high;
- A review article, government document, book or the like features research accomplishments in a positive or exemplary light;
- Research products receive regional recognition in the news media and/or well-respected and well-read web sites or blogs for their relevance, effectiveness, timeliness, originality, etc.;
- Mentorship of students in the successful publication of scholarly articles, particularly those appearing in peer-reviewed publications.

#### **CREATIVE ACCOMPLISHMENTS**

- Professional design work produces built work that demonstrably has a positive impact in producing or conserving landscapes that work well, serve important functions well, or create/ retain considerable value to the client and/or community they serve;
- Consistent exhibition of creative and/or professional design products that are peer-reviewed prior to exhibition and/or evidently have a significant impact upon professional practice, regional culture, the evolution of landscape related thought and aesthetics in the Pacific Northwest or upon other designers or artists within the same area of specialized creative practice;
- A review article, catalog, book or the like that features the faculty members creative accomplishments in a positive or exemplary light;

- Creative designs or other works receive regional recognition in the news media and/or well-respected and well-read web sites or blogs for their relevance, effectiveness, timeliness, originality, etc.

#### **GRANTS AND OTHER FUNDING**

- Substantial active work as the Principal Investigator on a substantial ongoing research or consulting grant, including that requiring unusually intensive, ongoing administrative tasks and/or coordination of multiple faculty and/or institutions;
- Significant active work as a Co-principal Investigator on a significant ongoing research, consulting or creative inquiry grant that contributes substantially to the production of research or creative products;
- Receipt of a significant new external grant to support research, consulting work, or creative inquiry.

#### **AWARDS AND COMPETITIONS**

- Received a local or regional award for research and/or communication from an academic or professional organization or the like;
- Received a local or regional award for design and/or creative accomplishments from an academic or professional organization or the like;
- Received a first-place award in a local, regional or minor design or art competition;
- Received a finalist or honorable mention award in a national, international or major design or art competition.

#### **CONFERENCES AND PRESENTATIONS**

- Presented an invited paper at a professional or academic conference;
- Presented an invited lecture at another school or professional education program;
- Invited to exhibit creative works at a regional gallery or other venue;
- Creative work included in a significant exhibition or gallery;

#### **PUBLISHED WORK**

- Published a peer-reviewed article in a major journal, edited volume or series;
- Published more than one peer-reviewed article in lesser journals than above;
- Published a chapter in a book issued by a major publisher;
- Authored or edited book proposal accepted by a major publisher;
- Authored a research report or technical document published by a government agency, professional organization, non-governmental organization, corporation, design firm, etc.;
- Authored an invited peer-reviewed published article for a major, high-reputation conference.

**Highest Expectations** – Faculty members receiving Highest Expectations ratings for creative enterprise and scholarship show reliable evidence of an acceptable minimum standard of scholarly expertise, as described above for meeting expectations. In addition, they achieve the kinds of indicators of exceptionally strong creative scholarship. Evidence of such performance include, but are not limited to, the following types of indicators:

#### **RESEARCH ACCOMPLISHMENTS**



- Very frequent dissemination of creative scholarly products that are peer-reviewed prior to publication and/or evidently have a very substantial impact upon professional practice, the evolution of landscapes in the Pacific Northwest, or a broad spectrum of scholars within the profession and/or other academic fields and professions;
- Citation rates for recent articles or other publications are evidently exceptionally high;
- Research products receive a preponderance of national or international acclaim in the news media and/or well-respected and well-read web sites or blogs for their relevance, effectiveness, timeliness, originality, etc.

#### **CREATIVE ACCOMPLISHMENTS**

- Professional design work produces built work that receives major awards and/or recognition in major national or international media;
- Very frequent exhibition of creative and/or professional design products that are peer-reviewed prior to exhibition and/or evidently have a very significant impact upon professional practice, culture(s), the broad evolution of landscape related thought and aesthetics, or upon other designers or artists within the same area of specialized creative practice.
- A review article, catalog, book or the like features creative accomplishments in a way that brings them national or international recognition as outstanding and original.

#### **GRANTS AND OTHER FUNDING**

- Significant active work as a Principal Investigator on a significant ongoing research or consulting grant that is funded at the top of the range that is available for such work, and/or that involves intensive collaboration across disciplines and institutions;
- Receipt of a significant new external grant to support research, consulting work, or creative inquiry that is funded at the top of the range that is available for such work.

#### **AWARDS AND COMPETITIONS**

- Received a national or international award for research and/or communication from an academic or professional organization or the like;
- Received a national or international award for design and/or creative accomplishments from an academic or professional organization or the like;
- Received a first-place award in a national or international major design or art competition;
- Received a “best paper” award at a major academic or professional conference.

#### **CONFERENCES AND PRESENTATIONS**

- Presented an invited paper at a national and prestigious professional or academic conference;
- Presented an invited full course of study at another school or professional education program;
- Invited to exhibit creative works at a nationally prestigious gallery or other venue;
- Creative work included in a nationally prestigious exhibition or gallery.

#### **PUBLISHED WORK**

- Published multiple peer-reviewed articles in major journals, edited volumes or series;

- Authored or edited a full book or technical volume issued by a major publisher;
- Acted as primary or team-lead author of a peer-reviewed article in a major prestigious journal.