

Approved by the Office of the Provost and Academic Affairs: May 11, 2017

DEPARTMENT OF LANDSCAPE ARCHITECTURE  
School of Architecture & Allied Arts  
University of Oregon

# GUIDELINES, RESPONSIBILITIES, & INDICATORS OF ACHIEVEMENT

for

# PROMOTION & TENURE

Created May 1999, revised January 2004, March 2017

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.

DEPARTMENT OF LANDSCAPE ARCHITECTURE  
School of Architecture & Allied Arts  
University of Oregon

# Table of Contents

Introduction to Guidelines	page 3
Responsibility Areas	page 4
• Teaching	page 4
• Scholarship, Research and Critical Practice	page 5
• Service	page 6
Applying Evidence in Evaluating Achievement	page 7
• Criteria for Consideration From Assistant to Associate Professor	page 7
• Criteria for Consideration From Associate to Full Professor	page 9
• Process and Criteria For Pre-Tenure Annual Review	page 12
• Process and Criteria For Pre-Tenure Midterm Review	page 12
• Process and Criteria For Post-Tenure Review	page 12
• Review Process For Joint Appointments	page 13

## INTRODUCTION

*Landscape Architecture is an environmental planning and design discipline and profession of broad scope whose central concern is the wise use of land. Its interests range from the detailed conservation and development of sites of all sizes and uses to the planning of larger landscapes. These planning and design activities rest on a foundation of ecological understanding that views human value systems as a major force in landscape making.*

*The Department of Landscape Architecture at the University of Oregon is an accredited professional program and academic unit of the university offering the five year Bachelor of Landscape Architecture (BLA), the Master of Landscape Architecture (MLA) and the Ph.D. The BLA and MLA professional degrees are accredited by the Landscape Architecture Accreditation Board, a national organization chartered by the US Department of Education, and are the only accredited degrees of their kind in Oregon. Graduates of these accredited programs regularly sit for statewide licensure exams following graduation.*

*In evaluating cases for faculty advancement the Department of Landscape Architecture endorses the three university responsibility areas (and corresponding average weights) of Teaching (40%), Scholarship (as it is broadly defined viz. research and critical practice) (40%), and Service (20%), recognizing that the weights may vary during a faculty member's career. The department head's letter accompanying a candidate's case file clarifies the relative weightings where needed as well as considerations related to joint appointments. Because of the department's professional mission, faculty spend considerable time and departmental resources on activities that support professional education. Approximately half the students in the department are pursuing the BLA, with the other half pursuing the MLA or Ph.D.*

*Departmental indicators of achievement for promotion and tenure acknowledge the differing roles that exist within a diverse professional faculty in an unusually broad planning and design field. They articulate the range of professional, critical, creative and scholarly accomplishments to be expected; they direct attention to the need to match evidence of achievement to a faculty member's rank and role within the department; and they set forth appropriate professional and academic measures for promotion, tenure and post-tenure review considered normative to the field.*

*We note the diversity of our department's teaching, scholarship and critical enterprise in accord with the breadth of landscape architecture internationally as both an academic discipline and practicing profession. We have faculty members who pursue teaching and critical scholarship in the arts, natural sciences, humanities, social sciences, communication, and professional practice. This requires an unusually broad scope for meritorious faculty achievement, and makes evaluative criteria correspondingly broad. Judgments in applying the indicators of achievement in this document should be made with an understanding of this diversity and an awareness of the different modes of inquiry found across our intentionally diverse faculty.*

*The following interpretations are provided to assist faculty in Landscape Architecture in understanding the forms of evidence deemed significant to the Department and University, and as a guide to those outside the discipline responsible for making recommendations and decisions on individual cases.*

## RESPONSIBILITY AREAS

### TEACHING

The structure of a professional curriculum in landscape architecture has important implications for the nature and evaluation of teaching. Accreditation mandates course work in core technical and historical areas of the field, and faculty are expected to teach and provide leadership in one or more of these areas. Teaching loads are heavy by university standards. Faculty often average 15-18 scheduled contact hours a week plus considerable time out of class advising students and serving on graduate committees. In most terms, faculty members teach both an integrative design studio and a non-studio subject course, dealing with specific issues or knowledge in the field.

Landscape architecture is, by nature and the way it is taught at the University of Oregon, an integrative professional discipline. Faculty with appointments fully in the department must be conversant with the broad content of the profession, be able to make reinforcing connections between their subject courses and other subject offerings, both in and outside of the department, and be strong advocates for their own expertise in all integrative work. Teaching assignments often shift within a person's general area of expertise because a relatively small number of faculty members must cover the breadth of a dynamic and expanding profession. Thus, both broad content versatility and specialization are to be valued along with a capacity for cooperation and collegiality in sustaining an effective ensemble of teachers. As a result, this instructional setting prioritizes the ability to address more than one subject area and more than one degree program (e.g., the ability to teach beginning and advanced classes, at both undergraduate and graduate levels), and to contribute effectively to required design reviews across subject areas and levels.

While subject courses tend to have formats similar to those of other courses taught in the University, studio courses are distinctive. Each of these is effectively a new course each term, and faculty may develop from two to three of these a year. The sequence of nine studio courses leading to the BLA, and seven leading to the MLA, plays a central role in building each student's environmental problem solving skills and abilities.

Studio faculty work directly with small groups of students (usually 15) for rather long periods of time (a minimum of 12 hours per week) in the generation of comprehensive project proposals. These studios operate much like case study tutorials. Faculty must be present for all these hours and able to offer criticism related to each individual student's understanding of the problem, assist them in the examination of their assumptions, the growth of their intentions, and in the development of appropriate and satisfying proposals. Each student's work is publicly presented and reviewed by three or more faculty, as well as outside clients and practicing professionals at the middle and end of every term. In the tenth week of each term, all faculty collaborate as external reviewers in the careful appraisal of each student's creative work.

In all areas of the curriculum it is common for instructors to participate and lecture in each other's classes and to seek collaborative ventures. Teaching evaluations by faculty colleagues, as well as evaluations from students, are especially respected because of the amount of close interaction, extensive contact and direct observation that the program requires.

Because landscape architecture faculty have a heavy commitment to teaching, there are very real programmatic constraints placed on the amount of time available for other pursuits that must be considered in decisions related to tenure. As a direct result, research interests, critical creative work, professional practice and other appropriate forms of scholarly activity often intersect with a faculty member's teaching responsibilities, especially in the early years. Important design commissions, high levels of scholarly momentum and external funding are usually associated with the middle and later stages of a candidate's career.

**The central question is whether a faculty member's teaching exhibits evidence of continued, effective and stimulating commitment to student's professional growth and development across the department's degree programs.**

The following are four areas of achievement in teaching. Indicators of achievement for each rank are listed later in this document.

- *Demonstrated teaching success*
- *Demonstrated curriculum development and delivery*
- *Demonstrated course quality*
- *Demonstrated student accessibility*

### SCHOLARSHIP, RESEARCH, & CRITICAL PRACTICE

Landscape architects conceive and undertake scholarship in a variety of ways. Within the field, contributions that advance the discipline in the form of critical activities and professional growth may be characterized as scholarship. Endeavors related to research and scholarship, professional growth, and critical artistic achievement are sometimes closely related to and supportive of teaching. Creative teaching is often at the forefront of inquiry in the field and may provide evidence of scholarship.

**The central question is whether a faculty member's scholarship and/or critical artistic activity exhibits evidence of continued and qualitative intellectual, professional and artistic growth in ways appropriate to their disciplinary interests, expertise and departmental role, and whether products of this growth are being communicated to appropriate audiences outside the department.** Here, the important questions are: Is the work recognized in the field and to what extent? Is the work expected to have an impact on others in the field? Do peer reviewers see the work as breaking important new ground?

The peer review of landscape scholarship, professional and critical work requires a process related to the nature and mix of the faculty member's work. Scholarly articles related to landscape architecture are sometimes published in journals from other fields. The department recognizes that, at this time, peer-reviewed scholarly books in the field are in great demand. Publication of landscape planning and other activities often take the form of research reports, agency publications, and monographs and generally require peer review as a condition of agency support.

The department head's letter accompanying a candidate's case file clarifies the relationship between the faculty member's modes of inquiry, relevant areas of achievement, the peer-review process and indicators of quality appropriate to these areas, and the qualifications of those selected for external peer review.

The following are two areas of achievement in scholarship. Indicators of achievement for each rank are listed later in this document.

- *Demonstrated research accomplishments*
- *Demonstrated critical practice and creative accomplishments*

## SERVICE

In the planning and design disciplines, community and public service are often closely related to professional growth, scholarship and teaching. Faculty help solve environmental problems through pro bono consultations, class projects, scholarship, public committees, etc. Such activity should be evaluated with this in mind. Further, since faculty at Oregon play a strong role in department governance and program development, it is especially important in evaluations to give appropriate consideration to particular service-related assignments. Special assignments should be recognized as essential roles in the Department that offer opportunities for significant contribution.

**The central question is whether a faculty member's service provides evidence of conscientious commitment and recurring citizenship toward Departmental, School, University and professional communities.**

Two areas of achievement in service are listed below. Indicators of achievement for each rank are listed later in this document.

- *Demonstrated participation at Departmental, School and University levels*
- *Demonstrated participation in local, national and international professional communities*

## APPLYING EVIDENCE IN EVALUATING ACHIEVEMENT

### *CRITERIA FOR CONSIDERATION FOR PROMOTION FROM ASSISTANT TO ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR WITH INDEFINITE TENURE*

The granting of tenure indicates a career commitment on the part of the University to an individual faculty member. Tenure, therefore, should be based on clear evidence of the potential for sustained contribution and leadership over a candidate's entire career. Evidence of effective teaching (which is stressed at this level), as well as professional or scholarly achievement and the potential for leadership in the field are all important, with relative weights identified in the department head's letter that accompanies the candidate's case file. At this level of advancement, there should be evidence of quality teaching, continuous intellectual inquiry and professional development of *sufficient quantity and quality to provide a basis of confidence in future growth and performance*. Institutional and community service should also be considered significant, especially when related to professional growth, scholarship and influence. Service plays a more modest role at this level of advancement as compared to service expectations related to promotion to full professor. The evaluation of tenure recognizes the responsibility that the University of Oregon has to the landscape architecture profession as the State's only professional degree-granting program in landscape architecture.

Forms of evidence of achievement for promotion to Associate Professor with indefinite tenure will vary, depending on a faculty member's professional and intellectual interests and corresponding modes of inquiry, their roles in the department, and the weighting of their teaching and scholarship expectations.

For areas of faculty emphasis, such as landscape ecology, landscape preservation, design theory, landscape planning and landscape history, and concentrations similarly associated with the development of professional and scientific knowledge, the writing of criticism and other forms of scholarship, peer-reviewed grants and publication in appropriate peer-reviewed journals are highly meritorious.

For areas of faculty emphasis, such as landscape design, landscape representation, media and communications and other forms of landscape architectural practice, where the nature of inquiry is more clearly that of practical and integrative problem solving and artistry, as opposed to the primary generation of new knowledge, the forms of evidence may include: a portfolio of professional projects and studies sent to qualified outside evaluators, exhibitions, design commissions, published or adopted plans substantially developed by the faculty member, influential professional reports or monographs, published studies, trade journal articles, demonstrated and tested methodologies, professional consultations, successful design competition entries, published or exhibited drawings and/or models, and innovative technical drawings or technologies. Other potential evidence of achievement may include political or community acceptance of proposed plans and policies strongly developed or influenced by the faculty member, documented substantial influence upon environmental planning and design

outcomes, original software, creation of effective instructional or scholarly digital laboratories, and other contributions to the practice of landscape architecture.

Following is a list of indicators of achievement appropriate for this rank.

## INDICATORS OF ACHIEVEMENT FOR PROMOTION FROM ASSISTANT TO ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR WITH INDEFINITE TENURE

**Teaching** achievement areas and associated indicators (*evidence of achievement in each area is more important than the total number of indicators engaged*):

### 1) Demonstrated teaching success

- Student course evaluations consistently neutral or positive with clear evidence of student learning
- Positive faculty peer evaluations of students' work in departmental reviews
- Positive faculty peer evaluations at candidate's mid-term contract review
- Positive collaboration with other faculty across campus and at other institutions

### 2) Demonstrated course and/or curriculum development and delivery

- Refining existing curricular content to reflect new knowledge, methods, needs
- Creating wholly new curricular content
- Offering exceptionally demanding curricular content
- Receipt of external support for new or improved course content, resources or facilities
- Leadership in departmental curricular revisions

### 3) Demonstrated course quality

- High student demand to enroll in candidate's studio and subject area courses
- High student demand to enroll in candidate's elective courses
- External recognition for teaching excellence, e.g. awards, invited classes, critiques, etc.
- Student's receipt of external recognition for mentored work in candidate's course

### 4) Demonstrated student accessibility

- Regular availability to students via posted office hours and by appointment
- Regular service on student capstone project classes and as thesis/dissertation chair or committee member

**Scholarship** achievement areas and associated indicators (*significant achievement in either or both areas is more important than the number of indicators engaged*):

### 1) Demonstrated research accomplishments

- Consistent production and dissemination of original, peer-reviewed scholarly work
- Receipt of internal (UO) or external research support
- Consistent collaboration and consultation with colleagues, students, community members and professionals on scholarly work
- Positive citation, awards or reviews by others of candidate's scholarly work
- Consistent presentation of original work at relevant conferences and/or workshops
- Leadership in organizing scholarly conferences and disseminating their products
- Invited presentations at conferences and/or workshops

### 2) Demonstrated critical practice and creative accomplishments



- *Professional licensure and registration*
- *Receipt of internal (UO) or external critical/creative practice support*
- *Reflective participation in professional landscape design and planning efforts, with dissemination of methods, tools, results and lessons learned*
- *Exhibition of creative works that have been peer-reviewed or had demonstrated peer influence*
- *Disseminated critical review of other's publications, exhibitions, conferences or landscape design and planning efforts*
- *Positive citation, awards or reviews by others of candidate's creative work*
- *Recognized design competition entries*
- *Expert witness testimony with demonstrated effect in contentious landscape problems*
- *Leadership in organizing scholarly conferences and disseminating their products*
- *Invited presentations at conferences and/or workshops*

**Service** achievement areas and associated indicators (*significant achievement is important in both areas*):

1) Demonstrated participation at Departmental, School or University levels

- *Membership and consistent, effective contributions to department, School or University governance, including voluntary, appointed or elected committees*
- *Leadership of departmental committees*
- *Direction of class projects that benefit community landscape problem solving efforts*

2) Demonstrated participation in local, national and international professional communities

- *Consistent and conscientious contributions to local community*
- *Consistent and conscientious contributions to professional communities*
- *Leadership of professional organizations and/or their committees*
- *Written and graphic products that aid professional landscape architects*

## CRITERIA FOR CONSIDERATION OF PROMOTION FROM ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR TO FULL PROFESSOR

For promotion to the rank of professor there is the expectation of continued excellent teaching and, in addition, clear evidence of significant impact on the development of programs in the Department in areas such as curriculum, course work, administration, and external relations. The aforementioned standards and criteria continue to apply in evaluating this ongoing contribution. Particular attention should be given to special contributions that markedly and creatively enhance the growth and quality of the Department's programs and outreach, including achievements while serving in key administrative positions.

For this level of advancement there should also be evidence of significant leadership and broad recognition as a reputed scholar in one or more areas of the candidate's demonstrated expertise. While teaching is stressed in the evaluation for associate professor and tenure, advancement to professor reflects a faculty member's acknowledged excellence in an additional area of

achievement significant to landscape architecture, such as scholarship, professional practice, critical artistic achievement, administration or professional service. Here too the aforementioned criteria apply except to higher standards that reflect this goal of a strengthened reputation outside the University.

Following is a list of indicators of achievement appropriate for this rank.

## INDICATORS OF ACHIEVEMENT FOR PROMOTION FROM ASSOCIATE TO FULL PROFESSOR

**Teaching** achievement areas and associated indicators (*evidence of significant achievement in each area is important*):

### 1) Demonstrated teaching success

- Student course evaluations consistently positive with clear evidence of student learning
- Consistently strong faculty peer evaluations of student's work in departmental reviews
- Strongly positive faculty peer evaluations when these periodically occur
- Regular positive collaboration with other faculty across campus and at other institutions
- Invitations to deliver classes at other universities

### 2) Demonstrated curriculum development and delivery

- Receipt of external support for new or improved course content, resources or facilities
- Regular leadership in departmental curricular revisions
- Substantive expansion of departmental curricular reach and scope
- Regular mentoring of junior faculty
- Teaching core required courses

### 3) Demonstrated course quality

- Regular unmet student demand to enroll in candidate's studio and subject area courses
- Regular unmet student demand to enroll in candidate's elective courses
- External recognition for teaching excellence, e.g. awards, invited classes, critiques, etc.
- Student's receipt of external recognition for mentored work with candidate

### 4) Demonstrated student accessibility

- Regular and successful service on large number of student capstone project classes and as thesis/dissertation chair
- Regular applications from prospective students for admission to the Department to work with candidate

**Scholarship** achievement areas and associated indicators (*evidence of significant achievement in either or both is more important than the number of areas engaged*):

### 1) Demonstrated research accomplishments

- Frequent production and dissemination of original, peer-reviewed scholarly work with demonstrated influence on the discipline and profession

- *Receipt of major external research support*
- *Notably high citation rates or comparably demonstrated influence of recent work*
- *National or international recognition of scholarly contributions*
- *Editor and/or editorial board of major national or international scholarly publication or monograph*
- *Invited participation as co-author of major national or international scholarly publication or monograph*
- *Regular leadership in organizing scholarly conferences and disseminating their products*
- *Invited plenary presentations at national and international conferences and/or workshops*

2) Demonstrated critical practice and creative accomplishments

- *Receipt of major critical/creative practice/design commission*
- *Receipt of major national or international award for professional landscape design and planning effort*
- *Invited exhibition of juried creative work in acknowledged high-profile venue*
- *Notably high rates of positive citation, awards or reviews by others of candidate's creative work*
- *High placement in design competition awards*
- *Service on juries for major design, professional or research award competitions*
- *Demonstrated efficacy in solving contentious landscape problems*
- *Regular leadership in organizing scholarly conferences and disseminating their products*
- *Invited plenary presentations at national and international conferences and/or workshops*

**Service** achievement areas and associated indicators (*evidence of significant achievement is more important than the number of areas engaged*):

1) Demonstrated participation at Departmental, School and University levels

- *Leadership critical to the future of the department, School or University*
- *Leadership of elected School or University committees*
- *Award for class projects that benefit community landscape problem solving efforts*

2) Demonstrated participation in national and international professional communities

- *Service on national or international organization's proposal review panels*
- *Service on national or international professional society's leadership bodies*
- *Service on national or international society's university accreditation bodies*
- *Regular requests to serve in evaluating tenure and promotion cases at peer universities*
- *Receipt of award for service to professional landscape architects*

### *PROCESS AND CRITERIA FOR PRE-TENURE ANNUAL DEPARTMENTAL REVIEW*

Case file reviewers should note that all tenure track faculty members receive the following reviews: Annual reviews every year pre-tenure except the year of the mid-term review; pre-tenure midterm review; tenure and promotion review, as well as three- and six-year post-tenure reviews. Within that series of reviews, an appraisal by the department head at the end of each academic year is an important component in each pre-tenure faculty member's growth. These annual reviews provide an opportunity to evaluate the faculty member's performance and offer an opportunity to address problems and to support faculty members in their progress toward the mid-term and tenure reviews. In the annual pre-tenure review, the unit head evaluates the faculty member's annual activity report and their vita, and the evaluation is provided to the candidate. In the year of a mid-term review, that review takes the place of an annual review.

The department head will use the criteria for promotion to the relevant rank, and assess the faculty member's progress towards those criteria.

### *PROCESS AND CRITERIA FOR PRE-TENURE MIDTERM REVIEW*

Each pre-tenure faculty member will have a mid-term review approximately halfway between appointment and tenure review. A successful review is one prerequisite for contract renewal. The mid-term review will use the criteria for promotion to Associate Professor, and will assess the faculty member's progress towards those criteria.

The faculty member will prepare a CV, personal statement, and teaching, research and service portfolios. The department will compile a student evaluation summary and peer teaching evaluation. Based on this material, a committee of tenured faculty from the department then prepares an assessment report. Upon receipt of this assessment report, the unit head then prepares an evaluative letter which is shared with the candidate, who has 10 days to provide responsive material or information, if desired, which is included in the evaluation file. This complete file is then submitted to the Dean, who prepares a separate report and recommendation and shares this with the faculty member candidate, who is allowed 10 days from the date of receipt to provide responsive information. All this material is then submitted to the Provost, who will decide the terms and duration of any subsequent appointment.

### *PROCESS AND CRITERIA FOR CONSIDERATION IN POST-TENURE REVIEW*

Post-tenure reviews occur at three and six year intervals of full-time equivalent service following promotion to the rank of associate or full professor with indefinite tenure. The post-tenure review will use the criteria pertinent to the candidate's rank at time of review, and will assess the faculty member's progress towards the relevant criteria. The primary purpose of such reviews is faculty development. Primary responsibility for the three-year review rests with the unit head, and includes at minimum a review of the faculty member's activity report, including a short statement of goals for teaching, research, and service, and a vita for the period of review. The unit head prepares an evaluative letter and shares this with the faculty member, who may

respond in writing. The evaluative letter and any response will be placed in the faculty member's personnel file.

In the case of a six-year post-tenure review, the process is similar, with the difference that here, vita, candidate's statement and sabbatical portfolio, as well as student evaluation summary and peer teaching evaluation (by department) are required. Based on this material, a committee of tenured faculty from the department then prepares an assessment report. Upon receipt of this assessment report, the unit head then prepares an evaluative letter which is shared with the candidate, who has 10 days to provide responsive material or information, if desired, which is included in the evaluation file. This complete file is then submitted to the Dean, who prepares a separate report and recommendation and shares this with the faculty member candidate, who is allowed 10 days from the date of receipt to provide responsive information. All this material is then submitted to the Provost, who gives a final evaluation of the faculty member's work.

During the post-tenure review, four evaluative standards and criteria are brought to bear in a manner fitting the faculty member's current rank, with appropriate consultation of the corresponding Indicators of Achievement. There is the expectation of a growing body of evidence regarding: 1) continued high quality teaching; 2) continued professional, scholarly and/or creative practice growth and achievement; 3) leadership in academic and administrative service to the department, School and University; and 4) service on behalf of the candidate's larger community of professional interest. Particular attention should be given to special contributions that markedly and creatively enhance the growth and quality of the Department's programs and outreach, including achievements while serving as head.

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.

### *JOINT APPOINTMENTS*

Faculty members holding joint appointments will be reviewed by and according to the evaluative criteria of their primary department. For faculty members holding a secondary appointment in another department, the Landscape Architecture department requests an evaluative letter from the secondary department's review committee, prior to the Landscape Architecture review committee's review, based on the candidate's submitted materials. This evaluative letter is added to the review file. This evaluative letter is requested for the Pre-tenure midterm review, the Tenure and promotion review, and the Six-year post-tenure review.