

**PERSONNEL DOCUMENT FOR  
FACULTY**

**FAY JONES SCHOOL OF  
ARCHITECTURE AND DESIGN  
University of Arkansas**

Approved by the Faculty: 5/11/2020



Personnel Document  
On Evaluative Criteria, Procedures and General Standards  
for  
Initial Appointment, Successive Appointments,  
Annual and Post-tenure Review,  
Promotion and Tenure

University of Arkansas  
Fay Jones School of  
Architecture and  
Design

This personnel document governs the Fay Jones School of Architecture and Design in the selection, retention, promotion, granting of tenure to, and evaluation of faculty, effective as of the date of the president’s approval. It has been approved by the faculty of the Fay Jones School of Architecture and Design, the Dean, the provost, the Chancellor, and the President of the University of Arkansas, as indicated by the signatures below.

These policies are required to be consistent with the policies of the university as set forth in Board of Trustees Policy 405.1 and in two campus policy statements: (1) Evaluative Criteria, Procedures and General Standards for Initial Appointment, Successive Appointments, Annual and Post-tenure Review, Promotion and Tenure, and (2) Guidelines for University and Distinguished Professor Appointments. In case of conflict, the board policy, the campus policy, the school, college, or library policy, and the department policy shall have authority in that order. Copies of these documents are available online, as referenced in the *Faculty Handbook*, at the UA web site <https://provost.uark.edu/faculty-handbook>.

It is the policy of the University of Arkansas, Fayetteville to provide equal employment opportunity to all qualified persons; to prohibit discrimination against any employee or applicant for employment because of race, color, religion, sex, age, national origin, sexual orientation, marital or parental status, veteran's status, or disability, and to promote the full realization of equal employment opportunity through a positive, continuing program of affirmative action.

**APPROVALS**

Dean	Date
Provost	Date
Chancellor	Date
President	Date



## TABLE OF CONTENTS

<b>1.0</b>	<b>INTRODUCTION</b>	
1.1	RESPONSIBILITIES AND GOVERNANCE STRUCTURE	6
1.2	MEMBERSHIP ON THE SCHOOL-WIDE PROMOTION AND TENURE COMMITTEE	6
1.3	PROCEDURES FOR THE SCHOOL-WIDE PROMOTION AND TENURE COMMITTEE	7
1.4	DEPARTMENTAL ADDENDA	8
1.5	REVIEW OF PERSONNEL DOCUMENT	8
<b>2.0</b>	<b>PROCEDURES &amp; CRITERIA FOR INITIAL APPOINTMENTS OF FACULTY</b>	
2.1	GENERAL REMARKS	8
2.2	PROCEDURES FOR INITIAL APPOINTMENTS OF TENURED AND TENURE-TRACK FACULTY	8
2.2.A	SEARCH COMMITTEES	9
2.2.B	APPOINTMENTS FOR ASSISTANT PROFESSOR	9
2.2.C	APPOINTMENTS FOR ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR, PROFESSOR, UNIVERSITY PROFESSOR AND DISTINGUISHED PROFESSOR	9
2.2.D	INITIAL APPOINTMENTS WITH TENURE	9
2.3	CRITERIA FOR INITIAL APPOINTMENTS FOR TENURE-TRACK FACULTY	
2.3.A	CRITERIA FOR INITIAL APPOINTMENTS AT OR BELOW THE RANK OF ASSISTANT PROFESSOR	10
2.3.B	CRITERIA FOR INITIAL APPOINTMENTS AT OR ABOVE THE RANK OF ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR	10
2.3.C	CRITERIA FOR APPOINTMENTS TO UNIVERSITY AND DISTINGUISHED PROFESSORSHIPS	11
2.3.D	CRITERIA FOR INITIAL APPOINTMENTS WITH TENURE	11
2.4	INITIAL AND SUCCESSIVE APPOINTMENTS OF NON-TENURE-TRACK FACULTY	11
2.4.A	LECTURER	12
2.4.B	INSTRUCTOR	12
2.4.C	CLINICAL, TEACHING, RESEARCH, AND PROFESSOR OF PRACTICE	12
2.4.D	VISITING	12
2.5	REQUIRED NOTIFICATION AND WORKLOAD ASSIGNMENTS	13
<b>3.0</b>	<b>SUCCESSIVE APPOINTMENTS, ANNUAL REVIEW, PEER REVIEW, THIRD YEAR REVIEW, AND POST-TENURE REVIEW OF FACULTY</b>	
3.1	SUCCESSIVE APPOINTMENTS FOR TENURE AND TENURE-TRACK FACULTY	13
3.2	ANNUAL REVIEW GENERAL REMARKS	13
3.3	ANNUAL REVIEW FOR ALL FACULTY AT THE RANK OF ASSISTANT PROFESSOR AND ABOVE	14
3.4	SCHOOL ANNUAL PEER REVIEW FOR ALL FACULTY AT THE RANK OF ASSISTANT PROFESSOR AND ABOVE	16
3.5	THIRD YEAR REVIEW FOR TENURE-TRACK FACULTY	17
3.6	POST-TENURE REVIEW	19
3.7	CRITERIA FOR ASSESSING FACULTY PERFORMANCE FOR ALL FACULTY AT THE RANK OF ASSISTANT PROFESSOR AND ABOVE	19
3.7.A	EVIDENCE OF ACHIEVEMENT IN TEACHING OR PROFESSIONAL PERFORMANCE	19
3.7.B	PROFESSIONAL PERFORMANCE (IN THE CASE OF FACULTY WITH NON-TEACHING TITLES)	21
3.7.C	EVIDENCE OF ACHIEVEMENT IN SCHOLARSHIP	21
3.7.D	EVIDENCE OF ACADEMICALLY RELATED SERVICE	22
3.7.E	ADDITIONAL SCHOOL CRITERIA AND PROCEDURE FOR FACULTY EVALUATION	23
3.8	FACULTY WORKLOAD ASSIGNMENTS	27
<b>4.0</b>	<b>PROMOTION FOR ALL FACULTY AT THE RANK OF ASSISTANT PROFESSOR AND ABOVE</b>	27
4.1	CRITERIA FOR PROMOTION	28
4.2	PROCEDURES FOR PROMOTION	29
<b>5.0</b>	<b>TENURE</b>	30
5.1	CRITERIA FOR AWARDING TENURE	30
5.2	PROCEDURES FOR AWARDING TENURE	30
5.3	PROCEDURES FOR SUSPENDING PROBATIONARY PERIOD	30
5.4	MANDATORY SIXTH YEAR REVIEW – TERMINAL APPOINTMENT	30
<b>6.0</b>	<b>DISMISSAL OF FACULTY</b>	30

## **I.0 INTRODUCTION**

### **1.1 Responsibilities and School Governance Structure**

This personnel document is specific in scope pursuant to the evaluation criteria, procedures and general standards for the appointment, successive appointments, annual and post-tenure review, and promotion of tenured and tenure-track faculty, and tenure of the latter. It is part of the governance of the Fay Jones School of Architecture and Design.

All decisions in selection, reappointment, promotion, and termination of faculty shall be made on the basis of professional merit, the quality of performance of assigned duties and the quality of, and potential for, contributions to the University. Exceptions are based on financial exigency as defined by Board of Trustee policy, or as might occur due to the elimination of programs.

Principal responsibility for implementation of this personnel document and other areas of school governance, and for considering recommendations made by the faculties of the three academic departments of the Fay Jones School of Architecture and Design, rests with the Department Heads and the Dean. In order to provide equity and transparency for the governance of faculty across School disciplines and modes of endeavor, the 'governing unit' is the Fay Jones School of Architecture and Design. Board of Trustees policy and University of Arkansas personnel policies also assign important roles to the faculty of the school, facilitating input through school and departmental personnel committees and by development of written department personnel documents delineating specific criteria and procedures.

An elected Fay Jones School of Architecture and Design Promotion and Tenure Committee will represent the faculty and provide advice to the Dean and the Department Heads on personnel matters.

### **1.2 Membership on The School-Wide Promotion and Tenure Committee**

The core membership will consist of one representative from each of the School's three academic departments. The core members will be tenured and elected to the committee by the tenured and tenure-track faculty of their respective departments. Elections will be recorded by the Department Heads and transmitted to the Dean. On receipt of departmental nominees, all core-members of the Committee are appointed by the Dean. As appropriate, new recommendations and appointments to the Committee must be completed by the end of the spring semester. The Chair of the Committee will be elected by, and from within, the three core-members and approved by the Dean. The Chair shall be responsible for overseeing and reporting the duties of the Committee and shall also be a voting member. The Committee shall not include School Department Heads or administration.

A fourth, ancillary, Committee member will be appointed to serve on promotion and tenure (and relevant initial appointment) cases. The ancillary member will normally be a full professor of the University of Arkansas, from outside of the School. The ancillary member will be elected to the Committee, on a case-by-case basis, by the tenured and tenure-track faculty of the candidate's home department in the first instance. A single nominee agreed by the departmental faculty will be transmitted, with a clear case for the nomination, to the three core-members of the Committee. The core-members of the Committee shall then review, and vote on, the nomination. The core-member vote-count must be transmitted and clarified to the Dean, along with the original departmental

nomination. The final decision of approval and appointment of the ancillary member rests with the Dean.

The exception to the above is made in cases where the promotion case refers to non-tenure-track faculty, where the ancillary member of the committee shall be a non-tenure-track faculty member at or above the rank sought by the candidate, and from outside the candidate's department. Non-tenure-track members shall not vote on the awarding of tenure.

All core-members will serve terms of no more than three consecutive years. A member may not serve more than two consecutive terms but may serve multiple terms if separated by a year off the committee. Terms of initial appointments will be from one to three years to establish suitable rotation schedules. New terms will begin on the 31<sup>st</sup> August of each year, with prior terms completing the 30<sup>th</sup> August.

### **1.3 Procedures for The School-Wide Promotion and Tenure Committee**

Any and all official business may be conducted if, and only if, the Committee Chair and the other core-members are in attendance, either in person or remotely. All discussions shall be confined to the clarification, assessment and evaluation of the information contained in the candidate's dossier. Committee members affiliated with the same department as a candidate are free to express substantive opinions regarding the candidate but are, in such cases, non-voting and expressly limited to accurately summarizing the sentiment recorded in the recommendations from the department. Similarly, if the Chair of the Committee is housed in the same department as the candidate being reviewed, he or she must step down as chair for the hearing of the case, and be replaced for the duration by another core-member, elected by and from within the core-membership, and approved by the Dean. Excepting cases of ancillary, non-tenure-track members, all members of the Committee, including core and ancillary members, are eligible to vote on candidates seeking the member's rank or lower. This restriction does not apply to candidates for University Professor and Distinguished Professor; tenured and tenure-track professors shall be allowed to vote on candidates for University Professor and Distinguished Professor.

Voting in absentia is permissible, provided the Chair is notified in advance of the anticipated absence so a conference call may be arranged to include the member in any relevant discussions. As members from the candidate's department are barred from voting, there will be three voting members on the Committee at any one-time.

Should there be less than three members of the Committee eligible to vote on a specific case, because of departmental affiliations and rank, then further committee member(s) – in priority from within the School, and then, only *in-extremis*, from outside the School, will be elected to hear the case. Any further ancillary members will again be elected to the Committee, on a case-by-case basis, by the tenured and tenure-track faculty of the candidate's home department in the first instance. A single nominee agreed by the departmental faculty will be transmitted, with a clear case for the nomination, to the three core-members of the Committee. The core-members of the Committee shall then review, and vote on, the nomination. The core-member vote-count must be transmitted and clarified to the Dean, along with the original departmental nomination. The final decision of approval and appointment of further ancillary members rests with the Dean.

It is in the best interest of the University and faculty that full and frank discussions occur during the deliberations of the promotion and tenure committees. The confidentiality of remarks made at such

meetings should, therefore, be carefully preserved. The only exception is that the Department Head and/or the Dean may share with the candidate guidance and advice resulting from the reviews.

#### **1.4 Departmental Addenda**

The Department Heads and departmental faculty of the Fay Jones School of Architecture and Design shall have a responsibility to develop an addendum to School governance documents, including this personnel document. Protocols, processes and policies not explicitly addressed within this document will be developed to facilitate activities, standards, practices and performance that are specific to the discipline of the departments. It is understood that an addendum is not a substitute for any school-level governance document and will in no way supersede the contents of this personnel document. All recommendations forwarded to the Dean and to the Provost from each of the three departments are understood to conform to policies and standards that represent those of the Fay Jones School of Architecture and Design. All amendments to Departmental Addenda must be approved by the Dean, the Provost, the Chancellor, and the President.

#### **1.5 Review of Personnel Document**

The Promotion and Tenure Committee, the Department Heads and the Dean shall review this personnel document at intervals no greater than three years. The purpose of these periodic reviews is to ensure that the provisions of the document are consistent with the Mission of the Fay Jones School of Architecture and Design, and University of Arkansas policies and procedures. Any ensuing amendments to this School Personnel Document shall be submitted to the School's full-time faculty for approval and in turn must be approved by the Dean, the Provost, the Chancellor, and the President.

### **2.0 PROCEDURES & CRITERIA FOR INITIAL APPOINTMENTS OF FACULTY**

#### **2.1 General Remarks**

The Fay Jones School of Architecture and Design adopts Academic Policy Series (APS) 1405.11.I. The School adds the following considerations for the procedures and criteria for initial appointments of tenured and tenure-track faculty:

The Dean's approval of departmental criteria and procedures for initial appointments of tenured and tenure-track faculty are predicated on consistency and common consensus across the School's three constituent departments.

The awarding of rank at initial appointment shall be dependent upon experience and qualifications; in compliance with the needs of the hiring department; University board policies; and in support of the mission of the Fay Jones School of Architecture and Design.

#### **2.2 Procedures for Initial Appointments of Tenured and Tenure-track Faculty**

In addition to parts A-C of APS 1405.11.II., the Fay Jones School of Architecture and Design has additional procedures for initial appointments of tenured and tenure-track faculty:

#### *2.2.A. Search Committees*

In order to initiate searches for tenure-track and tenured appointments, the Department Head will appoint a search committee constituted as follows: the hiring department's tenured/tenure-track faculty to a maximum of five; one tenured faculty member from one of the other two departments of the Fay Jones School of Architecture and Design; and a tenured faculty member from outside of the School. The Department Head will appoint a Chair of the search committee from within the faculty of his or her own department, who must hold the rank at or above the hire-position. The Department Head will submit his or her proposal for the committee's membership and Chair for approval by the Dean before the search committee is constituted and charged.

#### *2.2.B. Appointments for Assistant Professor*

For candidates proposed for appointment at the rank of Assistant Professor, the Department Head shall submit to the Dean evidence of potential teaching quality, research and/or creative activity, and the candidate's service record; at least three letters of reference; a complete vitae; the search committee's recommendations; recorded feedback from the general School community stemming from open events such as lectures, presentations, workshops etc., and his or her own recommendations. These materials should evidence a reasonable expectation of success and progress of the hire, as benefitting the appointee and the School.

#### *2.2.C. Appointments for Associate Professor, Professor, University Professor and Distinguished Professor*

For candidates proposed for initial appointment as Associate Professor, Professor, University Professor or Distinguished Professor, the Department Head shall submit to the Fay Jones School of Architecture and Design Promotion and Tenure Committee for review, the candidate's curriculum vitae and other relevant supporting application materials evidencing teaching quality; the research and/or creative activity record; the service record; letters of reference; the search committee's recommendations; recorded feedback from the general School community stemming from open events such as lectures, presentations, workshops etc.; and his or her own recommendations. These materials should evidence a reasonable expectation of success and progress of the hire, as benefitting the appointee and the School. The school-wide committee will vote on appointment at the proposed rank, and the results of the vote and a letter describing the committees' rationale shall be submitted to the Department Head and School Dean and is to be considered in the appointment recommendation. A search committee member who is also an elected member of the School-wide Promotion and Tenure Committee shall proceed in accordance with 1.3 of this personnel document.

#### *2.2.D. Initial Appointment with Tenure*

Before a new faculty member will be appointed with tenure, the Department Head shall submit to the Fay Jones School of Architecture and Design Promotion and Tenure Committee for review, the candidate's curriculum vitae and other relevant supporting application materials evidencing teaching quality; the research and/or creative activity record; the service record; letters of reference; the search committee's recommendations; recorded feedback from the general School community stemming from open events such as lectures, presentations, workshops etc.; and his or her own recommendations. These materials should evidence a reasonable expectation of success and progress of the hire, as benefitting the appointee and the School. The school-wide committee will vote on whether to recommend appointment at the proposed rank, and the results of the vote and a letter describing the committee's rationale shall be submitted to the Department Head and School Dean and

is to be considered in the Dean's appointment recommendation. A search committee member who is also an elected member of the School-wide Promotion and Tenure Committee shall proceed in accordance with 1.3 of this Governance Document.

### **2.3 Criteria for Initial Appointments for Tenure-track Faculty**

#### **2.3.A. *Criteria for Initial Appointment at or below the Rank of Assistant Professor***

For Initial Appointment at or below the rank of Assistant Professor, The Fay Jones School of Architecture and Design adopts APS 1405.11.II.A:

1. An appropriate degree or professional experience is an essential qualification for appointment to positions at academic ranks.
2. Other important qualifications include experience in teaching, research, or other scholarly or creative activity, and educational service either at other colleges and universities and/or in non-academic settings.
3. The academic rank awarded at the initial appointment shall be consistent with prior professional experience as well as Board policies and criteria adopted by the faculty and head of the appropriate unit.

In addition to APS 1405.11.II.A, when considering initial appointments at the rank of Assistant Professor, the School shall also consider potential for initiative and leadership, and evidence of abilities to work well with others.

#### **2.3.B. *Criteria for Initial Appointment at or above the Rank of Associate Professor***

For Initial Appointment at or above the rank of Associate Professor, The Fay Jones School of Architecture and Design adopts APS 1405.11.II.B (see 2.2.C). In addition, the School has additional specific criteria and considerations for initial appointments at the following ranks:

##### *Associate Professor:*

Initial appointment to the rank of Associate Professor is based upon demonstrated performance, and future potential. The Associate Professorship is a high academic rank and appointment to this rank carries no assurance of further promotion. Appointment is based on the evidence that the candidate will, in all probability, attain a high level of distinction during his/her professional career. In addition, demonstration of the ability to develop and conduct a sustained research and/or creative activity program of national prominence is expected. Examples of demonstrated ability may include the securing of externally funded grants and/or contracts, refereed publications, or design awards and other professional recognition. Evidence of a record of effective mentoring of students is expected. A candidate for initial appointment to the rank of Associate Professor should also:

1. Satisfy all criteria for appointment as an Assistant Professor.
2. Have a record of significant professional accomplishments in teaching, research and/or creative activity, and service, indicating that the candidate has the potential for becoming nationally or internationally recognized in his/her field.
3. Demonstrate that there will be the strong likelihood of continuing professional growth and effective activity toward achievement of individual, school and university goals.

*Professor:*

A candidate for initial appointment to the rank of Professor should satisfy all the criteria for appointment as an Associate Professor. Further, initial appointment to the rank of Professor is intended to recognize an individual's stature as an accomplished, advanced and significantly productive scholar who has achieved a national or international reputation with demonstrated and significant professional accomplishments in teaching, research and/or creative activity, and service.

*2.3.C. Criteria for Appointments to University and Distinguished Professorships*

For appointments to the ranks of University and Distinguished Professorships the Fay Jones School of Architecture and Design adopts APS 1405.13 Annex A and B.

*2.3.D. Criteria for Initial Appointment with Tenure*

The Fay Jones School of Architecture and Design adopts APS 1405.11.II.C (see 2.2.D.). In addition, the School has specific criteria and considerations:

An applicant for initial appointment with tenure must meet the requirements set forth in the criteria for appointment to the rank of Associate Professor or higher and must show evidence of the ability to sustain performance at a high level. The criteria for recommending tenure at initial appointment or after a period of service to the university are identical.

**2.4. Initial and Successive Appointments of Non-Tenure-Track Faculty**

The Fay Jones School of Architecture and Design adopts Academic Policy Series (APS) 1405.11.II.D:

Any appointment, extension or renewal of an appointment is at the sole discretion of the University. The typical length of appointment varies by the type of non-tenure track faculty. Specific provisions on the length of appointment by different academic title are as follows.

Any term of appointment in excess of one year, whether an initial appointment or a renewal, shall follow merit-based procedures established in School personnel documents approved by the President. Such merit-based procedures must include an application for such an appointment and subsequent review and evaluation of the application materials by the School-wide Promotion and Tenure Committee and the Department Head. Any recommendations must address the criteria for appointment or reappointment reflected in the relevant personnel documents. All appointments in excess of one year are subject to the approval of the Dean and the Provost.

Non-tenure track faculty are generally on appointments not to exceed one academic year. In some instances, multi-year appointments may be extended to instructors or non-tenure track faculty in professor ranks. Such appointments are generally intended for faculty hired in competitive searches or who have established a notable and consistently strong record of effective performance during their period of service to the University.

Multi-year appointments, to the extent they are utilized, must have satisfied a merit-based review process employing evaluative criteria and procedures established in this School personnel document. These appointments require the review and recommendation of the school-wide committee and the department head, and the approval of the Dean and the Provost. The first such merit-based

appointment would usually be up to three years. If successfully completed, in accordance with the evaluation procedure set out herein, an initial merit-based term appointment may be considered for renewal for an additional appointment of up to three years. After successful completion of a second three-year term (or after a total of six years of appointment), appointments may be considered for renewal for faculty in professor ranks for periods of up to five years.

Any merit-based term appointment of more than one year shall only be recommended when the candidate has consistently demonstrated (or, for initial appointment, shown clear potential for) highly effective teaching and/or, as appropriate to the appointment, a record of highly effective research or service/administration, as well as the ability and willingness to work productively with colleagues.

See APS 1405.111 for detailed procedures.

#### 2.4.A *Lecturer*

Appointment as a lecturer is usually part-time and on a semester-by-semester, or rarely, an academic year basis. These appointments may be renewed if successfully completed in accordance with department, school and university guidelines.

#### 2.4.B *Instructor*

Appointment as an instructor may be part-time or full-time and is usually on an academic year basis, though the appointment may be for up to a three-year term. These appointments may be considered for renewal for periods of up to three years if successfully completed in accordance with approved school and department personnel documents.

#### 2.4.C *Clinical, Teaching, Research, and Professor of Practice.*

Appointments of clinical, teaching, research, and professor of practice faculty may be part-time or full-time and may be multi-year appointments. The first such appointment would usually be up to three years. If successfully completed, in accordance with approved school and department personnel documents, an initial appointment may be considered for renewal for an additional appointment of up to three years. After successful completion of a second three-year term (or after a total of six years of appointment), appointments may be considered for renewal for periods of up to five years.

#### 2.4.D *Visiting.*

Appointments of visiting faculty may be for a term of up to three years and shall not extend beyond a total of three years. If a term of less than three years is successfully completed in accordance with approved school and department personnel documents, such appointments may be considered for renewal, at the discretion of the University. Any renewal shall require a merit-based review by the department personnel committee and the Department Head. Appointments in visiting faculty positions are not renewable beyond three total years of service.

Executive in Residence. Appointments of executives in residence faculty may be for up to three years and can be renewed with successful completion of the initial appointment. Colleges, schools, and departments shall specify policies for appointment, review, and reappointment of Executives in Residence, so long as such policies are consistent with Board and University policies.

Again, any term of appointment in excess of one year must be merit-based and meet all criteria and procedural requirements addressed above. Any appointment not fully satisfying all such requirements shall not exceed one year.

## **2.5 Required Notification and Workload Assignments for Faculty**

The Fay Jones School of Architecture and Design adopts APS 1405.11.II.E:

No later than 30 days after beginning employment in connection with a first appointment, each faculty member shall be advised in writing by their Department Head of the criteria, workload assignment, procedures, and instruments that are to be used in assessing their work.

In addition to APS 1405.11.II.E, the School has additional specific policies for the assignment of workloads (see 3.8)

## **3.0 SUCCESSIVE APPOINTMENTS, ANNUAL REVIEW, PEER REVIEW, THIRD-YEAR REVIEW, AND POST-TENURE REVIEW OF FACULTY**

### **3.1 Successive Appointments for Tenured and Tenure-track Faculty**

The Fay Jones School of Architecture and Design adopts APS 1405.11.III.A.:

1. Tenured faculty members have a right to a next successive appointment except for the reasons for termination of a tenured appointment specified by the Board of Trustees.
2. Non-tenured, tenure-track faculty do not have a right to a next successive appointment but may be offered an appointment after the expiration of a current appointment, provided it does not extend the time in probationary status beyond the limits set in Section IV.A.4 and IV.A.12 of Board Policy No. 405.1. and section 2.3 of this document.
3. In the event that a non-tenured, tenure-track faculty member is not recommended for reappointment, the procedure described in Section IV.B of Board Policy 405.1 shall be followed.

### **3.2 Annual Review General Remarks**

As appropriate to their appointment and rank, each tenured and tenure-track faculty member shall be evaluated on the basis of achievement in the areas of (a) teaching (b) scholarly and/or creative activities (c) academically related service, and (d) collegiality. The annual review of each faculty member with a teaching assignment shall include evaluation by students.

The annual faculty review in the Fay Jones School of Architecture and Design is the principal means by which to evaluate ongoing success and progress of faculty, as benefitting the faculty and the School. Specifically, it is designed to serve the following purposes:

#### *Development:*

1. To provide a means of encouraging faculty to remain current in professional and disciplinary developments, and to sustain success in teaching, research and/or creative activity, and service, by recognizing, reinforcing, and rewarding meritorious performance.

2. To increase the likelihood that each member of the faculty will work with all others in a collegial manner.
3. To provide information that can be used by the institution, and by the faculty member, to improve individual performance in teaching, research or creative practice.

*Evaluation:*

1. In accordance with board policy, to serve as the basis for decisions related to merit salary increases, reappointment, promotion and tenure, non-reappointment and dismissal.
2. To serve as a means for informing faculty of how their performance is viewed by their peers and supervisors, and of how their contributions are valued.
3. To ensure that individuals with differences in their faculty workload assignments can nevertheless be provided with fair comparisons and evaluation.

*Due Process:*

1. To provide a means for protecting faculty from arbitrary actions, favoritism, and discrimination.
2. To document compliance with board and campus policies and thus provide protection for the individual, and for the institution.

### **3.3 Annual Review for all Faculty at the Rank of Assistant Professor and Above**

The Fay Jones School of Architecture and Design adopts APS 1405.11. III.B.:

Each continuing faculty member shall be evaluated by their Department Head on an annual basis in accordance with the following procedures as relevant to their assigned activities. This annual review contributes to personnel decisions such as reappointment and merit salary increases, and annual review results are also considered in making recommendations for promotion and/or tenure.

The annual review process for full-time non-tenure-track faculty at the rank of assistant professor and above should be consistent with that for tenured and tenure-track faculty. All other non-tenure-track faculty should be evaluated in a manner consistent with School and Departmental policies.

1. The faculty and Department Head of each unit shall adopt criteria and procedures for an annual review and evaluation of the work and status of each tenured and tenure-track faculty member in the unit (see 3.4 and 3.5). These criteria and procedures must be approved by the Dean, the Provost, the Chancellor, and the President. The criteria and procedures adopted by the faculty and Department Head shall be consistent with Board policies and the following criteria and procedures.
2. No later than May 1 of each year, the Department Head shall inform each continuing faculty member in writing of their workload assignment and evaluation criteria for the next academic year, as well as evaluation procedures and instruments for the current calendar year. Each faculty member shall also be provided with any standard review forms upon which the faculty member is expected to submit information regarding professional activities.
3. To fulfill the educational mission of the University and in the best interest of each unit, the Department Head may later modify a faculty member's workload assignment and evaluation criteria, if necessary. Whenever there is a change in criteria, procedures, or instruments, each

faculty member shall be informed by the Department Head in writing within four weeks of the change.

4. No later than March 30, each faculty member's annual review shall be conducted on the basis of the previous calendar year's workload assignment and assigned duties and according to criteria and procedures stated herein. The Department Head shall consider the results of the faculty peer review when assessing annual performance.
5. The performance of each tenured and tenure-track faculty member shall be reviewed annually by their Department Head, provided that any faculty member on a terminal appointment will not be evaluated in their terminal year.
6. As long as it is submitted by the deadline established by the faculty and Department Head of the unit, each faculty member has the right to submit any material documenting the quality of their professional performance in the annual review.
7. The results of the annual peer evaluation shall be made fully available to the faculty member and those conducting the review.
8. Student evaluations of teaching shall be made fully available to the faculty member. The numerical ratings from student evaluations of teaching shall be made fully available to any persons conducting the annual review. Students' narrative comments from evaluations shall be made fully available to the faculty member's unit Department Head. The unit Department Head shall complete training in the evaluation of these narrative comments prior to conducting the review.
9. The annual review forms, recommendations, associated narratives, and all other relevant materials used in or resulting from the annual reviews of that faculty member shall be maintained as long as the faculty member is employed by the University and for at least three years thereafter. These materials shall be made available to the faculty member upon their request.
10. The responsibility for the initiation of the annual review of each tenured and tenure-track faculty member, including recommendations regarding reappointment of each non-tenured faculty member, lies with the Department Head. The Department Head shall make each recommendation regarding reappointment (which includes recommendations for non-reappointment) of a tenure-track faculty member only after considering the written report of the Unit committee conducting the annual peer review.
11. Prior to the Department Head's completion of the annual evaluation (including any recommendations based on the evaluation) in any year, the Department Head shall meet with the faculty member to discuss all issues related to the review; however, a tenured faculty member receiving a satisfactory evaluation may waive this required meeting. A copy of the Department Head's draft of the intended evaluation and recommendations to the Dean shall be provided by the Department Head to the faculty member, who shall be given a reasonable opportunity to submit a written response before the Department Head prepares their final recommendation. A copy of the Department Head's final recommendation to the Dean shall also be provided to the faculty member, who shall be given a reasonable opportunity to submit a written response to be forwarded to each subsequent level of review.

12. Except for non-reappointment, dismissal, tenure, or promotion decisions, a faculty member claiming that an evaluation or recommendation resulting from the annual review process violates their rights under established University personnel regulations, policies, or practices, has recourse through written appeal to the Dean. This written appeal may request reconsideration of the evaluation by the Dean, based on specific, articulated concerns. The Dean shall make the final determination on the annual review. For non-reappointment, dismissal, tenure, or promotion decisions, other University policies and procedures are applicable.

### **3.4 School Annual Peer Review for all Faculty at the Rank of Assistant Professor and Above**

The Fay Jones School of Architecture and Design adopts APS 1405.11. III.C.:

The purpose of the required annual Peer Review is to (a) provide feedback to the faculty member concerning their performance during that calendar year, and (b) to provide input advisory to the Department Head in performing each faculty member's annual review.

The university assumes that the faculty is a "community of scholars" where teaching; research, scholarship and/or creative activity; service and collegiality are life-long pursuits and where freedom of expression and inquiry are supported and protected. With a view toward supporting a strong ethic of faculty development, evaluations shall recognize consistent performance, recent accomplishments, degree of involvement, and accuracy of the contents of the self-evaluation statement.

As outlined above, initial appointment indicates a reasonable expectation of success and progress but may not be understood as projecting certainty. Tenure and promotion are earned, through continuous demonstration of success and progress, through critical review. The annual evaluation provides an assessment of a candidate's performance and contributions to their program, to the Fay Jones School of Architecture and Design, and to the University of Arkansas.

In line with the provisions of APS 1405.11.III.C., and consistent with the provisions of APS 1405.11 III.F the Fay Jones School of Architecture and Design has developed procedures for annual review through peer evaluation as appropriate to its Mission by a distinct School Annual Peer Review Committee. The review period shall be the previous calendar year.

The Fay Jones School of Architecture and Design Annual Peer Review Committee will be comprised of three representatives, with one from each of the three departments as elected by faculty vote. All fulltime tenure-track and non-tenure-track faculty at or above the rank of Assistant Professor may vote to elect the members of the committee, with two exceptions: (1) visiting faculty are not eligible to vote and (2) a faculty member who has received notification of non-reappointment or termination is not eligible to vote.

All fulltime tenured and non-tenure track faculty above the rank of assistant professor shall be eligible to serve on the Peer Review Committee. In addition, tenure-track and non-tenure track assistant professors, having successfully completed three academic years of service in the School, shall be eligible to serve.

In accordance with APS 1405.11.III.C.:

1. Each year, the members of the Unit Peer Review Committee shall elect a chair from among the members to coordinate the work of the committee.

2. Members of the Unit Peer Review Committee may evaluate Unit faculty at any academic rank.
3. Members of the Peer Review Committee shall not participate in their own reviews or for any colleague where there is a personal conflict of interest as defined by University of Arkansas, Fayetteville Policies and Procedures 404.0.
4. The committee as a whole shall have the opportunity to provide input into each peer evaluation before it is forwarded to the Department Head.
5. All Peer Review discussions shall remain confidential. Committee members shall not discuss deliberations outside of the meeting.
6. Operation of the Unit Peer Review Committee shall be governed by the criteria and procedures adopted by the unit and approved as provided for above and must be consistent with all applicable University policies.

### **3.5 Third Year Review for Tenure-track Faculty**

The Fay Jones School of Architecture and Design adopts APS 1405.11.III.D:

A written review of progress toward tenure shall be made of each faculty on the tenure track during their third year of the probationary period. As a reminder, promotion and tenure are not automatic based on years of service or performance that is merely satisfactory. Rather, in the pursuit of excellence, promotion and tenure are based on high levels of achievement and the trajectory toward sustained success over a career.

Third year review dossiers should utilize standard promotion and tenure packets. All dossiers should include material documenting the following:

1. Progress in teaching including student feedback (or progress in professional practice in the case of faculty with non-teaching titles)
2. Progress in all service activities
3. Progress in scholarly/creative activities including external funding if appropriate

Third year reviews should be conducted by Department Heads after input from the faculty of that academic unit.

Assessment of performance in the third-year review includes three options:

1. Currently making satisfactory progress - appointment is continued for 4th and 5th years, subject to all University policies;
2. Appointment is continued for 4th year, subject to all University policies and a required 4th year review. Department Head will address weaknesses;
3. Notice of non-reappointment, subject to procedures outlined in Board Policy 405.1(IV)(B), with the 4th year as the terminal year.

In addition to APS 1405.11.III.D., the Fay Jones School of Architecture and Design has additional

processes and procedures for the three-year review:

*Purpose:*

As part of the process for providing tenure-track faculty members guidance and assistance in their professional development and academic responsibilities, a review of their professional performance and progress toward tenure will be conducted in the third full year of service. Each pre-tenure candidate will prepare a dossier in the same manner as promotion and tenure candidates, excepting external letters, and proceed through the same review structure as for promotion and tenure cases. Broadly, this review continues the mentoring of success and progress benefitting the applicant and the School. Specifically, the purpose of this review is to measure and assess the candidate's progress toward a positive recommendation for tenure, and to provide the candidate with analysis and advice resulting from the review in support of an expectation of continued success and progress. The results of pre-tenure reviews provide a foundation for non-reappointment decisions and for future deliberations on awarding tenure.

In order to better accomplish the stated purpose of the third-year critical review, departmental committees must have no less than three members. Where the tenured faculty of a reviewee's home-department numbers less than three, the tenured and tenure track faculty must elect affiliate members from the School's tenured faculty to contribute to the critical review. The elected affiliate members must be transmitted by the Department Head and approved by the Dean. It should be taken that, in the following "all tenured faculty within the applicant's department" may, as necessary, be modified to include affiliate School faculty members from outside the department.

*Procedures:*

1. By January 31st, the faculty member submits a dossier to the Department Head, who reviews it for completeness. The dossier shall be consistent in content and format with that of an application for tenure and shall include (1) all previous annual evaluations; (2) a personal statement that discusses teaching, research or creative practice, and service accomplishments, as well as a forecast trajectory for the subsequent three years; (3) and student evaluations.
2. By February 7th, the Department Head submits the dossier to a committee comprising all tenured faculty within the applicant's department.
3. By February 28th, the committee of all tenured faculty within the applicant's department submits a written report to the Department Head, evaluating the faculty member's overall progress toward tenure, specifically commenting on past performance record of teaching, scholarship, research and/or creative practice, service, and collegiality as well as the forecast within the applicant's personal statement. The committee's evaluation should address the materials to determine if the content has sufficient potential to meet or exceed the criteria for tenure. Due to the developmental aspect of this review, areas of both success and of needing improvement are to be identified within the written report, along with suggested plans of action to address areas needing improvement for progress.
4. By March 15th, the Department Head prepares a report concurring with, or dissenting from, the committee review report prepared by the departmental tenured faculty, specifically addressing the basis of any recommendations. The Department Head meets with the faculty member and

provides him or her with a copy of both reports and discusses each. The faculty member may forward to the Department Head a written response to the reports within five working days of meeting with the Department Head.

5. By March 31st, the Department Head submits the faculty member's dossier; a draft statement outlining his or her own recommendations and those of the tenured faculty; and the faculty member's response, if applicable, to the Dean for review. The Head's draft statement should include recommendations and strategies that the candidate should consider strengthening future performance and produce a stronger record of achievement.
6. By April 20th, and after review by the Dean, a final statement is prepared by the Department Head and submitted to the faculty member. The statement reports the feedback developed through the review process, noting areas of excellence, identifying performance areas needing improvement, and communicating the final outcome of the review. If the third-year review results in a report of less than satisfactory progress from the Department Head, the statement shall be accompanied by a statement from the Dean, outlining School-level assistance and support for addressing areas of concern and movement towards a successful fourth year review. If the third-year review results in a recommendation for non-reappointment the Department Head, the Dean shall – on review – ask for reconsideration by the Department Head or accede and notify the faculty member of non-reappointment in accordance with the provisions of Board Policy 405.1.

### **3.6 Post-tenure Review**

The Fay Jones School of Architecture and Design adopts APS 1405.11.III.E. Regarding the adopted remediation plan, the School adopts the following:

Options for the remediation plan include (1) a change in assignment more appropriate to existing skills; (2) development of additional expertise in an area through scholarly activity; and (3) a plan of improvement in teaching, research and/or creative practice, and service.

### **3.7 Criteria for Assessing Faculty Performance for All Faculty at the Rank of Assistant Professor and Above**

The Fay Jones School of Architecture and Design adopts parts 1-3 of APS 1405.11.III.F:

Each faculty member shall be evaluated on the basis of achievement in the areas of (a) teaching (or professional performance, in the case of the faculty members with non-teaching titles), (b) scholarly or creative activities, and (c) academically related service.

Each faculty member should be actively engaged as a collegial contributor to the life of the academic unit (e.g., department, school, college, university) and should exhibit respect and cooperation in shared academic and administrative tasks.

Each unit shall develop procedures for peer evaluation appropriate to its mission (see 3.4). The annual review of each faculty member with a teaching assignment shall include evaluation by students.

#### **3.7.A. Evidence of Achievement in Teaching or Professional Performance**

In every case for appointment, reappointment, promotion, or advancement to tenure, achievement in

teaching or professional performance is essential.

*Teaching:*

Evidence of achievement in teaching should take into account the level and type of courses taught, the course delivery method, and the percentage of faculty time devoted to teaching and/or advising. Faculty must provide item A.1 from the list below and at least one additional item of evidence from A, B, or C below; however more items may be added.

Evidence from these sources may include:

A. Students

1. Qualitative and quantitative data from all electronic course evaluations and any other evaluations completed by students as specific to the unit.
2. Evaluation from former students addressing the candidate's instructional performance and effectiveness in learning course material garnered by exit interviews, letters of recommendation, or other methods specific to the unit.
3. Evidence of effectiveness in direction of research of undergraduate, graduate, and postdoctoral students including student completion, placement, achievements, and publications.
4. Evidence of effective participation in unit examination activities such as written and oral examinations for honors or graduate degree candidates.
5. Performance of students on uniform examinations or in standardized courses.
6. Evidence of effective advising and mentoring, both formal academic advising and mentoring of individual students.
7. Evidence-based measurements of student learning (such as pre- and post-testing or student work samples) that meet defined student learning outcomes.

B. Other Faculty

1. Evaluation (by peers and/or administrators) of course materials, learning objectives, assignments, syllabi, and/or a teaching portfolio.
2. In-class visitation and evaluation of instruction by peers and/or administrators.
3. External evaluation of teaching by evaluators knowledgeable about teaching and/or research in the faculty member's specific discipline either in-person or through recorded means.

C. Instructor

1. Self-assessment of teaching such as a teaching portfolio that includes but is not limited to teaching materials, instructional techniques, innovative assignments, course structures or pedagogy, teaching philosophy statements, and/or responses to student and peer evaluations. Although a teaching portfolio is recommended, other methods of self-assessment can be used as directed by the unit.
2. Evidence of curriculum development and interdisciplinary program participation including but not limited to:
  - a. Development and improvement of teaching laboratories.

- b. Continuous improvement of courses on a regular basis and/or the creation of new courses.
  - c. Development and improvement of distance learning.
- 3. Design and implementation of individual study courses
- 4. Evidence of participation in the scholarship of teaching including but not limited to:
  - a. Publications (textbooks, abstracts, articles, or reviews).
  - b. Conference presentations.
  - c. Grants/contracts to fund innovative teaching activities/course development.
  - d. Participation in teaching conferences.
- 5. Other professional development activities that support teaching.
- 6. Recognition of teaching/advising including awards, election to offices, committee activities, and other service to professional associations as related to teaching.

*3.7.B. Professional Performance (in the case of faculty with non-teaching titles):*

Evidence of achievement in professional performance should take into account the level and type of professional responsibilities, the percentage of faculty time devoted to various professional responsibilities, and may include evidence from supervisors, peers, clients, and self-evaluation. Evidence may include, among other items:

- 1. Annual ratings by supervisors.
- 2. Evidence of expertise in the area of professional responsibility and effectiveness in carrying out assigned duties.
- 3. Evidence of ability and willingness to accept additional responsibility and/or leadership.
- 4. Evidence of cooperation in dealing with personnel at all levels.
- 5. Evidence of efforts at self-improvement.
- 6. Evidence of innovations in program implementation.
- 7. Evidence of the development of special projects, resource tools, and/or the use of creative techniques in the performance of duties.
- 8. Evidence of initiative and resourcefulness in solving unit problems.
- 9. Evidence of ability to communicate effectively orally and in writing.
- 10. Evaluations by clientele.

*3.7.C. Evidence of Achievement in Scholarship*

In every case for appointment, reappointment, promotion, or advancement to tenure, achievement in scholarship (research or creative activities) is essential, and quality and impact are of the essence. In every case it is the responsibility of the reviewers to arrive at a judgment of the importance, originality, influence, sustained, and future promise of the candidate's body of work. The University process utilizes evaluations by outside experts in the formation of this judgment.

Assessments of scholarly contributions should consider the varying levels of depth, complexity, competitive rigor, and impact of achievements. Scholarly contributions that may be recognized include the following. This list is not exhaustive.

- 1. Books, essays, articles, or bulletins reporting the results of original research.
- 2. Novels, poetry, plays, exhibitions, or musical compositions.
- 3. Musical performances, workshops, recitals, or theatrical productions.

4. Visual arts, paintings, sculptures, videos or other media.
5. Patents, processes, or instruments.
6. Commercialization of discoveries or ideas.
7. Scientific expeditions.
8. Designs and built works.
9. Technology development and applications.

Evidence and context used in judging the quality of scholarship include the following items. This list is not exhaustive.

1. Publication by respected academic journals and publishing houses that accept work only after review and approval by experts.
2. Published reviews by experts.
3. Citations in research publications and other evidence of significance.
4. Awards for excellence, especially from national or international academic organizations.
5. Significance of completed performances, presentations, exhibitions, workshops, recitals, or lectures.
6. Awards of grants and contracts that indicate recognition of research achievement or capability.
7. Economically significant commercialized patents, ideas, or discoveries.
8. Impact on public policy or practice.

#### *3.7.D. Evidence of Academically Related Service*

A faculty member's academic service to the community or to the profession beyond the campus may confirm stature in scholarship and teaching, may enliven the intellectual climate on campus, and may improve opportunities for students and faculty colleagues. Evaluations of high-quality contributions of service are valued and may have weight in decisions on appointment, reappointment, promotion, and advancement to tenure.

Academically related service that may be recognized follows. This list is not exhaustive.

1. Membership and leadership in committee service for the department, college/school, or university.
2. Membership and leadership in campus governance bodies.
3. Membership and leadership in a professional organization.
4. Editorship or editorial board membership.
5. Refereeing or reviewing manuscripts or grant proposals.
6. Participation in certification boards.
7. Expert advice to professions, businesses, community organizations, or government agencies.
8. Organization of conferences or other events.
9. Appointments to governmental agencies.
10. Appointments to administrative positions with service beyond duties with the university.
11. Service as advisor to student organizations.
12. Contributions toward professional development of faculty
13. Judging student or professional competitions.
14. Service rendered to a community as a part of courses taught.

Evidence and context used in judging the quality of service include the following; this list is not

exhaustive.

1. Significant service to the program, department, college/school, or university.
2. Awards, honors or special recognition for service.
3. Significant service to professional organizations.
4. Significant academic related service to the community.
5. Editorial board membership or manuscript reviewer.

### *3.7.E. Additional School Criteria and Procedure for Faculty Evaluation*

In addition to parts 1-3 of APS 1405.11.III.F, the Fay Jones School of Architecture and Design has additional complementary procedures for assessing faculty performance:

Evaluative documents used to report faculty performance in the School shall work to a common format of evaluation:

- Exceeds Expectations
- Meets Expectations Fully
- Minimally Meets Expectations
- Does Not Meet Expectations

The following is provided to help define the meaning of "exceeds expectations," "meets expectations fully," "minimally meets expectations," and "does not meet expectations," in ways appropriate to the School's disciplines. The "does not meet expectations" designation shall be used when the faculty's performance is unsatisfactory. These following is not to be construed as a "check-list" nor are they self-limiting categories.

#### *Teaching:*

##### Exceeds Expectations

- Peer and/or student recognition of distinguished teaching, including consistently high student evaluations.
- Receipt of awards or grants that foster and/or recognize excellence in teaching.
- Development of innovative teaching methods and materials, (e.g. textbooks, software, new curricula, videos), particularly those that have broad impact on the field.
- Development of new courses that enhance the teaching mission of the School.
- Development of interdisciplinary teaching efforts beyond the School which seek to enhance the university's mission of collaboration.
- Invitation to lecture or contribute to University colleagues' teaching beyond the School, including invited jury membership.
- Invitations to lecture, teach, or participate on reviews at peer institutions or learned societies.
- Assumption of extra teaching loads while maintaining established expectations in research, scholarship and/or creative activity, and service.

##### Meets Expectations Fully

- Consistently good student evaluations.
- Development of interdisciplinary teaching efforts within the School which seek to enhance the university's mission of collaboration.
- Cultivating a pertinent and current body of knowledge in an area of specialization and

- maintaining artistic and/or intellectual currency in one's discipline.
- Undertaking efforts to improve teaching performance (e.g. participating in workshops, taking courses, attending conferences).
- Informing students of their progress during the semester.
- Invitation to lecture or contribute to colleagues' teaching within the School, including invited jury membership.
- Submission of materials for awards or grants that foster and/or recognize excellence in teaching.

#### Minimally Meets Expectations

- Demonstrating abilities to integrate and synthesize pertinent and current knowledge, skills, techniques and/or methods in the development and delivery of instruction, (e.g. effectiveness in organization and presentation of material).
- Invitation to lecture or contribute to colleagues' teaching within the department, including invited jury membership.
- Engaging with and maintaining professional relationships with students, including providing guidance and direction for career planning and professional development in the discipline.
- Maintaining fair and judicious standards in the grading and measuring of student competence while evaluating student results against both course and curriculum objectives.

#### Does Not Meet Expectations

- Failure to attend class.
- Failure to be accessible to students, including failure to keep office hours.
- Failure to engage in pedagogical discussions concerning the mission of the department.
- Failure to keep abreast of and integrate current knowledge into teaching.
- Consistently poor teaching evaluations from students.

#### *Scholarship:*

##### Exceeds Expectations

- Development of, at least, nationally recognized research and scholarship.
- Publication in a peer-reviewed venue, such as journal papers or books with national or international standing.
- Receiving an award for a paper and/or book.
- Being awarded a national fellowship.
- Editorship of refereed journals and books.
- Receipt of external research grant awards and/or progress towards completion of ongoing research grants.
- Invited lectures at international conferences.
- Presentation of a research or scholarly paper at an international forum.
- Development of, at least, nationally recognized creative work or practice.
- Peer-recognition at the national or international level.
- Juried, or otherwise selected or invited presentation, exhibition, or publication of creative work at the national or international level.
- Authorship of a project that contributes substantially to the progress of applied knowledge in the field.

#### Meets Expectations Fully

- Advancement of a consistent body of scholarship and research.
- Presentation of a research or scholarly paper at a national forum.
- Presentation at multiple regional scholarly forums.
- Receipt of a book contract.
- Receipt of competitive internal research grant awards and/or progress towards completion of ongoing research grants.
- Application for national fellowships, grants or equivalent.
- Maintaining efforts to secure external funded research.
- Invited lectures at regional and national conferences.
- Having research under peer-review with a journal or book publisher.
- Publication of none peer-reviewed books with national or international standing.
- Peer recognition at the regional level for distinguished creative work and/or practice.
- Producing creative work that contributes to professional development and increased competence.
- Presenting papers or lectures about creative work or practice at a national forum.
- Making multiple presentations about creative work at regional forums.
- Juried, or otherwise selected or invited presentation, exhibition, or publication of creative work at the regional level.
- Development of creative activity efforts which seek to enhance the university's mission.

#### Minimally Meets Expectations

- Presenting a research or scholarly paper at a meeting of a learned or professional society with regional standing.
- Presentation of a research or scholarly paper at a regional forum.
- Presentation at multiple local scholarly forums, or meetings of local learned or professional societies.
- Documenting work and progress of on-going work that leads to original scholarship which contributes to personal development and competence of the faculty member.
- Integrating research and scholarly activities into teaching.
- Submission of original research for peer-review with a journal or similar venue.
- Participating in professional practice by means of seeking commissions, contracts, competitions, and proposals that contribute to the professional development of the faculty member.
- Documenting work and progress of on-going work that leads to original scholarship which contributes to personal development and competence of the faculty member.

#### Does Not Meet Expectations

Failure to meet two or more of the requirements to minimally meet expectations as laid-out above, shall constitute unsatisfactory performance.

#### *Academically Related Service:*

#### Exceeds Expectations

- Providing effective leadership in areas of university, professional, or community service at the regional or national level.
- Successfully facilitating external support for the school or department and fostering

opportunities for external support.

- Successfully organizing or directing professional and/or scholarly events.
- Offering valuable assistance to the school's efforts in recruiting students and/or faculty.
- Assuming a leadership role on a School or University committee that requires an extraordinary effort.
- Assuming extra service loads and carrying them out effectively while maintaining established expectations in teaching and research, scholarship, and/or creative activity.
- Participating on national accreditation teams.

#### Meets Expectations Fully

- Demonstrating initiative and perseverance in carrying out service responsibilities.
- Participating in professional organizations and programs that support the faculty member's discipline.
- Providing expertise that assists the work of other institutional units.
- Making positive contributions to public education through teaching and presentations.
- Effectively supporting professional or scholarly events, (e.g. moderating a panel at a meeting of a learned or professional society, reviewing abstracts).
- Participating on committees at Department, School or University level(s) that convene frequently and require substantial service commitment.

#### Minimally Meets Expectations

- Performing willing and dependable service on university, school, and/or department committees as requested by the administration.
- Cooperating with colleagues in executing university, school, and/or department service.
- Participating on committees at Department, School or University level(s) that convene infrequently and require modest service commitment.

#### Does Not Meet Expectations

Failure to meet one or more of the requirements to minimally meet expectations laid-out below, shall constitute unsatisfactory performance.

#### *Summative Performance:*

In addition to the evaluations against each of the areas of teaching or professional performance, scholarship and academically related service, the Department Head is to provide each evaluated faculty member with a summative, overall evaluation using the same four-point scale, as well as a supporting narrative. This narrative is intended to explicate the overall evaluation, provide a synopsis of the work evaluated in the annual-dossier, and account for: the findings of the peer-review committee; time allocations for each semester, whether dictated by initial appointment or subsequent changes in workload assignment; an overall-view of achievements, challenges and synergies that characterize the work; how the work has built-upon and furthered work from the previous year(s); formative suggestions for next steps; and account for the faculty member's contributions to the life of the department and School beyond teaching, scholarship and service performance. This may include an individual's demonstrated ability to work productively with colleagues in carrying out the research/creative, teaching, and service missions of the department and the School. These summative remarks should be drawn from supportable sources, demonstrable and even-handed, and shall be crafted only following a discussion between the Department Head and faculty member pursuant to point 3.3.11 above.

### **3.8 Faculty Workload Assignments**

In supporting the Mission of the Fay Jones School of Architecture and Design, faculty time commitments will be allocated by the Department Heads in consultation with the Dean. Typically, for those who teach design studios, allocations will be 65 percent teaching; 25 percent scholarship; and 10 percent service. Elsewhere, 45 percent teaching; 45 percent scholarship; and 10 percent service will apply to certain appointments, including those with a full-time appointment to teach design history or other disciplines or sub-disciplines. Although these general proportions are to be maintained by each department, duties may vary individually by determination of the Department Head in consultation with the Dean. Annual evaluations will be based on performance in the areas of teaching (or professional performance), scholarship, and service in these proportions for each area, as assigned to each faculty member. Following the annual evaluation, a workload assignment for each faculty member's forthcoming year will be determined by the Department Head after consultation with the faculty member and the Dean. Faculty serving as School Endowed Chairs will have an assigned workload which originates with the Dean, finalized in consultation with the Department Head of the Chair's home department.

*Non-tenured assistant professors in tenure track positions:*

These faculty normally shall be assigned duties with greater emphasis on teaching and research and/or creative activity, and less emphasis on service. This policy recognizes that the service requirement for assistant professors should be carefully considered by school and departmental administration while they are developing their expertise in teaching and establishing a research or creative practice program.

*Tenured faculty:*

These faculty may be assigned duties with a degree of flexibility in the allocation of their responsibility for teaching, research or creative practice, and service.

### **4.0 PROMOTION FOR ALL FACULTY AT THE RANK OF ASSISTANT PROFESSOR AND ABOVE**

The Fay Jones School of Architecture and Design adopts APS 1405.11.IV. The School adds the following considerations:

Recommendations for promotion and/or tenure shall be based on criteria consistent with the Mission of the Fay Jones School of Architecture and Design, and related to a candidate's appointment responsibilities and activities, or those otherwise charged by the candidate's Department Head through annual workload assignments.

The Dean's approval of departmental criteria and procedures for promotion are predicated on consistency and common consensus across the School's three constituent departments.

A high level of performance while in the most recent rank, as demonstrated through the accumulated evidence of the candidate's annual reviews, is expected. Candidates must also clearly demonstrate a reasonable expectation of success and progress after promotion and/or tenure, as benefitting the applicant and the School. All materials should be formatted and submitted as required by policy and procedures in campus document 1405.11, and include content required of the same; be as complete as possible to facilitate a thorough and fair evaluation; and pursuant to timelines established by

campus policy 1405.101.

#### 4.1 Criteria for Promotion

The Fay Jones School of Architecture and Design adopts parts 1-3 of APS 1405.11.IV.A:

Each faculty member who is being considered for promotion shall be evaluated on the basis of (in-line with faculty performance areas at 3.7) achievement in the areas of (a) teaching (or professional performance, in the case of the faculty members with non-teaching titles), (b) scholarly or creative activities, and (c) academically-related service. Each faculty member should actively contribute to the life of the academic unit (e.g., department, school, college, university) and should exhibit respect and cooperation in shared academic and administrative tasks.

Although the criteria for promotion are similar to those used in annual evaluations, the relative emphasis, levels of achievement, and cumulative impact required for promotion, as opposed to reappointment, differ.

*Promotion from Assistant to Associate Professor (with tenure, if applicable) including for faculty with titles of Teaching, Research, Clinical, or Professor of Practice:*

In order to merit promotion from assistant professor to associate professor (and be granted tenure, if applicable), the candidate must document high-quality impact in both teaching and scholarship as appropriate to the discipline. In addition, the candidate must document satisfactory service to the university, discipline, profession, or public. Candidates must be effective scholars and teachers and show a pattern of accomplishments in scholarship that indicates progress toward a national or international reputation in their discipline. Individual colleges or schools may adopt additional or more specific requirements in their approved policy documents (see below).

No tenure-track faculty member shall be promoted to the rank of associate professor without also being granted tenure. (This does not preclude a faculty member from being hired into a tenure-track position with the rank of associate professor or full professor if they satisfy the applicable criteria.)

Non-tenure-track candidates must be effective scholars and teachers and show a pattern of accomplishments in scholarship that indicates progress toward a state-wide, regional, national or international reputation in their discipline. Individual colleges or schools may adopt additional or more specific requirements in their approved policy documents.

In addition to APS 1405.11.IV.A.1, the School has additional specific criteria and considerations for the promotion of *Assistant Professor to Associate Professor (with tenure, if applicable) including for faculty with titles of Teaching, Research, Clinical, or Professor of Practice:*

A candidate for promotion to the rank of Associate Professor should:

1. Satisfy the criteria for appointment as an Associate Professor.
2. Have a record of significant professional accomplishments in teaching, research and/or creative activity, and service, indicating that the candidate has the potential for becoming nationally or internationally recognized in his/her field. Evaluation of aptitude for, and attainment in, scholarship, research and/or creative activity shall hold that these endeavors

- are equally valuable to the School's culture and community.
3. Have a record of significant service contributions to the University, the School, or public interests.
  4. Demonstrate that there is likely to be continuing professional growth and effective, collegial activity toward achievement of individual, Department, School, and University goals.

*Promotion from Associate to Full Professor including for faculty with titles of Teaching, Research, Clinical, or Professor of Practice:*

In order to merit promotion to full professor, the candidate must document continuous and high-quality impact in both teaching and scholarship as appropriate to the discipline. In addition, the candidate must document satisfactory academic service to the university, discipline, profession, or public. Candidates must be effective scholars and teachers and demonstrate a pattern of distinguished accomplishments in scholarship that indicates achievement of a national or international reputation in their discipline. Individual Colleges or Schools may adopt additional or more specific requirements in their approved policy documents (see below).

In addition to APS 1405.11.IV.A.2, the School has additional specific criteria and considerations for the promotion of *Associate Professor to Full Professor including for faculty with titles of Teaching, Research, Clinical, or Professor of Practice:*

A candidate for promotion to the rank of Full Professor should:

1. Satisfy the criteria for appointment as a Full Professor.
2. Evidence stature as an accomplished, advanced and significantly productive scholar who has achieved a national or international reputation with demonstrated and significant professional accomplishments in teaching, research and/or creative activity, and service.

*Promotion from Professor to University Professor or Distinguished Professor:*

Specific criteria for promotion to University Professor or Distinguished Professor are contained in Board Policy 470.1 and Academic Policy 1405.13.

## **4.2 Procedures for Promotion**

The Fay Jones School of Architecture and Design adopts parts 1-24 of APS 1405.11.IV.B. In addition to the Fay Jones School of Architecture and Design has the following additional procedure:

*Faculty Committees:*

When a Department Head is being considered for promotion the Dean shall appoint a tenured faculty member from within the School, and he or she shall serve all roles designated for the Department Head in the procedures listed above. The appointed faculty member must be at or above the rank being applied for by the candidate. The appointed faculty member shall not be a member of the school-wide Tenure and Promotion Committee. His or her report will be accurately conveyed to the school-wide committee by the non-voting member of the School-wide committee that represents the home department of the candidate.

## **5.0 TENURE**

The Fay Jones School of Architecture and Design adopts APS 1405.11.V. The School adds the following considerations:

Recommendations for tenure shall be based on criteria consistent with the Mission of the Fay Jones School of Architecture and Design, and related to a candidate's appointment responsibilities and activities, or those otherwise charged by the candidate's department head through annual workload assignments during the probationary period. A high level of performance while in the most recent rank, as demonstrated through the accumulated evidence of the candidate's annual reviews, is expected. Candidates must also clearly demonstrate a reasonable expectation of success and progress after tenure, as benefitting the applicant and the School.

The Dean's approval of departmental criteria and procedures for tenure are predicated on consistency and common consensus across the School's three constituent departments.

### **5.1 Criteria for Awarding Tenure**

The Fay Jones School of Architecture and Design adopts APS 1405.11.V.A.

### **5.2 Procedures for Awarding Tenure**

The Fay Jones School of Architecture and Design adopts APS 1405.11.V.B.

### **5.3 Procedures for Suspending Probationary Period**

The Fay Jones School of Architecture and Design adopts APS 1405.11.V.C.

### **5.4 Mandatory Sixth Year Review - Terminal Appointment**

The Fay Jones School of Architecture and Design adopts APS 1405.11.V.D.

An individual in a tenure-track position who was not awarded tenure within any of the first six academic year or fiscal year appointments must be evaluated for tenure as set forth in Section IV.A. Board Policy 405.1 during the sixth appointment. If they are not approved for tenure, the seventh appointment shall be a terminal appointment and the individual may not be reconsidered for tenure during the seventh appointment. Additionally, no individual shall be considered for tenure and/or promotion during a terminal appointment.

## **6.0 DISMISSAL OF FACULTY**

The Fay Jones School of Architecture and Design adopts APS 1405.11.VI and 1405.11.VII.