

College of Architecture and Planning

Statement of Guidelines and Standards for Retention, Promotion, and Tenure

Approved by the Faculty: February 29, 2012

Approved by the Dean: February 29, 2012

Approved by the University RPT Standards Committee February 1, 2013 for implementation as of July 1, 2013

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
I. UNIVERSITY REGULATIONS AND PROCEDURES	2
II. OVERVIEW OF THE RPT PROCESS	2
III. COLLEGE STRUCTURE AND MISSION	3
IV. DEPARTMENTAL RPT ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEMBERSHIP	3
V. DEPARTMENTAL RPT PROCEDURES AND TIMELINE	4
VI. COLLEGE CRITERIA AND EVALUATION GUIDELINES	6
A. Criteria for Retention, Promotion, and Tenure	6
B. Guidelines for the Evaluation of Scholarship and Creative Work	7
C. Guidelines for the Evaluation of Teaching	9
D. Guidelines for the Evaluation of Service	10
VII. APPENDICES	12
Appendix A- Notice of URPTSC Final Approval	12

COLLEGE OF ARCHITECTURE and PLANNING
University of Utah
Statement of Guidelines and Standards for Retention, Promotion, and Tenure

The objective of this Statement is to provide uniform guidelines, standards, and procedures for faculty decisions related to retention, promotion, and tenure (RPT) action. The Statement outlines college-specific procedures for RPT reviews and defines the criteria used in RPT decisions for the departments of the College.

I. UNIVERSITY REGULATIONS AND PROCEDURES

University policies concerning retention, promotion, and tenure are contained in the University Regulations Library, in policies 6-300, 6-301, 6-302, 6-303, and 6-311, the current versions of which are available on-line at <http://www.regulations.utah.edu/index.html>. The College has developed its RPT standards and procedures in accord with these policies. *It is the responsibility of each faculty member to be familiar with all RPT policies and procedures contained in this Statement and in the University Policies.*

II. OVERVIEW OF THE RPT PROCESS

Typically, new entry-level tenure-track faculty in the College of Architecture and Planning are appointed at the Assistant Professor rank and have a probationary period of seven years. Consideration for promotion to the rank of Associate Professor and tenure customarily occur simultaneously. Each non-tenured Instructor, Assistant Professor, Associate Professor, and Professor are reviewed annually to assess their achievement in teaching, research/creative activity, faculty responsibility, and service, except during the faculty member's first year. On the third and fifth years there are formal retention reviews, with informal reviews in the second, fourth, and sixth years. A formal review for tenure and promotion to Associate Professor typically occurs in the seventh year. Shortening or extending of the probationary period for individual cases may occur in accord with relevant University Policies (6-311, 6-314, 6-315). Associate Professors with tenure may request, after five years at the Associate rank, that a formal review for promotion to Professor be conducted.

A. Informal Reviews

Informal retention reviews for non-tenured regular faculty members occur every year that does not have a formal review, beginning in the second year. The College purpose for these informal reviews are of a mentoring nature and are intended to provide regular feedback and guidance for junior faculty working toward tenure and promotion. Informal reviews are conducted by the department chair at the end of the fall semester and are based on an internal assessment of the candidate's record as well as a personal interview. The chair will request each candidate to submit a file containing appropriate materials, including but not limited to a curriculum vita and recent publications, that pertain to the review. The chair will schedule a face-to-face meeting with the candidate to discuss the candidate's progress based on the file. Upon completion of the informal review, the chair will provide a written report to the department RPT Advisory Committee chair and to the candidate. Both the committee chair and the candidate shall have the opportunity to respond to the report. The report and the responses, if any, are then filed in the candidate's cumulative file with a copy of each sent to the Dean of the College. Pursuant to University Policy 6-303-III-B-1-c, inadequate progress at the time of an informal review may lead to a "triggered" formal review.

B. Formal Reviews

Because the College of Architecture and Planning is a two-department college, University Policy 6-003-III-Sec. 2.C requires that the procedures for formal review differ from those in larger colleges. Nevertheless, all decisions for retention, promotion, and tenure involve multiple levels of formal RPT review. There are four independent RPT recommendations in the College generated from the following sources: (1) the Student Advisory Committee (SAC) which consists of undergraduate and graduate students from the relevant department, (2) the department RPT Advisory Committee whose membership is described below, (3) the chair of the department, and (4) the dean. Additionally, in those cases where candidates hold joint appointments in other college departments or programs, the recommendations of these college departments or programs are also solicited and included in the RPT formal review deliberations.

At the university level, the Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs reviews the file and refers it to the University Promotion and Tenure Advisory Committee (UPTAC) for a recommendation. Final decisions regarding retention, promotion, and tenure are made by the President of the University.

C. Implementation Date and Application to Existing Faculty

The RPT standards, criteria, and procedures contained in this Statement come into effect as of July 1, 2013. All faculty member RPT candidates appointed on or after this date will be considered under these RPT standards and procedures. Candidates whose appointments began prior to that date who are formally reviewed for retention or the granting of tenure will have the option of choosing the RPT requirements in effect at the time of their initial appointment as a member of the department's tenure-track faculty or the RPT requirements contained in this Statement. Previously appointed candidates to be reviewed for promotion to the rank of Professor may choose to be reviewed under the requirements in effect at the time of their initial appointment to the tenure-track faculty only for reviews completed in or before the 2015-16 academic year. In each case, the requirements contained in this Statement will apply unless the candidate's choice of prior requirements is communicated to the department chairperson by signed letter before evaluation materials are sent to evaluators for external evaluations (See V-C-2 below).

All decisions with respect to retention, promotion, and tenure must not discriminate on the basis of race, national origin, sex or gender, sexual orientation, age, religion, status as a physically challenged individual, gender identity or expression, or veteran status.

III. COLLEGE STRUCTURE AND MISSION STATEMENT

The College of Architecture and Planning brings together a community of students, faculty, and staff with a broad range of interests and expertise in creative design, building, planning, computer technology, issues of social and ecological responsibility, and the scholarly study of the history and theory of the built landscape. In this wide range of interests is a common concern for constructing and maintaining the highest quality in our built and natural environments. To this end, the school offers academically and professionally oriented degree programs in several related fields, including professionally accredited programs in architecture and city and metropolitan planning.

IV. DEPARTMENTAL RPT ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEMBERSHIP

During each academic year, each department in the College forms an RPT Advisory Committee "of the whole." However, membership on this committee will vary for different actions taken during the year depending on the candidate(s) under review. The membership structures described below exclude any faculty member who would have an independent RPT recommendation at a different level of review (e.g., the department chair, and college dean, or university president, if a member of the College). Per Policy 6-303-III-A-3 & E-5, such officers may attend committee meetings (unless the committee moves to executive session), and upon invitation by the majority may also participate in discussion, but cannot vote as members of the committee. The chairperson of the committee shall be elected annually from tenured members. In this election all regular faculty through the instructor rank shall be entitled to vote. In the event that the elected chair is ineligible for some committee decisions (e.g., an Associate Professor is not eligible to vote in reviews for promotion to Professor), then a second chair will be elected for those reviews.

Committee Structure for Retention Reviews. All tenured faculty members, regardless of rank, are eligible to participate in the consideration of and to vote on recommendations in individual cases on matters of retention. Other tenure-track faculty members may participate in the consideration of candidates for retention, but may not vote.

Committee Structure for Promotion Reviews. All tenured faculty members of equal or higher rank than that proposed for the candidate for promotion are eligible to participate in the consideration of and to vote on recommendations in individual cases on matters of promotion. Other tenured and tenure-track faculty members may participate in the consideration of candidates for promotion, but may not vote.

Committee Structure for Tenure Reviews. All tenured faculty members, regardless of rank, are eligible to participate in the consideration of and to vote on recommendations in individual cases on matters of tenure. Other tenure-track faculty members may participate in the consideration of candidates for tenure, but may not vote.

In the event that there are fewer than three faculty eligible to vote on a recommendation for a particular candidate, the chair will, pursuant to University Policy 6-303-III-A-3-a-iv, recommend to the dean one or more faculty members with the appropriate tenure status and rank and with some knowledge of the candidate's field from other units of the University of Utah or from emeritus faculty. In advance of the chair's contacting such faculty members, the chair shall notify the candidate of the potential persons to be asked, and the candidate must be offered the opportunity to comment in writing on the suitability of the potential committee members. The final selection rests with the dean.

V. DEPARTMENTAL PROCEDURES AND TIMELINE—Formal Reviews

The procedures described here are listed in chronological order. However, the timing of some steps can vary from year to year. Most procedures listed here are dictated by university RPT policies, but some are specific to the College. These procedures are applicable only for formal reviews (see Part II-B for informal reviews).

A. Spring Semester Prior to Anticipated RPT Reviews

The department chair notifies faculty members with obligatory RPT reviews in the upcoming year. The chair sends a letter to each candidate detailing what is required. Copies of University Policies 6-303 and 6-311, and the College statement of RPT standards and procedures are included.

B. Summer Semester Prior to Anticipated RPT Reviews

The department chair notifies appropriate tenured faculty and tenure-track faculty asking if they wish to request a formal review for promotion or tenure in the upcoming year.

Pursuant to Policy 6-303-III-D-9, the RPT Advisory Committee chair requests that each formal review candidate nominate seven established scholars from other universities or research institutions that have expertise related to the candidate's areas of scholarship and creative work who may act as external evaluators of the candidate's work. No external evaluators are used during informal review years. In submitting a list of nominees, candidates must describe the qualifications of each potential evaluator (institution, rank or position, and demonstrated areas of expertise). The candidate must also describe any professional and/or personal relationship that exists between the candidate and each potential evaluator. The chair also solicits nominations of external evaluators from the faculty and RPT advisory committee. From these nominations the chair selects a minimum of five external evaluators. College policy stipulates that at least three of the external evaluators will be chosen from the candidate's recommended list and if not, an explanation of why a decision was made to accept less than the prescribed number will be placed in the candidate's file.

The department chair requests that each candidate sign a waiver/non-waiver form concerning the confidentiality of the external evaluators' recommendations.

C. Fall Semester of the RPT Review Year

1. The RPT File (Policy 6-303-III-D)

Each candidate should begin to compile an RPT file. The department administrative staff provides copies of course evaluation summary sheets for all courses taught by the candidate. The candidate is responsible for the remaining file contents listed here:

- a. An updated curriculum vita
- b. Copies of all publications cited on the candidate's vita since the last formal review. If some are unavailable, this fact should be noted and the reasons should be explained. Publications listed as "accepted" or "in press" should be verified by copies of letters from publishers, formal contracts, etc.
- c. Reproductions of creative work cited on the candidate's vita.
- d. Reproductions of a Teacher Portfolio of Student Work, if applicable.
- e. A personal statement that explains the materials in the file, highlights achievements of special note, describes work in progress, and sets forth professional objectives.
- f. Other professionally relevant materials that the candidate wishes to include (e.g., published reviews or commentary on something published by the candidate, course materials, letters acknowledging public or professional service, etc.).

2. External Evaluators

For formal reviews, the department chair contacts the selected external evaluators requesting that they serve as evaluators. Upon acceptance of the responsibility, the chair sends each evaluator a letter that includes a description of the evaluator's role, the College RPT Statement of Guidelines and Standards, the candidate's vita, selected materials provided by the candidate, and a statement about the candidate's choice regarding confidentiality of the evaluator's comments.

3. The Student Advisory Committee (Policy 6-303-III-C-3)

At the beginning of the fall semester (at least 3 weeks prior to the initial meeting of the RPT Advisory Committee), the department chair will send a letter to the Student Advisory Committee (SAC) requesting it to prepare recommendations on the faculty members being reviewed. The SAC chair is provided with University Policy 6-303, the College's Statement of RPT Standards and Procedures, the University's SAC Faculty Evaluation Report Form, and the University's Guiding Principles for SAC Evaluations of Faculty Members. The SAC should conduct its review in accord with the principles described in the latter document.

4. Notice to Departmental Faculty & Staff (Policy 6-303-III-C-2)

At least three weeks prior to the convening of the RPT Advisory Committee, the department chair invites faculty and staff members in the department to submit signed, written recommendations for the file of each candidate. The chair's invitation will direct faculty and staff to include in any recommendation specific reasons for the recommendation.

5. Closing the File/File Contents

The RPT file of each candidate should be closed by October 20 (or an alternative date specified by the RPT Committee chair). It should contain all materials supplied by the candidate; letters from external evaluators (in formal reviews only); the SAC report; additional letters submitted by other faculty, staff, students, or other interested individuals; and key documents from previous formal and informal reviews. The candidate has the right to examine the contents of the file at any time, except for external evaluator letters if the candidate waived his or her right to see them. The candidate can also add responses to the contents of the file at various times specified below (except to the external evaluator letters if the waiver was signed). The RPT files are kept in a secure location by the department chair and the files are made available to members of the RPT Advisory Committee upon request.

6. Committee Reviewers

The RPT Advisory Committee holds an initial meeting to determine primary and secondary internal reviewers for each candidate. All committee members are expected to examine each candidate's file, but the two designated internal reviewers chosen from the faculty are charged with thoroughly reviewing all materials in the RPT file and presenting them to the RPT Advisory Committee during the formal review. The primary reviewer will coordinate this effort and the secondary reviewer will assist.

7. Committee Meetings & Voting (Policy 6-303-III-A-3 & E)

The chair of the RPT Advisory Committee calls the RPT formal review meeting(s), preferably by November 1. At least two-thirds of the committee must be present to form a quorum. All members of the eligible faculty are encouraged to participate in the formal review process. The Advisory Committee chair chooses a secretary for the meeting. The secretary records minutes of the meeting. Minutes for each candidate should be extensive enough to cover all essential elements of the discussion, but participants in the discussion should not be named or identified in any way.

For each candidate, the RPT Advisory Committee votes on summary ratings in three separate performance areas: scholarship and creative work, teaching, and service. These performance areas are described in Section VI of this document. In addition, separate votes are taken for each action under consideration (retention, promotion, and/or tenure). All votes will be open unless a majority of the committee decides to utilize secret ballots. Whenever practicable, the department chair shall advise all members on leave or otherwise absent of the proposed action and shall request their written opinions and votes. Absent members' written opinions shall be disclosed at the meeting and their votes will be counted the same as other votes. Absentee votes must be received prior to the meeting at which a vote is taken by the RPT Advisory Committee. Results of each vote are recorded in the formal minutes of the meeting.

8. Committee Report

In formal reviews, the chair of the RPT Advisory Committee prepares a written summary of the RPT review meeting(s) for the candidate. This summary contains a report on the outcome of all votes, outlines committee recommendations, and provides a brief summary of the contents of the letters from external evaluators. The summary of letters from external evaluators must be made without identifying the evaluators if the candidate waived the right to see the external evaluator letters. The summary report is then shared with all committee members. The committee is given up to five working days to recommend modifications. Copies of the final report are forwarded to the department chair and to the candidate.

9. Chair & Dean Recommendations (Policy 6-303-III-F,G, H, I.; Policy 6-003-III-Sec. 2.C).

Subsequent to receiving the final report of the RPT Advisory Committee, the department chair prepares his or her written recommendations with respect to the candidate, stating specifically the reasons for the recommendations, and sends an exact copy of her/his recommendations to the candidate. The candidate then has the opportunity at this time, but not the obligation, to add a written statement to his/her formal review file in response to the summary report of the RPT Advisory Committee and/or the evaluation of the department chair. Written notice of this option will be included with the copy of the chair's recommendation that is sent to the candidate. If the candidate chooses to add such a statement to the file, that statement must be submitted to the department chair within seven business days, except in extenuating circumstances, of the date upon which the chair's recommendation is delivered to the candidate. If the candidate submits a written statement to the department chair within this time limit, the candidate's statement will be added to the review file without comment by the chair.

After the department chair has provided an adequate opportunity for the candidate to submit a written statement (at least seven business days), the chair will forward the complete file to the dean. The dean will prepare his or her own written recommendation, with copies to the department chair, the RPT Advisory Committee chair, and the candidate. In formal reviews, the candidate has seven days following receipt of the dean's letter to add responses to the file if he or she wishes to do so.

In formal reviews, the dean forwards the complete file, including the RPT Advisory Committee's letter, the chair's letter, the dean's letter, and any responses from the candidate to the Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs, who will refer the file to UPTAC.

VI. COLLEGE CRITERIA AND EVALUATION GUIDELINES

A. Criteria for Retention, Promotion and Tenure (Policy 6-303-III-A-2)

A faculty member's standing in the College is based on three functions: (1) scholarship and creative work; (2) teaching; and (3) professional, university, and public service. The assessment may also consider the candidate's conduct as a responsible member of the faculty. Summary ratings of these functions will serve as the criteria for retention, promotion, and tenure. Possible ratings for each function are *exceptional*, *excellent*, *meritorious*, *satisfactory*, and *not satisfactory*. The specifics of this rating system are defined below in the sections pertaining to the activities under evaluation. In general, the department's rating of "excellent" coincides with the University standard of "excellent," and the department's rating of "meritorious" coincides with the University standard of "sustained effectiveness."

The criteria for retention at the Assistant Professor rank, tenure, and promotion to the Associate Professor and Professor ranks are listed here. Implicit in the criteria for each level is the concept that excelling in one area does not compensate for substandard performance in another area. The same criteria apply to both formal and informal reviews. Evaluation guidelines for ratings in scholarship and creative work, teaching, and service are described in subsequent sections.

Assistant Professor: Retention at this rank requires ratings of at least *meritorious* in either teaching *or* scholarship and creative work, with at least *satisfactory* in the two other functions.

Associate Professor: Promotion to this rank requires ratings of at least *excellent* in either teaching *or* scholarship and creative work, and with a rating of at least *meritorious* in the each of the other two functions.

Professor: Promotion to this rank requires a rating of *excellent* in teaching *and* scholarship and creative work, and of at least *meritorious* in service.

An *exceptional* rating in any performance function will be recognized and taken into consideration in evaluating all candidates.

Tenure: The requirements for achieving tenure are the same as those requirements for promotion to Associate Professor. With tenure, a permanent relationship between the faculty member and the University is implied, along with the expectation that the candidate has clearly demonstrated that he/she will continue to be a productive faculty member over time. In the event that a person is hired at or promoted to the rank of Associate Professor before achieving tenure, the subsequent conferral of tenure requires that the faculty member has provided convincing evidence that he or she will continue to achieve the standards expected of an Associate Professor and is likely to achieve the standards expected for promotion to the rank of Professor. In the event that a person is hired at or promoted to the rank of Professor before achieving tenure, the subsequent conferral of tenure requires that the faculty member has provided convincing evidence that he or she will continue to achieve the standards expected of a Professor.

Evaluation Process and Summary Rankings. An individual's activities in the areas of scholarship and creative work, teaching, and service will be considered in terms of their significance and constancy. The data gathered on a faculty member at the time of consideration for retention, promotion or tenure is considered to be predictive of future activity.

The evaluation process occurs in the areas of scholarship and creative work, teaching, and service. Within the scholarship and creative work area, evaluation is broken into three categories: innovation, significance, and impact. Candidates receive Level I, II, or III ratings in each of the areas/categories. Summary rankings are determined qualitatively by generally assessing the "levels" of output and production for each candidate, with substantive documentation of the determinants for the candidate's ranking.

B. Guidelines for the Evaluation of Scholarship and Creative Work

Judgments about a faculty member's scholarship and creative work are based on both the quality and quantity of scholarly and creative products. The characteristics of productive scholarship and creative work can differ as a function of the faculty member's program, special interests and capabilities, areas of research or creative work, and professional goals. Consequently, there are no strict quantitative criteria for amount and type of scholarly and creative work at the various faculty ranks. Rather, assessments of faculty scholarship and creative work in the RPT process reflect professional judgments that balance the quality and quantity of contributions and take into account the overall professional output and productivity of the faculty member.

Quantity of Scholarship and Creative Work

Faculty at all ranks are expected to demonstrate a range of scholarly/creative activity commensurate with the ranking, rather than a specific number of activities. Quantity, however, is one measure of accomplishment and is particularly important as a sign of continuity, self motivation, and substantive exploration.

Quality of Scholarship and Creative Work

Scholarship and creative work is evaluated with respect to three facets of quality, *innovation*, *significance*, and *impact*. Although these facets are not independent of one another, each defines a different aspect of quality. Overall excellence in scholarship and creative work can be achieved with a variety of products that differ with respect to these quality dimensions. However, judging the quality of scholarly/creative contributions is an essential part of evaluating faculty members in the area of scholarship and creative work, and these facets define the forms of scholarship and creative work that generally signify greater quality and importance.

1. Innovation

The mission of the University is, in part, to create new knowledge. Consistent with this goal, the quality of scholarly/creative work is evaluated by the degree to which the candidate's work contributes to new understanding. Three performance levels of innovation are listed below (Levels I-III), reflecting a general ordering from great to lesser significance. This ordering does not imply that the lower levels have no value. All levels represent traditional forms of scholarly/creative work that have a place in the various discipline areas contained within the College of Architecture and Planning. However, some scholarship and creative work reflect to a higher degree the University mission of creating new knowledge, and the College recognizes the greater significance of these forms.

Level I

This category includes scholarly/creative products that present new theory, methodology, or empirical evidence. New theory refers to an original proposal/idea that explains a system of behavior or design process, not simply new hypotheses or models of isolated behaviors. New empirical evidence can be quantitative or qualitative, but the emphasis is on the development of new and original understanding from the data, not merely an empirical description of phenomena. New methodological contributions can take many forms (e.g., research-related methods or methods of professional practice), but to belong in this category, contributions must be novel rather than re-expressions of existing methods.

Level II

This category includes work that presents a new synthesis of existing knowledge with new implications for future research and theory.

Level III

In this category are included scholarly/creative products that report new empirical evidence but with little or no development of new conceptual understanding (empirical studies that describe phenomena, e.g., surveys and other descriptive methods, without testing, contrasting, or proposing theoretical explanations fall under this heading); products that summarize existing knowledge (previously generated theory, concepts, methodologies, and/or empirical findings); and products that comment on or review previously published publications and materials.

2. Significance of the Scholarly/Creative Work.

The quality of scholarly and creative contributions is judged in part by the type of outlets in which they appear and the level of difficulty in achieving them. Three performance levels of scholarly/creative work are listed below in their order of significance. Common examples of work within these levels are also listed. The examples are meant to serve only as general guidelines for assessing the significance of the work; some types of scholarship and creative work may not be listed as examples. Each piece of scholarship and/or creative work is therefore to be considered for its own unique merits relative to this facet of quality. The scholarship and creative work distinctions are not mutually exclusive; candidates may move freely between categories in developing their resumes.

Level I

Examples of Level I scholarship include but are not limited to authored and edited books from nationally and internationally recognized presses, book chapters in peer-reviewed books, peer-reviewed articles or book reviews in national or international journals, funded international or national research grants or fellowships, major venue exhibition catalogs, and invited/funded international and national addresses and presentations.

Examples of Level I creative work include but are not limited to designs that are built or designs that are published in national or international journals, design competition awards, funded international or national research grants, exhibiting designs in professional galleries, and invited/funded international or national addresses and presentations.

Level II

Works at Level II in the area of scholarship include but are not limited to authored and edited books from state and local presses, peer-reviewed article or book review in a state or local journal, local/university grants and fellowships, juried presentations at national/international professional conferences, invited/funded local/university addresses or presentations, and local/university exhibition catalogs.

Works at Level II in the creative area include but are not limited to un-built designs, designs published in regional or local journals, international or national design competition entries, local/university creative grants and awards, and local/university exhibitions.

Level III

Works in the Level III category for scholarship include but are not limited to non-juried articles, papers on professional topics for a professional audience, juried lectures or addresses at state and local conferences, invited talks at state and local venues, unfunded grant proposals, articles in the popular press, technical reports, and publication in conference proceedings.

Works in the *Level III* category in the creative area include but are not limited to funded design consulting, state and local design competition entries.

3. Impact of the Work

Judgments of impact (or predicted impact) range from minimal to exceptionally high. These judgments are based on the RPT Advisory Committee members' individual assessments of the work, conclusions from qualified external evaluators, and in some cases other forms of recognition such as awards and honors. The impact of a work may be evident in the degree to which the work has been cited, used, or referred to.

Level I

The scholarly or creative work has inspired and changed the field of study, is referred to as groundbreaking, considered extremely important and/or stimulating and/or challenging, gains national and international recognition, is regularly cited, used or referred to, and emulated. This rating is reserved for scholarship and creative work of the highest quality.

Level II

The scholarly or creative work is significant, innovative, and challenging, attaining a national or state reputation. Work in this category makes a meaningful contribution to a particular field of inquiry, is cited and referred to, and is considered above the norm.

Level III

The scholarly or creative work is not considered a significant contribution to the field, but allows the candidate to enter the field and join in or comment on a body of work or a creative trend mostly created by others. Work in this category is not cited or regarded as an example or as advancement in practice. This work may, however, indicate a strong future potential for the candidate in a sustainable and eventually productive area of work.

Summary Ranking Scale for Scholarship and Creative Work

The ranking below reflects the joint consideration of quantity and quality of scholarship and creative work as described above, given the faculty member's time in rank.

Exceptional: The candidate clearly stands out as one of the most innovative, productive, and highly-regarded practitioners in their field/fields. This ranking is reserved for rare instances of truly superior work.

Excellent: The candidate has made outstanding and sustained scholarly or creative contributions in one or more areas. The contributions are original, consistent over time, and have established the individual as a recognized scholar in their areas of research and practice.

Meritorious: The candidate has made significant and sustained contributions in one or more areas of scholarship or creative works. The quality and quantity of scholarship or creative work reflect a substantial, positive impact in at least one area.

Satisfactory: The candidate has made some scholarly/creative contributions but the quality or quantity of existing contributions suggest that additional efforts need to be made to be sustainable over time.

Not Satisfactory: The candidate's scholarly/creative contributions are lacking in quality and quantity.

C. Guidelines for the Evaluation of Teaching

College faculty are expected to conform to the normal university definition of *teaching*, which means that they are expected to perform regularly scheduled instruction (studios, seminars, and lecture classes), participate in curriculum and program development, direct and evaluate student work, and contribute to the counseling, mentoring, and advising of students in general. Primary materials used in evaluating teaching performance consist of course evaluations and SAC reports, and may include peer reviews of teaching.

Regular teaching assignments are made by the chair, with the number and nature of courses being determined by the role of individual faculty members within the department. It is also recognized that student mentoring with respect to professional practice is a high priority in the scholar-practitioner model of education embraced by the professional nature of the College. For this reason, RPT judgments in the College of Architecture and Planning are made primarily in respect to the candidate's contribution to the overall education mission of the college in the following three levels of significance.

Level I

Activities in this category include engaging students in stimulating, informed, timely, and scholarly course work; employing innovative or especially effective methods of teaching; and receiving consistently high teaching evaluations and strong recommendations from SAC review committees. Other activities in the category include winning national and/or university teaching awards; developing new programs and curricula within the college; being awarded teaching

grants and fellowships; participating in studio juries; supervising teaching and research assistants; raising money for student work through grants and other sources; developing award-winning educational materials (course manuals, software, videos and so forth); and being recognized for work in community continuing education.

Level II

Activities in this category include attending to teaching duties in a timely and informed manner; employing effective methods of teaching; receiving above average teaching evaluations and positive recommendations from SAC review committees; and being nominated for teaching awards, applying for teaching grants; and participating regularly in juries and student advising. Other activities include developing course materials (handouts, videos, manuals etc.) that enhance teaching efforts, or teaching in continuing education programs.

Level III

Activities in this category include performing at a satisfactory level in teaching; receiving average-to-slightly below average evaluations from their students; and having adequate if not laudatory SAC reviews.

Summary Ranking Scale for Teaching

Rankings on the scale below reflect the joint consideration of the components of teaching, relative to the faculty member's time in rank. The first component reflects the fundamental teaching responsibilities of faculty members in this college, and consequently is weighted most heavily. The rankings will consider time in rank.

Exceptional: The candidate clearly stands out as a dedicated, innovative, and gifted scholar-teacher.

Excellent: The candidate ranks above others in teaching effectiveness and performance, and has demonstrated leadership and creativity in development of his or her teaching.

Meritorious: The candidate is an effective teacher with good reviews and performance, and aspires to continuing personal development in teaching.

Satisfactory: The candidate is a less effective teacher than indicated for time in rank, but has strong potential for improvement.

Not Satisfactory: The candidate has made insufficient contributions in the area of teaching given time in rank.

D. Guidelines for the Evaluation of Service

The viability of the College of Architecture and Planning and its departments depends in part on its ability to maintain an active presence in the University system, to represent itself within the larger professional communities, and to maintain itself as a public resource in the region and the world. Although this can be achieved partially through faculty research and teaching, public and professional service is another important mechanism for maintaining this presence. "Community" service can also include teaching service learning courses or community-based studios.

Evaluations are made with respect to three aspects of service: (1) professional service, (2) university service, and (3) community or public service. Note: "Professional" refers to both the professions of architecture and planning, and to the scholarly profession. It is not necessary for a faculty member to participate equally in all three service areas. Differing participation in the three service areas typically reflects the unique strengths and interests of faculty members and the different program foci.

Level I

Professional: Service in this category is with international or national professional organizations and includes such activities as holding offices, participating in the organization or operation of conferences, serving as chair, discussant, or reviewer for presentations at professional meetings, serving on various professional committees, panels, or boards (e.g., accreditation boards), and attending and presenting professional workshops. Significant professional service contributions can also include serving as editor, associate editor, editorial review board member, or regular reviewer for international and national scholarly or professional journals or design competitions.

University: Service in this category includes such things as serving on special university search and advisory committees, chairing university committees, serving in administrative positions in the University, College or Department or representing the University in national or regional activities.

Community: Service on international or national boards or as chair of a significant national or regional organization, or exceptional local leadership and time commitment to local community organizations, including volunteer design work.

Level II

Professional: Service in this category is with smaller regional or local organizations and includes such activities as holding offices, participating in the organization or operation of conferences, serving as a presenter at conferences or meetings, serving on committees, panels, or boards, and presenting professional workshops. Professional service contributions at this level also include serving as editor, associate editor, editorial review board member, or regular reviewer for regional and local journals and design competitions.

University: Service in this category includes membership in important university committees or Academic Senate, chairing of department or college committees, including ad hoc and search committees, and significant contributions to the administration of the unit.

Community: Includes service in regional activities and boards in a leadership position, continuous and influential service to a local organization or assisting with community events.

Level III

Professional: Service in this category includes attendance at meetings, participation as an active member, serving as discussant, or reviewer for presentations at professional meetings.

University: Includes membership on college committees and special college-level administrative assignments.

Community: Includes short-term, intense service to organizations, membership and general participation in local or regional organizations over an extended period of time, activism like letters to the editor or interviews on community issues.

Summary Ranking Scale for Service.

Rankings on the scale below reflect the joint consideration of service contributions in the three areas, relative to the faculty member's time in rank.

Exceptional: The candidate has made an extraordinary commitment to service in all three areas.

Excellent: The candidate has made outstanding and sustained contributions in at least one area of service. The faculty member's service contributions have distinguished him/her as a recognized leader in the profession, University, or community.

Meritorious: The candidate has made significant contributions to his/her profession, the University, and/or the community through professional service.

Satisfactory: The faculty member shows sufficient commitment to service in at least one area, suggesting that the eventual contributions of the faculty member will be significant.

Not Satisfactory: The candidate has made insufficient contributions in the area of service given time in rank.

VII. APPENDICES

Appendix A- Notice of URPTSC Final Approval



395 SOUTH 1500 EAST, ROOM 101 · SALT LAKE CITY, UTAH 84112-0260 · (801) 581-6191 · FAX (801) 585-3219 · WWW.SOCWK.UTAH.EDU

Memorandum

To: Nan Ellin –Chair, Department of City & Metropolitan Planning
 Prescott Muir – Director, School of Architecture
 Brenda Scheer, Dean, College of Architecture + Planning

Cc: Amy Wildermuth, Associate V.P. Academic Affairs

From: Hank Liese, College of Social Work
 Co-Chair, University RPT Standards Committee 2012-2013

Subject: Approval of RPT Statement
Date: February 1, 2013

This is to confirm that the attached version of the College of Architecture + Planning RPT Statement, dated as approved on February 1, 2013 by the University Retention, Promotion, and Tenure Standards Committee (URPTSC), has been reviewed and approved by the Committee pursuant to University Policy 6-303. The Statement may be implemented for RPT proceedings in your College for the academic year 2013-2014 (as of July 1, 2013).

Congratulations on completing the approval process, and revising your Statement to comply with University Policies and to serve well the missions of your College and the University. The URPTSC was pleased to see the College include peer review as one possible method of evaluating teaching performance. The Committee feels strongly that peer observation and evaluation of teaching is a “best practice,” and would encourage the College in the next revision of its Statement to require such observation in the RPT review process, particularly for all formal reviews. Many departments and colleges do so already or are moving in that direction.

Please ensure that a copy of this approval notice is attached to all copies of the final approved version of the RPT Statement.

Two further steps should be taken to ensure an orderly transition from using the version of your department Statement in effect until now, to using this newly approved Statement. First, all current faculty members who will in the future undergo formal reviews for retention, promotion, or tenure should have their attention directed to the passage within the new Statement which describes the “Implementation Date and Application to Existing Faculty,” and provides for certain procedures in making the transition from old to new. Second, those existing faculty members who are currently still in their pre-tenure RPT probationary period are requested to complete the “RPT Transition Choice Form” prior to the start of their next formal review, indicating their choice of having the remaining reviews conducted under the terms of the old or new Statement. That form is available from the office of the Vice President.