These standards, processes, and procedures are to be applied in making all reappointment, tenure, and promotion decisions in the Department of Architecture. This document is subsidiary to and elaborates on the following:

- University of Colorado Regent Laws, in particular Article 5 and Appendix A (http://www.cusys.edu/~regents/LawsPolicies/).
- The University of Colorado Faculty Handbook, in particular, Part 4 (http://www.cu.edu/Faculty_Handbook).
- The University of Colorado System Administrative Policy Statements, in particular “Performance Ratings for Faculty,” and “Procedures for Written Standards and Criteria for Pre-Tenure Faculty.”
- The policies and procedures documents of the University of Colorado at Denver, especially “Strategies for Success” and the memorandum “Reappointment, Tenure, and Promotion,” dated August 10, 2000.
- College of Architecture and Planning Bylaws, in particular, Section 10.

1. DESCRIPTION OF THE DEPARTMENT AND ITS FACULTY:
The Architecture Department offers a professional Master of Architecture degree, accredited by the National Architectural Accrediting Board. The M.Arch. degree is required by most states for licensure. Additionally, Architecture faculty members participate in three interdisciplinary college programs: a pre-professional Bachelor of Environmental Design program, a Design and Planning doctoral program, and an interdisciplinary Master of Urban Design program.

Architecture is a field with broad concerns, encompassing not only professional applications, but aspects of these areas: the arts, the humanities, the social sciences, and the natural sciences. Course offerings are grouped into four categories: Design Studies, Cultural Studies, Technology Studies, and Professional Studies. Consequently, the Department needs a diverse regular faculty in terms of education, experience, and expertise. Many current members have interdisciplinary training and interdisciplinary abilities for teaching, research, and creative work.

Regular faculty members of the Department of Architecture also need to follow diverse career paths. Some are publishing scholars, focusing on the history, criticism, and theory of architecture. Some combine teaching with limited consulting and professional practice, while some are employed part-time by the University and are in part-time practice. Some faculty members may combine creative work with scholarly research. The Department of Architecture concurs with the spirit of a 1996 Carnegie Foundation report on architectural education, which urged the academy to value, “the scholarship of discovery, the scholarship of integration, the scholarship of application, and the scholarship of teaching.” Therefore, candidate’s records may reflect diverse career paths.
2. DEFINITIONS:
(i) “Primary Unit” means the tenured and tenure track members of the Architecture Department faculty, who are eligible to make recommendations concerning reappointment, tenure and promotion. Only members of the primary unit holding tenure shall vote on decisions relating to tenure, although other faculty members may be present during the discussion prior to the vote. Faculty members who are on leave the semester during which a review is completed may vote on a candidate only if they have personally read the dossier materials and participated in the discussion and vote of the Primary Unit. No faculty member may vote on the Evaluation Committee Report by written proxy. Meetings where votes are taken must be conveniently scheduled. The Chair of the Primary Unit is the chair of the Architecture Department. The results of the vote of the Primary Unit will be forwarded in writing by the Department Chair to the Dean, indicating how many people voted and how many voted in each category: yes, no, abstain.

(ii) “Evaluation Committee” refers to the group within the Primary Unit that is delegated with the responsibility of initially reviewing the qualifications of candidates for reappointment, tenure, and promotion. Each candidate will have a committee. Each committee will be composed of three faculty members chosen from the Primary Unit, who are at or above the rank of the candidate. Evaluation Committees will be elected by the Primary Unit Faculty no later than the last Architecture Department faculty meeting of the academic year before the candidate comes up for review. Evaluation Committees will elect their own chairs. Administrators and faculty members who will review a candidate at later stages shall not serve on that primary unit Evaluation Committee. Recommendations of the Evaluation Committee are advisory to the faculty of the Primary Unit and to the Dean. The written report of the Evaluation Committee will be presented in writing to the Primary Unit. It may be approved or amended, and then it will be forwarded to the Dean by the Chair of the Department.

3. POLICIES SPECIFIC TO THE DEPARTMENT OF ARCHITECTURE
(i) The Department of Architecture is committed to supporting faculty members with various and evolving career paths. We value the combination of academic and professional expertise, and the idea that research and/or creative work patterns may change over time.

(ii) The concept of peer review in three areas is essential to the evaluation process. Those three areas are: teaching, research and/or creative work, and service. Consistent with the Laws of the Regents, persons awarded tenure must have demonstrated meritorious performance in each of the three areas, and excellence in either teaching or research and/or creative work. Candidates for re-appointment must show potential to perform at these levels at the time they are considered for tenure.

(iii) The Department has established a procedure for the peer review of non-traditional forms of research or creative work, and of compensated professional consulting work (see Appendix A). Such work will be considered supportive of candidates if it is relevant to their research and/or creative work and if it serves to advance the field of architecture or cognate disciplines.

(iv) In the evaluation of teaching, research or creative work, and service, evaluators at each level will consider a hierarchy of values, asking does the work indicate local, regional, national, or international recognition? As a general rule, awards and publications associated with
universities and professional and scholarly associations are valued over those made by for-profit businesses or trade organizations.
(v) The criteria and standards for these evaluations will be consistent with those used in the University of Colorado’s yearly Faculty Report of Professional Activities.
(vi) Recommendations for reappointment, promotion, and tenure will be based on a study of the complete record and the entire career of each candidate. Candidates must submit complete records in accordance with the various rules referenced in this document.
(vii) Credit for previous academic experience will be granted and will be stated explicitly in the initial appointment letter. The Department Chair is responsible for informing candidates for reappointment, tenure, and promotion about the schedules of reviews, their processes, and criteria.
(viii) The Dean, the Dean’s Advisory Committee, the Members of the Primary Unit, and the Department Chair will have access to all materials about the candidate gathered by the Evaluation Committee.
(ix) All faculty members have an ethical obligation to respect the confidentiality of personnel deliberations.
(x) All faculty members are expected to disclose any and all conflicts of interest or apparent conflicts of interest and to recuse themselves from personnel decisions and recommendations when such conflict of interest exists or may appear to exist.
(xi) For Comprehensive Reviews, letters will be solicited from a total of at least four external reviewers with at most one selected from the candidate's list, and at least three selected outside the candidate’s list.

4. CRITERIA AND STANDARDS FOR EVALUATION OF FACULTY MEMBERS, SPECIFIC TO THE DEPARTMENT OF ARCHITECTURE
(i) Terminal degrees: Ph.D. or equivalent in architecture or related field; M.Arch; or licensure in Architecture.
(ii) Teaching: the evaluation processes, criteria, and standards will be consistent with the documents listed in the introduction above. Below are elaborations specific to the Department of Architecture.
• The Evaluation Committee will consider the entire body of Faculty Course Evaluations, including all the sub-categories, not only the course and instructor ratings.
• Reports on class visitations on three separate occasions are mandatory as a part of all RTP evaluations. The visitations will be arranged in advance with the candidate by the Evaluation Committee.
• The Evaluation Committee will hold structured interviews with members of classes that the candidate is currently teaching or has recently taught. The Committee will consult with the candidate regarding who will be interviewed.
• The Evaluation Committee shall solicit confidential written reports from graduates of the Department regarding teaching abilities of the candidate. The Committee will consult with the candidate regarding who will be contacted.
• The Department of Architecture values team-teaching. Confidential statements will be solicited from co-teachers.
• The Department of Architecture values interdisciplinary teaching. Appropriate peer evaluation should be solicited.
• The Department of Architecture values alternative methods of course delivery and its faculty members’ activities in this respect. Appropriate peer evaluation should be sought.
• The evaluation committee will assess the quality of the papers and projects produced by the candidate’s students.
• The evaluation committee will consider the candidate’s course loads and student credit hour generation during the review period, in comparison to department averages.
• The candidate’s dossier statement about teaching should make specific reference to the College and Department strategic plan.

(iii) Research and Creative Work: the evaluation processes, criteria, and standards will be consistent with the documents listed in the introduction above. Below are elaborations specific to the Department of Architecture.
• The following items listed under Research/Creative Work in the College of Architecture and Planning Bylaws are considered in the Service category by the Department of Architecture:
  (10) Offices held in professional and academic organizations
  (11) Organization of conferences
  (27) Positions on juries
  (32) Recognition in institutional or governmental advisory boards.
It is recognized that in exceptional circumstances, if the work is peer reviewed and if the authorship is clear, such work may be considered research or creative work.
• The Department of Architecture values participation in design competitions by members of its faculty.
• The Department of Architecture values invitations to participate in design projects.
• The Department of Architecture values interdisciplinary, collaborative work.
• The Department of Architecture values the integration of teaching with research and creative work.
• The Department of Architecture values non-traditional forms of scholarship and creative work and non-traditional venues for publication. However, such work must be peer reviewed in accordance with procedures outlined in Appendix A.
• The Department of Architecture values the professional practice of architecture, including compensated work. However, such work must be peer reviewed in accordance with procedures outlined in Appendix A.
• The candidate’s dossier statement about research or creative work should make specific reference to the College and Department strategic plan.

(iv) Service: the evaluation processes, criteria, and standards will be consistent with the documents listed in the introduction above. Below are elaborations specific to the Department of Architecture.
• The following items listed under Research/Creative Work in the College of Architecture and Planning Bylaws are considered in the Service category by the Department of Architecture:
  (10) Offices held in professional and academic organizations
  (11) Organization of conferences
  (27) Positions on juries
  (32) Recognition in institutional or governmental advisory boards
• No amount of teaching, research, creative work, or other types of service exempts a faculty member from a minimum of departmental service.
• The Department of Architecture will consider for evaluative purposes non-pro bono activities in those categories where the College’s Bylaws refer to pro bono service. It is important that candidates identify compensated service as such. The Evaluation Committee will justify the inclusion of such work in its report.
• Minimum amounts of service of all types will be determined in relation to the candidate’s contract and rank. The normal expectation is that 20% of the work-week or eight hours will, on average, be devoted to service activities throughout the year.
• The candidate’s dossier statement about service should make specific reference to the College and Department strategic plan.

APPENDIX A: PROCEDURE FOR PEER EVALUATION OF NON-TRADITIONAL AND COMPENSATED WORK
The Evaluation Committee will solicit assessments of all the candidate’s work from external reviewers in accordance with University policies and this document (i.e. a minimum of six reviewers for tenure and four for comprehensive review). However, with respect to non-traditional work (websites, for example) and compensated work (completed buildings, for example) an additional process may be used, by mutual agreement between the candidate and the Evaluation Committee. For the evaluation of such work, no less than three additional, objective outside reviewers must appraise it positively in writing. These three reviewers will be chosen by the evaluation committee; no more than one may be selected from a list provided by the candidate. Reviewers will be asked to disclose any association with the candidate and to enclose of a copy of their own vita. Reviewers will be asked to indicate whether they consider the work to be of local, regional, national, or international significance. Any and all materials to be considered by the Evaluation Committee which are not already peer reviewed or for which the candidate received outside compensation, may be evaluated under the above procedures. This process is not mandatory. However, works that are compensated and not otherwise peer reviewed may not be counted for reappointment, promotion, and tenure if this procedure is not followed.