

Department of Architecture **REAPPOINTMENT, TENURE, and PROMOTION Criteria**

TABLE OF CONTENTS

A.	Preamble	2
B.	Description of the Department.....	2
C.	Accepted Domains of Scholarship in Architecture.....	2
D.	Department Specific Definitions, Policies and Practices.....	3
	1. <i>Primary Unit Mechanics</i>	3
	2. <i>Primary Unit Evaluation Committee</i>	4
	3. <i>Faculty Support</i>	4
E.	General Principles.....	5
F.	Standards of Performance for Tenure and/or Promotion.....	5
	1. <i>Tenure Standards</i>	6
	2. <i>Promotion Standards</i>	6
G.	Promotion and Tenure Category Descriptions.....	7
	1. <i>Scholarly/Creative work</i>	7
	2. <i>Teaching</i>	8
	3. <i>Leadership/Service</i>	10
H.	External Evaluators.....	11
	1. <i>The Process for Selecting External Evaluators</i>	12
I.	Comprehensive Review	12
J.	Early Tenure	13
K.	Post-Tenure Review.....	13
L.	Professional Plans	13
	APPENDIX.....	14

Department of Architecture REAPPOINTMENT, TENURE, and PROMOTION Criteria

A. PREAMBLE

1. The primary unit's written standards for comprehensive review, tenure, and promotion describe the nature and measures of achievement in teaching, scholarly/creative work, clinical activity, and leadership and service within the discipline that shall be employed in all Promotion, Tenure and Post-Tenure Review evaluations.
2. This document includes the standards used by the Department of Architecture (the "primary unit") to include guidelines/descriptions of "meeting expectations," the standard of acceptable professional performance. The primary unit and reviewing body or person making recommendations concerning comprehensive review, tenure and promotion and post-tenure review¹ shall strictly follow and apply these procedures and standards described herein.
3. These criteria are subject to the current laws and actions of the Regents and to other relevant university policies and procedures as described on the Board of Regents, System and Campus Policies and Procedures webpage, and as may be subsequently revised. These criteria are meant to be applied in a manner consistent with current Regent rules. In the event of conflict, Regent rules shall govern. Additionally, these criteria are responsive to [APS 1022](#) requiring that each unit (department or program serving as a tenure home) reflect its unit-specific features, approved in accordance with the unit's bylaws and by the Dean.

B. DESCRIPTION OF THE DEPARTMENT

Architecture is a field with broad concerns, encompassing not only professional applications but aspects of the following disciplines: the arts, the humanities, the social sciences, and the natural sciences. Consequently, the Department recruits a diverse regular faculty as defined by the Laws of the Regents in terms of education, experience, and expertise to respond to its teaching needs. Many current faculty members have interdisciplinary training and interdisciplinary abilities for teaching, scholarship, and creative work.

C. ACCEPTED DOMAINS OF SCHOLARSHIP IN ARCHITECTURE

In order to assist its faculty as they establish the terms for their tenure and promotion evaluation, the Department of Architecture has accepted the four domains of scholarship identified in the 1996 Carnegie Foundation report on education as the areas in which its faculty will document their performance. Those domains are the scholarship of discovery, the scholarship of integration, the scholarship of application, and the scholarship of teaching. The department consequently values each individual's performance in one or

¹ Each tenure-bearing unit must have a Post-Tenure Review Committee, comprised of members of the tenured faculty. During the year in which a faculty member is undergoing PTR, they should not serve on the PTR evaluation committee. The procedures for PTR are available separately from this document.

more of the domains, and accepts the following as its definitions of the intent and outcomes particular to each domain:

The scholarship of discovery is the commitment to knowledge for its own sake, to freedom of inquiry, and to following in a disciplined fashion an investigation wherever it may lead. Scholarship of discovery contributes not only to the stock of human knowledge, but also to the intellectual climate of the academy. It reflects the investigative tradition in academic life and demonstrates accomplishment in scholarly/creative work.

The scholarship of integration makes connections across disciplines, placing their specialties in larger contexts, and illuminating data in a revealing way through serious, disciplined work that seeks to interpret, draw together, and bring new insight to bear on original research in the field. It reflects the synthesizing tradition in academic life, may result in public scholarship, and demonstrates accomplishment in scholarly/creative work, teaching, and leadership and service.

The scholarship of application is concerned with new intellectual understandings that can arise out of the very act of application: whether in developing architectural technologies, serving the public through contributing to shape public policy, or creating works of architecture. With engaged activities such as these, theory and practice interact seamlessly, and the work of one renews the other, simultaneously applying, contributing to, and advancing human knowledge. Work in this area demonstrates accomplishment in applied scholarly/creative work.

The scholarship of teaching relates to research on the pedagogy of architecture. Work in this area demonstrates accomplishment in teaching along with pedagogically-based research. As such, the scholarship of teaching is evaluated under the criteria and standards for promotion as listed herein.

D. DEPARTMENT SPECIFIC DEFINITIONS, POLICIES AND PRACTICES

1. *Primary Unit Mechanics*

- a. *The Department Chair* is responsible for informing candidates about reappointment, tenure, and promotion, and the schedules of reviews, their processes, and criteria.
- b. *Only members of the primary unit holding tenure* shall vote on decisions relating to tenure, although tenure-track faculty members may also be present during the discussion prior to the vote.
- c. *Faculty members who are on leave* the semester during which a review is completed may not participate in that review process.
- d. *No faculty member* may vote on reappointment, tenure or promotion by written proxy.

- e. *Meetings where votes are taken* must be conveniently scheduled.
- f. *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: yes, no, and abstain.

2. *Primary Unit Evaluation Committee*

- a. *The Primary Unit Evaluation Committee (PUEC)* refers to the tenured members of the Architecture Department faculty, who are eligible to make recommendations concerning reappointment, tenure and promotion.
- b. *Each PUEC will be composed of* three faculty members from the primary unit above the rank of the candidate. If the primary unit does not have three faculty members above the rank of the candidate, the primary unit faculty members may identify and elect qualified faculty members above the rank of the candidate from other CU units (preferably from CU Denver) to serve on the PUEC. Administrators and faculty members who will review a candidate at later stages shall not serve on that PUEC.
- c. *PUEC members must be elected* by the primary unit faculty.
- d. *The primary unit faculty will elect PUECs* no later than the last Department of Architecture faculty meeting of the academic year before the candidate comes up for evaluation and/or review. The chair of the PUEC is chosen by its members with input by the candidate.
- e. *The written report of the PUEC* is presented in writing to the primary unit at least seven days prior to the meeting of the faculty when the report of the PUEC is discussed and a vote is taken by the primary unit to approve or amend the report.
- f. *The chair of the department reports on the deliberations, records the particulars of the vote, and any factors leading to votes that are not unanimous.* The chair's report will specifically identify those areas of performance that were evaluated by the primary unit faculty as being not meritorious, meritorious and/or excellent. The chair forwards his/her report and the original and amended version of the primary unit report – if any – to the Dean.
- g. *Recommendations of the PUEC* are advisory to the faculty of the primary unit and to the Dean. The candidate receives copies of the PUEC letter and the Dean's Advisory Committee/First Level Review Committee letter at the time they are inserted into the dossier.

3. *Faculty Support*

- a. *Faculty support.* The Department of Architecture is committed to supporting faculty members with various and evolving career paths. It recognizes that scholarly/creative work patterns may change over time, as long as they are

consistent with (where applicable) faculty Professional Plans and fall within one or more of the recognized domains of scholarly/creative work.

- b. *Consistency.* The individual categories of documented performance for all evaluations will be consistent with those used in the University yearly report on faculty activities.
- c. *Continuity.* Recommendations for reappointment, tenure and promotion will be based on a study of the candidate's entire career but with particular attention to the candidate's achievements while on the faculty of the University of Colorado Denver. Candidates must submit records in accordance with the University policies referenced in this document.
- d. *Accessibility to Materials and Confidentiality.* The Dean, the Dean's Advisory Committee, and the members of the Primary Unit will have access to all materials about the candidate gathered by the Primary Unit Evaluation Committee upon the submission of their report.
- e. *Ethical Requirements.* All faculty members have an ethical requirement to honor the confidentiality of personnel deliberations. Personal and professional integrity are expected of all involved in the process.
- f. *Conflict of Interest.* All faculty members are expected to disclose any and all conflicts of interest or apparent conflicts of interest, in accordance with University and campus policy, and to recuse themselves from personnel decisions and recommendations when such conflict of interest exists or may appear to exist

E. GENERAL PRINCIPLES

1. These approved criteria, called the "primary unit criteria," shall be subject to periodic review and approval by the Dean and review and approval by the Provost. All primary unit criteria shall be in writing and shall be included in the candidate's dossier or made available electronically to individuals and committees involved in higher levels of review. This primary unit criteria will also be made available by the head of the primary unit to each faculty member at the time of initial hiring/appointment.
2. Every unit evaluating faculty for tenure MUST have and publish criteria for excellence and meritorious performance in scholarly/creative work, teaching, and leadership and service. Even if these criteria are the same as a parent organization, such as a school or college, the unit must restate these criteria.

F. STANDARDS OF PERFORMANCE FOR TENURE AND/OR PROMOTION

Tenure can only be awarded by the Board of Regents. The granting of tenure is recognized as an indication of a career commitment on the part of the University to an individual faculty member. Tenure, therefore, should be based on clear evidence of the potential for sustained contribution and leadership over a candidate's whole career. Evidence of effective teaching should be on par with evidence of scholarly achievement

and the potential for leadership in the field. There should be evidence of continuous intellectual inquiry and professional development of sufficient quality to provide a basis of confidence in future growth and performance. Institutional and community service should also be considered significant, especially when related to professional growth, scholarship and influence. Service plays a more modest role at this level of advancement as compared to service expectations related to promotion to full professor.

Effort cannot be used as a criterion for excellence. No criteria can, for example, state that submitting a certain number of grant proposals or papers or teaching a certain number of courses is a condition for excellence.

The combination of quantity and impact of papers/books/creative work and the external means for judging impact, necessary for meritorious or excellence in scholarly/creative work are up to the unit and subject to approval by the Dean and the Provost.

1. *Tenure Standards*

Tenure may be awarded only to faculty members with demonstrated meritorious performance in each of the three areas of teaching, scholarly or creative work, and leadership and service to the University, the profession, and/or the public, and demonstrated excellence in either teaching or scholarly/creative work. By the seventh year of a tenure-track appointment, review for tenure is mandatory, unless an extension has been requested by the faculty member and approved by the provost and chancellor. Should tenure be denied, the individual will be given a terminal one-year contract for their eighth year.

2. *Promotion Standards*

All candidates for promotion to associate professor and professor must meet the University's standards of performance as approved by the Board of Regents. Promotion from assistant professor to associate professor is normally considered at the same time as tenure, and with the same requirements.

a. Departmental Requirements

(1) Promotion from Assistant to Associate Professor

Associate professors should have the terminal degree appropriate to their field or its equivalent, considerable successful teaching experience, and increasing accomplishment in scholarly/creative work, leadership and service, and other applicable areas.

Candidates for tenure and promotion to Associate Professor rank are expected to have demonstrated meritorious performance, in each of the three areas of teaching, scholarly/creative work, and leadership and service to the University and the faculty member's profession and demonstrated excellence in either teaching or scholarly/creative work.

(2) Promotion to Professor

Professors should have the terminal degree appropriate to their field or its equivalent, and (1) a record that, taken as a whole, is judged to be excellent;

(2) a record of significant contribution to both graduate and undergraduate education, unless individual or departmental circumstances can be shown to require a stronger emphasis, or singular focus, on one or the other; and (3) a record, since receiving tenure or promotion to associate professor, that indicates substantial, significant, and continued growth, development, and accomplishment in teaching, scholarly/creative work, leadership and service, and other applicable areas. (Board of Regents Policy 5.D.3(A, C))

Candidates for promotion to Professor rank are expected to have demonstrated leadership and achieved national or international stature in their area of scholarly and/or creative work, or professional expertise.

G. PROMOTION AND TENURE CATEGORY DESCRIPTIONS

Departmental criteria for promotion and tenure recognize creation of knowledge as well as application of knowledge through scholarly/creative work, and public scholarship.

1. Scholarly/Creative work

- a. Candidates for tenure and/or promotion to Associate Professor or full Professor rank are expected to have demonstrated meritorious performance in each of the three areas of teaching, scholarly/creative work, and leadership and service and demonstrated excellence in either teaching or scholarly/ creative work.
- b. *Evidence of scholarly/creative work* shall include and is not limited to:
 - Publications, including peer-reviewed manuscripts, books, book chapters, monographs and electronic publications
 - Other products of scholarship as broadly defined, including the scholarship of discovery, education, application or integration in which the candidate is a lead investigator, for example, lead author, lead designer, exhibition lead curator, or principal investigator
 - Recognition (through a process of masked peer evaluation or masked juried evaluation) by other scholars of research and publications and professional reputation (both inside and outside the University), established through presence in publications, exhibitions, conferences, conference proceedings, citations in scholarly publications, invited lectures, and awards
 - Creative work (design competitions, participation in exhibitions, large installations, juried exhibits)
 - Sponsored research, grants and contracts received
 - Invited lectures, conferences and/or presentations
 - Proactive and responsive research and creative work
 - Evidence of capacity for future achievements, through active ongoing research production, regardless of success in being published, disseminated, or awarded

c. Scholarly/Creative Work Evaluation Categories

Excellent. Superior productivity, as evidenced from peer-reviewed significant publications, acknowledged leadership in an area of research, success in international design competitions, or other recognition of sustained peer-reviewed research performance. It is expected that a candidate maintains this level of accomplishment. Specific indicators of excellent activity can be found in the Appendix at the end of this document.

In accordance with Regent Policy 5.D.2 “a recommendation of tenure based on excellence in scholarly/creative work shall include evidence of impact beyond the institution.”

Meritorious. The candidate has met the general scholarly/creative work expectations of the primary unit. This means that the candidate has a coherent scholarly/creative work agenda and a sustained record of contribution to the field in their area of expertise as demonstrated by success in various masked peer-reviewed regional and/or national venues for dissemination of scholarly/creative work. It is expected that the record presented shows that the candidate’s level of accomplishment will continue. Specific indicators of meritorious activity can be found in the Appendix at the end of this document.

Not Meritorious. The candidate has not met the criteria for excellent or meritorious.

2. Teaching

- a. Candidates are expected to have demonstrated effective and creative teaching. Subsequent enhancement of the curricular area and its connections to the professional discipline are also expected. In addition, candidates for promotion are expected to have demonstrated leadership in a curricular area. In accordance with Regent Policy 5.D.2 “a recommendation of tenure based on excellence in teaching shall “include multiple measures of teaching evaluation and demonstrated achievement at the campus, local, national, and/or international level which furthers the practice of scholarship of teaching and learning beyond one’s immediate instructional setting.”
- b. Teaching in architecture also relies primarily on knowledge of design and a range of specialized subject areas. Faculty members are expected to be experts in a particular curricular subject and where applicable, effective design educators who can integrate their specializations into the design studios.
- c. A rating of meritorious or excellent in teaching requires, instruction at both the graduate and undergraduate levels and multiple measures of teaching/instruction. Faculty Course Questionnaire (FCQ)s or their equivalents must meet at least an average level of performance.
- d. *Evidence of teaching* shall include but is not limited to:

- (1) In accordance with [university system policy](#) for each faculty member being evaluated, *a minimum of three components shall be included*; one of these **must** be a student evaluation, which must include, but is not limited to, the data from the FCQ or a similar, campus-approved system and form. See below:
- (2) Examples of criteria to be considered in evaluating teaching, are:
 - Evaluations of teaching effectiveness by students, graduate trainees or other learners, such as through **FCQs** (*normative minimal criteria*)
 - Peer evaluation of teaching
 - Independent studies directed
 - Research on curriculum and pedagogy
 - Mentoring and career counselling
 - Evaluations from alumni
 - Quality of Doctoral dissertation and Master's thesis supervision
 - Student advising and mentoring
 - Innovations in teaching
 - Student mid-term evaluations and retention rates |
 - Evidence of risk taking to enhance learning
 - Teaching cross-listed courses or co-teaching across departments and/or colleges
 - Co-teaching with professionals who bring significant off-campus experience to the classroom

Activities which may demonstrate academic and pedagogical impact beyond one's immediate instructional setting may include some but not all of, and are not limited to, the following examples:

- Teaching awards from the campus, the university, or outside the university or other outstanding accomplishments in instruction
- Evidence of national or international impact on education, such as citations of educational publications or presentations, authorship of a critically reviewed textbook or other educational materials used elsewhere, national or international teaching awards, and external letters reviewing educational contributions
- Research on curriculum and pedagogy (textbooks, publications, presentations)
- Contracts or grants to enable research on teaching/pedagogy
- Curriculum development that enhances learning and is adopted by others
- Performance of students, graduate trainees or other learners in higher-level courses or levels of training or placement
- Performance of learners on Standard Professional Examinations
- Public lectures and workshops
- Class visits and workshops with students at other universities and secondary schools

- Service-learning projects, whether through formal course delivery or alternative means
- Supervising student internships
- Creating experiential learning opportunities for students.
- Organizing on-campus interactions between students and guest speakers from beyond the CU Denver campus (i.e., class visits, Skype interviews, studio reviews and other feedback on student work, etc.)
- Mentoring undergraduate and graduate students in the service of their future professional careers
- Teaching outside of one's immediate classroom (i.e., Guest lecturing in another class, holding pedagogy workshops for faculty, etc.
- Significant community engagement activities embedded in formal course delivery or in alternative means
- Supervising, mentoring, or directing student engagement with industry through formal course delivery or co-curricular activities.

e. Teaching Evaluation Categories

Excellent. To be excellent in teaching for tenure/promotion, a candidate needs to demonstrate significant academic or pedagogical impact. The **excellence** distinction will be given to those candidates who demonstrate truly superior commitment to and success in teaching. Such candidates are thought of as outstanding teachers who are recognized by both students and faculty as having a significant impact through teaching at CU Denver and beyond. Indicators of excellence can be found in the Appendix at the end of this document.

Meritorious. Candidates demonstrate a positive impact on the intellectual development of students in the context of formal course work. Contributions are also expected in curriculum development, student advising, and/or individual instruction. Finally, there should be evidence that the candidate has an ongoing commitment to teaching excellence, and student advancement. Indicators of meritorious activity can be found in the Appendix at the end of this document.

Not Meritorious. The candidate has not met an excellent or meritorious evaluation.

3. *Leadership/Service*

- a. The architecture department relies on shared governance for effective, regular faculty participation. All faculty members serve on department and/or college and/or university committees. In addition, faculty members manage the undergraduate and graduate programs of the Department of Architecture. This commitment can be substantial and includes regular review, development, and maintenance of the curriculum, preparation for accreditation, evaluation of admission files, and student advising. Leadership and service contributions through allied national, professional, and community organizations are

encouraged and recognized as important to the mission and reputation of the Department and the College.

- b. Candidates for the award of tenure and promotion to Associate Professor rank are expected to have demonstrated meritorious performance in leadership and service through contributions to various committees and initiatives at the department, college, or university levels. Whereas candidates for promotion to professor rank are expected to also have demonstrated excellent performance in leadership and service by chairing various committees and leading initiatives in the department, college, or university.
- c. Evidence used in assessing leadership and service shall include and is not limited to:
 - Mentorship of junior faculty colleagues
 - Leadership and service on university committees
 - Leadership and service to profession and discipline (local, state, national, international level)
 - Consultation and public leadership and service
- d. Leadership/Service Evaluation Categories

Excellent. Candidates are expected to have demonstrated leadership and service that made significant contributions to the Department, College, and/or University. Candidates are also expected to have demonstrable contributions to one or more academic and professional societies, and/or community organizations. Examples of excellent activity can be found in the Appendix at the end of this document.

Meritorious. Leadership and service will be considered meritorious if the candidate has, at a minimum, contributed to the mission of the Department through cooperative participation on necessary Departmental committees and activities. Indicators of meritorious activity can be found in the Appendix at the end of this document.

Not Meritorious. Candidate has not met an excellent or meritorious evaluation.

H. EXTERNAL EVALUATORS

The primary unit shall request evaluations in writing by scholars from outside the university and from various locations who are qualified to judge the candidate, using a solicitation letter following the college-approved format. Such outside evaluations are mandatory in cases of recommendations for tenure and promotion. Comprehensive reviews must also include at least three external evaluations, as determined by the campus policy.

1. *The Process for Selecting External Evaluators*

Masked peer-review documentation of scholarly/creative activities plays an essential role in the evaluation of scholarly/creative work. Candidates should submit a portfolio to be evaluated by qualified external reviewers in a masked, peer-review process.

- a. Selection of external evaluators shall be undertaken by the primary unit; the candidate shall be given the opportunity to suggest possible evaluators and/or indicate specific scholars whom the candidate feels should be excluded from consideration.
- b. Care must be taken to exclude any evaluators whose evaluations may constitute a conflict of interest, such as a dissertation director. A minimum of three external letters shall be added to the file; however, campuses, schools/colleges/libraries may require a greater number of letters.
- c. The portfolio is sent out by the PUEC for evaluation.
- d. All letters that are received must be included in the candidate's promotion or tenure dossier. These letters must be treated as confidential; they shall not be shared with the candidate. The primary unit may offer external evaluators a modest stipend for their work. Primary unit letters should include summaries of key comments by evaluators, with all identifiers removed to preserve confidentiality.
- e. In the case of faculty hires with tenure, the process of requesting external evaluator letters differs in accordance with system and campus policy on the matter. See: [Campus Administrative Policy 1021 Hire with Tenure](#).

I. COMPREHENSIVE REVIEW

1. Each tenure-track faculty member below the rank of associate professor shall be evaluated in a comprehensive manner in years three (3) or four (4) of their tenure probationary period apart from the review for promotion or the award of tenure. The comprehensive review is meant to provide a critical appraisal designed to identify a candidate's strengths and weaknesses in sufficient time to allow promising candidates to improve their records before the evaluation for tenure.
2. The review must include evaluation by external reviewers, as determined by campus policy. Candidates for reappointment may receive specific advice about aspects of their performance that need improvement, although non-reappointment is also a possible result of the comprehensive review. If not reappointed because of the outcome of the comprehensive review, he/she will have a terminal year before her/his appointment ends.
3. Dossiers and related materials for candidates under review are due in the Office of Academic Affairs in accordance with procedures outlined in [Campus Administrative Policy 1004 Reappointment Tenure and Promotion Review](#).

J. EARLY TENURE

The standards of performance that apply to faculty members on the seven-year tenure clock apply to faculty members who come up for early tenure. They must have a record of achievement in teaching, scholarly/creative work, clinical activity, and leadership and service that is equal to the record expected of a faculty member coming up in the seventh year. Additional criteria or higher standards cannot be applied to candidates for early tenure. Department chairs and mentors have a responsibility to counsel tenure-track faculty on the wisdom of coming up for early promotion or tenure. An unsuccessful candidate for early tenure who does not get a denial at the level of Provost or Chancellor, may reapply within the existing tenure clock.

K. POST-TENURE REVIEW

Post tenure review (PTR) is a review of a tenured faculty member's performance record undertaken every five years. The PTR process for the Department of Architecture will follow the process outlined in the College of Architecture and Planning's Bylaws, section 5 "Post-Tenure Review." See: Campus Administrative Policy 1050, Post-Tenure Review.

L. PROFESSIONAL PLANS

University policy no longer requires professional plans but a reference to it remains in APS 1022 as a "highly recommended individually prepared blueprint that aids in evaluating performance, during both annual review and post-tenure review." The professional plan communicates the faculty member's teaching, scholarly/creative work, and leadership and service goals and explains how these goals support the needs of the primary unit and the college/school. Projections made in the plan, when compared to the faculty member's progress and achievements, can provide one basis for evaluating the faculty member's professional performance. If the Plan calls for a distribution of effort different from the primary unit's standard assignment, a differentiated workload agreement should be included. At the time of annual merit evaluation and during post-tenure review (or extensive review), the primary unit evaluation committee may review the professional plan (and any revisions or updates to the plan) and compare its goals to the actual achievements of the faculty member to date.

APPENDIX

1. SCHOLARLY/CREATIVE WORK

- **Indicators of Excellence* may include (in no priority)**
 - Publications of scholarly peer-reviewed book(s)
 - Publication of a chapter in a scholarly peer-reviewed book
 - Editor of a scholarly peer-reviewed book
 - Publication in peer-reviewed journals
 - Frequent citation of publications (or professional work)
 - Publication of papers at peer-reviewed national and international meetings
 - Presentation of invited papers at peer-reviewed national and international meetings
 - Editor or member of an editorial board of a major scholarly peer-reviewed journal
 - Receipt of major fellowship to conduct scholarly/creative work
 - Publication of peer-reviewed magazine articles
 - Member of a review panel for national or international research organization (or architectural competition)
 - Receipt of grants and contracts from recognized agencies that fund demonstration projects
 - Significant publication and/or funding resulting from collaborative efforts with researchers in other institutions / programs / fields, where the faculty member plays a substantial role in the scholarly/creative work. The specific details of his/her role are documented.
 - The registration of patents and/or copyrights for inventions and designs; documented involvement with technology transfer initiatives with the university
 - Presentation and participation in peer-reviewed conference project sessions
 - Peer-review and recognition of creative professional practice
 - Teaching-related peer-reviewed publications (scholarship of teaching)
 - Success in competitions
 - Notable participation in exhibitions
 - Awards
 - Books or articles about the candidate's scholarly/creative work
 - Peer reviewed built work

* Per Regent Policy 5.D.2 “a recommendation of tenure based on excellence in scholarly/creative work shall include evidence of impact beyond the institution.”

- **Indicators of Meritorious may include (in no priority)**
 - Publication of non-scholarly book(s) in the faculty member's discipline with documented recognition and impact
 - Presentation of papers in peer-reviewed local, national and international conferences
 - Significant self-development activities, such as a faculty development leave
 - Production and publication of peer-reviewed technical reports
 - Publication of non-refereed newspaper/magazine articles
 - Preparation of peer-reviewed book and book chapter proposals
 - Professional development through engagement in peer-reviewed local and national conferences
 - Professional development through engagement in colloquia, seminar, or workshops
 - Invitation to serve as a juror in design studio reviews
 - Presentation and participation in peer-reviewed conference poster sessions
 - Submission of research (or creative activity) grant applications
 - Development of research through submissions to competitions
 - Development of research through submissions to exhibitions
 - Awards
 - Books or articles about the candidate's scholarly/creative work
 - Peer reviewed built work

2. TEACHING

- **Indicators of Excellence* may include (in no priority)**
 - FCQ scores and student comments consistently indicate highly effective teaching
 - College and/or university peer-reviewed teaching award(s)
 - National or international peer-reviewed teaching awards
 - Teaching-related peer-reviewed student awards
 - Positive peer evaluations
 - Strong record of effective participation in and contribution to curricular development
 - Strong record of effective preparation and teaching of core courses
 - Strong record of effective preparation and delivery of new courses
 - Syllabi, assignments, rubrics and other class materials that are consistently recognized as well organized and effective
 - Strong record of effective student advising and mentoring
 - Strong record of effectively chairing Ph.D. dissertation committees
 - Strong record of effectively contributing as a member of Ph.D. dissertation committees

- Strong record of effectively chairing or being a member of a student thesis committee
- Peer-reviewed evaluation and recognition for innovations in teaching

* Per Regent Policy 5.D.2 “a recommendation of tenure based on excellence in teaching shall “include multiple measures of teaching evaluation and demonstrated achievement at the campus, local, national, and/or international level which furthers the practice of scholarship of teaching and learning beyond one’s immediate instructional setting.”

*Activities that may demonstrate academic and pedagogical impact beyond one’s immediate instructional setting may include some but not all of, and are not limited to, the examples that can be found in section G.2.d.(2) of this document.

○ **Indicators of Meritorious may include (in no priority)**

- FCQ scores and student comments consistently indicate effective teaching
- Positive peer evaluations
- Successful record of effectively advising student independent study
- Successful record of effectively being an advisor for a student journal
- Successful record of design studio review participation
- Successful record of effectively integrating technology in course delivery
- Successful record of design studio multiple section co-ordination
- Successful record of mentoring students

3. LEADERHIP AND SERVICE

○ **Indicators of Excellence may include (in no priority)**

- Leadership and service award(s) and honor(s) from the department, college, university, professional organization or community
- Strong record of effectively serving as a committee chair in the department, college or university
- Strong record of effectively serving as a committee member in the department, college, or university
- Authorship of a significant report for the department, college or university
- Strong record of effectively serving as a leader (e.g. chair) of a scholarly or professional organization
- Membership on a scholarly or professional organization’s board of directors

- Substantial involvement as a peer reviewer for scholarly journal and conference papers
- Substantial involvement as a peer reviewer for research grants
- **Indicators of Meritorious may include (in no priority)**
 - Record of serving as a significantly contributing committee member in the department or college
 - Co-authorship of a report for the department or college
 - Successful participation in design studio reviews
 - Peer reviewer for scholarly journal and conference papers
 - Peer reviewer for research grants
 - Consistent attendance at faculty meetings
 - Professional society member other than the Association of Collegiate Schools of Architecture (ACSA)
 - Attendance at commencement in academic regalia