

School of Planning
RPT Criteria
Approved by Faculty on February 21, 2017

Contents

Section I

Preamble p. 1

Section II

SOP Procedures p. 1

A. The SOP RPT Committee p.1

B. Annual Review p.2

C. Peer Review of Teaching p.2

Section III

Criteria and Evidence for Assessment p. 2

A. Teaching p. 2

B. Research/scholarly activity/creative work p. 3

C. Service p. 7

Section IV

Applications of Criteria for Reappointment, Promotion and Tenure p. 9

A. Emphasis p.9

B. Levels of Quality p.10

C. Application of Criteria and Levels of Quality
with Respect to Rank p.11

Section V

Non-tenure Track Faculty p. 16

Section VI

Emeritus Faculty p. 17

APPENDIX 1

p.18

Section I

Preamble

In the School of Planning (SOP), faculty members are considered to be professionals who are well-grounded in theories related to the planning discipline and have substantial knowledge and/or experience in the practical aspects of planning. The School recognizes the distinction between applications of planning knowledge in practice and the development of theoretical constructs as a basis for the generation of new knowledge in the field. Both activities are considered essential to the education of Non-tenure Track professionals receiving a baccalaureate, master's or a doctoral degree. Consequently, the School values a balance among its faculty with respect to engagement in original scholarship or creativity on the one hand, and professional activities on the other. It is not expected that all faculty will be devoting their efforts equally to both of these areas. Faculty members, however, are expected to demonstrate, through their work, a measure of development over time in both areas.

The School faculty members who are covered by these criteria are unqualified faculty (tenure-track and tenured), Non-tenure Track faculty, and represented Adjunct Faculty (65% FTE). There are three major categories of accepted faculty responsibilities and activities within the university: (1) teaching; (2) research/scholarly activity/creative work; and (3) service (professional; school, college and university; and public/community).

Section II

SOP Procedures

The procedures contained herein specify the responsibilities for all parties at the School level—the candidate; the SOP Reappointment, Promotion, and Tenure Committee (SOP RPT Committee); and the School of Planning Director—in the preparation, deliberation, and forwarding of a dossier and recommendations to the College Reappointment, Promotion, and Tenure Committee. During the course of this formal review, all parties are subject to confidentiality and must adhere to RPT requirements and deadlines published in the College Procedures which are in accordance with the AAUP/CBA and University policies.¹

In accordance with the UC/AAUP and College guidelines, it is recognized that the candidate has the primary responsibility for the development of the dossier submitted for review. The candidate must become thoroughly aware of the relevant School, College, and University guidelines and deadlines. Questions should be directed to the School Director, the Associate Dean for Faculty Affairs and Curriculum, the School RPT Committee or the College RPT Committee.

A. The SOP RPT Committee

The RPT Committee shall be composed of at least three members, at least two of whom shall be tenured. Members shall be elected for staggered two-year terms, and, if possible, no member shall serve for more than two consecutive terms. Each member must read and be knowledgeable about the provisions of the collective bargaining agreement, the College RPT Guidelines, and the SOP RPT Criteria, especially as they apply to the review of and recommendation for each candidate.

- Only one candidate is to be reviewed and evaluated at any one deliberation meeting.
- Each committee member shall review the candidate's dossier prior to the deliberation

¹ University procedures are found in the Collective Bargaining Agreement between the University of Cincinnati and American Association of University Professors, University of Cincinnati Chapter and will be updated in succeeding collective bargaining agreements. The College of DAAP's "RPT Procedural Guidelines" are available on the College website.

- meeting.
- At the meeting, committee members shall discuss the evidence as presented in relation to the approved criteria. Following the discussion, a recommendation motion shall be made and a vote taken according to parliamentary procedure. The vote shall be tabulated and must be recorded in the recommendation (in eRPT). All Committee members must vote.
 - A statement accompanying the recommendation shall be formulated and approved by all members of the Committee before it is submitted to the School Director. All members of the Committee must sign the recommendation letter.
 - All committee discussion and proceedings within the meeting shall be kept confidential.
 - The committee must not communicate with the candidate once they have submitted their dossier other than to inform them if there is an omission from their dossier submission.

B. Annual Review

Each faculty member shall provide the School Director with a written Annual Performance Review Summary Report prior to the Annual Faculty Review meeting. The Annual Faculty Review meeting shall focus on the Annual Performance Review Summary Report, and address as appropriate the three RPT criteria areas described below. The School Director and the faculty member shall review the Annual Performance Review, in the Annual Faculty Review meeting, per the current AAUP Contract. The School Director will provide an Annual Performance Review (APR) letter. Both the faculty member and the School Director shall sign the Annual Performance Review letter, which is added to the faculty member's RPT file as documentation of the ongoing RPT process.

C. Peer Review of Teaching

In accordance with standing School procedures for peer review of faculty teaching performance, the SOP Director, in consultation with the candidate, shall assign two SOP faculty colleagues who are not members of the School or College RPT committees, to provide a written review of the candidate's teaching performance before the candidate plans to submit the dossier for RPT evaluation. The reviewers must review the candidate's course syllabus and attend at least one class. The reviewers must use the form provided by the SOP, annexed to this document.

Section III

Criteria and Evidence for Assessment

In all cases, evaluation of faculty performance is based on a candidate's record of performance in three categories of activity as described below:

The School evaluates applications for reappointment, promotion, and tenure on performance in three areas: teaching; research/scholarly activity/creative work; and service (See Section III-A, B, and C below). RPT decisions presume continued productivity, growth, and evolution over a faculty member's career, and that over time, assessments will come increasingly from sources external to the University.

For purposes of evaluation, quality is defined as the importance of a faculty member's contribution to the discipline. (See Section III-A Emphasis for details concerning: overall emphasis of criteria over the course of an individual's career, the reappointment and promotion of Bargaining Unit Faculty, and the appointment of retired faculty to Emeritus status.)

Recommendation letters from the School RPT Committee and the SOP Director should interpret, for the benefit of reviewers above the School level, the relative significance of the evidence in the dossier and the credentials of the external reviewers.

A. Teaching

Teaching and learning are central to the mission of the School of Planning. An important goal of the School is to prepare and guide students who intend to become professionals in their major field of study in the public

and/or private sectors of society. Teaching is the ability to transfer concepts, to develop skills, and to cultivate critical thinking and judgment. Faculty demonstrate teaching effectiveness by the improvement in a student's knowledge, skill, understanding, and critical inquiry through effective classroom instruction, student learning, and student mentoring. All faculty are expected to carry an equitable load of both organized classes and supervision of independent study and graduate/terminal projects. Each faculty member is assigned student advisees as a part of her/his normal curricular duties; curricular counseling and career guidance is integral to this assignment. It is also expected that course revision and new course development is a necessary part of teaching, especially in light of continuing changes in the profession and the requirements of accrediting bodies. In the School of Planning, faculty are expected to assess their own course and teaching performance for continuous improvement in both content and process as well as manner and style, taking into account the mandatory student evaluation of each course.

Means of Assessment

A candidate's dossier must document activities related to teaching. The ways of assessing these activities are the following:

1. Evidence for Assessment of Teaching

Dossier will include:

- A self-assessment of teaching as part of the Self-Evaluation
- Student course evaluations from the period of review, in summary form as per the College RPT Procedural Guidelines
- Representative syllabi, examinations (if used), and instructional course materials
- Peer reviews (1-2 recommended) and observations

Dossier should also include evidence of the following, as appropriate:

- Letters from colleagues
- Letters from former students
- Examples of interdisciplinary or collaborative teaching
- Nominations or receipt of awards and other forms of recognition
- Invitations to lecture or be a guest critic, or faculty at UC or other schools
- Acceptance of student work in juried exhibitions, publications, conferences, awards received
- Activities related to the assessment of student learning, such as portfolio review, pedagogy workshops, or peer review
- Invited presentations and participation in academic, professional, and public meetings
- Documentation and dissemination of new courses, or innovative approaches to existing courses (such as papers and articles published in peer reviewed journals, invited presentations, and participation in academic, professional, and public meetings)
- Grants for course development
- Recruitment of students to the discipline
- Offering courses with honors and/or courses offered for credit in other disciplines
- Thesis/Dissertation advising
- Other evidence relevant to teaching effectiveness

B. Research/Scholarly Activity/Creative Work

The norm in academia is to consider "Research" as encompassing "research" and "scholarly work." In the SOP, we recognize the creation of projects and designs that embrace standard practice as a valued mode of inquiry

as well. For that reason, “Creative Work” is listed alongside “Research and Scholarly Activity.” It is understood that faculty may engage in any of the three to varying degrees, and that the three together constitute “Research/Scholarly Activity/ Creative Work.”

The candidate should show evidence of continuing productivity that advances the mission of the University. Faculty member shall achieve the levels of performance described in Section IV, Application of Criteria to Reappointment, Promotion and Tenure.

With research/scholarly activity/creative work, peer review is essential to assess the quality and significance of the work.

1. Research and Scholarly Activity

Research and scholarly activities are considered essential to each faculty member’s professional growth and development. They entail the generation of new knowledge, new concepts and/or new methods of professional work. Research and scholarship, whether supported by outside funding or not, are an expected part of faculty responsibilities in the planning profession. The end result of research and scholarly activity should be presented in a form useful for the generation of dialogue by others in the field. Accepted forms of planning research and scholarly work are dependent upon the type of work accomplished, the purpose for which it has been pursued, the faculty member’s specialized field(s) of expertise, and the stage which the individual has reached in her/his career.

Means of Assessment

For typical scholarly or theoretical writing, the most desirable publication outlets are books, chapters in books, and peer-reviewed journal articles. For professional projects and creative work, the most desirable outlets are exhibitions and articles or books published about the work for a broad professional audience, whether produced by the faculty member or by others writing about the work. Other research/scholarly activity/creative work contributing to a faculty member’s productivity should also be assessed. These include publishing in non-refereed journals, editorial work for a refereed journal, book reviews, research grant proposal writing, Fulbright or similar competitive awards given to pursue research, papers for presentation at professional meetings, technical reports, competition entries, and video or audio productions.

The quality of the work is to be evaluated by the review of the following, as applicable to each candidate: letters of review and comment, published criticism and response, citations of work published, success of research grant funding proposals, invitations to present work at important symposia, and awards or prizes given for distinguished efforts.

Research and Scholarly Activities define, develop, and apply knowledge of the discipline through intellectual and empirical investigation and interpretation. By means of dialogue and published scholarship, the body of knowledge is expanded, interrelated, connected with other disciplines, and made useful. These activities can significantly influence instruction, curriculum development, educational theory and application, and creative work.

1. Evidence for Assessment of Research and Scholarly Activity

The dossier should document research and scholarly activities, including peer-reviewed material and editor-invited material. Peer-reviewed material and editor-invited (where the invitation results from the candidate’s expertise and reputation) material should hold greater weight in consideration than material which is not peer-reviewed.

Work considered most important is that which contributes significantly to the advancement of knowledge or theory in the field, and which is recognized as useful and important by colleagues or professionals. Work performed professionally which does not contribute to the advancement of the field will not be considered as research/scholarly activity/creative work, but may be appropriate for inclusion as professional activity or

community service.

Dossier will include:

- A self-assessment of research and/or scholarly work (if relevant) as part of the Self-Evaluation
- Peer review letters from colleagues (including external review letters from outside the University for tenure and promotion to Associate Professor and Professor)

Dossiers should also include evidence of the following, as appropriate:

- Publication of research (in various formats) and of extended reviews in peer-reviewed journals of acknowledged stature, so that the results become part of the archival literature.
- Books and chapters in books (single-author books are not required, but a commensurate body of work should be considered)
- Exhibition catalogues, essays, and related contributions
- Articles in peer-reviewed and academic journals
- Examples of interdisciplinary or collaborative research and scholarly work
- Published reviews of and references to the candidate's research citations
- Book reviews by the candidate
- Presentations at conferences, with subsequent publication in proceedings
- Invited presentations, workshops and seminars at other universities or research institutes
- Technical communications, communications on ongoing research, book reviews
- Invited professional speaking engagements
- Publication in journals and/or conference proceedings with students
- Participation in joint research publications
- Translations of scholarly work
- Popular press publications and media appearances
- Invited presentations, workshops and seminars at other universities or research institutes, museums, schools, civic institutions
- Editorships or editorial board memberships for research/scholarly works
- Serving as professional peer reviewer
- Publication in journals and/or conference proceedings with students
- Conducting workshops or chairing panels at conferences
- Obtaining competitive awards given to pursue research
- Ability to attract funds to support research efforts of the candidate (including support of graduate students), particularly from sources external to the University
- Grants, fellowships, sponsored projects, and other funding
- Solicited reviews of books, manuscripts, essays, and research proposals
- Other evidence relevant to research and scholarly activities

2. Creative Work

Creative Work entails research that expands the appreciation and understanding of planning and urbanism through the creation of projects, designs, and plans. Creative work explores ideas — policy, aesthetic, practical, technological, methodological — and produces exemplary representations of those ideas. Further tangible academic benefits accrue when faculty integrate creative work with teaching or scholarship and research, and

when such work is disseminated to larger audiences through guest lectures, exhibitions, publications, public meetings, or design competitions. Quality is paramount; quantity is to be considered within this context. In other words, quantity alone is not sufficient. The candidate should show evidence of continuing productivity that will benefit the field of planning.

Means of Assessment

Creative work activities and their assessment and citation shall be documented in the dossier which is presented for reappointment, promotion, and/or consideration for tenure.

The assessment of creative work for “quality” is through a published record by community, political, professional, or academic critical reception and/or self-reflective written works, and/or evidence of peer regard through juried or invited venues.

The School Director and RPT Committee shall assess creative work by examining products of such activity, including documentation of drawings, models, exhibitions, as well as publications about the candidate’s work. The work shall be evaluated for originality, significance, and intellectual contribution to the field, as reflected in the critical reception of the creative work demonstrated in the dossier.

The work will be evaluated by peers, both internal and external (external letters for tenure and promotion to Associate Professor and Professor), for originality, significance, and intellectual contribution to the discipline.

1. Evidence for Assessment of Creative Work

Dossiers will include:

- A self-assessment of creative work (if relevant) as part of the Self-Evaluation
- An assessment of creative work for “quality.” This includes a published record of critical reception and/or published self-reflective written works and/or evidence of peer regard through juried or invited venues.
- Peer review letters from colleagues (including external letters from outside the University for tenure and promotion to Associate Professor and Professor)

Dossiers also should include the following, as appropriate:

- Creative work (slides, CD’s, visuals of creative work)
- Publication and dissemination of creative work in various formats
- Examples of interdisciplinary or collaborative creative work
- Exhibition of design/professional work (one-person, collaborative or group exhibitions in galleries, museums, other exhibition venues)
- Record of juried exhibitions of professional/design work
- Publication of original articles, chapters, books concerning the candidate’s own creative work or other mention of the candidate’s work
- Residencies or invited lectures
- Reviews or publications about work in catalogs, journals, or newspapers
- Commissions for significant work within the discipline
- Competitions (entered and placed)
- Reviews of projects in catalogs, journals, or newspapers
- Inclusion in public, corporate, or private collections
- Curation of exhibitions
- Obtaining competitive awards to pursue creative work

- Grants, awards, sponsored projects, fellowships, and other funding
- Professional service in form of invitations to jury exhibitions; grants, awards, and fellowships, serving on panels and/or other professional activities that enhance one's standing and make a contribution to the discipline.
- Other evidence relevant to Creative Work

C. Service

Service activities involve intellectual, creative, administrative, and leadership expertise and are important for individual professional growth as well as for the advancement of the university; schools/departments and colleges within the university; professional organizations and the community. Activities may include: assisting the institution by serving in administrative positions or on academic committees; advancing the discipline beyond the institution by serving on professional or research boards; and contribution to groups in the community, especially in special or "pro bono" ways.

a. Service to the School

The sharing of internal tasks (e.g., recruitment of students, admissions work, curriculum development, governance) is valued as a contribution to the School's learning community and its organizational growth and development. Improved management of academic programs is critical to the university's goals as well as to those of the School; therefore, the related activities and involvement should be considered an important component of an individual faculty member's total contributions.

b. Service to the College

At the college level, it is important to have School participation and involvement in governance and curricular matters, as well as the building of collegiality among the various disciplines represented in the larger unit. Because college members use limited space and centralized services jointly, it is necessary to manage the same through committee representation of all schools. These activities need to be shared among faculty members so that equity can be maintained over time. Each faculty member is expected to carry her/his share of these tasks in a balanced manner.

c. Service to the University

Inasmuch as university-wide campus service is an integral part of comprehensive planning and communication for higher education, it is important for a faculty member to become an active participant in activities related to the larger university community -- its governance, growth, improvement and reputation. The degree of involvement is dependent upon one's time, skills, and talents related to requests and/or assignments.

d. Service to the Public and Community Service

The importance of public and community service in the School of Planning is derived from the very nature of its constituent professions. Faculty members are encouraged to apply their professional knowledge to projects for the community. Activities included in public and community service are many and varied.

Evaluation of service productivity shall be based on evidence presented, for example, as completed project reports, designs, case studies and accompanying evaluation reviews and comments or letters. Service that stems from teaching and research and feeds back to these areas so as to complement the same are considered highly worthwhile. Other service that addresses the needs of various publics or communities but does not contribute to a faculty member's professional growth, will be considered but may not be rated as highly.

e. Service to the Profession

Professional service and activities are viewed as opportunities to broaden contacts with other professionals in one's discipline, further one's professional development, make contributions to the field and to its formal organization, and bring back to students, colleagues, and the university benefits of those activities. It is expected that over time a faculty member's participation will change but, overall, it will yield positive rewards both to the individual and the school, college and university. Professional activity includes but may not be limited to the following: professional consultation; holding office in a professional association; chairing or participating in committees at local, regional, and/or national levels; disseminating information and coordinating activities among professional planners and/or educators; participation at conferences and symposia as a moderator, coordinator or other type of facilitator; and editing of a professional association publication.

Just as evidence is presented for evaluation of other categories of service, so should evidence be accumulated and presented as a measure of professional service and activity. Letters of commendation and support, for example, can denote the nature, duration, and quality of service rendered.

Evidence of type and amount of service in any of the types of service that follow should be accumulated and presented for evaluation. Letters of commendation and support should be included as appropriate.

Means of Assessment

The candidate's dossier shall document activities related to service.

1. Evidence for Assessment of Service

Dossiers will include:

- A self-assessment of service as part of the Self-Evaluation

Dossiers may also include these items or evidence of these items, as appropriate:

- Service to School, College, and/or University through committee work or other activities
- Collaborating with colleagues or institutions on pedagogical, curricular, or academic strategic planning projects
- Providing pro bono professional expertise to organizations
- Assisting external organizations in planning, programming, grant writing, or educational activities related to scholarly expertise
- Recognition or awards for service
- Advocacy or expert testimony based on scholarly expertise
- Continued training and professional development to serve the educational and scholarly mission of the School.
- Peer review letters from colleagues (including from outside the institution for tenure and promotion to Associate Professor and Professor)
- Organizing and/or participating in professional conferences and meetings in a leadership capacity
- Service to state, national and international organizations
- Reviewing grant or other competitive proposals
- Serving as referee or editor for national or international journals
- Providing service in academic, public, or professional associations as an elected officer, board member, or special assignment
- Collaboration with members of other institutions
- Collaborating with other institutions that may lead to publication
- Providing service to industry or other organizations as a consultant, etc.
- Service to organizations

- Professional service in the form of invitations to jury exhibitions; grants, awards, and fellowship, serving on panels and/or other professional activities that enhance one's standing and make a contribution to the discipline.
- Participating in administrative activities and responsibilities
- Service to the community through membership and leadership in local organizations and committees
- Leadership and mentorship of student service activities in academic and community settings
- Other evidence relevant to effectiveness in service

Section IV

Applications of Criteria for Reappointment, Promotion and Tenure

A. Emphasis

The emphasis, or weighting, of specific categories of activity will vary depending on the type of faculty appointment, as well as the mission of the academic unit:

Tenure-Track Appointments

Of the three principal categories of activity (teaching; Research/scholarly activity/creative work ; and service), there is clear recognition at the University and national level of the primary importance of research in constituting a strong Research Level I (i.e., very high research activities in Carnegie Foundation terminology) institution such as the University of Cincinnati.

We further recognize that in constituting a strong School, individual faculty members will contribute in unique and different ways.

In light of this crucial fact, each faculty member may retain a certain discretion to choose how contributions within each of the aforementioned categories are to be weighted or emphasized, understanding that this is to be done carefully over time, in consideration of the overall needs and values of the School and with the collaboration and concurrence of the School Director (as reflected in the Annual Reviews). It is also understood that a faculty member should demonstrate a consistent and meaningful level of contribution in service at all times.

The School expects all faculty members to make positive contributions through both Teaching and Research/scholarly activity/creative work . The School does not expect a faculty member to excel in Research/scholarly activity/creative work. It is the responsibility of the faculty member to describe her/his area of emphasis in the Self Evaluation portion of the RPT dossier.

The School expects its faculty members to serve on committees, and in other leadership positions at the School, College, and University levels. Consistent attention to duty and/or leadership in the administrative and governance functions is a valuable asset. Participation in appropriate professional, technical and educational activities is important for the development of faculty members. However, for faculty members who have not been awarded tenure, service on committees shall be considered of lesser importance and should be approached in close consultation with the School Director, as the primary focus of untenured faculty members should be on developing teaching and Research/scholarly activity/creative work credentials.

Although the School expects Service of every faculty member, for untenured faculty, the primary areas of activity to be emphasized during the RPT process shall be 1) Teaching and 2) Research/scholarly activity/creative work .

Non-tenure Track Faculty Appointments

AAUP-represented faculty with Non-tenure Track appointments are subject to periodic review according to the

DAAP Faculty Handbook and the relevant RPT criteria as specified in the current UC/AAUP Contract. The School expects Non-tenure Track Faculty to emphasize the particular area which justified their initial appointment, and to bring that expertise to their teaching; however, there is also an expectation of growth. The School expects Non-tenure Track Faculty to engage in service activities inasmuch as they serve the profession and the community and are integral to professional focus.

A Non-tenure Track Faculty member's Letter of Appointment details his/her responsibilities, areas of emphasis, and workload expectations for reappointment and promotion in relation to the criteria outlined in this document (See Section V, Non-tenure Track Faculty). For the first reappointment review, the initial letter of appointment shall be included in the dossier. For subsequent reappointments or consideration for promotion, the current letter of reappointment shall be included in the dossier. Such letters shall also be required for expedited reappointment review procedures as specified in the current AAUP contract.

The Letter of Appointment also should state that future reappointments are contingent upon the faculty member having met the criteria described in the SOP RPT criteria and the need within the School and Program. The Faculty Member's Annual Performance Review letter will further augment these conditions and set future expectations. The School expects a Non-tenure Track Faculty member to demonstrate continued development and transmission of professional expertise in the two principal areas of activity as appropriate (Teaching OR research/scholarly activity/creative work AND Service).

Represented Adjunct Appointments

As AAUP-represented faculty, adjunct faculty with 65-99 percent FTE, have teaching as the primary responsibility, with less emphasis on research/scholarly activity/creative work and Service categories. The faculty member and School Director work together to form expectations.

Represented adjuncts are expected to attain levels of quality as described in this document for reappointment and promotion, with greater emphasis placed on evaluating performance in those categories specified in the appointment letter and in annual reviews.

B. Levels of Quality

The ratings below depend upon a common (or shared) definition of the terms to be applied. Interpretation of these ratings is by definition and should not be interpreted otherwise.

Excellent: Meritorious; notable; distinguished in a particular quality or activity.

An **excellent** rating in *teaching* is achieved when students and peers alike refer to what they have learned, how much they have been influenced by, how much thinking and pursuit of new or additional knowledge is generated, and how much enthusiasm for producing quality results emanates from the particular contact with that individual in a course, whether a classroom, independent study, project, thesis, or dissertation. Extremely innovative teaching approaches and/or application of technology also may be mentioned.

An **excellent** rating in research/scholarly activity/creative work is achieved when those in the same or related areas refer to the high quality of research/scholarly activity/creative work that is disseminated to a wide range of interested parties. Excellence is usually achieved in one or only a few related specialty areas. Quality and evidence of a continued pattern of important research/scholarly activity/creative work are key elements in judging excellence.

The application of an **excellent** rating to the area of *service* should be recognized as significant or outstanding in one or more areas of service. A rating of excellent cannot be given even if a candidate's level of activity is outstanding or significant in some areas of service (e.g., professional or community) but does not meet the standard for at least a rating of good at the School, College or University level.

Good: Situated higher up or farther from the base; of more value, usefulness, or merit; of higher quality, accomplishment, or significance.

A **good** rating for *teaching* can be achieved when reference is made to a degree of learning, to qualities and characteristics of teaching method and style, etc. which are above average, more than sufficient, more than adequate, greater effort, very good, and above and beyond the “call of duty.” Innovative teaching approaches and/or application of technology also may be mentioned.

A **good** rating for research/scholarly activity/creative work can be achieved when reference is made to contributions to a specific area of endeavor and the potential to attain excellence and make greater contributions to this specialty area. Reference also may be made to the possible importance of a breakthrough in the knowledge area or a presentation of a challenge in the field.

In the *service* area, a **good** rating is indicative of higher or greater than average usefulness, importance, accomplishment or significance. A rating of good cannot be given if a candidate is good or excellent in some areas of service but, at the School, College or University level, does not meet the standard for a rating of good. A candidate cannot receive a good if, at the School, College or University level, candidate is found to have demonstrated an unwillingness to participate or has consistently failed to meet commitments.

Satisfactory: Sufficient to meet a condition or obligation; marked by quantity, scope, or quality to meet with the demand or needs of the situation; adequate, competent but not out of the ordinary.

A **satisfactory** rating in *teaching* is achieved when the individual is perceived as responsibly meeting his/her teaching duties with competence, sufficiency and quality. Procedural and technical requirements will be met and equity of teaching load will be met when compared with the average. There may be reference to normal progress in improvement toward a good rating.

A **satisfactory** rating for research/scholarly activity/creative work is achieved when the candidate demonstrates active involvement in research/scholarly activity/creative work and demonstrates potential for higher productivity in this category.

Within the *service* area, a **satisfactory** rating is used when there is evidence that some participation or involvement occurs, and the degree or extent of same is moderate.

C. Application of Criteria and Levels of Quality with Respect to Rank

Tenure Track Appointments

The School seeks to maintain quality in all areas of faculty performance. The following ratings are our standards for reappointment, promotion and tenure to desired professorial levels:

a. First Reappointment at Assistant Professor Level

For a 1-year reappointment,² the candidate must show:

satisfactory performance in both

- teaching, with demonstrated effort toward improvement of teaching skill and student learning
and
- research/scholarly activity/creative work, with evidence of a research agenda that is endorsed by the School Director and shows a clear path toward appropriate attainment in research/scholarly activity/creative work on a local, state or regional scale, and with activity that is likely to result in the dissemination of that work in publications or exhibitions
and

good performance in

- service, in at least one of the areas

² A 1-year only reappointment indicates that substantial improvement is warranted for continuance in a tenure-track position. If a one-year reappointment is the only option, given contract dates, the SOP RPT committee should state as such in its letter of recommendation.

For a 2-year reappointment,³ the candidate must show:

good performance in both

- *teaching*, with demonstrated effort toward improvement of teaching skill and student learning,
- *research/scholarly activity/creative work*

and

satisfactory performance in

- *service*

For a 3-year reappointment⁴, the candidate must show:

excellent performance in one and at least **satisfactory** performance in the other

- *teaching*,
 - *research/scholarly activity/creative work*,
- and

good performance in

- *service*

b. Subsequent Reappointment at Assistant Professor Level

For a 1-year reappointment⁵, the candidate must show:

good performance in one and **satisfactory** performance in the other

- *teaching*
- *research/scholarly activity/creative work*

and

good performance in

- *service, in at least one of the areas*

For a 2-year reappointment⁶, the candidate must show:

good performance in both

- *teaching*,
- *research/scholarly activity/creative work*

and

satisfactory performance

- *in service*

For a 3-year reappointment⁷, the candidate must show:

³ In DAAP, a 2-year reappointment following an initial 3-year appointment is the norm. The initial 3-year appointment allows the candidate to have at least one full year of teaching that may be reviewed. A 2-year reappointment (first reappointment) subsequent to that, provides the opportunity to have at least one more reappointment (second reappointment) review prior to the tenure review.

⁴ In DAAP, a 3-year reappointment following an initial 3 year appointment is not used, as it does not allow for a second reappointment review prior to the tenure review. A 3-year reappointment would only be acceptable following an initial 2-year appointment.

⁵ A 1-year only reappointment indicates that substantial improvement is warranted for continuance in a tenure-track position.

⁶ In DAAP, a 2-year reappointment following an initial 3-year appointment is the norm. The initial 3-year appointment allows the candidate to have at least one full year of teaching that may be reviewed. A 2-year reappointment (first reappointment) subsequent to that, provides the opportunity to have at least one more reappointment (second reappointment) review prior to the tenure review.

⁷ In DAAP, a 3-year reappointment following an initial 3 year appointment is not used, as it does not allow for a second reappointment

excellent performance in one and at least good performance in the other

- *teaching,*
- *research/scholarly activity/creative work*

and

good performance in

- *service*

c. Promotion from Assistant Professor or Associate Professor

excellent performance in one and good performance in the other (with high potential for achieving excellence in a short period of time)

- *teaching,*
- *research/scholarly activity/creative work*

and

good performance in

- *service*

d. Promotion from Associate Professor to Professor

To attain the level of full professor indicates recognition in one's field, the achievement of distinction as a teacher and scholar, high regard by colleagues in one's own university, college, and school as well as one's professional associates outside the university.

The candidate must show:

excellent performance in both

- *teaching,*
- *research/scholarly activity/creative work*

and

good performance in

- *service*

e. Tenure

The awarding of tenure is an important decision. It has a lasting impact on the future of the School and on the career of the faculty member seeking tenure. The awarding of tenure requires evidence of continued growth and productivity throughout the career of a faculty member, in addition to the Level of Quality achievements listed above.

2. Non-tenure Track Faculty Appointments

Faculty Members with Non-tenure track titles do not have the right to request a review for tenure. It is

review prior to the tenure review. A 3-year reappointment would only be acceptable following an initial 2-year appointment.

expected that reappointment and promotion of Non-tenure Track Faculty will be infrequent, even rare. When such a case arises, the following levels of quality will be observed:

a. Reappointment and Subsequent Reappointment at Non-tenure Track Assistant Professor Level

The candidate must show:

good performance in

- *the areas specified in the appointment letter or most recent reappointment letter*

and

satisfactory performance in

- *other areas*

b. Promotion from Non-tenure Track Assistant Professor to Non-tenure Track Associate Professor

The candidate must show continuous and progressive development as specified in the appointment letter or most recent reappointment letter:

excellent performance in

- *the areas specified in the appointment letter or most recent reappointment letter*

and

good performance in

- *other areas*

c. Reappointment(s) at the Non-tenure Track Associate Professor Level

The candidate must show continuous and progressive development with special attention to the emphasis for which he/she was initially hired, unless changed in the most recent reappointment letter:

excellent performance in

- *the areas specified in the appointment letter or most recent reappointment letter*

and

good performance in

- *other areas*

d. Promotion from Non-tenure Track Associate Professor to Non-tenure Track Professor

To attain the level of Full Professor indicates at least regional recognition in one's field, the achievement of distinction as a teacher, high regard by colleagues in one's own university, college, and school as well as one's professional associates outside the university. Evidence can include newspaper and magazine articles; professional awards; and notable contracts.

The candidate must show continuous and progressive development with special attention to the emphasis for which they were initially hired, unless changed in the most recent reappointment letter:

excellent performance in

- *the areas specified in the appointment letter or most recent reappointment letter*

and

excellent performance in

- *other areas*

e. Reappointments at the Non-tenure Track Professor Level

The candidate must show continuous and progressive:

excellent performance in

- *the areas specified in the appointment letter or most recent reappointment letter*

and

excellent performance in

- *other areas*

3. Represented Adjunct Appointments (65-99 percent FTE)

Represented Adjunct faculty (65-99 percent FTE) concentrate their effort in teaching. Teaching criteria (Section III) are the primary means of assessing Adjunct faculty. The Represented Adjunct faculty member, in conjunction with the School Director, establishes particular emphases, subject to general expectations for Represented Adjunct faculty (see section on Emphasis above.) Titles of rank may include Adjunct Instructor, Adjunct Assistant Professor, Adjunct Associate Professor, and Adjunct Professor.

Represented Adjuncts follow the same reappointment and promotion procedures as Tenure Track and Non-tenure Track Faculty. The following applications of criteria and weighting with respect to rank are to be followed in all cases with Represented Adjuncts.

If there is continuing need for the position, as described in the Represented Adjunct's appointment letter, the faculty member has the right to be reviewed for reappointment and promotion, per the current AAUP contract.

4. Application of Criteria and Levels of Quality with Respect to Rank for Represented Adjunct Faculty (65-99 percent FTE)

Represented adjuncts are subject to the Levels of Quality as described below. The maximum term of reappointment for Represented Adjunct Assistant Professors will be three years, and for Represented Adjunct Associate Professors or Professors the maximum reappointment will be five years.

a. Reappointment at Adjunct Assistant Professor Level

The faculty member must demonstrate that the appointment terms, as set out in the Letter of Appointment, are being met in a continuous and progressive manner with:

satisfactory performance in

- *teaching*

b. Subsequent Reappointment at Adjunct Assistant Professor Level

The faculty member must demonstrate that the appointment terms, as set out in the Letter of Appointment, are being met in a continuous and progressive manner with:

good performance in

- *teaching*

c. Promotion from Adjunct Assistant Professor to Adjunct Associate Professor

The faculty member must demonstrate that the appointment terms, as set out in the Letter of Appointment, are being met in a continuous and progressive manner with:

excellent performance in

- *teaching*

d. Reappointment at Adjunct Associate Professor Level

The faculty member must demonstrate that the appointment terms, as set out in the Letter of Appointment, are being met in a continuous and progressive manner with:

excellent performance in

- teaching

e. Promotion from Adjunct Associate Professor to Adjunct Professor

The faculty member must demonstrate that the requirements, as set out in the contract letter of appointment, are being met at a high level. The candidate must show:

excellent performance in

- teaching

and

good performance in

- *research/scholarly activity/creative work*
- *service*

f. Reappointment at Adjunct Professor Level

The faculty member must demonstrate that the requirements, as set out in the contract letter of appointment, are being met at a high level. The candidate must show sustained and:

excellent performance in

- teaching

and

good performance in

- *research/scholarly activity/creative work*
- *service*

Section V

Non-tenure Track Faculty

Non-tenure Track faculty are represented by the AAUP and are members of the Bargaining Unit, and adhere to RPT Criteria developed at the academic unit level. Titles of rank and promotion in the Non-tenure Track Faculty Track parallel those in the Tenure-Track, with categories of Non-tenure Track Assistant Professor, Non-tenure Track Associate Professor, and Non-tenure Track Professor. Faculty Members with Non-tenure Track titles do not have the right to request a review for tenure. However, they may be reappointed for subsequent terms, or apply for a separate, open tenure-track appointment in the program, if one exists.

The School of Planning considers that faculty members in the Non-tenure Track Faculty track are professionals who have demonstrated depth of knowledge and/or extensive experience in one or more particular aspects of the Planning and Design professions.

These individuals are qualified to contribute significantly to the excellence of specific disciplines and are invited to join a program only when their area of specialization can augment or complement the expertise of the existing faculty.

Non-tenure Track Faculty members are expected to maintain a strong connection with the discipline or activities for which they were brought into the School and to bridge teaching with issues of the profession, contributing to the development of the discipline

The individual's particular strengths that led to the hire, his/her specific responsibilities, areas of emphasis, and the workload expectations for reappointment and promotion in relation to the criteria are to be considered in RPT decisions. Formal annual review reports developed in consultation and agreement with the School Director will further establish or change the nature, scope, and workload distribution.

The School of Planning considers development and transmission of professional expertise to be the primary consideration in making Non-tenure Track Faculty appointments. It is also understood that a faculty member

should demonstrate a consistent and equivalent level of contribution in service as tenure-track faculty, though the nature of service assignments may differ.

A Non-tenure Track Faculty member's Letter of Appointment details the individual's particular strengths that led to hiring, specific responsibilities, areas of emphasis, and the workload expectations for reappointment and promotion in relation to the criteria outlined in this document.

Formal Annual Performance Reviews, developed in consultation and agreement with the School Director, further establish the nature, scope, and workload distribution. Reappointment will be confirmed with an appointment letter that, with the Annual Performance Review, will detail the responsibilities and workload expectations, as well as expectations for growth, in alignment with the SOP RPT criteria.

A Non-tenure Track Faculty member may choose to engage in any category as defined in the appointment letter, and may be a very valuable contributor to the research mission of the School and College; however, it is recognized that this contribution is not the primary basis for reappointment decisions, as it is not the primary basis for appointment to Non-tenure Track Faculty positions. The primary basis for appointment and reappointment shall be development and transmission of professional expertise. It is the responsibility of the faculty member to clearly describe the particular focus, relative importance, and interrelationships of teaching, research/scholarly activity/creative work, and service and their relationship to the development and transmission of professional expertise in the Self Evaluation portion of the RPT dossier.

Evaluation for Reappointment and Promotion of Non-tenure Track Faculty shall be based on the same criteria definitions used for tenure-track and tenured faculty, with weighting of the criteria appropriate to the established expectations for that faculty member, as described above.

Section VI

Emeritus Faculty

Emeritus status is defined by the University as "as a non-salaried, non-official position and academic title of honor, usually corresponding to that held in the last period of active academic service." Each faculty member who is approaching retirement and who wishes to be appointed to Emeritus status upon retirement shall submit a full CV. The self-evaluation should refer to the School RPT criteria at the appropriate rank and demonstrate how those criteria have been maintained at a level deserving of the honor of Emeritus status.

All full-time School faculty members are eligible to review the self-evaluation and CV and provide written comments to the School Director on the awarding of emeritus status. In addition to using the School RPT criteria, the faculty should give additional weight to long term (at least five years) service to the School.

The School Director makes a written recommendation to the Dean for appointment to Emeritus status based upon the CV, and the faculty review.

APPENDIX 1

School of Planning
Peer Review of Teaching Performance
Section II – SOP RPT Criteria

Faculty member assigned to the review:

Date of the class/studio attended:

Type of course:

- Studio/charrette/workshop
- Lecture/seminar

Course title:

How many times the course has been taught by the faculty member under review?

Evaluation of teaching:

- Effectiveness (Efficient use of class time to accomplish the prescribed student learning outcomes. Use of current local, national, and/or international examples, case studies, and literature. Consistency with the syllabus (contents, evaluation, schedule).
- Communication (In class: verbal communication, and use of different media. Use of Blackboard and other social media to communicate with the students. Types of electronic or hardcopy documentation provided)
- Engagement (In class: involvement of students in class or in group discussion.)

Evaluation of the Syllabus/Blackboard

- Effectiveness (completeness of the course description and student learning outcomes, clarity of the nature and timing of all assignments, exams, projects and papers, and how grades will be assigned to each, and how these contribute to the student's course grade; list of readings and references. Appropriateness of the program, the teaching method, and/or the subject. Evidence of connection with other courses and or disciplines and/or with the program and PAB curriculum map)

Assessment:

- Documentation of process by which faculty member assesses how the course has met student learning outcomes and contributes to programmatic and PAB objectives and goals.