

Approved Office of
the Provost
December 5, 1995

1. Criteria for Faculty Performance in the School of Planning

In the School of Planning, faculty members are considered to be professionals who are well-grounded in theories related to the planning discipline and who have substantial knowledge 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 qualified professionals receiving either a baccalaureate or a master's degree. Consequently, the School values a balance among its faculty with respect to engagement in original scholarship or creativity on the one hand, and practical applications on the other. At the same time, 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.

There are five major categories of accepted responsibilities and functions within the university: (1) teaching and student advising, (2) research, creative and scholarly work, (3) professional activity, (4) school, college and university-wide service, and (5) public and community service. Criteria for performance are based on the relative value of each to the School of Planning within the overall framework and criteria of the College of Design, Architecture, Art and Planning, the University of Cincinnati's Statement of Purpose and Direction, and the procedures and guidelines set forth in Articles 5 and 6 of the Agreement between University of Cincinnati and American Association of University Professors, University of Cincinnati chapter (latest edition)(UC-AAUP Agreement). Statements and evaluation guidelines for each category appear in Section C: Responsibilities and Functions of Faculty.

A. Evaluation Criteria for Different Promotional Ranks

The School seeks to maintain quality in all areas of faculty performance. While no one faculty member may excel in all areas at all times, each is expected to attain excellence in several areas within the established probationary period following initial appointment.¹ The following ratings shall be considered minimum standards for reappointment, promotion and tenure to desired professorial levels.

Reappointment as Assistant Professor

1-year² - Satisfactory to Good in teaching and student advising and research, creative and scholarly work, with at least satisfactory service expected in at least one of the remaining three areas.

2-year³ - Good to excellent in teaching and research with at least satisfactory in two of the remaining three areas.

3-year - Excellent in teaching or research, good in the other, and service expected in all of the remaining three areas, two of which shall be rated good to excellent.

Assistant Professor to Associate Professor with Tenure

Good to excellent ratings in all areas with excellent in either teaching or research and high potential for achieving excellence in the other within a short period of time; an excellent rating in at least one of the other three areas.

¹Probationary period is established and set forth in Article 6, Sections 6.1 and 6.2 of the UC-AAUP Agreement.

²A 1-year only reappointment indicates that substantial improvement is warranted or there may be little probability for continuance in a tenure track.

³This rating would not apply when a 2-year reappointment follows a first reappointment of three years. In this case the 3-year rating would apply.

Associate Professor to Full Professor

Excellent ratings in both teaching and research and excellent ratings in two of the remaining three areas with good in the other. To attain the level of full professor indicates some national recognition in one's field, the achievement of distinction as a teacher **and** as a scholar, high regard by colleagues in one's own university, college, and school as well as one's professional associates outside the university.

B. Definitions of Ratings for Reappointment and Promotion

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 Meritoriously near an ideal; notable; preeminent in a particular quality or activity. This rating is not easily achieved and should be used judiciously.

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, or thesis. Extremely innovative teaching approaches and application of teaching may also be mentioned.

An EXCELLENT rating in research, scholarly, and creative work is achieved when those in the same or related areas refer to high quality of results and products which are shared with them and disseminated to a wider 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 scholarship are key elements in judging excellence.

The application of an EXCELLENT rating to the categories of professional activity; service to the school, college and university; and public and community service, is quite subjective and dependent on each judge's ideal. However, using the definitional terms of notable and preeminent in a particular quality or activity, evidence of reference to these and like characteristics should stand out.

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 application of technology may also be mentioned.

A GOOD rating for research, scholarly and 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 may also be made to the imminence of a breakthrough in the knowledge area or a presentation of a challenge in the field as well as the quantity of additional or complementary ideas or applications of current knowledge.

In the activity and service area, a GOOD rating is indicative of higher or greater than average usefulness, importance, accomplishment or significance. Reference from a recipient of the service or participation in the activity, noting the indicators identified or other like indicators, should be considered sufficient evidence for such a rating.

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 - no more so and no less so.

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. Normal progress in improvement toward a good rating may be referred to.

A SATISFACTORY rating for research, scholarly and creative work is achieved when the candidate demonstrates active involvement in research, scholarly or creative work and demonstrates potential for higher productivity in this category.

Within the activity or service area, a SATISFACTORY rating is used when there is evidence that some participation or involvement occurs, the degree or extent of same is moderate, and there is not too much activity spread over too many bases.

WEAK Deficient; lacking strength; lacking skill or proficiency, lacking in power to perform or convince; not supported, as by force or logic.

This rating is used when there is sufficient evidence that progress and improvement can and should be made in any of the categories being evaluated. Or it is used for supporting negative recommendations on tenure or non-reappointment. Extreme caution should be used when this rating is being considered. Poor quality and lack of evidence to support statements of work accomplished or no achievements will be prevailing factors.

C. Responsibilities and Functions of Faculty

Apportionment of faculty effort and evaluation of faculty performance among the five categories below shall be consistent with formally adopted workload policies.

1. Teaching and Student Advising - Teaching and learning are central to the mission of the School of Planning. The primary goal of the School is to prepare and guide students who intend to become professional in their major field of study (i.e. urban planning; health administration and planning, or urban studies), in either the public or private sector of society. All faculty are expected to carry an equitable load of both organized classes and supervision of independent study, senior problems and/or 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. Expectations for course preparation and ongoing revisions are detailed in a subsequent section of this document. In the School of Planning, faculty are expected to assess their own courses and teaching performance for continuous improvement in both content and process as well as manner and style, taking into account student evaluation of each course as well as their own.

Evaluation of teaching effectiveness shall be based on all available evidence presented by and for the individual faculty member, student course evaluations, evaluation by students engaged in non-organized teaching activities (e.g., thesis, project, and independent study consultation), evaluation by colleagues engaged in team or co-teaching activities, and evaluation by colleagues who, as part of a formal process of peer review or otherwise, have spent time in classroom observation of an individual's teaching performance.

2. Research, Creative and/or Scholarly Work - Research and scholarly activity are considered essential to each faculty member's professional growth and development. The generation of new knowledge, new concepts and/or new methods of professional work is an expected part of being a faculty member in the planning profession, whether supported by outside funding or not. 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, creative, 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.

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, creative, and scholarly efforts contributing to a faculty member's productivity should also be acknowledged. 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 following: 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.

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 or creative work, but may be appropriate for inclusion as professional activity or community service.

3. Professional Activity - Professional service and activities are viewed as opportunities to broaden contacts with other professionals in one's discipline, to further one's professional development, to make contributions to the field and to its formal organization, and to 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 can denote the kind and quality of service rendered.

4. School, College, and University Service

a. School - The sharing of internal tasks (e.g., recruitment of students, admissions work, curriculum development, governance, other committees) 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 contribution.

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

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

5. 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 as completed project reports, designs, case studies, etc., and accompanying evaluation reviews and comments or letters. Service which stems from teaching and research and feeds back to these areas so as to complement same are considered highly worthwhile. Other service which supplements the needs of various publics or communities but does not contribute to a faculty member's professional growth, although considered of value, may not be rated as highly.

II. Responsibilities and Procedures for the Initiation, Development, and Presentation of Dossiers for Reappointment, Promotion, and Tenure (RPT)

The procedures contained herein specify the responsibilities and general schedule for all parties at the School level: the candidate, the School of Planning Reappointment, Promotion, and Tenure Committee (SOP RPT Committee), the School of Planning (SOP) Director, in the preparation, the deliberation, and the forwarding of a dossier and recommendations to the College Reappointment, Promotion and Tenure Committee, and beyond. All parties are to adhere to relevant College and University procedures during the course of review.⁴

- A.** In accordance with standing School of Planning procedures for **peer review of faculty teaching performance**, at least two quarters before a candidate must submit a dossier for RPT evaluation, the SOP Director will assign one or more faculty colleagues to provide a written review of the candidate's teaching and advising performance.
- B.** The deadline for submission of dossiers at the first level of review shall be communicated in writing to the Bargaining Unit member by the Dean at least six(6) months in advance of the earliest deadline date for review. (Bargaining Agreement P. 25) (SEE TABLE 1)
- C.** **Notice of intention to review or be reviewed** shall be given in writing to the School RPT Committee and the candidate by the SOP Director, along with the date of submission to the School RPT Committee three (3) months in advance of that date. Included in this letter shall be all submission and notification of recommendation dates which apply to the candidate.
- D. Preparation and Submission of Dossier**
 - 1. The Candidate shall prepare and submit to the Chair of the SOP RPT Committee a list of names and addresses of individuals who are familiar with (and willing to comment on) the Candidate's activities and service in any of the following areas: teaching, research and publication; School, College and/or University Service; professional association; and community organizations and institutions. This list shall be submitted no later than one month before the final date for the submission of his/her dossier. The SOP RPT Committee Chair shall send out requests for and receive these reference letters to be placed in the Candidate's dossier. The SOP RPT Committee Chair shall also request evaluative statements on the candidate's performance from all full-time School faculty colleagues. Evaluative letters may also be solicited by the SOP RPT Committee Chair from currently enrolled students and recent graduates who may have had several classes with the candidate and have had an opportunity to assess the impact of the candidate's teaching beyond the classroom. Letters may also be solicited from individuals not indicated by the candidate but felt appropriate by the SOP RPT Committee. All such letters received will be placed in the candidate's dossier.
 - 2. The Candidate shall prepare and submit his/her dossier to the SOP RPT Committee by the date given in the notification to recommend letter from the SOP Director. The Candidate's dossier shall include all necessary materials presented in an orderly manner with some means (e.g., tabs) for separating and identifying each segment. A recommended order is outlined in Attachment A. A 10x11-1/2 inch three-ringed notebook binder is considered appropriate for holding dossier items. Examples of published materials or copy of the title page and/or table of contents or the like should appear in the "evidence of research" section of the dossier.

⁴University procedures are found in the Agreement Between the University of Cincinnati and AAUP, University of Cincinnati Chapter, April 2, 1993 to August 31, 1995, and will be updated in succeeding collective bargaining agreements. (Details regarding Reappointment, Promotion and Tenure can be found in Article 7, pages 18-29. The College of DAAP "Reappointment, Promotion and Tenure Responsibilities and Procedures" shall be attached to this document.

Space should be provided in the front of the binder for the items which are to be added after submission to the SOP RPT Committee: Recommendation Sheet and Recommendation Letters from the SOP RPT Committee, SOP Director, College RPT Committee and Dean.

3. The SOP Director shall be responsible for submitting to the Candidate a summary of student evaluation of all courses taught during the period for which the candidate is being reviewed.

E The SOP RPT Committee shall review evidence demonstrating the faculty member's performance in the following areas, and rate each according to the criteria approved by the School of Planning Faculty, Dean of the College of Design, Architecture, Art, and Planning, and the Provost.⁵

Teaching and Student Advising
Research, Scholarly, and/or Creative Work
Professional Activity
School, College, and University-Wide Service
Public and Community Service

In reviewing and rating candidates for reappointment, the Committee will consider evidence of activities and performance during the time period extending from the date of initial appointment or the previous review for reappointment, whichever is later. In the case of a second reappointment, some evaluation of the progress toward promotion and tenure will be made as well.

In reviewing and rating candidates for promotion with tenure or promotion to a higher rank, the SOP RPT Committee will take into account the entire period of faculty service to the University.

Procedure for Conduct of the School RPT Committee - The Committee shall be composed of five members, at least three of which are to be tenured and one non-tenured. Members are to be elected for staggered two-year terms and 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 Guidelines, especially as they apply to the review of and recommendation on each candidate.

- Only one candidate is to be reviewed and evaluated at any one deliberation meeting.
- Each committee member reviews the candidate's dossier prior to the deliberation meeting.
- At the meeting, committee members discuss the evidence as presented in relation to the approved criteria. Following the discussion, a recommendation motion is made and a vote is taken according to parliamentary procedure. The vote is tabulated and recorded in the recommendation. All Committee members must vote. A majority of the Committee must be present and voting for a recommendation to be forwarded.

⁵After such approval, academic recommendations at all levels of evaluation shall be based on such criteria. The recommendations and decisions of the Provost, the President, and the Board of Trustees, to the extent that they are concerned with academic performance, shall also be based on such academic criteria. In applying these criteria to individual cases, the committee, administrative officer, or Board of Trustees shall take into account the recommendation of the preceding or administrative officers, but may arrive at an independent recommendation based on the same criteria. Academic performance based on such criteria shall be the only consideration in promotion cases. Academic performance based on such criteria shall be the only consideration in cases involving reappointment, or the granting of tenure or continuous appointment, unless reappointment, tenure, or continuous appointment is denied because of program needs or budget restraints.

- A statement accompanying the recommendation is 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 are to be kept confidential.

F. The SOP RPT Committee's Letter of Recommendation is submitted to the School Director forthwith. A copy is to be sent to the candidate by the School Director.

G. The School Director shall review and evaluate the candidate's dossier and makes an independent judgment, write his/her letter of recommendation and forward the complete dossier to the Chair of the College RPT Committee. The School Director shall send a copy of his/her letter of recommendation to the candidate, with a copy to the SOP RPT Committee.

III. Recommended Contents and Order of the Candidate's Dossier

Copies of the following items are forwarded to the Senior Vice President and Provost for his/her review and evaluation for a recommendation to the President and Board of Trustees.

Recommendation or Cover Sheet
Dean's Letter of Recommendation
College RPT Committee Letter of Recommendation
School Director's Letter of Recommendation
School RPT Committee Letter of Recommendation
Candidate's Vita or Resume
Candidate's Self Evaluation
A Summary of Student Evaluations if same is not included in School Committee Recommendation

Dossier material to be submitted to the School RPT Committee includes the following. The order recommended is the order in which the Committee reviews a dossier. Notes to the right of the items are reminders for checking.

Checklist

Table of Contents

- Current Vita** Although a standard format is not required, it is important to see dates clearly and to be able to review types of work and activities as they relate to each other. Scholarly works which have been published should be listed separately from those which have been submitted for publication, circulating, or in progress. Also indicate all relevant dates - submission, expected to complete, etc.
- Self-Evaluation** This is the candidate's own view of what he/she has accomplished toward personal goals for academic development during the period under review. It should be written in the first person; it need not be lengthy nor formal in style. It should provide information and evaluative comments.
- Statement of Teaching Duties** A table will be prepared by the candidate and placed in the dossier that includes the following:
1) A listing of each course taught by number, name, credits, and quarter taught, dates of when the course was first taught and when the course was substantially revised by the candidate; 2) a listing of independent studies supervised, with topics and names of students; 3) service as senior or graduate project advisor, committee chair, or member, with names of students advised, 4) a listing of academic advising responsibilities carried out, including numbers of students advised at the baccalaureate and masters levels
- Evidence of Teaching** Copies of syllabi, including before and after syllabi showing substantial revisions, if appropriate.
- Preparation** If bulky, this evidence should be presented in a separate carrier with reference made to it in the table.
- Student Evaluations** This should be a clear, concise presentation of the individual faculty member's ratings by students, indicating what the ratings show and how the data is to be interpreted. This summary is the responsibility of the School Director. Exceptional care should be taken in making comparisons between the individual and others or with averages. When in doubt, comparisons should be avoided.
- Peer Evaluation** Evaluative comments related to teaching by peers who have had the opportunity to observe the individual in the teaching setting, in accordance with established School procedures for peer review, should be included.

Letters from Students	Letters received by the Chair of the SOP RPT Committee will be included here. Unsolicited letters or notes received by the candidate during the period under review are also considered appropriate and desirable. Requests by the candidate for comments at the time of dossier submission should be avoided.
State of Research, Scholarly and Creative Work	This should be a summary statement of the kind of research in which the individual is involved, its focus, how far the work has progressed in relation to its initiation, what is expected as results or products for dissemination and what has already been produced or disseminated.
Letters from Colleagues- Within and External to the University	Evaluative comments will be requested by the SOP RPT Committee via letter sent to individuals identified by the candidate or by the SOP RPT Committee. More specifically, it is the obligation of each full-time School faculty colleague to write University an evaluative statement for all candidates being reviewed for reappointment, promotion and tenure. The Committee chair is responsible for soliciting these letters. Although letters from external evaluators are quite important to the review process, of equal importance are valuatve comments from UC colleagues.
Evidence of Research, Scholarly and Creative Activity	As appropriate to the type of work, the presentation should include offprints, programs, reviews, visuals, photographs. Bulky materials should be placed in a separate carrier and referenced in an appropriate manner in the main body of the dossier.
Statement of Professional Activity	A statement of the kind and extent of involvement or participation, its importance to the candidate and to the profession, and benefits or potential benefits to the, university, its faculty, and students.
Evidence of Professional Activity	Letters, awards, commendations, programs, offprints of edited professional publications, etc.
Statement of School, College and University Service	Committee work and other types of activities at any or all levels at the University should be identified. The extent and degree of participation or involvement should be specified as well as the length of service which is anticipated or required.
Evidence of School, College and University Service	Letters of appreciation, commendation, or requests to serve as well as any other indicators should be included. Whatever is presented, however, should be brief, not bulky.
Statement of Public and Community Ser vice	The type, kind, and extent of involvement or participation, its relationship to teaching, research, and/or professional practice should be described.
Evidence of Public and Community Service	Letters, awards, commendations, programs, published accounts of the service, etc.

Table 1

Dossier Submission and Notification Dates

Notice from Dean of College to Candidate of Deadline for Submission of Dossiers	from Director to Candidate & SOP RPT Committee	SOP RPT (latest date)	Dossier Submitted to SOP RPT Committee (date)	College RPT Committee (approx. date)	Dossier Submitted to VP-Provost Office	Candidate Notified of Recommendation to Board of Trustees
Initial Appointment Date	October 1	December 1	January 3	February 1	March 1	
April 1	July 1	October 1	October 15	November 15	December 15	
September 1	December 1	March 1	April 8	May 1	September 1	
May 1	August 1	November 1	February 1	February 1	Min. 12 mos. in advance of promotion pd.	
May 1	August 1	November 1	November 1	February 1	Normally June 15	

**SCHOOL OF PLANNING
COLLEGE OF DESIGN, ARCHITECTURE, ART, AND PLANNING
UNIVERSITY OF CINCINNATI**

RPT COMMITTEE WORKSHEET
(For individual comments following
review of documentation)

Faculty Member Being Reviewed

Action Being Reviewed

Date

A. Vitae

B. Self-Evaluation

C. Teaching

1. Factual description/duties

2. Student evaluations

3. Letters from colleagues

D. Creative, Clinical, or scholarly Work (including external evaluations)

1. Factual description

2. Letters of evaluation

E. Professional Activity

1. Factual description
2. Letters of evaluation

F. Service to School, College, and University

1. School
2. College
3. University

G. Service to Public and Community

1. Factual description
2. Letters of evaluation

H. General Observations/Comments