

School of Architecture and Interior Design Criteria for Reappointment, Promotion, and Tenure

Contents

Section I Preamble

Section II Procedures

A. The RPT Committee

B. Annual Review

Section III Criteria and Evidence for Assessment

A. Teaching

B. Research/Creative/Scholarly Activities

1. Creative Work

2. Research/Scholarly Activities

C. Service

Section IV Application of Criteria for Reappointment, Promotion and Tenure

A. Emphasis

B. Levels of Quality

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

1. Tenure Track Appointments

2. Qualified Faculty Appointments

3. Represented Adjunct Appointments

Section V Qualified Faculty

Section VI Emeritus Faculty

Section I

Preamble

The procedures and criteria for reappointment, promotion, and tenure (RPT) in the School of Architecture and Interior Design (SAID) reflect the mission of the School, and serve the best interests of the College and the University.

This document describes in general terms the criteria for reappointment, promotion, and tenure of the School of Architecture and Interior Design, subject to interpretation with respect to the candidate's discipline and area of emphasis.

This document applies to faculty represented in the AAUP Contract (Article 1, Recognition and Description of Bargaining Unit), including unqualified appointments (Professor, Associate Professor, Assistant Professor), qualified appointments (Qualified Faculty) and part time appointments or Adjunct Faculty whose position is 65 percent or more of a full time faculty member. For the purposes of this document, the Academic Unit is the School of Architecture and Interior Design (the School).

The College of DAAP RPT Procedural Guidelines (approved 4.28.05) supplements SAID procedures and criteria, including recommendations for the Timeline for Dossier Submission, Preparation of the Dossier, Content and Format of the Dossier, and Evaluation of the Dossier. The AAUP Collective Bargaining Agreement states that, "RPT recommendations shall be based on criteria related to the responsibilities and functions of the candidate's academic unit or library jurisdiction." Therefore, the SAID document takes precedence when it differs from the College RPT Procedural Guidelines.

Section II

Procedures

The candidate and the School Director share responsibility for periodic RPT review, with support from the University, the College, and senior colleagues in the School.

A. The SAID RPT Committee

The role of the RPT Committee is to:

- advise candidates on RPT procedures and the organization of the dossier, PRIOR to the candidate submitting the document for the official review
- interpret and assess the quality and sufficiency of evidence in the dossier in regard to the School Criteria
- comment on the qualification of assessors, but ONLY in regard to the qualifications included in the dossier
- write a recommendation letter, which becomes part of the dossier as it moves to the next level of review.

The RPT Committee of the School of Architecture and Interior Design is a standing committee of four members, elected by majority vote of the Bargaining Unit Members of the School. The Committee shall consist of tenured faculty members—two faculty whose primary teaching responsibility is in Interior Design and two faculty whose primary teaching responsibility is in Architecture. One alternate from each discipline (that discipline's runner-up in the election) should stand ready to fill a position should an elected member be unable to serve.

Members shall serve two-year terms with the membership elected in alternate years, one from each discipline to maintain experience and continuity through overlapping membership. The election shall occur every year within six weeks prior to the end of the spring term of the Academic Year.

Alternates shall serve for one year.

The SAID RPT Committee shall elect a chair to serve for one year. This person shall sign all letters of recommendation as Committee chair. The RPT Committee should meet as soon as possible after the yearly election in order to elect a chair.

For each candidate in either discipline going through the RPT process, the Chair of the RPT Committee in consultation with the RPT Committee shall form a sub-committee, consisting of three members: the chair of the RPT Committee, and two other members. Two out of three members shall be from the candidate's discipline, unless there are not enough eligible faculty members from the candidate's discipline.

Each sub-committee member has one vote on sub-committee recommendations. All sub-committee members must be present to vote. A member may abstain from voting. A majority of those voting is required to carry a recommendation.

One sub-committee member may take responsibility for preparing an initial draft of the committee's letter, but in all reviews, the sub-committee determines the final recommendation. All sub-committee members shall sign the Letter of Recommendation.

B. Annual Review

Each faculty member shall provide the School Director with an annual written report of activities (the Annual Report). Each faculty member will consult with the School Director at least once each year (the Annual Faculty Review). The Annual Faculty Review shall focus on the Annual Report, and address as appropriate the three RPT criteria areas described below. The School Director and the faculty member shall summarize the Annual Report and the Annual Faculty Review in the Annual Performance Review, per AAUP Contract. Both the faculty member and the School Director shall sign the Annual Performance Review, which is added to the faculty member's RPT file as documentation of the ongoing RPT process.

Section III

Criteria and Evidence for Assessment

The School evaluates applications for reappointment, promotion, and tenure on performance in three areas: teaching; creative/research/scholarly activities; and service (see Section IV-A 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 IV-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 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 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.

Teaching activities revolve around the knowledge, intellectual processes, approaches, and preparations that produce instruction, and associated services for undergraduate and graduate students in the School. They also involve curriculum development, scholarship and research, creative work, and service achievements that inform and extend teaching and pedagogy.

There are general expectations of all faculty teaching in SAID that include: developing courses and preparing syllabi, readings, projects, and exams; lecturing and/or leading seminar discussions; coaching and criticism of studio design work and/or graduate research; evaluating student performance; making effective use of course enrichment possibilities, such as visiting speakers and critics, field trips, and innovative instructional technology.

Teaching responsibilities might also include academic advising of students, serving on graduate thesis committees, independent studies with students, participation in course development, and mentoring teaching assistants.

Teaching: Means of Assessment

A candidate's dossier must document activities related to teaching. The means of assessing these activities are evaluated as follows. A candidate's dossier must document activities related to teaching. The means of assessing these activities are evaluated as follows.

Peer reviews of classroom teaching are required for all Assistant Professors. The School Director shall assign a member of the SAID faculty who is qualified to assess the teaching and subject matter, and who is not a member of the SAID RPT committee when the candidate is under review. The assessor shall provide a written and signed evaluation of the candidate's teaching in class, which is included in the dossier.

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 (not required for Associate Professors)

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

- Letters from colleagues
- Letters from former students
- 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 advising

B. Creative/Research/Scholarly Activity

The candidate should show evidence of continuing productivity that advances the mission of the University by “discovering, creating and reporting knowledge” (AAUP Agreement, 3.1.1). For a faculty member in SAID, the creation of projects, artwork, plans, and built artifacts constitutes a clearly defined and valued mode of investigation analogous to “research and scholarly work.” Creative/research/scholarly activities constitute the intellectual inquiry required for understanding and developing the knowledge of architecture and interior design. A faculty may engage in any of the three to varying degrees, and shall achieve the levels of performance described in Section IV, Application of Criteria to Reappointment, Promotion and Tenure.

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

1. Creative Work

Creative work expands the knowledge, appreciation, and understanding of the disciplines through the creation of projects and built artifacts. Creative work explores ideas—theoretical, 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 they disseminate such work to larger audiences through guest lectures, exhibitions, publications, 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 learning of others.

Creative Work: Means of Assessment

Creative work activities shall be documented in the dossier. Documentation includes assessment and citation of the work, and where justified by the performance standards of Section IV, a published record of critical reception, which validates and provides evidence of quality creative work.

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

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 evaluations 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
- 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 research and 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 given to pursue research
- Grants, awards, sponsored projects, fellowships, and other funding
- Curation of exhibitions
- Obtaining competitive awards given to pursue research
- Grants, awards, sponsored projects, fellowships, and other funding
- Professional service in 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.

2. Research/Scholarly Activities

Research/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.

Research/Scholarly Activities: Means of Assessment

The dossier should document research/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.

Evidence for Assessment of Research/Scholarly Activities

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 evaluations 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 refereed 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
- Peer-reviewed and academic journals
- 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, such as Festschriften, corpora, encyclopedia, dictionaries, reference guides, and other compendia and anthologies
- Translations for 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, 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

C. Service

Service activities involve intellectual, creative, administrative, and leadership expertise to support and advance: the academic institution, professional organizations in design and related fields; and public, civic and community organizations.

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.

The School expects its faculty 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. However, for Faculty prior to receiving tenure, service on committees shall be assessed in consultation with the School Director, with the focus on developing the candidate’s Teaching and Creative / Research / Scholarly Activity credentials. Participation in appropriate professional, technical and educational activities is important for the development of faculty members.

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

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:

- 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

School of Architecture and Interior Design
Criteria for Reappointment, Promotion, and Tenure

College of Design, Architecture, Art, and Planning
University of Cincinnati

Approved by Provost on February 13, 2011

- 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.
- Service to school, college, and/or university through committee work or other activities
- 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

Section IV

Application of Criteria for Reappointment, Promotion, and Tenure

A. Emphasis

The emphasis, or weighting, of specific criteria will vary depending on the type of faculty appointment, as follows:

Tenure-Track Appointments

The School recognizes that in constituting a strong School, individual faculty members will contribute in unique and different ways. The School expects all faculty to make positive contributions through teaching. In addition, The School expects all faculty to make contributions through their Creative/Research/Scholarly activities. The School does not expect a faculty member to excel in both creative and research/scholarly activities. Each faculty member, in consultation with the School Director, chooses the relative weight or emphasis of her/his contributions in each area of Creative/Research/Scholarly activities. This occurs over time, in consideration of the overall needs and values of the School, and with the collaboration of the School Director (as reflected in the Annual Performance Reviews). It is the responsibility of the faculty member to describe her/his area of emphasis in the Self Evaluation portion of the RPT dossier.

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

Qualified Faculty Appointments

AAUP-represented faculty with qualified appointments (Qualified Faculty) are subject to periodic review and the relevant RPT criteria described in this document and the UC/AAUP Contract. The School expects Qualified 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 Qualified Faculty to engage in service activities inasmuch as they serve the profession and the community and are integral to professional focus.

A Qualified 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, Qualified 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.

The Letter of Appointment also should state that future reappointments are contingent upon the faculty member having met the criteria described in these RPT guidelines 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 Qualified Faculty member to demonstrate continued development and transmission of professional expertise in the three principal areas of activity as appropriate.

Represented Adjunct Appointments

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

B. Levels of Quality

Definitions of levels of quality:

Competent:

A level of endeavor which fulfills minimum expectations for the faculty member, as outlined in Article 3, Academic Safeguards and Responsibilities, in the AAUP Contract, this document, and in Annual Performance Reviews conducted with the School Director. Performance lower than competent is not considered satisfactory for reappointment, promotion or tenure.

Emerging Effective:

Evidence of immediate and expected achievements that are the foundation for sustained contributions as defined by effective.

Effective:

Reflects sustained contributions of consistently good quality, resulting in the dissemination or recognition of work at a local, regional, or broader level.

Emerging Significant:

Evidence of immediate and expected achievements that are the foundation for sustained contributions as defined by significant.

Significant:

A high level of sustained commitment; contributions consistently excellent and meaningful to the field or discipline; new and creative endeavors or experiments which help to define or redefine positions within the field; contributions acknowledged as being exceptional on multiple levels (including local, regional, national, and international).

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

1. Tenure Track Appointments

a. First Reappointment at Assistant Professor Level

The candidate must show:

emerging effective performance in both

- teaching
- and
- creative/research/scholarly activities
- and

competent performance in

- service

b. Subsequent Reappointment at Assistant Professor Level

The candidate must show:

effective performance in both

- teaching
- and
- creative/research/scholarly activities
- and

competent performance in

- service

c. Promotion from Assistant Professor to Associate Professor

The candidate must show:

effective performance in one and **emerging significant** performance in the other

- teaching
- creative/research/scholarly activities
- and

emerging effective performance in

- service

d. Promotion from Associate Professor to Professor

The candidate must show:

Significant performance in both

- teaching
- creative/research/scholarly activities
- and

effective performance in

- service

e. Tenure

The awarding of tenure is an important decision, with a lasting impact on the future of the School, of the institution in general, and the career of the faculty member. 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. Qualified Faculty Appointments

a. Reappointment at Qualified Faculty Assistant Professor Level

The candidate must show:

effective performance in

- one area specified in the appointment letter or most recent reappointment letter
- and

emerging effective performance in

- teaching
- and

competent performance in

- service

b. Subsequent Reappointment at Qualified Assistant Professor Level

The candidate must show:

effective performance in

- two areas specified in the appointment letter or in the most recent reappointment letter
- and

competent performance in

- service

c. Promotion from Qualified Faculty Assistant Professor to Qualified Faculty Associate Professor

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

emerging significant performance in

- teaching or research
- and

effective performance in the other area

and

effective performance in

- service

d. Subsequent Reappointments at the Qualified Faculty Associate Professor Level

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:

Significant performance in

- one area specified in the appointment letter or in the most recent reappointment letter

and

competent performance in

- service

and

effective performance in

- two other areas

e. Promotion from Qualified Faculty Associate Professor to Qualified Faculty Professor

The candidate must show continuous and progressive:

significant performance in

- one area specified in the appointment letter or in the most recent reappointment letter

and

effective performance in

- two other areas

f. Reappointments at the Qualified Faculty Professor Level

The candidate must show continuous and progressive:

significant performance in

- one area specified in the appointment letter or in the most recent reappointment letter

and

effective performance in

- two 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, establish 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 Qualified Faculty, but use the following applications of criteria and weighting with respect to rank.

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 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 above. 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:

effective performance in

- *teaching*

and

competent performance in

- *service and/or creative/research/scholarly activity*

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:

effective performance in

- *teaching*

and

competent performance in

- *service and/or creative/research/scholarly activity*

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, evidencing a sustained commitment to the institution with:

emerging significant performance in

- *teaching*

and

competent performance in

- *creative/research/scholarly activity and service*

d. Reappointment at Adjunct Associate 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:

significant performance in

- *teaching*

and

competent performance in

- *creative/research/scholarly activity and service*

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:

significance performance in

- teaching

and

effective performance in

- creative/research/scholarly activity

and

effective performance in

- 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:

significance performance in

- teaching

and

effective performance in

- creative/research/scholarly activity

and

effective performance in

- service

Section V

Qualified Faculty

According to the AAUP Contract, Qualified Faculty: are represented by the AAUP, follow the same RPT articles, and adhere to RPT Criteria developed at the academic unit level. Titles of rank in the Qualified Faculty Track parallel those in the Tenure-Track, with categories of Qualified Faculty Assistant Professor, Associate Professor, and Professor. Faculty Members with Qualified 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 considers Qualified Faculty members as professionals who have demonstrated depth of knowledge and/or extensive experience in one or more particular aspects of the design professions, complementing the expertise of existing faculty.

The School expects Qualified Faculty members to develop and transmit professional expertise to the institution—the primary consideration in making Qualified Faculty appointments. Qualified Faculty members must maintain a strong connection with the discipline or activities for which they were brought into the School. Qualified Faculty members must bridge teaching and research/creative/scholarly activities with the profession, and contribute to the development of the profession. Qualified Faculty members should demonstrate a consistent and equivalent level of contribution in service as tenure-track faculty, though the nature of service assignments may differ.

A Qualified 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 Reviews, and the associated Annual Performance Report, developed in consultation and agreement with the School Director, further establish the nature, scope, and workload distribution.

A Qualified Faculty member may choose to engage in creative/research/scholarly work 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 Qualified 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, creative/research/scholarly, and service and their relationship to the development and transmission of professional expertise in the Self Evaluation portion of the RPT dossier.

Section VI

Emeritus Faculty

The University defines Emeritus faculty “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 self-evaluation and CV. The self-evaluation should refer to the School RPT criteria at the appropriate rank and demonstrate 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 self-evaluation, CV, and the faculty review.