

SCHOOL OF ARCHITECTURE
College of Arts + Architecture
The University of North Carolina at Charlotte

PROCEDURES, STANDARDS, AND CRITERIA
FOR REVIEW, PROMOTION AND TENURE

(Approved May 11, 2016)

I. INTRODUCTION

II. FACULTY ANNUAL REVIEWS

1. Annual Review Letter
2. Annual CV Update
3. Annual Teaching, Professional Development, and Service Portfolio

III. RPT STANDARDS AND CRITERIA

1. Teaching, Professional Development, and Service
 - A. Teaching
 - B. Professional Development
 - C. Service
2. Faculty Ranks: Assistant, Associate, and Full Professor
 - A. Reappointment at the Rank of Assistant Professor
 - B. Promotion or Appointment to the Rank of Associate Professor and the Granting of Permanent Tenure
 - C. Promotion or Appointment to the Rank of Professor

IV. PROCEDURES

1. Evidence
 - A. Administration

 - B. Faculty
 1. Testimony
 2. Testimony From Members of the School Review Committee
 3. Additional Testimony

 - C. Candidate
 1. External Evaluators
 2. Required RPT Documents
 - a) Curriculum Vitae
 - b) Overview
 - c) Supporting Factual Evidence
 3. Schedule

2. School Review Committee
 - A. Purpose
 - B. Composition
 - C. Eligibility

- D. Obligation to Serve
- E. Election Procedures
- F. Confidentiality
- G. Meetings with the Candidate
- H. Recommendation
- I. Recommendation Reports

3. Director

4. College Review Committee & Dean Review

APPENDIX ONE

- Reappointment, Promotion and Tenure (RPT) Review Schedule
- Tenured Faculty Performance Review (TFPR) Schedule

APPENDIX TWO

- Suggested Format for Curriculum Vitae

APPENDIX THREE

- Teaching, Professional Development & Service Activities and Evidence

PROCEDURES, STANDARDS, AND CRITERIA FOR REVIEW, PROMOTION AND TENURE

I. INTRODUCTION

The purpose of the Review, Promotion, and Tenure (RPT) Review is to evaluate a candidate's success and potential growth in three areas: Teaching, Professional Development, and Service.

The School of Architecture (SoA) has adopted the following *Procedures, Standards, and Criteria for Review Promotion and Tenure* in accordance with the following documents:

The Code of the Board of Governors of The University of North Carolina (hereinafter referred to as *The Code*).

Tenure Policies, Regulations, and Procedures of the University of North Carolina at Charlotte revised effective April 20, 2007 (hereinafter referred to as *TPRP-UNCC*).

College of Arts and Architecture Procedures for Reappointment, Promotion, and Conferral of Permanent Tenure (hereinafter referred to as *CoAA-RPT*).

If any part of the *Procedures, Standards, and Criteria for Review Promotion and Tenure* is found to be in conflict with either *The Code*, the *TPRP-UNCC*, or the *CoAA-RPT*, these documents shall prevail. Changes in the School of Architecture *Procedures, Standards, and Criteria for Review Promotion and Tenure* may be made by a two-thirds vote of the tenure line faculty present and voting in a School Faculty Meeting.

II. FACULTY ANNUAL REVIEWS

1. Annual Review Letter

The Director will provide each faculty member with an Annual Review Letter addressing Teaching, Professional Development, and Service. The Annual Review Letter is based on the faculty member's annual CV Update, annual Teaching, Professional Development, and Service Portfolio, the Director's direct observation of the quality of the candidate's work, and student evaluations of the faculty member's teaching. The Annual Review Letter will identify strengths and successes, as well as areas that need improvement, and will use the standards and criteria defined for faculty ranks contained in this document.

The Chair or Director will meet with tenure track faculty no later than May 1st to discuss their annual review. All annual review letters for tenure track and tenured faculty must be completed by June 15th. The Annual Review Letter will be forwarded in duplicate to each faculty member. Both copies shall have a designated place for the faculty member's signature.

Within 30 days of receipt of the Annual Review Letter, the faculty member must return a signed copy of the Annual Review Letter to the Director. Within 30 days of receipt of the Annual Review Letter a faculty member may also register in writing his or her disagreement with its content. The Annual Review Letter and any faculty response will be placed in the faculty member's Personnel File.

2. Annual CV Update

Every faculty member is required to submit an annual CV Update. The format of this update is tightly prescribed due to the reports the School Administration must provide to the College and University administration and to NAAB.

3. Annual Teaching, Professional Development, and Service Portfolio

All tenure track and tenured faculty are required to submit an electronic Annual Teaching, Professional Development, and Service Portfolio. The Portfolio must include: course syllabi, handouts, and exams; digital samples of student work; evidence related to professional development activities; and a summary of service activities. By May 1st the Director will issue instructions regarding the process of submission.

III. STANDARDS AND CRITERIA

1. Teaching, Professional Development, and Service

Normative academic Performance and Product Standards are categorized into three major areas: Teaching, Professional Development, and Service. In outlining the standards in these categories, it is important to note that each activity utilizes the processes of creation, discovery, analysis, integration, dissemination, and peer evaluation common to all academic intellectual activity. In the case of collaborative work, the faculty member must document the extent of his/her responsibilities and involvement.

In addition to the information in Section III. STANDARDS AND CRITERIA, see Appendix Three.

A. Teaching

Teaching is understood as the combination of content, methodology, and preparation that produces instruction and student products/accomplishments. Assessment of a faculty member's effectiveness will include teaching in the classroom and studio, participation on thesis committees, independent study courses, and informal teaching that takes place on student juries and reviews. The normative performance and products for Teaching are outlined below.

1. Delivery of group or individual instruction that enables students to accomplish the activities below includes but is not limited to the following:

- a. Create architectural designs and works;
- b. Develop knowledge, problem-solving abilities and skills in architecture and the practice of architecture (includes social, environmental, technological, theoretical and aesthetic aspects of architecture);
- c. Integrate and synthesize knowledge and skills in the creation of architectural designs;
- d. Research, analyze and understand architecture in terms of its practical, aesthetic, social, cultural, environmental and technical aspects;
- e. Research, analyze and understand architecture and the histories and theories of architecture as well as their meaning and influence on the discipline;
- f. Understand architecture as it engages related fields of study.

2. Preparation for Studio and/or Classroom Instruction includes but is not limited to the following:

- a. Maintaining intellectual currency in the discipline;
- b. Creating, integrating, synthesizing and applying ideas, subject matter, and techniques for effective instructional applications;
- c. Designing, coordinating, administering, and supervising student projects, research, theses, etc.

3. Effective Evaluation and Communication of Student Performance includes but is not limited to the following:

- a. Examinations;
- b. Assignments, papers, etc.;
- c. Project reviews, juries, pin-ups, etc.

B. Professional Development

In the field of Architecture, Professional Development is defined to include two realms of academic production: *Scholarship* and *Creative Work*. The normative performance and product standards for Professional Development are outlined below.

1. Scholarship

Scholarship includes but is not limited to the following activities: 1) authoring and publishing studies, critiques, scholarly findings and compilations including books, chapters in books, articles, monographs, book reviews, conference papers and proceedings; 2) lecturing and participating on reviews outside the School, 3) presenting at symposia, participating in panel discussions; 4) receiving fellowships; and/or 5) receiving competitive grants.

The products of Scholarship are expected to be peer reviewed and disseminated to other academics, the profession, and/or the lay community. These products demonstrate knowledge acquired through research, synthesis, practice and teaching. They include but are not limited to the following:

- a. Developing new knowledge, technologies, design methodologies, and/or pedagogical approaches and curricula that advance the discipline;
- b. Interpreting, expanding and bringing new insights to bear on existing knowledge;
- c. Making connections across disciplines that result in new or expanded knowledge or interpretations of architecture;
- d. Exploring and developing connections between the academic discipline and the practice of architecture.

2. Creative Work

Creative Work includes but is not limited to 1) built works of architecture or urban design and/or related endeavors such as object design related to architecture; 2) products of design competitions; 3) modeling, painting & drawing in service of architectural representation and/or exploration; and/or work that draws on engagements with related fields such as landscape architecture, the arts, architectural engineering, computer science, and business. Creative Work is expected to be peer reviewed and disseminated to other academics, the profession, and/or the lay community. These products demonstrate knowledge acquired through research, synthesis, practice and teaching, and include, but are not limited to, the following:

- a. The design and production of architecture, urban design and related works by means of commissions, contracts, etc.
- b. The creation of design and/or design proposals by means of competitions, grants, consultation agreements, etc.
- c. The creation of components, assemblies and other technologies associated with the field.
- d. The engagement in and formation of creative work that advances professional skills and competencies in service of enhanced teaching.

C. Service

Service includes activities outside normal teaching and professional development that significantly aid the School, College, University, Profession and/or Community in accomplishing their respective missions. Assessment of service activities shall take into account the results of such service.

The normative performance and product standards for Service include but are not limited to the following:

1. Assisting the School, College, University and/or Community

- a. Organizing, coordinating, administering, or maintaining curricular programs, academic objectives, faculty organizations, student organizations, technical facilities or institutional events;
- b. Serving on School, College, and University committees;
- c. Providing expertise that assists the work of other institutional units, including academic and administrative departments, development offices and support agencies.

2. Advancing the Profession Beyond the Institution

- a. Organizing, coordinating, and/or administering exhibitions, projects, seminars or other events;
- b. Serving on community-based committees, task forces, review and advisory boards and councils.
- c. Contributing to public education through teaching and presentations;
- d. Participating in professional organizations.

2. Faculty Ranks: Assistant, Associate, and Full Professor

Evaluations and recommendations regarding reappointment, promotion and conferral of tenure shall be made in the context of the expectations by rank identified below.

A. Reappointment at the Rank of Assistant Professor

As befits a nascent academic career, candidates recommended for reappointment at the rank of Assistant Professor will have produced substantive evidence that they have accomplished the following:

- 1) Established a clear pedagogy resulting in student products and levels of understanding that are consistently average to above average;
- 2) Received student course evaluations that are consistently average to above average;
- 3) Engaged in Professional Development activities that evidence a clearly defined scholarly/creative agenda and an appropriate search for productive domains of activity and investigation that suggests a sustainable and consistent trajectory.
- 4) Contributed to the School, College, University, Profession and/or Community through their service activities in a manner that evidences potential for influence and leadership.

B. Promotion or Appointment to the Rank of Associate Professor and the Granting of Permanent Tenure

Tenure is awarded on the basis of the candidate's accomplishments and potential for a lifetime of significant contribution to the institution as well as the profession. The conferral of permanent tenure automatically includes promotion from Assistant Professor to Associate Professor. The *TPRP-UNCC* (Section 3, Subsection 3.2.1) states that permanent tenure **may not** be awarded to a faculty member at the rank of Assistant Professor. The *TPRP-UNCC* (Section 3, Subsection 3.2.2) states that an Associate Professor **may** be granted tenure without promotion to Professor.

Candidates recommended for the granting of permanent tenure will have produced substantive evidence that they have accomplished the following:

- 1) Established a clear and effective pedagogy resulting in contributions to the curriculum of the School and student products and levels of understanding that are consistently above average;
- 2) Received student course evaluations that are consistently average to above average;
- 3) Engaged in Professional Development activities that evidence a clearly defined scholarly/creative agenda that demonstrates exactitude, depth, a clear methodology and products that contribute new knowledge and/or expand existing knowledge/practice;
- 4) Contributed to the School, College, University, Profession and/or Community through their service activities in a manner that evidences influence and leadership.

C. Promotion or Appointment to the Rank of Professor

Candidates recommended for promotion or appointment to the rank of Professor will have produced substantive evidence that they have accomplished the following:

- 1) Established a clear and effective pedagogy resulting in significant contributions to the curriculum of the School; and student products and levels of understanding that are consistently above average to excellent;
- 2) Received student course evaluations that are consistently above average;
- 3) Engaged in Professional Development activities that evidence a clearly defined scholarly/creative agenda that demonstrates intellectual leadership, refinement and distinction in the field by contributing new knowledge and/or expanding existing knowledge/practice;
- 4) Contributed to the School, College, University, Profession and/or Community through their service activities in a manner that evidences significant influence and active leadership.

IV. PROCEDURES

The Procedures for conducting RPT reviews in the School of Architecture involve the following:

- 1) Collection of evidence;
- 2) Thorough review of the evidence by an elected School Review Committee (SRC);
- 3) Drafting of a formal recommendation by the SRC;
- 4) Thoughtful consideration of that recommendation and thorough review of the evidence by the Director;
- 5) Drafting of a formal recommendation by the Director which is submitted to the Dean of the College of Arts + Architecture.

1. Evidence

A. Administration

The Director will provide the following information to be used by the SRC:

- 1) Copies of Annual Review Letters;
- 2) Student Course Evaluations;
- 3) Previous RPT Review Reports (if applicable);
- 4) Testimony from External Evaluators.

B. Faculty

1. Testimony

The SRC shall request testimony from the entire SoA faculty at the outset of the review process. It is the responsibility of all members of the faculty who are at or above the rank for

which a candidate is under consideration to review the candidate's CV, Overview Statement and Supporting Factual Evidence and to provide testimony to the SRC either in writing or via oral communication transcribed by the SRC. A minimum of two members of the SRC must be present to receive oral testimony. Testimony from faculty of the School will be kept confidential and made available to the candidate only if specifically requested by the candidate.

2. Testimony from Members of the School Review Committee

Testimony relative to a faculty member under review shall not be solicited or accepted from any persons who are members of the SRC.

3. Additional Testimony

At any level of the review process, the SRC, Director or Dean may solicit additional written and/or oral testimony from persons deemed to be sources of pertinent information regarding a candidate's performance.

C. Candidate

1. External Evaluators

A. Reappointment Review

Each candidate under review must submit a list of 5 suggested External Evaluators to the Director complete with contact information for each including correct title (if applicable), mailing address, email address and phone number.

External Evaluators should be considered nationally recognized authorities well-positioned by education and/or practice to understand the candidate's scholarly/creative agenda and particular ideologies and theoretical affinities. External Evaluators must be tenured at or above the rank of the candidate under consideration. Individuals who have

or have had close personal or professional relationships with the candidate that could result in biased evaluations (current or former teachers, mentors, partners, employers, friends, etc.) are disqualified to serve as External Evaluators. In no case is the candidate allowed to contact External Evaluators prior to or during the review process or to directly provide External Evaluators with information of any kind.

It shall be the responsibility of the Director in consultation with the SRC to arrange for the services of External Evaluators. The candidate shall be informed of the External Evaluators selected by the Director in order to avoid the selection of External Evaluators whose participation may pose a conflict of interest. The final authority to choose External Evaluators rests with the Director, not with the candidate.

A minimum of 2 External Evaluators will be secured for each review and each will be provided with a copy of the Evaluation Criteria from the *SoA Procedures, Standards, and Criteria for Review, Promotion, and Tenure*. External Evaluators will be instructed by the Director to submit concise and reasoned evaluations on the merit of the candidate's contributions and not merely letters of praise or condemnation. They will also be cautioned not to offer an opinion as to whether promotion, reappointment, and/or tenure should be granted but to compare the work of the Candidate to faculty at peer institutions who are at a comparable point in their career. In making this comparison, the External Evaluators must have direct knowledge of the work of the comparable faculty member.

Upon receipt and analysis of evaluative reports from the External Evaluators, the SRC must sanction the quality of such reports. External Evaluator reports must be comprehensive, fact-based, in-depth and clear. Should the SRC conclude that a given evaluative report is insubstantial or unusable for some reason, it must secure another External Evaluator through the Director.

B. Tenure Review

Each candidate under review must submit a list of 5 suggested External Evaluators to the Director, complete with contact information for each individual including correct title (if applicable), mailing address, email address and phone number.

External Evaluators should be considered nationally recognized authorities well positioned by education and/or practice to understand the candidate's scholarly/creative agenda and particular ideologies and theoretical affinities. External Evaluators must be tenured at or above the rank of the candidate under consideration. Individuals who have or have had close personal or professional relationships with the candidate that could result in biased evaluations (current or former teachers, mentors, partners, employers, friends, etc.) are disqualified to serve as External Evaluators. In no case is the candidate allowed to contact External Evaluators or to directly provide External Evaluators with any information of any kind.

It shall be the responsibility of the Director, in consultation with the SRC, to arrange for the services of External Evaluators. The candidate shall be informed of the External Evaluators selected by the Director in order to avoid the selection of External Evaluators whose participation may pose a conflict of interest. The final authority to choose External Evaluators rests with the Director, not with the candidate.

A minimum of 3 External Evaluators will be secured for each review and each will be provided with a copy of the Evaluation Criteria from the *Procedures, Standards, and Criteria for Review, Promotion, and Tenure*. External evaluators will be instructed by the

Director to submit concise and reasoned evaluations on the merit of the candidate's contributions and not merely letters of praise or condemnation. External evaluators are to be cautioned not to offer an opinion as to whether promotion, reappointment, and/or tenure should be granted. External evaluators are specifically asked to compare the work of the Candidate to others of his/her direct knowledge.

Upon receipt and analysis of evaluative reports from the External Evaluators, the SRC must sanction the quality of such reports. External Evaluator reports must be comprehensive, fact-based, in-depth and clear. Should the SRC conclude that a given evaluative report is insubstantial or unusable for some reason, it must secure another External Evaluator through the Director.

2. Required RPT Documents

A.) Curriculum Vitae

The candidate must submit a Curriculum Vitae (CV) summarizing the factual information related to his or her professional accomplishments (see Appendix Two). The Curriculum Vitae should include the most significant products related to each of the three areas of contribution: Teaching, Professional Development and Service. The CV should not contain any evaluative information offered by the faculty member or obtained from other sources.

B.) Overview

The candidate must submit an Overview, limited to approximately 1500 words, offering a description of his or her achievements, contributions, and activities that will contextualize the work being reviewed and assist reviewers at every level to more clearly understand the candidate's various endeavors in Teaching, Professional Development and Service. The Overview should be explanatory in nature, providing interpretative clarity to illuminate the CV and the Supporting Factual Evidence. It should not be viewed as an opportunity for self-promotion.

C.) Supporting Factual Evidence

The submittal of supporting factual evidence related to a candidate's contributions should be strictly limited to the factual information listed in the Curriculum Vitae and should be edited, organized and assembled to reflect the most significant products indicated in the CV (see Appendix Three). These materials must be submitted digitally to a shared Drive and separated into three folders, one for each of the three areas of contribution – Teaching, Professional Development and Service:

- 1) A folder containing Supporting Factual Evidence regarding Teaching;
- 2) A folder containing Supporting Factual Evidence regarding Professional Development;
- 3) A folder containing Supporting Factual Evidence regarding Service.

Each folder must also contain the candidate's CV and Overview statement.

Editing of the CV and Supporting Factual Evidence is of the utmost importance and should be exercised so as to include only those materials that will most concretely and clearly show the content, significance and trajectory of the candidate's work. A carefully edited document allows reviewers to focus closely on the work and to produce a careful and thorough evaluation.

4. Schedule

Candidates shall submit all documentation for the review process according to the schedule provided by the Director (see Appendix One). The confirmation of procedures, schedule, and submittal dates along with a copy of the *SoA Procedures, Standards, and Criteria for Review, Promotion, and Tenure* shall be conveyed in writing to the candidate at the start of the review process.

2. School Review Committee

A. Purpose

The School Review Committee (SRC) provides written recommendations to the Director regarding reappointment, promotion, and tenure. The recommendations are the result of an assessment of a candidate based on the assembled RPT evidence.

B. Composition

The SRC shall be composed of three full-time, permanently tenured faculty members elected by the faculty of the School of Architecture.

C. Eligibility

Only full-time, permanently tenured faculty members are eligible to serve on the SRC. All full-time, permanently tenured faculty members are eligible to serve with the following exceptions:

- The Director and Associate Director are ineligible to serve on the SRC;
- Faculty members are ineligible to serve during the academic year in which they are under formal review, including Tenured Faculty Performance Review.

D. Obligation to Serve

Service on the SRC is an obligation of the tenured faculty. Faculty members who are eligible to serve on the SRC may only withdraw from consideration by submitting a request that references any of the conditions below. Such a request must be submitted to the Director in writing at least one week prior to elections)²:

- 1) Inability to serve due to physical limitations or other circumstances beyond the person's control;
- 2) An actual or well-reasoned perception of a conflict of interest;
- 3) Service on the SRC during the two-year period immediately preceding the SRC Committee election.

E. Election Procedures

- 1) Schedule
Elections to fill openings on the SRC shall be held and decided no later than the final faculty meeting of the Spring semester of each year. The Director shall announce to the faculty the date of election two weeks in advance.
- 2) Nominations
At the meeting to nominate SRC members, the Director shall provide the faculty with a list of eligible nominees. Eligible faculty members may be nominated by any tenure line faculty member.
- 3) Election Procedures
Nominated faculty members must be elected to the SRC by a two-thirds majority vote of the full-time tenure line faculty members present and voting in a School Faculty Meeting.
- 4) Term in Office
Members of the SRC shall be elected for a term of two years. Members of the SRC may be reelected for one additional two-year term if they allow their names to be placed in nomination.
- 5) Resignation
Committee members may request resignation from the SRC due to a conflict of interest or other inability to serve under the same standards as set forth in the *TPRP-UNCC*. Requests for resignation must be received by the Director, in writing, by June 1, and must clearly specify the reasons for resignation. The Director must notify the committee member requesting resignation, in writing, of acceptance or denial of the request. Upon a faculty member's successful resignation from the SRC, the Director shall call for a special election to complete the committee membership.

F. Confidentiality

SRC members, School Administrators, and permanently tenured faculty members at or above the candidate's rank, who review a candidate's CV, Overview Statement, and Supporting Factual Evidence shall treat as confidential all documents submitted or created in connection with the process. Both the information contained therein and information derived from any discussions that are part of the formal review process shall be kept confidential.

² The decision of the Director with regard to a faculty member's eligibility is final and cannot be appealed.

Confidential records and information shall not be disclosed to or discussed with any person except the following:

- 1) SRC members as provided in these policies;
- 2) Those persons required or permitted to be consulted in accordance with the requirements of School, College, or University policies;
- 3) Those persons permitted access to such documents by law.

G. Meetings with the Candidate

After an initial review of all submitted materials, the SRC shall meet with the faculty member being reviewed to provide an opportunity for a factual exchange regarding the review process. A second meeting, later in the review process, may be scheduled by the SRC or at the request of the candidate to clarify information relevant to the process.

H. Recommendation

At every level of review, the assembled factual and evaluative information will be assessed to determine the value of the candidate's contribution; this assessment will be summarized in a reasoned and concise Recommendation Report.

1. Recommendation Report

The Recommendation Report must reference the evidence gathered and examined during the review and must include the following components:

- 1) A detailed assessment of the candidate with clear reference to expectations by rank regarding the following:
 - a. Teaching;
 - b. Professional Development;
 - c. Service.
2. A positive or negative recommendation of the SRC.

Recommendation Reports should be carefully composed and crafted to achieve a high level of organization and clarity. As documents that hold the future career of a faculty candidate in the balance, these reports must be able to withstand both academic and legal scrutiny.

3. Director

Upon receipt of the Recommendation of the SRC and the accompanying required RPT documents, the Director will draft a Recommendation that is the result of an assessment of the candidate based on the assembled RPT evidence and the SRC's Recommendation. Following the completion of the draft Recommendation the Director shall meet with the faculty member being reviewed to provide an opportunity for a factual exchange regarding the review process.

The following procedure is prescribed by the *College of Arts and Architecture Procedures for Reappointment, Promotion, and Conferral of Permanent Tenure*, Section II: College Review Committee Procedures.

- 1) If the Director's determination is positive, the Director shall, after consulting with the assembled SRC, submit his or her determination and rationale, the recommendation and

³“The word ‘Day’... shall mean any day except Saturday, Sunday, or an institutional holiday except when calendar day is specified. In computing any period of time, the Day in which notice is received is not counted but the last Day of the period being computed is to be counted.” *The Tenure Policies, Regulations and Procedures of the University of North Carolina at Charlotte* (Section 1, Subsection 1.3).

rationale of the SRC and the faculty member's RPT Review file to the Dean of the College. After receipt of these materials the Dean shall deliver them to the College Review Committee (CRC).

- 2) If the Director determines not to reappoint, promote, or confer Permanent Tenure for a Faculty Member under review, he or she shall meet with the Faculty Member to explain the Faculty Member's right of rebuttal and to provide the Faculty Member with a copy of his or her determination and its rationale as well as a copy of the recommendation(s) and rationale(s) of the SRC. Within ten days after this meeting, the Faculty Member may submit to the Dean and the Director a written rebuttal to the Director's determination.³ Upon receipt of the Faculty Member's rebuttal, or at the end of ten days after the Director meets with the Faculty Member if the Faculty Member does not submit a rebuttal, the Director shall submit his or her determination and rationale, the recommendation(s) and rationale(s) of the SRC, the Faculty Member's rebuttal (if any), and the faculty member's RPT Review file to the Dean of the College.

4. College Review Committee & Dean Review

The actions and responsibilities of the College Review Committee & Dean are prescribed by the *College of Arts and Architecture Procedures for Reappointment, Promotion, and Conferral of Permanent Tenure*, Section II: College Review Committee Procedures.

Appendix One **Review Schedule**

Reappointment, Promotion and Tenure (RPT) Review Schedule

Final faculty meeting of the Spring semester prior to the Reappointment, Promotion and Tenure (RPT) review of the candidate

- The School of Architecture (SoA) faculty will elect members of the School Review Committee (SRC). Upon election in the Spring Semester, the SRC will receive notification of upcoming reviews.

February 1st

- The SoA Director will convey the SoA *Procedures, Standards, and Criteria for Review, Promotion, and Tenure* to the candidate(s) under review.

February 10th

- The Director will meet with the candidate(s) under review to discuss the RPT process.

April 1st

- The CoA+A Dean will provide notice of the impending RPT process to candidate(s) under review with a copy to the SoA Director.
- The candidate(s) will provide a list of recommended External Evaluators to the Director.

April 15th

- Candidate(s) under review will submit a letter to the Dean acknowledging their understanding of review policies and dates of submission.

June 15th

- In consultation with the SRC, the Director will select the External Evaluators and inform the candidate(s) under review of these Evaluators.

July 15th

- The candidate(s) under review will submit an electronic copy of all Professional Development work to the Director.
- The Director will make an electronic copy of all Professional Development work available to the External Evaluators.

First day of class (Fall semester)

- Candidate(s) under review will submit **all required materials** to the CoA+A Dean electronically via a shared Drive with a hard copy Letter of Transmittal.
- The Dean will forward all materials directly to the Director.
- The Director will forward all materials to the SRC.

September 15th

- The SRC will conclude its review and submit the RPT recommendation(s) to the Director.

September 30th

- The Director will conclude his/her review and submit the RPT recommendation(s) to the CoA+A Dean.

October 15th

- The CoA+A Dean shall meet with, transmit all materials, and initiate the review by the College Review Committee (CRC).

November 15th

- The CRC will submit the RPT recommendation(s) to the CoA+A Dean. The CRC will have a conference with the Dean to complement the recommendation(s).

December 15th

- The Dean shall submit the RPT recommendation(s) to the Provost / Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs.

Tenured Faculty Performance Review (TFPR) Schedule

January 1st

- The Director will send electronic copies of the Annual Review Letters from the past five years to the faculty under review.

January 30th

- Faculty scheduled for a Tenured Faculty Performance Review (TFPR) will submit a current Curriculum Vita, an optional statement and copies of the Annual Review Letters from the past five years to the Dean. The Dean will forward these materials directly to the Director.
- Faculty who wish to pursue the rank of Full Professor at the time of their TFPR *next year* should submit a letter of intent to the Director by this date.

April 15th

- The Director will submit the SRC recommendation and his/her TFPR recommendation(s) to the CoA+A Dean.

May 15th

- The Dean will complete the review of the Tenured Faculty Performance Review report(s) and forward his/her recommendations to the Provost.

Appendix Two
Suggested Format for Curriculum Vitae

NAME

Full name and present rank

EDUCATION

Institution Attended

Degree(s) and Date(s) Awarded

PROFESSIONAL EXPERIENCE (list chronologically starting with most recent)

Include teaching experience, years employed, and ranks held using the format shown below.

The University of North Carolina at Charlotte, 1990 - present

Associate Professor, 1996 – present

Assistant Professor, 1990-96

(Also include related employment at other academic institutions and/or design firms)

TEACHING

List courses taught during your career to date in the School of Architecture.

PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT (Scholarship / Creative Work)

List by category (papers, books, designs, etc.), all works/products associated with *Scholarship* and/or *Creative Work*.

SERVICE

List membership/leadership on School, College, and University committees as well as any involvement in community affairs, consulting activities, etc. (Provide names of contact persons for all community service venues.)

HONORS AND AWARDS

Award, Awarding Agency, Year

PROFESSIONAL AFFILIATIONS

List current memberships in local, regional, national and international professional organizations.

Appendix Three
**Teaching, Professional Development & Service
Activities and Evidence**

I. Introduction

The evaluation of a candidate's success and potential in the areas of Teaching, Professional Development, and Service involves the examination of specific activities and evidence associated with the candidate under review. The following is a sampling of the types of activities and evidence that may result from work undertaken in the categories outlined in the performance standards. The listing is not all-inclusive; it is intended only to illustrate an array of normative activities and evidence associated with the various academic ranks defined in this policy.

II. Teaching

A. Teaching Activities

- Provides instruction that enables students to develop knowledge, problem-solving abilities, and skills in architectural design and the practice of architecture design
- Provides instruction that enables students to integrate and synthesize knowledge and skills in the creation of architectural design and works
- Provides instruction that enables students to study, understand and evaluate architecture by analyzing architecture in terms of its practical, aesthetic, social, cultural, environmental and technical aspects
- Provides instruction that enables students to study, understand and evaluate architecture by researching, analyzing and understanding the histories and theories of architecture and their meaning and influence on the discipline
- Provides instruction that enables students to understand architecture and its relationship to other disciplines (examples: landscape architecture, engineering, computer science, natural and physical sciences, sociology, philosophy, psychology, and/or anthropology)
- Integrates and synthesizes knowledge, skills and techniques in the development and delivery of instruction; participates in local, regional and national conferences, symposia, etc., on education and teaching
- Participates in teaching activities at other academic institutions
- Maintains intellectual currency in the discipline
- Creates, integrates, synthesizes and applies ideas, subject matter and techniques for specific instructional applications
- Develops and produces comprehensive course syllabi
- Prepares and delivers lectures, seminars, presentations, etc.
- Produces materials that evidence instructional innovation
- Prepares and produces design problem statements
- Prepares and produces course assignments
- Prepares and produces quizzes, examinations, etc.
- Measures the development of student competence via (a) examinations, (b) assignments, papers, etc., and (c) juries, reviews, and pin-ups
- Assesses personal effectiveness in the classroom and/or studio as well as in less formal teaching.
- Appraises classroom and studio results in light of the stated goals and objectives of specific courses as well as the larger goals and objectives of the curriculum
- Advises students regarding curriculum and progress in the program
- Advises students on professional issues and/or career development
- Advises students on publications

B. Teaching Evidence

- Course syllabi
- Course assignments
- Quizzes, examinations, etc.
- Lectures, presentations, etc.
- Design problem statements
- Examples of student work

II. Professional Development

A. Professional Development Activities

- Participates in educational programs, workshops, and travel that contribute to a broader knowledge and a deeper understanding of a particular topic, issue, or problem
- Completes tutorials, or comparable achievements, that reflect a desire to develop new skills as a designer, educator, and/or scholar
- Prepares and edits a paper or book review
- Delivers lectures at local, regional or national venues
- Develops a grant project description or contract proposal
- Prepares material necessary to apply for funding or resources to support a specific research project, investigation, or event
- Secures funding to support a specific research project, investigation, or event
- Organizes a conference, symposium, or other special event for the College
- Edits an ongoing scholarly journal
- Prepares and edits a book
- Consults on a major building project
- Works on a specific design project or proposal
- Participates in local, regional or national design competitions

B. Professional Development Evidence

- Successful grant project description or contract proposal.
- Fellowship award for study of a particular topic, issue, or problem.
- Competition award.
- Original work published in a refereed publication.
- Design competition entries
- Paper(s) selected for presentation at a conference
- Paper(s) selected for inclusion in published proceedings of a conference
- Published article in a professional journal
- Published technical or extension bulletins
- Published book
- Published design work
- Individual or group exhibition of creative work
- Citation or award for scholarly and creative work from regional, national, or international organizations
- Invitations from other schools, colleges, or universities to participate in a panel discussion, deliver a lecture or deliver a keynote address

III. Service

A. Service Activities

- Organizes, coordinates, administers, or maintains curricular programs, academic objectives, campus events.
- Chairs and/or serves on SoA committees
- Chairs and/or serves on College committees
- Chairs and/or serves on University committees and/or task forces
- Provides expertise that assists the work of other institutional units, including academic and administrative departments, development offices and support agencies
- Organizes, coordinates, and/or administers exhibitions, projects, seminars and/or events
- Chairs and/or serves on community-based committees, task forces, review and advisory boards and/or councils
- Consults and practices in the community
- Contributes to public education through teaching and presentations
- Participates in working groups, professional organizations and community events
- Participates as a member of academic and/or professional organizations.
- Serves in a curatorial capacity
- Participates in or organizes community assistance projects
- Advises the University or community on architectural or urban/planning design

B. Service Evidence

- Project descriptions, correspondence, and other written or graphic material describing the candidate's committee service within the Institution
- Project descriptions, correspondence, and other written or graphic material describing the candidate's service activities beyond the Institution

School of Architecture
Tenured Faculty Performance Review Standards
(Approved 22 April, 2016)

The possible results of a Tenured Faculty Performance Review are *Exceeds Expectations*, *Meets Expectations* or *Does Not Meet Expectations*. The standards for these categories are outlined below and are consistent with the expectations contained in the *CoA+A and SoA Procedures for Reappointment, Promotion, and Conferral of Permanent Tenure*.

Meets Expectations

- a.) Candidate pursues a defined scholarly/creative agenda that includes a record of peer-reviewed publication and/or practice that illustrates professional contributions to the field
- b.) Candidate demonstrates average to very good teaching skills
- c.) Candidate actively and effectively participates in service activities within the SoA, CoA+A, University and/or community at large

Exceeds Expectations

- a.) Candidate pursues a clearly defined scholarly/creative agenda and a sustained record of peer-reviewed publication and/or practice that illustrates significant professional contributions to the field
- b.) Candidate demonstrates excellent teaching skills and pedagogical/curricular contributions to the SoA
- c.) Candidate proactively and effectively leads service activities within the SoA, CoA+A, University and/or community at large

Does Not Meet Expectations

- a.) Candidate does not show evidence of a clearly defined scholarly/creative agenda and a record of peer-reviewed work that effectively illustrates professional contributions to the field
- b.) Candidate demonstrates poor teaching skills
- c.) Candidate fails to demonstrate effective participation in service activities within the SoA, CoA+A, University and/or community at large