

OUTLINE

I. INTRODUCTION	2
II. DEPARTMENT COMMITTEE and COLLEGE REPRESENTATIVE	3
A. MEMBERSHIP	
B. ELECTION of COMMITTEE MEMBERS	
C. DURATION of SERVICE	
D. COMMITTEE CHAIR	
E. GUIDELINES	
III. GENERAL PROCEDURES	4
A. CHARGES to the COMMITTEE	
1. General Provisions	
2. Promotion and Tenure Reviews	
3. Evaluation Process	
B. INITIATION of REVIEW	
C. REVIEW PROCEDURES SCHEDULES and DEADLINES	
D. NOTIFICATION of CANDIDATES	
IV. CRITERIA, EXPECTATIONS and METHODS of EVALUATION	10
A. MAJOR AREAS	
1. The Scholarship of Teaching and Learning	
2. The Scholarship of Research and Creative Accomplishments	
3. Service and the Scholarship of Service to the University, Society, and the Profession	
4. Relative Importance of the Criteria	
B. EVALUATION DOCUMENTS	

I. INTRODUCTION

The Department of Architecture Promotion and Tenure Committee, in accordance with University policies, current college guidelines, and the following departmental guidelines, shall evaluate candidates with respect to the general academic and professional excellence in the field of architecture. Such excellence requires selectivity and choice; the faculty and the Committee empowered to evaluate faculty members must recognize that the established standards and choices made are intended to shape the academic character, scholarly vitality and recognition of the Department as a vital force within the University.

Following the guidelines of AC-23, The College and the Department, the Committee's report will express the views of the members and recommended action. The Committee's report will become part of the candidate's file held by the Department Head. The Department Head shall make the general results of the evaluation known to the faculty member being reviewed.

II. DEPARTMENT of ARCHITECTURE PROMOTION and TENURE COMMITTEE & REPRESENTATIVE of the DEPARTMENT to the COLLEGE PROMOTION & TENURE COMMITTEE

A. MEMBERSHIP

The Departmental Committee shall be composed of five (5) tenured faculty members selected from all continuing faculty members within the Department and shall not include any faculty members currently being reviewed by the Departmental Committee.

B. ELECTION of COMMITTEE MEMBERS

Every two years, the faculty shall elect one (1) representative from the group of eligible faculty to serve on the College P&T committee for a two year term with the understanding that this person should be a faculty member who is able to vote on all matters of both Promotion and Tenure (the ideal representative should be a tenured full professor).

Every year, the faculty shall elect five (5) representatives from the remaining group of eligible faculty to serve on the Departmental P&T committee, with a subsequent faculty election to select one (1) of the five (5) representatives as committee chair.

This process represents three (3) elective rounds:

- first, to select a college representative every two (2) years
- second, to select five P&T representatives
- third, to select from this group the departmental committee chair

All members are elected by a simple majority of the Departmental faculty by the end of the Spring Semester. Run-off elections shall be held in case of ties or in case of elected members' inability to serve on the committee.

In the case of a candidate under review for promotion to full professor, the committee must contain a minimum of three members who are tenured full professors, or a separate committee may be formed with at least three members, all of whom are full professors.

C. DURATION of SERVICE

Department members elected shall serve for a full year and may be reelected. The college representative shall serve two consecutive years. Full membership shall be maintained by faculty election.

D. COMMITTEE CHAIR

The Committee Chair shall be elected by the faculty of the Department. The Chair will be responsible for calling meetings, assure that proper procedures are followed, assign responsibilities to members for the proper conduct of the reviews, and act as liaison between the Committee and the Department Head.

E. GUIDELINES

The departmental guidelines under which this committee operates must be approved by the faculty.

III. GENERAL PROCEDURES

A. CHARGES to the COMMITTEE

1. General Provisions

- a. The Committee shall summarize in writing an independent evaluation of a given candidate on each of the three general criteria, as per AC-23, by using the following classifications: Excellent, very good, satisfactory, and unsatisfactory. For faculty at non-University Park locations whose locus of tenure resides in a University Park college, the campus review committee shall also make a judgment of the candidate's teaching effectiveness in terms of the same four-category classification. Reviewers should understand that unsatisfactory carries a negative connotation; satisfactory conveys a neutral evaluation; very good, a positive one; and excellent, a highly positive evaluation. The Committee must provide appropriate documentation for its judgment.
- b. Proper records should be kept without breaching the confidentiality of any private communications by individuals to the Committee.
- c. In evaluating a colleague, the Committee shall recognize that the responsibilities and credentials may differ between faculty and, as a corollary, direct comparisons are not valid and should not be made.

2. Promotion and Tenure Reviews

Evaluate the candidates and make recommendations in writing to the Department Head. The following basic procedural and operational rules shall apply:

- (1) It is the responsibility of the department head in consultation with the candidate to prepare the dossier in accordance with AC-23.
- (2) Only higher rank faculty than the candidate may review, discuss, and vote on decisions to grant promotion.
- (3) The department head will make available continuing evaluations of the candidate's Teaching Ability and Effectiveness to the committee according to the schedule outlined in III.C.1. Student evaluations should be taken after the end of each semester and letters of evaluation solicited from students prior to the semester the candidate is being reviewed. All students are eligible. Letters are to be solicited from a random sample of the eligible students.
- (4) Peer evaluations of the candidate's Teaching Ability and Effectiveness will be obtained in two different ways. First, each faculty member with first-hand knowledge of the candidate's teaching will be invited by the department head to write a letter of evaluation. Second, the P & T Committee shall select 2-3 members of the faculty, submit them to the department head who will add them to the list. The department head, will then request these faculty members to visit the candidate's classes and evaluate the candidate's Teaching Ability and Effectiveness to complement other peer evaluations. If during the year of review the candidate will not be teaching a course that the department head and the candidate agree is significant for a thorough assessment of Teaching Ability and Effectiveness, peer evaluations should also be conducted in the semester prior to the actual review year. In such a situation, the department head shall request the elected committee at that time to initiate the process outlined above.
In soliciting peer evaluations, the department head shall inform the writers that these evaluations are accessible to the candidate. Furthermore, peer evaluations should address directly the substance of teaching based solely on first-hand knowledge of the candidate's Teaching Ability and Effectiveness. The evaluation letters must clearly state the duration, the basis, and the nature of the writer's involvement in the candidate's teaching activities. Peer evaluations shall include comments on the content and structure of course, clarity of course material, student assignments and outcomes, and teaching skill. All peer evaluation letters shall be included in the dossier.
- (5) Following the evaluations by the College P&T Committee, at the conclusion of the process, the Dept. of Architecture college representative shall meet with the faculty of Architecture and inform them as to matters relevant to the departmental promotion and tenure process.

Each Fall the Committee is responsible for reviewing and updating promotion and tenure review procedures and keeping the Departmental faculty informed of procedures and forms used in the discharge of their responsibilities. These procedures shall be subject to the approval of the faculty. The department's college P&T representative shall, in an advisory capacity, participate in the departmental P&T Committee's process of making recommendations as to the updating of the promotion and tenure procedures.

3. Evaluation Process

1. The departmental promotion and tenure committee shall review the dossier and provide an evaluation letter and recommendation on the signatory cover page;
2. The department head shall review the dossier and provide an evaluation letter and recommendation on the signatory cover page;
3. The department head shall then forward the dossier to the Dean.

B. INITIATION of REVIEW

Promotion and Tenure recommendation proceedings will be initiated in all cases by the Department Head:

- (1) upon consultation with the candidate, faculty members, and/or members of the Committee
- (2) upon recommendation by the Departmental P&T Committee, where applicable, according to University policies.

C. REVIEW PROCEDURES SCHEDULES and DEADLINES

(NOTE: "week" refers to the last Friday of the specified week of classes)

General action schedule

Spring Semester

- Final Faculty Meeting
 - Candidates scheduled for review during the following AY notified in writing by the Department Head.
 - P&T Committee elected by Faculty for the following year.
- April 15th
 - Department Head forwards the candidate's name in an official letter to the Dean for consideration for promotion in the following year.
- April 1st
 - Candidate(s) submit(s) list of suggested External Evaluators to Department Head.

Summer Semester

Throughout Summer

- Candidate(s) work(s) with Department Head to prepare Dossier, Portfolio and contents of information.
- May 1st
 - Head submits list of External Evaluators to the Dean.
- August 1st
 - All materials (vita, narrative statement, examples of research/creative accomplishments, etc.) submitted to external evaluators.
- August 15th
 - External evaluations for joint appointments due to Dean

Fall Semester

1st Week:

- First P&T Committee Meeting, attended by Department Head.
 - P&T Committee notified in writing of review initiation.
 - External Evaluators Log submitted to the P&T Committee by Department Head.
 - Department Head initiates teaching evaluation by peers and students.
- 2nd Week:
- P&T Committee submits proposed changes to departmental guidelines to faculty for consideration/approval.
- 5th Week:
- Revised version of departmental P&T guidelines forwarded to Dean's Office.
- October 1st
- External evaluations for regular appointments due to Dean

P&T dossier schedule:

Fall Semester

- 5th Week:
- 6th-year completed dossiers and portfolios submitted to P&T Committee by Department Head.
 - 4th-year dossiers due to Department Head in final version
- 8th Week:
- 4th-year completed dossiers and any supplemental materials submitted to P&T Committee by Department Head.
- 9th Week:
- 2nd-year dossiers due to Department Head in final version
- 11th Week:
- 6th-year dossiers final evaluation and recommendation submitted to Department Head by P&T Committee.
 - 6th-year reviews by Head
- 12th Week:
- 2nd-year completed dossiers and any supplemental materials submitted to P&T Committee by Department Head.
- 14th Week:
- 6th-year dossiers due to Dean
- 15th Week:
- 4th-year dossiers final evaluation and recommendation submitted to Department Head by P&T Committee.
 - 4th-year reviews by Head

Spring Semester

- 4th Week:
- 2nd-year dossiers final evaluation and recommendation submitted to Department Head by P&T Committee.
 - 2nd-year reviews by Head
- 5th Week:
- 4th-year dossiers due to Dean
- 10th Week:
- 2nd-year dossiers due to Dean

D. NOTIFICATION of CANDIDATES

- a.** The general results of the evaluation shall be made known to the faculty member by the Dean and shall include guidance to the faculty member.
- b.** Review with candidate of recommendations made at College, University Committee, and Provost level will occur as stipulated in AC-23.
- c.** On matters of grievances, the faculty member shall first be directed to the College Ombudsman.

IV. STATEMENT of CRITERIA/EXPECTATIONS and METHODS of EVALUATION

A. THE MAJOR AREAS of CRITERIA/EXPECTATIONS ARE DEFINED:

- (a) by the University;
- (b) by the College of Arts and Architecture Promotion and Tenure Guidelines and Criteria; and
- (c) interpreted, expanded, and defined by the Department of Architecture as follows:

1. The Scholarship of Teaching and Learning

- a.** Effective ability to convey subject matter to students; demonstrated competence in teaching and capacity for growth and improvement; ability to maintain academic standards; stimulate the interests of students in the field.
- b.** The department is dedicated to maintaining rigorous academic standards with an awareness of the particular needs and aims of its individuals. Thus, the faculty member is responsible for the recognition of a student's talents and abilities and for fostering them not only by means of effective teaching but also by setting an example in creativity, performance, exhibition activity or scholarship, as may be appropriate to the discipline. In addition to inculcating a mastery of subject matter, instruction is to be directed toward developing the student's ability to communicate.

In graduate programs, teaching is considered to include the supervision of theses or graduate projects and the guiding of advanced students toward professional careers. A great deal of teaching is extended beyond the classroom. Therefore, in evaluating teaching in such areas, one must also judge the conduct of studios, workshops and informal critiques. In areas where the normal operation of the department requires working with groups of students and other faculty, the factor of human relations between the candidate and others must be considered part of his or her qualifications.

- c.** Intellectual, professional and interdisciplinary responsibility to the professional curriculum; commitment to the discipline of architecture; demonstrated correlation between teaching content and practical and professional capabilities; encouragement of individual creativity and perceptiveness in the arts; professional competence and constructive critical response to the student's work in studio projects; the ability to use outside studio and classroom activities (field trips, exhibits, seminars, etc.) to broaden the student's attitude and experience.
- d.** Advising and counseling are part of the teaching process. The department will assign advisees to faculty member advisers. Faculty members are responsible for assisting their advisees in accordance with Senate Policy 32-00.

2. The Scholarship of Research and Creative Accomplishments

- a.** Effective Ability, usually demonstrated through publications and creative work, to carry out research of high quality and scholarly significance, including contribution to the arts, and the ability to educate students in research methods and practice.

2. The Scholarship of Research and Creative Accomplishments (continued)

- b. Creative or interpretive contributions are of special importance in the Department of Architecture. Creative accomplishments and scholarly research are equally valued and the principles underlying the evaluation of both shall be similar. Accomplishments are expected to be of high quality and of artistic, scholarly and/or professional significance. The department expects its faculty to be professional role models for students through an active commitment to creative activity, research or a combination thereof as determined for each individual faculty member.
- c. Design and artistic projects are produced by the architectural faculty in a variety of forms and with disparate objectives but can be generalized in the form of the following three models:
 - (1) Professional projects:
 - (a) It is expected that architectural or urban design projects done for clients will be built or otherwise executed.
 - (b) Consideration shall be given to the full range of activities involved in the design and execution of the project with two parameters of consideration: creativity and professional competence.
 - (c) Quality shall be established by one or more of the following mechanisms with the first three being of equal potential value and the last being employed in the absence of the former and is of lesser value or significance.
 - Publication (see below), Awards or honors, Exhibition, and Peer evaluation.
 - (2) Competition and exhibition projects
 - (a) The quality of the competition project is established by its having received an award or similar recognition.
 - (b) The quality of an exhibited project is established by its acceptance to an exhibition in which the projects accepted for exhibition are limited on the basis of their design quality.
 - (c) The quality of the competition and the exhibited project is directly related to the stature of the jury for the competition or the selection committee for the exhibition and similar factors discussed below.
 - (d) Publications associated with competitions and exhibition, press releases and similar media release are not viewed as publications establishing the quality of the project.
 - (e) Competition projects that are not awarded prizes, honorable mentions, etc. and exhibition projects not accepted for exhibition shall be evaluated by peers.
 - (f) It is not expected that such projects be built.
 - (g) It is recognized that a competition or exhibition project could also produce research or could be built for a client and in such cases, this additional dimension or accomplishment shall also be recognized.
 - (3) Theoretical projects
 - (a) Such work as is done as research/inquiry for the generation of knowledge to enhance the discipline and/or profession shall be evaluated as research, i.e. published in appropriate journals dedicated to that purpose as described under “Research.”
 - (b) Such work done for “personal development” or “personal inquiry” shall be viewed as scholarly development and judged by the standards/principles/criteria for that AC-23 category.
 - (c) It is recognized that theoretical works may be, but are not necessarily, built.
 - (d) Should a theoretical project be recognized in the area of creative accomplishments, it should also be credited in that category in manner consistent with the standards for that category.

2. The Scholarship of Research and Creative Accomplishments (continued)

- d. Accreditation of the professional program by the NAAB (National Architectural Accrediting Board) is based upon the faculty's: professional competence and/or active practice of architecture which manifests itself in the application of a body of knowledge to the total process of planning and design; contributions to the establishing of process; the planning of projects and design of buildings commissioned by clients; products and processes investigated and created for the public and private sector; participation and recognition attained in architectural competitions and exhibits; production of a significant body of professional work and the attainment of some higher degree of recognition beyond the confines of the University; recognition commensurate to the position under consideration; contribution to knowledge, technology and art forms; experimental or empirical research; producing or expanding interpretation, analysis, or synthesis of existing knowledge; developing new applications of knowledge; creating artistic products or forms; developing theories or philosophical views.
- e. The recognition of effectiveness and excellence for research and creative accomplishments shall be measured by the same basic principles, standards, and techniques. Fundamentally, these are in the form of publications, awards and honors, and expert peer review. The assignment of the qualitative value of a project based on its publication, exhibition, competition, and similar mechanisms including associated awards is predicated on the characteristics of the acceptance process in a manner similar to that used in research with expert peer review being of the highest standard and other forms of lesser quality.
- f. General standards throughout the university exist for establishing the quality of research. Consistent with the principles embedded therein, the effectiveness and quality of creative accomplishments shall be measured in the following ways:
 - (1) Publications are relevant and of value with respect to the degree to which they address the creative quality of the project or of the architect in that context. Hence, those that are technical in nature, deal with the use of a material or technology from that perspective, or report an event are not relevant. Within that context, the added value of publication shall be ranked in the following descending order:
 - (a) Books about the person's creative architectural ability written by an appropriate expert
 - (b) Parts of books about the person's creative architectural ability and/or presenting the person's design work, ditto above
 - (c) Projects appearing in peer reviewed academic journal articles presenting his/her work
 - (d) Projects appearing in professional architecture, urban design, or urban planning journals or as a technical report to an agency, institute, etc.
 - (e) Projects appearing in professional "design" journals.
 - (f) Projects appearing in non-professional journals, e.g. builder and building supply publications.
 - (g) Projects appearing in popular journals and magazines

2. The Scholarship of Research and Creative Accomplishments (continued)

- (2) The qualitative value attributed to a creative project entered in design competition or exhibited as well as that assigned to awards or honors in these or other contexts is related to the stature and credibility of the members of the jury or reviewers. These are shown below in descending order of qualitative value. In this context, it is recognized that for reviewers such as media critics, a favorable review in the New York Times Sunday Magazine Section attributes significantly more value/quality to the project than does the Centre Daily Times.
- (a) Expert peers
 - (b) Architectural historians and media critics
 - (c) Architectural professionals
 - (d) Building type related specialists
 - (e) Others
- (3) In addition, the value of all forms of recognition resulting from juried evaluation is related to:
- (a) The geographic scope (international, national, local, etc.) of the competition;
 - (b) The design ability of the entrants and especially the “winners”; and
 - (c) The ratio of entries to winners
- (4) In cases where the quality of creative accomplishments is not established through appropriate publication, exhibition, honors, or awards, the promotion and tenure committee shall serve as the internal expert peer review to evaluate their effectiveness and creative quality. This internal expert peer review alone may not be sufficient for a fully satisfactory 6th-year review. The committee may and should consult with other members of the faculty with appropriate expertise. For early or final tenure review and/or for promotion to full professor, the process shall be an extension of the external evaluations normally conducted at these times and defined by the College P&T guidelines, but with a targeted focus on the quality of the candidate’s creative accomplishments and their appropriateness for tenure and/or promotion.
- At least four of the external reviewers invited shall be associated with institutions that are members of the AAU (Association of American Universities).*
- g.** In cases where the faculty member was not the “architect-of-record,” validation as to the specific role and responsibility for the project design shall be provided. If this is not clearly indicated on the drawings or other representations, testimony from the “architect-of-record” or other persons qualified to report on the activity shall be provided.
- h.** Evidence of thorough understanding of the field; maintenance of high levels of academic performance; recognized reputation in the subject matter field; evidence of continued professional growth.
- i.** There should be evidence of a thorough understanding of the faculty member's particular discipline through attendance, participation, and presentation at scholarly and professional meetings. There should also be evidence of a recognized reputation in the subject matter field as shown by invitations to lecture, to serve on panels, or to be a visiting architect, scholar, judge, juror, or referee. The development of new courses and the refinement of existing courses in the faculty member's discipline can also be cited as evidence of scholarship and mastery of subject matter.

- j. Professional registration.

3. Service and the Scholarship of Service to the University, Society, and the Profession

- a. Evidence of participation in the University, College, Departmental, and unit affairs; competence in extending the University's specialized knowledge to the public; active contribution to professional organization.
- b. The dossier should contain evidence of the faculty member's contributions to departmental, college, and university committees and programs, and to the public through the extension of specialized knowledge and service to local, state, and national service and professional organizations.

4. Relative Importance of the Criteria

- a. PSU policy directs that all candidates for promotion and tenure shall be evaluated according to three general criteria which should be further defined and elaborated by each academic unit.
- b. In addition to the general criteria listed in AC-23, the College of Arts and Architecture is often concerned with more specific values. Which of these three criteria should be dominant must be determined in every case by the department head who must make clear to every faculty member what is expected in each of the areas and assure that this information is present in the dossier.
- c. In the spring of each year in conjunction with each faculty evaluation, the department head shall discuss with the faculty member the department's expectations for that individual's long range achievements and performance in the forthcoming year. Following this discussion, the department head shall make clear to the faculty member the relative importance of teaching, creative project, research, scholarship, and service activities for that individual's advancement toward tenure or in rank and shall define that individual's task-related responsibilities as related to the three criteria. The department head shall make sure that these expectations are included in each faculty member's dossier.

5. Standards for Promotion to Professor Rank

- a. For promotion to the rank of Professor, the Candidate must demonstrate substantial, and sustained contributions in Teaching, Research and/or Creative Accomplishment, and Service. Achievements in these areas of scholarship must be beyond those presented at the time of promotion to Associate Professor. The Candidate's expertise shall be recognized through peer review at the national and/or international level.

B. EVALUATION DOCUMENTS

Review and evaluation will be based on the contents of the dossier divider sheets provided by the university every year. The divider sheets have detailed outlines for the three areas of evaluation: The Scholarship of Teaching and Learning; The

Scholarship of Research and Creative Accomplishments; and the Scholarship of Service to the University, Society, and the Profession.

The required documentation for each level of review shall consist of a) dossier organized according to the University-provided divider sheets, and b) supplemental materials organized according to the candidate's choice, as per Administrative Guidelines for AC-23, section III-C-5.