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Introduction

1 Purpose of Document

These guidelines are established by the Architecture Department, within the College of Architecture and Environmental Design, to supplement the criteria given in the Campus Administrative Manual (CAM) and agreement between the Board of Trustees of California State University and the California Faculty Association Unit 3 - Faculty (MOU), which are the overriding policy manuals of the University.

The purpose of this document is to promote

- **Clarity as exemplified by:**
  - Clear ARPT requirements
  - Communication of performance expectations
  - Communicating ARPT timetables and processes
  - Evaluations that are clear, tied to evidence and specific

- **Consistency as exemplified by:**
  - Advice and evaluations that are consistent with expectations for tenure and/or promotion
  - Reviews that are scrupulous in following ARPT procedures and requirements
  - Reviews that are complete, consistent and cover the entire evaluation period
  - Reviews that address teaching, scholarship and service
  - Reviews that are consistent over multiple review periods

- **Candor as exemplified by:**
  - Providing regular periodic evaluations
  - Providing specific examples that illustrate performance evaluations
  - Clearly outlining potential areas for improvement

- **Collegiality as exemplified by:**
  - Treating all faculty members with respect and defending each other’s rights
  - Each faculty member accepting their share of the responsibilities for governance
  - Creating a supportive work environment for all faculty members
  - Encouraging mentoring by senior faculty
  - Support for development in teaching, scholarship and service
  - Fostering a balance between professional and personal life
2 MOU and CAM Precedent Statement

"The role and scope of responsibility for the candidate, tenured faculty, peer review committee(s), and department head are incorporated herein to offer clarification of the process and respective responsibilities of the participants in the appointment and review processes. If conflict arises between this document and the MOU or CAM, then the MOU or CAM shall prevail, with the MOU superceding."

3 Definitions

3.1 Performance Reviews

A Performance Review shall normally be required for:
retention of probationary faculty unit employees;
award of tenure; and
promotion.

3.2 Periodic Evaluations

A periodic evaluation of faculty unit employees shall normally be required for:
evaluation of temporary faculty unit employees (lecturers);
probationary faculty unit employees who are not subject to a Performance review (1st academic year
evaluation); and
tenured faculty unit employees who are not subject to a Performance Review (post-tenure reviews).

3.3 Personnel Files Defined

The Personnel Files references in this document include the following:

3.3.1 Applicant Working File (AWF)

A file established by each applicant for a faculty position. It contains the original faculty application and supporting materials submitted by an applicant when applying for a position. Materials from the Applicant Working File become part of the Personnel Action File if the applicant receives an appointment by the Department. If no appointment is made, materials are retained by the department for a period of three years during which period applicants not hired may request that their materials be returned, or may use them for a subsequent recruitment within the department.

3.3.2 Working Personnel Action File (WPAF)

A file established for faculty undergoing a formal review for Retention, Promotion, and Tenure (RPT) or for Periodic Evaluation including Post-Tenure review. It contains an updated resume/vitae, an Index of Materials submitted, all other material, submitted by the candidate and the comments submitted by each level of review during any phase of faculty evaluation. The updated resume/vitae and the Index, along with the evaluations and professional development plans, are transferred to the Personnel Action File after completion of the review process. The remaining materials are returned to the review candidate.

3.3.3 Personnel Action File (PAF)

The PAF is the official permanent campus personnel file. It contains such items as application and resume/vitae, letters of offer, student evaluation of faculty, and previous faculty evaluations for faculty members who have been appointed within the college. The Personnel Action File is maintained by the dean.
Part I: Procedures and Process

4 General

4.1 Security of Personnel Files

During the period of review for appointment, retention, promotion, or tenure, the candidate’s Applicant Working File or Working Personnel Action File shall reside in the Architecture Department in the custody of the Department Head. As custodian of the Applicant Working Files and Working Personnel Action Files during a review cycle, it is the responsibility of the Department Head to assure the integrity of the files, facilitate access to the personnel files by the faculty body participating in the review of the files, affirm that all files are complete and signed, and forward them to the Dean as appropriate.

4.2 Department Employment Equity Facilitator

The department is responsible for providing equal employment opportunities to qualified applicants. The Department Head appoints an Employment Equity Facilitator (EEF) for each job search/selection committee. The role of the EEF is to ensure that the selection process is a careful, thorough, and systematic consideration of the qualifications of each applicant, and the selection is based on valid job-related criteria. The EEF will, among other things: assist in the development of the job announcement; suggest recruitment strategies; participate in all search committee meetings, and brief the committee on Employment Equity Guidelines.

5 Procedures and Process for Appointments

5.1 Initial Appointments for Probationary, Tenured, Full-Time & Part-Time Pools.

5.1.1 Advertising and Recruitment

The Architecture Department shall follow the University’s prescribed advertisement and recruitment procedures and the department’s Search & Screen Process Policy.

5.1.2 Faculty Review of Applicants

5.1.2.1 Probationary (Tenure-Track) Appointments

Tenured Faculty shall elect a Search & Screen Committee and a Search & Screen Subcommittee that shall review applicant qualifications and make hiring recommendations to the Department Head in accordance with the process described in the department’s Search & Screen Process Policy.

5.1.2.2 Full-time Lecturer Appointments

Tenured Faculty shall elect a Search & Screen Committee and a Search & Screen Subcommittee that shall review applicant qualifications and make hiring recommendations to the Department Head in accordance with the process described in the department’s Search & Screen Process Policy.

5.1.2.3 Part-time Lecturer Appointments

Tenured and Tenure Track Faculty not on leave or on off-campus assignment during the review cycle shall be given a reasonable period to review applicant qualifications and make hiring recommendations to the Department Head. The Department Head shall review faculty recommendations and make the final hiring recommendations to the Dean.

5.2 Faculty Transfers from Other Colleges and Departments

Should a tenured or probationary faculty member from another campus department wish to seek transfer to the Architecture Department, the candidate shall go through an application and review process similar to that of a recruitment for a probationary position except that the Tenured Faculty PRC- Retention, Promotion & Tenure shall serve as the screening committee. The PRC comments and recommendations shall be considered by the Department Head, who shall make a recommendation to the Dean for or against approval of the transfer. The Department Head shall report the recommendation to the Tenured Faculty.
Transfer candidates shall be considered for acceptance at their current rank and salary within the University. The qualifications of transfer candidates shall be evaluated relative to the criteria established herein for the equivalent rank in the Architecture Department.

5.3 Reappointment of Full-Time Lecturers

If the initial appointment was the result of a national or broad regional recruitment, a full-time lecturer is eligible for reappointment by the Department Head for a second year based on the recommendation of the PRC, review of all submitted materials, the Personal Action File and the lecturer’s potential for making a continued contribution to the department’s goals and objectives.

5.4 Emergency Appointments

Should it be necessary to make an emergency appointment, the Department Head shall conduct a search for a qualified candidate through past applicants, unsolicited applications, professional contacts and networking. The results of this search shall be shared with available area coordinators and/or area faculty for their analysis of the candidate’s qualifications. A statement of qualifications shall be written and three references obtained for each appointment. Following consultation, the Department Head shall present the Dean with one or more eligible candidates for appointment.

6 Procedures and Processes for Evaluations and Reviews

Evaluations and reviews shall be conducted for tenure-track faculty, tenured faculty and full- and part-time lecturers. A unique peer review committee shall be elected for each evaluation of tenure-track faculty, post-tenure faculty and full-time lecturers. Part-time lecturers may be reviewed by a peer review committee at the discretion of the Department Head.

Emphasis shall be upon the supportive function of evaluation, as well as the necessary function of providing a basis for personnel action decisions. These twin objectives will serve the individual, the department and the University.

In accordance with the MOU, deliberations and written recommendations of the PRC shall remain confidential.

It is the responsibility of the Chair of the PRC to assure that all members of the committee have reviewed all personnel files and materials submitted by review candidates, and assure that all PRC members have signed both the WPAF and PAF for each candidate.

6.1 Departmental Peer Review Committee Formation

The Tenured and Probationary Faculty shall elect the Peer Review Committee (PRC) in accordance with criteria in the faculty bargaining unit agreement.

Peer Review Committees shall be elected during Fall quarter and serve for the academic year. A Chairperson shall be elected by each PRC by a simple majority of its members.

A single qualified individual may serve on more than one committee but not at more than one level of review. Inasmuch as the tenured faculty wish to act as “committees of the whole,” they are automatically nominated to serve on all Peer Review Committees for which they are eligible.

6.1.1 Retention, Promotion to Associate Professor and Tenure PRC Membership

Shall include all full-time tenured faculty of Associate Professor rank or higher not on leave or on off-campus assignment during the review cycle or serving on the College Peer Review Committee.

6.1.2 Promotion to Professor & Post tenure Review PRC Membership

Shall include all full-time tenured faculty of professor rank not on leave or on off-campus assignment during the review cycle or serving on the College Peer Review Committee.
6.1.3 Full-Time Lecturer PRC Membership

Shall include all full-time tenured faculty not on leave or on off-campus assignment during the review cycle.

6.1.4 Withdrawal

Should any tenured faculty member choose to relinquish his/her right to participate on a PRC, he/she must submit to the Department Head a written or e-mail withdrawal from the list of nominations to the relevant Peer Review Committee prior to the election of such committees. Once a faculty member has withdrawn, he/she may not participate in the PRC deliberations or any matters related to that PRC.

6.2 College Peer Review Committee

The Architecture Department will elect one full-time tenured professor to serve on the College Peer Review Committee for a two-year term. This committee serves as the college wide personnel review committee and reviews all applications for promotion and tenure within the college.

The Chair of the tenured faculty shall call for nominations. The tenured and tenure-track faculty shall elect the department’s representative by paper ballot during the first six weeks of the Fall quarter.

6.3 Retention, Promotion to Associate Professor & Tenure Performance Reviews

Candidates up for review shall be notified by the Dean concerning the calendar of events and associated activities related to the review process.

The first year a tenure-track faculty member is on campus they are not subject to a Performance Review by the Provost. Refer to the following section on First Probationary Year Periodic Evaluations.

6.3.1 Faculty Submittals

Candidates shall include, at a minimum, the following materials in their Working Personnel Action File (materials already part of the candidate’s Personnel Action File need not be duplicated for the Working Personnel Action File):

6.3.1.1 Index of Materials submitted

6.3.1.2 Curriculum Vitae

The Curriculum Vitae documents a candidate’s complete history (refer to the department’s Curriculum Vitae Guidelines).

6.3.1.3 Current and Revised Professional Development Plans

The Professional Development Plan defines a candidate’s goals and priorities in the areas of teaching, professional growth and service and their relative weight for use in the review process (refer to the department’s Professional Development Plan Guidelines).

6.3.1.4 Faculty Evaluation Report

A description of a candidate’s teaching, development and service activities and accomplishments since the previous evaluation and a statement of areas of improvement relative to recommendations of previous evaluation (refer to the department’s Faculty Evaluation Report Guidelines).

6.3.1.5 Syllabi

Syllabi for all courses taught since the previous evaluation (refer to the department’s Syllabus Guidelines).

6.3.1.6 Portfolio of Student Work

The student materials should be chosen to provide evidence of student’s engagement of published learning objectives across the full range of course issues and content (refer to the department’s Student Work Portfolio Guidelines).
6.3.1.7 Student Evaluations

A Student Evaluation shall be conducted for a minimum of one course per quarter since the previous review.

6.3.1.8 Other

In addition, candidates may also wish to submit other evidence of activities of merit or letters of recommendation to be incorporated in the Working Personnel Action File and referenced in the Index of Materials submitted.

6.3.2 Levels of Review

6.3.2.1 Level 1 Review: The Faculty Peer Review Committee (PRC)

The Department Head shall call a meeting of the Peer Review Committee and present the names of each candidate for retention or promotion to Associate Professor and tenure, and the schedule for completing the first level review. The Department Head shall then leave the proceedings to be recalled if and when appropriate.

The PRC shall review both the Personnel Action File and the Working Personnel Action File.

The PRC shall submit a written review that addresses the candidate's performance in the areas of teaching, professional growth and service. The review shall identify the candidate's achievements and areas that need improvement, and make recommendations based on his/her submitted materials in relationship to the candidate's Professional Development Plan.

In accordance with the MOU, deliberations and written recommendations of the PRC shall remain confidential.

It is the responsibility of the Chair of the PRC to assure that all members of the committee have reviewed all personnel files and materials submitted for review by the candidates, and assure that all PRC members have signed both the WPAF and PAF for each candidate.

6.3.2.2 Level 2 Review: Head of the Architecture Department

The Department Head shall review and consider all evidence in the Personnel Action File and Working Personnel Action File of each candidate, the Level 1 comments submitted by the PRC, and any response submitted by the candidate.

The Department Head shall then make an independent judgment and recommendation in each case. The written judgment and recommendation shall be signed and should include reasons in sufficient detail for validation.

The Faculty Evaluation Form (AP 109) that is completed by the Department Head shall be signed by the candidate before it is submitted to the next level of review.

If the Department Head's recommendation differs from that of the faculty PRC's, the Department Head shall discuss this with the faculty PRC.

6.3.2.3 Level 3 Review: College Peer Review Committee

Shall review all recommendations for promotion and tenure from the Architecture Department Peer Review Committee and Department Head.

6.3.2.4 Level 4 Review: College Dean

Shall review the candidate's PAF, WPAF, and all faculty evaluations and reviews, and provide a separate recommendation.
6.4 First Probationary Year Periodic Evaluations

Candidates up for review shall be notified by the Department Head concerning the calendar of events and associated activities related to the evaluation process.

The First Probationary Year Periodic Evaluations shall be done by the Retention, Promotion to Associate Professor and Tenure Performance Review committee.

6.4.1 Faculty Submittals

Candidates shall include, at a minimum, the following materials in their Working Personnel Action File (materials already part of the candidate’s Personnel Action File need not be duplicated for the Working Personnel Action File):

6.4.1.1 Index of Materials submitted

6.4.1.2 Curriculum Vitae

The Curriculum Vitae documents a candidate’s complete history (refer to the department’s Curriculum Vitae Guidelines).

6.4.1.3 Professional Development Plan

The Professional Development Plan defines a candidate’s goals and priorities in the areas of teaching, professional growth and service and their relative weight for use in the review process (refer to the department’s Professional Development Plan Guidelines).

6.4.1.4 Syllabi

Syllabi for all courses the candidate is currently teaching (refer to the department’s Syllabus Guidelines).

6.4.1.5 Other

In addition, candidates may submit other materials related to their teaching assignment or professional development to be incorporated in the Working Personnel Action File and referenced in the Index of Materials submitted.

6.4.2 Levels of Review

6.4.2.1 Level 1 Review: The Faculty Peer Review Committee (PRC)

The Department Head shall call a meeting of the Peer Review Committee and present the names of each first year probationary candidate, and the schedule for completing the first level review. The Department Head shall then leave the proceedings to be recalled if and when appropriate.

The PRC shall review both the Personnel Action File and the Working Personnel Action File.

The PRC shall submit a written review that addresses the candidate’s Professional Development Plan, and Syllabi. The review shall comment on the appropriateness of the Professional Development Plan and Syllabi and make suggestions for improvement.

6.4.2.2 Level 2 Review: Head of the Architecture Department

The Department Head shall review and consider all evidence in the Personnel Action File and Working Personnel Action File of each candidate, the Level 1 comments submitted by the PRC, and any response submitted by the candidate.

The Department Head shall meet with the candidate and discuss his/her recommendations relative to the Professional Development Plan and Syllabi and come to an agreement with the candidate concerning any changes to be made in the Professional Development Plan.

6.4.2.3 Level 3 Review: College Dean

Shall review the candidate’s PAF, WPAF, and all faculty evaluations and reviews.
6.5 Promotion to Professor (and tenure if applicable) Performance Reviews & Post-Tenure Periodic Evaluations

Candidates for review shall be notified by the Dean concerning the calendar of events and associated activities related to the review process.

6.5.1 Faculty Submittals

Candidates shall include, at a minimum, the following materials in their Working Personnel Action File. (Materials already part of the candidate's Personnel Action File need not be duplicated for the Working Personnel Action File):

6.5.1.1 Index of Materials submitted

6.5.1.2 Curriculum Vitae

The Curriculum Vitae documents a candidate's complete history (refer to the department's Curriculum Vitae Guidelines).

6.5.1.3 Current and Revised Professional Development Plans

The Professional Development Plan defines a candidate's goals and priorities in the areas of teaching, professional growth and service and their relative weight for use in the review process (refer to the department's Professional Development Plan Guidelines).

6.5.1.4 Faculty Evaluation Report

A description of a candidate's teaching, development and service activities and accomplishments since the previous evaluation and a statement of areas of improvement relative to recommendations of previous evaluation (refer to the department's Faculty Evaluation Report Guidelines).

6.5.1.5 Syllabi

Syllabi for all courses taught since the previous evaluation (refer to the department's Syllabus Guidelines).

6.5.1.6 Portfolio of Student Work

The student materials should be chosen to provide evidence of student's engagement of published learning objectives across the full range of course issues and content (refer to the department's Student Work Portfolio Guidelines).

6.5.1.7 Student Evaluations

A Student Evaluation shall be conducted for a minimum of two courses per year in different quarters since the previous Performance Review or Periodic Evaluation.

6.5.1.8 Other

In addition, candidates may also wish to submit other evidence of activities of merit or letters of recommendation to be incorporated in the Working Personnel Action File and referenced in the Index of Materials submitted.

6.5.2 Levels of Review

6.5.2.1 Level 1 Review: The Faculty Peer Review Committee (PRC)

The Department Head shall call a meeting of the Peer Review Committee and present the names of each candidate for promotion to Professor or post-tenure review and the schedule for completing the first level review. The Department Head shall then leave the proceedings to be recalled if and when appropriate.

The PRC shall review both the Personnel Action File and the Working Personnel Action File.
The PRC shall submit a written review that addresses the candidate’s performance in the areas of teaching, professional growth and service. The review shall identify the candidate’s achievements and areas that need improvement and make recommendations based on his/her submitted materials in relationship to the candidate's Professional Development Plan, WPAF, and PAF.

6.5.2.2 Level 2 Review: Head of the Architecture Department

The Department Head shall review and consider all evidence in the Personnel Action File and Working Personnel Action File of each promotion to Professor and post-tenure review candidate, the Level 1 comments submitted by the PRC, and any response submitted by the candidate.

The Department Head shall then make an independent judgment and recommendation in each case. The written judgment and recommendation shall be signed and should include reasons in sufficient detail for validation.

The Faculty Evaluation Form (AP 109) that is completed by the Department Head, shall be signed by the candidate before it is submitted to the next level of review.

If the Department Head’s recommendation differs from that of the faculty PRC’s, the Department Head shall discuss this with the faculty PRC.

6.5.2.3 Level 3 Review: College Peer Review Committee

Shall review all recommendations for promotion from the Architecture Department Peer Review Committee and Department Head.

6.5.2.4 Level 4 Review: College Dean

Shall review the candidate’s PAF, WPAF, and all faculty evaluations and reviews and provide a separate evaluation. For promotion, a separate recommendation is required. For post-tenure review, the dean will meet with the faculty member, department head, and PRC chair to discuss the evaluation.

6.6 Full-Time Lecturer Periodic Evaluations

Candidates for review shall be notified by the Department Head concerning the calendar of events and associated activities related to the review process.

6.6.1 Faculty Submittals

Candidates shall include, at a minimum, the following materials in their Working Personnel Action File. (Materials already part of the candidate’s Personnel Action File need not be duplicated for the Working Personnel Action File):

6.6.1.1 Index of Materials submitted

6.6.1.2 Curriculum Vitae

The Curriculum Vitae documents a candidate’s complete history (refer to the department’s Curriculum Vitae Guidelines).

6.6.1.3 Faculty Evaluation Report

A description of a candidate’s teaching accomplishments since the previous Periodic Evaluation and a statement of areas of improvement relative to recommendations of previous Periodic Evaluation (refer to the department’s Faculty Evaluation Report Guidelines).

6.6.1.4 Syllabi

Syllabi for all courses taught since the previous Periodic Evaluation (refer to the department’s Syllabus Guidelines).

6.6.1.5 Portfolio of Student Work
The student materials should be chosen to provide evidence of student's engagement of published learning objectives across the full range of course issues and content (refer to the department's Student Work Portfolio Guidelines).

6.6.1.6 Student Evaluations

A Student Evaluation shall be conducted for a minimum of one course per quarter since the previous evaluation.

6.6.1.7 Other

In addition, candidates may also wish to submit other evidence of activities of merit or letters of recommendation to be incorporated in the Working Personnel Action File and referenced in the Index of Materials submitted.

6.6.2 Levels of Review

6.6.2.1 Level 1 Review: The Faculty Peer Review Committee (PRC)

The Department Head shall call a meeting of the Peer Review Committee and present the names of each candidate for review and the schedule for completing the first level review. The Department Head shall then leave the proceedings to be recalled if and when appropriate.

The PRC shall review both the Personnel Action File and the Working Personnel Action File.

The PRC shall submit a written review that addresses the candidate's performance in the areas of teaching, professional growth and service. The review shall identify the candidate's achievements and areas that need improvement and make recommendations based on his/her submitted materials.

6.6.2.2 Level 2 Review: Head of the Architecture Department

The Department Head shall review and consider all evidence in the Personnel Action File and Working Personnel Action File of each candidate, the Level 1 comments submitted by the PRC, and any response submitted by the candidate.

The Department Head shall then make an independent judgment and recommendation in each case. The written judgment and recommendation shall be signed and should include reasons in sufficient detail for validation.

The Faculty Evaluation Form (AP 109) that is completed by the Department Head, shall be signed by the candidate before it is submitted to the next level of review.

If the Department Head's recommendation differs from that of the faculty PRC's, the Department Head shall discuss this with the faculty PRC.

6.6.2.3 Level 3 Review: College Dean

Shall review the candidate's PAF, WPAF, and all faculty evaluations and reviews, and provide a separate recommendation.

6.7 Part-Time Lecturer Periodic Evaluations

Part-time lecturers teaching one or two quarters per academic year may be evaluated annually at the discretion of the Department Head.

Part-Time Lecturers teaching three quarters per academic year shall be reviewed annually until they achieve MOU Section 12.12 classification.

Faculty covered under MOU Section 12.12 are normally scheduled for review in their 2nd year of appointment but may be evaluated more frequently at the discretion of the Department Head or at the request of the lecturer.
It is recommended that all Part-time Lecturers teaching two or more quarters per year be evaluated in their first year, and every third year thereafter or more frequently at the request of the Department Head. This review may be by a peer review committee called at the discretion of the Department Head.

Candidates for review shall be notified by the Department Head concerning the calendar of events and associated activities related to the review process.

6.7.1 Faculty Submittals

Candidates shall include, at a minimum, the following materials in their Working Personnel Action File. (Materials already part of the candidate’s Personnel Action File need not be duplicated for the Working Personnel Action File):

6.7.1.1 Index of Materials submitted

6.7.1.2 Curriculum Vitae

The Curriculum Vitae documents a candidate’s complete history (refer to the department’s Curriculum Vitae Guidelines).

6.7.1.3 Faculty Evaluation Report

A description of a candidate’s teaching, development and service activities and accomplishments since the previous Periodic Evaluation and a statement of areas of improvement relative to recommendations of previous Periodic Evaluation (refer to the department’s Faculty Evaluation Report Guidelines).

6.7.1.4 Syllabi

Syllabi for all courses taught since the previous Periodic Evaluation (refer to the department’s Syllabus Guidelines).

6.7.1.5 Portfolio of Student Work

The student materials should be chosen to provide evidence of student’s engagement of published learning objectives across the full range of course issues and content (refer to the department’s Student Work Portfolio Guidelines).

6.7.1.6 Student Evaluations

A Student Evaluation shall be conducted for a minimum of one course per quarter for each quarter that the candidate taught since the previous evaluation.

6.7.1.7 Other

In addition, candidates may also wish to submit other evidence of activities of merit or letters of recommendation to be incorporated in the Working Personnel Action File and referenced in the Index of Materials submitted.

6.7.2 Levels of Review

6.7.2.1 Level 1 Review: The Faculty Peer Review Committee (PRC) (required only when called for by the Department Head)

The Department Head shall call a meeting of the Peer Review Committee and present the names of each candidate for review and the schedule for completing the first level review. The Department Head shall then leave the proceedings to be recalled if and when appropriate.

The PRC shall review both the Personnel Action File and the Working Personnel Action File.

The PRC shall submit a written review that addresses the candidate’s performance in the areas of teaching. Contributions in the areas of professional growth and service should be noted in the category of other accomplishments. The review shall identify the candidate’s achievements and areas that need improvement and make recommendations based on his/her submitted materials.
6.7.2.2 Level 2 Review: Head of the Architecture Department

The Department Head shall review and consider all evidence in the Personnel Action File and Working Personnel Action File, the evaluation from the PRC, if conducted, and any evaluative comments submitted by Tenured and Tenure-Track faculty.

The Department Head shall then make a judgment and recommendation in each case. The written judgment and recommendation shall be signed and should include reasons in sufficient detail for validation.

The Faculty Evaluation Form (AP 109) that is completed by the Department Head, shall be signed by the candidate before it is submitted to the next level of review.

6.7.2.3 Level 3 Review: College Dean

Will review the candidate's PAF, WPAF, and all faculty evaluations.
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7 Criteria for Initial Appointment

The practice of architecture requires an intricate balance of technological competence, humanistic approach, artistic sensitivity, problem-solving ability, and concern for the overall environment. In architectural education it is important that these elements be integrated effectively in the teaching of a total design process. The success of the program is, therefore, dependent upon the effective interaction and collaboration of faculty from varying backgrounds and expertise in a wide range of activities. Excellence in performance is the uniform goal of this faculty in fulfilling the teaching mission of this department.

This section presents the required qualifications and describes the type of activities and performance expectations of a faculty member related to a specific area of expertise and particular level of evaluation.

Each candidate shall be evaluated relative to the stated criteria. Beyond these minimums, decisions will be based on professional judgment as to the quality of the candidate’s work and experience in advancing the program mission of the Department. Deliberation shall necessarily consider the overall faculty composition and profile within the context of program goals and objectives and present and future needs of the Department and the College.

The ultimate purpose of this set of criteria is to ensure the highest quality of professional education possible for future architects from the teaching programs of this Department.

7.1 Definitions

7.1.1 First Professional Degree: An accredited Bachelor of Architecture (BArch), Master of Architecture (MArch) or Doctor of Architecture (DArch).

7.1.2 Ph.D. Degree: A Post-graduate degree with an emphasis on theory and research.

7.1.3 Professional Licensure: Licensure in architecture granted by a governmental or other appropriate agency.

7.1.4 Eligibility for Professional Licensure: Recognizing that eligibility requirements vary, the Architecture Department will use the following definition: Professional degree plus minimum of three years of work experience under the direct supervision of a licensed architect attained after receiving a first professional degree.

7.1.5 Terminal Degree in Architecture: Master of Architecture (MArch), Doctor of Architecture (DArch), or MS in Architecture when accompanied by Professional Licensure or Ph.D. or their equivalents.

7.1.6 Allied Disciplines: Including but not limited to Architectural, Environmental, Structural, Electrical and Mechanical Engineering; Landscape Architecture; Interior Design; City and Regional Planning; Urban Design; and Construction Management.

7.2 Probationary Appointments (Tenure Track)

7.2.1 A First Professional Degree (see definitions) in architecture; and

7.2.2 A masters degree in architecture or an Allied Discipline (see definitions) or a DArch; and

7.2.3 Professional Licensure (see definitions) or a Ph. D.; and

Eligibility for Professional Licensure (see definitions) or Ph.D. is acceptable for appointment, but promotion or tenure is contingent upon acquisition of either Professional License or Ph.D.

7.2.4 Experience in Architecture through practice or professional consultation; and

7.2.5 Related college-level teaching experience.

7.2.6 Candidates for Architectural History positions are required to have a Ph.D. with a dissertation on Architectural History or the history of the built environment.
Eligibility for Ph.D. is acceptable for appointment, but promotion and/or tenure for probationary academic rank faculty is contingent upon acquisition of the Ph.D.

7.3 **Academic Rank Position Criteria for Probationary Appointments**

Initial appointments to an academic rank position are generally at the Assistant Professor rank.

Appointment at the Associate Professor or Professor rank is possible for experienced individuals to fill key positions in the teaching program. For such cases, the following experience level and qualifications required for the particular rank shall apply:

Candidates for appointment at the Associate Professor rank must, in addition to the Criteria for Initial Appointment, have at least five (5) years of experience in practice and/or teaching.

Candidates for appointment at the Professor rank must, in addition to the Criteria for Initial Appointment have a record of distinguished professional and/or academic accomplishment extending over a period of at least ten (10) years, and must give evidence of the capability to effectively transfer the demonstrated professional qualities into the educational process and fulfill program objectives of the Department and College.

Exceptions to the minimum requirements for Academic Rank Positions require approval by the Provost after consultation with the Tenured Faculty, Department Head, and Dean. If tenure is offered, the President must also approve.

7.4 **Exceptions for Probationary Appointments**

On occasions when deemed important to the Department by the faculty, exceptions to the minimum criteria for initial appointment may be made if a candidate meets one or more of the following:

- Possesses exceptional professional knowledge corresponding to the position advertised;
- Possesses exceptional teaching experience corresponding to the position advertised; or
- Has an exceptional body of completed work that has received professional recognition.

Such an appointment requires approval of the Search & Screen Committee, Department Head, Dean and Provost.

7.5 **Full- and Part-Time Lecturers**

The Lectureship classification is for temporary appointments, separate and distinct from tenure-track appointments, and is used for candidates with capabilities useful to the teaching program in accordance with the Department’s mission and objectives.

7.5.1 A First Professional Degree (see definitions) in architecture; and

7.5.2 Professional Licensure (see definitions); and

Eligibility for Professional Licensure (see definitions) is acceptable for appointment, but advancement is contingent upon acquisition of Professional License.

7.5.3 Experience in Architecture through practice or professional consultation.

In addition, lecturers shall have:

7.5.4 Related college-level teaching experience; or

7.5.5 Fulfill a specific need in the department in the instructional area(s) for which they apply.

7.6 **Lecturer Level Position Criteria**

Qualifications for appointment to a particular level are similar to corresponding rank positions. Initial appointments to a lectureship position are generally at the Lecturer B rank (similar to Assistant Professor).

Exceptions to the minimum requirements for Lecturer Level positions require approval by the Dean, after consultation with the faculty and Department Head.
7.7 Emergency Hires

When instructional needs arise that cannot be met through the probationary or lecturer process described in this document, emergency hires of lecturers may be made contingent on the candidate meeting the same criteria as those stated for full- and part-time lecturers.

8 Criteria for Retention/Reappointment, Promotion/Elevation, and Tenure

Faculty evaluations and recommendations shall be based on individual records of achievement in a particular period of time. Such recommendations shall include consideration of the candidate’s progress relative to previous evaluations and the candidate’s value to the teaching program. Each candidate shall be evaluated relative to the minimum criteria stated in this document. Beyond these minimums, decisions will be based on professional judgment as to the quality of the candidate’s work and experience in advancing the program mission of the Department.

Retention/Reappointment, Promotion/Elevation, and Tenure are not automatic. For consideration, in addition to those criteria established for initial appointment, the following sets the criteria for each level of appointment.

The ultimate purpose of evaluations and recommendations is to ensure the highest quality of professional education possible for future architects from the teaching programs of this Department.

In all evaluations and recommendations, any evaluative statements should be accompanied by supporting evidence.

Retention/Reappointment, Promotion/Elevation, Tenure and Post-Tenure evaluation criteria fall within the areas of teaching, professional growth, and service established by the University. These categories constitute the general expectations for faculty performance at the department and college levels. The Faculty Evaluation Form (AP109) has been established by the University as the formal faculty evaluation tool, and becomes a part of the Personnel Action File. Should the AP 109 criteria be revised at a future date, this section shall be updated to reflect those changes.

The following identifies criteria and appropriate activities for merit consideration under each category stated in the Faculty Evaluation Form (AP109).

8.1 Teaching

Effective teaching is the foundation for both the advancement and transmission of knowledge. Teaching takes several different forms in the Architecture Department. For the purposes of performance evaluation, the distinction is made between teaching and the scholarship of teaching and learning. However, the two are closely allied and some of the same types of evidence may be applicable to both. The criteria for the Scholarship of Teaching and learning are provided in the section on Professional Growth.

8.1.1 Written self-evaluation by the candidate

The faculty member assesses his or her achievements in teaching based on specific goals established for the period of review. Refer to the Faculty Evaluation Report Guidelines.

8.1.2 Student Evaluations

Courses taught by faculty members shall be evaluated by students using forms and/or evaluation instruments adopted by the department and approved by the college and university.

8.1.3 Performance of students

Student work, tests and other outcomes are assessed according to course objectives as described in the course syllabus and course descriptions and student-learning requirements set forth by accreditation bodies.

8.1.4 Informed judgment of colleagues

The faculty member’s colleagues review teaching philosophy, course syllabi, student evaluations, and student work as part of Periodic Evaluations, and reviews for promotion and tenure.
8.1.5 Teaching Criteria

The criteria for the assessment of effective teaching shall include but is not be limited to:

- Competence and currency in the discipline
- Currency of material presented
- Comprehensiveness of material presented
- Rigor of treatment and depth of material presented
- Appropriateness and relevance of material and assignments to course objectives
- Versatility and appropriateness of teaching techniques
- Effectiveness of teaching techniques
- Ability to communicate ideas effectively
- Teaching stimulates student creativity and energy

- Organization of course
- Organization of material presented
- Defined methods and criteria for evaluating student achievement
- Clarity, quality and fairness in evaluation of student performance

- Tolerance and understanding of, and respect for, diverse opinions
- Effectiveness of student consultations
- Accessibility of faculty member to the students
- Concern for individual students and class as a whole
- Relationship with students in class

- Changes indicating improvements in teaching performance
- Enhancement or development of existing course
- Development of a new course

8.1.6 Evidence of Teaching Performance

- Course syllabi (refer to the department’s Syllabus Guidelines)
- Written self-evaluation by the candidate (refer to the department’s Faculty Evaluation Report Guidelines)
- Student evaluations (refer to the department’s student evaluation form)
- Evidence of teaching improvements and innovation
- Evidence of improved course materials
- Courses taken in education
- Quality of Master’s Thesis Supervision
- Student Work (refer to the department’s Student Work Portfolio Guidelines)
- Letters from peers submitted by the candidate
- Open letters sent to the Evaluation Committee
- Teaching awards

8.2 Professional Growth

Architecture Department faculty members are expected to be current in their disciplines as well as their teaching skills and are encouraged to belong to appropriate professional organizations and be involved in national and international activities. The Architecture Department shall whenever possible support faculty in achieving success in their professional growth.

Active participation in various types of scholarly activities is essential to remaining current. The Architecture Department recognizes and endorses the four types of scholarship identified in Cal Poly's strategic plan as part of the expectations for faculty. These include The Scholarship of Teaching, the Scholarship of Discovery, the Scholarship of Integration, and the Scholarship of Application.

All Architecture Department faculty members shall demonstrate continuing sound and effective intellectual work in one or more of the four types of scholarship. While activity in all types of scholarship may characterize the career of a faculty member, at any given time it is likely that one or more types will receive greater emphasis.
The validation of professional growth scholarship is based on both self and peer evaluation by those within and outside of Cal Poly.

8.2.1 Scholarship of Teaching

The Scholarship of Teaching begins with what the teacher knows. Those who teach must be well-informed and steeped in the knowledge of their fields. Teaching is also a dynamic endeavor that must bring students actively into the educational process. Teaching builds bridges between the teacher’s understanding and the student’s learning. Pedagogical procedures must be carefully planned, continuously examined, and related directly to the subject taught. Those involved in the Scholarship of Teaching shall ask: What is the current relevant base of knowledge? What pedagogy would engage students in learning? Is the pedagogy effective—does student learning meet educational objectives?

The Scholarship of Teaching focuses on the art and science of teaching theory and methodology. Both the traditional classroom and the studio may be the focus of work in this area. Faculty may concentrate in such areas as the teaching of new discoveries, strategies for applying or integrating knowledge, and the development of innovative curricula.

8.2.2 Scholarship of Discovery

The Scholarship of Discovery comes closest to what is meant when academics speak of "research." This scholarship contributes to the intellectual climate of the department, college and university and the stock of human knowledge. Those involved in the Scholarship of Discovery shall ask: What is known and what is yet to be discovered?

The Scholarship of Discovery involves the generation and interpretation of new knowledge through research. It may relate the cultural, political, and social context to architecture and the built environment. It may take the form of inquiry, in which architecture is considered a "text" to be read and interpreted within historical and contemporary contexts. These texts include drawings, models, treatises, polemics, commentaries, and actual built works, and reflect the ideas, values, emotions, and aesthetic tastes of their author. It may employ empirical methods and theories of the natural and social sciences to the study of the built environment.

8.2.3 Scholarship of Integration

The Scholarship of Integration involves the serious, disciplined work of interpreting, drawing together, and bringing new insight to bear on original research. This scholarship can involve doing research at the boundaries where fields of study converge, or it can involve the interpretation and fitting of one’s own research—or the research of others—into larger intellectual patterns. Integration means making connections across disciplines, placing the specialties in larger context, illuminating data in a revealing way, often educating non-specialists, too. Those engaged in the Scholarship of Integration shall ask: What do the research findings mean and is it possible to interpret what has been discovered in ways that provide a larger, more comprehensive understanding?

8.2.4 Scholarship of Application

The Scholarship of Application involves using knowledge to solve problems. This scholarship is a dynamic process where new research discoveries are applied and where the applications themselves give rise to new intellectual understandings. Those engaged in the Scholarship of Application shall ask: How can knowledge be responsibly applied to consequential problems? How can knowledge be helpful to individuals as well as institutions? How can social, economic, and other problems define an agenda for scholarly investigation?

Through outreach, practical architectural problems are investigated and implemented, design processes are tested, and design products developed for real clients. New design processes, tools of simulation and representation, and design solutions that integrate technical and scientific advances are disseminated through design studio projects involving students. The Scholarship of Application in architecture may take the form of commissioned work that is reviewed within a reflective and critical perspective.
During the evaluation process, evidence will be sought of creative activity of high quality and significance. Due to the diversity and complexity of theoretical, applied, and skill-oriented knowledge required in the architecture profession, research and creative activities assume a variety of forms including, but not limited to, classical scientific research and publications. Research and creative activities are inclusive of broad range of efforts, including basic and applied research, survey, synthesis, and interpretation of the works of others, innovative design projects, further development and/or improvements of the technical and spatial methods of design, investigation of contemporary and historical architectural precedent and its relationship to specific and particular projects and sites, and architecture and planning case studies.

Validation of scholarship in this area is based on peer review, and client satisfaction.

8.2.5 Evidence of Professional Growth

All professional growth activities must be supported by some evidence for it to be considered in ARPT review processes. Evidence of professional growth can be demonstrated in but not limited to the following ways.

Articles in refereed journals
Books
Book chapters
Edited books
Editorship of journals
Conference proceedings
Public lectures
Critical reviews
Scholarly papers
Offices held in professional and academic organizations
Organization of conferences
Conference participation
Funded research projects
Research reports
Published abstracts
Reference to the candidate's written work in professional publications
Peer evaluations, confidential
Peer evaluations, public
Expert testimonies given by the candidate
Honors and awards
Self-evaluation by the candidate
Exhibits of design or creative works
Printed critical reviews of design or creative works
Further academic training, credentials or degrees
Professional registration
Competition prizes
Fellowships
Positions on juries
Critical professional practice and consulting
Completed projects
Critical professional and public recognition of projects completed
Juried awards for projects completed
Recognition through institutional or governmental advisory invitations
8.2.6 Dissemination of Professional Growth Products

The validation of professional growth activities is through the dissemination of their products. The following identifies a range of acceptable means by which professional growth products can be disseminated. Each mode has its own form of peer review that includes academic, colleagues, practitioner colleagues, editorial boards, exhibition and competition juries, and clients.

Paper presentation: presentation made to professional audiences based on written papers or abstracts.

Published works and designs: paper, articles, books and book chapters published (or edited) in any source that has a procedure for manuscript review.

Invited lectures: invited lectures to audiences off campus

Competitions: local, regional, national, and international design competitions entered.

Exhibitions: curated and juried exhibitions of faculty work displayed in local, regional, national, or international arenas.

Video presentations: includes work that explores the artistic merits of video media, or documents research and service activities.

Reports of outreach activities: published works that describe the theory and application of methods of outreach activities.

Private consulting or commissions: commissioned design work or works of art in a form that communicates to others the nature of the work.

Software: new software developed, or current software applied in a unique manner, prepared in a form that communicates to others.

Digital media: electronic journals, web-based disseminated competitions, etc.

8.3 Service

There are three dimensions of the service category: service within the University, College and Department; service to the community outside the University; and service to the professional or academic communities. An individual's willingness to contribute through service is important to the functioning of the college and the department's educational program. This can be demonstrated through leadership and participation in committees, task forces, projects, events, and special assignments at the University, College, and Program levels.

All faculty members are expected to participate in College, Departmental and instructional area meetings.

Tenured and Tenure-Track faculty members are expected to participate in University, College and Departmental committee work. This commitment of time and energy is necessary to facilitate the model of shared governance adopted by the faculty and counts toward a faculty member's development in terms of service.

Service by faculty to the community outside of the university and the profession is encouraged. Community service that enhances the standing of and goodwill towards the University in the community, or pro bono that enriches classroom teaching, are examples of such service.

8.3.1 Service to the Department, College, and University includes but is not limited to:

- Collegiality and collaboration
- Demonstrated Initiative and leadership
- Demonstrated dependability and quality in assignments or tasks undertaken
- Participation in student academic advising and counseling
- Participation in Department committees and activities
- Participation in College committees and activities
Participation in University committees and activities
Participation in California State University system committees and activities
Advising student clubs and groups
Elected or appointed administrative leadership

8.3.2 Service to community may include but is not limited to:
Leadership and participation with outreach programs of the University
Lectures, exhibits, speeches, design, and planning for public groups
Consultation pro bono for civic and other public groups
Assisting agencies and organizations by reviewing proposals and publications, juries and awards, etc.
Providing consultation to governmental agencies and non-profit civic organizations
Donation of professional skills to community projects
Serving as a member of civic boards, commissions, committees, councils, task forces, etc.

8.3.3 Professional service may include but is not limited to:
Leadership and participation in the organization and activities of professional and academic organizations
Refereeing for scholarly and professional journals and research proposals
Participation in professional licensing boards and related activities
Contributions to continuing education in the candidate's field of expertise
Pro bono research and consultation for professional or academic organizations

8.3.4 Evidence of Service may include but is not limited to:
Academic advisement
Department, College, and University committee service
Service in community affairs directly related to the faculty member's teaching area, as distinguished from those contributions to more generalized community activities
Service project reports
Letters of appointment or election to offices in professional and academic organizations
Peer review of service activities, confidential
Peer review of service activities, public
Letters acknowledging services rendered
Testimonials, in writing
Awards and honors

9 Criteria for Retention, Promotion, and Tenure of Tenure Track Faculty
In addition to those Eligibility Criteria established for initial appointment to an academic rank position, the candidate must demonstrate continued progress and achievement in teaching, professional growth and service.

Tenure requires that the candidate has acquired Professional Licensure or a Ph.D. or Doctoral degree, if not already attained prior to initial appointment or subsequent promotion.

The weighting for teaching, professional growth and service shall be defined in the candidate's Professional Development Plan (refer to the department's Professional Development Plan Guidelines) with the emphasis being placed on teaching.

A tenure-track faculty member's primary teaching assignment and the basis for their teaching evaluation during their probationary period should be in the instructional area for which they were hired.

If during their probationary period a faculty member is assigned to teach outside the area for which they were hired for more than one quarter, the assignment must be agreed to by the faculty member and be reflected in the faculty member's Professional Development Plan.

10 Criteria for Reappointment of Full-Time Lecturers
Reappointment is not automatic. In addition to those Eligibility Criteria established for initial appointment to a lecturer position, the candidate must demonstrate continued progress and achievement in teaching.
11 Criteria for Range Elevation of Lecturers

Range elevation is not automatic. In addition to those Eligibility Criteria established for initial appointment to a lecturer position, the candidate must demonstrate continued progress and achievement in teaching.

11.1 From Lecturer B to Lecturer C (similar to Associate Professor)
Lecturers who meet all of the qualifications of appointment or promotion to the ranked position of Associate Professor qualify for the classification of Lecturer C.

11.2 From Lecturer C to Lecturer D (similar to Professor)
Lecturers who meet all of the qualifications of appointment or promotion to the ranked position of Professor qualify for the classification of Lecturer D.

12 Criteria for Review and Promotion of Tenured Faculty

In addition to those Eligibility Criteria established for initial appointment to an academic rank position, the candidate must demonstrate continued progress and achievement in teaching, professional growth and service.

Individuals are obligated to demonstrate continued professional growth to fulfill the responsibilities of a senior faculty member.

Promotion to Professor rank is a special acknowledgment of exceptional career accomplishment, both as a dedicated academician and an outstanding professional.

The weighting for teaching, professional growth and service shall be defined in the candidate's Professional Development Plan (refer to the department's Professional Development Plan Guidelines) with the emphasis being placed on quality teaching.

12.1 Exceptions for Promotion of Tenured Faculty

On occasions when deemed important to the Department by the faculty, exceptions to the minimum criteria for Retention/Reappointment, Promotion/Elevation, and Tenure as stated above may be made if a candidate meets one or more of the following:
Developed a nationally recognized body of knowledge in their area of teaching during their tenure;
Developed and shared exceptional and nationally recognized teaching pedagogy and practices during their tenure; or
Developed an exceptional body of recognized professional work during their tenure.
Such an exception requires approval of the tenured faculty, Department Head, Dean and Provost.