The Oxford geographer, Halford J. Mackinder once said, “All knowledge is one; its division into subjects is a concession to human weakness.” That comes close to describing the philosophical drive for the Environmental Design (ENVD) program as we embrace the opportunity to advance the planned School of the Environment and Sustainability at CU.

The environmental challenges facing our society loom large and demand creative solutions. Our program’s expertise in addressing solutions within the context of built and natural environments provides our students with unique advantages. Influenced by the advice of the ancient Roman architect Vitruvius on the education of the architect, our students engage with a broad range of subjects in the humanities, sciences, and social sciences, in order to understand the gravity of the challenges society faces and the contribution designers can make to addressing such challenges. ENVD fosters an innovative interdisciplinary education to prepare students for practice and advanced study in the design-based fields of architecture, landscape architecture and planning, as well as apply design thinking to a variety of other possible careers.

These professions are in the midst of exciting changes, and we are driven to understand the new fundamentals of integrative and sustainable design thinking. Our faculty push forth the frontiers of design research and practice in order to train our students to design sustainable buildings, neighborhoods, cities and regions. We do this by relying on:

- design approaches that blend technical, ecological, economic, social, cultural, aesthetic, and ethical concerns;
- evidence-based knowledge to help inform design and planning decisions;
- an interdisciplinary culture of individuals who are not only experts in a core design and planning discipline, but also well-versed in the sciences, humanities, arts, and other professions; and
- a spirit of service to diverse communities, to social justice, and to sustainability.

Our graduates are uniquely qualified to confront the significant environmental challenges that lie ahead. Engaging in much more than vocational training, our students become adept at complex problem solving, analytical thinking, and leadership in order to lay the foundation for a purposeful and fulfilling career.

Students enroll in studios, lectures, and seminars taught by 30 faculty with both academic and professional expertise. They design innovative “green” buildings and infrastructure and they work directly with cities to figure out how to integrate social, ecological, and economic needs to support a sustainable future. Students apply state-of-the-art educational technology including computing tools, digital image databases, fabrication equipment, and advanced media to make a persuasive case and bring their ideas into light. Layer on top of all this the resources of the Boulder campus—from sciences, social sciences, humanities, arts, and technology fields—and we offer an educational opportunity like no other.

The knowledge to address sustainable solutions for the built and natural environment requires holistic design thinking. Welcome to the next generation of ENVD at CU Boulder.

Kevin J. Krizek, PhD.
Program Director & Professor
Our Aim at ENVD

At ENVD, we cultivate the next generation of design professionals to address the world’s most pressing urban challenges. We do this by bridging insights from the academy and professional practice through rigorous research and scholarship, design excellence, innovative pedagogy, skill-building, and critical practice.
‘One’ central charge for ENVD

A path forward to establish ENVD’s excellence requires awareness of the changing landscape of:

(a) design education, in general,
(b) markets (i.e., what are growth domains not being addressed by other universities (globally) and regionally (other Colorado institutions),
(c) opportunities (i.e., connections to other aligned disciplines), and
(d) constraints (i.e., state statues and budget).

Leveraging ENVD’s unique identity, CU Boulder, the region, and other assets will be imperative in the quest to create a program of international stature. ENVD cannot compare itself to other major design programs; they are not our peers; replicating what other Landscape Architecture, Architecture, or Planning programs are doing will not advantageously advance ENVD’s unique identity. Rather, ENVD needs to set a new precedent for education in the fields of architecture, landscape architecture, planning and design studies. ENVD’s critical advantage is to embrace a broader approach to environmental design—one that is steeped in elements of sustainability, design, and trans-disciplinary thinking.

As a wide-ranging and diverse group, the ENVD faculty will need to be resolute in defining and charting new norms for design education. While it may be risky to not lay a path forward that prepares students for mainstream accreditation, the alternative opportunities are too rich and exciting to pass up. After all, if ENVD is aiming to build a unit responsive to the 21st century, why would it be necessary to subscribe to a 20th century system to determine its shape? It is clear that society needs to change the way cities and spaces are built, managed and designed; changing the professions is one part; changing the educational system is another.

Overarching challenge: How should ENVD pursue activities that advance the unit (and students and the campus at large) to explore the “changing landscape of design education.” How can ENVD best lead a discussion to meet the demands of this 21st century reality?
Annual merit review guidelines

Annual reviews will be based on a scoring of faculty performance in a range from 0 to 5 in areas of evaluation, depending on the extent of your appointment for Research, Teaching, and Service. Each member of the merit review committee will evaluate independently faculty performance and committee scores will be averaged for a composite score in each category. Composite scores will be fractionally weighted by the individual faculty work load (e.g., for TTT faculty, typically 40:40:20 research:teaching:service) for an aggregate total ranging from 0-5. It is their responsibility to communicate the appropriate workload rating to the merit review committee in the annual merit summary.

Guidelines for numerical scores assigned to each performance category. Performance Category Numerical Score Range:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Performance Category</th>
<th>Numerical Score Range</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Far Exceeds Expectations</td>
<td>4.1-5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exceeds Expectations</td>
<td>3.1-4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meets Expectations</td>
<td>2.1-3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Below Expectations</td>
<td>1.1-2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unsatisfactory</td>
<td>0-1.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Research Review Criteria

For appointments containing a research component, this section provides an overview of the criteria used to gauge a faculty member’s performance in the research review. Productivity with respect to research or creative work includes publications, presentations, grants, or other design-related activities. Within ENVD there are considerable variations in the type, quantity, and nature of research output across different areas of scholarship; please consult the RTP guidelines for further detail. The merit review committee will seek to develop expectation appropriate for the individual’s research emphasis (weighted to percentage of effort). Faculty can aid in this effort through their submitted documents and narrative. ENVD recognizes a variety of activities as evidence of research productivity but also recognizes that not all research activities are equal.

Teaching Review Criteria

Teaching performance includes a variety of activities all of which are used to form a basis for annual merit evaluation. These areas are described in more detail in the below table, but include formal classroom/studio instruction at the undergraduate and graduate level, mentoring of graduate students, mentoring of undergraduate students. It can also include effort as a studio coordinator or other educational activities in which faculty are specifically working with students with a specific pedagogical orientation. ENVD is relatively unique in this latter respect. Many activities involve both practical applications and students. In this respect, creative work that enhances the student experience (and thus retention and teaching reputation) should be highlighted.

For example, elements of service learning\(^1\) and/or community-based participatory research\(^2\) could comprise significant teaching and/or service contributions.\(^3\) Pursuing creative work that is closely tied to student outcomes and community engagement can be an effective way to for

---

2. [https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Community-based_participatory_research](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Community-based_participatory_research)
faculty without a research appointment to conduct – and be recognized for – these activities. It is the faculty member’s responsibility to explain such and describe it as part of the teaching or service category. At present, compensated teaching during Maymester and/or summer session, do not count toward the annual teaching load; however, pedagogical innovations during these sessions can be noted as evidence of teaching effort.

Faculty will be evaluated annually on the basis of the degree to which they meet their designated teaching loads (articulated by a percentage of their appointment).

Far Exceeds Expectations: Faculty that far exceed expectations will have an aggregate level of teaching activity that is considerably higher than normal disciplinary expectations and/or which indicates a high level of achievement relative to other faculty members. Evidence for this level of achievement will be drawn from activities in category 1 and/or 2 in Table 1 or may include additional metrics such as university teaching awards or publications in the education literature. If faculty believe their effort warrants a designation of ‘far exceeds’ for teaching, they are encouraged to present this rationale in their annual activities summary.

Exceed Expectations: Faculty that exceed expectations teach at their designated course load and illustrate a greater than average teaching effort through a combination of the following: new course development, substantive implementation of education reform, demonstration of student achievement through quantitative metrics, support of a larger than average number of graduate students, extensive interaction with and support of undergraduate honors theses, exceptionally high FCQs in combination with other metrics demonstrating excellence in teaching.

Meets Expectations: Faculty are expected to teach at their designated course load (adjusted for differentiated work loads). Faculty can also meet expectations for student mentoring by serving on preliminary, comprehensive, or thesis committees. Similarly, mentoring of a greater than average number of honors thesis students may serve as evidence for meeting expectation in lieu of graduate advising.

Below Expectations: Faculty falling below expectations are not teaching at their designated load (over a three year rolling period) or are failing to support the number of graduate advisees expected based on their designated teaching load. Faculty may also fall below expectations based on a lack of evidence of engagement in graduate committee service, undergraduate committee service, or based on evidence for poor performance in the classroom. In all these cases, a designation of below expectation will be made if faculty fail to perform at expectation across a range of these categories (e.g., falling below expectation in any single category is not grounds for designation of falling ‘below expectations’).

Unsatisfactory: Faculty in this category exhibit little evidence of teaching activity or have more than two consecutive years of below expectation ratings.

The following table provides a structure for the evaluation of faculty teaching activities beyond the simple metric of courses taught. Faculty are encouraged to clearly articulate circumstances when their activities fall outside the list here or deviate from the ranking criteria identified here.
## Table 1: Ranking of Impacts for Teaching Activities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ranking of Impact</th>
<th>Teaching Activity</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Evidence of teaching accomplishments in the form of awards, specific pedagogical publications or similar.</td>
<td>Evidence of higher than normal effort due to size and/or pedagogical considerations should be noted.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Major course reform and/or implementation of pedagogical approaches and/or formal assessment of learning outcomes. Development of a new course, with completely revamped syllabus, assignments, and content.</td>
<td>Description of effort or intensity of teaching should be communicated by faculty in their annual merit report.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Primary advising—more so graduation—of PhD students. Considerable assistance or support provided to an auxiliary course (beyond normal assignments, duties, or expectations).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Primary mentor for several honors thesis students. Primary instructor to independent study students. Disproportionate service on other undergraduate/graduate committees. Disproportionate service on honors committees (in addition to prescribed service obligations). Receipt of FCQs that are higher than departmental norms for equivalent level courses.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### ENVD Service

All ENVD faculty with \( \frac{1}{2} \) time appointment or greater contain some percentage of service and outreach as part of their obligations. There are a broad range of activities that qualify as service, including program, college, campus, and university obligations as well as activities in support of external constituencies such as professional societies, governmental and non-governmental organizations, the general public, and others. Activities are wide ranging, as are the clients. Different obligations require very different levels of faculty effort. Advancing some efforts are far more time consuming than other committees. Faculty service obligations that focus on ENVD as an operational unit are detailed below. They generally fall into one of three categories. ENVD faculty who are instructors, sr. instructors, and tenure/tenure track faculty are expected to:

(A) **Primarily** champion one major program service activity (i.e., the individual responsible for carrying the flag). Individually specific ENVD service activities for the year are provided under a separate cover. Other faculty can/will serve as support to these efforts (see B below), but responsibilities will largely be singularly focused with accountability to the program director.

(B) play a **supporting** role to one or more activities specified in A, immediately above.

(C) Support each of the following all-program efforts:
- Recruiting new students into the program; 4 5;
- Advising and assisting current students about ENVD related career possibilities and mentoring (e.g., reference letters, support to internships).
- Other ENVD service obligations on an as needed basis.

---

4 Faculty make phone calls to accepted students and/or parents to answer questions and promote CU enrollment in late April. This is part of a recruitment effort to reach out to accepted ENVD students to answer questions in support of academic enrollment.

5 Such activities may also involve a presentation and providing supplemental information about the ENVD program on a Saturday morning in April, followed by an open house.
Service Review Criteria

Faculty will be evaluated annually on the basis of the degree to which they meet their designated service loads (articulated by a percentage of their appointment). ENVD service obligations that are mentioned above and individually assigned provide a baseline level for faculty who are deemed to “meet expectations.” It is incumbent upon faculty to communicate their service accomplishments—both quantity and quality—as well as additional efforts so that the merit review committee can make equitable judgments of service effort.

Far Exceeds Expectations: Faculty may far exceed expectations through a portfolio of service activities that, in combination, greatly exceed the expectations described for a specific rank in the ‘meets expectation’ description. In addition, faculty in this category will typically show evidence of leadership and/or excellence in one or more major service obligations. This would typically include a number (e.g., > 4) of activities drawn from categories 1 and 2 in Table 4 in excess of those required to meet expectations.

Exceeds Expectations: Faculty may far exceed expectations through a portfolio of service activities that, in combination, exceed the expectations described for a specific rank in the ‘meets expectation’ description. In addition, faculty in this category will typically show evidence of leadership and/or excellence in one or more major service obligations. This would typically include a number (e.g., > 2) of activities drawn from categories 1 and 2 in Table 4 in excess of those required to meet expectations.

Meets Expectations: Service to external constituencies including professional societies, national or international groups, or as editors or associate editors of peer-reviewed journals.

Unsatisfactory: All Ranks: Faculty in this category exhibit little evidence of service activity or have more than two consecutive years of below expectation ratings.

The below table provides a structure for evaluating faculty service activities.

This table is not an exhaustive list of possible service activities but is intended to serve as a guide. Faculty are encouraged to clearly articulate circumstances when their activities fall outside the list here or deviate from the explicit ranking criteria identified here.

Table 2: Ranking of Impact for Types of Service that are (mostly) separate from ENVD obligations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ranking of Impact</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1                 | - Editor of a major, internationally-recognized, journal  
|                   | - Leadership on an exceptional and time-consuming university effort (e.g., new degree program)  
|                   | - Leader or director of a major conference |
| 2                 | - Chair of PUEC or similar committee  
|                   | - Member of intensive university committee (e.g., P&T committees)  
|                   | - Leadership of major departmental effort (e.g., ARPAC)  
|                   | - Service as Associate Editor for a major journal  
|                   | - Service as panel member or member of an external review board |
| 3                 | - Member of PUEC committee  
|                   | - Regular reviews of research/peer review manuscripts/projects (e.g., in excess of 10 per year)  
|                   | - Public outreach (e.g., frequent contributor to columns or other speaking obligations) or frequent interaction with other forms of media |
| 4                 | - Member of non-time intensive community boards  
|                   | - Membership on other departmental or institute committees  
|                   | - Service to one time university committees  
|                   | - Dedicated service to other community activities (e.g., frequent design reviews) |
Studio Teaching

Context
One significant part of the teaching culture of ENVD relates around studio education. A variety of studios are required of all ENVD students. Lower division studios are usually offered in multiple sections and coordinated; more senior studios are stand-alone. Key tenets of all studio-based education in the ENVD program include, but are certainly not limited to:

(a) Critical collaboration: In the studio, the process—not just the product—takes center stage. Work in progress is made public and it is important to accept critique from many sources. Critique, evaluation, and continued improvement represent key platforms for lifelong learning.

(b) Interdisciplinary problem solving is fundamental to high-stakes environmental design process. Designers are problem-solvers and critical thinkers who find solutions through form. Designers rarely get it right the first time. The path to a preferred solution is laden with schemes tried, and tossed aside, in an attempt to discover a better solution. Solutions are continuously revisited and improved.

(c) Thoughtful balance between the digital and analog.

CU Boulder recognizes that studio teaching is a unique educational model that is shared with only a handful of programs on campus. In ENVD, studios usually consist of between 15 and 17 students; instruction takes several forms, including desk critiques, mini-lectures, small group sessions, group critique and consolidation on larger monitor screens, etc. At its core, however, the instruction centers on producing creative design solutions for problems posed by the studio instructor. There are no “right” or “wrong” answers, but rather independent responses that are a product of critical and evidence-based thinking, discussion, and creative action. Value is placed on a student's ability to develop new methods of inquiry and experimentation. Instructors play a critical role in ensuring a series of open-ended discussions between students and faculty, where students propose ideas and faculty shape and guide development with formal and informal critiques.

Students value the professional expertise of the faculty in helping guide development, while faculty value the perspectives and interests of students. Instructors are encouraged to employ their own approach (e.g., mini-lectures versus individual desk critiques) and notifying students of the benefits and value to their personal philosophy. However studio learning is balanced by other forms of learning. It is amplified by knowledge and experience completely outside the disciplines typically contained within ENVD; furthermore, reading and writing are fully appropriate means of learning, even for a studio course.

Student Expectations - Students are expected to attend all classes and critiques and commit the appropriate amount of time to develop their designs. Quality of time spent on studio work is more important than quantity, and students should make every effort to manage their time wisely in order to effectively complete all of their work. Students are excused from class for medical or family emergencies only. Faculty use their discretion to excuse any other absences, but even a single unexcused absence can result in a lowered grade or failure.

Faculty Expectations - The ENVD program recognizes the importance of both its full-time and part-time faculty, and requires full commitment from its teaching personal. Faculty are required to fulfill their obligations in terms of total required contact hours of teaching. For example, a studio scheduled for 8-9 hours per week (i.e., M, W, F for 3 hours each day) means that the instructor should provide pedagogical delivery in the form of direct contact hours to the students for 8-9 hours per week. Faculty understand that it is important that they make every effort to limit cancelled or changed class meeting times to one or two sessions per semester, in order to limit conflicts with non-studio classes or other activities. Altered class times must have consensus from all the students; clarity is paramount in communicating expectations in this respect. Any cancelled class must be re-scheduled and the class made up. No classes can be held outside of scheduled class times including re-scheduled classes unless the instructor reaches agreement with his or her own students on the re-scheduled class time prior to the class. Furthermore, faculty (including lecturers) teaching
Coordinated studios are expected to create a syllabus for the course and maintain regular office hours and communicate such to the students.

**Coordinator Responsibilities and Procedures**

Coordinated studios are a unique educational model where learning outcomes, assignments, and other are coordinated between sections. These include first-year fundamentals courses (1052, 1102) and 6-credit ENVD core studios (2120, 2130, and 3100). Coordination does not apply to advanced studios, global seminars, individually directed design-build studios, and similar studios beyond or outside of the normal sequence required for all students.

Studio coordinators are assigned by the director with the primary focus to ensure consistent quality of studio teaching. It is intended that studio coordinators serve in their capacity for a minimum of two consecutive semesters; it may be desirable to teach in both the morning and afternoon sections of their studio. Certain coordinator responsibilities carry credit toward teaching responsibilities (e.g., ensuring pedagogical delivery of a team); other coordinator responsibilities may carry toward program service expectations (e.g., advising the curricular efforts for the unit). The extent of these activities shall be detailed/described by the faculty member and considered as part of the annual performance review (including, when appropriate, contributions to mentoring other faculty).

**General responsibilities of the coordinator include:**

- Fostering collaboration, collegiality, good morale, and esprit de corps among faculty teaching that particular studio in that that semester. Being an effective steward of the studio.
- Leveraging the diversity of expertise of the teaching team, supporting unique contributions from its members, and ensuring the meeting of common outcomes.
- Allowing students to be exposed to and learn from the work being done by their colleagues in other sections of the course.
- Serving as liaison to the curriculum committee (e.g., tracking of outcomes within their core studio).
- Serving as a liaison to constituencies external to ENVD.
- Engaging all section instructors in assignment development, studio reviews, overall lectures, and rubric development, to the degree possible.

**Coordinated Studio Outcomes**

- Studios shall be developed, organized, managed, and evaluated based on clearly defined outcomes and assessment criteria. It is the responsibility of the curriculum committee, working with assigned studio coordinators, to identify, track, and write specific outcomes for all core studios.
- These jointly developed and approved outcomes provide the framework to allow studio coordinators to develop appropriate courses that build on previous semesters skills, understandings, and outcomes.
- The coordinator will work with the teaching team to develop semester specific course outcomes and may also be asked to serve as a representative to program-wide curricular discussions. Section instructors may propose modifications to assignments that meet the outcomes and these must be approved by the coordinator.

**Specific Responsibilities** for the studio coordinator include, but are not limited to:

- Being primarily responsible for developing the course syllabi.
- Determining a primary text, if needed, and other appropriate readings to augment all assignments.
- Being responsible for preparing initial and final versions of assignments, and shepherding the development and distribution of assignments.
- Developing and coordinating outside field visits (e.g., determining appropriate locations, coordinating with section instructors, and facilitating appropriate professionals to meet at the site to discuss the project that is the focus of the field visit).
- Organizing a meeting of all studio instructors for the given studio to present and discuss the assignments for that semester (prior to the first day of classes, if possible). The coordinator shall facilitate a discussion to gain input from all instructors for improvement of assignments, and how they can best achieve the stated outcomes. The coordinator shall take these comments into consideration, make modifications, and distribute assignments. The coordinator shall also provide examples of expectations for all assignments and help guide standards on the extent to which
individual instructors modify specific assignments.

- Supplying rubrics for assessment of each assignment in an effort to provide consistency in evaluation across sections.
- Facilitating a weekly meeting of section instructors (or as needed) to gauge progress, answer specific questions, and generally coordinate the progress of all sections of studio.
- Developing and presenting lectures as appropriate to communicate specific assignment information, precedents, and background knowledge to provide all sections with the same baseline information that will help them in the specific assignment. The coordinator shall present the information to both morning and afternoon sections when possible. The coordinator may also work with another speaker to present the information based on background knowledge, interest, and other factors.
- Being available to meet as needed with section instructors to discuss specific questions and appropriate methods to achieve outcomes for each assignment.
- Coordinating evaluation rubrics as well as ensuring consistency for end of the semester grading protocol (e.g., encouraging section instructors to provide examples of varying work quality to discuss among all instructors).
- Convening an end-of-semester meeting with studio instructors to evaluate the specific assignments, and provide a written summary to the directors that comments on possible modifications to the assignments, timing, specific outcomes, and other areas of improvement.

### Faculty/Conference Travel

A critical part of raising the stature and profile of the ENVD program at CU revolves around national/international visibility and individual professional development. Towards this end, faculty are eligible to receive up to $2,000 per academic year to offset costs related to efforts that will achieve these aims on an approval basis. For faculty who are leveraging these funds, they are expected to have at least one presentation (two is preferred) at nationally/internationally recognized, environmental-design related conferences where the content/contribution has been peer-reviewed. For approval of any travel for which they are seeking, they must email Vanessa Sikorski the title of their presentation(s), the name and location of the conference, information about the nature of the peer review process (i.e., abstract, a paper, a title), and estimated costs to attend the event (not to exceed $2,000 per annum).
Rules of the ENVD Program
(Bylaws)

Approved by the faculty, January 14, 2014

Preface
At the time of the creation of these bylaws, the ENVD Program is housed in the Graduate School and is led by a Director appointed by the Provost. These rules are written to reflect the current status. It is expected that the Program’s College or School affiliation and leadership will change within the next two years. At that time these bylaws will be revised, with the approval of the faculty, to reflect the new Program structure.

1) The Faculty: Members of the General Faculty of the Program shall be those individuals who hold any University of Colorado faculty appointment, as defined by the Rules of the Regents, in the Program. Voting members of the faculty shall consist of those members of the Program holding at least a 50% appointment in the Program in the ranks of Instructor, Senior Instructor, Assistant Professor, Associate Professor, and Professor; Research Professor, Research Associate Professor, and Research Assistant Professor. Instructors must have held the position for one year. Others of the General Faculty may be temporarily included as voting members for a specified period upon approval by two-thirds of the voting members present at a regular or special faculty meeting.

a) Powers: The faculty shall have the right to make recommendations in all matters that concern the Program. In particular, it shall concern itself with matters of educational policy affecting the Program, including requirements for admission and graduation for all students.

b) Faculty Meetings: Faculty meetings shall be held monthly, unless otherwise determined by the chair in consultation with the executive committee, to discuss educational policy and other Program activities. It is expected that staff will attend faculty meetings. Special meetings may be called by the Director or shall be called by the Director upon written request of five members of the faculty. A meeting agenda is to be circulated with the notice of meeting at least 48 hours before the meeting. Minutes are to be taken by a staff secretary designated by the Director, circulated to the faculty within a week after the meeting, and approved or revised at the next meeting. At least 24 hours notice of a special meeting shall be given. The Director of the Program, or his or her designated substitute, shall chair the meeting.

c) Voting and Quorum: At any meeting a quorum shall consist of the majority of the voting members of the Program. Effective participation at meetings requires that voting members be present for face-to-face discussions and when votes are taken.

d) For a motion to pass, it must be approved by a majority of the members present who express a preference, (i.e., abstentions do not count in the vote tally). A written ballot may be requested through a normal motion. More restrictive voting requirements may apply as specified in other sections of these bylaws.

2) Organization of the Program: In addition to the Program Director, there shall be an Executive Committee and Standing Committees.

a) Director of the Program: The Director of the Program shall be its chief administrative officer and shall act as the Program’s representative in negotiations with both Graduate School and Campus administrations. He or she shall be responsible for the general operation and efficiency of the Program and shall confer with the Executive Committee concerning Program needs, actions, and except in matters such as allocation of resources that are the authority of the Chair as set by university guidelines, shall be guided by its recommendations. He or she shall provide leadership to the Program in the appropriate development of its activities and shall make regular reports both to the faculty and to the Dean of the Graduate School concerning items of importance and interest. The Director shall prepare a budget detailing the anticipated income and expenses of the Program for the coming fiscal year for review by the Executive Committee. The Director may appoint an Acting Director from among the Executive Committee members to serve in the absence of the Director.

b) Executive Committee
The Executive Committee shall consist of the Director, who serves as chair, and four elected members from the voting faculty, who shall each serve for a term of two years. One staff member, the Assistant Director, shall serve as a non-voting member. The Executive Committee shall aim to make decisions through collegial discussion and consensus, but when a vote is needed, each member of the Committee, including the Director, shall have one vote. In recognition of the significant roles of both tenure-track and non-tenure-track faculty in ENVD, the Executive Committee shall be comprised of two tenured/tenure-track faculty members and two instructors/senior instructors. Each year both groups shall meet prior to the election and nominate one candidate for the Executive Committee. The nominees must be approved by a subsequent vote of the majority of voting members of the faculty in a written ballot. The Executive Committee member elections will be staggered so that each year two new Executive Committee members start their two-year terms.

The duties of the Executive Committee shall be to establish Program administrative policy and to initiate and advise on fiscal matters and other activities affecting the operation and development of the Programs. The Executive Committee will make non-binding recommendations to the Director on the Program budget. These recommendations will apply both to the budget for the coming fiscal year based on anticipated income and expenses and to any major adjustments made during the current year. The Executive Committee will review the faculty’s annual reports of activities in order to assist the Director in making recommendations for merit ratings and salary increases. (See Program policy on Merit Reviews.) The Executive Committee shall be responsible for defining the charge of all standing committees, guided by the principles of these bylaws, and for the establishment and charge of all ad-hoc committees. The Executive Committee shall meet regularly as decided by the members, keep records of its activities, and make minutes of meetings available to the faculty and staff.

c) Standing Committees: The Director is responsible for appointing members of standing committees on an annual basis, with appointments renewable. All members of the faculty shall serve on standing committees, and staff may serve as non-voting advisors as needed. Committee members will elect a chair who will be responsible for ensuring that the committee fulfills its designated responsibilities and that records are kept of committee activities and decision. When appropriate, committees should seek input from students.

1. Academic Operations and Assessment Committee: Develop and maintain activities for assessing ENVD student outcomes in individual courses and the overall program. Oversee student advising. Engage alumni and other design professionals in program review to provide input for program improvement.

2. Undergraduate Curriculum Committee: Initiate, review and recommend new courses, degree requirements and electives, study abroad programs, and summer school. Advise on semester course offerings and recommend potential teaching assignments to the Director for approval. Represent ENVD in arranging cooperative or joint course offerings in environmental studies, architectural engineering, art and art history, and other related programs.

3. Graduate Committee: Develop Masters and PhD programs, including initiation and recommendation of graduate courses for faculty approval. Recruit and approve new graduate students for these programs, as well as associated programs where ENVD support may be committed. Recommend graduate student funding and TA appointments for new and existing graduate students, within limits of the budget provided by the Director. All TA appointments and other graduate student support from General Funds must be approved by the Director. Maintain a graduate studies web page containing ENVD program descriptions, rules, and policies for graduate students that are consistent with Graduate School Rules and Policies.

4. Facilities Committee: Review and make recommendations for use of ENVD facilities, including ENVD building classrooms, labs, offices and exhibit spaces and CINC facility; make recommendations for maintenance and renovations; planning, purchase, and maintenance of major equipment.
5. Tenure Committee: Review and recommendations for reappointment, promotion and tenure, including hiring new faculty with tenure. The committee consists of all tenured faculty in the Program. The Director chairs the Tenure Committee but does not vote on recommendations. (See Program Guidelines for Reappointment, Promotion and Tenure.)

6. Computing and IT Committee: Enable integration of digital technology into teaching and classes. Oversee OIT contracts for academic technology services, computer lab maintenance, and software installation. Solicit faculty and staff input on computer and IT resources; evaluate and make recommendations on software purchases.

7. Diversity Committee: Support ENVD activities to promote diverse student and faculty populations, including coordination with campus efforts through ODECE and related programs.

8. Lecture and Exhibit Committee: Faculty in this committee obtain outside lecturers and exhibits to be presented to the general Program each semester and coordinate student graduation shows. Staff in the committee market the lectures and exhibits to the Program, alumni and general public, coordinate alumni lectures, exhibits, and document lectures and exhibits. Lectures to the general Program that use committee funds must be approved through the committee in advance.

3) Appointments, Promotions and Merit Review

   a) Tenured or Tenure-Track Faculty Appointments: All proposals to hire tenured and tenure-track faculty shall be discussed in faculty meetings with respect to program needs and opportunities. When a tenure-track faculty vacancy is to be filled, a search committee and chair shall be appointed by the Director. A majority of the members of search committee shall be tenured/tenure track faculty. One member of the search committee shall be a faculty member from outside ENVD, and one member shall be from a protected class, in accordance with Boulder Campus policy. The search committee will prepare a search plan addressing the needs and opportunities identified by the faculty. Upon approval of the plan by the Dean and Associate Vice Chancellor for Faculty Affairs, the search committee shall initiate the appropriate steps to solicit qualified applicants, screen the applications received, select candidates for formal interviews, and supervise the interview process. Nonconfidential information on applicants will be made available to faculty members and students, and as many members of the Program as practical shall be given the opportunity to meet candidates during interviews. The search committee shall solicit opinions about the candidates from the faculty and students and make a formal recommendation for hiring to the Director. A vote of the faculty will be taken to confirm or disagree with the search committee recommendation. After receiving the recommendation of the search committee and the faculty vote, the Director will recommend a candidate to the Dean, duly noting whether the Director, search committee, and faculty concur or disagree in their recommendations.

   b) Non-Tenure-Track Faculty Appointments: A plan for hiring instructors and senior instructors for 50% or more appointments shall be drafted by the Executive Committee each year and presented to faculty for discussion based on Program needs, opportunities, and budget constraints. When non-tenure-track faculty vacancies are to be filled, a search committee shall be appointed by the Director. The search committee shall initiate the appropriate steps to solicit qualified applicants and screen applications. Information on applicants being seriously considered will be made available to ENVD faculty members and as many members as practical shall be given the opportunity to meet the candidates during interviews. After soliciting opinions about the candidates from the faculty and students, the search committee will make recommendations for hire(s) to the Director. After considering recommendations from the search committee, the Director will recommend the candidate(s) for instructors and senior instructors to be offered positions after approval by the Dean of the Graduate School and the Associate Vice Chancellor for Faculty Affairs.

   c) Faculty Rating and Raises: Annual faculty merit ratings shall be made by the Executive Committee and Director based on the Faculty Reports of Professional Activities (FRPA) and criteria for research, creative work, teaching and service approved by ENVD faculty. (See Program policies on Merit Review and Guidelines for
Reappointment, Promotion and Tenure) The Director shall notify each faculty member in writing of his or her merit rating and make recommendations for salary raises to the Dean using the annual merit ratings as a guide.

d) Reappointment, Promotion and Tenure of Tenure Track Faculty: Recommendations for promotions, tenure, and reappointment of tenure-track faculty members shall be made by the Tenure Committee. (See Program Guidelines for Reappointment, Promotion and Tenure.) Program standards for evaluating research, creative work, teaching and service that are consistent with College and Campus guidelines shall be developed in consultation with the entire faculty and approved by the Tenure Committee, the Director, and the Dean.

3) Amendments to the Rules: Amendments to these rules require approval by written ballot by a two-thirds majority of those voting. Written notice of a proposed amendment shall be given to all members of the faculty at least two weeks in advance of any meeting in which such amendment is to be considered.

4) Effective Date: These rules will become effective upon approval by the Dean of the Graduate School.
ENVD Guidelines for Reappointment, Promotion, and Tenure

Approved on 13 November 2014 by the ENVD tenured faculty who constitute the Primary Unit Evaluation Committee (PUEC) for the Program.

Introduction

The Environmental Design Program explains by means of this policy statement the procedures and standards that it will use in evaluating tenure track personnel for reappointment, tenure, and promotion. This statement complies with policies of the Board of Regents as described in its “Standards, Processes, and Procedures for Comprehensive Review, Tenure and Promotion,” Administrative Policy Statement 1022 on the same subject, and the C.U. Boulder Faculty Handbook.

The Environmental Design Program (ENVD) is devoted to developing nationally and internationally recognized degree and research programs. Its success in attaining this goal depends on the quality of its faculty and their contributions to ENVD’s overall enterprise. As such, the standards that are incorporated into merit, promotion and tenure guidelines seek to recognize and support faculty members in their many contributions toward excellence in the Program, including their research and scholarship, teaching and learning, and outreach and service activities. Representatives of ENVD seek to impartially consider all available evidence in evaluating properly the quality, impacts and significance of those faculty contributions. The following is offered in order to guide faculty members in their understanding of the Program’s expectations for merit, promotion, and tenure and the achievements that will be considered in our evaluation of a faculty member’s contributions.

Requirements for Tenure and Promotion to Associate Professor

According to the CU Boulder Faculty Handbook, the award of tenure, which is typically concurrent with promotion to Associate Professor, requires that a faculty member be able to demonstrate “excellence” in either teaching or research and creative work and at least “meritorious” achievement in the other category, plus at least meritorious service. For promotion to the rank of Associate Professor with tenure, the successful candidate will demonstrate: (a) a record of effective teaching and learning in the classroom, in one-to-one level advising and mentoring students, and in development of curriculum and pedagogy; (b) a significant body of research or creative work that is held in high regard by peers in the same field; and (c) service to the school, college, university, community, state, nation and/or world. As the granting of tenure is a long-term commitment of university and state resources, it requires evidence of excellence in past performance as well as a forecast that the individual faculty member’s performance will continue to be of high quality. Since it is difficult to make a strong case for tenure on teaching and outreach alone, candidates are advised to develop a body of research and scholarship.

Requirements for Promotion to Full Professor

Promotion to the rank of full Professor requires, according to the laws of the Regents, that a candidate possess “(a) a record that, taken as a whole, is judged to be excellent; (b) a record of significant contribution to both graduate and undergraduate education, unless individual or departmental circumstances can be shown to require a stronger emphasis, or singular focus, on one or the other, and (c) a record, since receiving tenure and promotion to associate professor, that indicates substantial, significant, and continued growth, development, and accomplishment in teaching, research, scholarship or creative work, and service.” Candidates may show a range of combinations of research, teaching and service that contribute to a record of excellence as a whole; individual categories are not ranked in this determination.
For promotion to the rank of Professor with tenure, the successful candidate will demonstrate: (a) a record of effective teaching in the classroom and, when possible, commendable mentoring and guidance of graduate students to their advanced degrees; (b) a nationally or internationally recognized body of research or creative work that is seen as contributing to knowledge in a discipline, i.e., intellectual leadership in a field; and (c) leadership and service that advances the mission of the candidate’s school, college, university, or profession, or that applies knowledge for the benefit of citizens of the state, nation or world.

**Timetable for Reappointment, Promotion, and Tenure.**

Each faculty member is required to prepare and keep updated a Professional Plan that provides a clear statement of a faculty member’s goals and the nature of effort to be made in the areas of teaching, research/creative work, and service (“The Professional Plan for Faculty,” Administrative Policy Statement 1011). Beginning in their second year at the University, tenure track faculty will prepare a Professional Plan that will help them progress toward tenure. Professional Plans are also used for Annual Merit and required for Post-Tenure Review.

The program Director/Chair will meet with each tenure-track faculty member each academic year to discuss his or her Professional Plan, annual merit review and progress toward tenure and/or promotion. Consistent with Administrative Policy Statement 1021 (“Faculty Development and Mentoring”), tenure-track faculty members may request other opportunities for training and information on the tenure process, such as mentoring.

A decision regarding promotion to Associate Professor and tenure shall be made after a maximum probationary period of seven years of continuous full-time service at the rank of Assistant Professor (Laws of the Regents, Article 5: Faculty). Normally, the promotion review of a faculty member will come at the beginning of the seventh year of service. Up to three years of full-time service in the ranks of Assistant Professor, Associate Professor, or Professor at another institution may be included in the probationary period. Any years of credit toward tenure must be specified in writing at the time of hiring. In exceptional cases, if the record meets the established criteria, tenure can be awarded early.

Typically, promotion to Associate Professor is considered simultaneously with the consideration of tenure. Under unusual circumstances, individuals may be hired as associate professors without tenure, and in this case the issue of tenure is separated fully from the issue of appointment as Associate Professor.

There is no defined requirement for a period of time in rank as an Associate Professor prior to consideration for promotion to full Professor. Individuals who believe they have achieved the level of overall excellence required for promotion to Full Professor should seek advice from the Director/Chair, who may appoint an ad hoc personnel committee to evaluate the candidate’s case. The Director/Chair may also initiate consideration of promotion to full Professor with the concurrence of the candidate.

**Procedures for Reappointment, Promotion and Tenure**

The Director/Chair will advise faculty of submission dates for all materials required for Reappointment, Promotion and Tenure reviews. Materials required by the University for the reappointment, tenure and promotion process are outlined in the Faculty Handbook and APS 1022 on “Standards, Processes and Procedures for Comprehensive Review, Tenure and Promotion.”
Reappointment and Comprehensive Review

Individuals who are hired as assistant professors will have at least one evaluation for reappointment prior to a mandatory tenure decision. The last reappointment prior to a tenure decision must be based upon a comprehensive evaluation, which involves the compilation of a dossier with the materials specified at https://facultyaffairs.colorado.edu/a-z-information-guide-docs/VCAC_Checklist_CR_PT_PF_Oct_2012.pdf/view?searchterm=vcac%20checklist. Letters from external reviewers are optional at this time, but the Primary Unit Evaluation Committee (PUEC) may request three external letters if they believe that it will help assess a candidate's status in preparation for tenure. A standard pattern is for an assistant professor with no credit to tenure to receive a four year appointment with comprehensive review for reappointment after the third year. Upon a positive recommendation of the Chancellor, the candidate will receive a second appointment that would extend to the mandatory tenure review. According to the Rules of the Regents, the comprehensive review involves full consideration of all credentials (see the Faculty Handbook and APS 1022 for documents required for a dossier). The question to be considered by the Program, administrative review committees, and any external reviewers for the comprehensive review is whether the candidate is making satisfactory progress toward tenure. For faculty members who successfully pass the comprehensive review, this review will be used to advise them about how to prepare for their future tenure review as effectively as possible. If the candidate does not receive a recommendation for reappointment after the comprehensive review, he or she will receive a one-year terminal contract the following year.

Application for Tenure and Promotion to Associate Professor

The candidate will prepare a dossier as described in https://facultyaffairs.colorado.edu/a-z-information-guide-docs/VCAC_Checklist_CR_PT_PF_Oct_2012.pdf/view?searchterm=vcac%20checklist, which will be sent to external reviewers and also used for internal reviews. The external peer review package should include statements describing scholarship, teaching and service, the CV, and a selection of materials that best represents the candidate's work, with an emphasis on scholarship/creative work, as external reviewers are asked for their opinions of the quality of the candidate’s scholarship or creative work according to https://facultyaffairs.colorado.edu/a-z-information-guide-docs/external-reviewer-guidelines/?searchterm=external%20letters.

The Program will gather additional evidence of the candidate’s scholarly achievements from a minimum of six authoritative reviewers external to the University. The candidate is asked to provide the names of six potential peer reviewers whose scholarship is in the same area as the candidate. These individuals must hold the rank of tenured Associate or full Professors or have equivalent renown in the relevant field, and they should not be friends, mentors, dissertation advisors, or individuals with whom the candidate has a close professional or personal relationship, currently or in the past. Three external reviewers will be selected from this list by the Primary Unit Evaluation Committee (PUEC) described below, which will also develop another list from which three more reviewers will be selected. The PUEC, not the candidate, must solicit these letters.

The external peer reviewers are given the Program and University’s promotion/tenure criteria as well as the candidate’s dossier. They are asked to provide an evaluation of the dossier that is a candid review addressing these criteria. A series of questions are usually included to assist the reviewer. These include the length of time that the reviewer has known the candidate and in what capacity, an evaluation of the candidate’s scholarly and creative work, a comparison of the candidate’s standing in the field in relation to others of similar experience, rank and stage in career development, and the candidate’s qualifications for long-term success. The purpose of this external review is to provide an independent and comparative review of the quality of the candidate’s scholarship. The reviewer is asked to provide a brief CV so that senior faculty and administrators will be able to place the reviewer in the context of the candidate’s area of expertise.

The candidate will not have access to the peer reviewers’ identities or letters. Candidates’ access to letters is restricted to ensure confidentiality for the peer reviewers and to create an opportunity for them to make frank evaluations.
Review Process

The process of review begins for the Program with the Director/Chair’s appointment of the PUEC. The Evaluation Committee shall consist of at least three tenured faculty members at or above the rank for which the candidate is being considered who have knowledge of the candidate’s field of scholarship and teaching. In non-mandatory cases, if there is some doubt as to the likelihood of a favorable outcome, the committee may advise the candidate to withhold the case until more time has elapsed. The committee may give this advice either initially, or after accumulating information indicating that the case needs to be stronger in order to be successful. The candidate is not bound to the advice of the PUEC, however, and can proceed against it.

The second purpose of the committee is to solicit the external letters of reference and to collect other confidential information that the candidate cannot collect independently.

The candidate is responsible for assembling the bulk of the personnel file, but can seek the help or advice of the PUEC, the Director/Chair, the Dean, and Faculty Affairs as appropriate. The Director/Chair of the Program will receive the file and will review it for completeness. The file should meet the requirements of the Graduate School and Campus as outlined on specification sheets that are available from the Dean’s office. Material for the dossier should follow the sections in the VCAC checklist: in https://facultyaffairs.colorado.edu/a-z-information-guide-docs/VCAC_Checklist_CR_PT_PF_Oct_2012.pdf/view?searchterm=vcac%20checklist. The Program will provide the candidate binders with appropriate sections for the internal review copies of the dossier. It is the candidate’s responsibility to see that the file is professional in appearance, complete, and well ordered, and that it has places for the insertion of confidential materials by the personnel committee. It is the responsibility of the PUEC and the Director/Chair to obtain any additional information that it may require in order to make a complete presentation to the Program.

Following the assembly of all materials, the PUEC will have a final meeting in which it decides by vote its opinion on the case. The committee also will assign to its members responsibilities for presentation of the case to the Program. After the vote by the PUEC, the Director will make the candidate’s entire file available on a confidential basis to the Tenure Committee two weeks prior to discussion of the case. The candidate for a particular decision will be absent on the day of discussion, and the PUEC will be asked to make a presentation. This will be followed by detailed discussion of the case by all attending members of the tenure committee. When the Director/Chair is satisfied that discussion is complete, there will be a vote by closed or secret ballot. The right to vote is limited to those faculty members who have the rank to which the candidate aspires, or higher. For example, only Associate and full Professors with tenure would vote on the case of an Assistant Professor being considered for promotion to Associate Professor and tenure.

Following the Program’s vote, the PUEC will write a detailed letter of evaluation giving its own view of the case and reporting its vote. The letter will be addressed to the Program Director/Chair, and will be added to the file. All letters will be copied to the candidate. The letter should include:

- A description and evaluation of the candidate’s scholarly and creative work, teaching, and service to the Program, University and community, as required by primary unit criteria
- A statement describing procedures followed and actions taken by the unit in making its recommendation, including any vote taken, and any dissenting statements from the recommendation
- Salient points of the external reviewers’ analyses, with care taken to maintain confidentiality
- The findings of the review

The candidate may inspect the file’s contents at any time, with the exception of the external letters, which remain confidential. In addition, the candidate may add materials to the file at any time.

The Director/Chair does not vote on the PUEC recommendation. In a letter addressed to the Dean, the Director/Chair reports the PUEC vote
and recommendation summarizing the faculty discussion, including an explanation of dissenting votes, and makes a recommendation on behalf of the Program. This letter should also explain how the candidate’s work fits within the culture and priorities of the program. In the case of a disagreement between the Director/Chair and PUEC, the case may be returned to the PUEC for further discussion and, if appropriate, a second vote.

**Application for Promotion to Full Professor**

A tenured faculty member may apply for promotion to the rank of Professor at any stage of his or her career. The Director/Chair should remind eligible faculty of deadlines and the process and discuss how to demonstrate mature scholarship and national recognition. Associate Professors are also encouraged to discuss their career plans with senior faculty in the Program as they plan to seek promotion to full Professor. The application process is identical to that followed for tenure and promotion to Associate Professor, although the deadlines are different, and the candidate must provide evidence of earning a national or international reputation, emphasizing achievements subsequent to attaining the rank of Associate Professor. The PUEC must consist of at least three full Professors, and letters from external reviewers must be solicited from people with the rank of full Professor who are prominent scholars in the candidate’s area of expertise, who are capable of ranking the candidate. Only Program members who hold the rank of full Professor are qualified to vote on this case.

**Post-Primary Unit Review**

*NOTE: The following description of post-program process is for information only, based on current guidelines in the Laws of the Regents, the CU Boulder Faculty Handbook, and associated policies.*

Following the program vote, the candidate’s file is sent from the Program to the Dean. The Dean refers the case to a standing College committee, which discusses the case, votes on it and advises the Dean. The Dean then writes a letter to the Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs. This letter gives the Dean’s personal evaluation of the case and a recommendation for action, as well as reporting the vote and, if appropriate, the opinions of the Dean’s Personnel Committee.

Beyond the Dean’s office, the personnel file passes to the office of the Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs. The Vice Chancellor’s office receives files on all personnel decisions from all colleges on the Campus. The Vice Chancellor relies heavily on the review of the Vice Chancellor’s Advisory Committee (VCAC), which considers all cases for reappointment, promotion, and tenure. The VCAC discusses each case in detail and votes on the disposition of the case. The vote is considered a recommendation to the Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs and Provost, who may or may not accept the recommendation. The Vice Chancellor’s decision is relayed to the Chancellor.

Beyond the Vice Chancellor’s level, review occurs by the Chancellor, and, in the case of tenure, by the President, and the Regents. Difficult cases may be scrutinized at all levels, but the typical case is not examined closely at levels beyond the VCAC.

A negative decision by any level of review can be overruled by a positive decision at a higher level. For example, a negative decision by the Department could be overruled by the Dean or by the Vice Chancellor, and so on. Similarly, a positive decision at any level can be overruled by a negative decision at a higher level. When any decision is overruled, the case is sent back to the lower level with advice from the upper level and a request for clarification, reconsideration, or additional information. The case is then reconsidered by the lower level and forwarded again to the upper level for final review. The rights of appeal for rejected candidates are outlined in the Faculty Handbook.

Return of cases from an upper level to a lower level cannot always be taken as a sign of weakness in the case. Sometimes, review committees find critical pieces of information missing from the file and ask for additional information, even though they fully expect to approve the case. Individuals under review should not be unduly concerned by a request for additional information, unless the request is accompanied by a negative vote from a review committee.
The candidate is directly advised through the Director by the Dean’s office of all review committee decisions. In addition, the candidate will receive copies of all correspondence that pass between the Dean and the VCAC.

Personnel cases are prepared in the fall semester of the year before they take effect. The order of preparation is typically by increasing rank: comprehensive review, promotion to associate professor with tenure, promotion to full professor. Under the current scheduling system, comprehensive reappointment cases shall be received in the Dean’s Office by October 15, mandatory tenure cases by November 5, and promotion to full Professor by January 20.

Standards for Reappointment, Promotion, Tenure and Merit Reviews

Consistent with the four forms of scholarship defined by Ernest Boyer in Scholarship Reconsidered: Priorities of the Professoriate (Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, 1990) and applied to design education by Ernest Boyer and Lee Mitgang in Building Community: A New Future for Architectural Education and Practice (Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, 1996), the Program values different forms of scholarship associated with research, teaching, and service: the creation of new knowledge, the integration of insights across disciplines, the application of knowledge to solve social and environmental problems, and investigations of different pedagogical approaches to foster student creativity and problem-solving.

Candidates for promotion and/or tenure should consult the current University guidelines, and nothing herein should be understood as obviating or contradicting those guidelines. Rather, what follows is a more complete list of the types of evidence that we will consider in our assessment of the quality of contributions provided in each of the three domains of activity for which faculty are responsible. We do not expect that each candidate for a personnel action will present all of these types of evidence of significant accomplishment in all three areas or present them in an identical mix. Instead, this listing is intended to convey the range of accomplishments and evidence that will be considered pertinent to developing a full and fair assessment of quality, impact and significance of work. The following guidelines for evaluation of teaching, research/creative work, and service for tenured/tenure track faculty, may also serve during merit review of non-tenure track faculty, while taking into account the different balance of expectations between research, teaching, and outreach.

Research and Creative Work

Research and creative work are fundamental to the university, and all candidates for promotion and tenure need to provide a body of work that demonstrates high quality, impact, and significance. Given the foundations of ENVD in the professions of architecture, landscape architecture, urban planning, urban design and graphic design, the activities of its faculty may encompass the arts, the humanities, the social sciences and the natural sciences. The domain of topics is large, and includes but is not limited to theories and history of architecture, landscape architecture and urban planning and design, application of theories from the social and environmental sciences to architecture and planning, development of digital technologies applied to the design and planning fields, and studies of the cognitive basis for creative design.

Accepted forms of research and creative work in ENVD may be articles in peer-reviewed journals, professionally reviewed reports, books, book chapters, invited talks, conference presentations and proceedings, exhibitions of designs, graphics and photographs, competitions, computer software, patents, and designs and plans distinguished by the stature of their commissioners and/or recognition in scholarly reviews and awards. Recognizing that design practice is as much communicative as it is analytical, scholarship and creative work can include innovative approaches to dialogue and community engagement as well as design products such as plans, buildings, and landscapes, which achieve demonstrated recognition in the wider community of scholars and creative practitioners.

A distinguishing feature of scholarship or creative work, whether as published, creative or constructed works, is review and recognition by academic peers. If designs with multiple participants are a component of
a faculty’s work, the individual’s contributions must be clearly identified as project leader or as having responsibility for a distinguishable component of the work. Faculty active in practice must make an effort to demonstrate that their work has been recognized for its originality and importance and show how it contributes to conceptual and methodological advances in design and planning. National and international recognition of professional work may be in the form of awards, published reviews, and exhibits that have been positively received.

Demonstrated impacts are paramount in establishing the importance of a body of research and scholarship. The quality of faculty research and creative works is evaluated by a number of measures: citations of published work, distinction of the publisher or conference as determined by impact factors or other recognized measures, stature and selectivity of journal/book publishers, peer regard and citations, the degree of peer review, the rigor of review of entries for exhibitions or design competitions, and the stature of professional clients. Many creative projects may involve collaborative efforts. In those cases, the individual contributions of the faculty should be delineated clearly. Similarly if a faculty is an editor of a book, scholarly contributions to the volume beyond editing and assembling the works of others should be evident. National and international awards and competitive fellowships supporting research and creative work are valued indicators of the quality of a faculty’s scholarship.

Extramural support is taken as one important external validation of creative work and scholarship, and should be evident in sufficient quantity to support an active program in research or creative work. Competitive grants and contracts that further the mission of the Program through recognition of the candidate, institution building for research/creativity, and support of student assistants, are considered as part of the contribution to research and creative work. In applying this criterion, recognition will be given to the general standards of funding expected in areas where little funding is available.

In order to be judged meritorious in research and creative work, faculty must have established a strong record of accomplishment as judged against the criteria of the primary unit. A meritorious record must evidence the following: regular research activity, sustained productivity in research that goes beyond the dissertation, intellectual originality and independence, high quality as indicated by publication in recognized refereed journals or similarly prestigious venues, and impact on relevant fields of scholarship. Additional indicators include external funding, invitations to publish or present, and awards.

Demonstrated excellence in research or creative work, in addition to satisfying the primary unit’s criteria for meritorious accomplishment, requires research or creative works which can be considered equivalent both in quantity and quality to that of the top group of tenured faculty in the discipline at a similar stage of career, here and in comparable departments or programs at other institutions. External review letters play an important role in this judgment. Measures include the stature of publishers and publications, the frequency of citation or adoption of the work by others, positive reviews by distinguished practitioners and scholars, the stature of reviewers in juried competitions, the competitiveness of review and selection processes for conferences, the importance of competitions and awards nationally and internationally, patent recognitions for technological work, the stature of professional clients, the level of the candidate’s contribution in the case of collaborative work, and whether the candidate’s work has impacted legislation, policy, codes and standards.

Teaching

Teaching is a major part of ENVD faculty work that involves many activities. Teaching evaluations in ENVD include student and peer reviews of classroom instruction in studios, lectures, labs and seminars. Mentoring graduate and undergraduate student researchers is an important component of the Boulder Campus academic culture, and is encouraged in ENVD. Supervising independent research and creative work of undergraduate students is encouraged and is enhanced by the strong mentoring that occurs in design studios, lab and Praxis design classes.

Multiple measures of teaching effectiveness should be included in dossiers as described in https://facultyaffairs.colorado.edu/faculty/reappointment-promotion-and-tenure/related-policy-information/
multiple-measures-of-teaching. Campus requirements are for FCQ’s and two additional measures of teaching selected from the following options: letters from randomly solicited students, peer reviews based on classroom visits, reports of class interviews, or other materials as defined by the candidate or unit as most appropriate for the type of instruction given (e.g., measures obtained through the Faculty Teaching Excellence Program, publications or presentations describing teaching innovations, grants and awards for teaching).

Within the categories described in the Boulder Campus guidelines for multiple measures of teaching, the following indicators may be used to assess the contributions made to this domain:

- Unsolicited letters from undergraduate or graduate students
- Volume and quality of advising offered to undergraduate students
- Number and quality of guidance offered to graduate students, for example, number of advised students who finish terminal degrees, placement of students in employment or advanced study, publication and conference activity of students, co-publishing with graduate students. In addition, when a candidate is up for promotional consideration, the Evaluation Committee may solicit letters from former graduate students, asking for their assessment of the quality of guidance and mentoring they received from the faculty member.
- New course creation (syllabi and other materials)
- Innovations introduced into teaching and advising
- Contributions to curriculum design and reorganization
- Incorporation of service learning and community engagement into classes
- Mentoring interns
- Peer-reviewed journal articles and scholarly conference papers on teaching, advising, and pedagogy (which also count toward scholarly achievement)
- Textbooks that contribute to the instructional mission (also a measure of scholarship)
- Invited lectures and conference presentations on teaching, curriculum, and pedagogy
- Candidate’s statement regarding pedagogical approach
- Independent study or independent research projects involving undergraduate students
- UROP and URAP sponsorships
- Serving on honors theses’ committees
- Activities promoting faculty-student interaction.

Faculty members can request that the Director/Chair arrange a peer consultation that will assist them in making improvements in teaching prior to evaluation. Other campus mechanisms for consultation on teaching include the Faculty Teaching Excellence Program and the Presidential Teaching Scholars consultation program. Many national professional and academic organizations also offer teaching workshops. Faculty members are not required to use these mechanisms for improving teaching, but are encouraged to do so.

Growing interest in outreach to civic groups and communities by faculty and students is expressed in the Flagship 2030 strategic plan and the annual Faculty Report of Professional Activities. Benefits for outreach programs at public universities are improved community relations, attracting excellent students, and increasing student satisfaction with their degree programs. Community engagement has been integrated into the ENVD curriculum for a number of years and is especially compatible with its design curriculum and studio project focus. ENVD recognizes that developing curricula that feature project- and service-based learning requires significant additional effort on the part of the instructors, often including obtaining external resources. Faculty are encouraged to document teaching that incorporates outreach and service learning in their teaching portfolios, through publishing or presenting service learning contributions to pedagogy, students’ design and/or planning documents submitted to community clients, actual structures, and reporting results of learning assessment tools. When a candidate’s case for a meritorious or excellent teaching rating includes project-based service learning, the letters of the unit Evaluation Committee and Director should document the importance of this form of teaching in ENVD.

To demonstrate meritorious teaching, a candidate should receive positive
student evaluations, show quality as well as quantity in any individualized instruction and mentoring that he or she has performed, make contributions to the curriculum of the Program, thoughtfully prepare course materials and syllabi, show conscientious grading, involve students in research activities, and participate in professional pedagogical activities or organizations.

Excellence in teaching is based on many of the same factors, but a teaching record may be deemed excellent only if it goes both qualitatively and quantitatively beyond excellent classroom teaching and other standard activities that support classroom teaching. Excellence in teaching requires exceptionally strong performance in classroom teaching and in individualized instruction and advising, substantial contributions to curriculum development that may include securing grants in the field of education, visiting professorships and lectures that emphasize teaching, and/or extramural testimonials of impact such as awards for teaching and other measures of contribution to the pedagogy of design education, such as conference presentations, textbooks, and journal articles. To achieve excellence in teaching, therefore, not only includes being an excellent teacher but also includes demonstrated engagement with the pedagogical research community.

Service

As a public university, the University of Colorado Boulder values outreach and service, especially that which has demonstrated impact on external constituencies, including individuals, communities, organizations, and government agencies. Service is expected of all faculty members in the ENVD Program, but the overall commitment to service during the probationary period of junior faculty members should be less than that for more senior faculty. Two broad categories of service are expected: (1) service to the University (the ENVD program, the school/college, the larger University or University System; and (2) service to wider academic, professional and societal/community constituencies. Service to the ENVD Program and other University communities can take many forms, including:

- Membership and leadership roles in Program and University committees (Emphasis will be placed on the tangible outcome of the assignment, and evaluative judgments of peers may be sought in assessing the value-added that the individual brought to the outcome.)
- Instrumental/leadership roles the individual played in improving the climate or programs on campus (e.g., instigating donor contributions; developing an institute; shepherding new degree programs)
- Organizing symposia or conferences at the university

Service to wider academic, professional and societal/community constituencies can include:

- Service to other universities as an extramural reviewer of programs or of candidates for promotion
- Direct provision of service to citizens and national or international civic organizations, or governing bodies by application of academic knowledge to their needs
- Application of research knowledge to the betterment of the nation and the world, for example, through policy formation
- Authored outreach reports
• Communication and visibility of the value of research, outreach, and the University to the wider public through mass media coverage of research, outreach and instruction (e.g., TV, newspapers, radio)
• Achievements integrating outreach into instruction and research
• Awards for outreach and service
• Leadership roles in professional associations, especially election to office
• Editorship of journals; service on editorial boards/grant review panels; reviewer of manuscripts for journals or grant proposals for funding agencies
• Commissions
• Participation and leadership on design and zoning review boards, community improvement groups and regional or national resources management and policy-making agencies.
• Leadership in committees of professional societies such as AIA, panels and/or committees developing professional and regulatory standards such as building codes, land use and zoning policies, professional accreditation and certification guidelines.
• Service on design juries and translation of research to the benefit of practitioners in workshops.

Because it is not possible to make a case for promotion and tenure on the basis of outreach alone, candidates for promotion to Associate Professor with tenure or full Professor who wish to engage in outreach activities should link those activities with research or creative work.

Summary

We have not established volume or quantity benchmarks in the faculty’s three domains of responsibility. In general, no set number of courses taught, scores on teaching evaluations, graduate students mentored, works published, or committees or communities served guarantees, in itself, automatic tenure, promotion, or high meritorious rating. The Program seeks collective excellence in all domains, and when all is said and done, the review process remains a collegial process, conducted in good faith, with the aim of recognizing and rewarding work that is of high quality and significance. For this reason, demonstrated impacts are paramount in establishing the importance of a body of work, whether the impact of one’s work is on the students guided, on the development of an academic field of study, on the building of university programs or on the lending of expertise to the development of state, national or international practices or policies. These guidelines of evaluation are offered toward that end and in that spirit.