

GUIDELINES FOR REAPPOINTMENT, PROMOTION AND TENURE

These guidelines were approved on November 13, 2014 by the ENVD tenured faculty who, at the time, constituted the Primary Unit Evaluation Committee (PUEC) for the Program; the below applies to tenure or tenure-track faculty.

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 http://www.colorado.edu/facultyaffairs/sites/default/files/attached-files/vcac_checklist_cr_pt_pf_9_2015_remediated.pdf. 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 http://www.colorado.edu/facultyaffairs/sites/default/files/attached-files/vcac_checklist_cr_pt_pf_9_2015_remediated.pdf, 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 <http://www.colorado.edu/facultyaffairs/external-reviewer-guidelines>.

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: <http://www.colorado.edu/facultyaffairs/sites/default/files/attached->

[files/vcac checklist cr pt pf 9](#)

[2015 remediated.pdf](#). 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.