

PROMOTION AND TENURE GUIDELINES

DEPARTMENT OF ARCHITECTURAL STUDIES

Approved 11/15/2004; Revision 12/8/2017, Revision 12/24/2020

Introduction

The Department of Architectural Studies (ARCHST) at the University of Missouri has established the following guidelines for determining professional rank and awarding tenure and promotion to members of the department. The policies and procedures for this department are consistent with the guidelines established by the College and the University. Unique departmental differences and individual achievements are considered in the following guidelines. It is very important for faculty members to understand and follow the criteria outlined in this document from the time of employment in order to collect appropriate data to document relevant achievements. Regardless of the percentages for teaching, research and service stated in the letter of appointment, it is critical that new faculty begin a research agenda immediately and that they show evidence of scholarship through publications in refereed journals by the end of the first three years of employment.

The departmental guidelines include the following sections: schedule for reviews, procedure, criteria for academic ranks, and expectation for evidence of faculty achievement in the areas of scholarship, teaching, and service.

Schedule for Reviews

Faculty entering a tenure track position at the assistant professor level, and who remain on tenure track for the full probationary period, must be prepared to undergo at least two critical reviews during the initial probationary period, one at the end of the third year of employment, and one at the end of the fifth year of employment. All tenured faculty in the Department will evaluate the performance of the faculty member at the end of three years of service. After independent reviews of the candidate's materials by tenured faculty in the Department, the Department Chair, and the HES Promotion and Tenure Committee, the Department Chair will then meet with the candidate to discuss his/her strengths and areas needing improvement and make a written recommendation regarding continuation of employment. The second review will be initiated at the end of the fifth year of employment. It is a more formal review process; the outcome of this review will determine whether the faculty member will be awarded continuous appointment at the University of Missouri and promoted to the academic rank of associate professor. The procedure followed for these two reviews is presented in the following sections. The timelines on the following pages are meant to serve as a guide, but may be subject to revision by the College, University, or by special circumstances. The following procedure is used for initiating and undergoing the review process at the end of the five-year probationary period:

Once a faculty member has achieved a continuous appointment by becoming tenured, and promoted to the academic rank of associate professor, performance evaluation will continue in the form of an annual review with the Department Chair. Each faculty member is expected to continue to achieve high levels of professional recognition for scholarship. The individual faculty member, in consultation with the Department Chair, will determine when to undergo the review process necessary to be promoted to the academic rank of professor. The procedure will be the same as for promotion to associate professor; however, the expectations regarding scholarship are much greater and are discussed in a later section of this document.

Procedure

All faculty are reviewed annually. Faculty members on a tenure track should understand that they can be dismissed at any time up until the time they are awarded tenure.

Pretenure Third-Year Review

Purpose

As a helpful examination, the purpose of this progress review is to ascertain if an individual is making adequate progress toward tenure. Because faculty are mutually responsible in helping colleagues advance, this review gives faculty in the department an opportunity to assess progress. If adequate progress is not being made, messages of concern will be communicated, and questions will be raised regarding the goodness of fit between the faculty member and the institution.

Procedure

During the third year in a tenure track position, a faculty member's materials are submitted to the department chair who facilitates the third-year review. Materials submitted by the candidate include the resume and other materials stating progress that are *criterion referenced* (documenting performance as outlined in department/college/campus promotion and tenure guidelines). The candidate's materials are submitted to the department's promotion and tenure representative no later than February 1 of the third full year of service to allow enough time for the review process.

Reviewers examine progress in teaching, research, and service as described in promotion and tenure guidelines. Reviewers also indicate what the candidate has contributed intellectually. Independent review letters will be written by the following:

- HES Associate Dean of Research and Graduate Studies
- A MU campus-recognized teaching scholar outside the department (i.e., recipient of a teaching award such as Provost award, Kemper, Burlington, etc.).
- Member of the college of HES promotion and tenure committee of the same academic rank or higher and who has had past experience on the college promotion and tenure committee.
- Tenured ARCH department faculty
- Department chair
- HES Associate Dean for Extension (if the candidate has an Extension appointment)
- (optional) Reviewer from campus of the same academic rank or higher and who has had past experience in serving on the campus tenure and promotion committee. The department chair and the department's promotion and tenure representative will accept recommendations on individual reviewers from the candidate before making the selection.

Independent letters are received by department chair and are submitted to the department's promotion and tenure representative. Tenured department faculty will review these independent letters and the department's promotion and tenure representative will write a letter summarizing the results of their review and submit it to the department chair. The candidate will receive copies of all review letters during the candidate's annual performance review with the department chair.

Conclusions

Conclusions drawn at the time of the three-year review should not be considered as binding at the time of mandatory tenure review. Rather, they represent a "snapshot" for perceived progress at the time of the review.

Mandatory Fifth-Year Review for Promotion and Tenure

Review and recommendations for tenure and promotion to rank of associate professor will be initiated at the departmental level. The University publishes guidelines for preparation of the dossier each year.

1. At the close of the Spring Semester of the fifth year of service to the University, the faculty member who is undergoing the review process will make an appointment with the Department Chair to discuss the University guidelines for preparing the dossier. At this time both the faculty member and the department chair will separately develop a list of possible outside reviewers of the dossier (preferably ranked at the professor level, but at least ranked at the associate professor level).
2. The faculty member will prepare the dossier in May and June according to University guidelines. The dossier will contain documentation of the faculty member's performance in each of three areas: teaching, research/creative endeavor, and service. The candidate and the department chair will agree on a date for the dossier to be completed and submitted to the chair, but no later than June 30th.
3. The completed dossier and selected research articles will be sent by the Department Chair to outside reviewers no later than July 15 requesting an evaluation from them by August 15. Outside reviewers will include equal representation of people suggested by the faculty member and those suggested by the Department Chair.
4. Early in the Fall Semester the Department Chair will assemble materials for the faculty review process including the dossier with letters from outside reviewers. The contents and the format of the dossier will follow the university guidelines. Letters from outside reviewers will be handled confidentially and not shared with the candidate.
5. Tenured faculty in the Department will review materials as soon as they are made available. After having sufficient time to review the materials, tenured faculty will meet to discuss and vote on whether the faculty member be tenured and promoted to associate professor. The vote will be recorded in the department letter which will be added to the dossier.
6. The faculty member seeking tenure and promotion will be notified of the departmental recommendations immediately and in writing. If the decision is not positive, the faculty member will have a right to an appeal at the departmental level.
7. The Department Chair will carefully review the dossier and supporting materials and make a written recommendation to the college committee concerning tenure and promotion of the candidate by the deadline set by that committee, typically in October. The Department Chair letter will become part of the dossier.
8. A copy of the letter from the department chair will be shared with the candidate. The candidate may request a meeting to discuss evaluation by the department chair.
9. The College Promotion and Tenure committee will evaluate the dossier including the recommendations made in letters from the faculty in the Architectural Studies Department and the Department Chair. The College committee will vote on the candidate, and the dossier, including the written report of the results of the College Promotion and Tenure committee evaluation, will be sent to the Dean. If the decision is not positive, the candidate will have a right to an appeal at the college level.
10. The Dean of the College will review all of the materials in the dossier and make a recommendation to the Campus Promotion and Tenure committee by the committee's deadline.
11. The Campus Promotion and Tenure committee will review the dossier during the first half of the Spring semester. Members of the committee will vote on whether to recommend to the Provost that the candidate be tenured and promoted. If the vote is negative, the candidate will be informed of the decision and be given an opportunity to have a hearing before this committee. After a hearing is held, the committee will vote again.

12. The candidate as well as the Dean of the College and Department Chair will be informed of the decision. A written recommendation from the Campus Promotion and Tenure committee will be sent to the Provost during the Spring semester along with the candidate's dossier.
13. The Provost will evaluate the candidate's dossier and make a recommendation to the Chancellor as to whether the candidate should be tenured and promoted. The candidate will receive a letter from the Chancellor during the summer informing the faculty member that he/she has or has not been awarded tenure and promoted to associate professor. If tenure is granted, the faculty member will be on a continuous appointment at the University of Missouri-Columbia. If tenure is denied, the faculty member will be allowed to stay one year. The faculty member who is denied tenure may appeal the decision following guidelines in the Faculty Handbook of the University of Missouri-Columbia.
14. Faculty candidates with prior academic appointments who seek tenure-track position in the department may negotiate the number of probation years required for mandatory promotion and tenure evaluation at the time of hiring. This agreement must be included in the appointment letter and should be approved by the unit head, dean and the provost.
15. As noted in CRR 320.035, cases for promotion and/or tenure prior to their mandatory year should be "rare and restricted to truly exceptional cases." To be considered an exceptional case for early promotion and/or tenure in the Architectural Studies department, the candidate must present multiple pieces of evidence that demonstrate exceptional scholarly or creative accomplishments. Examples of such evidence include (but are not limited to):
 - a. Receiving prestigious or highly prestigious awards for scholarship and creative activity recognized by Association of American Universities (AAU), Association of Collegiate Schools of Architecture (ACSA)
 - b. Being the lead author on multiple articles published in indexed journals with very high impact factor
 - c. Receiving multiple prestigious architecture or interior design awards and winning competitions at the national or international level
 - d. Other exceptional scholarly recognitions and achievements

In these cases, letters from department committee and chair, as well as the college committee and the dean should clearly address what makes this candidate's record "truly exceptional." Simply meeting departmental guidelines prior to the mandatory year is not sufficient. External reviewers should be made aware of this requirement for all candidates seeking early consideration.

The CRR also specifies, "Early recommendations for promotion and/or tenure should not be made primarily on the basis of market conditions which make it appear that a faculty member might accept an offer elsewhere." Recommendations for promotion and tenure must be based on the merits of the specific case.

Criteria for Academic Ranks

As a basis for appointment and promotion to academic rank in the Department of Architectural Studies, the academic preparation and achievements essential to the responsibilities and expectancies associated with each rank are designated.

- A. Instructor
This rank is recommended for individuals who do not hold a terminal degree and who do not have other traditional scholarly or professional attainments. Except for special circumstances, this is generally a nontenure track position, requiring the following:
 1. Minimum of a master's degree from a specialized academic program or possesses equivalent scholarly or professional attainments.
 2. Evidence of professional promise.
- B. Assistant Professor

Assistant professor is the usual entry-level rank for a candidate who has completed the appropriate doctorate, terminal degree, or possesses equivalent scholarly or professional attainments.

Candidates for assistant professor must show satisfactory competence or high promise as teachers and researchers appropriate to their level of experience.

C. Associate Professor

The awarding of tenure and promotion to the rank of associate professor must be based on convincing evidence that the faculty member has achieved an outstanding record as a teacher, as a scholar, and one who provides effective service, and can be expected to continue a program of high quality teaching, scholarship, and service relevant to the mission of the academic unit. When evaluating a candidate, the focus of the evaluation is the candidate's primary areas of responsibility. A mediocre performance in an area of primary responsibility cannot be offset by excellent performance in a secondary area of responsibility.

1. Candidates must demonstrate the quality, and effectiveness of their teaching. This must reflect growth and development over the probationary period and suggest a high likelihood that professional development with respect to teaching will continue. Examples of evidence of this are found in the Teaching section of this document
2. Candidates for promotion to associate professor with tenure must demonstrate a strong record in a program of sustained scholarship which contributes to a body of knowledge embraced in the department's mission. It is important that the candidate clearly demonstrate progress toward achieving excellence in scholarship. Examples of this scholarship are given in the Research section of this document.
3. Individuals must be recognized by peers at other institutions for contribution to the field and profession. This shall be determined through a formal review by faculty at peer institutions.
4. Candidates are held to a high standard of departmental citizenship. Departmental citizenship is defined as assuming individual and departmental responsibility, reliable, and carrying on responsibilities that might extend beyond the nine-month period of the appointment. Poor departmental citizenship at best imposes additional service burdens on other faculty and at worst may obstruct a department's ability to function and may damage its reputation. Poor departmental citizenship is basis for a negative recommendation.
5. Candidates are expected to provide convincing evidence of a sustained record of effective participation in professional, university, and community service. Effective participation is expected; however, service contributions may not be substituted for excellence in teaching and research. Examples of appropriate service contributions are given in the Service section of this document.
6. Changes in workload from the initial appointment letter during the probationary period is discouraged for pre-tenure faculty. Any changes in workload or performance expectations should be documented.

D. Professor

University of Missouri guidelines state:

A person recommended for promotion to the rank of professor should have significant accomplishments, especially in the area of research and scholarly activity, beyond those justifying the rank of associate professor. Years of service alone do not justify advancement. Rather, sustained contributions during a career to research, scholarship, and teaching are necessary. A person to be considered for promotion to professor should be a scholar who has achieved national distinction. (from: UM Collected Rules and Regulations 320.035 Policy and Procedures for Promotion and Tenure; B.2.f. Promotion to Professor)

1. The criteria applicable to appointment at the rank of professor are those already indicated as applicable to the rank of associate professor. Expectations for “effective” performance to merit promotion are considerably higher than for lower ranks. For appointment at this rank, candidates should have an established record of accomplishment, national visibility, and demonstrated the ability to direct research of graduate students.
2. Candidates must provide convincing evidence of a sustained record of excellence in areas central to their responsibilities. A mediocre performance in an area of primary responsibility is not counterbalanced by excellent performance in a secondary area of responsibility. Candidates for promotion to professor are to be role models for less senior faculty, for students, and for the profession.
3. Candidates must provide evidence of a sustained record of excellence in teaching. Evidence shall include student evaluations and peer evaluations. The teaching portfolio may be submitted for consideration but carries much less weight than the previous two forms of evaluation.
4. Candidates are expected to provide convincing evidence of a sustained record of excellence in scholarship. A sustained record of scholarship excellence is reflected through a significant body of scholarship which is recognized nationally.
5. Candidates are expected to provide convincing evidence of a sustained record of effective participation and leadership in professional, university, and community service.
6. Candidates are held to a high standard of sustained departmental citizenship. Poor departmental citizenship at best imposes additional service burdens on other faculty and at worst may obstruct a department’s ability to function and may damage its reputation. Poor departmental citizenship is basis for a negative recommendation.

Scholarship: Research and Creative Activities

The candidate should have **demonstrated** the ability to conduct research or creative activities that reflects (1) original scholarship, (2) a contribution to the knowledge base, and (3) the likelihood of continued quality performance. This ability and future promise may be demonstrated by accomplishments in one or more of the following categories:

- Conduct research/creative endeavor with appropriate methods and rigor.
- Conceptualize and theorize in an original way.
- Synthesize, criticize, and clarify extant knowledge and research.
- Innovate in the collection or analysis of data.
- Relate research/creative endeavor to the solution of practical problems of individuals, groups, organizations, or societies.
- Create design that appears in a national juried show.
- Develop an exhibit that is reviewed by expert evaluation for acceptance.

Refereed activities will be given greater weight than non-refereed activities. A significant part of the evidence for scholarly activities should be from the primary scholarly activities as listed below. Research scholarship of the candidate after earning the Ph.D. and design projects after the candidate's first professional design degree are considered by the Architectural Studies department as part of the tenure review process. However, research scholarship and design or creative activity after start of the tenure-track appointment will be given greater weight compared to activities prior to appointment at the University of Missouri.

Evidence of **scholarly activity** and of a candidate's standing in a discipline may include:

A. Primary scholarly activities

- Articles published, or accepted for publication, in scholarly journals
- Articles published in proceedings of international conferences that are included in the CumInCAD database¹
- Scholarly books published by reputed academic press
- Monographs of design projects published by reputed publishers
- Book chapters (peer-reviewed)
- Juried design or art shows
- Funded external grant/project proposals including those from federal agencies, foundations, and industry
- University of Missouri campus and UM System level grant/project proposals (funded)
- Patents (awarded)

B. Secondary scholarly activities

- College-level grant/project proposals (funded)
- External grant/project proposals (unfunded)
- University of Missouri campus and UM System level grant/project proposals (unfunded)
- Technical Reports resulting from externally funded grant project and published by the funding agency
- Textbooks
- Non-peer reviewed book chapters
- Design work that is featured in professional architecture and interior design trade publications
- Abstracts, or summaries, published in a journal, conference proceeding, or a similar format
- Scholarly presentations to a regional or national professional organization for which the full-papers, abstracts, or posters are refereed
- Work that leads to the development of public policies
- Funding for training and/or professional development
- Testimony before governmental committees
- Professional honors and awards for research and creative scholarship
- Serving as an editor of a journal
- Serving on an editorial or review board of a high caliber journal of national/international stature

¹ Cumulative Index of peer-reviewed proceedings publications in Computer Aided Architectural Design supported by the sibling associations ACADIA, CAADRIA, eCAADe, SIGraDi, ASCAAD and CAAD futures

- Invited presentations
- Reviewed exhibits by expert evaluation for acceptance
- Invention disclosures and pending patents
- Development of software tools or simulations that have gained acceptance among professionals

This listing identifies many of the important and typical activities that constitute scholarly activity. Other than articles published in professional journals, no particular order of importance is implied by the above listing, and other professional activities, not listed, may also provide supporting evidence of scholarly activity.

Teaching

The Architectural Studies department highly values effective classroom teaching for undergraduate and graduate students. Thus, a candidate should have demonstrated effective teaching abilities and should provide evidence of one's personal commitment to teaching, success in the communication of material, and stimulation of students' interest. Evidence of continual improvement should also be furnished. One's influence on the curricula and teaching strategies of other colleagues and programs, both within the department, on campus, nationally, and internationally, is also valued.

There is a wide range of legitimate approaches to teaching that are the result of the kind of material that is taught, the level of the student, the personality of the teacher, and the environment in which the teaching occurs. Distinctions among types of teaching situations may include lectures, discussions, studios, seminars, institutes, workshops, in-service training, teaching by correspondence and distance-learning, one-on-one tutorials, student advising, and consulting. In documenting teaching proficiency, the candidate should indicate how the teaching approach was appropriate to the learner constituency's needs and abilities. Of course, no teacher can be expected to be equally masterful in all teaching situations.

A 60% teaching load in the Architectural Studies Department is defined as 14 credit hours, typically comprising of two studio courses (4 credit hours each) and two lecture courses (3 credit hours each) taught in a 9-month, academic-year comprising of Fall and Spring Semesters. Directing graduate students (thesis projects as well as independent readings and problems courses) and academic advising of undergraduate students are included as part of the teaching responsibilities. Any unusual changes or exceptions, depending on the faculty's circumstance may be negotiated with the department chair and documented in writing.

Evidence of Teaching Mastery

Evidence must be presented that the candidate has engaged in a teaching program of substantial quality and impact. Because each type of evidence provides an incomplete picture, a balanced judgment of teaching ability and competence must rely on several kinds of evidence. Evidences described below under A, B, C, and D must be provided in the dossiers of resident instructional faculty. Both teaching and extension faculty are encouraged to consider parts E-J and provide documentation as available and appropriate. Extension faculty must document teaching mastery based on the guidelines in Part K.

A. Statement of Teaching Philosophy

Candidates should provide a statement describing his/her personal teaching philosophy, strategies, objectives, long term teaching goals, and expectations for continued improvement.

B. Statement of Departmental Congruence

The candidate should provide a statement describing his/her contribution to the teaching mission of the department and general contribution to curricular policy and innovation.

C. History and Student Evaluations

The candidate should provide a chronology of the candidate's teaching history at the University of Missouri since the previous review, or of teaching at other institutions where appropriate. All courses taught, by semester, should be listed and accompanied by enrollment numbers, and standardized quantitative evaluation summaries. Other teaching situations should be described in terms of clientele, situation,

numbers of student participants, level of students, duration of instruction, method of teaching, method of student assessment, method of course/teacher, and results of course/teacher assessment.

D. Colleague Evaluations

Evaluations by colleagues are a dedicated form of teaching evaluation in the Department. It should be based on direct observation of teaching or extension program presentations and the examination of teaching or program materials, as described in the *Guidelines for Teaching Evaluation* and approved by the MU faculty.

E. Graduate Student Teaching, Tutoring, Advising

Recognizing that graduate student teaching is intense and time consuming, data regarding the numbers of graduate students taught in non-classroom situations should be provided including: relationship to the student (advisor, committee member), level of student, and degree of involvement with the student. Information on effectiveness as a teacher from former students and evaluations by graduate students with whom the candidate worked closely may be included if their anonymity can be protected.

F. New Course Development

The candidate may indicate any new courses developed or major sections of a course completely revised. For each, a rationale for the development and explanation of the contribution it makes to the overall curriculum should be included. All materials for the new course or section should also be provided for review.

G. Teaching Materials

The candidate is encouraged to provide documentation of attempts at new or improved teaching methods and materials and his/her evaluation of their effectiveness. Course outlines, syllabi, and other relevant teaching materials should be provided as an appendix to the dossier.

H. Individual Teaching/Supervision

Documentation of student advising, consultation, and research or laboratory supervision may be provided as appropriate.

I. Honors/Awards

Evidence of recognition related to the candidates teaching may be provided, such as teaching-related publications, honors and awards.

J. Other Indicators

Indicators of leadership in curriculum development, publications related to teaching, grants awarded for teaching enhancement, or service to a committee on teaching should be documented. Where appropriate, other kinds of evidence may be included, such as assessments by workshop participants, clients, trainees, teaching assistants, or others. Such evidence should summarize systematically, rather than simply quoting a few laudatory comments.

K. Extension Teaching Faculty

Extension faculty may indicate evidence of outstanding teaching by providing descriptions of up to five significant extension programs for which the candidate had primary responsibility. Such descriptions should include (a) the identification of the program goals, clientele, and the needs-assessment procedure; (b) outline of program objectives; (c) details on the method of instruction and delivery, innovative teaching methods, materials, aids or approaches, and client evaluation of the program's effectiveness; and (d) description of the significance of the program and its relevance to the issues in the state and nation, and its potential or demonstrated impact on public policy and citizen welfare.

Service

For teaching and extension faculty, service activities fall into three general categories: university, professional, and public. However, while public service in the sense of *good citizenship* is encouraged for all faculty, it is not legitimate for P&T purposes. In instances in which a candidate is uncertain of how a service activity will be valued for promotion/tenure purposes, or when a service commitment is inordinately time demanding and consuming, the faculty member should ask the departmental P&T committee for clarification, in writing, prior to undertaking or continuing, that service activity.

University: The effective operation of the university requires a high degree of faculty participation and, at times, intensive activity in faculty government, departmental and university committees, administrative roles, advisory functions, and similar tasks. All faculty must share in this task, but that a heavier burden may and should fall on the shoulders of more senior (and already tenured) faculty members.

Professional: Service to one's profession or academic discipline may occur at local, state, national or international levels. Appropriate activities include service as an officer, member of a board, committee, or task force of a professional group, on-site visits, reviewing research proposals or manuscripts, and organizing and participating in professional and technical meetings such as training institutes, workshops, conferences, and continuing professional education.

Public Service: Public service for teaching faculty is valued when it enhances the department's perception and value in the public arena and when the faculty member is engaged in it because of his/her university/professional affiliation. These may include such things as testifying at public hearings, consulting with public bodies, and the like.

Public Service for Extension Faculty: Public service for extension faculty is a critical part of their professional responsibilities. The documentation in such cases must clearly demonstrate either how the candidate is meeting the extension and outreach program needs of the public through the teaching, coordination, and evaluation of outreach programs or how the candidate's work may have aided in shaping public policy. Evidence should be presented showing that a candidate with extension responsibilities has been able to identify program needs utilizing stakeholder input, design programs to address those needs, use a variety of information sources in program development, procure necessary resources, skillfully deliver programs including appropriate partners and evaluate those programs and their demonstrated impact. For extension faculty, the detailed documentation of service activities is critical in P&T evaluations.

Documentation of service

Teaching Faculty: Documentation of service for teaching faculty should include the specific responsibilities of the faculty member, the nature of the service provided, some indication of the faculty member's time involved, a brief summary of contribution to the department, and letters of support or commendation.

Extension Faculty: In addition to the documentation of university and professional service indicated for teaching faculty, extension faculty should also provide detailed description of outreach program planning and development, and public appearances/presentation as a part of one's extension responsibilities.

Evidence of public service may include:

- A. Consultations to the community and significant advisory work with government, business, or industry.
 - Outreach program planning and development.
 - Membership on committees and boards.
 - Public lectures and presentations.
 - Participation in radio and television programs
- B. Service in official positions of public organization or agencies related to the mission of the department
 - Publications and other resources for general audiences

Evidence of university service may include:

- A. Committee assignments in the department, college, or university.

- B. Participation in statewide outreach programs.
- C. Special administrative assignments in a department, college, or university.

Evidence of professional service may include:

- A. Membership on state, regional, national committees or councils, or review panels.
- B. Membership on editorial boards of professional journals or other reviewing or editing activities.
- C. Officer or board member of state, national or international scientific, professional, and educational organizations.
- D. Leadership in the development of continuing professional education for personnel in the field.

Post Tenure Review General Standards

The University of Missouri emphasizes the research/creative endeavor at this Research I institution. Scholarly activity is interpreted as original intellectual work evaluated and validated by peer review and communicated to the scientific/academic community within the scope of the department's mission and goals.

Required minimum expectations for overall satisfactory performance of tenured faculty are established in the Post Tenure Review (approved by department faculty 8/27/01) and required by UM. These general standards coordinate with criteria used for annual reviews and raises.

- Faculty productivity is expected in all three areas of research/creative endeavor/scholarship; teaching; and service.
- In each area, performance should demonstrate quantity, quality, and relevance.
- The faculty member's record should demonstrate a specific and identifiable area(s) of expertise (i.e., special competence). The development of this area of expertise implies movement toward and the achievement of national stature.
- It is expected that the faculty member's performance in all three areas should demonstrate a relatedness to architectural studies. Relevance is assessed primarily from the perspective of demonstrated relatedness and/or application of the activity to practice.
- Faculty performance that demonstrates integration and relatedness of research/creative endeavor, service, and teaching is particularly valued.
- These department standards are provided to supplement the University of Missouri Collected Rules 310.015 as described. Updates of University regulations supersede those printed below.

Procedure:

The Post Tenure Review begins five years from the tenured date OR the date of this initial policy OR the hire date if hired with tenure. Post Tenure Reviews are done at five-year intervals. The dossier will include a complete resume and supplementary evidence at the discretion of the Chair.

A committee comprised of tenured Departmental faculty, excluding the department Chair, will review the dossier addressing items above and make a written recommendation to the Chair and the faculty member under review. The Chair will write an independent review of performance and incorporate this review in the faculty member's annual review that year. The five-year evaluation process will be complete with a satisfactory evaluation.

If the evaluation is unsatisfactory, then the five-year report will be sent to the Dean. The Dean may request additional letters of evaluation to perform an independent full review of the performance of the faculty member over the five-year period. The five-year evaluation process will be complete if the Dean judges the performance of the faculty member to be satisfactory.

At every level of review, the faculty member will be provided with a copy of any written report regarding this process.

UM SYSTEM COLLECTED RULES AND REGULATIONS

Also see UM System Collected Rules and Regulations for most current rules and regulations.

[310.015 Procedures for Review of Faculty Performance](#)

[320.035 Policy and Procedures for Promotion and Tenure](#)

- Department Guidelines Approved 11/15/2004;
- Revised and Approved 12/8/2017;
- Draft 11/15/2019 for review by Provost Office;
 - Draft incorporating feedback from Provost Office voted and approved by faculty on 07/20/2020.
 - Approved by Provost Office on 12/24/2020