

## **College of Architecture, Design and Construction**

School of Architecture

McWhorter School of Building Science

Department of Industrial and Graphic Design

### **CADC Guidelines for Annual Assessment, Promotion and Tenure, and Post-Tenure Review**

#### **I. Introduction**

##### **A. Overview**

Auburn University College of Architecture, Design and Construction strives for excellence in faculty research/creative work, outreach, teaching, and service endeavors. In particular, the college recognizes the need to identify guidelines and expectations for faculty activity in teaching, research/creative work, outreach, and service related to annual assessment, promotion and tenure, and post-tenure review. The CADC Guidelines are supplemental to the *Auburn University Faculty Handbook*, and accordingly may be reviewed, revised and updated periodically in response to changes in the *Auburn University Faculty Handbook* or to relevant CADC criteria. These guidelines will be made available to the Auburn University Promotion and Tenure Committee with each application.

##### **B. Purpose**

The purpose of this document is to establish a framework that is specific to our range of disciplines to be used by both internal and external constituents in the assessment of CADC faculty activity. As a professional college representing a broad spectrum of disciplines, the CADC values both non-traditional and traditional scholarly contributions. CADC faculty members are actively engaged in the pursuit of new knowledge and contributions to our disciplines through research, creative activity, outreach scholarship, and teaching scholarship. Some examples of CADC profession/discipline specific and discipline-valued scholarly activities and award venues are indicated in this document in Appendix A.

##### **C. Audience**

The audience of this document is CADC faculty, CADC administrators, external peer reviewers in the tenure and promotion process, members of the Auburn University Promotion and Tenure Committee, and the Auburn University central administration. A full version of the CADC Guidelines will be provided to external peer reviewers with each candidate dossier. The dean, the department/school heads, and faculty may reference these guidelines in the support letters that go to the University Promotion and Tenure Committee with a candidate's package.

##### **D. Context**

The CADC Guidelines operate under, and in conjunction with the standards and procedures contained in the *AU Faculty Handbook*. The *AU Faculty Handbook, Chap. 3, section 11.A* defines the process for promotion and tenure at Auburn University. Faculty who come to Auburn from another university or from professional practice may have prior peer reviewed scholarship and creative activity count toward promotion and tenure (see *AU Faculty Handbook, Chap. 3.4. "prior service"*).

## **II. Annual Faculty Assessment**

Teaching, research/creative work, outreach and service are addressed as part of the annual assessment of faculty and for tenure and/or promotion applications. The annual assessment process takes into account yearly faculty activity and considers the yearly contribution in the larger context of the faculty member's body of work. Specific teaching and scholarship goals are reviewed and revised every year for each faculty member. On a yearly basis, each faculty member is rated in relation to the criteria for their respective appointment percentages in Teaching, Research/Creative Work and/or Outreach, Service, and Administration. A rating is given for each separate area of the appointment using the scale of Exemplary, Exceeds Expectations, Meets Expectations, Marginal, or Unacceptable. There will also be an overall rating given to each faculty member using the same scale.

### **A. General Guidelines**

#### **1. Annual Faculty Assessment cycle**

According to the *AU Faculty Handbook, Chapter 3.7*, each faculty member should undergo a formal performance review each year before April 30. The department/school head will conduct the review and the subsequent faculty annual review report which will provide the basis for recommendations related to salary, promotion, tenure, reappointment and dismissal. The annual assessment cycle is based on the standard review calendar established by Auburn University.

#### **2. Annual Assessment and Faculty Assignment procedure**

At CADC, the department/school head will conduct the annual review of each faculty member before April 15. The *AU Faculty Handbook* addresses the annual review *stating*, "in the case of faculty members who have not achieved tenure or promotion to associate professor or professor, particular care shall be taken by the department head to relate the faculty member's job performance to the promotion and tenure criteria set forth in this document (the Handbook)."

- **Phase 1. Submission of Review Materials (by January 15)**

Each year faculty members will submit review materials to the head by January 15. Required materials include:

- a. Full professors and visiting faculty will submit a current **curriculum vita** or updated dossier.

Assistant and associate professors will submit an updated current Auburn University promotion and tenure formatted **dossier** of accomplishment in order to prepare for the tenure and/or promotion submission. The format is described in the *AU Faculty Handbook, Chap 3.11.c.1.*, and abbreviated in Section III.B.2.d of this document.

- b. A CADC annual assessment document

The current data collection forms and/or templates will be available from the Dean's Office and/or the respective school/department. The assessment process requires inclusion of:

- a **summarized list** of teaching assignments, scholarly activity and accomplishments from the assessment period. A web or digital template is available from the department/school head and aligns

with the requirements in the AU Faculty Handbook. Distribution of time and effort for the assessment period should be specified.

- an **annual planning record** for the next assessment period indicating work load and goals anticipated in the next assessment year. Any agreement between the faculty and Head regarding teaching activities not directly related to credit hours should be detailed in the annual planning record. This record as well as the formal conference is the appropriate venue to discuss other goals related to future development.
  - a copy of the **previous annual planning record**.
- **Phase 2. Formal Conference (before April 15)**  
The department/school head will review the current and cumulative contributions and progress of each faculty member in the areas of teaching, scholarly activity, service, and collegiality. Faculty members are responsible for providing the information to demonstrate significance or impact of their endeavors, level of engagement, and the context for the activities.

The annual review of performance in each area to which a faculty member is assigned will be assessed according to the university performance descriptor scale: Exemplary (characterizing performance of high merit), Exceeds Expectations (characterizing performance of merit), Meets Expectations (characterizing sufficient performance), Marginal (performance is insufficient), or Unacceptable (performance that requires a comprehensive development plan, can trigger Post-tenure review, or requires a letter of non-continuance). An overall assessment will establish an overall performance descriptor of the faculty member's performance for the evaluation period. The head and faculty member will meet to discuss the faculty performance over the review period and to discuss the faculty member's assignment for the coming year.

- **Phase 3. Written Faculty Annual Review Report (before May 15)**  
The department/school head prepares a written report by May 15 covering the major points of the meeting in relation to the faculty assignment for the assessment period. The report should indicate the faculty member's overall performance level and include evaluative comments according to the performance descriptors Exemplary, Exceeds Expectations, Meets Expectations, Marginal, or Unacceptable for each area of the appointment. The report should detail the faculty member's assignment for the next calendar year.
- **Phase 4. Report Receipt Confirmation by Signature (due back by May 25)**  
The faculty receives a copy of the report, which must be signed by both the department/school head and the faculty member and returned to the Dean's Office by May 25. Each faculty member is responsible for signing a copy of the report in order to indicate that it was received. If the faculty member disagrees with information in the report, then she or he may write a response to be appended to the report. One copy of the signed report and response, if applicable, is to be retained for the faculty member's departmental personnel file. The faculty member should receive a final copy also.

## **B. Allocation of Time and Effort**

### **1. Faculty Appointment types and standard percentages**

CADC faculty appointments are established each year during the annual assessment process for faculty. The appointment is agreed upon between each faculty member and the department/school head and ratified by the Dean's Office. Appointments are reevaluated each year during the faculty annual review.

Appointment percentages may be allocated in the areas of teaching, scholarship [scholarship includes research/creative work, teaching scholarship or outreach scholarship], service, and administration.

Visiting or adjunct faculty members in the CADC may have a scholarship or service load in addition to teaching activities-with prior approval from the Dean.

#### **a. Teaching Appointment**

Teaching loads in the CADC will vary depending on the needs of the respective program and on each faculty member's scholarly plan, service assignments, and/or administrative responsibilities.

Teaching appointment percentages are calculated on the standard of 3.94% per each credit hour of teaching load.

For example:

- A faculty member teaching a credit hour load of 24 credit hours per 9 month academic year would equate to a teaching appointment of 95%.
- A faculty member teaching a credit hour load of 18 credit hours per 9 month academic year would equate to a teaching appointment of 70%.

Faculty teaching appointment may include credit equivalency value for teaching activities/responsibilities that do not produce credit-hours. Examples include the teaching of courses with no credit hours, the teaching of courses that do not meet minimum enrollment guidelines (Directed Studies, for example), shared oversight for courses managed via committee of faculty, etc. Credit hour equivalency for these teaching duties should be established prior to the assignment and should be documented in the annual assessment process.

Teaching loads are further addressed in *AU Faculty Handbook*, Chap. 4.2.

#### **b. Scholarship Appointment**

In the CADC, the scholarship percentage is inclusive of research/creative work, teaching scholarship, and outreach scholarship. The percentage of each faculty member's scholarship appointment may vary, depending on each faculty member's teaching assignment, scholarly plan, service assignments, and/or administrative responsibilities.

The percentage of a faculty member's appointment assigned to scholarship should be commensurate with their plan for scholarly activity and scholarly production. Each faculty member should review their scholarly plan for the year with their department/school head and determine the appropriate appointment percentage. The department/school head's annual assessment of performance relative to the faculty member's scholarship appointment should be calibrated to this plan.

CADC faculty members on tenure-track appointments should have at least 25% of their total appointment devoted to scholarship. Refer to section III. A.2. of this document for a description of scholarship requirements in relation to rank.

### **c. Service Appointment**

Service to the university is an expected and integral component of a tenured or tenure-track appointment. Typical service duties in the CADC include service on program, department, and/or university committees; assistance with special assignments determined by the unit head; participation in faculty meetings; advising of students and student organizations; etc. Many service activities are related to teaching and may be factored into the teaching appointment percentage (see B.1.a.). Service activities and responsibilities should be detailed in the annual review documents and performance of these duties will form the basis of the performance assessment for this portion of the annual assignment.

While individual service assignments will vary, service assignments that meet the norm for the unit equate to a 5% service appointment. Exceptional service assignments might result in a higher service appointment percentage with approval by the department/school head and the dean.

As noted in the AU Faculty Handbook (Chap. 3.3.), "...expectations in the area of departmental, college or school, and/or University service for an assistant professor are typically modest."

### **d. Administrative Appointment**

Administrative appointments may be factored into the appointment percentage to accommodate different circumstances related to administrative duties and other assignments that exceed the normal expected service contribution. Administrative appointments are determined by the department/school head and the dean.

## **2. Summer Teaching**

Summer teaching appointments are available for some faculty members. Eligibility for summer teaching appointments is determined by the department/school head and approved by the dean.

The CADC standard full-time teaching load (1 FTE) in the summer semester is 9 credit hours. Variations from this standard must be approved by the dean.

**3. Graduate Faculty**

Faculty may be appointed to the graduate faculty at Level 1 by application. The Graduate School approves graduate faculty appointments if the criteria are met.

### **III. Guidelines for Promotion and Tenure**

#### **A. General Criteria and Considerations**

##### **1. General Criteria**

According to the *AU Faculty Handbook*, faculty scholarly contribution is evaluated in the areas of (A) teaching; (B) research/creative work; (C) outreach; and (D) service. In this document, Section IV explains some general criteria for understanding scholarship at CADC in relation to the areas defined in the *AU Faculty Handbook*.

##### **2. Promotion**

Promotion is based on meritorious performance and scholarly activity in the areas of research/creative work and teaching and/or outreach. Refer to Section IV for details related to CADC scholarship criteria relative to areas defined in the *AU Faculty Handbook* as teaching, research/creative work, and outreach. CADC scholarship evaluation levels of Highest Distinction, Distinction, and Adequate are explained in Section V.B. of this document.

Candidates for promotion from ***assistant to associate professor*** at CADC are expected to develop a body of work that demonstrates consistent growth and progress toward achievement of Distinction in scholarship related to one or more areas of a candidate's appointment along with an appropriate level of service to the Department/School and/or the University. The candidate must also demonstrate evidence of an emerging national/international reputation in their discipline and of the potential to ultimately advance to full professor rank. This level of accomplishment must be substantiated through internal and external peer review and recognition.

Candidates for promotion from ***associate to full professor*** at CADC must demonstrate a respected national/international reputation in their discipline as evidenced by a sustained body of scholarly activities of Distinction and Highest Distinction to her/his discipline. This level of accomplishment must be substantiated through internal and external peer review and recognition.

In addition, candidates for promotion from associate to full professor rank must demonstrate active involvement, collaboration, and leadership in departmental, school or college, and university affairs. Academic Ranks and promotion are addressed in *AU Faculty Handbook, Chap. 3.6*.

##### **3. Tenure**

Academic tenure is a principle that affords the individual faculty member academic freedom in the university environment. The *AU Faculty Handbook* explains that Tenure exists in order to ensure academic freedom by protecting "the faculty member's ability to criticize and advocate changes in existing theories, beliefs, programs, policies and institutions" (*Chap 3.9*). A candidate's collegiality in teaching, research/creative work, and service assignments is the primary factor in achieving tenure.

##### **4. Collegiality**

According to the *AU Faculty Handbook*, "Collegiality should not be confused with sociability....," and is, "a professional, not personal, criterion relating to the performance of a faculty member's duties within a department." (*Chap. 3.9*). Collegiality in teaching,

research/creative work, and service assignments is the primary appraisal factor in tenure decisions and is judged at the departmental or school level by tenured departmental/school colleagues.

At the CADC, collegiality is understood to include participation in shared governance of the unit and professional interaction with faculty, staff, and students. Examples include but are not limited to: regular and constructive participation in faculty meetings, participation in activities related to peer review and faculty recruitment, and professional interaction with external constituencies. Collaboration in teaching, research/creative work, and outreach activities may also be considered in evaluating collegiality in relation to tenure.

## **B. Review Processes**

In addition to the annual assessment process (outlined in Section A.2 above), as described in the *AU Faculty Handbook, Chap. 3.7.*, candidates on tenure track appointments will be reviewed by their tenured faculty peers in the Third Year review, “no later than 32 months after initial appointment, normally before April 30 of the faculty member’s third year.” The candidate will be reviewed again when the candidate initiates the process of application for tenure and promotion.

An assistant professor typically acquires at least 4 years full-time experience in rank before going up for promotion and tenure (refer to *AU Faculty Handbook, Chap. 3.10* for more information). Faculty on tenure track appointments normally initiate the process for tenure and promotion in the fifth year of their full-time appointment. “Consideration for tenure normally occurs during a candidate’s fifth year of full-time service” (*Chap. 3.10*). A candidate may request that tenure consideration be deferred from the fifth to the sixth year; however, a candidate must be considered during her/his sixth year if she/he has not been considered earlier and has not waived consideration.

An associate professor may go up for promotion to full professor after serving four years in full-time service at the rank of associate professor.

### **1. Third Year Review**

The focus of the third year review is to assess the candidate’s progress towards tenure. The candidate’s department/school head is responsible for scheduling the candidate’s third year review at the appropriate time.

Prior to the third year review, the candidate should turn in a current dossier following the provisions (outlined below in Section 2.d.2.) for review by the tenured faculty in the department or school. Each school and department sets additional guidelines for the third year review, often including a presentation by the candidate to all faculty followed by a discussion by the tenured faculty only. In the review the voting faculty members vote whether or not the candidate is making adequate progress towards developing a body of work that is worthy of earning tenure and promotion. In order to make this assessment, the voting faculty members review the dossier of the candidate in relation to the criteria explained in this document, particularly in Sections IV and V and in the appropriate appendices.

The third year review must result in a vote by the tenured faculty. The voting options are:

- Present and voting
- Present and abstaining
- Absent but submitting a written vote prior to the meeting, or
- Absent and not voting (this response does not count in the total vote)

The faculty vote occurs by ballot. Ballot choices are either:

- yes, the candidate is progressing appropriately towards achieving tenure or
- no, the candidate is not progressing appropriately towards achieving tenure
- abstain

If a tenured faculty member cannot attend the third year review meeting and would like to vote on the candidate's progress, the vote should be sent in writing in advance of the meeting to the department/school head or to the unit's tenure and promotion committee chair. Vote counting should not begin until all ballots of those in attendance are turned in to the meeting chair. The result of the vote must be announced at the meeting. Third year review voting records will be retained by the school/department and reported to the Office of the Provost upon request.

After the faculty vote is complete, the head prepares a written report summarizing the results of the review for the candidate. This written report is confidential and "may only be consulted by the tenured faculty when the faculty member is a candidate for tenure" (*AU Faculty Handbook, Chap. 3.7*).

## **2. Review for Tenure and Promotion, and for Promotion**

The CADC requires both an internal peer review at the departmental/school level and an external peer review for all candidates petitioning for tenure and/or promotion.

### **a. Promotion and Tenure Dossier and Supporting Materials**

After initiating the process, the candidate prepares the dossier for promotion and tenure following the format described in Section C below. The candidate may also prepare supplemental materials designed to illustrate her/his accomplishments in greater depth for use in the internal and external peer reviews. These supplemental materials do not go to the university Promotion and Tenure Committee, but are available in the CADC Dean's Office if the university Promotion and Tenure Committee would like to review them.

All materials prepared for the promotion and tenure process are confidential and should only be used by CADC administrators, tenured faculty in the department/school, and by external peer reviewers. Dossier materials should not be copied and/or distributed to anyone beyond the faculty who are eligible to vote on the candidate. However, the candidate may independently choose to make the materials available to other colleagues.

### **b. External Peer Review**

External peer review of accomplishments and scholarship is an integral part of the method for assessing a CADC candidate's achievement. External peer review provides validation of the faculty member's scholarly contributions by a discipline-specific audience outside of Auburn University. The head will direct the external peer evaluator to focus the evaluation on the quality and significance of the faculty member's

scholarship as defined by the criteria described in this document and illustrated in the appendices.

CADC requires external peer review by three evaluators for promotion. From the Auburn University Faculty Handbook (Section 3.11.C.3.D.1):

“In consultation with the candidate and the faculty voting on the candidate the head (or dean) shall compile a list of potential evaluators. He or she shall then seek responses from at least three of the potential evaluators. These evaluators shall be people outside of Auburn University who are nationally acknowledged experts in the candidate's field and can comment on the quality and reputation of the candidate's work. If the evaluator is from an academic institution, he or she shall be of higher academic rank than the candidate. Letters from the candidate's major professor for a graduate degree, from former graduate students, and from ongoing research partners are unacceptable. Evaluators may be associated with industry, government agencies, foundations, etc. If these letters arrive in time, they shall be made available to the voting faculty; otherwise they shall be sent on to the Promotion and Tenure Committee,” *AU Faculty Handbook Chap. 3.11.C.3.-D. 1.*

The procedure for external peer review is as follows:

#### **b.1. Selection of Evaluators**

- 1.1. The department/school head will develop a list of potential evaluators by soliciting a list of 4-6 names from the candidate and names of potential evaluators from the tenured faculty who are eligible to vote on the candidate's application (the committee). The Head will then review this list with the candidate to ensure that evaluators are acceptable prior to the selection of the final evaluators.
- 1.2. Peer evaluators affiliated with an academic institution should be from faculty at a rank higher than that of the candidate.
- 1.3. Peer evaluators affiliated with an academic institution should be from an institution considered to be a peer of Auburn University in the candidate's discipline.
- 1.4. A peer evaluator not affiliated with an academic institution must have an appropriate background to adequately assess the candidate's scholarly activities and the candidate's impact on the discipline and/or profession.
- 1.5. Potential peer evaluators will be contacted by the department/school head using the approved template letter from the Office of the Provost prior to the forwarding of the dossier and any supporting materials.
- 1.6. The department/school head will select the final external peer evaluators from this list of potential evaluators. At CADC, typically two of the evaluators will be selected from the list proposed by the candidate and 1-2 will be selected from the faculty-submitted names.
- 1.7. The identity of the final evaluators will not be shared with the candidate.
- 1.8. In cases where the candidate has had significant experience at another university an additional evaluation may be solicited from an individual who has first-hand knowledge of the candidate from a supervisory perspective.

#### **b.2. External Review Materials**

The external review package sent to all external evaluators will include the following:

- A cover letter prepared by the department/school head outlining the procedure for external review and providing additional information relative to workload and other relevant conditions of the faculty member's appointment.
  - The candidate's dossier in the format outlined by the *AU Faculty Handbook*.
  - Supplemental materials as determined by the candidate.
- Supplemental materials may contain portfolio of creative work, samples of research papers and other research/creative work/outreach scholarship, teaching portfolio including students' work and syllabi from courses taught, support letters from outreach stakeholders and collaborators, etc.
- curriculum vita.
  - copy of a signed statement regarding candidate's waiver or non-waiver of right to know reviewer's identity
  - copy of *CADC Guidelines for Annual Assessment, Promotion and Tenure, and Post-Tenure Review*
  - copy of Chapter 3 of the *AU Faculty Handbook*

### **b.3. Format for Evaluator's Response**

The external peer evaluators should review the candidate's materials and write a letter of evaluation addressing the candidate's scholarly activities. As noted above, the evaluators will be advised to use these guidelines in framing the evaluations.

The external evaluators' letters will be made available to faculty members who are eligible to vote on the candidate's application for tenure and/or promotion.

The department/school Head is authorized to provide a summary to the candidate of the comments made in the evaluation letter only if the confidentiality of the evaluator's identity is maintained.

### **b.4. Due Date for Response**

The external review package should be mailed out by mid-June in order to allow for an eight week period for review letters to be mailed back to CADC.

## **c. Internal Peer Review by School/Departmental faculty** (*AU Faculty Handbook, Chap. 3-11.E*)

The internal school/departmental peer review process will begin early in the fall term (refer to timeline below). The department/school head will work with the candidate to establish deadlines for the submission of required materials, to schedule the candidate's presentation to the departmental/school faculty when applicable, and to schedule a meeting of the voting faculty.

The procedure for internal review is as follows:

### **c.1. Explanation of Candidate Internal Review Information**

- Dossier in Auburn University format (see below)
- Supplemental materials (see below)

The candidate will provide the department/school head with a copy of the dossier in the required format (see Section D below) and with any supplemental materials. Typically, this package contains the same material that is provided to external evaluators. The head will make this material available to the eligible voting faculty prior to the internal review, if applicable, and for the meeting of voting faculty. The supplemental materials will not be included in the package that is forwarded to the University Promotion and Tenure Committee. The *Auburn University Faculty Handbook* and this document, the *CADC Guidelines*, should be the point of reference for the process of internal review.

**c.2. Internal Review Presentation**

The candidate may make a presentation to the departmental/school faculty.

**c.3. Faculty Vote** (*AU Faculty Handbook, Chap. 3. 11.E*)

The faculty eligible to vote should conduct a closed meeting to discuss the candidate's qualifications for tenure and/or promotion. These deliberations are confidential. A secret ballot vote on the candidate's application will be taken at the meeting to determine the faculty's final recommendation to the AU Promotion and Tenure Committee.

The voting options are:

- Present and voting
- Present and abstaining
- Absent but submitting a written vote prior to the meeting, or
- Absent and not voting (this response does not count as part of the total vote)

Ballot choices are either:

- yes, the candidate is deserving of tenure
- no, the candidate is not deserving of tenure
- abstain

and/or,

- yes, the candidate is deserving of promotion
- no, the candidate is not deserving of promotion
- abstain

If a candidate is under consideration for tenure and promotion then separate votes for each issue must be taken and recorded.

If an eligible voting faculty member cannot attend the meeting, but intends to vote on the candidate's application, that faculty member is responsible for sending the vote in writing in advance of the meeting to the department/school head or to the unit-level promotion and tenure committee chair. Vote counting should not begin until the ballots of all faculty in attendance and all votes from absent and voting faculty are submitted to the meeting chair.

If the department/school head holds the appropriate rank, then the head should vote by secret ballot at the meeting. According to the *AU Faculty Handbook*, "Any other faculty member serving as an administrator who has an official vote on the candidate at a higher administrative level shall excuse himself or herself at the departmental level," -- otherwise that faculty member may vote.

The result of the vote must be announced at the meeting.

#### **c.4. Department/School Head Recommendation**

The department/school head will review all available materials after the faculty deliberation and the external peer review are completed. The head will provide a letter with a written evaluation of the candidate's qualifications for tenure and/or promotion to the University Promotion and Tenure Committee via the dean of the CADC. The letter should provide additional information relative to workload and other relevant conditions of the faculty member's appointment. Most importantly, the letter should clearly indicate the department/school head's recommendation with regard to the candidate's tenure and/or promotion.

#### **c.5. Dean Recommendation**

The CADC dean will review all available materials after the process of faculty deliberation, the external peer review, and the department/school head's recommendation. The dean will provide a letter with a written evaluation of the candidate's qualifications for tenure and/or promotion to the University Promotion and Tenure Committee. The letter should indicate clearly a recommendation for or against tenure and/or promotion.

#### **c.6. Communication to Candidate**

The head will communicate the departmental/school recommendation and the dean's recommendation to the candidate. At this point the candidate can choose not to continue the process of pursuing promotion and/or tenure.

#### **c.7. Faculty Support Letters**

Faculty who are eligible to vote are encouraged to write letters to the University Promotion and Tenure Committee explaining their position regarding the candidate's application for tenure and/or promotion. These letters should be directed towards the department/school head or to the CADC dean for inclusion in the candidate's package. Comments from faculty may be summarized by the committee of voting faculty members in lieu of sending individual letters. The package is sent from the CADC Dean's Office to the Office of the Provost. Letters should not be sent directly to the University Promotion and Tenure Committee.

#### **c.8. Submission to the Office of the Provost**

The CADC Dean's Office will collect all materials including the information to be submitted by the candidate, the information submitted by the head, and all relevant letters. The full dossier will be submitted to the Office of the Provost by December 6.

#### **d. Dossier Format**

##### **d.1. Auburn University Dossier Format**

The candidate will prepare a dossier of accomplishments and contributions, which is submitted for external peer review, internal peer review and to the University Promotion and Tenure Committee. The dossier must follow the format detailed in the *AU Faculty Handbook, Chap. 3. 11.C.1-2*. The statements/descriptions in Items A. 8., B.9., and C.1. (if applicable) are very important and should be developed as a part of the annual review each year for junior faculty. Interdisciplinary and collaborative efforts related to Teaching, Research/Creative Work, and Outreach should be included in the dossier in sections A. 8., B. 9., and C.1.

##### **d.2. Information Supplied by the Candidate**

The information should exactly follow the *AU Faculty Handbook* format. The format without detailed descriptions is as follows in italics:

1. *Standard Biographical Data sheet*
2. *Appointment percentages for the last three years*
3. ***Honors and Awards list***
4. *Scholarly Contributions as:*
  - A. *Teaching*
    1. *Courses, past 3 years*
    2. *Graduate students supervised*
    3. *Current graduate student committees*
    4. *Courses and curricula developed*
    5. *Grants received related to teaching*
    6. *Publications pertaining to teaching*
    7. *Other contributions to teaching*
    8. *Statement of teaching philosophy, self-evaluation*
  - B. *Research/Creative Work*
    1. *Books*
    2. *Article length publications*
    3. *Papers or lectures*
    4. *Exhibitions*
    5. *Performances*
    6. *Patents and inventions*
    7. *Other research/creative contributions*
    8. *Grants and contracts*
    9. *Description of scholarly program, work in progress, work anticipated*
  - C. *Outreach*
    1. *Commentary*
      - a. *Description*
      - b. *Mission*
      - c. *Scholarship*
      - d. *Impact*
    2. *Activities and Products*
      - a. *Instructional activities*
      - b. *Technical assistance*

- c. *Outreach publications*
- d. *Electronic products*
- e. *Other outreach products*
- f. *Copyrights, patents and inventions*
- g. *Contracts, grants, and gifts*

D. *Service*

1. *University Service*
2. *Professional Service*

**d.3. Information Supplied by the Department Head**

The department/school head will provide the following supplemental information for the candidate's package:

A. *Teaching*

1. Student evaluations
2. Peer teaching evaluations
3. Letters from former students

B. *Research/Creative Work*

1. Level of support statement
2. Assessment of scholarly contributions

C. *Outreach*

1. Confidential letters solicited by candidate addressing outreach contributions

**e. Promotion and Tenure Schedule**

All dates are approximate and are subject to change. Refer to the Office of the Provost website for specific dates in a given academic year.

- March 30 Candidate submits 4-6 names to Head for potential external reviewers
- April 2 Head/Promotion Committee identify potential external reviewers
- April 3 Head notifies candidate of dept./school selected external reviewers
- April 8 Head/Promotion Committee select final external reviewers  
[At CADC, 2 names from candidate's list, 1-2 names from committee list]
- April—May Head confirms list of final reviewers and sends letters to the reviewers
- June 15 Candidate external review dossier submitted to office for reproduction
- June 17 External review dossier package mailed to external reviewers by head
- September 15 External review letters due to head
- September 30 Dossier and any other internal review materials due to head (no new information added to file after this date). No external letters can be added to the dossiers

after October 1.

- October Candidate's presentation (if applicable) Department/School meeting to vote on the candidate. Department/school Committees should submit a summary of their deliberations to the Dean.
- November 1 Department/School recommendations and dossiers due to Dean's office. No external letters can be added to the dossiers after October 1.
- December 6 All recommendations and dossiers due to the Office of the Provost
- January 14 – March 14 All promotion and tenure deliberations and discussions completed
- March 31 Appeals received.
- May 2 Promotion and Tenure completed.

#### **IV. CADC Scholarship Criteria**

This section explains the CADC criteria for understanding scholarship relative to areas defined in the AU Faculty Handbook as teaching, research/creative work, and outreach.

Section V of this document classifies CADC criteria for classifying the accomplishment level of scholarship according to the system of "Highest Distinction", "Distinction" and "Acceptable". See IV. B. and V. B. below for more information on these accomplishment levels. The annual review process should take these accomplishment levels into consideration when defining performance descriptors (i.e. exemplary, exceeds expectations, meets expectations, marginal, unacceptable) for each faculty member's scholarship appointment. The appendix provides examples and assessment criteria for scholarly activity in the areas of teaching, research/creative work, and outreach.

The college standard is that a faculty member with a 25% allocation for scholarship should produce externally peer reviewed activities at a level appropriate to both the faculty's rank and disciplinary expectations. A tenure track faculty member with a 25% scholarly contribution appointment should have at least 1-3 items of scholarship at a Distinctive level each year. Refer to appendices of this document for information on determining if a scholarship item is at the Distinctive level based on the individual's disciplinary requirements and values.

Tenured faculty pursuing promotion to Professor rank are expected to achieve a body of work and activity commensurate with the establishment of a national reputation within their respective discipline. This reputation may be established via recognition for exemplary teaching and/or by a record of scholarship within their field, and should be substantiated both by the evaluation of their peers within their unit and via external peer review.

##### **A. Teaching Scholarship**

The CADC places a high value on teaching performance, and candidates for promotion and/or tenure are expected to demonstrate strength in this area. Because the CADC is a

proven leader in professional design and construction education, teaching is a viable arena for related faculty scholarly activity due to the potential for the scholarship to reinforce and strengthen the teaching mission and the professional disciplines.

General teaching activity is assessed annually by the department/school head and peer teaching evaluation. Teaching scholarship is different than general teaching activity. Information on teaching activity is included in the P+T dossier in order to contextualize candidate's requirements for scholarship.

Daily teaching activities, curriculum development, teaching/research/outreach activities, and international study program contributions may be contributors to teaching scholarship if there is related meritorious performance as evidenced by some form of peer review or other measurable impacts (such as awards). In particular, many faculty members in the CADC are able to demonstrate significant and frequent meritorious performance in the areas of teaching as evidenced by the receipt of national awards, the acceptance of peer-reviewed journal articles, and in national conference proceedings. Faculty are encouraged to apply for regional, national and international teaching awards and grant opportunities in order to advance the strong educational mission of the college and to demonstrate exceptional faculty performance in teaching.

### **B. Research/Creative Work Scholarship**

A strong culture of faculty scholarship in the form of research and/or creative work is essential to the CADC faculty's continued success in the promotion and tenure process at Auburn. Productivity in research and creative practice is important evidence of CADC faculty scholarship because it demonstrates our significance to external audiences, enhances educational opportunities for CADC students, and advances the respective CADC disciplines. Each faculty must describe an individual research/creative work agenda in section B.9 of the dossier. An initial review of each junior faculty's developing research/creative work agenda should be a vital component in the third year review.

For the tenure and/or promotion process, peer-reviewed or refereed work is valued more highly than non-peer-reviewed endeavors. Research/creative work valued by the CADC includes traditional peer-reviewed publications and other forms of scholarship. The individual departments, schools, and disciplines in the CADC are actively engaged in defining and determining the standards for each discipline within the larger context of the CADC and Auburn University requirements. In all CADC disciplines it is imperative for faculty to develop a sustained body of high quality work.

This CADC Guidelines document and appendix detail potential research/creative work scholarly activity in three categories of accomplishment: (1) scholarship of **Highest Distinction**, (2) scholarship of **Distinction**, and (3) scholarship that is considered **Acceptable**. [As noted in the Boyer report called "Scholarship Reconsidered" of 1990,] research/creative activity may include exploration and analysis of professional practice, original inquiry, outreach, and teaching, in addition to basic and applied research.

### **C. Outreach Scholarship**

The CADC has a strong history of outreach. As identified in the *AU Faculty Handbook, Chap. 3 .8.C.*, "outreach refers to the function of applying academic expertise to the direct benefit of external audiences in support of university and unit mission." In order to be considered outreach for the purposes of tenure and promotion, the faculty activity must meet the six criteria detailed in *Chap. 3.8.C.*

Outreach is an option for CADC faculty scholarship because it can be considered either “meritorious” or “scholarly” depending on the specific activity and the relevant documentation. Daily outreach activities, outreach program development and/or implementation, teaching/research/outreach activities, and international outreach opportunities may contribute to outreach scholarship if there is related meritorious performance as evidenced by some form of peer review or other measurable impacts.

All outreach activities must be documented with regard to significance and contribution. *AU Faculty Handbook, Chap. 3. C.2.C.* details the documentation requirements which are mentioned in an abbreviated form in this document. *AU Faculty Handbook, Chap. 3. Appendix A* includes a detailed example of the outreach section of a dossier. Outreach is not required of all CADC faculty, but is required of faculty who have a portion of their research/creative work time allocated to outreach efforts.

#### **D. Other Scholarship**

As members of a professional college, faculty in CADC have the opportunity to significantly impact their disciplines and establish a national reputation via meritorious performance related to service and collaboration in their community and profession. Criteria for assessment of these activities is found in the appendix.

### **V. Evaluating Teaching, Research/Creative Work, Outreach Scholarship**

CADC disciplines are varied and encompass different types of scholarship in the areas of teaching, research/creative work, and outreach. A detailed list with examples and assessment criteria is found in Appendix A: CADC Scholarly Activities/Awards and Evaluation of Significance. These activities represent an overview of scholarship and award venues and levels of achievement that are generally valued by CADC. Candidates are expected to have meritorious performance in at least two major areas i.e. teaching and research/creative work, teaching and outreach, or research/creative work and outreach. Meritorious performance in service is generally valued in the evaluation of collegiality and in the annual review process. Additional appendix information will be provided by each school and/or department if available. Appendix A also includes information related to interdisciplinary work which is encouraged by CADC in the context of a faculty member’s appointment.

#### **A. Categories**

Appendix A is organized into six primary categories of activities relevant to our faculty.

The categories of activities are:

- Peer-reviewed Publication
- Creative Work
- Acknowledgement of Reputation, Expertise, and Peer Recognition
- Funded Activities
- Outreach Scholarship
- Teaching Scholarship

Some activities fit into multiple categories.

## **B. Evaluation Levels**

Within the five categories, the significance of an endeavor and/or award is evaluated as Highest Distinction, Distinction, or Acceptable. Please reference the Appendices for specific information regarding the significance level of an activity or award.

Highest Distinction scholarship and/or awards demonstrate national reputation. A candidate progressing from associate professor to full professor must have Highest Distinction scholarship and/or awards in addition to Distinctive scholarship and/or awards.

Distinction in scholarship and/or award demonstrates the faculty member's potential for building a national reputation. A candidate for tenure and for promotion from assistant professor to associate professor should have substantial Distinctive scholarship and/or awards.

Acceptable scholarship and/or award indicates general productivity.

## **VI. Service**

At the CADC most service activities are related to the mission of teaching. As indicated in section II.B.3 above, all faculty members are expected to contribute some department/school service and university service.

Examples of service activities include but are not limited to the following:

- a. participation in departmental/college/university committees,
- b. graduate program officer,
- c. development of new academic programs,
- d. work on accreditation documentation,
- e. revision of curricula,
- f. recruitment of new faculty,
- g. holding office in a professional organization,
- h. committee work for professional associations.

For the annual assessment process, documentation of contributions in the area of service may consist of:

- Description of the service activity
- Explanation of how the activity contributes to the university, college, departmental/school mission
- Specific contribution of the faculty member
- Impact of the activity (was it evaluated or recognized as significant?)
- Description of activities and products

Also faculty may contribute service to professional organizations relating to their discipline (Professional Service).

## **VII. Guidelines for Post-Tenure Review**

Faculty are expected to be productive throughout their tenure at Auburn. The Post-Tenure Review policy is available from the Office of the Provost.

## **VIII. Appendices**

- CADC Workload/Overload Policy

- Appendix A – CADC Scholarship/Awards and Evaluation of Significance

Please address questions to:

Rebecca O'Neal Dagg, Associate Dean for Research and Academic Affairs.  
[onealrg@auburn.edu](mailto:onealrg@auburn.edu).

## **College of Architecture, Design and Construction Faculty Workload/Overload Policy**

### **Workload**

CADC faculty appointments are established each year during the annual assessment process for faculty as detailed in the document *CADC Guidelines for Annual Assessment, Promotion and Tenure, and Post-Tenure Review*. Appointment percentages may be allocated in the areas of teaching, scholarship [according to the *CADC P & T Guidelines*, scholarship includes research/creative work, teaching scholarship or outreach scholarship], service, and administration. For examples, refer to section II.B.1. of the CADC Guidelines.

A 95% teaching appointment requires a faculty member to teach 24 credit hours per academic year, according to Auburn University standards. A 70% teaching load equates to 9 credit hours per semester or 18 credit hours per academic year. Credit equivalency value for teaching activities that do not produce credit-hours, for the teaching of courses with no credit hours, or for the teaching of courses that do not meet minimum enrollment guidelines (Directed Studies, for example) should be determined during the annual assessment process, prior to the initiation of the upcoming academic year.

A scholarship appointment of minimum 25% is required for tenure-track assistant professors. The default service appointment at the CADC is 5%, and it should be appropriately adjusted within the context of the overall appointment.

In situations where a tenured associate professor or full professor is not satisfactorily fulfilling the non-teaching component requirement of his/her annual assignment, the corresponding school/department head will produce a memorandum of understanding (MOU) adjusting that assignment in order to ensure that the tenured faculty member is effectively fulfilling a 100% workload. In this case, the faculty member's workload will be readjusted to reflect a minimum of 10% scholarship, and the teaching load will be increased correspondingly. (This minimum percentage for scholarship has been defined in order to ensure that the faculty member will be able to stay current in the respective discipline relative to their teaching assignments).

In the case of such a readjustment of a faculty member's workload assignment, the corresponding school/department head must make it clear that neither tenure-track nor tenured faculty can be promoted based solely upon their teaching performance. For example, based on a 100% CADC faculty appointment comprised of 70% teaching, 25% scholarship, and 5% service, the reassignment would result in an appointment consisting of 85% teaching, 10% scholarship, and 5% service. The resulting 10% scholarship component will be assessed over a three year period. If this activity has not achieved a minimum average rating of "meets expectations" over the three year period, then there will be a proportional increase in the assigned teaching load. If, during the three year period, the faculty member's production in the area of scholarship and other non-teaching aspects of his/her workload shows the necessary improvement, there will be a corresponding reduction in his/her teaching load.

In those atypical cases in which a tenured faculty member has been unable to meet the minimum requirements of a 10% scholarship component, his/her workload assignment may be adjusted to consist of only teaching and service. These exceptions must be approved beforehand by the school/department head and the dean of the college.

### **Overload**

In those cases where a CADC faculty member is asked to teach courses in excess of the load previously established according to the individual annual appointment assignment, the faculty member and the respective head will review in advance the options for the accommodation of this revised assignment.

Overload accommodations may include additional compensation at a specific rate approved by the dean and provost. This rate is not related to the faculty member's nine-month salary; the current approved rate is \$2000 per credit hour. Other types of compensation may include a reduction in another area of the faculty member's appointment assignment; this reduction must be previously agreed upon by the faculty member and the corresponding school/department head.

To qualify for overload compensation, the faculty member must meet the following minimum requirements/qualifications:

- On the most recent annual performance review, a minimum overall evaluation of “meets expectations” must have been received by the participating faculty member in all performance areas (teaching, scholarship and service).
- The course being offered as an overload assignment must meet the provost’s minimum class size guidelines.
- Only one overload course per faculty member per semester will be permitted unless otherwise approved by the CADC dean and the provost; this includes credit-granting distance education courses.

These additional factors must be taken into consideration when defining overload course assignments:

- Untenured tenure-track and part-time faculty are not eligible to participate in the teaching of overload courses unless warranted by extenuating circumstances and with approval by the dean.
- Overload courses will not be approved for any faculty members during the summer semester.
- Teaching overloads will be assigned only if the faculty member is in agreement.
- Courses excluded from the overload policy include study abroad courses, distance education, internships, non-credit courses, directed studies, and practicum courses.
- All overload assignments must be approved in writing by the Dean’s Office and the Office of the Provost.
- To qualify for overload compensation, the faculty member must generate their normal teaching workload percentage through credit bearing courses.

Workload/overload policy revised October 25, 2010