

# UVA SCHOOL OF ARCHITECTURE: Procedure + Criteria for Tenured & Tenure-Track Peer Review

Prepared by the School of Architecture Faculty Council, 5/2/2016

---

## 1. Objectives:

- Review of the Research, Teaching, Service and Administration activities of tenured and tenure-track faculty for merit pay increase recommendations.
- Inform professional growth of each faculty member through the peer review.

## 2. Reviewers:

- The review committee will consist of five tenured faculty members.
- Each committee will be comprised of: one from the reviewee's department (who will head the committee), two randomly assigned members from any department, the reviewee's department chair or proxy, and a current member of the Promotion, Tenure and Reappointment committee.

## 3. Who will be reviewed and frequency:

- Every year for all tenured and tenure-track faculty members. The evaluation covers the past three years of activity.

## 4. Materials to be submitted to the Dean's Office for the review process:

- One-page Summary of Accomplishments during past 3 years
- Annual Report Form
- Updated CV

## 5. Process:

- Each committee will review and evaluate materials for ALL their assigned reviewees prior to a brief meeting with each reviewee. It is essential that the process is comparative across reviewees.
- Review committees will complete a Peer Review Evaluation form for each reviewee. The form summarizes the faculty member's performance, main achievements, and accomplishments over the review period, and assigns a metric to the evaluation as set out in item 6 below. Where appropriate the review will identify areas for future growth.
- Review Committee Chairs will submit the Peer Review Evaluation forms directly to the Dean's Office.

## 6. Criteria for evaluation:

4 = Significantly exceeds expectations

3 = Exceeds expectations

2 = Meets expectations

1 = Does not meet expectations

- Definitions of what constitutes excellence and expectations for research, teaching, administration and service is to be clearly defined by each department under the direction of the Department Chair, and set out in such a way that a reviewer outside of the department is understands the standards being applied.

- The relative weighting of the peer review components should be based on the standard School of Architecture ratio between research (40%), teaching (40%), and administration and service (20%). Unique circumstances, such as significant administrative or teaching loads, shall be taken into consideration when appropriate.

- Colleagues on family leave or on sick leave should be rated taking into account the forced absence or inability to perform at their usual level.

- Colleagues undertaking significant administrative duties in the Department, College, University, or in national or international organizations should be rated taking into account the demands that the administrative position puts on their ability to perform at the highest levels in research.

## DEPARTMENT OF ARCHITECTURE: Peer Review Evaluation Criteria

### RESEARCH

Faculty are expected to provide evidence of a coherent research activity. Depending on its nature, it will be built, published in specialized journals, published as a book or essays, exhibited, or disseminated through other media. Active research is demonstrated by honor awards for design, recognition in design competitions, publication of design work in internationally recognized journals and books, selection for biennales or broad impact exhibitions/events, articles in scholarly journals and other media, books published, digital projects, digital publications, curating exhibits and other activities. Invitations for lectures/presentation of research and creative work are additional examples of successful activity.

**4. Significantly Exceeds Expectations:** May include any of the following: awards in international competitions, major design honor awards, publications of design work in internationally recognized journals, publication of a book-length monograph on own creative work, a book-length peer-reviewed monograph, or other major multi-year peer-reviewed project and/or receipt of a major funded research fellowship.

**3. Exceeds Expectations:** May include any of the following: Publications of design work in internationally or nationally recognized journals, recognition in national or international competitions, and inclusion of creative work at national or international exhibitions, publication of an edited collection, the publication of two or more articles and/or chapters and other publications, curating an exhibit, lectures and presentations

**2. Meets Expectations:** Includes submission of creative work for publication, competition submissions, presentation of creative work at conferences or lectures, creative work included in local or smaller exhibitions, publication of an article, submission of an article, exhibit plans, completion of a book chapter, book reviews, encyclopedia articles and presentations of work at different forums including conferences, lectures, etc.

**1. Does Not Meet Expectations:** Indicates a faculty member who has provided no evidence of a coherent research program in progress and little to no scholarly activity.

### TEACHING

**4. Significantly Exceeds Expectations:** Indicates major awards for excellence in teaching, major grants for teaching projects, or introducing major new ways of teaching (especially with technology).

**3. Exceeds Expectations:** Indicates teaching awards or other public recognition as well as the introduction of new courses, significant revision of ongoing courses, and evidence of effective mentoring of graduate students (e.g., directing or reading Master thesis or PhD dissertations, successful progression of PhDs under direct supervision towards completion as reflected in the program calendar).

**2. Meets Expectations:** By teaching a normal load and receiving generally positive teaching evaluations.

**1. Does Not Meet Expectations:** Indicates consistently poor teaching evaluations, consistently low enrollments, or consistently offering the same courses without substantial revision over an extended period of time (in the latter case, except when department demands require a faculty member to offer consistently the same course without change), or failing to provide the required contact time or the basic documentation (syllabus, assignments, feedback, etc.).

### SERVICE

**4. Significantly Exceeds Expectations:** Indicates significant service to the discipline or institution, such as editing a journal, or organizing a national professional conference or accepting a major administrative role such as chair or other higher appointment.

**3. Exceeds Expectations:** Indicates tasks beyond the ordinary departmental responsibilities (chairs major departmental, school, university committees, such as a search committee, a P&T committee) and/or important service to the discipline (e.g. serving as an officer of a national professional organization, conducting outside review of tenure cases, serving as judge for PhD dissertations, major grants, conference organization, departmental reviews, reading for journals and presses, etc.).

**2. Meets Expectations:** Indicates a normal level of service, including productive participation on assigned department committees, appropriate service to the college and university, and normal service to the profession.

**1. Does Not Meet Expectations:** Indicates unsatisfactory performance on committees, an uncommonly low service record for their rank, or in some cases active refusal to accept committee service.

## DEPARTMENT OF ARCHITECTURAL HISTORY: Peer Review Evaluation Criteria

### RESEARCH

Faculty is expected to provide evidence of a coherent research project, normally but not always directed to the publication of a book, essays, exhibit, or other media. Active research activity is demonstrated by articles in scholarly journals and other media, books published, digital projects, digital publications, curating exhibits and other activities. Invitations for lectures/presentation of research and work are additional examples of successful activity.

**4. Significantly Exceeds Expectations:** Indicates publication of a book-length peer-reviewed monograph, or other major multi-year peer-reviewed project and/or receipt of a major funded research fellowship (NEH, Guggenheim, ACLS, etc.).

**3. Exceeds Expectations:** Indicates publication of an edited collection, the publication of two or more articles and/or chapters and other publications, curating an exhibit, lectures and presentations

**2. Meets Expectations:** Indicates a combination of: publication of an article, submission of an article, exhibit plans, completion of a book chapter, conference presentations, book reviews, encyclopedia articles and presentations of work at different forums including conferences, lectures, etc.

**1. Does Not Meet Expectations:** Indicates a faculty member who has provided no evidence of a coherent research program in progress and little to no scholarly activity.

### TEACHING

**4. Significantly Exceeds Expectations:** Indicates major awards for excellence in teaching, major grants for teaching projects, or introducing major new ways of teaching (especially with technology).

**3. Exceeds Expectations:** Indicates unusually high teaching evaluations as well as the introduction of new courses, significant revision of ongoing courses, and evidence of effective mentoring of graduate students (e.g., directing or reading dissertations, successful progression of PhDs under direct supervision towards completion as reflected in the program calendar).

**2. Meets Expectations:** By teaching a normal load and receiving generally positive teaching evaluations.

**1. Does Not Meet Expectations:** Indicates consistently poor teaching evaluations, consistently low enrollments, or consistently offering the same courses without substantial revision over an extended period of time (in the latter case, except when department demands require a faculty member to offer consistently the same course without change).

### SERVICE

**4. Significantly Exceeds Expectations:** Indicates significant service to the discipline or institution, such as serving as an officer of a national professional organization, editing a journal, or organizing a national professional conference or accepting a major administrative role such as chair or other higher appointment.

**3. Exceeds Expectations:** Indicates tasks beyond the ordinary departmental responsibilities (chairing major departmental/school/university committees, such as a search committee, a P&T committee) and/or important service to the discipline (e.g. serving on major discipline committees, such as C.A.A. or S.A.H. committees, conducting outside review of tenure cases, serving as judge for major grants, conference organization, departmental reviews, reading for journals and presses, etc.).

**2. Meets Expectations:** Indicates a normal level of service, including productive participation on assigned department committees, appropriate service to the college and university, and normal service to the profession.

**1. Does Not Meet Expectations:** Indicates unsatisfactory performance on committees, an uncommonly low service record for their rank, or in some cases active refusal to accept committee service.

## DEPARTMENT OF LANDSCAPE ARCHITECTURE: Peer Review Evaluation Criteria

### RESEARCH

Faculty are expected to provide evidence of a coherent research activity. Depending on its nature, it will be built, published in specialized journals, published as a book or essays, exhibited, or disseminated through other media. Active research is demonstrated by honor awards for design, recognition in design competitions, publication of design work in internationally recognized journals and books, selection for biennales or broad impact exhibitions/events, articles in scholarly journals and other media, books published, digital projects, digital publications, curating exhibits and other activities. Invitations for lectures/presentation of research and creative work are additional examples of successful activity.

**4. Significantly Exceeds Expectations:** May include any of the following: awards in international competitions, major design honor awards, publications of design work in internationally recognized journals, publication of a book-length monograph on own creative work, a book-length peer-reviewed monograph, or other major multi-year peer-reviewed project and/or receipt of a major funded research fellowship.

**3. Exceeds Expectations:** May include any of the following: Publications of design work in internationally or nationally recognized journals, recognition in national or international competitions, and inclusion of creative work at national or international exhibitions, publication of an edited collection, the publication of two or more articles and/or chapters and other publications, curating an exhibit, lectures and presentations.

**2. Meets Expectations:** Includes submission of creative work for publication, competition submissions, presentation of creative work at conferences or lectures, creative work included in local or smaller exhibitions, publication of an article, submission of an article, exhibit plans, completion of a book chapter, book reviews, encyclopedia articles and presentations of work at different forums including conferences, lectures, etc.

**1. Does Not Meet Expectations:** Indicates a faculty member who has provided no evidence of a coherent research program in progress and little to no scholarly activity.

### TEACHING

**4. Significantly Exceeds Expectations:** Indicates major awards for excellence in teaching, major grants for teaching projects, or introducing major new ways of teaching (especially with technology).

**3. Exceeds Expectations:** Indicates teaching awards or other public recognition as well as the introduction of new courses, significant revision of ongoing courses, and evidence of effective mentoring of graduate students (e.g., directing or reading Master thesis or PhD dissertations, successful progression of PhDs under direct supervision towards completion as reflected in the program calendar).

**2. Meets Expectations:** By teaching a normal load and receiving generally positive teaching evaluations.

**1. Does Not Meet Expectations:** Indicates consistently poor teaching evaluations, consistently low enrollments, or consistently offering the same courses without substantial revision over an extended period of time (in the latter case, except when department demands require a faculty member to offer consistently the same course without change), or failing to provide the required contact time or the basic documentation (syllabus, assignments, feedback, etc.).

### SERVICE

**4. Significantly Exceeds Expectations:** Indicates significant service to the discipline or institution, such as editing a journal, or organizing a national professional conference or accepting a major administrative role such as chair or other higher appointment.

**3. Exceeds Expectations:** Indicates tasks beyond the ordinary departmental responsibilities (chairs, major departmental, school, university committees, such as a search committee, a P&T committee) and/or important service to the discipline (e.g. serving as an officer of a national professional organization, conducting outside review of tenure cases, serving as judge for PhD dissertations, major grants, conference organization, departmental reviews, reading for journals and presses, etc.).

**2. Meets Expectations:** Indicates a normal level of service, including productive participation on assigned department committees, appropriate service to the college and university, and normal service to the profession.

**1. Does Not Meet Expectations:** Indicates unsatisfactory performance on committees, an uncommonly low service record for their rank, or in some cases active refusal to accept committee service.

## DEPARTMENT OF URBAN & ENVIRONMENTAL PLANNING: Peer Review Evaluation Criteria

### RESEARCH

Faculty are expected to provide evidence of a coherent research agenda and body of work, normally but not always directed to the publication of books, peer-reviewed articles in scholarly journals (such as JAPA, JPER, JPL, and others), book chapters, exhibits, and other media. Active research activity is demonstrated by books and articles in scholarly journals and other media, digital projects, digital publications, preparation and submittal of research proposals and grants received. Invitations for lectures/presentation of research and work, presentation of papers at major professional conferences (e.g. APA, ACSP, UAA), are additional examples of successful activity.

**4. Significantly Exceeds Expectations:** Exceptional performance might be evidenced by publication of a book or edited collection, the publication of at least one major article in a top-tier journal, two or more articles and/or chapters and other publications, lectures and presentations, and receipt of a major award (NSF, NEH, etc.).

**3. Exceeds Expectations:** Faculty member shows significant scholarly productivity, as evidenced by the following: publication of at least one article in a peer-reviewed journal, one or more book reviews, and one or more book chapters. Evidence could also include efforts to prepare and submit one or more research proposals seeking outside funding.

**2. Meets Expectations:** Progress can be expressed through a combination of the following activities: the publication of an article, submission of an article, completion of a book chapter, conference presentations, book reviews, encyclopedia articles and presentations of work at different forums including conferences, lectures, etc. Progress can also be expressed by preparation and submittal of one or more research grant proposals (NSF, NEH, etc.).

**1. Does Not Meet Expectations:** Activity is identified as a faculty member having provided no evidence of a coherent research program in progress and little to no scholarly activity.

### TEACHING

**4. Significantly Exceeds Expectations:** May be recognized in cases where a faculty member significantly surpasses the above expectations in a variety of ways. For instance, the individual may receive major awards for excellence in teaching, major grants for teaching projects, or introduce major new ways of teaching (especially with technology). Above-average activity may also be expressed, for instance, by an unusually high number of directed theses

**3. Exceeds Expectations:** A faculty member goes above and beyond in their teaching commitments. They have created and taught one or more new courses during the year, exhibiting creative and innovative teaching pedagogy, and evidence of commitment to student learning. Teaching evaluations are generally positive above average. The faculty member has taken on the tasks of chairing one or more thesis or PhD committees, and exhibits a commitment to effective advising.

**2. Meets Expectations:** Faculty is expected to receive positive student evaluations. Success in teaching can be additionally expressed through a combination of the following activities: introduction of new courses, significant revision of ongoing courses, and evidence of effective mentoring of graduate students (e.g., directing or reading dissertations, successful progression of PhDs under direct supervision towards completion as reflected in the program calendar).

**1. Does Not Meet Expectations:** Ranking is reserved for faculty members who consistently receive poor teaching evaluations, have consistently low enrollments, or consistently offer the same courses without substantial revision over an extended period of time (in the latter case, except when department demands require a faculty member to offer consistently the same course).

### SERVICE

**4. Significantly Exceeds Expectations:** Takes on particular tasks beyond the ordinary responsibilities of departmental life (chairing major departmental/school/university committees, such as a search committee a P&T committee, department chair) and/or important service to the discipline (e.g. editing journals, serving on major discipline committees, conducting outside review of tenure cases, serving as judge for major grants, conference organization, departmental reviews, reading for journals and presses, etc.).

**3. Exceeds Expectations:** Goes beyond the minimum expectations, and is actively involved in one or more of the following: serving on a major School committee or task force; actively participating in one or more department committees or service tasks (such as admission); faculty member also shows evidence of positive engagement in the larger community, university, and in the profession.

**2. Meets Expectations:** Require that the department member exhibit a normal level of service, including productive participation on assigned department committees, appropriate service to the college and university, and normal service to the profession.

**1. Does Not Meet Expectations:** Ranking is reserved for department members who show unsatisfactory performance on committees, have an uncommonly low service record for their rank, or in some cases actively refuse to accept committee service.