INTRODUCTION

The traditional goals of higher education are the generation of knowledge through research, the transmission of knowledge through teaching; and the use of knowledge through service. The primary goal of the Department of Urban Planning in the School of Architecture, Design and Planning is the education of students who will receive a nationally accredited degree in urban planning. Faculty members in the department have responsibilities not only to the mission of the University, but also to their associated professional constituencies. The areas of teaching, scholarship, and service encompass the functions of a faculty member, which will be assessed relating to promotion and the award of continuous tenure. Except in highly unusual cases, promotion to any professorial rank is made only after the completion of the appropriate terminal degree. Any exception to this policy will be considered for endorsement by the School of Architecture, Design and Planning Promotion and Tenure Committee only in the instance of outstanding merit.

SECTION 1

STATEMENT OF PERFORMANCE EXPECTATIONS

For annual evaluation, the Department of Urban Planning utilizes the Statements of Performance Expectations outlined in Appendix B: Criteria and Procedures for Tenure, Promotion and Reappointment.

Unit Expectations

Faculty members in the Department of Urban Planning must engage in the three traditional areas of academic endeavor: teaching, scholarship and service. A primary function of the department is to provide an outstanding education to its students. Each faculty member is therefore expected to conduct classes wherein deep understanding and emergent knowledge are conveyed in clear and engaging ways, but also to supervise student inquiry, mentor and advise students, and engage in other teaching-related activities outside of the classroom. Scholarship encompasses not only traditional academic research and publication, but also other products or activities accepted by the academic discipline as reflecting scholarly effort and achievement for purposes of promotion and tenure. Service includes scholarly service to the discipline or profession, service within the university, and public service at the local, state, national, or international level.
The Department of Urban Planning adheres to the traditional faculty workload distribution ascribed by the University of Kansas wherein tenure-track faculty members are expected to allocate their time and effort in the following percentages: 40 percent teaching, 40 percent scholarship and 20 percent service.

**Standards for Acceptable Performance for Tenured Faculty**

As stated in the Faculty Handbook, “the University is committed to the principles of academic freedom and, within those principles, to the system of tenure. Tenure is an important part of academic freedom, but does not accord freedom from accountability.” As such, once a faculty member has been awarded tenure, it is expected that s/he will continue to engage in teaching, scholarship and service and to do so in a manner that is aligned with the mission of the department, the School and the University. The following have been established as defining the substandard level of performance in regard to teaching, scholarship and service, any one of which will initiate the process for failure to meet academic responsibilities.

**Teaching**

Threshold levels that indicate substandard performance in teaching include the following:

1. Refusal by the faculty member to negotiate a teaching assignment in any given semester.
2. Failure to attend the regularly scheduled class periods or have multiple unexcused absences from assigned classes. It is the responsibility of the faculty member to inform the Department Office in the event of the inability to attend classes and failure to make such notification will be defined as an unexcused absence.
3. Failure to meet acceptable levels of teaching performance in a calendar year as demonstrated through performance measures. These measures may include:
   a. Instruction Evaluation Reports for courses.
   b. Perceptions of advisees, recent alumni, and faculty peers. Peer evaluations are an important component of the assessment of faculty teaching.
   c. Other evidence, including peer evaluation of course syllabi, experimental teaching formats, the development of model teaching techniques, and similar activities.

**Scholarship**

Threshold levels that indicate substandard performance in research/creative activity include the following:

1. Refusal and/or failure by the faculty member to engage in a specific, ongoing program of research/creative activity.
2. Failure by the faculty member to have her/his research/creative activity accepted or acknowledged through external review at least once every three years.
3. Failure to meet one of the indices of scholarly competence as defined in Appendix B, Section 3.

Service

Threshold levels that indicate substandard performance in service include the following:

1. Refusal by the faculty member to engage in any form of service as defined in Appendix B: Criteria and Procedures for Tenure, Promotion and Reappointment.

2. Failure to perform negotiated service duties in any given calendar year.

Differential Allocation of Effort

Recognizing that not all faculty members are the same, the department permits the crafting of one’s workload and the pursuit of one’s strengths in a way that is aligned with the mission and needs of the department and in accordance with School and University policy. The department recognizes its role as part of the State of Kansas’ flagship research university, but also places high value on the quality of instruction and on the provision of service. The following paragraphs seek to guide faculty and administration in achieving the larger mission of the department while recognizing faculty individuality and promoting faculty excellence.

Differential allocation of workload may be negotiated at each annual review. Both teaching and scholarship components may not be negotiated to less than 20% of allocation and service may be no less than 10% and no more than 40% (except as described in Appendix B, Section 5). As the University of Kansas Faculty Senate Rules and Regulations states: “Teaching and scholarship should normally be given primary consideration, but the particular weight to be accorded each component of a faculty member’s activities depends upon the responsibilities of the faculty member.” In promotion decisions, the weighting of teaching, scholarship and service shall be proportional to the faculty member’s workload allocation.

The department is also open to negotiating offset loads wherein the instructional load of a faculty member may be higher in one semester than another. Faculty can bank their course loads in consecutive years to meet their usual course load required every two academic years. In any negotiation of offset load, the higher instructional loads shall be met in the earlier semesters, except in exceptional circumstances. As with workload reallocation, offset loads will only be negotiated in keeping with the mission and needs of the department.
SECTION 2

ANNUAL EVALUATION SYSTEM

Annual evaluations of faculty performance will be made on behalf of the department by the Chair. Assessments of faculty performance in each of the three areas of teaching, scholarship and service will be based on evaluations from multiple information sources and using diverse methods as outlined in Sections 2, 3, and 4 of Appendix B: Criteria and Procedures for Tenure, Promotion and Reappointment. The purpose of this diversity of evaluation methods is to ensure a balanced and comprehensive view of the individual’s contribution to the mission of the Department, School, the University, and the larger community. The annual evaluation process has multiple outcomes including establishing goals and allocation of effort for the following year, providing data for merit salary decisions and developing plans for faculty development.

Each faculty member will, in negotiation with his/her Department Chair, establish on an annual basis the relative degrees of emphasis he or she will place on the three areas of teaching, service, and research and/or creative activity. It is also recognized that the primary missions of higher education are teaching and scholarship, and in no instance shall the area of service be evaluated at a level greater than forty percent in the career of any individual faculty member, except as noted in Appendix B, Section 5. The candidate’s performance in regard to teaching, scholarship and service will be weighed according to the allocation of effort the faculty member was assigned during that calendar year.

Annual evaluations are conducted on the basis of a calendar year, and thus cover the spring semester of one academic year and the autumn semester of the subsequent year (as well as summer if the faculty member is on appointment). The Chair is responsible for disseminating to faculty the annual report form by the end of the fall semester of the calendar year being evaluated. Faculty are to submit complete annual reports to the Chair by February 1st of the subsequent year. The Chair is to disseminate draft versions of evaluations to faculty no later than April 1st. All tenure-track faculty must meet with the Chair to discuss the evaluation. Tenured faculty have the right to request a meeting to discuss the evaluation with the Chair.

Annual Report Preparation

The annual faculty review process is viewed as an opportunity for the faculty member to update and clarify his/her academic career objectives, and data collected as part of the annual review should become part of the member’s cumulative academic record that will be used in the promotion and tenure process. Faculty Annual Reports include a completed annual report form along with an updated curriculum vitae, all course syllabi, evidence of scholarly activity and any other supplemental information they seek to have inform the annual evaluation. Evidence appropriate to inform the annual evaluation is from the evaluation calendar year only. Guidance for submission of evidence relevant to the evaluation of teaching is available at: http://www.cte.ku.edu/documenting/evaluating/index.shtml. Faculty members do not need to submit the results of Student Surveys of Teaching.
Annual Report Evaluation

The Chair is to review all relevant evidence in regard to the performance of each faculty member in regard to teaching, scholarship and service. Each area of effort shall receive its own assessment and the overall evaluation of faculty annual performance shall be based on a weighting of those three assessments according to the faculty member’s allocation of effort for that year. A “poor” evaluation in any area of effort shall automatically result in a report from the Chair to the faculty member that suggests ways to correct this substandard level of performance for the subsequent calendar year. The Standards for Acceptable Performance for Tenured Faculty above identify the thresholds for substandard performance and therein identify the definition of “poor performance” within each area of effort.

Teaching

Teaching shall be evaluated in regard to the indices of teaching competence identified in Appendix B: Criteria and Procedures for Tenure, Promotion and Reappointment. In addition, the Chair shall endeavor to assess the degree of alignment between departmentally identified learning outcomes and Planning Accreditation Board (PAB) curricular requirements and the evidence of teaching submitted by the faculty member as well as consider the results of Student Surveys of Teaching distributed to the department. The Chair may consider mediating variables such as teaching overloads, status of first-time course offerings, alignment of teaching load to faculty expertise and the like in the assessment of teaching.

Scholarship

The Chair shall evaluate scholarship in regard to the indices of competence identified in Appendix B: Criteria and Procedures for Tenure, Promotion and Reappointment. Of particular value is scholarship that adds to the body of knowledge in the field, those efforts at scholarship that are disseminated in externally-reviewed venues and bring recognition to the School and University.

Service

The Chair shall evaluate service in regard to the indices of competence identified in Appendix B: Criteria and Procedures for Tenure, Promotion and Reappointment. It is expected that tenured faculty members will serve the University at multiple levels and in addition engage in service to the community and/or profession at local, national or international levels. It should be noted that membership to an organization is not the same as providing service to an organization.

Annual Evaluation Feedback Process

The Chair is to disseminate draft written summaries to the faculty by the date specified above. This summary shall note: the allocation of effort for the year evaluated, the subsequent year (as established during the previous annual review process) and suggest an allocation of effort for the following year; an assessment of performance in regard to each area of effort, an overall assessment of performance, and expectations for the subsequent year. Suggestions regarding progress toward promotion and/or tenure,
and/or strategies for improvement/renewal are to be provided as deemed necessary. The written summary must inform the faculty member of the opportunity to discuss the evaluation (tenure-track faculty must discuss the evaluation with the Chair).

**Conflict Resolution Process**

In the event that a faculty member disagrees with the Department Chair’s annual evaluation and subsequent discussions between the Chair and faculty member do not resolve the issues, the faculty member may request an administrative review by the Department Promotion and Tenure Committee. At that time, the faculty member may provide additional information to the Committee for its consideration. This committee shall issue a non-binding recommendation the Chair along with any additional information submitted by the faculty member relevant to their decision. Regardless of the Chair’s decision to retain or change the evaluation, the report of the Department Committee shall become part of the faculty member’s official file. If the faculty member is dissatisfied with the result at the program level, s/he may appeal at the School level according to the By-laws of the School of Architecture, Design and Planning. Similarly, recommendations for dismissal may also be appealed at the School level according to the By-laws of the School.

**Outcomes of the Annual Performance Evaluation**

The Department of Urban Planning views the annual faculty evaluation process as a comprehensive process yielding multiple outcomes. These outcomes include, but are not limited to, the initiation of discussions influencing a faculty member’s career and departmental planning, identification of faculty development or renewal activities, data for merit salary determination, documentation for special recognitions, and cumulative data supporting personnel decisions, such as progress toward tenure or promotion, reassignment of responsibilities, and risk for failing to meet performance expectations.

If a faculty member is evaluated as failing to meet performance expectations in an annual evaluation, the written evaluation shall be specific in describing those areas and ways for improving performance in each such area, or, based upon the performance trajectory of the faculty member, the Chair may propose differential allocation of effort away from problem areas to areas where performance is more satisfactory, subject to the necessity for the unit to meet its teaching, research, and service obligations and the need for all faculty members to contribute appropriately.

If a faculty member is evaluated as failing to meet performance expectations in any area of effort for two consecutive years, the Chair, in consultation with the faculty member, shall develop a written Plan for Academic Performance to improve the faculty member’s performance. The Chair shall give the faculty member 20 days to respond to the first draft of the plan, and seven days to any subsequent plan draft. Failure of the faculty member to consult with the Chair within those timeframes shall constitute a default acceptance of the proposed plan. The plan may include appropriate provisions for faculty development, such as campus opportunities for faculty continued renewal and development, or for other appropriate interventions, such as counseling, medical leave, or a change in teaching assignments. The plan shall present specific benchmarks and timeframes aimed at improving the faculty member’s
performance. Failure to meet any benchmark within its assigned time frame shall represent a failure to meet performance expectations and shall be reported as such in the appropriate annual evaluation.

If a faculty member is evaluated by the Chair as failing to meet the performance expectations of a Plan for Academic Performance, subsequent to having previously been assessed as performing below the threshold of substandard performance for two consecutive years, this shall by definition constitute a sustained overall failure to meet academic responsibilities as this Plan for Academic Performance shall constitute the “program for corrective action” identified in Appendix B, Section 7. Given that determination, the Chair shall recommend to the Dean that the faculty member be dismissed and the By-laws of the School of Architecture, Design and Planning shall be followed.

SECTION 3

FACULTY DEVELOPMENT INITIATIVES

Faculty development is defined as a continuous process in which the School, the University, and the individual faculty member work together to insure that the personal goals of the member and the missions of the School and University complement and enrich one another. Faculty development begins with the first academic appointment through the assignment by the Department Chair of a mentor to assist the new faculty member during the latter’s preparation for promotion and tenure. Faculty development continues throughout the member’s career through such institutions and programs as sabbatical leaves, leaves without pay, faculty exchanges, scholarly travel and research/creative activities, and teaching innovation and development funds and workshops. In addition, the Department Chair will make opportunities available (on a semester-by-semester basis) to the faculty member through reduced teaching, research/creative activities, or service loads in order to allow the member time to develop his/her academic career or address specific performance deficiencies. These opportunities will be subject to current resource availability and will be made at the discretion of the Department Chair. It will be the responsibility of the Department Chair to apprise the faculty member of development opportunities, while the faculty member will be responsible for initiating and completing the requirements of the various development programs to further and/or improve his/her academic effectiveness.
APPENDIX A

Instrument used for the Student Evaluation of Teaching

The Department of Urban Planning utilizes the most recent Student Survey of Teaching made available to departments by the University.

APPENDIX B

Criteria and Procedures for Tenure, Promotion and Reappointment

General Principles

The University strives for a consistent standard of quality against which the performance of all faculty members is measured. Nonetheless, the nature of faculty activities varies across the University and a faculty member’s record must be evaluated in light of his/her particular responsibilities and the expectations of the discipline. Teaching and scholarship should normally be given primary consideration, and the Urban Planning Department typically recognizes the 40-40-20 formula for weighting teaching, research, and service. There is some flexibility in this weighted formula to assign a differential allocation of effort to a tenured faculty member, in light of the needs of the tenured faculty member and the departmental needs and aspirations.

Teaching

Teaching is a primary function of the Urban Planning Department, which strives to provide an outstanding education for its students. The evaluation of teaching includes consideration of syllabi, course materials, and other information related to a faculty member’s courses; peer and student evaluations; a candidate’s own statement of teaching philosophy and goals; public representations of teaching; and other accepted methods of evaluation, which may include external evaluations.

High quality teaching is serious intellectual work grounded in a deep knowledge and understanding of the field and includes the ability to convey that understanding in clear and engaging ways.

The conduct of classes is the central feature of teaching responsibilities in the Urban Planning Department, but teaching also includes mentoring and advising students, supervising student research, and other teaching-related activities outside of the classroom. The Urban Planning Department recognizes that faculty involvement in independent projects, theses, and dissertations requires a greater time commitment than more typical advising duties. In evaluating this involvement, the Department further recognizes that graduate-level projects and chairing student committees require a greater level of faculty commitment and effort.
Expectations of Teaching Performance

For the award of tenure and/or promotion to associate professor, the record must demonstrate effective teaching, as reflected in such factors as command of the subject matter, the ability to communicate effectively in the classroom, a demonstrated commitment to student learning, and involvement in providing advice and support for students outside the classroom. While not expected, awards related to a faculty member’s teaching are further evidence of highly effective performance.

For promotion to the rank of professor, the record must demonstrate continued effectiveness and growth as a teacher, as reflected in such factors as mastery of the subject matter, strong classroom teaching skills, an ongoing commitment to student learning, and active involvement in providing advice and support for students outside the classroom. Teaching awards are further evidence of a successful teaching record, as are efforts to attract students from other departments to take appropriate planning classes.

Scholarship

In Urban Planning, the concept of “scholarship” typically encompasses traditional academic research and publication. Research is expected to culminate in some combination of activities that further the faculty member’s research agenda and that reflect the faculty member’s productivity in peer-reviewed settings. Typical outlets for scholarship include refereed journal articles, books, book chapters, book reviews, and published conference papers.

1. **Major Publications and Creative Activities** typically include: articles that appear in peer-reviewed journals; non-peer-reviewed journals of significant reputation in the field; books; book chapters that have undergone some form of peer-review; and papers published in peer-reviewed national conference proceedings.

2. **Minor Publications and Creative Work** typically includes book reviews, non-peer-reviewed book chapters, and other articles in trade journals, newsletters, magazines, and the like.

3. **Scholarly presentations** are an important part of an Urban Planning faculty member’s research agenda, but are alone insufficient for achieving promotion and tenure. Faculty members are expected to share their research with audiences of their peers, but ultimately that research should be turned into publications of some type. Major presentations would typically include those that undergo a peer review process, invited presentations that take place in front of a national, international, or lecture series audience, and the like.

4. **Grants and other Funded Projects** are further evidence of a faculty member’s success as a scholar. It is expected that funded research projects will produce publications, but also understood that there may be a time delay between receipt of a grant and publications stemming from the research. While grants are not an expected achievement of Urban Planning
faculty members, successful proposals will be regarded favorably as evidence of scholarly achievement during promotion and tenure.

5. *Interdisciplinary Research Collaboration* is an important aspect of the University of Kansas’s strategic planning efforts. While such collaboration is not expected, it provides additional evidence of a faculty member’s scholarly achievement.

**Expectations of Productivity**

For the award of tenure and/or promotion to the rank of associate professor, an Urban Planning faculty member’s record must demonstrate a successfully developing scholarly career, as reflected in such factors as the quality and quantity of publications or other scholarly activities, external reviews of the candidate’s work by respected scholars or practitioners in the field, the candidate’s regional, national, or international reputation, and other evidence of an active and productive scholarly agenda. In Urban Planning, it is generally expected that faculty members produce a minimum equivalent of one peer-reviewed scholarly work per year. A combination of minor publications and creative work may serve as equivalent to a major publication, although major publications remain the most important element of a faculty member’s scholarship. Joint-authored work is treated as the equivalent of sole-authored work.

For promotion to the rank of professor, the record must demonstrate an established scholarly career, as reflected in such factors as a substantial and ongoing pattern of publication or creative activity, external reviews of the candidate’s work by eminent scholars or practitioners in the field, the candidate’s national or international reputation, and other evidence of an active and productive scholarly career.

**Service**

Service is an important responsibility of all faculty members that contributes to the University’s performance of its larger mission. Although the nature of service activities will depend on a candidate’s particular interests and abilities, service contributions are an essential part of being a good citizen of the University. The Urban Planning Department accepts and values scholarly service to the department, school, discipline or profession, service within the university, and public service at the local, state, national, or international level.

**Expectations of Service Contributions**

For the award of tenure and/or promotion to associate professor, the record must demonstrate a pattern of service to the University at one or more levels (including the departmental level), to the discipline or profession, and/or to the local, state, national, or international communities.

For promotion to the rank of professor, the record must demonstrate an ongoing pattern of service reflecting substantial contributions to the University at one or more levels, to the discipline or profession, and/or to the local, state, national, or international communities.