

Illinois School of Architecture  
Policies and Procedures Manual

**TABLE OF CONTENTS**

- I. Policy for Program Governance, Program Institution, Modification, Review, and Dissolution (pp. 2-4)
- II. Faculty Meeting Policy (pp. 4-5)
- III. Elected Committee Policy (pp. 5-7)
- IV. Faculty Grievance Procedures (pp. 7-10)
- V. Standing Committee Policy (pp. 10-11)
- VI. Initial Programs Establishment Policy (pp. 12)
- VII. Initial Executive Committee Establishment Policy (pp. 12)
- VIII. Promotion and Tenure Policy (pp. 13-15)
- IX. PT-2 Committee Transition Procedures (pp. 15)
- X. Diversity Plan (pp. 15-19)
- XI. Culture Policy (pp. 19-22)
- XII. Awarding ISOA Emeritus/Emerita Status Policy (pp. 22-25)
- XIII. Evaluation and Promotion of Specialized Faculty (pp. 25-28)

# **I. Policy for Program governance, Program institution, modification, review and dissolution**

*Distributed to all faculty by email attachment 4/7/2014*

*Approved with revisions by vote of the faculty 5/8/14 (see faculty meeting minutes)*

*Distributed to all faculty by email attachment 4/18/19*

*Approved with revisions by vote of the faculty 4/25/19 (see faculty meeting minutes)*

*Approved with revisions to P&T by vote of the faculty 4/25/25*

## **1. Number, Size and Contribution of Academic Programs**

- a. Number. Programs within the School of Architecture shall be limited to eight total School subunits.
- b. Size. A Program must have at least 5 members who hold 100% faculty appointments in the School of Architecture (hereafter referred to as faculty), not less than 3 of these faculty must have the Program as their primary affiliation.
- c. In extraordinary circumstances a Program may be constituted of less than 5 faculty. Formation of such Programs must be approved by a vote of the full faculty by paper ballot with a 2/3's majority approving the proposal.
- d. Contribution. See Bylaws, V. Organization of the School, A. Academic Programs, 2. Duties

## **2. Program Participation**

- a. Individual faculty, except the Director, shall participate in at least one Program, to be selected in consultation with the Director, the School's Executive Committee, the Program Area Chair, and the faculty of a Program. The Director shall serve as a non-voting ex-officio member of all programs.
- b. In addition to this primary affiliation, faculty, except the Director, are encouraged to participate in one additional Program through secondary affiliation. Such secondary affiliation is subject to approval through a vote by the faculty of said Program and consultation with the Director, and the School's Executive Committee.
- c. Faculty participate in a Program through research, instruction, governance, and outreach.
- d. In matters related to program governance a faculty member may vote in up to two Programs. However, in matters related to School governance a faculty member may vote only as a member of their primary Program.

## **3. Program Officers – Chair**

- a. Appointment. Program Chairs are elected by the faculty with primary affiliation with the Program from among the primary affiliated tenured faculty to serve a two-year term.
- b. Term. Chairs may serve a maximum of two consecutive terms. If a Program does not have an eligible tenured faculty member, then tenure-track faculty may serve. Election of said Program Chair is subject to review by the School's Executive Committee.
- c. Evaluation. The Director shall call for the annual evaluation of the Program Chairs by the faculty currently having primary and secondary affiliation with the Program. Annual reviews shall serve to improve the effectiveness of the chair and only in extraordinary circumstances shall the Director, in consultation with the Program faculty, call for the appointment of a new chair upon completion of the annual review.

#### 4. Program Meetings

- a. The Program Chair shall schedule regular meetings of the faculty of the Program but not less than twice each semester.
- b. Any faculty member in the Program may request a meeting.
- c. A record of activities shall be maintained each semester, which outlines the Program Area meetings, discussion points and major conclusions. This record shall be electronically archived by the Program Chair. At the conclusion of each year of a Chair's appointment, the Chair shall provide electronic copies to the Chair of the School's Executive Committee.

#### 5. Establishing New Programs

- a. After consultation with the Director, Executive Committee, and Program Chairs, a tenured or tenure track faculty member may choose to develop an area of special study intended to lead to the formation of a new Program. The assignment of faculty to such areas shall be evaluated annually by the Director in consultation with the Executive Committee.
- b. A new program proposal shall include (in writing):
  - i. A brief definition of the Program area
  - ii. A list of tenured and tenure track faculty who have agreed to participate in the area as their primary or secondary Program.
  - iii. A list of existing courses to be offered by the Program
  - iv. A list of courses to be developed by the Program
  - v. A summary of any resources needed to start up the program (financial and faculty)
  - vi. Evaluation of availability of proposed faculty
  - vii. An evaluation of the benefit and impact of the program offerings on the existing core undergraduate and graduate curricula
- c. The following approval process shall be followed for consideration of any proposals for new programs:
  - i. New program proposals shall be sent to the Executive Committee who shall review for conformance to School Bylaws for Program Areas and to determine the Program's means and manner of supporting the greater good of the School of Architecture.
  - ii. In consultation with the Executive Committee, the Director shall appoint a preliminary Program Chair.
  - iii. Proposed programs will meet with the Curriculum Committee to coordinate the Program Area's contribution to the core and elective offerings and secure Curriculum Committee approval.
  - iv. Upon approval of the Curriculum Committee (simple majority vote) the proposal for a new Program Area will be forwarded to the Executive Committee who will put the proposal before the Full Faculty for discussion and vote.
  - v. Programs shall be approved by a vote of the full faculty by paper ballot with a 2/3's majority approving the proposal.

#### 6. Review of Existing Programs

- a. Programs shall be reviewed by the School's Executive Committee for Program Area continuation every three (3) years.

- b. Program continuation will be based upon:
  - i. Number of faculty affiliated and active within the program area,
  - ii. Number of courses offered to graduate students in the Program area,
  - iii. Number of graduate students electing specializations within the Program area,
  - iv. The program's contributions to the general education of graduate students, undergraduate students, and the general welfare of the School. At each Program review, the School's Director, in consultation with the Executive Committee, will determine whether a Program is providing adequate contribution to the education and general welfare of the School and if the Program's original area definition still adequately delineates the scholarly area within which the Program operates.

## 7. Dissolution of Programs

- a. Initiation of Program Dissolution
  - i. The Director, in consultation with the Executive Committee, may initiate dissolution of any Program as a result of the triennial review process. The Program-affiliated faculty may also initiate dissolution of any Program.
  - ii. A proposal for dissolution of any program, whether arising from the Director or Program-affiliated faculty, must be presented to the Executive Committee in writing. Any such proposal shall clearly outline the reasons for dissolution.
  - iii. Having received such a written proposal, the Executive committee shall vote on the proposal for dissolution.
  - iv. Proposals for Program dissolution that are approved by a simple majority vote of the Executive Committee shall be forwarded to the Full faculty at the next scheduled faculty meeting for discussion and ratification.
  - v. Proposals for Program Dissolution brought to the full faculty by the Executive Committee must be approved by a 2/3's majority of Faculty. A paper ballot must be used for such votes.
- b. Plan for Phasing out a Program
  - i. Following ratification votes by both the Executive Committee and the full faculty to dissolve any Program, the Program faculty, in consultation with the Curriculum Committee, the Executive Committee, and the Director, shall propose a plan for phasing out the Program to ensure that any students currently completing specialization in that area are able to complete the curriculum in that area.
  - ii. Any plan for phasing out a program must illustrate completion of the process over not more than a three-year period.

## 8. Curricular Development

- a. Programs may propose specific course requirements and concentrations within their area for review and approval by the Curriculum Committee, the Executive Committee, the Director, and the School's Director of Graduate Studies.
- b. Approved course requirements and concentrations proposals shall be brought to a vote of the full faculty for ratification. A simple majority faculty vote is needed for any ratification.

## II. Policies for Faculty Meetings

*Approved by Faculty 05.07.13*

1. Setting meetings and agenda
  - a. Dates of general faculty meetings shall be fixed by the Director in consultation with the Executive Committee and announced at the commencement of faculty contracts each academic year.
  - b. Meetings shall be held between the first and last official days of the regular academic year.
  - c. The Chair of the Executive Committee shall provide faculty members with written notice of, and the agenda for, each meeting at least five calendar days prior to the date of the meeting.
  - d. Agenda items must be forwarded to the Chair of the Executive Committee at least seven days in advance of regular general meetings of the School faculty.
2. Decorum
  - a. The meeting shall be conducted according to *Robert's Rules of Order*.
  - b. Items introduced as new business at any regular meeting shall be introduced in the form of a resolution. In introducing the new business item, the sponsor may speak for not more than ten minutes in explanation of the purpose of the resolution. Items introduced from the floor as new business shall be held over for action until the next regular meeting.
3. Voting
  - a. Voting ordinarily shall be by voice vote of "yeas" and "nays." A vote count may be ordered by the presiding officer or when requested by any faculty member who is present and eligible to vote.
  - b. Voting on any issue shall be by private, paper ballot when requested by any faculty member entitled to vote.
  - c. Elections in which a tie or contest exists shall be voted by paper ballot.
4. Minutes
  - a. The Director shall appoint a secretary from the faculty at the beginning of each meeting. That secretary shall work with the School staff member recording meeting minutes to ensure that minutes accurately reflect the conduct and discussion of the meeting.
  - b. The Director shall be responsible for ensuring that the minutes of every regular and special faculty meeting are distributed within one week of the meeting.
5. Special Meeting Procedures
  - a. All procedures for a special meeting shall be the same as those for a regular meeting, including those of notice, agenda, quorum, and the recording of minutes.

### **III. Policies for Elected Committees**

*Approved by Faculty Vote 5.07.13*

*Approved with revisions by vote of the faculty 5/15/23 (see faculty meeting minutes)*

1. Executive Committee

a. Member Terms

- i. Elected faculty members shall serve two-year terms beginning on August 16 in the year they are elected.
- ii. Elected faculty members may serve no more than two consecutively elected two-year terms.
- iii. In case of a tie vote, the Director will vote to break the tie.

b. Elections

- i. Timing - Elections of members of the committee shall be held before the third Friday in April in the spring semester to replace those representatives whose term expires at the end of that academic year.
- ii. Notification - The Chair will send notification to the faculty of the need for and scheduling of an election for Executive Committee membership no later than the first week of April of each year in order to prepare to elect new members from among the eligible faculty.
- iii. The ballots shall include the names of all members of the faculty eligible to serve.
- iv. Votes shall be tallied by the Chair and Secretary of the Executive Committee.
- v. The Chair shall oversee the announcement of the election results.
- vi. A runoff election by paper ballot shall be held for any election in which a tie or contest exists.

c. Meetings

- i. The agenda for each meeting shall be distributed to all faculty one week before the meeting.
- ii. Meetings of the Executive Committee shall be open to all faculty, unless the meeting is declared closed when the agenda is distributed to all faculty as noted in Section 1.c.i. of the School's Policies for Elected Committees.
- iii. The first order of business shall be to approve the minutes of the preceding meeting.
- iv. Voting ordinarily shall be by voice vote of "yeas" and "nays." A vote count may be ordered by the presiding officer or when requested by any committee member who is present and eligible to vote. Voting on any issue shall be by private, paper ballot when requested by any committee member entitled.
- v. Voting in which a tie or contest exists shall be voted by paper ballot.
- vi. A quorum shall be three voting members.
- vii. The Executive Committee may meet in Emergency Session without one week's notice or a pre-published agenda to deal with business requiring immediate action. A pre-published agenda shall be distributed if possible. Minutes of an Emergency Session shall be recorded and disseminated in the same manner as a regular meeting and shall be open to all faculty, unless published as a closed meeting.

2. Faculty Grievance Committee

a. Member Terms

- i. All members serve a one-year term
  - ii. Members may not serve more than two consecutive terms
  - iii. No members may also serve simultaneously on the Executive Committee
- b. Elections
  - i. Timing - Elections of members of the committee shall be held before the third Friday in April in the spring semester to replace all members of the committee.
  - ii. Notification - The Chair of the Executive Committee will send notification to the faculty of the need for and scheduling of an election for Faculty Grievance Committee membership no later than the first week of April of each year in order to prepare to elect new members from among the eligible faculty.
  - iii. The ballots shall include the names of all members of the faculty eligible to serve.
  - iv. Votes shall be tallied by the Chair and Secretary of the Executive Committee.
  - v. The Chair of the Executive Committee shall oversee the announcement of the election results.
  - vi. A runoff election by paper ballot shall be held for any election in which a tie or contest exists.
- c. Meetings
  - i. The chair shall set the agenda for each meeting of the committee and shall distribute it to all committee members one week before the meeting.
  - ii. Meetings of the Grievance Committee shall be closed to the general faculty and school membership but members of the School who are named in any grievance shall have the opportunity to meet with the committee upon invitation.
  - iii. Voting ordinarily shall be by private, paper ballot. All votes shall be recorded in meeting minutes.
  - iv. A quorum shall be three voting members.
  - v. The minutes of each meeting shall be recorded. The duty of recording minutes shall rotate among members of the committee.
- d. Grievances
  - i. All grievances of any faculty or academic staff members of the School shall be made in writing to the Chair of the Grievance Committee.
  - ii. The Chair shall deliver all written grievances to the full committee as attachments to and meeting agenda when the grievance will be discussed.
  - i. All deliberations and decisions of the Grievance Committee shall be reported by written communication to those bringing or named in any grievance brought before the committee. Written communications shall be copied to the Chair of the Executive Committee and the Director.

#### **IV. Faculty Grievance Procedures**

*Submitted by Illinois School of Architecture Faculty Grievance Committee, March 21, 2014*

*Distributed to all faculty by email attachment 4/7/1014*

*Approved as distributed by vote of the faculty 5/8/14 (see faculty meeting minutes)*

I. Purpose:

The purpose of grievance is to provide mutual protection of the rights and reputations of the constituents the Illinois School of Architecture from being violated by each other, ranging from the individual faculty or academic professional to the committees, the subunits, and the School.

II. Applicable Cases

In principle, applicable cases of individuals may include, but not limited to, violation or infringement of the Right to Personal Welfare, including the right to be free from harassment or discrimination; Right to Academic Freedom; Right to Due Process; and Right to Governance of the School as specified in the applicable Statutes and Bylaws (Right to Governance beyond the School should be brought up to the similar committee at the appropriate level). At the organizational level, the cases may include any deliberate action of one party that can be claimed as having caused or could cause undue defamation to the reputation of another.

III. Grievance Structure of the University

University of Illinois has a layered grievance structure:

Resolution on an informal basis without formal appeal;

School Grievance Committee;

College Grievance Committee, and

Faculty Advisory Committee at the University level.

Also at the University level are various entities that are specifically designed to address various types of specific concerns most effectively. These include (from 4/08/13 Draft School Grievance Procedure):

Faculty Senate Committee on Academic Freedom and Tenure.

Personal Services Conflict Resolution Office.

Office of Equal Opportunity and Access(OEOA),

Office of Academic Human Resources (HR)

In addition, Unit Affirmative Action Officer at the unit level is also available.

Any member of the faculty or academic professional, or any organizational component of the Illinois School of Architecture who/that believes his/her/its rights or reputations have been violated or infringed upon may file complaints at any level of the University grievance structure. However, the School strongly recommends, as does the University, to try to resolve the matter on an informal basis first with the individual(s) against whom the grievance is being made before filing grievance internally with the Faculty Grievance Committee (FGC) of the School, and move



upward along the hierarchy only if acceptable resolution cannot be reached by the parties of concern. "External Grievance," be it within or outside the University, without efforts for internal resolution within the School may result in the loss of right for "Internal Grievance."

#### IV. Illinois School of Architecture Faculty Grievance Procedure

1. In the event that informal resolution cannot be reached, formal grievance may be filed in a timely manner with the Chair of Faculty Grievance Committee (FGC) of the School. The grievance should be explicitly stated in writing, including the facts relating to the matter and the resolution sought by the grievant. Grievance involving FGC itself, not the individual member, as a party must be filed with the Executive Committee.
2. Within 10 working days of receiving a grievance, FGC will inform, in writing, the individual(s) against whom the grievance is made ("the respondent(s)") of the matter under dispute, including the identity of the grievant. The respondent(s) will then be given the opportunity to reply in writing to the written grievance within 10 working days of receipt.
3. The grievant will be given the opportunity to file written "Reply to the Respondent's Rejoinder" with FGC within 10 working days of receipt of the rejoinder.
4. Within 10 working days of receiving the grievant's reply to the respondent's rejoinder, or after the lapse of 10 working days without such reply, FGC shall try to mediate both parties to find a mutually agreeable resolution. If successful, the case is closed at FGC level. All the original documents and materials furnished by any of the parties involved will be returned to the originators, and the rest shall be destroyed.
5. If no agreeable resolution can be found after a reasonable effort, FGC will proceed to hold fact-finding sessions concerning the allegation. FGA will establish a time frame for completing this stage of the process and will inform the grievant and respondent(s) of this schedule. During this process, all parties involved are entitled to present to provide relevant evidence, including testimony by other. They will also have the right to be accompanied by an advisor of his/her choice to any hearing. This process shall not be open to the public.
6. At the end of this process, FGC will deliberate the case and make a recommendation for resolution. FGC decisions should be desirably unanimous. However, if consensus cannot be reached after substantial efforts, majority rule shall govern. In this case, the descending vote must file Minority Report.
7. The decision and recommendation of FGC, accompanied by the findings, and the minority report if applicable, will be communicated in writing to the Director, or the Executive Committee (EC) of the School in case the Director is a party in the case. Within 10 working days of receiving the FGC recommendations, the Director or EC, whichever the case may be, shall either
  - a) communicate his/her/its intention to implement the recommendation to the grievant, respondent(s), and FGC; or
  - b) return it to FGC for further deliberation if he/she/it believes that the implementation of such recommendation would be unjust.

8. Should the recommendation be returned, FGC will reevaluate the case, and within 10 working days, forward the final recommendation with or without revision to the Director (or EC) for implementation. Without delay, excepting for extraneous circumstances, the Director (or EC) shall communicate his/her (or its) intention to implement the recommendation to the grievant, the respondent(s), and FGC.
9. Within 10 working days of the receipt of the Directors' (or EC's) Intention for Implementation of the recommendation, any of the concerned parties may file an appeal with FAA Grievance Committee with copies to the Director (or EC) and the FGC, although a direct appeal to the University Faculty Advisory Committee is not necessarily barred. Otherwise, the recommendation that the Director (or EC) intends to implement is considered accepted as being fair by all the parties involved, and the Director (or EC) will communicate the Plan of Implementation to the parties involved. The implementation must be timely.
10. The case involving fact-finding processes will be closed officially at the School level upon:
  - a) Completion of the implementation of the resolution at the School level, or
  - b) Filing of appeal with FAA Grievance Committee by any of the parties involved.
11. Upon closing of the case at the School level, any material or original document furnished by any of the parties involved shall be returned to the originator, and a complete set of copies of all the documents, including FGC originated ones, should be sealed and kept in the School for six (6) years at which time it will be destroyed.

## **V. Policies for Standing Committees**

*Approved by Faculty vote 5.7.13*

*Approved with revisions by vote of the faculty 5/15/23 (see faculty meeting minutes)*

1. Curriculum Committee
  - a. Member Terms
    - i. Faculty members are appointed for staggered two-year terms.
    - ii. Student members are appointed for one-year terms.
    - iii. Terms of faculty committee members shall be staggered so that not more than 3 members rotate off the committee in any year
    - iv. Appointed members cannot serve consecutive terms.
  - b. Faculty and student members of the Curriculum Committee shall be appointed by the members of the School's Executive Committee at that committee's last meeting in the spring of the academic year preceding appointment.
  - c. The five faculty members of the Curriculum Committee shall be appointed to, as nearly as possible, represent the diversity of the School's faculty and include faculty at all ranks whenever possible.
  - d. If not members of the Curriculum Committee, Program Chairs shall be invited as non-voting guests to any meeting where there is a need for input to coordinate between core degree curricula and the curriculum of any concentration.
  - e. Meetings

- i. The meeting agenda shall be distributed to all faculty one week before the meeting.
  - ii. The first order of business shall be to approve the minutes of the preceding meeting.
  - iii. All votes other than to approve minutes, shall be taken by secret ballot.
- 2. Promotion and Tenure Committee
  - a. Member Terms
    - i. Members are appointed for staggered two-year terms.
    - ii. Terms of committee members shall be staggered so that not more than 3 members rotate off the committee in any year.
    - iii. Committee members shall serve not more than two consecutive terms.
  - b. Faculty members of the Promotion and Tenure Committee shall be elected by the members of the School's faculty eligible to vote per the bylaws. In cases of promotion to Full Professor, all Full Professors shall serve on the Promotion and Tenure Committee. In cases of promotion of Specialized Faculty, a Specialized Faculty member at the appropriate rank shall be elected by the School's faculty eligible to participate on the appropriate Promotion and Tenure Committee(s).
  - c. Concurrent Membership on Other Committees. Faculty members shall not serve concurrently on the Promotion and Tenure Committee and the Faculty Grievance Committee.
  - d. Confidentiality. All meetings of the Promotion and Tenure Committee(s) are closed meetings and as such the discussions conducted during the meetings will be considered confidential where members in attendance are obligated to refrain from discussing the meeting transactions with those not in attendance.
- 3. Bylaws, Policies and Procedures Committee
  - a. Member Terms
    - i. Faculty members are appointed for staggered two-year terms.
  - b. Faculty members of the Bylaws, Policies and Procedures Committee shall be appointed by the members of the School's Executive Committee at that committee's last meeting in the spring of the academic year preceding appointment.
  - c. The three faculty members of the Bylaws, Policies and Procedures Committee shall be appointed to, as nearly as possible, represent the diversity of the School's faculty but shall only include tenured faculty at Associate and Professor ranks.
- 4. International Programs Committee
  - a. Member Terms
    - i. Members shall serve three-year terms, staggered so that no more than one member rotates off the committee each year.
  - b. Members of the International Programs Committee shall be appointed by the members of the School's Executive Committee at that committee's last meeting in the spring of the academic year preceding appointment.
  - c. Number of Consecutive terms need to be included here
- 5. Student Concerns Committee

- a. Members of the Student Concerns Committee shall be appointed by the members of the School's Executive Committee at that committee's last meeting in the spring of the academic year preceding appointment.
- b. Members of the Student Concerns Committee shall be appointed to, as nearly as possible, represent the diversity of the School's students and include a diversity of faculty ranks whenever possible.
- c. Members may not serve more than two consecutive terms.

#### **VI. Initial Programs Establishment Procedures**

*Draft April 30, 2013 – reviewed by faculty May 7, 2013 as guiding document for summer 2013 program development discussions.*

- a. In consultation with the Director, Executive Committee and the Curriculum Committee, tenured and tenure track faculty may propose the establishment of a program area.
- b. Initial program areas shall be required to provide in writing a list of tenured and tenure track faculty who have agreed to participate in the area as their primary or secondary Program.
- c. A new program proposal shall include:
  - 1. A brief definition of the Program area
  - 2. A list of existing courses to be offered by the Program
  - 3. A list of courses to be developed by the Program
  - 4. A summary of any resources needed to start up the program (financial and faculty)
  - 5. Evaluation of availability of proposed faculty
  - 6. An evaluation of the benefit and impact of the program offerings on the existing core undergraduate and graduate curricula.
- d. Initial Program Establishment requirements, as enumerated above, shall be in place until the last day of the second full semester following initial ratification of the bylaws in which Program Areas are established. After the aforementioned date the Policy for Program governance, Program institution, modification, review and dissolution, Part 3. Establishing New Programs, shall govern the establishment of program areas. All other requirements of program area governance as enumerated in the Policy for Program governance, Program institution, modification, review and dissolution shall be in place upon ratification of the bylaws in which Programs are established.

#### **VII. Establishing Initial Executive Committee Procedures**

*Approved May 7, 2013*

- a. All tenured faculty shall be eligible to serve on the Executive Committee unless they are on leave for one or both of the semesters of 2013-14 academic year.
- b. Ballots will be distributed via email to all eligible faculty members.

- c. Faculty will cast ballots by submitting choice of five candidates Chris Wilcock and Dianne Tellschow who will each record and tally the votes.
- d. The five (5) faculty receiving the most votes will comprise the School's Executive Committee beginning summer 2013.
- e. The members will identify 2 individuals who will serve for 2-year-terms and 3 individuals who will serve for 1-year-terms.
- f. The Executive Committee members will elect a chair at their first meeting following the committee's election.

### **VIII. Policies, Procedures, and Criteria for Promotion and Tenure**

*Distributed to all faculty by email attachment 4/22/2025*

*Approved with revisions by vote of the faculty 4/25/2025*

#### **1. General Purpose and Definitions**

The purpose of this document is to provide candidates for promotion and tenure in the School of Architecture with information to help them navigate the multi-year process and create their dossier. Architecture is a diverse field that encompasses a broad range of built environment scales and integrates research in the humanities, social and physical sciences, and technology with practice, teaching, public engagement, and service. Faculty pursue scholarly agendas across these subfields, developing a wide variety of portfolios related to creative practice, building technology, the social sciences, and architectural history, theory, and preservation. Fundamental to the tenure and promotion process is the respect of all faculty for this wide range of fields and the diversity of candidates' expertise. In return, individual candidates must be able to clearly define their own field of expertise, its standards for excellence, ways impact of work is measured, and how their work contributes to their discipline. Faculty at the University of Illinois may select from two pathways for research evaluation - the traditional path or the Public Engagement Research Option (PERO).

Candidate – refers to a tenure-eligible faculty member who is either required by U of I Urbana campus policies to be evaluated for tenure and/or promotion or who has self-identified their desire to undergo this evaluation.

Dossier – refers to the set of materials referenced in the U of I Urbana campus Provost's Communication No. 9 that each candidate must prepare prior to promotion and tenure evaluation.

Promotion and Tenure Committee – The School has two committees involved in tenure and promotion for tenure-eligible faculty; one that addresses promotion to Associate Professor with Tenure; another that addresses promotion to Full Professor. (See item 3 below for details about these committees.)

Public Engagement Research Option (PERO) – A recognized and structured pathway to promotion for faculty members at the University of Illinois who draw on their expertise to engage in scholarship that addresses societal problems, concerns, issues, or interests in sustained partnership with public or private communities or organizations at the local, state, national or international level for mutually beneficial exchange of knowledge and resources in a context of partnership and reciprocity.

UEO – Refers to the Unit Executive Officer. For the School of Architecture, the UEO is the School's Director.

## **2. Tenure and Promotion Process for Tenured and Tenure-Track Faculty:**

*Provost's Communication No. 9* and the *College of Fine and Applied Arts Promotion and Tenure Policies and Procedures*, available on the campus and college websites respectively, outline the general process and standards for promotion and tenure, summarized below.

In addition to University and College requirements and procedures, those tenure-eligible candidates for Promotion and Tenure in the School of Architecture should prepare, as part of their formal dossier, a teaching portfolio that documents student work along with supporting material (syllabi, program briefs, assignment descriptions, etc.) and supporting materials that provide evidence of their scholarly efforts and outcomes (e.g., a portfolio of scholarly work).

Review of Faculty in the Probationary Period - In tenure code year two, faculty in tenure-eligible positions need to begin preparing for a third-year review or "Review of Faculty in Year Three of the Probationary Period." This review is guided by the content of Provost's Communication #13 available on the Urbana Campus Provost's website. The purpose of the third-year review is to provide a candid assessment of an individual's professional development and his or her prospects for being recommended for indefinite tenure at the end of the probationary period.

The third-year review is an evaluation that considers each aspect of a faculty member's performance that will eventually be assessed in the final tenure review. The third-year review will include an assessment of the strengths and weaknesses of the faculty member's efforts within each area of their responsibilities. Shortcomings will be noted as will suggestions for resources to assist the faculty member to address these. Likewise, strengths will be indicated during this review. The third-year review will also provide the faculty member with clear expectations for the remaining pre-tenure time. The faculty member will be informed in writing of the results of the third-year review, and that the results of the review will become part of the faculty member's departmental personnel file. It is important to note that the third-year review is meant to be constructive and provide critical feedback, but its results do not determine or suggest any future decisions on promotion and tenure.

In tenure code year two, faculty in tenure-eligible positions need to choose one of two possible paths for tenure and first promotion: 1) the traditional path of scholarship or 2) the Public Engagement Research Option (PERO). Choice of path should be made in tenure code year two because this choice will determine key steps in a faculty member's preparation for the third-year review.

All candidates should fill out all parts of the Communication #9 CV template, including itemized lists of accomplishments in each area of the template and all statements of Research, Teaching, Service and DEI. Candidates should also compile supplementary materials that provide evidence of significant achievements in research and teaching as these will accompany submissions of the Communication #9 CV and statements.

For candidates selecting the Public Engagement Research Option, a memorandum of understanding (MOU) will be completed in the spring semester of the second year. The MOU will be reviewed by the campus Pero Advisory Committee in the fall of the third year. The MOU will identify appropriate external evaluators from outside the academy; outline and describe the public engagement research; and "specify the products and means of evaluation reflecting societal impact." See Provost Communication 9, Section 3.3.8.3 and the Public Engagement Research Option Guide for guidance and the MOU template.

Timeline for the Fifth Year Review Process – In the academic year prior to tenure and/or promotion decisions, typically when a candidate is Tenure Code Year 5 for first promotion, the candidate should finalize their dossier for promotion. Dates below are based on University and College documents and should be confirmed by candidates each year:

- Spring of Tenure Code Year 4: Candidate meets with UEO or their designate to outline expectations for Tenure Code Year 5 and to begin preparation of the dossier and accompanying materials.
- September 1: Candidate meets with the UEO about process for the coming 2 years
- January 15: Candidate submits their draft dossier and their list of suggested external reviewers to School (per FAA timeline). For candidates who have selected PERO, the list will include non-academic external reviewers per the candidate's PERO MOU. If a candidate chooses not to continue with the PERO, this is the deadline to make that decision and instead to pursue the traditional path.
- February 1: UEO submits proposed list of external reviewers (combining candidate's and school's lists) to the college, with bios. (per FAA timeline).
- February 15: The School's UEO, or their designate, returns draft dossier to candidate with suggestions from UEO and any designated advisory members (per FAA timeline)
- March 1: Candidate returns their revised dossier to the UEO via UEO's assistant; unit sends draft to College for review (per FAA timeline)
- April 1: College returns the dossier to unit with comments. Subsequently, UEO and any designated UEO representatives return the dossier with comments to candidate for revisions. (per FAA timeline)

- April 8: College makes any suggestions regarding proposed reviewers (per FAA timeline)
- April 15: Candidate provides final version of dossier and supporting materials for circulation to external reviewers.
- April 21: UEO confirms willingness of reviewers to serve (per FAA timeline)
- May 15: Unit sends dossiers and supporting materials (i.e. portfolios) to external reviewers, without departmental evaluations (per FAA timeline)
- May 30: Unit sends draft internal reviews to college. (optional, per FAA timeline)
- July 1: College returns comments on departmental evaluations (per FAA timeline)
- August 1: External reviews due to unit. Final opportunity for candidate to add to dossier. Unit assembles dossiers (including departmental evaluations), external letters, and supporting materials for unit P&T committee review (per FAA timeline).

Academic Year of tenure and/or promotion decision:

- Sept. 15: Unit P&T committee(s) review(s) dossier with departmental evaluations, external letters, and supporting materials, meets to discuss case and develop findings, and subsequently vote(s) on the case (per FAA timeline)
- Sept. 30: UEO reviews committee findings, advances case or informs candidate of denial (per FAA timeline)
- October 7: For denials, UEO meets with candidate to review appeal options per campus policies (see Provost's Comm #10); discusses future timeline (per FAA timeline)
- October 21: College P&T committee reviews case, then votes or issues questions to UEO (per FAA timeline)
- December 1: College P&T committee reconvenes for final deliberations and voting (per FAA timeline)
- December 7: Dean reviews findings, decides whether to advance case. For denials, college issues notice of non-reappointment (per FAA timeline)
- December 15: College submits recommendations for promotions to the Office of the Provost and Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs (per Comm. #9)
- January – May: Campus P&T committee reviews case and makes recommendation to the Provost and Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs

### **3. School's Promotion and Tenure Committees: role and scope of their work**

*Per Provost's Communication No. 9, C2*, the School elects one committee of tenured faculty members to serve on the Promotion and Tenure Committee overseeing promotion and tenure cases of untenured faculty. A separate committee, of all full professors in the School, oversees cases of promotion from associate to full professor. The role, process of member selection, and compositions of the School of Architecture's promotion and tenure committees is detailed in the School's Bylaws, Section VIII.B.



The Committees are responsible for arranging teaching observations and for reviewing candidates' dossiers, internal evaluative reviews of teaching, research, service, and DEI, and external review letters. Based on those, the committees discuss and vote on advisory recommendations to the UEO.

#### 4. Criteria for Promotion

The University's general criteria for Promotion and Tenure are defined in Communication #9:

*"Promotion and tenure decisions involve a holistic evaluation of not only past performance, but also the likelihood of continued excellence. The university is committed to excellence in research, teaching, and service but recognizes that it is rare for an individual case to achieve equal excellence in all three domains. For most faculty members, the primary basis for promotion and tenure will be the candidate's record of research and teaching, with consideration also being given to service as well as public engagement and diversity, equity, and inclusion in research, teaching, and service. Promotion and tenure will generally be awarded only if there is evidence of excellent research accomplishments and a strong record of teaching and service. However, it may also be that excellence in teaching and service activities will meet the requirements for promotion and tenure as long as the candidate's research accomplishments are sufficiently strong."*

The Promotion and Tenure Committees review candidate dossiers to assess the "past performance" and "likelihood of continued excellence," per this definition. Candidates' dossiers must demonstrate *originality, trajectory, and impact* to evidence excellence in research, teaching, service, public engagement, and diversity, equity, and inclusion.

This document provides additional, specific criteria for evaluation that is used in the School of Architecture. There is no single path to tenure or professorship, but candidates considering tenure and/or promotion should understand that the following questions will be asked by the promotion and tenure committee when evaluating each candidate's research, teaching, and service:

- How does the candidate's scholarship, teaching, and service compare among their peers at peer and aspirant institutions in terms of range, depth, and quality?
- Have they achieved significant results in their field?
- Has their work appeared in important and appropriate venues for time in rank?
- How have they contributed toward a diverse community characterized by equity and inclusion in at least one of the three domains?
- Does their work represent an upward, original, and impactful trajectory?
- Do they show potential for national and/or international leadership in their field?
- Will granting indefinite tenure and/or promotion be in the best interest of the School of Architecture, the College of Fine and Applied Arts, and the University of Illinois?

A candidate's narratives included in their dossier should frame their teaching, research, and service efforts with respect to these questions, and use evidence and outcomes from their work to demonstrate overall excellence in their area(s) of focus.

Per University of Illinois Urbana campus policy, the P&T committee will consider efforts within research, teaching, and service, along with public engagement and diversity, equity, and inclusion in a holistic evaluation of both past performance and likelihood of continued excellence. The School's committee will assess candidates' records based on the University's requirement for "overall excellence." See Contributions to Excellence, Comm #9 pg. 8. When preparing a comprehensive dossier for promotion and tenure evaluation, candidates should address the following areas.

- Research/Creative Activity - evaluated through a dossier/portfolio of peer-reviewed creative, professional, and/or scholarly work;
- Teaching - evaluated through a dossier including a teaching portfolio, collection of teaching assessments conducted by peers within and occasionally outside the candidate's unit, and student feedback;
- Service - evaluated through a record of service roles and contributions to the department, college, university, profession, and/or community;
- Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion - evaluated through evidence of contribution in at least one of the three categories above.

### External Letters

There are two different processes for selecting external evaluators - one for the traditional path and one for the Public Engagement Research Option.

Traditional Path - External letters written by full professors at peer and aspirant institutions who are experts in the candidate's field<sup>1</sup> are particularly important for evaluations of the candidate's research portfolio. Close collaborators, thesis and dissertation advisors and committee members, and individuals who are employed at an institution where the candidate earned a degree, may not serve as external reviewers. During their probationary period, candidates should work to establish professional networks of individuals familiar with their scholarship. This will allow a wide pool of potential reviewers. Candidates with questions about possible reviewers or peer/aspirant institutions should consult the UEO.

PERO - For candidates pursuing the Public Engagement Research Option, direction on external letters comes from Comm 9, Section 3.3.10.1: "two of the five letters must be from experts

---

<sup>1</sup> In rare promotion and tenure cases, and with College of FAA guidance, a full professor expert in the candidate's field who teaches at an institution other than peer or aspirant, may serve as an external letter writer.

*outside* academia who can objectively evaluate the impact of the candidate's publicly engaged research (e.g., someone in another community who holds a parallel position to a community partner, a leading public figure, or an expert in industry or government). *These letters should carry the same weight as the letters from experts in academia* (for the full set of guidelines for selecting these letters, see the *Public Engagement Research Option Guide*). It is also advised that at least one of the five letters be from a publicly engaged scholar in the candidate's field at an academic institution."

## RESEARCH AND CREATIVE ACTIVITY

In the School of Architecture, research may encompass activities such as scholarly work, creative design work, exhibition, community engaged scholarship, professional consultancy and/or design work (see Comm #9 pg. 7). Review of candidates' dossiers will consider a balance of quantity, constancy, and quality, the latter being evidenced by *peer review* and *invitation*.

Wherever the candidate's work is focused, evidence of achievement should demonstrate *originality, trajectory, and impact*:

- *Originality*: the work produces new knowledge, fresh ideas, and/or projects that expand our understanding, move the discipline forward, and/or bring about positive change in a community.
- *Trajectory*: the body of work demonstrates a clear trajectory with a coherence in theme, approach, and/or results that is extensive, robust, and sustainable. Candidates on tenure track should evidence promise of becoming a leader in their field, bringing national and/or international recognition to themselves, the School, and the University. Candidates for promotion to Full Professor should demonstrate further development as a national/international leader in their field. A candidate's Comm #9 may include work completed prior to their appointment in the School of Architecture at the University of Illinois. The weight of any such prior work in the School's P&T review will vary among candidates depending on currency, coherence, and trajectory. Early in their appointment in the School of Architecture, each candidate should discuss their P&T dossier development with the UEO including the role of work completed prior to their tenure-eligible appointment.
- *Impact*: the peer-reviewed work reaches an appropriately focused and sized audience in academia, the profession, and/or through public engagement. For some fields and architecture subfields, this is evidenced by measurements like Impact Factor, h-index, number of citations, or other discipline-appropriate scales where relevant. Work demonstrates impact through its citation, use, and/or discussion in meaningful ways by its intended audience. Publicly engaged work should demonstrate impact through positive, meaningful, and measurable community transformation.

For candidates pursuing PERO, research evidence must comprise two types of scholarly outcomes and dissemination: 1) traditional scholarly work that has undergone evaluation through academic peer review, 2) work for public audiences, professional entities, and communities that produces content and products of value for partners and their needs. Client-based commercial work is not appropriate content for a portfolio of work submitted for the PERO option.<sup>2</sup>

Publicly engaged research should involve sustained engagement distinct from a faculty member's teaching efforts and any engaged studio or coursework. The process and outcomes of these public engagements should evidence extensive involvement from a breadth of stakeholders, interdisciplinary inputs where appropriate, products showcasing depth of knowledge in the faculty member's field of specialization, and processes and methodologies that push the design professions in new directions. The body of work should expand beyond object or product-based items to be inclusive of a socio-spatial, economic, political, involved context. A faculty member's value-based motivations and theoretical foundations should be evident in the body of work and should become the basis for the narrative for the PERO-focused research statement in the candidate dossier.

PERO is a highly structured process as the PERO MOU documents suggest, and it requires a high degree of advance planning, engagement with partners in shaping research trajectories and outcomes, and development of the agenda across time. Mentors with experience in structuring public and community partnerships and finding appropriate means to produce scholarly work based on those partnerships are essential.

Peer review in Architecture may take traditional academic forms, but the School recognizes that it may also occur in practice or creative settings, in the form of juried competitions, articles in the professional and/or regional/national press, and/or invitations to lecture, serve on juries, participate in charrettes, exhibitions, etc. in venues beyond the Urbana campus. Whatever the venue, peer review occurs when the candidates' work is positively and independently assessed, without bias or conflict of interest, by others in the field who have appropriate knowledge and background.

Candidates may demonstrate impact and/or peer review in a variety of outlets<sup>3</sup>, including but not limited to:<sup>4</sup>

- Honors, Recognitions, and Outstanding Achievements;
- Invited Lectures and Invited Conference Presentations (these are distinct from and with higher impact than peer-reviewed venues);
- Offices Held in Professional Societies;

---

<sup>2</sup> See Appendix C for a non-exclusive list of possible venues and examples of PERO scholarly work.

<sup>3</sup> See Appendix A for a non-exclusive list of possible venues for peer review of a broad range of architectural research and creative activity.

<sup>4</sup> Note that the following list reflects many categories found in Provost's Communication #9 as well as some that are specific to architectural scholarship and practice. The order of listing reflects a hierarchy of significance embedded in the Comm.#9 dossier template.

- Editorships of Journals or Other Learned Publications;
- Grants Received from Sources External to the University of Illinois Urbana campus;
- Review Panels Outside the University of Illinois Urbana campus;
- Books authored or co-authored, published by University or scholarly presses, or by presses that serve the professional community;
- Books edited or co-edited, published by University or scholarly presses, or by presses that serve the professional community;
- Invited and/or Peer-reviewed Chapters in Books, published by University or scholarly presses, or by presses that serve the professional community;
- Monographs, published by University or scholarly presses, or by presses that serve the professional community;
- Articles in journals with double-blind peer review processes, including those published by or associated with respected scholarly societies;
- Creative Works (e.g., architectural designs for buildings, urban spaces, landscapes, interiors, installations or exhibitions) that have been distinguished by peer-recognition through, for example: design awards programs, placing in juried competition, inclusion in juried exhibitions, professional and/or popular press coverage;
- Curation and/or design of scholarly exhibitions;
- Patents
- Articles in the professional and popular press
  - Bulletins, Reports, or Conference Proceedings with double-blind peer review processes;
  - Abstracts published in Journals or Conference Proceedings with double-blind peer review processes;
  - Book Reviews
  - Paper presentations at conferences with double-blind peer review processes;
  - Citations in other scholars' work
  - Consulting
  - Professional Commissions

a. Evaluation Criteria for Promotion to Associate and Full Professor

Per Comm. #9:

*"Promotion to associate professor with indefinite tenure should be recommended only if a candidate shows concrete evidence of accomplishments. It should be clear that the candidate exhibits real promise of becoming a leader in their field. Recommendation for tenure should be based on an assessment that the candidate has made contributions of an appropriate magnitude and demonstrates a high likelihood of sustaining contributions to the field and university."*

*“Recommendation for promotion to full professor should include concrete evidence of national or international stature in the candidate’s field. The recommendation should be based on an assessment that, since the last promotion, the candidate has made contributions of appropriate magnitude, independence, and quality. The candidate should demonstrate the ability to sustain such contributions to their field and the university. In making an assessment, it is the totality of the contribution since the promotion to associate professor, rather than the amount of time that has passed or the consistency in research production, that is relevant. Supervision of graduate or professional students to degree completion (or for faculty in positions with limited engagement in graduate or professional education, corresponding achievements involving undergraduates) is expected for the promotion to full professor.”*

In addition, the School’s committees will assess the candidate’s potential for or, in the case of Promotion to Full Professor, evidence of leadership in their field.

## **TEACHING**

Faculty are expected to demonstrate high achievement in teaching. Contributions to teaching include course-based teaching, advising, mentoring, and a range of other activities (access the University of Illinois’ Definition of Teaching Excellence through links on the Provost’s website). Faculty should demonstrate a consistent record of effective classroom teaching as well as innovative and/or evolving teaching pedagogy, methods, courses, and/or programs and to contribute to the advising and mentoring of students, and overall curricula, co-curricular, and extra-curricular dimensions of the school.

A faculty member must present evidence of student and peer validation of their teaching and advising efforts through a teaching portfolio. This portfolio should include a range of student work, course material such as syllabi, representative lecture notes and/or slides, etc. Faculty are encouraged to make use of Urbana campus resources such as those coming from the Center for Innovation in Teaching and Learning (CITL) and the Office of the Provost Teaching Advancement area.

## **SERVICE**

Faculty are expected to contribute to school, college, university, professional, local, state, national, and/or international communities through leadership, expert consultation, and/or organizational assistance. Faculty are expected to serve on committees, task forces, etc., and to assume leadership roles appropriate to their faculty rank.

## **DIVERSITY EQUITY & INCLUSION**

Per Comm. #9,

*“all faculty are expected to make contributions to diversity, equity, and inclusion in at least one of the three domains (i.e., research, teaching, and service).”*

Candidates are advised to consult the latest version of the Guide To Diversity, Equity, And Inclusion (DEI) Work In The Promotion And Tenure Process, available on the Urbana Campus Provost’s Office website, for examples of relevant Institutional, Programmatic, and Organizational activities in Research, Teaching, and Service. This document also includes guidance for candidates on planning DEI work and communicating their contributions in their required DEI statement.

## **Appendix A:**

Non-exclusive and evolving list of venues for peer review of architectural research and creative activity.

### **Journals**

The following lists of journals focus on hard-copy and digital journals that address architecture and design generally and some sub-fields. There are a broad range of journals that address sub-specializations in architecture. One can increase the likelihood of successful publication by researching and selecting journals that are most closely aligned with the focus of their scholarship.

#### **Scholarly Journals (highly competitive)**

*Advanced Materials*

*Architectural Histories* (EAHN)

*Architectural History* (UK)

*Architectural Science Review*

*Architectural Theory Review* (UK)

*Architecture and Culture*

*ARQ* (Architectural Research Quarterly) (UK)

*(The) Art Bulletin*

*Art History*

*Ashrae Journal*

*Automation in Construction*, Elsevier

*Building and Environment*, Elsevier

*Building Research & Information*

*Building Simulation*

*Buildings and Landscapes* (Journal of VAF)

*Built Environment*

*Construction History* (UK)

*Energy* (Science Direct)

*Energy and Buildings*, Elsevier

*Engineering Structures*, Elsevier

*Future Anterior*

*Harvard Design Magazine*

*Heritage and Society*

*International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health*

*International Journal of Heritage Studies*

*International Journal of Intangible Heritage*

*JAE* (Journal of Architectural Education)

*Journal of Applied Social Psychology*

*Journal of Architectural and Planning Research*

*Journal of Architectural Conservation*

*Journal of Architectural Engineering*, ASCE



*Journal of Architecture*  
*Journal of Building Engineering*, Elsevier  
*Journal of Building Performance Simulation*, Taylor & Francis  
*Journal of Cultural Heritage*  
*Journal of Environmental Psychology*  
*Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health*  
*Journal of Green Buildings*  
*Journal of Lighting Research & Technology*  
JSAH (Journal of the Society of Architectural Historians)  
*Journal of Urban Design*  
*October*  
*Res*  
*Solar Energy*  
*Structures*, Elsevier  
Sustainable Cities and Society  
TAD (Technology Architecture Design)  
*Technology and Culture*  
*The Plan Journal*  
*Traditional Dwellings and Settlements Review* (Journal for IASTE)  
*Urban Design International*

**Scholarly Journals (moderately competitive)**

*ArchNet-IJAR: International journal of architectural research*  
*Architecture Structures and Construction*  
*Enquiry* (The ARCC Journal of Architectural Research)  
*Buildings* (Journal)  
*Built Heritage*  
*CoDesign*  
*Design Studies*  
*Heritage*  
*International Journal of Architectural Heritage*  
*International Journal of Islamic Architecture*  
*Journal of Asian Architecture*  
*Journal of Heritage Management*

**Professional Journals (highly competitive)**

*Abitare*  
*APT Bulletin*  
*The Architect's Journal*  
*Architectural Design*  
*Architectural Digest*  
*Architectural Record*  
*Detail*  
*Dezeen*

*Domus*  
*Dwell*  
*Frame*  
*Icon*  
*Interior Design*  
*Harvard Design Magazine*  
*Lotus International*  
*Metropolis*  
*Places Journal*  
*Space and Culture*  
*The Plan*  
*Wallpaper*  
*Werk, Bauen + Wohnen*

#### **Professional Journals (moderately competitive)**

*L'Architecture*  
*d'Aujourd'hui*  
*D'A*  
*Canadian Architect*  
*Chicago Architect*  
*Green: sustainable architecture and landscape design*  
*Perkins and Will Research Journal*  
*The Plan*  
*The Architect's Newspaper*  
*The Architect's Journal*

#### **Annual Conferences<sup>5</sup>**

##### **Scholarly Conferences (highly competitive)**

ACSA Annual Conference  
ASHRAE Winter Conference  
CAA Annual Meeting  
Dumbarton Oaks Landscape Architecture Annual Symposium  
EAHN Biannual Meeting  
IAQVEC Association  
IBPSA  
International Congress on Construction History (Triennial)  
SAH Annual Conference

##### **Scholarly Conferences (moderately competitive)**

---

<sup>5</sup> One-off conferences or symposia are not included here but are possible venues for dissemination of scholarly work.

EDRA Annual Conference  
ARCC Annual Conference  
BTES Bi-Annual Conference  
Construction History Society of America  
PLEA – Sustainable Architecture and Urbanism

**Professional Conferences (highly competitive)**

AIA National Annual Conference  
Chicago Biennale  
Council on Tall Buildings and Urban Habitats  
Facades+  
International Conference on Green Building  
Living Futures Annual Conference  
NOMA Annual Conference  
UIA International Forum  
Venice Biennale

**Professional Conferences (moderately competitive)**

AIA State Annual Conference  
NeoCon

**Awards**

**Annual Awards Programs (highly competitive)**

ACSA Awards  
AIA National Awards  
Architectural League of New York - Young Architect  
Architectural League of New York - Emerging Voices  
Architectural Record Design Vanguard  
A'N Best of – Architects Newspaper  
A+Awards – Architizer  
AZ Awards – Azure Magazine  
Mies Van der Rohe Prize  
Progressive Architecture Award  
WAN Awards – World Architecture News Awards  
World Architecture Festival

**Annual Awards Programs (moderately competitive)**

AIA State and Local Awards

**Annual Design Competitions**

## **Appendix B:**

Non-exclusive and evolving list of fellowships, residencies, and grants to support architectural research and creative activity. Each has a particular focus and application process. One can increase the likelihood of successful by researching and selecting fellowships that are aligned with the focus of their scholarship or area of sub-specialization.

### **B.1. Fellowships**

ACLS  
ACOR/CAORC/COARC  
Allen Brooks Travelling Fellowship (SAH)  
American Academy in Berlin  
American Academy in Rome Prize  
American Philosophical Society  
American School of Classical Studies at Athens  
Archaeological Institute of America  
Canadian Centre for Architecture/CCA  
CASVA  
DAAD, ARIT (Turkey)  
Dumbarton Oaks  
Fulbright Fellowship  
Getty Center  
Guggenheim  
Institute for Advanced Study  
Kluge/LOC  
MacDowell Colony Fellowship  
Mellon & Kress Foundations (various awards)  
Monument Lab  
National Humanities Center  
National Trust for Historic Preservation  
NEH/NEA  
Newberry Library & NYPL Fellowships  
Radcliffe Institute for Advanced Studies  
Richard Morris Hunt Fellowship in Architecture  
Richard Rogers Fellowship (Harvard GSD)  
Society of Fellows at Princeton, Stanford, etc.  
SOM Prize and Travel Fellowship  
SSRC

### **B.2. Residencies**

I Tatti/Harvard,  
Dumbarton Oaks (Landscape, Byzantine, Pre-Columbian)

### **B.3. Grants**

Graham Foundation

## **Appendix C: [Completely Revised – Red Not Used for Ease of Reading]**

In the School of Architecture at the University of Illinois, **Community Engaged Scholarship** links creative work in architecture extending beyond traditional academic endeavors to include community engagement and outreach initiatives that address pressing social, environmental, or urban challenges. Candidates seeking this approach should discuss the planned scholarly and partner-focused outcomes with mentors and partners throughout their pre-tenure period. This appendix includes more information and useful links to resources on community engaged scholarship.

Many scholars and teachers in architecture schools do work that engages communities at various levels and depths. Scholars choosing the PERO option will have a long-term commitment to a particular community partner, place, and/or non-profit that allows the development of a robust co-production of knowledge and its dissemination through multiple types of media and platforms. This goes well beyond teaching a studio based in a particular neighborhood, for example, and requires the amplification of research, teaching, and service across multiple projects.

Public-facing publication - In addition to the publishers listed in Appendix A above, PERO candidates may find productive paths to dissemination of work through targeted op-eds, authorship of reports for public agencies (like city planning offices) and professional groups (like AIA), and other work intended to reach a public, or non-academic audience. The candidate should be able to clearly state the ways these public facing publications relate to and amplify their larger scholarly and community-focused agenda.

A note on collaborative authorship: It is expected for there to be examples of co-authorship in any PERO dossier. Candidates should clearly state their role in the collaboration, with an expectation that leadership and/or facilitation roles in those collaborations would increase with seniority.

Below are examples of the kinds of scholarly products that can be valued in the context of an architecture PERO portfolio.

### **Place-Based Contextual Knowledge Production**

Community workshops and public convenings - when organized as part of an organic process to co-produce knowledge that then appears in other forms. Records of workshops in the form of agendas, recordings, and proceedings that document their design and outcomes.

Community design and/or policy documents - when these documents significantly aid communities and/or organizations in achieving their stated goals or produce documented shifts in public policy. Examples of this may include design guides, professional reports, and/or legislative actions or government initiatives.

Grant-seeking and public support - Funding to support community engaged projects from national, state, and local agencies, including NEA Grants for Arts, Humanities in Place, CLG grants, etc. Funding need not go directly to the faculty member but may go to the community partner with faculty support.

Awards - Local, regional, and national organization awards may be found to recognize scholars engaging in PERO. Examples may include AIA Illinois, EDRA, and ACSA.

Journal articles - in addition to the journals cited in Appendix A, see the growing scholarly publication community surrounding community engagement, including, but not limited to:

*Action Research Journal*

*Education, Citizenship, and Social Justice*

*Gateways: International Journal of Community Research and Engagement*

*International Journal of Research on Service-Learning and Community Engagement*

*Journal of Community Engagement and Higher Education (Indiana State University)*

*Journal of Community Engagement and Scholarship*

*Journal of Community Practice*

*Journal of Service-Learning in Higher Education*

*Journal of Urbanism*

*Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning*

*Public: A Journal of Imagining America*

## **Additional External Resources**

Excellence in Community Engagement

<https://www.artsengaged.com/excellence>

AIA Guide for Equitable Practice 08: Engaging Community

[https://content.aia.org/sites/default/files/2019-12/AIA\\_Guides\\_for\\_Equitable\\_Practice\\_08\\_Community\\_Engagement.pdf](https://content.aia.org/sites/default/files/2019-12/AIA_Guides_for_Equitable_Practice_08_Community_Engagement.pdf)

Arts Journal Blog Post: Community Engagement: What You Need to Know

<https://www.artsjournal.com/engage/resources/community-engagement-what-you-need-to-know/>

Portland State University: Demonstrate Your Impact: Community-Engaged Scholarship

<https://guides.library.pdx.edu/c.php?g=407041&p=2883869>

Campus Compact: Tenure and Promotion for Engaged Scholarship

[https://compact.org/resources/tenure-and-promotion-for-engaged-scholarship-a-repository?f%255B0%255D%3Dresource\\_tag=698](https://compact.org/resources/tenure-and-promotion-for-engaged-scholarship-a-repository?f%255B0%255D%3Dresource_tag=698)

The University of British Columbia: Defining and Describing Community-Engaged Scholarship for Promotion and Tenure

<https://communityengagement.ubc.ca/events/defining-and-describing-community-engaged-scholarship-for-promotion-and-tenure/>

#### **IX. PT-2 Committee Transition Procedures**

*Approved May 7, 2013*

- a. The Promotion and Tenure Committee in place beginning Fall 2012 will continue to steward current Promotion and Tenure cases through the Fall 2013 semester.
- b. P&T2 Committee will be appointed by the Executive Committee at their first meeting of the Fall 2013 semester.
- c. All new Promotion and Tenure cases coming to the committee in the Fall 2013 will be overseen by the P&T1 and P&T2 Committees as appropriate under the School of Architecture Bylaws approved 4/30/2013.

#### **X. Diversity Plan**

This document received the unanimous support of our School of Architecture faculty at its final meeting of the 1999-2000 academic year on May 2, 2000. The Affirmative Action Committee received approval to begin implementing this plan during the 2000-2001 academic year.

Our 1999-2000 committee included the following:

Kathryn Anthony, Chair and Coordinator of Minority Recruitment

Ellen Colfax, student representative from Women in Architecture organization

Jeff Gordon

Amos Heath, student representative from the National Organization of Minority Architecture Students (NOMAS)

Kevin Hinders

Joy Malnar

Barbara Schaede

Rob Schultz, student representative from NOMAS

Rebecca Williamson

\*\*\*

The School of Architecture is committed to creating a workplace in which all faculty, staff, and students are valued for their contributions to accomplishing the School's mission. The School of Architecture strives to create an equitable and inclusive environment for persons of all races, genders, levels of physical abilities, and sexual orientations. This Diversity Plan is designed to provide a mechanism for

creating plans, measures, and milestones to ensure that establishing and maintaining diversity remain a high priority for the School.

The five major diversity principles are accountability, inclusiveness, evaluation, shared responsibility, and institutionalization. With these in mind, specific outcomes, objectives, and actions for achieving greater diversity in the School are described below.

### **1) Emphasizing Diversity in the School's Promotional Materials**

Expected Outcome: Underrepresented architects will become a prominent part of the School's promotional materials.

Objectives: Identify the extent to which the School promotes women, persons of color, persons with physical disabilities, and gays and lesbians in its promotional materials.

Actions: The Office of Media and Communications, with the assistance of the School Affirmative Action Committee, will seek out underrepresented persons in architecture to feature in its media communications. For example, the School Web pages will include prominent female alumni and alumni of color. A separate section on diversity will be linked with relevant work from school projects such as:

- East St. Louis Action Research Project
- the Building Research Council's Lead Hazard Reduction program in low-income neighborhoods in Illinois, and HUD's Healthy Home pilot project in low-income housing in Chicago
- NOMAS and the annual NOMAS symposium
- Women in Architecture student organization
- Architecture/Women's Studies 324 course
- Other efforts to promote diversity

### **2) Recruiting a More Diverse Student Body**

Expected Outcome: Increased public outreach in key arenas will increase the numbers of students of color in the School of Architecture.

Objectives: Representatives of the School will establish contact with key high schools with large populations of students of color, including those which submit student work to the annual Newhouse Foundation design competition, sponsored by the Chicago Architectural Foundation, in Chicago.

Actions: Invite students who win awards at the Newhouse Foundation design competition to visit our School of Architecture, and encourage them to apply. In addition, a team of faculty and minority students will visit Illinois high schools with high minority populations. The purpose of the visit will be to interest talented students in pursuing a career in architecture at the University of Illinois. If possible, a web-based presentation highlighting the School's efforts at promoting diversity will be shown at each school.

### **3) Retaining a More Diverse Student Body**



Expected Outcome: The School will learn about the attrition rates of underrepresented groups (i.e. persons of color, women, persons with physical disabilities, and gays and lesbians) among its students. Based on this information, it will begin to outline steps to retain a more diverse body of faculty, staff and students.

Objectives: Identify where retention of underrepresented groups has been most problematic, and reverse that pattern.

Actions: On an annual basis, both the undergraduate and the graduate office will monitor the attrition rates of underrepresented students, and how these compare with the attrition rates of majority students. The staff at each of these offices, in consultation with the School Affirmative Action Committee, will conduct systematic exit interviews with a sample of underrepresented students who dropped out of the architecture major. Ascertain what, if anything, the School could have done differently so that they would have wanted to remain. Analyze this information and summarize in a report to our School administrators.

#### **4) Retaining a More Diverse Faculty**

Expected Outcome: The School will learn about the attrition rates of underrepresented groups (i.e. persons of color, women, persons with physical disabilities, and gays and lesbians) among its faculty, staff, and students. Based on this information, it will begin to outline steps to retain a more diverse body of faculty, staff and students.

Objectives: Identify where retention of underrepresented groups has been most problematic, and reverse that pattern.

Actions: Conduct systematic exit interviews with persons who have left the School during a specified time frame to find out why they left. Ascertain what, if anything, the School could have done differently so that they would have wanted to remain. Analyze this information and summarize in a report to our School administrators.

#### **5) Teaching a More Diverse Curriculum**

Expected Outcome: The School will include the work of underrepresented individuals in the profession throughout its curriculum, and especially in its required courses.

Objectives: Increase the extent to which the contributions of women, persons of color, persons with physical disabilities, and gays and lesbians are included in our architecture course offerings.

Actions: The School Affirmative Action Committee will work with the Design Committee to suggest how information about underrepresented individuals can become an integral part of studio courses. For example, a design studio could focus especially on creating environments for persons with physical disabilities. In examining design precedents, students could be pointed to the work of women architects and architects of color.

## **6) Stressing Diversity in the School's Extracurricular Activities**

Expected Outcome: Underrepresented architects will become a prominent part of the School's extracurricular activities.

Objectives: Identify the extent to which the School has invited women, persons of color, persons with physical disabilities, and gays and lesbians to participate in such School events as the Plym professorship, the School lecture series, on-campus gallery exhibitions, I Space exhibitions, brown bag talks, alumni gatherings, its Advisory Board, etc.

Actions: The School Lectures, Gallery and I Space Committees, with the assistance of the School Affirmative Action Committee, will seek out underrepresented persons in architecture to participate in each of these events in upcoming academic years. For example, an exhibit and lecture featuring the work of U of I School of Architecture women alumni could be planned for the month of March, Women's History month. Similarly, an exhibit and lecture of U of I School of Architecture African-American alumni could be offered during February, African-American History month.

## **7) Increasing Diversity among Design Reviewers**

Expected Outcome: Underrepresented architects will become a prominent part of the School's student evaluation process.

Objectives: Identify the extent to which the School has invited women, persons of color, persons with physical disabilities, and gays and lesbians to participate in student design reviews and thesis reviews.

Actions: The Design Committee and the Design Thesis faculty, with the assistance of the School Affirmative Action Committee, will actively seek out underrepresented persons in architecture to participate in design and thesis reviews in upcoming academic years. Establish a system whereby Chicago Women in Architecture and the Illinois Chapter of the National Organization of Minority Architects can involve its members in our School's design reviews.

## **8) Soliciting Awards for Underrepresented Students**

Expected Outcome: The School of Architecture will substantially augment its present student awards program with a series of awards specifically targeted to underrepresented students. These will be awarded publicly at the Annual Architecture Awards Banquet.

Objectives: Identify the extent to which the School has offered awards programs targeted to underrepresented students.

Actions: Together with the Associate Director of Development, identify potential alumni, corporate sponsors, and professional organizations to donate awards aimed at underrepresented students. Among the organizations that could be targeted are Chicago Women in Architecture and the Illinois National Organization of Minority Architects. If such awards are already in place, invite representatives from such organizations to participate in the Annual Architecture Awards Banquet.

## **9) Mainstreaming "Fringe" Events into the School**

Expected Outcome: The annual National Organization of Minority Architecture Students (NOMAS) symposium will become a centerpiece of the School's activities.

Objectives: Building upon the success of this year's NOMAS symposium, turn this into a School-wide event. Publicize it widely in School promotional materials.

Actions: Consider different scheduling options for the NOMAS symposium, including offering this event mid-week when other classes are not in session, canceling afternoon studio courses, or making the symposium part of a course assignment in order to boost attendance and participation.

## **XI. Culture Policy**

*Adopted May 11, 2010. Revisions adopted August 18, 2014*

### **Mission Statement**

At Illinois, we are an internationally recognized leader in educating future professionals and scholars in architecture and allied fields. We provide a robust technical and conceptual program that enables students to create and innovate. The depth and breadth of our curriculum enables students to become leaders in a range of disciplinary specialties. Our comprehensive programs prepare students to design and research in a rapidly changing global context from the macro to the micro scale through our bachelor's, master's, and doctoral degrees. (Approved by vote of the faculty 11/18/11)

Vision Statement: Learn from the past. Question the present. Shape the future.  
(Approved by vote of the faculty 11/18/11)

### **Core Values**

The school's mission is based upon the tenet that great architecture grows from creative inquiry, built on a solid technical foundation, incorporating state-of-the-art research and reflection on the changing goals, beliefs, and resources of society. We value social, cultural, and intellectual diversity that underpins any vibrant and flourishing community. We believe that architects have various and vital roles in interpreting and determining the status, values, conditions, and direction of society, its culture and quality of life.

### **School of Architecture Culture and Environment**

The Illinois School of Architecture fosters an academic culture that emphasizes: Respect, Sharing, Engagement, Innovation, Communication, and Academic Excellence among all members of our community.

This living document sets forth guidelines that encourage a positive and productive learning environment in which each of these ideals are equally valued. Faculty promote a learning environment in which students actively explore the design, historic, cultural, technical, and aesthetic aspects of architecture, and attain experience in the field through internships and community involvement. We work together honestly, courteously, and with integrity to pursue the shared goal of excellence in architectural education.

The School of Architecture's Culture Policy specifically addresses four main topics of importance:  
Expectations | Physical Environment | Relationships | Implementation & Maintenance

## **Expectations**

Students and faculty base all time expectations on the notion of respect. The architecture community will be respectful of class time as well as outside commitments, allowing members to live a balanced lifestyle.

Students should practice effective time management skills that do not necessitate unduly intense and condensed efforts. Students will maintain realistic expectations of their own time obligations, resisting the temptation to overextend themselves and work to balance various commitments.

Professors and students should creatively address the critical issues facing architectural education and the profession. Both faculty and students are expected to be present throughout the duration of any established course and to provide constructive feedback and encouragement in a timely manner. Design reviews and other assessments are intended to evaluate but not to discredit student projects and efforts. Reviews and evaluations should be informative and critiques will be provided in ways that help students advance creatively, conceptually, and productively.

The design studio is an important component of architectural education. We strive to create an interactive studio environment where students learn from each other as well as their professors. To ensure a beneficial studio review experience, students must be well prepared mentally and be completely ready to present their work. Faculty should ensure that reviewers are well informed on the project specifications prior to the review and are able to advise based on project type, context, location, scope, and project phase.

Professors must provide students with course syllabi for each course at the start of each semester and strive to abide by their syllabi. Changes must be presented to students in written format well in advance of deadlines. Students are expected to be willing participants and engaged in their education.

The Illinois School of Architecture seeks to promote interaction between students and faculty from different cohorts, programs, and disciplines. Students and faculty are encouraged to engage in learning activities outside of the classroom. This includes opportunities that arise through external organizations. Engaging in these opportunities reinforces core values of the school, and builds relationships that continue after graduation.

Students and faculty are encouraged to develop professional relationships that extend beyond the immediate classroom environment. Through invitations for alumni to participate in student reviews, current students and alumni interact and create relationships that often continue into their professional careers. This also provides alumni the opportunity to view student work, engage with faculty, and understand transformations within the school.

## **Physical Environment**

The School of Architecture should be a safe, comfortable, and efficient place to work. To achieve this standard, we maintain the following principles:

**Respect for Equipment:** Our equipment will work and be up-to-date, to the best of the school's ability.

Students, faculty, and other users should be taught how to properly use resources/equipment and must report damage as it happens.

**Care:** The building environment should provide a clean and healthy working venue. Students are responsible for maintaining their own environment. Emphasis shall be placed on environmental sustainability both inside and outside of the studio.

Students are encouraged to explore and communicate architectural expressions in an academic environment, including the school's facilities, atrium and studio spaces, in a manner that does not pose any threat, disrespect or ulterior motive, which may undermine the integrity of school community.

**Personal Safety/Property:** The school will strive to provide security for all members of the school community. The community will respect the property of others, including personal property within shared spaces. In order to maintain property and personal safety, members of the school community are requested to secure buildings and studios. Students are encouraged to travel in groups when they leave campus buildings after dark.

## **Relationships**

The Illinois School of Architecture fosters a community based upon mutual respect, which promotes interaction and productivity among students, faculty, and staff. This community should be engaged, inquisitive and supportive. We must practice tolerance of varied ideas, collegially discuss different perspectives and respect diverse perspectives and persons.

Students should be informed of, and where possible involved in, the administrative decision-making processes that may affect quality of academic experiences. These include but are not limited to curriculum changes, new school policies, leadership changes and new faculty hires.

Collaboration within the whole community, including students, faculty, staff, and professionals, is highly encouraged in design studios, other courses and independent studies. Through shared projects, courses, lectures, and social activities the architectural community will collaborate with others in the design and arts disciplines and interact with members of the larger university community to provide a well-rounded education, to increase knowledge, and to promote innovation.

When conflicts or disputes arise between faculty and students, among students, or among faculty, all members in the conflict should work to reach a solution in a respectful manner. If an acceptable solution cannot be achieved, parties involved should seek adjudication through the Illinois School of Architecture Student Concerns Committee for all conflicts involving students or the Illinois School of Architecture Faculty Grievance Committee if students are not a party to the conflict.

## **Implementation and Maintenance**

This policy will be distributed to all members of the Illinois School of Architecture community each year through its placement on the school website, posting in visible locations in all school facilities and by physical distribution and discussion at appropriate all-school venues. Faculty should reference this policy as appropriate in course syllabi and discussions.

This policy is a living document to be changed and updated as needed. Periodically, a task force should be created that ensures representation from all student levels and faculty.

**This policy was originated in 2010 by a student-faculty task force and revised in 2014.**

**2010 Student Taskforce Members:**

Chair, ASAC President Britta Monson with students Glorio Colom, Alina Hsieh, Kevin Jele, Taylor Knoche, David Marshall, Jacob Mellor, Danielle Mullendore, Andrew Steinweg, Rosemarie Woodbury, and Michelle Zupancic

**2010 Faculty Taskforce advisers:**

Co-chair, Administrator for Undergraduate program - Lee W. Waldrep, Ph.D.  
Lynne M. Dearborn, Ph.D., Gaines Hall, Areli Marina, Ph.D., and Scott Murray

**2014 Revisions by:**

Min Hoo Kim, President ISOA Gargoyle Honor Society, with students Kevin Grewe, Manasvinee Pramod, Neris Sandoval  
Faculty Staff Advisers: Lee W. Waldrep, Ph.D., Lynne M. Dearborn, Ph.D.

*Revised Version Adopted by ISOA Faculty August 18, 2014, Allerton Conference Center Retreat*

**XII. Awarding ISOA Emeritus/Emerita Status Policy**

Draft Prepared by the Bylaws, Policies & Procedures Committee  
Date: November 17, 2015.

Draft Approved by ISOA Executive Committee for distribution to Faculty for discussion. Date: December 9, 2015.

Approved by the Faculty. Date: April 12, 2016.

**Policy for Awarding of Emeritus/Emerita Status**

The rank of Professor Emeritus/Emerita or Associate Professor Emeritus/Emerita is an honorary status granted a retired faculty member to acknowledge a distinguished professorial career that made significant contributions to the Illinois School of Architecture. The ISOA may recommend emeritus/emmerita status at the time of retirement or after retirement. Emeritus/Emerita status may be bestowed posthumously.

**Criteria for Candidacy**

The criteria for awarding emeritus/emerita status, a distinctive title given at the time of permanent retirement, shall be determined by the Director and ISoA Executive Committee. All policies shall be in accordance with the POLICY FOR AWARDING EMERITUS/EMERITA STATUS OFFICE OF THE PROVOST COMMUNICATION NO. 12. See:

[http://www.provost.illinois.edu/communication/12/2013/Communication\\_12-3-15.pdf](http://www.provost.illinois.edu/communication/12/2013/Communication_12-3-15.pdf)

The bestowal of emeritus status is an earned honor, not a right.

Consideration to the rank of Professor Emeritus/Emerita or Associate Professor Emeritus/Emerita will be based on the following criteria:

- The professor or associate professor must be tenured at the time of retirement;
- Emeritus status will not ordinarily be granted to an individual who has served less than six years of full-time employment within the ISoA.
  - If during the six-year period the professor works in another area of the College, the specific contribution to the ISoA must be demonstrated.

A consistent record of quality production within one's specific discipline as demonstrated by one or more of the following:

- A substantive record of scholarly or creative achievement having national and international recognition with significant production occurring during tenure at ISoA;
- A recognized record of outstanding teaching and educational contributions; and
- Clear evidence of beneficial service to and active participation in activities occurring within the ISoA.

Thus a recommendation for Emeritus/Emerita Status should be based upon an assessment that the candidate has made contributions of an appropriate magnitude and quality in research, teaching, and service, and has demonstrated a high level of sustaining contributions to the School.

#### **Director and Endowed appointments:**

Endowed positions may not be held after retirement. However, the ISoA may recommend that a person be bestowed the additional honorific title of Director Emerita/Emeritus or "Name of Endowed Appointment" Emerita/Emeritus.

#### **Processes**

Nominations for Emeritus/Emerita status may be initiated by the Director, a current or a recently retired ISoA faculty member who is familiar with the nominee's professional contributions, or the candidate. Nominations are to be initiated within two years following the declaration of retirement by the candidate. The nomination must include a current comprehensive curriculum vitae and a letter that briefly states specific evidence of the nominee's qualifications for emeritus status.

The Director notifies the ISoA Executive Committee in writing by placing on their meeting agenda a notification that the process has been initiated. The Committee reviews the material, deliberates, and

delivers its recommendations as a vote to the Director by the last day of the fall semester. Given a majority vote, the Director completes the Transmittal for Emeritus/Emerita Status Request and provides a brief letter in support of the recommendation that identifies the basis for the recommendation. To obtain the “Transmittal form for Emeritus/Emerita Status Request” go to the POLICY FOR AWARDDING EMERITUS/EMERITA STATUS OFFICE OF THE PROVOST COMMUNICATION NO. 12.

The Director forwards the recommendation, with the necessary supporting materials, to the Dean by February 1 of the succeeding spring semester.

The recommendation must be submitted through the appropriate reporting channels for the endorsement of the Provost. With the Provost’s approval, recommendations will be submitted to the Board of Trustees via the President.

If Emeritus/Emerita status is requested in more than one department, all relevant departments and colleges must review the candidate.

### **Emeritus Privileges**

The privileges associated with having been granted the rank of [Associate] Professor Emeritus are as follows:

1. Lifetime listing indicating the rank of [Associate] Professor Emeritus in University catalogues and directories;
2. Physical and on-line library access privileges with (with an I-card that includes the emeritus/emmerita title);
3. Email access per CITES policies related to retired faculty and staff;
4. Participation in University public ceremonies and processions with use of graduate regalia;
5. Based on availability and the recommendations of the Director, and with the concurrence of the Dean and Provost, use of office and/or lab space; equipment, and other campus facilities to support creative and/or scholarly work and/or educational activities; and
6. Authorization to serve on thesis and/or dissertation committees or engage in other research or educational activities within the ISOA based on permission of the Director and with recommendations by either the Ph.D. committee or Executive Committee and with the concurrence of the Dean of the College.

### **Obligations**

Emeritus/Emerita faculty are expected to uphold the UIUC mission and vision in their professional activities. Emeritus/Emerita faculty have an obligation to cite ISOA as their academic affiliation when university resources and/or university facilities are used in the performance of their professional or scholarly activities.

### **Length of Term**

The appointment of Professor Emeritus/Emerita is for life, subject to University standing regulations on conduct and performance.



## **Adjunct and Part-Time Service**

Emeritus/Emerita faculty are eligible to be appointed as adjunct studio faculty or part time lecturers, according to the guidelines of the University. Retired faculty who plan to return part-time to teach in a department should seek emeritus/emmerita status. Similarly, faculty who plan to continue their research activities in a department should seek emeritus/emmerita status. The unit also may consider providing a 0% time research faculty position, especially if the faculty member plans to apply for external funding. Emeritus/Emerita faculty are encouraged to contribute their knowledge and skills to the intellectual and cultural life of the university. The ISOA Administration shall provide an environment which encourages Emeritus /Emerita faculty to continue to make contributions to the campus consistent with funding and the desire of the Emeritus faculty member.

## **XIII. Policy on the Evaluation and Promotion of Specialized Faculty**

*Approved by vote of the faculty 4/25/2025 (see faculty meeting minutes)*

### **1. General Purpose and Definitions**

The purpose of this document is to provide Specialized Faculty in the School of Architecture with information to help them navigate the promotion process and create their dossier.

The preamble to the School's Promotion and Tenure Procedures is broadly applicable to Specialized Faculty:

"Architecture is a diverse field that encompasses a broad range of built environment scales and integrates research in the humanities, social and physical sciences, and technology with practice, teaching, public engagement, and service. Faculty pursue scholarly agendas across these subfields, developing a wide variety of portfolios related to creative practice, building technology, the social sciences, and architectural history, theory, and preservation. Fundamental to the...promotion process is the respect of all faculty for this wide range of fields and the diversity of candidates' expertise. In return, individual candidates must be able to clearly define their own field of expertise, its standards for excellence, ways impact of work is measured, and how their work contributes to their discipline."

However, the School recognizes the diverse roles Specialized Faculty play in the Department's mission, in particular, the importance of effective teaching, connections to practice, focused research, and/or other contributions that are primarily defined and evaluated based on agreements and contracts negotiated with the Unit Executive Officer (UEO) at the time of hiring as well as governed by the Non-Tenure Faculty Coalition contract. These areas may or may not align with traditional measures of scholarly activity. Evaluating Specialized Faculty for promotion is necessarily different from evaluating tenure track faculty, and the process relies on the clarity and thoroughness of these initial agreements with the UEO.

## **2. Promotion Process for Specialized Faculty.**

*Provost's Communication No. 26 and the College of Fine and Applied Arts Promotion and Tenure Policies and Procedures, available on the campus and college websites, respectively, outline the general process and standards for promotion for Specialized Faculty, summarized below.* This document addresses those responsibilities delegated by Comm. #26 to the Unit and the Unit Executive Officer, particularly the criteria and procedures within the School of Architecture for advancing cases.

Timeline for the process – In the academic year prior to promotion decisions, the candidate should begin assembling their dossier for promotion. The dates below are based on University and College documents and should be confirmed by candidates each year:

### *Academic Year Prior to Review*

#### Spring Semester:

Early semester, launch of the process with candidate, Associate Director, and Director.

Begin thinking about primary & contributing authors for internal reviews.

Discussion of external reviewers.

Identify and arrange evaluators for at least two classroom visits for each course taught.

Candidates begin preparing dossiers in Communication 26 format using the template provided by the Provost: <https://provost.illinois.edu/policies/provosts-communications/communication-26-promotion-to-teaching-research-or-clinical-associate-or-full-professor-titles/>. Teaching statements should be prepared early in the evaluation process, as they provide important contextual information for peer and external evaluators.

The UEO or designate assigns classroom evaluation teams in consultation with the candidate. Classroom visits are conducted by two or more evaluators who may be internal or external to the School's faculty. Evaluators should be conversant with the faculty member's subject area and class type (i.e., studio, seminar, lecture) and/or have relevant or related expertise.

First of at least two classroom visits

*Academic Year of Review*

September: Copies of the final Dossier in Communication 26 format, along with accompanying materials, including a teaching portfolio (syllabi, assignments, student work, etc.) and portfolio of professional and/or scholarly work due to the Director's Office

P&T Committee forwards names of 8-10 potential external reviewers (at any rank higher than the candidate's), including short biographies, to the Director's Office. Candidate forwards names of 4-5 potential external reviewers, including short biographies, to the Director's Office.

The School returns the dossier to the candidate with suggested revisions (if applicable).

Candidate submits names of internal reviewers. The UEO or designate confirms these reviewers' willingness to write a review.

Sept/Oct: Second of at least two classroom visits.

The candidate meets with internal reviewers and provides a copy of their dossier with appropriate statements. Include teaching observations and ICES scores for teaching reviewers.

January: Final revisions of the dossier due to the Director.

Internal and external reviews due to the Director.

Jan/Feb: School P&T committee review case.

February: Any final edits made to the dossier.

Dossiers are due to the college for review and vote by the college committee.

April: The Dean's recommendation is referred to the Provost for approval.

### **3. School's Specialized Faculty Promotion Committee: Role and Scope of work**

The regular Promotion and Tenure Committee for tenure-track faculty is supplemented by one elected Specialized Faculty member above the rank of the candidate being considered, as detailed in the School's Bylaws, Section VIII B. Promotion evaluations must remain independent across levels (e.g., someone who votes on a case at the department level cannot also review a case at the college level). Committee members must not have a direct professional (co-author, grant recipient, etc.), personal, or fiscal interest in the candidate's promotion.

The Committee is responsible for assessing that the candidate has made contributions of an appropriate magnitude and quality in the specialized area(s) of teaching, research, or clinical instruction that are required of the specific appointment and consistent with the rank. The Committee is responsible for compiling a list of potential external reviewers.

### **4. Criteria for Promotion**

Communication #26 sets out general criteria for promotion for Specialized Faculty in three areas: Teaching, Research, and Clinical. Within each of these, ranks of Associate and Full are also defined. The following discipline-specific standards supplement these criteria and definitions.

Specialized Faculty have specific roles and responsibilities negotiated with the UEO at the time of hiring and specified in these initial agreements and contracts that need to be considered alongside these general criteria. These may not align with the traditional measures of scholarship used to assess tenure-track cases.

#### *Teaching Specialized Faculty*

The University's definition of teaching excellence is the broad basis for assessment; course-based teaching should be "well-designed, well-delivered, inclusive and ethical, and reflective and evolving." Communication #26 requires the following:

"This evaluation must draw on student feedback, peer evaluation, the candidate's teaching statement, and, if appropriate, the candidate's statement of DEI activities. The rest of the teaching evaluation section should include a list of courses taught, a representative sample of syllabi and course materials (e.g., exams, assignments, quizzes), new course proposals, innovative instructional tools, and a summary of ICES data (or, in the alternative, a summary developed through use of a unit's instrument)."

Because of the broad nature of subject matter, modalities, and assignment types that make up architectural instruction, the candidate should submit a Teaching Portfolio of student work for review by the School's committee. This may be in traditional print/electronic format or a format that better suits the candidate's teaching methods (video, website, etc.). It should demonstrate students' coursework and illustrate the course's learning objectives, teaching methods, and levels of student achievement. It may include student projects, assignments, exam responses, and/or reflective commentary showing how the candidate's overall teaching strategies support the Campus definition of teaching excellence.

The candidate and UEO also select peer reviewers to conduct in-person assessments of classroom teaching. Peer reviewer selection should reflect the type of teaching involved (i.e., studio, seminar, large lecture) and subject area for each class observed.

The committee reviews the candidate's dossier, teaching portfolio, and peer-reviewer assessments according to the initial appointment documents and the following criteria:

- Quality of Design
- Efficacy of Delivery
- Inclusivity
- Ethics
- Opportunity for reflection
- Evolution

The School recognizes that ICES data are one of many forms of evaluation and, therefore, should be assessed proportionally to the teaching portfolio, particularly in required classes and in those with small sample sizes.

Scholarly and professional activity outside of teaching responsibilities can enrich a candidate's teaching, demonstrate mastery of the subject area by showing peer-reviewed acceptance of research and creative work, and evidence innovation in course materials by incorporating new knowledge and findings (pedagogical research may directly illustrate these). As such, candidates may submit scholarly activity such as conference papers, journal articles, books, book chapters, etc. as part of their dossier. The committee should review teaching research and disciplinary scholarship in the context of the candidate's teaching statement and responsibilities, keeping in mind that scholarship in architecture is particularly broad and may include creative activities, commissioned work, exhibitions, competitions, graphic work, etc. While expectations for research quantity are lower than for tenure-track faculty, peer-review, impact, originality, and trajectory are still used to assess quality of research done by specialized faculty, in the context, however, of the negotiated expectations in the original agreements and contracts negotiated with the UEO.

Communication #26 has additional language regarding promotion to Teaching Full Professor:

"Promotion to the rank of teaching professor should be based on a fulfilled expectations in terms of the quality of disciplinary work, teaching, and pedagogy, including making advancements in teaching and learning in the discipline that led to innovative strategies and marked course improvement. At this level, a teaching professor should be making broader contributions to their discipline or field as well, such as by sharing creative, pedagogical, or scholarly work at conferences; publishing articles, monographs, edited collections, or textbooks with reputable presses; or securing competitive internal and external grants to develop curricula or research pedagogy."

Finally, service to the School, College, University, and discipline is considered in relation to expectations agreed in the appointment document agreed with the UEO. Committees and evaluators should assess the quantity and quality of this holistically.

#### *Research Specialized Faculty*

Communication #26 notes that Research Specialized Faculty:

"...are expected to develop independent research agendas and, typically, secure some external funding for their work. Appointment to a research associate professor title requires, at a minimum, that the individual has demonstrated the ability to make a substantial impact in a

research area, as shown by publications, invited talks, external funding, and other related activities. Promotion to the rank of research professor should be based on a fulfilled promise of quality research, including making discoveries that lead to grant funding and publications in books or leading peer-reviewed journals.”

Within the School, the committee considers promotion to Research Associate Professor or Research Full Professor based on a research dossier similar to those prepared by tenure-track faculty. The committee will generally consider these along the guidelines in the School’s “Policies, Procedures, and Criteria for Promotion and Tenure,” and associated appendices.

### *Clinical Professors*

Communication #26 defines Clinical Specialized Faculty as:

“primarily engaged in providing instruction but do so from the perspective of an experienced and knowledgeable practitioner, either within a traditional classroom setting or a lab or other applied learning environment.”

Within the School, this typically involves studio or practice instruction with a basis in practice. Minimum criteria for promotion, therefore, includes a professional credential, usually licensure as an Architect or Engineer in a U.S. state or another country, or equivalent professional experience.

The candidate submits a dossier similar to that required for Teaching Specialized Faculty above but may additionally submit a portfolio of professional works. This may include built projects in which the candidate played a significant role in design or construction; articles, books, or conference papers that have been peer-reviewed by members of the profession and/or have demonstrated impact in practice; awards or recognitions from professional societies or organizations; and evidence of professional engagement or service, including service on committees, boards, juries, etc.

From Communication #26:

“At a minimum, promotion to a clinical associate professor must be based upon an assessment that the candidate has made contributions of an appropriate magnitude and quality in the discipline, and in the teaching and learning in the unit and on campus, and must demonstrate a high likelihood of sustaining contributions to both.

Promotion to the rank of clinical professor should be based on fulfilled expectations of appropriate accomplishments in the relevant field and with respect to teaching in the department, college and campus, as identified in the unit promotional policy.”

## **5. Diversity Equity & Inclusion**

The University’s requirement, from Provost’s Communication #9:

“all faculty are expected to make contributions to diversity, equity, and inclusion in at least one of the three domains (i.e., research, teaching, and service)” applies in full to Specialized Faculty as well. Like tenured or tenure-track faculty, candidates are advised to consult the latest version of the *Guide to Diversity, Equity, And Inclusion (DEI) Work In The Promotion And Tenure Process*, available on the Urbana Campus Provost’s Office website, for examples of relevant Institutional, Programmatic, and Organizational activities in Research, Teaching, and Service. This document also includes guidance for candidates on planning DEI work and communicating their contributions in their required DEI statement.

## **6. References**

Candidates and evaluators are directed to the Appendices in the School’s Promotion and Tenure Policies Document for guidance on typical outlets for scholarship and research.