

Accepted by SOA faculty and forwarded to Dean Bueno for approval, April 26, 2007
 Revised to reflect Departmental status and accepted by Architecture Department faculty vote September 24, 2008. Forwarded to Dean Bueno on November 25 2008,
 Revised by Architecture Department faculty vote on December 8, 2008 to include departmental merit raise and merit bonus criteria and procedures, and forwarded to Dean Bueno on December 11, 2008.
 Revised 3-22-2019 Revised by Department Chair based on Faculty vote of 2-15-2019 to include candidate access to external review letters.
 Revised 3-6-2020, Faculty votes to adopt the College's Differential Workload and Assignment Classification Policy. See added section.
 Revised 3-12-2021 Non-Tenure-Track Promotion Guidelines Adopted by faculty vote All in favor, one abstention. See added section.

**Tenure, Promotion, Third-Year Review and Non-Tenure-Track Promotion Guidelines
 Merit Raise and Merit Bonus Criteria & Procedures
 Differential Workload and Assignment Classification Policy
 Department of Architecture
 School of Architecture
 College of Communication, Architecture + The Arts
 Florida International University**

1. CRITERIA

The criteria for tenure and promotion in the Architecture Department set forth in these guidelines shall supplement, but not supersede, the most current college and university tenure and promotion guidelines. These criteria are based upon those established for annual faculty assignments and evaluations. These include the areas of teaching, research and creative work, service, professional development, and other activities agreed upon by the faculty member and supervisor.

a. Teaching

Faculty members recommended by the Architecture Department for tenure and promotion must show a commitment to excellence through sustained high levels of teaching performance as demonstrated through teaching evaluations, innovation in pedagogy, and through a demonstrated responsiveness to student and peer input. Faculty members must also show the ways in which their teaching contributes towards meeting the accreditation criteria of their discipline. Faculty must demonstrate that they meet the criteria in this category through student evaluations, peer review, and other appropriate means.

As part of an excellent teaching record faculty must develop courses that demonstrate their creative and intellectual currency on the subject matter covered in their area of expertise. Courses must reflect thorough development and a significant contribution to the curriculum. They must demonstrate a commitment to excellence in the development of syllabi and assignments, and maintain satisfactory results in students' evaluations of the faculty member's abilities to administer the course and to deliver the course content. Consideration should be given to the candidate's participation in collaborative environments and in collaborative projects. These may include both formal and informal co-teaching, invitations to participate in other classes, lecturing and participating in studio critiques and seminars. Faculty members are encouraged to demonstrate the level of excellence achieved through the publication and exhibition of teaching activities. These may intersect with the faculty member's research agenda and it is the faculty member's responsibility to demonstrate the value achieved in the type of publication or venue for exhibition. Qualitative evaluation and the recognition of peer review, invited exhibition, juried venue, etc. shall be critical to the evaluation process. Finally, consideration should be given to faculty who are invited to teach at other schools. This may include the type of commitment and length of involvement by the candidate, testimonials from the other schools or departments, and activities including invitations to speak at other schools, guest instructing, guest jurying, etc.

Assistant, Associate, and Full professors are expected to:

	Asst.	Assoc.	Prof.
1. To demonstrate the ability to communicate effectively	X	X	X
2. To identify educational objectives clearly and effectively organize courses	X	X	X

3. To effectively advise students	X	X	X
4. To pursue continued growth and competence in their subject area	X	X	X
5. To encourage students to think purposefully, creatively, critically, and rigorously	X	X	X
6. To construct effective procedures to evaluate student performance	X	X	X
7. To promote and maintain rigorous academic standards	X	X	X
8. To have demonstrated effective teaching		X	X
9. To have taken the initiative in promoting educational programs within the Department		X	X
10. To be good teachers.		X	X
11. To be accomplished teachers			X
12. To serve as a source of specialized information and general knowledge of the field			X
13. To demonstrate continued teaching excellence			X

b. Research and Creative Work

Faculty members recommended by the Architecture Department for tenure and promotion must show a commitment to excellence through sustained high levels of research and creative work that may include funded and unfunded activities of a scholarly nature as well as critical engagement in their fields. Research and creative work in the Architecture department may include, but is not limited to: 1) scholarly books and articles written and/or edited by the faculty member on contemporary or historical design issues; 2) creative work completed by the faculty member alone or in a collaborative setting; and 3) editorials, reviews, professional and academic juries, or any public commentaries in any media made by the faculty member in a professional capacity about design issues. Research in any of these areas that is not yet complete at the time of tenure and promotion, such as unpublished manuscripts or unfinished creative works, may be included in the tenure and promotion file with a detailed explanation of future progress and plans for the work.

Scholarly and professional books, articles, and presentations in other media written and/or edited by others that focus on or include the faculty member’s own designs are very important areas of faculty achievement and recognition. In these cases, it is imperative that the faculty member gives a detailed account of the process for selection and review that their creative work underwent to be included in the book, article, or other media. All forms of research must be presented with evidence that it both sets acceptable professional standards and contributes to disciplinary knowledge through original and innovative work. Evidence of peer review and/or broad professional acknowledgement of one’s accomplishment will be most highly considered.

Faculty who engage in funded research projects should demonstrate the nature of the work’s recognition, critical assessment, and review within both the academy and the discipline. Consideration should be given to whether the faculty member is principal or co-investigator and to the prestige of a funding agency, the impact or the potential impact of the work, and the monetary value of the grant. Faculty who engage in research projects that do not receive outside funding should demonstrate how the results of their investigations are disseminated through publication, presentation, lectures or other appropriate venues. External peer recognition and critical review is particularly important in these cases.

Faculty members engaged in creative design work must demonstrate achievement and distinction through peer review, public exhibition, publication and presentation. Consideration will be given to the level of peer review and to the nature of the selection process for publication. The nature of the work’s critical reception will also be considered. To facilitate an understanding of the peer-review context and processes for competitive review and prize placement for creative work, faculty must clearly articulate the evaluation process, number of competitors, opportunities for dissemination, and any other relevant information that would assist in the evaluation of the achievement. Faculty members may include compensated design work in the file. They must provide evidence of

how the work contributes critically to the discipline. This may be demonstrated through the publication of the work in peer-reviewed journals, and through “critical” reviews on the work, and awards. Particular consideration should be given to how an award was granted (e.g. juried by a group of peer reviewers with the names of the competitors given—also known as “peer-reviewed,” or by peer reviewers without names attached to projects—also known as “blind peer-reviewed,” or juried by some other method). Consideration should also be given to the type of award (international, national regional or local), the scope of work that the award recognizes (a life time achievement award versus an award for a single work of design), the prestige of the awarding agency and of the specific jurors. Examples of institutions offering awards and medals for research and creative work at the local, state, national, and international levels considered especially important for tenure and promotion in the Architecture department include, but are not limited to: The Association of Collegiate Schools of Architecture (ACSA); American Institute of Architects (AIA); American Society of Landscape Architects; the American Society of Interior Designers; and the International Interior Design Association.

There is an ever-changing array of high quality, publications, exhibition venues, and professional competitions and opportunities in the design fields. Examples of those publications considered especially important for tenure and promotion in the Architecture Department include, but are not limited to: *The Journal of Architectural Education* (blind peer-reviewed, see explanation of process above); *The Journal of Interior Design* (blind peer-reviewed); *The Journal of the Society of Architectural Historians* (peer-reviewed); *Landscape Journal* (blind peer-reviewed); and any peer-reviewed proceedings. In all cases, it is the candidate’s responsibility to place their achievements in the most objective light possible for evaluation. Likewise, it is the evaluators’ responsibility to describe in detail the basis for their evaluation of faculty research in terms of what is considered to be acceptable standards in quality research.

Assistant, Associate, and Full professors are expected to:

	Asst.	Assoc.	Prof.
1. To demonstrate evident engagement in research and creative activities, such as writing, research, exhibition, and design work	X	X	X
2. To demonstrate a capacity for independent thought and intellectual curiosity	X	X	X
3. To exhibit quality in research and creative work	X	X	X
4. To develop & maintain intellectual depth in an area of expertise	X	X	
5. To make a practice of clear, thorough documentation and presentation of research and creative work		X	X
6. To demonstrate a potential for continued creative work / research / scholarship of outstanding quality		X	X
7. To provide evidence of completed creative work and/or research of outstanding quality			X
8. To achieve peer recognition of completed creative work / research beyond the University			X

c. Service

Faculty members recommended by Architecture Department for tenure and promotion should show a sustained commitment to service. This may be at the Department, College, or University level through mentoring faculty and students, committee work and task forces. Faculty members may also participate in service to the profession and community in areas consistent with a faculty member’s academic preparation and interests. They must demonstrate the nature of community service activities and the manner in which such service activities are consistent with a faculty member’s academic preparation and interests.

Assistant, Associate, and Full professors are expected to:

	Asst.	Assoc.	Prof.
1. To mentor students effectively	X	X	X

2. To participate effectively in faculty governance, committee work, etc.	X	X	X
3. To participate effectively in general Departmental events	X	X	X
4. To support and promote the Department, College, and University missions	X	X	
5. To contribute to the community service of the Department		X	X
6. To mentor faculty effectively		X	X
7. To contribute to the University through service on Dept, College and University committees		X	X
8. To participate significantly in service to the discipline (academic and/or professional) in ways other than teaching and research			X

2. PROCEDURES

The procedures for tenure and promotion in the Architecture Department set forth here shall supplement, but not supersede, the most current college and university tenure and promotion procedures. Candidates for tenure and promotion shall follow the schedule set forth by the university and college, and the criteria for evaluation set forth above by the Architecture Department.

a. Outside Evaluators

The selection of outside evaluators for tenure and promotion will follow university and college guidelines. Within two weeks of the announcement by the dean of the college of an individual’s eligibility for tenure and promotion and the accompanying schedule set by the Office of Academic Affairs the candidate will provide the chair of the department a list of evaluators. These evaluators must follow the guidelines for evaluators set forth by the university and follow university policies in cases where they do not do so. No less than one week before the deadline set by the Office of Academic Affairs for sending out External Review Request Letters, the chair of the department must present to the candidate a list of no less than the minimum number of external reviewers, with alternates, if necessary. Following university policy, any external reviewer who the candidate asks to be excluded from the evaluation will not be included. Following university policies, candidates may request additional letters of evaluation. Candidates for tenure and promotion shall have access to the external reviewers’ letters.

b. The External Review Package

The External Review Package must represent all activities that fall under the tenure and promotion criteria and were undertaken by the candidate during the time of their evaluation. For candidates being evaluated for tenure and promotion, this generally includes those activities undertaken from the time the candidate started working toward tenure and promotion in the Architecture Department or at any prior institution. For candidates with tenure applying for promotion, this generally includes activities undertaken after the date the previous tenure and promotion file were completed.

The package should include a bound volume with an overview of the candidate’s accomplishments in teaching, research, and service. Following consultation with the chair of the department and the dean of the college, candidates may include with their evaluator’s packages books, manuscripts, visual media (DVDs, CDs, etc.), and any other materials that may help an evaluator gain a more complete and objective understanding of the candidate’s efforts.

c. Timeline

Candidates for tenure and promotion will follow the timeline provided by the Office of Academic Affairs for mailing out external review request letters and mailing out external review packages. Voting on tenure and promotion must occur within thirty calendar days from the first day allowed for voting by the Office of Academic Affairs. Unless otherwise arranged with the dean of the college

and the chair of the departmental tenure and promotion committee, from the date the faculty vote on a candidate's file, the Faculty Tenure and Promotion Committee has two weeks to write a letter of evaluation addressed to the dean and submitted to the department chair. The Department Chair will have two weeks to write a letter of evaluation addressed to the dean and submitted with the dossier to the dean and the college tenure and promotion committee.

d. Faculty Tenure and Promotion Committee

Following university policy, all tenured faculty members in the Architecture department are expected to evaluate and vote upon a candidate's tenure and promotion to associate professor with the exception of the candidate's chair as the chair contributes a separate letter of evaluation of the candidate to the file. For votes on tenure and promotion to associate professor, the constitution of the committee will follow university Tenure and Promotion Guidelines. The committee must have a quorum, which will be two-thirds of the faculty members eligible to participate on the committee according to university guidelines. Committee members will discuss the candidate's file and elect a chair, who will be responsible for drafting the letter of recommendation on behalf of the committee that will be addressed to the dean of the college and will outline the results of the committee's deliberations. The committee chair will schedule at least one meeting of the eligible tenured faculty for such deliberations. The committee chair will oversee a secret ballot by committee members at that meeting with the options of "yes" or "no" for tenure and "yes" or "no" for promotion to associate professor. The committee chair will count the votes and report the results back to the committee during the meeting when the votes are taken. Abstentions are to be discouraged and votes by proxy or those offered in any other manner than by secret ballot at the meeting will not be considered.

The results of the vote will be made known in the committee chair's letter and an explanation of any irregularities or abstentions noted. The vote will be considered positive if the candidate receives a simple majority of positive votes for tenure and/or promotion.

If the Architecture Department has fewer than three professors at the level of full professor, the chair of the candidate's department will contribute letters of evaluation to the file, and the faculty vote on the file will be conducted at a college committee of full professors, before being sent to the dean of the college.

e. Chair's Responsibility

In accordance with the deadlines, policies and timetables set forth by the university and by the Office of Academic Affairs, the departmental chair shall notify tenure candidates of their eligibility for tenure consideration and shall inform candidates of their responsibilities. The departmental chair shall schedule appropriate teaching evaluations, classroom visits and work with the faculty to schedule meetings, deliberations and votes and shall be responsible for selecting external reviewers in accordance with university standards and procedures as well as delivering copies of the candidate's dossier. When the external reviewer's letters have been received, the chair shall be responsible for adding them to the file and making the entire file available for the faculty T&P committee for their deliberation.

Once the Departmental Tenure and Promotion Committee has delivered its summative memo to the chair, the chair will review the letter, the entire file and the external reviewer's letters and make a written summative recommendation. The chair's recommendation along with the entire tenure file/dossier shall be delivered to the Dean for further review.

Difference of recommendation between the chair and the faculty Tenure and Promotion Committee. If the chair's recommendation differs from that of the faculty T&P committee, the chair's summative memo shall explain the reasons for the differing conclusions.

Third-Year Review of Tenure Earning Faculty

Procedures

According to the schedule and procedures established each year by the Office of Academic Affairs and followed by the Architecture Department, faculty in the third year of a tenure-earning contract shall have their progress towards tenure reviewed during the spring semester by the Department's Tenure & Promotion committee, by their chair, and the dean.

Candidates are obligated to demonstrate that they are making progress towards tenure according to the department's tenure and promotion guidelines, and that they will likely meet the criteria set forth therein by the time they come up for tenure and promotion.

Candidates will follow the schedule for third year reviews outlined by the Office of Academic Affairs. Candidates must discuss their third year review with their department chair, and the college dean in the year prior to the review and be prepared to assemble and submit a portfolio/dossier by February 15 of their third year. According to university policy, the third-year candidate's file with letters of review by the faculty, their chair, the director, and the dean, will be sent to the provost for review. The portfolio/dossier shall contain the necessary information required to adequately assess progress towards tenure. The portfolio/dossier must have

- A current *curriculum vitae*
- A narrative description of accomplishments in the areas of research, creative work, scholarship & professional work
- A narrative description of the plan for the remaining years of the tenure track of appointment
- Past annual appraisals and teaching evaluations
- Evidence of significant research / creative work (including papers and works in progress)

University procedures allow for a faculty member to be given a terminal contract for the following academic year if it is deemed that there is unsatisfactory progress towards tenure.

The Tenure and Promotion committee will review the portfolio/dossier prepared by the candidate following the procedures outlined for tenure review.

Candidate's Responsibility

The candidate is responsible for gathering evidence (in written and/or graphic form) that she or he is making progress toward tenure that will result in likely meeting the department's criteria for tenure and promotion when eligible to apply. The candidate is free to include work of any kind in the portfolio/dossier which she or he believes is relevant to showing progress. It is recommended that the candidate follow, as closely as possible, the format established in the university Tenure and Promotion guidelines for the creation of such a file.

Faculty Tenure and Promotion Committee's Responsibility

Following university policy, all tenured faculty members in the Architecture Department are expected to evaluate and vote upon a candidate's third year review with the exception of the candidate's chair who contributes a separate letter of evaluation of the candidate to the file. The committee must have a quorum, which will be two-thirds of the tenured faculty members eligible to participate on the committee according to university guidelines. Committee members will discuss the candidate's file and elect a chair, who will be responsible for drafting the letter of recommendation on behalf of the committee that will be addressed to the dean of the college and will outline the results of the committee's deliberations. The committee chair will schedule at least one meeting of the eligible tenured faculty for such deliberations. The committee chair will oversee a secret ballot by committee members at that

meeting with the options of : 1) the candidate is “making satisfactory progress towards tenure”; 2) the candidate is “making satisfactory progress towards tenure with recommendations”; 3) the candidate is “making unsatisfactory progress towards tenure”. The committee chair will count the votes and report the results back to the committee during the meeting when the votes are taken. Abstentions are to be discouraged and votes by proxy or those offered in any other manner than by secret ballot at the meeting will not be considered. The results of the vote will be made known in the committee chair’s letter and an explanation of any irregularities or abstentions noted.

Chair’s Responsibility

The chair of the department is responsible for working together with the candidate to outline their professional and academic development towards the third year review, and tenure and promotion. As early as possible in their academic careers at FIU, faculty members should identify, and, in consultation with the chair, approach one or more tenured faculty members to serve as mentors. The mentors may provide advice, look for research, teaching, and, where appropriate, service opportunities, and be available to answer questions about the process of tenure and promotion. The chair of the program will consider such mentoring on the part of tenured faculty members as service to the department. The chair will advise the faculty member and mentor on the direction and nature of the faculty member’s development. In all cases, however, it is the candidate’s responsibility to seek out opportunities for teaching, research, and service that the candidate considers appropriate for progress towards tenure and promotion.

In the Fall semester of the third year, the candidate shall be notified by the department chair of their upcoming third-year review and of their responsibilities in preparation for this review. The chair shall schedule appropriate teaching evaluations and opportunities for the Tenure and Promotion committee members to sit in on the candidate’s classes if they so desire, and evaluate the candidate’s file and the accompanying recommendation of the Tenure and Promotion committee. The department chair will add a letter of review to the candidate’s file and remit the file with all review letters to the dean in a manner consistent with the timetable set forth for third-year review by the Office of Academic Affairs.

Non-Tenure-Track Promotion (NTP) Guidelines

The Department of Architecture Non-Tenure-Track Promotion Guidelines are to abide by the requirements of the Florida International University “Appointment and Promotion Guidelines for Non-Tenure-Track Faculty.”

Non-Tenure-Track Faculty ranks:

Assistant Teaching Professor
Associate Teaching Professor
Teaching Professor

Promotion to Associate Teaching Professor

Promotion to Associate Teaching Professor requires a consistent record of outstanding teaching. In addition to the candidate's qualitative self-evaluation, the promotion dossier should also include student evaluations, indications of any teaching awards received, and annual assignments and annual evaluations. Documentation of this should be included in the file. Promotion will not be considered prior to the start of the sixth year of continuous service as an Assistant Teaching Professor.

For promotion to Associate Teaching Professor, there must be evidence of consistent meritorious achievements in teaching, advising (including student engagement and mentoring), and in other assigned administrative or service activities (e.g., program coordinator, certificate director). Student evaluations of teaching should be superior. In addition, the evaluation will consider such items as peer reviews of one's teaching, one's importance to, and role in improving, the unit's instructional or academic program of course development (or in other areas of assignment) and use of innovative techniques or technologies.

Any pedagogical publications, discipline publications, classroom and laboratory innovations, contributions to student advising, and university service should be included in the promotion application along with evidence that the Assistant Teaching Professor has used the assessment of student learning outcomes to influence in a positive manner his or her teaching. Assistant Teaching Professors are not required to apply for promotion at any time, and an Assistant Teaching Professor applying and failing may continue as an

Assistant Teaching Professor.

Promotion applications will be considered by a committee composed of two Associate Teaching Professor (or Assistant Teaching Professors, if no Associate Teaching Professors are in the department) and three tenured faculty members, chaired by one of the tenured faculty members. The committee makes a recommendation to the department faculty who vote by secret ballot on the application. The Chair makes a recommendation to the Dean who makes a recommendation to the Provost. The promotion is effective in the semester subsequent to the approval by the Provost.

Assistant Teaching Professors promoted to Associate Teaching Professor receive a promotion increment as established in the BOT-UFF Collective Bargaining Agreement.

Promotion to Teaching Professor

Promotion to Teaching Professor uses the same criteria as those for promotion to Associate Teaching Professor. The consistency of teaching success, evidence of teaching quality enhancement, contribution to pedagogy, innovation, and service are important considerations for promotion to Teaching Professor. Associate Teaching Professors are not required to apply for promotion at any time, and an Associate Teaching Professors applying and failing may continue as Associate Teaching Professors. Teaching Professor promotion will not be considered prior to the start of the sixth year of continuous service as a Associate Teaching Professor.

For promotion to Teaching Professor in addition to the above, there should be evidence of superior achievements in teaching (or in other areas of assigned duties), development of innovative techniques or technology, nominations or receipt of teaching awards, grants, or other forms of recognition for achievements.

Promotion applications will be considered by a committee composed of two Teaching Professors (or Associate Teaching Professors or Assistant Teaching Professors, if no Teaching Professors are in the department) and three tenured faculty members, chaired by one of the tenured faculty members. The committee makes a recommendation to the department faculty who vote by secret ballot on the application. The Chair makes a recommendation to the Dean who makes a recommendation to the Provost. The promotion is effective in the semester subsequent to the approval by the Provost.

Associate Teaching Professors promoted to Teaching Professors receive a promotion increment as established in the BOT-UFF Collective Bargaining Agreement.

Merit Raise and Merit Bonus Criteria & Procedures

Criteria:

The criteria for determining merit raise and merit bonus in the Architecture Department shall supplement, but not supersede, the most current college and university criteria. Additionally they shall supplement but not supersede those criteria set forth in the BOT_UFF policy concerning salaries and employee performance evaluation.

The criteria for merit raise and merit bonus in the Architecture Department shall be those established for tenure and promotion. These criteria include the areas of teaching, research and creative work and service and are fully described in sections 1.a)Teaching, 1.b)Research and Creative Work, 1.c) Service.

Procedures

The procedures for determining merit raise and merit bonus in the Architecture Department shall supplement, but not supersede, the most current college and university procedures. Additionally, they shall supplement but not supersede the procedures set forth in the BOT_UFF policy concerning salaries and employee performance evaluation.

The Department Chair shall use the annual reports of faculty accomplishments in the areas of teaching, research and creative work and service as the instrument by which distribution of merit raise and merit bonus is determined. Faculty members shall have the right to present any supplemental accomplishments that were erroneously not included by them in past annual -reports. Any supplemental accomplishments shall be presented to the chair in writing and attached to a copy of the extant annual report as an addendum. If the term (number of annual reports) that the merit increase covers has been determined by the university, it shall be communicated to the

departmental faculty by the chair. If the term is not established by the university or by the UFF-BOT contract, the chair shall confer with the departmental faculty to determine the term. Generally the term for merit raise and merit bonus shall be that period between the last merit raise or bonus and the most recent annual faculty accomplishment submission.

**Department of Architecture
Differential Workload and Assignment Classification Policy**

The College of Architecture + The Arts uses nine categories of teaching and research effort distribution to determine Annual Assignments for all tenured, tenure earning, and non-tenure earning full-time and visiting faculty. Each of the nine categories describes a numerical allocation of weighted teaching, research, and service effort.

Teaching/Research Classification:	# Courses (Fall / Spring)	Teaching Assignment	Classroom Contact Minutes/Week	Research Assignment	Service Assignment
1. Teaching Only	8 (4 / 4)	.90	1200	.00	.10
2. Significantly Enhanced Teaching	7 (3 / 4)	.73 - .89	1050	.001 - .17	.10
3. Enhanced Teaching	6 (3 / 3)	.62 - .72	900	.18 - .28	.10
4. Standard Teaching + Research	5 (2 / 3)	.51 - .61	750	.29 - .39	.10
5. Enhanced Research	4 (2 / 2)	.40 - .50	600	.40 - .50	.10
6. Significantly Enhanced Research	3 (1 / 2)	.29 - .39	450	.51 - .61	.10
7. Intensive Research	2 (1 / 1)	.17 - .28	300	.62 - .72	.10
8. Extensive Research	1 (0 / 1)	.001 - .17	150	.73 - .89	.10
9. Research Only	0 (0 / 0)	.00	0	.90	.10

Notes:

Decisions for allocations of weighted effort should be based on each faculty member's productivity over the most recent three years and the department's needs.

Appendix A, "Course Equivalency Matrix," should be consulted to determine appropriate teaching coefficients.

Appendix B, "Typical Assignment Examples," can also be consulted to determine load distribution.

A total annual teaching load of five courses or fewer (with an assignment of <.89) but which collectively entails 1200-1500 contact minutes per week will be classified as an "Enhanced Teaching" classification.

During the first three-years of the tenure track period, tenure track faculty members are expected to be offered the equivalent of 3 three-credit course reductions. The teaching reduction typically translates into a 2/2 load during each of the first three academic years.

Starting in the fourth year, tenure-track faculty members typically move to a Standardized Teaching + Research classification.

All faculty members in the College will annually be assigned a service effort of ten percent (.10) of their total effort. The remaining ninety percent (.90) of the total effort will be distributed between teaching and research.

Department Chairs will submit **Appendix C, "Department Summary of Effort Table,"** to the Dean listing all department faculty members and their proposed weighted annual assignment using the chart above to indicate planned teaching, research, and service load. Once the Dean has approved the Annual Assignments, the Chair will distribute the Annual Assignments their respective faculty members incorporating the weighted allocation delineated numerically and in narrative form as part of *the Chair's Annual Assignment of Effort Memo*, which is distributed to each full-time and visiting faculty member in accordance with the Collective Bargaining Agreement.

Appendix A: Course Equivalency Matrix

Course Type Description	Assignment Coefficient (equivalency to a standard 3cr course)	Course Credit Hours description	Course Contact Time (Contact Minutes / week)	Course Contact Time Conversion (to 3cr. equivalent)	Enrollment Conversion Factor (for large course enrollments)
2 – 3 Credit Seminar Course	0.1125 of effort	2 Cr – 3 Cr	Minimum 150 contact minutes per week	na	>25 (x 1.17)
2 – 3 Credit Lecture Course	0.1125 of effort	2 Cr – 3 Cr	Minimum 150 contact minutes per week	na	151-250 (x 1.17) 251 -350 (x 1.34) >350 (x 1.50)
4 Credit Lecture/Seminar	0.15 of effort	4 Cr	Minimum 150 contact minutes per week – varies	varies	151-250 (x 1.17) 251 -350 (x 1.34) >350 (x 1.50)
1 Credit Lecture/Seminar	0.04 of effort	1 Cr	Minimum 50 contact minutes per week	varies	na
Design Studio	0.22 of effort	4 Cr – 6 Cr Pre-graduate and Graduate design Studios	Minimum 510 contact minutes per week	255 contact minutes/week	>19 (1.34)
2 – 3 Credit Individual, Applied and Composition Lessons	0.0225 of effort	2 Cr – 3 Cr Typically constituted as weekly 50 min private lessons	Minimum 50 contact minutes per week	250 contact minutes (five lessons equal one 3 cr course)	na
1 Credit Individual, Applied and Composition Lessons	0.0113 of effort	1 Cr Typically constituted as weekly 25 min private lessons	Minimum 25 contact minutes per week	250 contact minutes (ten lessons equal one 3 cr course)	na
Large Ensemble Coaching	0.1125 of effort	Varies	Minimum 200 contact minutes/week	na	>30 (1.17) >50 (1.34) >70 (1.50)
1 Credit Chamber Ensemble	0.022 of effort	1 Cr Typically constituted as weekly Ensemble lessons (per student group)	Minimum 50 contact minutes per week	250 contact minutes (five lessons equal one 3 cr course)	na
Sight Singing, Music Ed, Technique, Other Ensembles & Lab-type classes	0.08 of effort	Varies		na	na
Thesis / Master Project, Recital Sequence	0.1125 of effort	9 credits of lessons & 6 credits of thesis	Minimum 150 contact minutes per week	na	na
Theatre Lab (Variable Credits)	0.04 of effort	1 Cr – 2 Cr A single course's content is typically shared amongst 2-4 faculty. Each faculty receives .04 credit	Minimum 360 contact minutes per week (shared amongst 2-4 faculty)	na	na
Theatre Thesis / Senior Project	0.08 of effort		Minimum 100 contact minutes per week	150 contact minutes	na
New Course Development or Major Curriculum Development	0.04 of effort	Specific duties and expected deliverables are to be outlined in memo from Chair and attached to Annual Assignment	Minimum 50 minutes per week	150 contact minutes	na

Appendix B: Typical Assignment Examples

Example A: (Standard)

Category: Standard Teaching @ .56 (750 Contact Minutes)

Fall	Spring
3 credit course (.1125)	3 credit course (.1125)
3 credit course (.1125)	3 credit course (.1125)
3 credit course (.1125)	

Example B: (Hybrid – Lessons)

Category: Standard Teaching @ .56 (950 Contact Minutes)

Fall	Spring
3 credit course (.1125)	5 2 credit lessons (.022x5=.13)
3 credit course (.1125)	3 credit course (.1125)
5 2 credit lessons (.023x5=.1125)	

Example C: (Lesson - Enhanced)

Category: Enhanced Teaching* @ .56 (1250 Contact Minutes)

Fall	Spring
5 2 credit lessons (.023x5=.1125)	5 2 credit lessons (.022x5=.13)
5 2 credit lessons (.023x5=.1125)	5 2 credit lessons (.023x5=.1125)
5 2 credit lessons (.023x5=.1125)	

Example D: (Studio - Enhanced)

Category: Enhanced Teaching* @ .66 (1320 Contact Minutes)

Fall	Spring
3 credit course (.1125)	3 credit course (.1125)
6 credit studio (.22)	6 credit studio (.22)

Example E: (Studio - Significantly Enhanced)

Category: Significantly Enhanced Teaching @ .88 (1830 Contact Minutes)

Fall	Spring
3 credit course (.1125)	3 credit course (.1125)
6 credit studio (.22)	6 credit studio (.22)
4 credit studio (.22)	

Example F: (Studio - Significantly Enhanced)

Category: Significantly Enhanced Teaching @ .88 (2040 Contact Minutes)

Fall	Spring
6 credit studio (.22)	6 credit studio (.22)
4 credit studio (.22)	4 credit studio (.22)

Example G: (Teaching Only)

Category: Teaching Only @ .90 (1200 Contact Minutes)

Fall	Spring
3 credit course (.1125)	3 credit course (.1125)
3 credit course (.1125)	3 credit course (.1125)
3 credit course (.1125)	3 credit course (.1125)
3 credit course (.1125)	3 credit course (.1125)

*A total annual teaching load of five courses or fewer (with an assignment of .89) but which entails 1200-1500 contact minutes per week will be deemed an "Enhanced Teaching" classification.

Appendix C: Department Summary of Effort Table

Department Name _____
 AY _____
 Department Chair _____

Date Submitted _____
 Date Approved _____

	Last Name	First Name	T TE NTE	Faculty Rank	Assignment Classification	Total Credits	Teaching %	Research %	Service %	Notes
1.										
2.										
3.										
4.										
5.										
6.										
7.										
8.										
9.										
10.										
11.										
12.										
13.										
14.										
15.										
16.										
17.										
18.										
19.										
20.										
21.										
22.										
23.										
24.										
25.										
26.										
27.										
28.										
29.										
30.										

Please identify any of the following in the Notes column:

- Extra State Compensation requests, including proposed additional administrative duties and/or working department titles. ESC requests do not impact the annual assignment as these duties are compensated beyond the annual assignment.
- Explanation for proposing a faculty member's annual service assignment exceeding .10 of his/her total assignment
- Explanation of course release requests