

1. **Department name & general provisions.** In accordance with Article 12 of the UMass-MSP Collective Bargaining Agreement (CBA), these Bylaws have been adopted by a majority vote of the faculty of the Department of Landscape Architecture and Regional Planning (the “Department”) in the College/School of Social and Behavioral Sciences (the “College”) at the University of Massachusetts Amherst (the “University” or “UMass”). Federal and state laws, UMass Trustee policies (including, but not limited to, T76-081, the Academic Personnel Policy, aka the “Red Book”), the CBA, and other established university policies will prevail in instances of conflict with these bylaws. These bylaws may not be construed to limit the rights of the Administration as preserved by Article 4 of the CBA. Those rights include, but are not limited to, the management of budgets, the management of curriculum delivery, the management of space and equipment, and the performance of all responsibilities related to personnel actions as prescribed by the CBA and the Red Book. As required by Article 12, these bylaws are subject to review by the Administration and MSP to ensure that the bylaws do not conflict with prevailing laws, policies, and the CBA; such review must occur before the bylaws or their amendments take effect.
2. **Faculty membership, rights, privileges, and responsibilities.** The Department’s faculty (the “Faculty”) includes all faculty in the Department without regard to bargaining-unit status, tenure status, or full-time equivalency. In general, all members of the Faculty have both the right and duty to participate in governance of the Department, including voting on matters brought before the Faculty, except as specified otherwise below and elsewhere in these Bylaws.
 - 2.1 *Non-Unit Faculty.* Non-unit faculty (department chair/head, associate deans, deans, and other non-unit administrators) may not participate as voting members in personnel actions governed by the CBA. Such non-unit faculty members may not serve on core DPCs (or DPCs expanded to become a committee of the whole) and may not participate as members of the Faculty in promotion and tenure cases. Non-unit faculty may participate in other aspects of academic governance (such as curricular decision-making and faculty searches), provided those faculty do not have separate administrative purview over the same matters.
 - 2.2 *Access & Voting Rights.* All bargaining-unit Faculty may have access to relevant information and may deliberate on all promotion and tenure cases but may vote only on cases where they have themselves been voted onto the DPC or expanded DPC as defined below, and have achieved the rank and/or tenure status under consideration for the candidate.
 - 2.3 *Graduate Faculty.* Only Faculty who have been designated Graduate Faculty by the Dean of the Graduate School may deliberate and vote on graduate program and graduate curricular matters.
 - 2.4 *Part-Time Faculty Appointments Under 50%.* Part-time bargaining-unit non-Graduate Faculty with an FTE less than 50% may have access to relevant information and may deliberate on all non-graduate programmatic and curricular matters but may not vote on such matters.
 - 2.5 *Faculty Appointments Greater than 50%.* Bargaining-unit, non-Graduate Faculty with an FTE of 50% or greater, without regard to tenure status, should have access to relevant information and may deliberate and vote on all non-graduate programmatic and curricular matters.
 - 2.6 *Duty to Participate in Governance.* Except where the composition of an individual’s assigned workload would prohibit such an obligation, all members of the Faculty have a responsibility to participate in governance of the Department and in service to the Department, the School/College, and the University.
 - 2.7 *Rights and Duties of Faculty on Leave.* Faculty on full-time paid leave (including parental leave and sabbatical leave) maintain their rights during the leave to exercise their rights to participate in the governance of the Department. Unless the leave is taken in an emergency, faculty on leave must make prior arrangements for students whose grades may be affected by the leave.
3. **Standing Committees:** The Department maintains the following standing committees:
 - 3.1 *Department Personnel Committee (DPC).*
 - 3.1.1 DPC Purview. All of the Department’s Faculty will annually elect a core DPC to perform the functions assigned to it by the CBA, including but not limited to reviewing the Annual Faculty Review and Evaluation of every member of the Department’s Faculty; reviewing and making recommendations on all promotion and tenure applications within the Department; reviewing and making recommendations on all reappointments of tenure-track Faculty within the Department; reviewing and making recommendations on all promotions of non-tenure-system faculty; participating in Periodic Multi-Year Review of Faculty as

prescribed by the CBA; reviewing and determining Pool A allocations of merit pay among the Department's eligible Faculty as provided for by the CBA; reviewing and making recommendations for anomaly adjustments to salaries as provided for by the CBA; leading the review process for potential reappointment of the Chair/Head.

- 3.1.2 Composition & Eligibility. The core DPC will consist of three LARP faculty. Only DPC members at a rank at or higher than the promoted rank can vote on a case of tenure and/or promotion. In years with a promotion or tenure case, the faculty will vote for enough alternate DPC members of an appropriate rank so that there will always be four people able to vote. These alternate DPC members will convene with the core DPC to make up the Expanded DPC. The Expanded DPC will meet and deliberate on the relevant tenure and promotion case(s), with the core CPC determining all other items in the CPD purview.
 - 3.1.3 Means of Election. At the faculty retreat held each spring, the Chair will solicit nominations (whether self-nominated or by other faculty) for membership in the DPC for the following year. All of the Department's Faculty except for non-unit Faculty are eligible to vote in electing the core DPC. The election should occur by secret ballot at a Department meeting to be convened by the Department Chair/Head. Eligible Faculty who cannot attend the meeting may vote by e-mail to the Department Chair/Head.
 - 3.1.4 Leadership of the DPC. Once elected, the members of the core DPC will select their own committee chair.
 - 3.1.5 Independence of the DPC. On personnel actions for which the CBA identifies independent roles for the DPC and the Chair/Head—such as AFR reviews, reappointment, promotion, tenure, PMYRs, merit-pay allocations, and anomaly recommendations—the DPC will operate independently, and the Chair/Head must not convene or deliberate with the DPC, nor may the Chair/Head attempt by any means to influence the deliberations or judgment of the members of the DPC.
 - 3.1.6 DPC Meetings and Operations. The core DPC should organize and schedule its meetings as necessary to perform its duties and meet the deadlines established by the campus master calendar or by College or Department policies. The DPC, whether meeting as the core or expanded committee, requires a quorum of two-thirds of its eligible members in order to conduct official business; in voting and in drafting written materials, the DPC may conduct its business electronically. When addressing confidential personnel matters, DPC meetings will not be open to non-DPC members. The core DPC should keep a record of its meetings and transactions, which the Department should retain for five years and should be available to subsequent core DPC members; the DPC need not keep meeting minutes.
 - 3.1.7 DPC Responses to the Dean's Queries in RPT Cases. Under the CBA and the Red Book, a dean must consult with the DPC if she/he is considering making a recommendation that differs from the recommendation of the DPC in reappointment, promotion, and tenure cases for tenure-system Faculty. The core DPC must respond in writing.
 - 3.1.8 DPC Consideration of Merit Pay. When the CBA authorizes the award of merit pay and authorizes the DPC to recommend or determine the amounts of merit pay to be allocated to individual members of the Faculty, the DPC must adhere to the CBA's terms for eligibility and the basis of evaluation for such allocations. The DPC may not exclude from consideration any merit-eligible member of the Faculty based on tenure status, rank, full-time equivalency, or constraint of assigned duties.
 - 3.2 *Department Executive Committee*.
 - 3.2.1 DEC Purview. The DEC advises and assists the Chair/Head in the management of the Department, reports on the DEC members' operational areas, and promotes two-way communications between the Chair/Head and the Faculty.
 - 3.2.2 DEC Composition. The DEC includes the following members: the Department Chair/Head, the Associate Chair/Head, the Graduate Program Directors, and the Undergraduate Program Directors.
 - 3.2.3 DEC Meetings and Operations. The Chair/Head schedules and convenes meetings of the DEC, which need not be publicly announced or open to non-members except as required by Massachusetts law.
4. **Tenure-System Faculty Search Committees & Procedures:** The Department will conduct individual tenure-system faculty searches as follows:
- 4.1 *Appointment of Search Committees for Tenure-System Faculty*. When the Provost and the College's Dean have authorized a search for a tenure-system faculty member, the Chair/Head will solicit from among the faculty interest in serving on the search committee. The Chair/Head will appoint members of the committee from among those expressing interest and from other members of the Faculty whose service on the committee would benefit the search process. At the Department Chair's discretion, students may serve on a committee

but cannot vote. Students should be given opportunities to meet faculty candidates and to provide feedback to the search committee. In selecting members, the Chair/Head will attempt to compose a committee that is representative of the Department, that ensures well qualified consideration of applicants' credentials, that promotes the achievement of the University's diversity goals, and that will achieve efficient execution of the search. For senior and open-rank searches, the composition of the committee should be weighted toward senior members of the Faculty. The Chair/Head will designate the committee chair from among its members.

- 4.2 *Purview of Search Committees in Tenure-System Searches.* Committees charged with conducting searches for tenure-system faculty will collaborate with the Chair/Head in developing the position description, advertising/recruitment plan, facilities plan, and other elements of the hiring requisition; will work with the Department's Hiring Manager to fulfill the advertising/recruitment plan; will work with the Office of Equal Opportunity & Diversity and the College's Director of Diversity Advancement with regard to promoting the recruitment of a diverse applicant pool; will receive and screen applications; will conduct initial interviews by phone, by Internet video connection, or at professional meetings (as applicable); will propose a campus-interview list; will make confidentially available to the Faculty the application materials of approved campus interviewees—provided the Faculty individually agree to maintain that confidentiality as described below; will organize campus visits, including public sessions open to all Faculty and students, for approved interviewees; will organize a meeting of all of the Department's Faculty after the last campus interview in order to deliberate and vote (by secret ballot) on the ranking of the acceptable finalists; will write a recommendation that reflects the committee members' independent assessment of the finalists as well as the Faculty's ranking and rationale for that ranking. If the Hiring Authority for the search has asked for an unranked list of acceptable finalists, the Faculty will limit its vote to distinguish between acceptable and unacceptable candidates, and the search committee will use its recommendation to report that information and to describe the strengths and weaknesses of the acceptable finalists.
- 4.3 *Access to Confidential Applicant Materials.* The Department will place in a secure online location the application materials of candidates who have been approved for campus interviews (but not for other applicants). The Department Chair/Head and any Faculty who wish to view applicant materials may do so only after first signing a confidentiality statement that specifies the following:
- ▶ She/he will not disclose or distribute the contents of such confidential information to anyone outside the Department's Faculty or academic administration.
 - ▶ She/he will not disclose or distribute the contents of such confidential information to any of the candidates, including the candidate who may be ultimately employed.
 - ▶ She/he will not make a physical (including printed) or electronic copy of any of the materials.
 - ▶ She/he will not contact any of the parties who have provided confidential references.
 - ▶ She/he will abide by university policies in using the information disclosed in the materials. In particular, she or he will adhere to the university's guidelines on impartiality/objectivity in the university's non-discrimination policy.
- Except for applicants' CVs and cover letters, confidential materials should not be made available to students.
- 4.4 *Role of Faculty in Tenure-System Searches & Selection.* All tenure-system members of the Department's Faculty have a duty to engage in the search and selection process from the beginning of the campus-interview phase through the meeting at which the Faculty rank the acceptable finalists. In order to fulfill that duty, the Faculty should inform themselves by reviewing candidates' application materials and attending candidates' public sessions. The Department's non-tenure-system faculty are welcome to similarly engage in the search and selection process but they do not have a duty to do so; they are also welcome to join with the tenure-system Faculty in deliberating the ranking of the finalists but may not vote on that ranking.
- 4.5 *Conflicts of Interest.* A real or perceived conflict of interest between an applicant and a Faculty member engaged in the search process must be disclosed and must be managed, mitigated, or eliminated. The principles underlying the above prescription include:
- ▶ Neither professional nor personal relationships between applicants and evaluators should influence the selection decision.
 - ▶ Neither professional nor personal relationships between applicants and evaluators should *appear* to influence the selection decision.

- ▶ When such relationships exist, the evaluator must disclose the relationship. Management, mitigation, or elimination of such conflicts should occur as follows:
 - 4.5.1 Search committee members engaged in a **personal** relationship with an applicant must disclose the relationship to others involved in the evaluation of the candidate and must recuse him/herself from any deliberations involving that particular applicant. In most cases, a search committee member with a personal relationship with an applicant who has reached the campus-interview list should recuse him/herself from the committee's work, including deliberations over other applicants.
 - 4.5.2 Search committee members engaged in a **close professional** relationship with an applicant must disclose the relationship to others involved in the evaluation of the candidate and must recuse him/herself from any deliberations involving the applicant but may vote along with other department faculty on all applicants.
 - 4.5.3 A search committee member with a **distant** professional relationship (few collaborations or collaborations older than five years) with an applicant who has reached the shortlist need not recuse him/herself from the committee's work but should disclose the relationship to others involved in evaluation of the candidate. The Faculty member may participate in all discussions of that applicant and need not abstain from voting on any applicant.
- 5. **Non-Tenure-Track (NTT) Faculty Search Committees & Procedures:** The Department will conduct individual non-tenure-track faculty searches using the same procedures as those described above for tenure-system faculty searches with these exceptions:
 - 5.1 *Committee Composition.* While the composition of committees for tenure-system faculty searches should be weighted toward tenured faculty (or, in the case of senior searches, faculty of equal or higher rank), committees composed for NTT searches need not favor senior or tenure-system faculty and should include at least one current NTT faculty member if the Department has such a faculty member available whose workload composition would permit such participation.
 - 5.2 *Purview of Search Committees in NTT Searches.* The purview of the search committee in NTT faculty searches is the same as that for tenure-system faculty searches except that in lieu of convening to deliberate on the finalists, the committee may solicit feedback from all of the Department's Faculty after the last campus interview; will write a recommendation that reflects the Faculty's feedback, the committee's ranking of the acceptable finalists, and the committee's rationale for that ranking.
 - 5.3 *Role of the Faculty in NTT Searches.* The Department's Faculty have a duty to engage in searches for NTT faculty whose appointments are 50% FTE or greater due to the potential for such faculty eventually achieving continuing appointments.
- 6. **Representation by Faculty on College- and University-Level Committees.** Faculty may volunteer for or may agree to be appointed by the Chair/Head to service on college- and university-level committees and in similar roles. Service on the following committees, however, is by election as described below:
 - 6.1 *College Personnel Committee (CPC).* All of the Department's Faculty will annually elect one representative to the CPC to perform the functions assigned to it by the CBA. Eligibility for service on the CPC will be limited to full-time tenured faculty who have achieved the rank of Professor.
 - 6.2 *College Review Committee (CRC).* The CRC reviews the promotion applications of Lecturers and Senior Lecturers and is elected at large across the College by Faculty with any form of the title Lecturer. The Department's Faculty with any form of the title Lecturer will annually nominate from among themselves one person to stand for election to the CRC.
- 7. **Department Meetings.**
 - 7.1 *Frequency.* At least twice per semester and with at least one week's notice, the Chair/Head will schedule and convene general meetings of the Faculty. The Chair/Head may call and convene additional special meetings as necessary to address urgent business of the Department. By petition of at least 20% of the Faculty, the Chair/Head will convene additional special meetings to address matters raised by the petitioners.

- 7.2 *Faculty Duty of Participation.* All Faculty of the Department are expected to attend all general faculty meetings and to attend all special meetings unless university-related duties or event conflicts with the special meeting.
- 7.3 *Meeting Agendas.* The Chair/Head will publish the agenda for each regular Department meeting. The Chair/Head will publish the agenda for any special meeting at the time of the meeting's announcement.
- 7.4 *Rules of Order.* Generally faculty meetings will work by consensus. Any faculty may ask for a more formal process for any topic, and when that occurs, the Department will follow Roberts' Rules of Order in conducting meetings of the Faculty.
- 7.5 *Quorum.* The Department may meet and act on the business of the Department with a quorum consisting of at least half of the Faculty.
- 7.6 *Voting.* On matters requiring a vote of the Faculty, votes may be made by written proxy or electronically in a method to be determined by the Chair/Head. Voice votes on any matter are acceptable unless any individual member of the Faculty requests otherwise, in which case the vote must occur by secret written ballot. Except as otherwise specified in these bylaws, a simple majority vote will suffice to carry a motion.
- 7.7 *Minutes and Recordkeeping.* Unless the Faculty request otherwise and a member of the Faculty volunteers for this duty, the Department's administrative assistant will attend all meetings of the Faculty to take minutes, which will be circulated to the Faculty no later than two weeks after the meeting. The Department will maintain records of all meetings, including minutes and votes, for at least five years.
8. **Department Specifications for Reappointment, Promotion, and Tenure (RPT).** All standards and most procedures related to reappointment, promotion, and tenure of Faculty are governed by the CBA and the Red Book. The following additional terms do not alter or interpret those standards and procedures but instead set department-level specifications where the CBA and Red Book permit local control.
- 8.1 *External Reviews of RPT Cases.*
- 8.1.1 *Personnel Actions Requiring External Reviews.* All promotion and all tenure cases for tenure-system faculty require external reviews (as specified in the Red Book and CBA). Reappointments of tenure-system faculty during their probationary periods do not require external reviews. Neither reappointments nor promotions for non-tenure-system faculty require external reviews; however, as permitted by the CBA's Article 21, Lecturers may request external reviews.
- 8.1.2 *Number of External Reviews.* The Department Chair/Head will make a good-faith effort to secure six to eight "arm's-length" external reviews for every promotion and/or tenure case that requires external reviews. The Chair/Head may solicit and add to the file any number of reviews from reviewers "close" to the candidate. Such close reviews are especially helpful in cases where the reviewer can describe the candidate's particular contributions to collaborative work.
- 8.1.3 *Identification and Solicitation of External Reviewers.* The CBA charges the Chair/Head with soliciting external reviewers and permits the candidate to suggest external reviewers, some or all of whom shall be solicited by the Chair/Head. The Chair/Head may consult with the DPC or other members of the Faculty in identifying appropriate external reviewers but may not delegate the solicitation process to others. Similarly, the Chair/Head may receive assistance in describing the "standing" of each external reviewer in the candidate's file, but the Chair/Head is ultimately responsible for ensuring that that description clearly and completely makes the case for why each external reviewer is well positioned to perform the review; this description should be crafted for academic audiences who are unfamiliar with the pertinent scholarly field. Under most circumstances, the solicitation of external reviews should occur no later than three months before the candidate's file submission deadline.
- 8.1.4 *Qualifications of External Reviewers.* In general, external reviewers should be well recognized scholars or professionals in the candidate's field, should hold the rank of Professor, should have active scholarly programs, and should be at institutions that are at least peers of UMass. External reviewers who do not meet these criteria may be appropriate and acceptable, but in describing the "standing" of such reviewers, the Chair/Head should carefully explain why such reviewers are appropriate for the task of commenting on the candidate's having met the relevant standards.

- 8.1.5 *Candidate's Rights Regarding External Reviewers.* Before making such solicitations, the Chair/Head must show the solicitation list and solicitation message to the candidate, who may comment on but may not demand changes to the list or message. The list shall include some of the external reviewers suggested by the candidate. If the candidate identifies a conflict of interest with any of the proposed reviewers, the Chair/Head should assess whether a true conflict exists and, if one does, should eliminate, mitigate, or manage the conflict.
- 8.2 *Internal Reviews of RPT Cases.*
- 8.2.1 *Identification & Solicitation of UMass Faculty & Staff Reviews.* The candidate and the Chair/Head may identify potential reviewers internal to UMass Amherst. Such internal reviews are not required and should not be regarded as substitutes for external letters. Internal letters may be especially helpful in cases where the reviewer can describe the candidate's particular contributions to collaborations within the department or across campus. The Chair/Head must individually solicit such internal reviews.
- 8.2.2 *Identification and Solicitation of Student Reviews.* The Chair/Head may solicit comments from individual students. Written, signed comments from individual students—especially from those for whom the candidate has served as an advisor, mentor, or collaborator—are especially helpful in identifying the candidate's work outside the classroom. Such reviews should be individually solicited. The Chair/Head may also solicit comments from groups of students; responses to such non-individual solicitations are never protected by the candidate's waiver of access rights, and any "group solicitations" should advise potential respondents that their responses will not be confidential.
- 8.3 *Waiver of Rights of Access to Review Letters.* A candidate for RPT may waive or decline to waive her/his rights of access to internal and external review letters that have been individually solicited. The decision whether or not to waive those rights belongs exclusively to the candidate, and neither the Chair/Head nor any other member of the Faculty should pressure the candidate to decide one way or another.
- 8.4 *Participation of Faculty in RPT Cases.* Section 2 above describes the permissible participation of the Faculty beyond the core DPC in the consideration of RPT cases.
- 8.5 *Evaluation of Teaching Effectiveness for RPT.* The CBA's Article 33 requires that every department develop or adopt one or several modes appropriate to the evaluation of teaching in that unit and procedures for the administration of student evaluations of teaching. In compliance with that requirement, the Department adopts the following:
- 8.5.1 *Student Evaluations of Teaching Effectiveness in Classroom Settings.* All Faculty should use the centrally administered SRTI instrument to solicit and receive student evaluations in every course section taught. Faculty may not themselves administer or collect student evaluations. Individual Faculty may supplement but may not replace the SRTI instrument with other another instrument(s).
- 8.5.2 *Peer & Expert Evaluations of Teaching Effectiveness.* Untenured Faculty in their probationary period and NTT Faculty intending to seek promotion should seek consultation and formative evaluations of their teaching effectiveness from the Institute for Teaching Effectiveness & Faculty Development. Such Faculty plus tenured Faculty expecting to apply for promotion within a year or two should solicit evaluations through direct observation of their teaching from peers inside or outside the Department. While peer and expert evaluations are not required of any Faculty member, they help provide valuable evidence in making a case for reappointment, promotion, and/or tenure.
- 8.5.3 *Contributions to Program & Curriculum Development.* Applications for RPT should include evidence of the candidate's contributions to program and curriculum development (if any).
- 8.5.4 *Evidence of Effective Service for RPT.* Applications for RPT should include evidence of the candidate's contributions to service. The CBA and Red Book require that all tenure-system Faculty engage in service. NTT faculty are required to engage in service only if it is part of their assigned duties. The CBA requires that service to the faculty union and service outside the Department be considered at the department level as part of any Faculty member's AFR or evaluation for RPT purposes. In general, the consideration of service should be inclusive, acknowledging the contributions that candidates make both inside and outside the Department and inside and outside the university. The extent to which service outside the university is relevant to a case for RPT depends on the pertinence of that service to the individual's professional profile or to advancement of the university's mission. Service may include that provided in governance or management of the Department, the College, the University, or the profession; that representing outreach to extend knowledge beyond the university/professional community; and that intended to promote

community engagement as a benefit both to the university community and to the off-campus community. Especially important is evidence of leadership in making service contributions.

9 Annual Faculty Review and Evaluation. All MSP bargaining unit faculty are to be evaluated annually. The CBA's Article 33 requires use of the bargained AFR form by every member of the Faculty who is 50% FTE or greater. . The core DPC and the Chair/Head should substantively and candidly conduct their evaluations of each Faculty member's AFR.

- 9.1 *Review of the Department Chair/Head.* If the Chair/Head wishes to be reappointed to another term in that position, the Department's Faculty, led by the DPC, will conduct a review of the Chair/Head during the fall semester of the final year of her/his appointment. The DPC will follow the procedures prescribed by Senate Document #82-021, beginning the process no later than October 15 during the final year of the Chair/Head's appointment.
- 9.1.1 *Self-Evaluation.* As an initial step, the Chair/Head will prepare a written self-evaluation of her/his administrative achievements during the current appointment and will provide that document to the Faculty no later than October 15th.
- 9.1.2 *Survey.* The DPC will prepare and distribute three confidential surveys no later than November 1st: (1) one to departmental staff; (2) one to all undergraduate majors and all graduate students; and (3) one to the Department's Faculty. Each survey will include specific questions regarding overall performance, both administrative, interpersonal, and management of departmental interactions. These surveys will provide space for extended comments. Raw data and summaries of responses to these surveys will be reviewed by the DPC, will be redacted to protect the identities of all respondents, and will be included with the DPC's report to the dean but will not be available to faculty, staff, or students.
- 9.1.3 *Meetings with Constituencies.* The DPC will offer to meet with employee and student groups to receive confidential assessments of the Chair/Head's performance. Summaries of information gathered in such meetings will be included with the DPC's report to the dean but will not be available to faculty, staff, or students.
- 9.1.4 *Meeting with the Chair/Head.* After most data collection is complete, the DPC will invite the Chair/Head to meet to discuss the initial findings of the data collection process. The Chair/Head may decline to meet.
- 9.1.5 *Draft Report.* No later than December 1st, the DPC will complete and distribute to the Faculty a draft report (excluding raw or other data that could compromise the confidentiality of those contributing to this process), including a summary of findings, an assessment of areas of success and of needed improvement, and a non-binding recommendation regarding whether the Chair/Head should be reappointed. The report should assiduously limit its assessment to areas within the purview and control of the Chair/Head.
- 9.1.6 *Concluding Meeting of the Faculty.* The DPC will convene the Faculty to discuss the draft report and to receive recommendations for revision of the document.
- 9.1.7 *Final Report.* The DPC will finalize its report and will then submit it to the Dean, simultaneously providing a copy to the Chair/Head (excluding raw and other confidential data). The Dean may ask to meet with the DPC to discuss the report, but neither the DPC nor the Dean is obliged to meet.
- 9.1.8 *Chair/Head's Response.* The Chair/Head may prepare and submit to the Dean a written response to the final report.

10. Implementation of these bylaws: By at least a two-thirds' majority vote of the Faculty, these bylaws are adopted and take effect on [date]. The terms of these bylaws supersede existing policies or practices of the Department to the extent that they address or conflict the matters addressed by such policies and practices. However, if ongoing processes would be unreasonably disrupted by implementation of these bylaws, individual provisions of these bylaws may be deferred until those processes are complete, provided that such deferral lasts no longer than one year beyond the effective date cited in this paragraph. Deferral of individual provisions will not result in deferral of other provisions.

11. Amendment of these bylaws: By majority vote, the Faculty may elect an ad hoc committee to review and propose amendments to these bylaws. Adoption of any such amendments, including their dates of effectiveness, requires a two-thirds' vote of the Faculty.

Hiring, Tenure and Promotion Guidance

Department Landscape Architecture and Regional Planning

Approved by full vote of the faculty, March 23, 2012, revised with vote of full faculty XXX, 2016

This guidance document supplements the Departmental ByLaws. In cases of conflict, the ByLaws will be the ruling document.

The Department Landscape Architecture and Regional Planning is a multidisciplinary department that involves social sciences (planning, public policy and management, economic development, and cultural and heritage studies), physical sciences (ecology, site engineering and construction) and humanities (history and design). The department recognizes both basic and applied research, including studies and outreach efforts that support the land grant mission of the University of Massachusetts. The department has three nationally accredited professional degrees, two in landscape architecture and one in planning, and thus the department has a strong connection to both research and practice.

The Department Personnel Committee (DPC), whose members are nominated and elected by vote of the full faculty, makes personnel recommendations for tenure and promotion. Only DPC members at a rank at or higher than the promoted rank can vote on a case of tenure and/or promotion. That is, only Associate or Full professors can vote on a case of promotion from Assistant to Associate, only Full professors can vote on a case of promotion from Associate to Full Professor, etc. In years with a promotion or tenure case, the faculty will vote for enough alternate DPC members of an appropriate rank so that there will always be four people able to vote.

For tenure system faculty personnel recommendations and decisions for tenure and promotion, the DPC must follow section 4.1 of the UMass "Red Book" which states: "Personnel recommendations and decisions shall be made only after a review of all of the qualifications and all the contributions of the individual in the areas of teaching; of research; creative or professional activity; and of service. All three areas must be considered, but the relative weight to be given to each may be determined in the light of the duties of the faculty member".

For tenure and promotion to Associate Professor, a candidate's record must include, among other things, "convincing evidence of excellence in at least two, and strength in the third, of the areas", demonstration of "recognition on and off campus among scholars professionals in his or her field" and "reasonable assurance of continuing development and achievement leading to further contributions to the University" (sections 4.6 b and 4.9 a & b).

For promotion to Full Professor, a candidate must demonstrate contributions in all 3 areas, and “must have a record of achievement sufficient to have gained substantial recognition on and off campus from scholars or professionals in his or her field; and must show significant potential for continuing professional achievement” (section 4.6c).

For promotion to Senior Lecturer, a candidate must demonstrate meritorious performance in the area(s) of the individual’s responsibility and show promise of continuing professional development and achievement. The candidate must also demonstrate excellence in teaching.

For promotion to Senior Lecturer II, a candidate must demonstrate sustained meritorious performance in the area(s) of the individual’s responsibility and promise of continuing professional development and achievement.

The typical tenure track faculty teaching appointment is either 4 lecture classes or 2 lecture classes and 3 half-semester studio modules per academic year. This results in 50-62.5% instructional activity (12-15 credits/academic year). The remaining components are 20-40% research, creative, or professional activity, and 5-17.5% service activity. A typical lecturer appointment is teaching 6-7 classes per academic year (75-82.5%), 0% research, creative, or professional activity, and 5-17.5% service activity. However, individual faculty may have appointments with different allocations that are agreed upon by the faculty member and department chair, and appointments for individuals may vary among years. As a result, the expectations for publications, grants, teaching, extension, and other activities may vary with the faculty member’s discipline and the nature of the appointment. Individuals with a fractional appointment have proportional expectations.

Tenure-track faculty receive the MSP bargained course load reduction once during their pre-tenure period, and have reduced service expectations. Associate and full professors are expected to provide increasingly higher amounts of service to the department and the university than untenured faculty.

Expectations for Teaching and Mentoring

A teaching load of 15 academic credits (5 courses) per academic year is equivalent to a 62.5% appointment, with 100% teaching being equal to a maximum of 24 credits. Teaching load, however, also includes consideration of research activity, administrative service to the department, the number of labs and multiple sections taught, student enrollment, and the establishment of new courses.

The department values faculty members’ engagement in informal teaching defined as the advising/mentoring of students, assisting with student design competition entries and supervising practica. In addition, all faculty

are expected to act as chairs and members of graduate student theses and project committees at a rate roughly proportional to the need based on numbers of graduate students in the faculty member's home program.

Evaluations of teaching focus on SRTI Questions 10, 11 and 12 (considered to be "global items" by TEFD). In addition to SRTI responses, teaching load, letters of commendation, undergraduate advising, graduate advising, the amount of informal teaching engagement, student awards, course syllabi and other submitted materials are considered in identifying excellence. There should be evidence of continued pedagogical development by the faculty and we expect course topics to be up to date and course content to cover the breadth and depth of an experienced faculty member.

Faculty preparing for promotion and/or tenure are encouraged to prepare a teaching portfolio sufficient to enable departmental and university peers, administrators and outside evaluators to evaluate the candidate's teaching effectiveness.

Expectations for Research, Creative, or Professional Activity

Excellence in research or other creative activities is judged substantially by the impact that a faculty member has on their field. External letters from experts in the field play an important role in assessing the quality of a faculty member's achievements. A complete tenure/promotion package should include a minimum of six to eight external reviewers of higher rank, who are considered 'arms length' or 'not-close' under standards developed by the Provost and/or MSP. Generally, 'arms length' excludes those who were thesis or post-doctoral advisors, recent collaborators, or personal friends. An expanded list of reviewers may include internal reviewers -- close collaborators and colleagues from UMASS from other departments. The candidate must provide the Department Chair with a list of recommended reviewers, including a brief description of their expertise and qualification. The Department Chair will develop his/her own list of potential reviewers, and discuss these with the candidate to assure that there is no perceived conflict of interest. But the Department Chair is solely responsible for choosing and soliciting reviewers.

In more quantitative assessments, LARP Departmental expectations for each 20% research appointment are for authorship or co-authorship of one refereed journal article per year, or one significant, completed, and peer-recognized creative or professional activity per year. Thus a faculty with a 40% research appointment would be expected to have two publications or creative achievements per academic year to meet expectations.

Books are considered a significant accomplishment, roughly equivalent to 3 – 4 journal articles if published in an

academic press. Refereed/edited book chapters are considered equal to one journal article. Reviewed papers in conference proceedings and publications in professional periodicals with large readership are important, however they are of lesser impact than journal articles or book chapters, therefore they are typically valued as a half of a publication. Conference presentations, published abstracts, book reviews and editorship of conference proceedings are examples of other achievements contributing to a positive research evaluation.

The quality of publications and level of author contribution are also considered in evaluating the level of achievement. Quality is always a subjective measure, but indications of high quality include journals that have a high impact factor or are otherwise considered 'excellent' by peers in the discipline. In preparation for tenure and promotion, faculty may wish to solicit letters from co-authors that delineate the respective roles of the co-authors, and include this in their package.

Creative and professional activity is highly valued in the planning and design fields and department. Designs achieve significance when they have been recognized through peer-review. This usually takes the form of design awards by professional organizations (rated by international, national, regional) and design competitions (rated by scope and importance). An honor or merit award by a professional organization or winning a national design competition may be viewed as being equivalent to a publication, book chapter or refereed article. If students win a design competition or win a student award, the faculty advisor should be given the same recognition as a faculty serving as second author to a student on a journal article or conference paper depending on the organization. Publication of design entries in catalogs, exhibitions of work, or curated exhibitions are considered peer-recognized activities.

Faculty members are encouraged to seek external grant funding to support their research. The department recognizes all forms and sources of external funding to support research, creative and professional activity as significant. Competitive external awards are considered most significant, proportional to the candidate's contribution and role (PI, Co-PI, Contributor). External funding from contracts for design and planning services with state, regional, local or private sources are also recognized as significant if the funding runs through the university.

Expectations for Service

There is an expectation that all tenure and non-tenure track faculty will participate in: 1) regular departmental governance; 2) governance committees and other activities associated with interdepartmental, center, college, or university governance or management activity; and 3) professional and disciplinary activities. However, junior faculty are advised to have somewhat less activity with university and/or professional service overall, and to

focus that service, when possible, to activities such as the review of manuscripts or grant proposals, organizing conferences, or serving on journal editorial boards.

Extension and other outreach activities are also considered to be important service activities. Excellence in service, regardless of faculty rank, must include evidence of leadership or exceptional influence in university and/or disciplinary service. This usually includes more than membership on committees (e.g., serving as chair or co-chair), but might also include significant, noteworthy, and documented university service, or professional public service through the application of academic or professional expertise at the local, state, regional, national, or international level.

Hiring Procedures

LARP is guided by the university search and personnel procedures in effect at the time of any faculty line search. Generally, the Department Chair will appoint a Search Committee chair, and then work with the Search Chair to identify a committee of between three and five members who represent the diversity of interests in the department. The Search Committee may include an outside member. An advanced graduate student may be appointed as a non-voting member of the Search Committee. The Search Committee performs an initial screening of candidates, selects those candidates for on-campus interviews, and then interviews candidates. Times in each candidate's schedule must be provided so that all full-time LARP faculty have an opportunity for a small group meeting with candidates. Candidates' job talks are open to all faculty, students, and the outside community. Soon after all candidates have completed their on-campus interviews, the Search Committee will hold an open forum with all full-time faculty invited. At the forum, faculty of all ranks have an opportunity for a full and frank discussion of each candidate's strengths and weaknesses which serves as consultative and collaborative input for the Search Committee. In addition, the Search Committee may conduct an anonymous survey of the faculty to identify leading candidates. The Search Committee may poll students as to their preferences. The Search Committee takes the collective and consultative input of the full faculty and students into account when they evaluate each candidate's strengths and weaknesses. In the hiring of senior faculty (associate and above), particular consideration will be given to the perspectives of faculty at and above the proposed rank of the new hire. In cases where a proposed hire is likely to come in as a tenured and full professor, any LARP full professor can ask for a vote of all full professors to rank the candidates, and this vote will be used by the Search Committee to develop their memo to the Chair. The Search Committee then prepares a memo for the Department Chair, who also prepares a separate memo expressing her/his perceptions of each candidate's strengths and weaknesses. These memos are then sent to the Dean for hiring action.

Please note that nothing in this document overrides the departmental bylaws or the duly negotiated MSP guidelines in effect at the time of a personnel action.