



Landscape Architecture Program 2023-2024

Introduction

Appendix I.1: Completed Current Tenure and Promotion policies.

Appendix I.2: BLA Updated Exit Survey

Appendix I.3: MLA Updated Exit Survey

DRAFT

SCHOOL OF ARCHITECTURE

TENURE, PROMOTION, AND REVIEW PRINCIPLES AND GUIDELINES

Parts I and II as approved by the faculty 25 October 2019

I. OVERARCHING PRINCIPLES

1. **Faculty Manual Guidelines:** School Tenure, Promotion and Review (TPR) and Post-Tenure Review (PTR) procedures shall abide by and align with the guidelines outlined in the Faculty Manual, including appendices, as well as other Provost and Senate-approved guidelines and best practices. The Faculty Manual indicates that the academic unit's TPR document will specify criteria for evaluation and promotion; procedures; and committee structures; and that this document shall be distinct from Bylaws.
2. **Shared Structures and Procedures:** The School is a shared academic structure and its faculty shall work to maintain productive collaboration and utilize shared procedures in TPR matters.
3. **Peer Review:** The Faculty Manual indicates that peer evaluation is essential and that the regular faculty are the primary judge of the qualifications of its members. All peer recommendations regarding rank originate with the regular faculty of a discipline.
4. **Respect for Disciplines:** The Faculty Manual, including the University's *Constitution*, indicates the importance of disciplines and aligns individual disciplines with individual departments. In TPR matters, the faculty and administrators of the School shall respect the faculties' knowledge of their various disciplines. Disciplines shall be granted appropriate levels of autonomy and self-determination in academic matters, including curriculum, appointment, tenure, and promotion. In the case of accredited programs, a certain degree of autonomy is expected and shall be considered in these guidelines.
 - a. At the time of this document's approval by the School's faculty, the disciplines within the School of Architecture are: Architecture; Historic Preservation; Landscape Architecture; and Urban Design. These are intellectual fields with distinct histories; distinct educational traditions and degree programs; national and international academic bodies; national and international professional bodies; accreditation procedures (in the case of Architecture and Landscape Architecture); etc. Because faculty are responsible for curriculum, course content, and peer review, administrative structures shall not undermine disciplines as defined by their faculties.
 - b. Faculty are associated with disciplines by virtue of their academic/professional degrees and appointment. For example, an "assistant professor of architecture" is associated with the discipline of architecture, as well as the School's program or programs in architecture; the "director of the Master of Resilient Urban Design" is associated with the discipline of Urban Design, as well as the School's program in urban design. Within the School of Architecture, faculty also have a tradition of meeting by program or disciplinary subgroups; these groupings also generally define disciplines within the School.
 - c. Respect for individual disciplines is not regarded as being in opposition to interdisciplinary or transdisciplinary collaboration. However, a general expectation in such collaborations is individual expertise within a discipline.

5. **Respect for Differing Modes of Working:** Even within disciplines, the faculty of the School follow different professional paths and develop their expertise in different areas or sub-disciplines. While all faculty are expected to pursue their work at a high level, their differing modes of working—whether focused on practice, design, or scholarship (i.e., history, building technology, professional practice, fabrication, visualization, etc.)—shall be respected within TPR guidelines and recognized within evaluation criteria.
6. **Respect for Faculty Ranks:** Faculty of different ranks and faculty aspiring to promotion to various ranks have differing criteria for promotion. However, all faculty, whatever their rank, deserve respect for their contributions to the School.
7. **Anticipating Change and Growth:** Whereas academic disciplines often have long histories, academic administrative structures appear, disappear, and change more quickly. Today, the School includes various disciplines in a college-like way. With a history of changes in mind, these TPR guidelines, as a set of principles, seek to anticipate changes to the structure of the School and College; the addition of disciplines and programs; the growth of disciplines and programs, and the departure of others; and other such circumstances related to the aggregation or disaggregation of disciplines.
8. **Future Changes to this Document and these Guidelines:** Insofar as disciplines are important and insofar as regular faculty are the primary authors of this peer-evaluation system, faculty shall have the means to revise this document and these guidelines. The ability to revisit and change these guidelines, as they affect the various disciplines, shall not be precluded by the size of a discipline.
9. **Procedures for Changing this Document and these Guidelines:** Any faculty member (special, regular, or administrative) may request the review of and propose changes to this document. Such a request will trigger the scheduling of a Faculty Advisory Committee meeting, if not already scheduled within the next four weeks (during the academic year), to review the request or proposal. If the Advisory Committee feels that the issue or proposal has merit, it will be discussed with the TPR committees (as deemed appropriate for the issue). If the FAC and TPR committee(s) draft a change, then a TPR document change will then be circulated two weeks in advance of a school-wide faculty meeting (see Bylaws regarding calling faculty meetings) for discussion and/or vote. If the change concerns only disciplinary assessment matters such as the 7-point scales or other evaluation systems that are specific to a discipline, then the change will only need approval of the faculty within that discipline (as well as any required administrative review, but not other faculty within the School).
10. **Distinction of TPR Guidelines from Bylaws:** As specified in the Faculty Manual, TPR matters shall be contained within this document, separate from School bylaws.
11. **Definitions.**
 - a. “Guidelines” refer to the overall TPR process.
 - b. “Procedures” refer to the operations of the process, including committee formation; communications; and the work of the committee, etc.
 - c. “Criteria” refer to the faculty-determined standards for promotion and evaluation.
 - d. As defined by the Faculty Manual, “regular faculty” are those holding the ranks of Instructor, Assistant, Associate, and full Professor, who do not have administrative responsibilities that include reviewing or evaluating other faculty members (i.e., they are not “administrative faculty”). “Special faculty” include Lecturers,

Professors of Practice, and all other non-tenure-track and non-tenured ranks. Individual faculty ranks are defined in the Faculty Manual.

- e. "Discipline," following the familiar dictionary definition, refers to an academic branch or field of knowledge. A discipline is an intellectual specialization that has a distinct history, educational traditions, degree programs and academic degrees, national academic and professional bodies, accreditation processes, and/or conferences, publications, etc. that distinguish it from other disciplines.
- f. "Program" has multiple meanings, which makes it a vague term in everyday language. While sometimes "Program" may refer to a discipline, "program" shall generally refer to a degree program. A discipline (i.e., a capital-P "Program") may have multiple programs (i.e., the disciplines of Architecture and Landscape Architecture have various undergraduate and graduate degree programs, certificate programs, off-campus study programs, etc.).

II. PROCEDURES INCLUDING COMMITTEE MEMBERSHIP

1. **Independence of TPR Committee and School Director:** As indicated in the Faculty Manual, the TPR Committee shall be composed of regular faculty. The TPR Committee shall perform evaluations independently from the school director, but the director may serve as a resource for the TPR committee. Following procedures elaborated in the Faculty Manual, this Committee reviews matters of appointment, tenure and promotion, and in each case prepares a formal recommendation.
2. **Written and Explicit Procedures:** As indicated in the Faculty Manual, TPR procedures shall be written, as herein, as explicitly as possible. The general process for review of faculty for promotion and tenure is described in the Faculty Manual. Each request for reappointment, promotion, and tenure requires the uploading of supportive materials to the University's online review system. Faculty seeking reappointment, tenure, or promotion must initiate a request in advance of the request deadline; the deadlines set forth by the provost and college's dean must be observed. These dates are available each year from the Dean's office. To guide and answer questions of candidates, the TPR committee offers candidates an annual meeting on matters of promotion and tenure; additionally, tenure track candidates are urged to seek guidance from their faculty mentors as assigned by the school director.
3. **TPR Committee Formation and Membership:** Committees shall be formed by election of regular faculty within a discipline when there are a sufficient number of faculty of the requisite rank within a discipline to form a committee (minimum of 3).
 - 3.1 As indicated in the Faculty Manual, a department chair may not appoint committee members, and this is understood to apply to school directors as well.
 - 3.2 The slate of eligible TPR committee members shall be based on the number and rank of candidate(s) to be reviewed for reappointment and promotion in the upcoming academic year. The slate shall be voted on or affirmed by the discipline's voting membership prior to the Provost's deadline for the department chair/school director to enter the committee members into the eTPR system.
 - 3.3 TPR committee members must be at or above the rank to which promotion is sought.
 - 3.4 As indicated in the Faculty Manual, when a discipline does not have enough faculty to form the appropriate committee, whether due to the overall number of

regular faculty or faculty at a given rank, the program director of that discipline, with the assistance of the school director and Faculty Advisory Committee, shall identify eligible committee members in a related discipline. The slate shall be voted on or affirmed by the discipline's regular, tenured faculty prior to the provost's deadline for the department chair to enter the committee members into the eTPR system.

- 3.5 If elected regular faculty members from other disciplines do not consent to serve, then the discipline's program director will consult with the Faculty Advisory Committee for resolving TPR committee formation. (See Conflicts of Interest and Recusal below.)
 - 3.6 Committee membership shall be made known to the faculty, including the candidate, if not known through a vote.
 - 3.7 TPR committees shall elect a chair. The committee chair shall have a leadership role in the committee and its operations. However, the committee chair shall not be the sole author of any written evaluations. All committee members shall have the full responsibility and opportunity to participate in the peer-review process and the writing of the evaluation summary.
 - 3.8 Associate school directors, program directors, and associate chairs who do not review faculty performance in an administrative capacity and who are not considered administrative faculty may serve as TPR committee members.
 - 3.9 The TPR committee and school director have until the date specified by the Provost's office to write their letters of recommendations to the Dean. These letters are uploaded by the school director and TPR committee into the eTPR system. The candidate is notified once letters are uploaded. The candidate is asked to view the letters and sign that they read said letters. Following the Dean's review the candidate is notified once more to review the Dean's letter and sign. They then request the Dean's recommendation be forwarded to the Provost. This process is consistent with procedures in the Faculty Manual, and if found not to be in the future, the Faculty Manual procedure supersedes.
4. **Post-Tenure Review (PTR) Committee Formation:** The PTR committee is distinct from TPR committees. PTR committee members must be of the appropriate rank. See the Faculty Manual for more information.
 5. **School TPR Chair/Representative to College/University Committees:** The TPR committee members of all disciplines shall elect a TPR representative for the School. This School TPR Chair shall be a liaison for communications to and from the faculty, school director, and college dean. This School representative shall not supersede the role of disciplinary committee TPR chairs as described above.
 6. **Conflicts of Interest and Recusal:** Faculty shall recuse themselves from serving on review committees for colleagues with whom they have an intimate personal relationship or especially close professional relationship, characterized by substantial collaborative work such as numerous co-authored papers; significant or

numerous shared research projects; business partnerships; and similar circumstances wherein the evaluator has a vested interest in the work of the candidate.

- 6.1 If a faculty member with conflicts of interest does not recuse themselves of their own initiative, then school director shall seek advice from the Faculty Advisory Committee to mandate recusal.

7. **TPR Committee Collaboration with Search and Screening Committees:** Search and screening committees are separate from TPR committees and are formed in accordance with the Faculty Manual and School Bylaws. Proposals for appointment with immediate tenure, tenure probationary periods of two years or less, and appointment at a rank higher than assistant professor must be reviewed in accordance with the department's tenure and promotion process. At a minimum, department criteria regarding teaching, research, and service must be applied; tenure and/ or promotion at another institution be considered; and the department TPR committee, chair, Dean, and Provost must all endorse the procedure. The TPR committee may review the qualifications of faculty candidates at other ranks as deemed necessary by the school director, and/or Faculty Advisory Committee.
8. **General Terms of Hiring:** The hiring and evaluation of all new faculty shall be subject to faculty search processes and disciplinary peer review, with the exception of lecturers, who may be hired by the school director on short notice to fulfill unanticipated, short-term staffing shortages.
9. **General Terms of Performance Evaluation and Promotion Schedules:** The details in this section are consistent with the Faculty Manual, but if found not to be in the future, the Faculty Manual supersedes these terms of promotion and review by rank. The specific timelines of evaluation for faculty of various ranks are determined outside of the School but are summarized in this section; faculty seeking renewal and promotion shall consult the *Provost's Calendar of Date and Deadlines*. Performance evaluation is independent of reviews for the purposes of reappointment, tenure or promotion, although the annual performance evaluations are a critical data point in post-tenure review. The performance evaluation by the school director shall be conducted on a performance year basis using the Faculty Activity System (FAS). The ranks listed below are those held by faculty within the School of Architecture; the list shall be amended as ranks are added. Faculty shall be evaluated by disciplinary TPR committees, according to the following schedule for promotion and according to the disciplinary evaluation criteria found in the Appendices:

Regular Faculty

- 9.1 **Assistant Professor:** Performance evaluation and reappointment review annually. Assistant professors shall participate in a comprehensive review of progress toward tenure by the disciplinary TPR committee in the 3rd year. Promotion to Associate Professor occurs according to the timeline specified in an Assistant Professor's letter of offer. The Faculty Manual provides guidelines regarding "early tenure" requests or delay of the tenure timeline.

- 9.2 **Associate Professor with Tenure:** Performance evaluation annually. See Post-Tenure Review section of this document for PTR review schedule. Promotion to full professor may be requested after the 5th year following tenure. Evaluation for promotion to Full Professor occurs after a candidate's Notification of Intention to Request Promotion.
- 9.3 **Full Professor with Tenure:** Performance evaluation annually. See Post-Tenure Review section of this document for PTR review schedule.

Special Faculty

- 9.4 **Lecturer:** Performance evaluation annually. TPR and reappointment review annually. Promotion to Senior Lecturer may be applied for after four full academic years of service by a lecturer; equivalent experience at Clemson may be counted towards the four-year service requirement. Following the lecturer's fourth year of service, the school director and the TPR committee shall conduct a comprehensive review of the lecturer either in response to a request for promotion to senior lecturer or to advise the lecturer of progress towards promotion to senior lecturer. Lecturers shall not be reappointed following a final ninth year if not promoted to senior lecturer.
- 9.5 **Senior Lecturer:** Performance evaluation annually. TPR and reappointment review every three years. Promotion to Principal Lecture may be applied for after four full academic years of service by a Senior Lecturer; equivalent experience at Clemson may be counted towards the four-year service requirement. Following a senior lecturer's fourth year of service the school director and TPR committee shall conduct a comprehensive review of the senior lecturer either in response to a request for promotion to principal lecturer or to advise the senior lecturer towards progress towards promotion to principal lecturer.
- 9.6 **Principal Lecturer:** Performance evaluation annually. TPR review every five years.
- 9.7 **Research Assistant Professor:** Performance evaluation annually.
- 9.8 **Professor of Practice:** Performance evaluation annually and TPR review annually.
- 9.9 **Endowed Chairs and Titled Professorships:** Performance evaluation annually. TPR review per their underlying rank and the terms of their appointment.
- 9.10 **Affiliated Faculty:** Per terms of appointment.

10. Post-Tenure Review (PTR): Post-Tenure Review— including purpose, timing, guidelines, committee formation, and Part I and Part II reviews— is described in the Faculty Manual. As indicated in the Faculty Manual, the following are additional “unit specific guidelines”.

- 10.1 Part I and Part II Post-Tenure Review:
- 10.2 Part I PTR: As described in the Faculty Manual, faculty satisfying the conditions for Part I PTR are exempt from Part II review.
- 10.3 Part II PTR: As indicated in the Faculty Manual, the department must select from one of three options for seeking external feedback for a Part II PTR review. The faculty of the school selected option iii “Allow each faculty member

under review the option of either having external letters solicited or incorporating the external committee member in the review process.”

DRAFT, Part III

For the review of the faculty

III. EVALUATION CRITERIA

All faculty members should be evaluated by their performance in Teaching, Research and Service as elaborated below. The granting of reappointment, promotion or tenure shall be considered in light of the person's demonstrated ability in each of these criteria.

1. **Intent:** The criteria for evaluation may remain Discipline specific as needed. Common criteria are the criteria enumerated as part of the main body of the TPR document Part III which apply to all Disciplines. Discipline-specific criteria are found in the Appendices.
2. **Changes to The Evaluation Criteria:** Changes to the common criteria will be approved by a simple majority of voting faculty from each Discipline. If a Discipline approves a change but another does not, then the changes will apply only to the Discipline approving the change. In this case the criteria will move from common criteria to Discipline-specific criteria found in appendices A1-A4. Changes to Discipline-specific criteria need a simple majority vote from the Discipline's faculty. Criteria can be moved from a Discipline-specific appendix to the common section by a simple majority of each Discipline voting to approve matching language.
3. **Categories of Activity:** Within the School of Architecture, it is not unusual for activity undertaken by Faculty to transcend the clear boundaries of the categories of Teaching, Research, and Service, and this overlapping often increases impact. Activity should, however, be documented in only one category for the purpose of review, but the candidate may select which category is most appropriate given the nature of the activity and discuss how it is a blend in the documentation of the activity. The sections on Criteria 1- Teaching, Criteria 2- Research, and Criteria 3- Service offer guidance about where activities typically would be documented but are not prescriptive.
4. **Weighting of Activities:** Assessment of teaching, research and service may be weighted according to assigned duties and goals, respecting that some faculty members in certain years exhibit intensive productivity, impact, and/or focus in one or two assessment areas (Teaching, Research, Service), resulting in more modest yet satisfactory achievements in the other assessment area(s).
5. **Impact of Activities:** An activity within the area of teaching, research and service may be more or less consequential in terms of its impact. The candidate should indicate if an activity has impact at the local, national, or international level. Ways to indicate impact, or quality and acceptance, of research are outlined in the Criteria Two, Research section.
6. **Activities and Workload:** Faculty may take on activities beyond their contracted workload, for improving harmony, collaboration, and productivity in the university community and for achieving the University's missions of research, teaching, and service. These activities should be documented in the materials submitted for review.
7. **Accomplishment:** Decisions on promotion should emphasize demonstrable achievement rather than potential.
8. **Multi-Year Projects:** Assessment of Teaching, Research and Service respects that a significant activity may develop over more than one academic year, so that demonstrable

outcomes (e.g. publication, exhibition, approvals, implementation) may be forthcoming. In this case, evidence of the work-in-progress should be provided, along with correspondence from an editor or organizer of the work concerning its status, whenever possible.

9. **Specialization:** If a candidate's work is so specialized that the committee feels it cannot make an adequate assessment, the evaluation of an outside consultant may be included.
10. **Intrapersonal and Integrity:** Candidates for reappointment, tenure and promotion should exhibit appropriate personal qualities for maintaining harmony and productivity in the university community and for achieving the University's missions of research, teaching, and service. These characteristics include interest and fairness toward students, integrity in scholarship, dependability in meeting professional commitments, and maintaining total intellectual honesty.
11. **Assessments:** of Excellent, Very Good, Good, Fair, Marginal and Unsatisfactory – are guided partly by Appendix B, Guidelines for Annual Faculty Performance Rating, School of Architecture, which articulates annual expectations for Teaching, Research, and Service.
12. **Regular Faculty:**
 - a. **Time Frame of Material:** In seeking reappointment, candidates collect and present evidence for the previous year only. In seeking promotion and/or tenure, candidates collect and present evidence representing the period since their hire for tenure candidates, or since promotion for Full Professor candidates. Significant accomplishments post-dating the submission of the candidate's e-TPR materials will not be considered.
 - b. **Promotion to Associate Professor:** Advancement to the rank of Associate Professor requires an assessment of "Excellent" in either Teaching or Research and no assessment lower than "Fair".
 - c. **Tenure:** To be considered for tenure, candidates must meet requirements for Associate Professor.
 - d. **Promotion to Full Professor:** Advancement to the rank of Full Professor requires an assessment of "Excellent" in two of the criteria Teaching, Research or Service; an assessment of "Very Good" or above in both Teaching and Research; an assessment of "Good" or above in Service; and a record of continuing contribution. Significant impact and accomplishment is required, as measured by the depth and breadth of reputation, dissemination, and influence.

13. **Special Faculty:**

- a. **Time Frame of Material:** In seeking reappointment, candidates collect and present evidence for the previous year only.
- b. **Assessment of Lecturer Ranks:** Lecturers, Senior Lecturers, and Principal Lecturers are evaluated primarily on Teaching.
 - i. Full-time Lecturers are expected to be competent, effective, and professional teachers and to offer Service and/or to demonstrate accomplishment in Research annually.
 - ii. Senior Lecturers are expected to be high performing teachers who make consistent contributions to the education mission of the School of Architecture. Senior Lecturers hold multi-year appointments, as per the Faculty Manual. They are expected to consistently achieve "Very Good" or better in teaching, and achieve at least a "Good" in either Research or Service on an annual basis.

- iii. Principal Lecturers are considered exemplary teachers who make substantial contributions to the education mission of the School of Architecture. Principal Lecturers hold a multi-year appointment, as per the Faculty Manual. Candidates for promotion to Principal Lecturer will usually have served at least five years as a Senior Lecturer before applying for promotion. They must demonstrate ongoing growth as a teacher beyond that required simply for reappointment. Candidates will be expected to demonstrate exemplary teaching via, at minimum:
- Consistent high response rates on, and visible patterns of success in, student feedback forms.
 - Documented excellence on at least five measures of teaching effectiveness
 - Demonstrated creativity and improvement of courses and course materials.
 - Additionally, candidates for promotion to Principal Lecturer will be expected to demonstrate
 - Evidence of ongoing pedagogical development (workshop attendance, program participation, Creative Inquiries, Honors seminars, etc.)
 - A pattern of engagement with the educational mission of the school (service, mentorship, leadership, etc.)
- c. **Assessment of Research Faculty:** Research faculty are evaluated primarily on Research. This faculty appointment is a professional career track without tenure considerations. See Appendix C.
- d. **Assessment of Professors of Practice:** Professors of Practice are evaluated on the criteria described per their rank and terms of appointment. Most are expected to bring acknowledged, contemporary expertise in practice of their discipline to their teaching and other responsibilities. This faculty appointment is without tenure considerations.
- e. **Assessment of Chairs and Titled Professorships:** Chairs and Titled Professors are evaluated on the criteria described per their underlying rank and terms of their appointment.

CRITERIA I: TEACHING

All School of Architecture faculty members are expected to be competent, effective, and professional teachers. Teaching is defined as credit-awarding instruction.

The instructional process entails a number of elements, all of which merit consideration in the evaluation of teaching. Among these are the individual's skills, abilities, and ingenuity related to:

- Designing instructional courses; preparing instructional materials; and selecting and effectively using appropriate instructional strategies and techniques.
- Assessing student learning needs.
- Delivering course content.
- Interactions with students that encourage them to do their best work.
- Assessing and providing feedback on student performance.

- Adjusting course content based on new opportunities, changing knowledge and scholarship, and student feedback.
- Dissertation and thesis advising

To be considered for promotion and/or tenure, the candidate must submit evidence of teaching effectiveness or performance as outlined above. Such evidence must include student input in some form.

Examples of evidence of teaching performance include:

- Direct peer observation.
- Syllabi and educational materials.
- Student work.
- Supervision of independent studies.
- External peer review.
- Awards or special recognitions for teaching.
- Evidence of extra efforts to improve teaching skill and effectiveness.
- Material collected from exit interviews by department head and program director.
- The results of standard university student course evaluations

CRITERIA II: RESEARCH – Adding to a Collective Body of Knowledge

Research includes the achievements of an individual in expanding the body of knowledge and contributing to the knowledge of others. The term “research” is intended as inclusive of activity sometimes called “creative work” or “scholarship.” In assessing research, attention will be paid to the quality of the products and activities, and their acceptance by, and impact on, the intended audience.

CRITERIA FOR RESEARCH, ARCHITECTURE, LANDSCAPE ARCHITECTURE, RESILIENT URBAN DESIGN AND HISTORIC PRESERVATION

The following kinds of products or activities are valued as contributing to the knowledge of the discipline. Faculty members are entitled to freedom in the selection of topics for research and in the publication of any results and conclusions. The following list of products or activities may be documented as evidence of research (not given in order of priority):

- peer-reviewed monographs
- peer-reviewed book chapters
- peer-reviewed books as author or editor
- peer-reviewed articles
- peer-reviewed design competitions
- peer-reviewed design awards
- peer-reviewed exhibition of design and related creative works
- peer-reviewed conference paper presentations

- peer-reviewed non-print publications (film, tape, software, video and television)
- journal editorships, proceedings, symposium editorships
- chairing panels
- published book and exhibition reviews
- funded research projects
- funded industry partnerships
- funded community partnerships
- service-learning projects contributing to economic development
- professional and government reports
- consultation with practitioners and government agencies
- competitions, creative work and projects published or reviewed in journals
- completed dissertations
- invitations to lecture or jury
- work acquired by museums and/or collections
- patents, technology transfer and intellectual property
- developing standards and guidelines for industry
- chairing industry sponsored competitions or initiatives
- participation on review panels for funding agencies
- organizing events, conferences, symposia, colloquia and proceedings
- developing online resources, blogs, podcasts, publications to promote scholarship and research

The quality and acceptance of such products or activities may be documented in part by information pertaining to:

- reviews of candidate's work by others
- citations
- funding
- copies of works sold or in use
- prizes and awards
- election to scholarly or professional societies
- peer evaluation of work
- impact on practice, scholarship and research
- participation on review panels for funding agencies
- impact on practice, and research in the field

CRITERIA III: SERVICE

Service includes (1) contributions to scholarly and professional associations and the broader discipline, (2) contributions to the university through university, college, and Department committees and administrative activity (3) contributions through applications of professional expertise, contributions to community at large. It may range from service to the local community to service on an international level. In assessing service, attention should be given not only to the amount of service but also to the quality and impact of the contribution. Contextual issues such as teaching load, scope of assigned administrative responsibilities, and opportunities for service will be evaluated. Examples of service activity may include:

- individual effort (as an administrator, innovator, consultant to academic bodies, grant participant, service in designated departmental roles, recipient of academic service awards, etc.);
- member of committees or other collective professional and academic bodies;
- professional practice with individuals and groups with letters from these consumers documenting the quality of the candidate's competence in the use of appropriate techniques and skills as well as the level of difficulty involved;
- consultation with agencies or organizations (local, state, regional, international) with letters from these consumers documenting the quality, relevance, acceptance, and impact of the candidate's contributions;
- voluntary consultation to former students regarding various professional activities, assignments, or projects with letters from these consumers documenting the nature, quality, and value of the technical assistance;
- chair or leadership role in committees and other collective academic and professional bodies
- non-research grant activity that directly benefits the department, College and/or University
- serving on professional juries
- training of public officials and continuing education short courses
- public service outside one's discipline
- service activity and projects that build opportunities for students (paid work, internships, classroom opportunities, service learning.)
- student academic advising

APPENDICIES

APPENDIX A

Discipline Specific Criteria

A1Architecture

A2 Historic Preservation

A3 Landscape Architecture

A4 Resilient Urban Design

APPENDIX B

Guidelines for Annual Faculty Performance Rating, (existing document)

Excellent Meets the following criteria	Very Good Meets the following criteria	Good Meets the following criteria
TEACHING: “Excellent” student outcomes and evidence such as those listed for Very Good.	TEACHING: “Very Good” student outcomes that address the student performance criteria outlined in the course syllabus, and satisfactory student evaluations in-line with the departmental year-level average; and evidence, such as: publication of student outcomes, teaching pedagogy; student award; faculty teaching award; academic/thesis advising duty; significant course and/or curriculum development.	TEACHING: “Good” student outcomes that address the student performance criteria outlined in the course syllabus, and satisfactory student evaluations in-line with the departmental year-level average.
RESEARCH: any one of these: a published book chapter for a major press; documented progress towards a book for a major press; significant external funding award for interdisciplinary research; - or – a national/international peer-reviewed artifact (e.g. a conference/journal publication, a contribution to juried exhibition, design competition prize) along with one of these: submission of a proposal for external funding; a second peer-reviewed artifact; progress on a book chapter, book or significant creative work	RESEARCH: a national/international peer-reviewed artifact (e.g. a conference/journal publication, a contribution to juried exhibition, a design competition prize); - and one of the artifacts listed for “Good”	RESEARCH: any two of these: a regional peer-reviewed artifact (e.g. a conference/journal publication, a contribution to juried exhibition, a design competition prize); a national/international peer reviewed work-in-progress (e.g. a poster; a short paper); an internal research funding award; submission of a proposal for external funding; demonstrable collaborative, interdisciplinary and/or community activity.
SERVICE: serving in two of the capacities listed for “Very Good” – or – at least one of these: leadership in a professional or academic body; service as school administrator; service as conference chair or editorial board member or workshop convener at national or international level; or facilitator of a School, College or University development prospect.	SERVICE: (same criteria as for “Good”), and at least one of these: chair of a department committee; service on College or University committees/task forces; engagement as peer-reviewer (of e.g. paper submissions, competition entries); invited speaker or design juror at peer institution.	SERVICE: active, impactful contribution to at least one School committee.
Fair	Marginal	Unsatisfactory
The individual is generally performing at the level expected for a rating of Good but is below expectations in some of the criteria with no special circumstances	The individual is generally NOT performing at the level expected for a rating of Good and is significantly below expectations in several of the criteria with no special circumstances	The individual is seriously neglecting his or her duties to the department, college and University.

Notes:

[1] While Lecturers and Senior Lecturers are evaluated primarily on teaching, research and service accomplishments can also be considered.

[2] Assessment of Teaching, Research and Service may be weighted according to assigned duties and goals, respecting that some faculty members in certain years may exhibit intensive productivity/impact/focus in one or two assessment areas (Teaching, Research, Service), resulting in more modest yet satisfactory achievements in the other assessment area(s)

[3] Assessment of Teaching, Research and Service respects that a significant activity, under a given assessment area, may develop over more than one academic year, so that demonstrable outcomes (e.g. publication, exhibition, approvals, implementation) may be forthcoming. In this case, evidence of the work-in-progress should be provided, along with correspondence from an editor or organizer of the work concerning its status, whenever possible.

APPENDIX C

Guidelines for Appointment, Reappointment and Promotion of Research Faculty, (Existing Document)

a) *Qualifications:* Research faculty shall possess both the earned doctorate consistent with the disciplines that are typically associated with the field of Architecture and research qualifications in the research field consistent with the expectations for the rank of Professor. If an individual's qualifications warrant the title of "Research Associate Professor" or "Research Assistant Professor," these may be used instead of "Research Faculty."

b) *Appointment, Reappointment and Promotion:* Appointment, reappointment and promotion shall be coordinated through the department's tenure, promotion and reappointment (TPR) committee. Recommendations for these personnel actions shall be initiated by the faculty member's immediate supervisor. The primary role of the TPR committee shall be to certify that the supervisor's recommendation meets the appropriate department standards for the position and rank. Appointments are on a 12-month basis or a nine-month basis with the typical/usual/normal summer remuneration practice.

c) *Guidelines for Reappointment and Promotion:* The primary role of research faculty members is to seek and communicate knowledge that is guided by both the contractual agreement (s) with the research sponsor (s) and the general mission of the Architecture department. Evaluation criteria for reappointment and promotion should include, but are not limited to

- a. Fulfillment of research contract obligations
- b. Additional funding obtained from federal, corporate or state sources
- c. Participation in collaborative research contracts and grants
- d. Collaborative research contracts and grants initiated
- e. Honors and Awards at all levels – Department, College, University, National, Professional Society
- f. Publication in refereed journals and other appropriate media
- g. Participation in technical committees of professional societies
- h. Service on research advisory boards and panels
- i. Support and advising of graduate and undergraduate students
- j. Patents and licenses awarded

d) *Performance Evaluation and Salary Recommendations:* The faculty member's performance evaluation shall be made jointly by the faculty member's immediate supervisor and/or chair. The TPR committee may be asked, at the request of the chair, to provide a perspective on performance.

e) *Participation in Related Departmental Activities:* the research faculty member may participate in departmental activities, including:

- a. Service in graduate student committees as research advisor or member
 - b. Service as advisor to undergraduate students conducting research
 - c. Teaching on an as-needed/as-available basis
 - d. Other activities directly supporting the research mission/enterprise of the department.
- Participation in the above activities must be consistent with the grant or contract obligation (s) of the research sponsor(s) and approved by the faculty member's immediate supervisor.

Research faculty shall be able to participate fully in all deliberations of departmental matters but shall not have the privilege of voting.

Exit Survey - UG Landscape Architecture Fall 2023

Start of Block: Spring 2024 BLA Exit Survey

Q1

.

Q2 Dear graduating BLA student,

We are have enjoyed having you in the Bachelor of Landscape Architecture program at Clemson University, and we hope that your time here has been memorable, productive, and enriching. As you near the completion of your degree, we ask that you take a moment to share your thoughts and opinions on the program, as well as your plans after graduation. Your feedback will help shape the future of the program for upcoming generations of students.

End of Block: Spring 2024 BLA Exit Survey

Start of Block: Fall 2023 BLA Exit Survey

Q1 Please rate your overall satisfaction with our program's design studios.

- ☐ Very Satisfied (4)
 - ☐ Satisfied (5)
 - ☐ Neutral (6)
 - ☐ Dissastisfied (7)
 - ☐ Very Dissatisfied (8)
-

Q17 Please discuss your overall satisfaction with our program's design studios in the space below. What suggestions, if any, do you have for improving our design studios and studio experience?

Q2 Please rate your overall satisfaction with our program's required support courses in LA (non-studio courses).

- ☐ Very Satisfied (4)
- ☐ Satisfied (5)
- ☐ Neutral (6)
- ☐ Dissatisfied (7)
- ☐ Very Dissatisfied (8)

Q18 Please discuss your overall satisfaction with our program's required support courses in LA (non-studio courses) in the space below. What suggestions, if any, do you have for improving program electives and non-studio coursework?

Q4 Please rate your overall satisfaction with our off-campus programs.

- ☐ Very Satisfied (4)
 - ☐ Satisfied (5)
 - ☐ Neutral (6)
 - ☐ Dissatisfied (7)
 - ☐ Very Dissatisfied (8)
-

Q19 Please discuss your overall satisfaction with our off-campus programs in the space below. What suggestions, if any, do you have for improving off-campus programs?

Q21 Please rate your overall satisfaction with the program's success in creating an environment that welcomes diversity and inclusion.

- ☐ Very Satisfied (4)
 - ☐ Satisfied (5)
 - ☐ Neutral (6)
 - ☐ Dissatisfied (7)
 - ☐ Very Dissatisfied (8)
-

Q22 Please discuss your overall satisfaction with the program's success in creating an environment that welcomes diversity and inclusion. in the space below. What suggestions, if any, do you have for improving the environment for diversity and inclusion?

Q5 Please list four (4) strengths of the Bachelor of Landscape Architecture program.

Q6 Please list four (4) weaknesses of the Bachelor of Landscape Architecture (BLA) program.

Q8 Please share with us any additional thoughts or suggestions you have about our program.

End of Block: Fall 2023 BLA Exit Survey

Start of Block: Section 3

Q1 Have you received any landscape architecture program, college, or university awards or recognition during your time at Clemson University?

☐ Yes (1)

☐ No (2)

Q2 Have you received any landscape architecture state or national awards or recognition during your time at Clemson University?

☐ Yes (1)

☐ No (2)

Q3 Have you been engaged in any student organizations at the program, college, or university level during your time at Clemson University?

☐ Yes (1)

☐ No (2)

Q4 Have you been engaged in any program, college, or university committees or advisory councils during your time at Clemson University?

☐ Yes (1)

☐ No (2)

End of Block: Section 3

Start of Block: Block 4

Start of Block: BLA General Information

Q1 What are your plans after graduation?

☐ I have a job with a firm in landscape architecture. (4)

☐ I have a job with local or federal government in landscape architecture. (5)

☐ I have a job outside of landscape architecture. (12)

☐ I am looking for a job in landscape architecture. (13)

☐ I am continuing my education. (14)

☐ I am changing careers. (15)

☐ other (please describe) (16)

Q2 If you have accepted a job in landscape architecture, where will you be practicing?

☐ Firm, Organization, or Agency Name (4)

☐ Location (5) _____

Q3 Please briefly describe your future work or education plans.

Q4 Please provide your permanent address and email.

- ☐ Name (1) _____
- ☐ Address (2) _____
- ☐ Address 2 (3) _____
- ☐ City (4) _____
- ☐ State (5) _____
- ☐ Postal code (6) _____
- ☐ Email address (7) _____

End of Block: BLA General Information

Start of Block: Block 5 Thank you

Q1 Thank you for filling out the survey. Return to review your answers, or proceed to submit the survey.

End of Block: Block 5 Thank you

Exit Survey - MLA Landscape Architecture Spring 2024

Start of Block: Spring 2024 MLA Exit Survey

Q0

.

Q1 Dear graduating MLA student,

We are have enjoyed having you in the Master of Landscape Architecture program at Clemson University, and we hope that your time here has been memorable, productive, and enriching. As you near the completion of your degree, we ask that you take a moment to share your thoughts and opinions on the program, as well as your plans after graduation. Your feedback will help shape the future of the program for upcoming generations of students.

End of Block: Spring 2024 MLA Exit Survey

Start of Block: Section 1

Q2 Please rate your overall satisfaction of the design studios

- ☐ Very Satisfied (1)
 - ☐ Satisfied (2)
 - ☐ Neutral (3)
 - ☐ Dissatisfied (4)
 - ☐ Very Dissatisfied (5)
-

Q3 Please describe your opinion of the design studios. What suggestions, if any, do you have for improving the design studios?

Q4 Please rate your overall satisfaction of the Design Implementation course sequence

- ☐ Very Satisfied (1)
- ☐ Satisfied (2)
- ☐ Neutral (3)
- ☐ Dissatisfied (4)
- ☐ Very Dissatisfied (5)

Q5 Please describe your opinion of the Design Implementation course sequence. What suggestions, if any, do you have for improving the Design Implementation course sequence?

Q6 Please rate your overall satisfaction of the Research course sequence (Research Methods and Graduate Colloquium)

- ☐ Very Satisfied (1)
 - ☐ Satisfied (2)
 - ☐ Neutral (3)
 - ☐ Dissatisfied (4)
 - ☐ Very Dissatisfied (5)
-

Q7 Please describe your opinion of the Research course sequence (Research Methods and Graduate Colloquium). What suggestions, if any, do you have for improving the Research course sequence?

Q8 Please rate your overall satisfaction of the program's professional and career development (via classes, workshops, career fairs, field trips, events, or other)

- ☐ Very Satisfied (1)
- ☐ Satisfied (2)
- ☐ Neutral (3)
- ☐ Dissatisfied (4)
- ☐ Very Dissatisfied (5)

Q9 Please describe your opinion of the program's professional and career development (via classes, workshops, career fairs, firm visits, field trips, conferences, or other). What suggestions, if any, do you have for improving the program's professional and career development?

Q10 Please rate your overall satisfaction of program communications (emails, announcements, flyers, or other)

- ☐ Very Satisfied (1)
- ☐ Satisfied (2)
- ☐ Neutral (3)
- ☐ Dissatisfied (4)
- ☐ Very Dissatisfied (5)

Q11 Please describe your opinion of program communications (emails, announcements, flyers, or other). What suggestions, if any, do you have for improving program communications?

Q12 Please rate your overall satisfaction of the program's success in creating an environment which welcomes diversity and inclusion

- ☐ Very Satisfied (1)
- ☐ Satisfied (2)
- ☐ Neutral (3)
- ☐ Dissatisfied (4)
- ☐ Very Dissatisfied (5)
-

Q13 Please describe your opinion of the program's success in creating an environment which welcomes diversity and inclusion. What suggestions, if any, do you have for improving the environment for diversity and inclusion?

End of Block: Section 1

Start of Block: Section 2

Q14 In your opinion, what are the top 3-5 **strengths** of the MLA program at Clemson University?

Q15 In your opinion, what are the top 3-5 **weaknesses** of the MLA program at Clemson University?

Q16 Please provide any suggestions for **improvement** of the MLA program at Clemson University.

End of Block: Section 2

Start of Block: Section 3

Q43 Have you received any landscape architecture program, college, or university awards or recognition during your time at Clemson University?

☐ Yes (1)

☐ No (2)

Q44 Have you received any landscape architecture state or national awards or recognition during your time at Clemson University?

☐ Yes (1)

☐ No (2)

Q45 Have you been engaged in any student organizations at the program, college, or university level during your time at Clemson University?

☐ Yes (1)

☐ No (2)

Q46 Have you been engaged in any program, college, or university committees or advisory councils during your time at Clemson University?

☐ Yes (1)

☐ No (2)

End of Block: Section 3

Start of Block: Section 4

Q17 What was your undergraduate degree, and from which school did you earn the degree?

☐ Undergraduate Degree (4)

☐ Undergraduate School (5)

Q18 Which degree track are you completing?

- ☐ First Professional MLA (3 year) (4)
- ☐ Second Professional MLA (2 year) (5)
-

Q19 What are your plans after graduation?

- ☐ I have a job with a firm in landscape architecture. (4)
- ☐ I have a job with local or federal government in landscape architecture. (5)
- ☐ I have a job outside of landscape architecture. (12)
- ☐ I am looking for a job in landscape architecture. (13)
- ☐ I am continuing my education. (14)
- ☐ I am changing careers. (15)
- ☐ other (please describe) (16)
-

Q20 If you have accepted a job in landscape architecture, where will you be practicing?

- ☐ Firm, Organization, or Agency Name (4)
-
- ☐ Location (5) _____
-

Q21 Please briefly describe your future work or education plans.

End of Block: Section 4

Start of Block: End

Q22 Please provide any additional comments or opinions you have about the MLA Program at Clemson University

End of Block: End

Start of Block: Block 5

Q41 Thank you for filling out the survey. Return to review your answers, or proceed to submit the survey.

End of Block: Block 5
