



Landscape Architecture Program 2023-2024

Standard 5

Appendix 5.1: Faculty time allocation for teaching, research, and service by rank

Appendix 5.2: School of Architecture Faculty Travel Policy and Guidelines.

Appendix 5.3: Faculty Performance Rating for Merit Increase



School of Architecture Faculty Travel Policy:

1. Travel plans for the year must be submitted to the Director by September 1st and approved by the Director by October 1st. A maximum of four trips per year are recommended if funding is available. They should be organized in order of priority and must be marked as:

- definite (paper accepted or any such confirmed activity)
- potential (would like to attend but not yet confirmed)

As new opportunities arise, they will be evaluated by the Director individually. In this case the faculty should make every attempt to inform the Director at least 30 days in advance.

2. Normally, travel is arranged through the School using the most economical airfare available between 30 and 14 days in advance whenever possible. The School will only support "early-bird" registration. If a late registration is necessary, it must be approved by the Director.
3. Travel support for the first two years of a tenure track position will be negotiated as part of a startup package for the new position.
4. This policy and travel expenses should be reviewed on a yearly basis and appropriate changes made to the policy with the approval of the faculty.

Priority will be given to:

1. Travel in support of significant progress in peer-reviewed scholarship and research.
2. Travel that supports the annual goals and plan submitted by individual faculty and is part of a clear sequence of presentation, revision, publication and exhibition. The priority of this item will be adjusted to suit the reputation of the conference, publication, the peer review process, and/or exhibit venue whether abstracts or papers and other works are submitted and similar issues of quality and stature that will be reflected in the faculty member's vitae.
3. Faculty members who accompany students on a school trip arranged at the beginning of the semester as agreed by the Program faculty.
4. Travel that is part of an ongoing commitment of the School to support attendance and/or representing the School at national and international organizations.
5. Travel in support of funding proposals to agencies outside the university. Faculty members with a track record of gaining travel support from agencies outside the university, and secondarily those outside the College and School, will have priority.
6. Travel that is a significant training or educational workshop that supports or initiates an area included in the annual goals and plan submitted by individual faculty.

GUIDELINES FOR ANNUAL FACULTY PERFORMANCE RATING FOR MERIT INCREASES

SCHOOL OF ARCHITECTURE, Clemson University

Approved by a vote of the faculty, 12 March 2018

Introduction

This 7-point evaluation scale was developed as part of the Merit Plan process, spearheaded by the Office of the Provost. Each department was required to develop a plan that stipulates the decision rules to be followed by department chairs when they make recommendations to the Dean regarding merit compensation for faculty, with the goal of better alignment of merit compensation with faculty performance. Category ratings will be individually weighted by % Effort. Weighted category ratings will sum to Total Score for individual faculty. It is expected that Total Scores will average about 4.0.

This rating system will be used for this pilot year, after which it will be evaluated by the faculty and modified as necessary. This system will be used for all tenured, tenure-track and non-tenure-track faculty.

Notes:

- 1) The following are general criteria for merit that inform the breakdown of ratings in the merit tables:
 - a. Breadth/extent of impact and recognition
 - b. Prestige of recognition
 - c. Rigor and quality of peer review and/or competitiveness
 - d. Extent of scope, effort, and time
 - e. Furtherance of the Clemson University mission and goals
- 2) This listing is not exhaustive, items are examples. Refer to the school's TPR guidelines for a more comprehensive listing. In certain instances faculty may make the case that a particular accomplishment should be considered under a different category than specified in the tables.
- 3) Faculty will receive a rating in each of the following areas: Research, Teaching, and Service.
- 4) Ratings for each category are based on a preponderance of evidence for the category.
- 5) Performance expectations are related to position, rank and tenure, i.e., the expectations of a tenured full professor are different than a tenure-track assistant professor.
- 6) Percentage of effort for each of the 3 areas of responsibility will be agreed to by the faculty member and supervisor (chair) at annual goal setting and reviews.
- 7) Faculty members should complete a detailed annual FAS summaries, identifying accomplishments in relation to relevant items in the merit tables, a rigorous self-assessment rating summary prior to and as part of each annual review.
- 8) The department chair must consider contextual factors (e.g., opportunity, experience) when assigning ratings.
- 9) It is assumed that eventually annual reviews for merit increases will be based on a 3-year average of annual reviews.

Guidelines for Annual Faculty Performance Rating for Merit Increases for Faculty, School of Architecture

RATING TEACHING

7 <i>Extraordinary</i>	6 <i>With Distinction</i>	5 <i>Above Expectations</i>	4 <i>Expected</i>	3 <i>Below Expectations</i>
Meets the standards for a rating of “6”, And additional evidence such as the following: 1) National or international publication/presentation of student outcomes, and/or scholarship of teaching and learning; 2) National or international student award; 3) National or international faculty teaching award or peer recognition; 4) Nationally adopted curriculum materials, texts, etc.; 5) Selected as a Clemson Alumni Professor.	1) Notably high student outcomes that address the student performance criteria outlined in the course syllabus; 2) Consistently above average ratings on Q10 and Q1 in comparison to program;	1) Very good student outcomes that address the student performance criteria outlined in the course syllabus; 2) Above average ratings on Q10 and Q1 in comparison to program;	1) Good student outcomes that address the student performance criteria outlined in the course syllabus; 2) Average ratings on Q10 in comparison to program; 3) Evidence of reflective teaching.	1) Student outcomes that address the student performance criteria outlined in the course syllabus; 2) Mostly average ratings on Q10 in comparison to program.
	And more than one of the following: 3) Publication/presentation of student outcomes, and/or scholarship of teaching and learning; 4) Regional or university student award; 5) University faculty teaching award or peer recognition; 6) Significant academic advising; 7) Significant course and/or curriculum development.	And at least one of the following: 3) Publication/presentation of student outcomes, and/or scholarship of teaching and learning; 4) Regional or university student award; 5) College or local faculty teaching award or peer recognition; 6) Significant academic advising; 7) Significant course and/or curriculum development.		2 <i>Well Below Expectations</i>
				The individual is generally NOT performing at the level expected and is significantly below expectations in several of the criteria.
				1 <i>Wholly Inadequate</i>
				The individual is NOT performing at the level expected and is significantly below expectations in several of the criteria with no special circumstances.

Guidelines for Annual Faculty Performance Rating for Merit Increases for Faculty, School of Architecture

RATING RESEARCH

7 <i>Extraordinary</i>	6 <i>With Distinction</i>	5 <i>Above Expectations</i>	4 <i>Expected</i>	3 <i>Below Expectations</i>
Meets the standards for a rating of “6”, and in addition has at least one more of the following: 1) A significant published book for a major press, (counts as a minimum of 2 artifacts); 2) Documented progress towards a significant book chapter or book for a major press or other significant creative work; 3) Significant <u>external</u> funding award for research; 4) A <u>national/international</u> peer-reviewed journal publication, juried exhibition, or design award; 5) A national/international design competition award; 6) Best paper/book award in a national or international venue; 7) Patented work receives award or becomes industry standard.	Meets the standards for a rating of “5”, and in addition has at least one more of the following: 1) A <u>national/international</u> peer-reviewed artifact (at a minimum a significant publication or journal, national design award, or national juried exhibition); 2) Documented progress towards a book chapter or book for a major press or other significant creative work; 3) <u>External</u> funding award for research; 4) Receipt of a competitive research fellowship; 5) Invited plenary/keynote address at national/international conference; 6) Patent awarded for research work.	At least one of these: 1) A <u>national/international</u> peer-reviewed artifact (at minimum the equivalent of a conference proceedings publication); And at least one of these: 1) <u>Regional</u> peer-reviewed artifact (see description under “4”); 2) <u>National/international</u> peer-reviewed work-in-progress; 3) National/international invited lecture; 4) <u>Internal</u> research funding award; 5) Submission of a proposal for <u>external</u> funding; 6) Demonstrable collaborative, interdisciplinary and/or community activity. 7) Significant citations of work.	Any two of any of these: 1) <u>Regional</u> peer-reviewed artifact (e.g. at minimum the equivalent of a conference presentation, regional juried exhibition, or regional design award); 2) <u>National/international</u> peer-reviewed work-in-progress (e.g. a poster; a short paper); 3) Regional invited presentation or citation; 4) <u>Internal</u> research funding award; 5) Submission of a proposal for <u>external</u> funding; 6) Demonstrable collaborative, interdisciplinary and/or community activity.	Any one of the outcomes listed for a rating of 4.
				2 <i>Well Below Expectations</i>
				The individual is generally NOT performing at the level expected and is significantly below expectations in several of the criteria.
				1 <i>Wholly Inadequate</i>
				The individual is NOT performing at the level expected and is significantly below expectations in several of the criteria with no special circumstances.

Guidelines for Annual Faculty Performance Rating for Merit Increases for Faculty, School of Architecture

RATING SERVICE

7 <i>Extraordinary</i>	6 <i>With Distinction</i>	5 <i>Above Expectations</i>	4 <i>Expected</i>	3 <i>Below Expectations</i>
Meets the standards for a rating of “5”, and in addition has at least two more of the following: 1) Leadership in a professional or academic body (including Faculty Senate); 2) Service as program or school administrator; 3) Service as conference chair or editorial board member or workshop convener at regional, national or international level; 4) Facilitator of a School, College or University development prospect.	Meets the standards for a rating of “5”, and in addition has at least one more of the following: 1) Leadership in a professional or academic body (including Faculty Senate); 2) Service as program or school administrator; 3) Service as conference chair or editorial board member or workshop convener at regional, national or international level; 4) Facilitator of a School, College or University development prospect.	1) Active, impactful contributions to at least one school committee. And more than one of these: 2) Chair of a program or school committee; 3) Service on College or University committees/task forces; 4) Service to community, regional, state or national committees; 5) Engagement as peer-reviewer (of e.g. paper submissions, competition entries); 6) Invited speaker or design critic at peer institution or professional meeting/organization; 7) Notable professional practice and/or consulting; 8) Service on national/international review panels.	1) Active, impactful contributions to at least one school committee. And at least one of these: 2) Chair of a program or school committee; 3) Service on College or University committees/task forces; 4) Service to community, regional, state or national committees; 5) Engagement as peer-reviewer (of e.g. paper submissions, competition entries); 6) Invited speaker or design critic at peer institution or professional meeting/organization; 7) Notable professional practice and/or consulting.	Active, impactful contributions to at least one school, college, university or professional committee.
				2 <i>Well Below Expectations</i> The individual is generally NOT performing at the level expected and is significantly below expectations in several of the criteria.
				1 <i>Wholly Inadequate</i> The individual is NOT performing at the level expected and is significantly below expectations in several of the criteria with no special circumstances.