

Amended May 13, 2013

**BYLAWS
of the
FACULTY OF DEPARTMENT OF PLANNING, DEVELOPMENT AND PRESERVATION**

**College of Architecture, Arts & Humanities
Clemson University**

The Faculty of Planning, Development and Preservation establishes these Bylaws to provide a mechanism for faculty to participate in the formulation, modification, and implementation of the Department's policies, procedures, and practices.

**ARTICLE I.
Department Mission and Vision**

The mission of the Department of Planning, Development and Preservation is to provide a solid education to students who will play a role in the state and the nation in the complex task of creating a better environment. By applying a systematic and creative approach, these professional degree programs in the Department collectively aim at producing planners, developers, and preservationists, who will be equally effective in the public and private sectors with a particularly solid understanding of the physical environment and the land development process.

**ARTICLE II.
Structure and Organization**

The Department is organized into three academic programs:

- Master of City and Regional Planning,
- Master of Real Estate Development, and
- Master of Science in Historic Preservation.

Curricular decisions will be made at the program level. Other decisions will be made at the Departmental level, with recognition that the MRED and MSHP programs have a differential tuition and operational issues.

**ARTICLE III.
Voting Membership**

Voting membership shall consist of all members of the Faculty who hold their primary appointment at the university (at least 75 per cent appointment) and for which 51 per cent of that appointment is committed to the Department of Planning, Development and

Preservation. Adjunct faculty, non-voting faculty, and emeriti faculty shall not be precluded from attending meetings of the School and expressing opinions and otherwise offering counsel.

**ARTICLE IV.
Officers and Election**

The Chair of the Department or another faculty member appointed by the Chair shall preside over meetings of the Faculty. The Chair shall prepare an agenda in advance of the meeting. In governing the Department, the Chair shall adhere to duties outlined in the Faculty Manual.

**ARTICLE V.
Meetings**

The Chair of the Department shall schedule a meeting at the beginning and a subsequent meeting at the end of each semester. The Chair of the Department is not precluded from scheduling other meetings during the semester on a needs basis. Special meetings may be scheduled as needed by the Chair or at the request of two or more faculty.

Meetings are scheduled for the purpose of conducting ordinary and recurring business of the Department, for special announcements, and for purposes not otherwise indicated in these Bylaws. Individual program areas will meet on a regular basis to address curriculum and other issues specifically affecting that program.

**ARTICLE VI.
Voting Procedures**

All matters brought before the Faculty that require a vote shall be resolved by a simple majority of the eligible voters present, except as prescribed in Articles on Amendments and Ratification of these Bylaws where two-thirds majority is required. Votes shall be taken by voice or show of hands, unless a secret ballot is requested.

If a faculty member must be away from a faculty meeting, that member shall be allowed to vote by absentee ballot on any issue published in the agenda. That member's vote shall be registered with the presiding officer prior to the meeting. Voting shall be permitted by written proxy.

**ARTICLE VII.
Quorum**

A quorum of the Faculty of the Department shall consist of two-thirds of the voting membership. New business may be discussed, but voting decisions may not be made without a quorum.

If summer meetings are required for pressing concerns, every effort will be made to have good representation, but fifty per cent of the voting membership shall constitute a quorum for emergency voting procedures. Emergency voting procedures do not pertain to changes in the by-laws which will still require a quorum.

ARTICLE VIII. Rules of Order

Robert's Rules of Order shall govern Department Faculty meetings in all cases where they are applicable and are not inconsistent with the Bylaws or with the rules of order of the Faculty.

ARTICLE IX. Committees

The Department shall have committees to conduct daily and recurring business. Committees will include Standing Committees and may include ad hoc Committees.

Section 1. Standing Committees

Admissions Advisory Committee

Each of the Programs in the Department shall have an Admissions Advisory Committee. Because of the size of the faculty in each of the Program Areas, Admissions Advisory Committees may consist of the faculty as a whole or a subset of the faculty as appointed by the Program Director.

The Admissions Advisory Committees shall establish admissions guidelines, review applications of prospective students, conduct interviews with prospective students as necessary, and, recommend financial assistance as available.

Curriculum Committee

Each of the Programs in the Department also shall have a Curriculum Committee. Curriculum Committees may consist of the faculty as a whole or a subset of the faculty as appointed by the Program Director, who shall serve as the Chair or appoint a designee.

The Curriculum Committees shall accept, initiate, and evaluate proposals for changes in the Program's curriculum and advise on other curricular matters referred to it. It shall make

reports to the Faculty and recommendations to the College Curriculum Committee. Chairs or their designees of the Program Curriculum Committees may alternate as the Department representative to the College Curriculum Committee. Chairs of Program Curriculum Committees shall be consulted on all matters that affect individual program areas.

Tenure and Promotion Review Committee

The Department shall have a Tenure and Promotion Review Committee. The Committee shall consist of three tenured faculty members, with at least two being from different programs housed in the Clemson area. When there is an untenured faculty member in the historic preservation program, we will include a member on the committee from that unit. Each member of the committee will be elected by all faculty in the Department that are eligible to vote. Committee members shall serve three year staggered terms and shall elect their own committee chair.

In matters concerning promotion from associate to full professor, all full professors within the Department shall act as a special standing committee to evaluate each candidate. Where fewer than three full professors are available within the Department, a committee shall be assembled by the Tenure and Promotion Review Committee selecting from other Units/Programs within the College full professors, who are most closely aligned academically with the candidate's Program Area.

Section 2. Ad Hoc Committees

The Department Chair or the Faculty may establish ad hoc committees to perform specific tasks. The motion establishing an ad hoc committee shall specify its function, duration, and membership as well as its convener.

**ARTICLE X.
Department Advisory Committee**

The Department does not have an advisory committee at this time.

**ARTICLE XI.
Amendment Procedures**

Any proposed amendments or additions to these Bylaws shall be announced and circulated in writing to all Faculty of the Department at least five business days in advance of the meeting. Amendments and additions shall be approved by a two-thirds majority of members present and voting. Persons submitting written absentee ballots in advance of the meeting will be considered present and voting.

ARTICLE XII.

Faculty Search and Appointment

A Search and Screening Committee shall be convened by the chair as necessary to fill faculty vacancies. The Committee shall consist of at least three faculty members—at least two of whom must be tenured or tenure-track. The predominant make-up of the committee will be from the Program for which the search is being conducted. Students and practitioners should be included on the committees as appropriate.

The Search and Screening Committee shall elect its own chair and be responsible for conducting, reviewing, and recommending new Program faculty members. All hiring recommendations shall be approved by the Program Director, Department Chair, and Dean of the College.

ARTICLE XIII. Reappointment

The Faculty Manual requires, in Part IV-E, an annual performance evaluation of all tenure track and non-tenure track faculty performed by the Department Chair that rates the faculty member's accomplishment of assigned duties and objectives for the calendar year.

For tenure track faculty, annual reviews will be conducted by the Department Tenure and Promotion Review Committee. The review will evaluate annual and cumulative performance on teaching, research, and service accomplishments according to criteria established in the Department's tenure and promotion guidelines as indicated in Section XIV of this document.

For non-tenure track faculty, the Department Chair will conduct annual reviews for reappointment each calendar year and make recommendations to the dean. In the case of full-time, non-tenure track faculty (at least 75 percent appointment) annual reviews also will be conducted by the Tenure and Promotion Review Committee with a report submitted to the Department Chair. All reviews will be made on the basis of the job description for the position and how successfully the faculty member has accomplished the requirements of the job. The chair may seek outside input as appropriate. For teaching positions, the chair may seek input from the Tenure and Promotion Review Committee. For research positions, the chair may seek input from research colleagues or funding entities. For public service funded positions, the chair may seek input from extension personnel.

Review materials should include a current curriculum vitae and FAS report and other supplemental information as appropriate to the job description. Supplemental materials may include course syllabi, student evaluations, and examples of student work for teaching appointments. Supporting documentation including examples of research and service outputs should be provided as appropriate for research and public service faculty. Unless specifically included in the job description, non-tenure faculty will not be expected to do university service, but service may be counted as a positive factor in reappointment.

ARTICLE XIV.
Promotion and Tenure

The Clemson University Faculty Manual in Part IV-D requires that every tenure-track faculty member undergo a faculty review of progress towards tenure and promotion. Fulfilling that requirement, tenure track faculty in each of the program areas shall be reviewed annually by the Department's Tenure and Promotion Review Committee. The annual review is based on information provided by the faculty member. In promotion and tenure decisions, the committee receives input from the College's faculty, graduates, and others having input into the decision and in each case prepares a formal recommendation that is submitted to the Department Chair. The Department Chair, in turn, reviews the applicant's submission material and makes a separate recommendation to the Dean of the College. The College Dean combines all the material, including his/her own summation recommendation, and forwards the package to the Provost.

Both the Department Chair and the Dean of the College will review the candidate's professional portfolio and the recommendation of the Tenure and Promotion Review Committee before completing their own written review. Reference may be made to the material forwarded. On the other hand, their written recommendation may be based on their own unique perspectives and experiences of the candidate in addition to the document prepared by the Tenure and Promotion Review Committee or the scholarly/professional portfolio. The Department Chair must provide results of the evaluation and rationale including letters from the Tenure and Promotion Review Committee, Chair, and Dean.

It is the responsibility of the Faculty of the Department to define the requirements for reappointment, tenure and promotion for the Department Tenure and Promotion Review Committee. The annual review process allows the individual faculty member an opportunity for regular input and review. The fact that the faculty member receives not only the decision (to reappoint or not to reappoint) but also the rationale behind the decision should provide the candidate guidance and act (along with the annual performance evaluation) as a road map for improvement.

Reappointment, promotions and tenure shall be based on levels of performance in the three (3) basic academic activity areas as outlined in the University's mission statement and restated here as:

- teaching in studios, seminars or lecture classes;
- creative scholarly and/or professional activity; and

- outreach and service to the School, college, university, profession and the public.

The evaluation underlayment for these three academic arena areas are stated in the College of Architecture, Arts and Humanities' *Statement of Guiding Principles* and preamble thereto as well as the Department of Planning, Development and Preservation's *Tenure, Promotion, Reappointment Framework*. These documents appear as Appendices to the Department By-Laws.

In addition, tenure-track candidates should work within a personal long-range plan developed with respect to the criteria above and the mission statement, goals and other objectives of the program and Department. This plan for development should also reflect the requirements inherent in the Recommendation and Suggestions of any individual program's Accrediting Board Reports on the program at Clemson. Likewise, candidates for promotions should have a plan for development with more flexibility as time-in-grade increases.

Candidates for tenure and promotion shall exhibit appropriate personal qualities for maintaining harmony and productivity in the university community and for achieving the university's missions of teaching, research, and service outlined above. These characteristics include interest and fairness toward students, integrity in scholarship, dependability in meeting professional and service commitments, and complete intellectual honesty. Evidence in the form of appropriate items from course evaluations and letters from students and colleagues may serve as documentation. The candidate is also expected to carry out duties and meet professional responsibilities in a spirit of collaboration across program department and college lines.

The Tenure and Promotion Review Committee should expect any candidate for reappointment, promotion or tenure to be strong on teaching. The committee should not recommend for promotion or tenure any candidate who is not an effective teacher, either in a studio, lecture or seminar format. For promotion and tenure, meaningful contributions are expected in the other areas of scholarly activity and professional service. Findings for promotion should emphasize "achievement" rather than "potential." If an individual's scholarly work is so specialized the committee feels it cannot make an adequate judgment, the evaluation of an outside consultant may be included.

Mission Statements

City and Regional Planning Program: The primary mission of the City and Regional Planning Program is to serve the state, region, and nation by integrating theory and practice in dealing with challenges of community growth and change by:

- educating and preparing planning professionals for both the public and private service and

- engaging in research and service activities that address critical planning issues.

The general focus of the program is on sustainable land development applying appropriate building practice and technology and incorporating natural, physical, economic, social, and policy dimensions of planning.

Real Estate Development Program: The mission of the Master of Real Estate Development Program is to create the educational opportunity for encouraging future development entrepreneurs to produce exciting, quality communities and places respecting environmental and economic sustainability, social consciousness, design excellence, and financial feasibility within the risk-reward framework. The MRED program focuses on promoting an entire vision for a community through sustainable design, creative financing methods, place-making and healthy communities. We want each student to become a visionary who serves as a craftsman and designer of neighborhoods and community development, one who recognizes the role of the developer in guiding the different aspects of creating the built environment—political, economic, physical, environmental, legal and sociological parameters. We want our students to become great Place Makers—not just builders of projects.

Historic Preservation Program: The primary mission of the Graduate Program in Historic Preservation is to protect and restore the cultural and material landscape. The program is dedicated to educating future leaders in the evaluation and interpretation of historic structures, sites, and landscapes for the development of the appropriate preservation strategies and treatments. Utilizing the Charleston-based laboratory, graduate students acquire diverse professional skills for rewarding preservation careers. Areas of emphasis include Sustainability and the Economics of Rehabilitation; Historic American Building Materials and Techniques; Conservation Science and Material Analysis; Architectural History and Cultural Significance; Documentation of Structures, Sites, and Landscapes; Building Treatment, Contextual Design and Historic Site Planning; and Preservation Policy and Cultural Resource Management.

I. PROCEDURES

A. Introduction: The primary responsibility for collecting and presenting evidence belongs to the candidate seeking promotion and/or tenure. The lone exceptions to this rule are solicitation of external reviews which will be done by the chair of the Tenure and Promotion Review Committee. The primary responsibility of the committees and individuals who review and recommend is to evaluate the material presented by the candidate, not to collect information or testimony. Candidates are advised to be thorough and systematic in preparing their files. The following recommendations should guide that effort.

1. Prepare a record of performance organized to correspond to the categories of evaluation discussed elsewhere in this document. Primary documentation must conform

in content and format to the summary document guidelines provided by the Provost. Only summary documents are sent to the Provost for review.

2. Include in that documentation a record of performance: (a) a factual listing of accomplishments and (b) a narrative providing interpretation of the evidence in light of the tenure and promotion standards.
3. Provide back-up documentation organized to correspond with the presentation in the factual listing of accomplishments. This material should include original course evaluation forms and copies of books, articles, reports, letters, and other documentation as appropriate.

Despite the structure of the summary document, some latitude in the specific manner of organizing the presentation and back-up material is left to the candidate; several suggestions are offered below.

- Teaching evaluation data tallied chronologically by course, for credit and non-credit instruction, should be included in the written record of performance with the actual evaluations and forms included in the back-up file.
- Publications should be presented in the record of performance in such a way that peer reviewed items are distinguishable from those not peer reviewed.
- A statement regarding professional reports and activities should, if possible, include evidence of their impact and use by clients and community.

B. Process: The general process for review of faculty for promotion and tenure is described in the Faculty Manual. The procedures described in this document provide more specifics for faculty in the Department of Planning, Development and Preservation and are consistent with University procedures. As described below, there are four levels of review prior to submission to the Provost's Office to be included in the review process: External Reviewers, Tenure and Promotion Review Committee, Department Chair and Dean. The Provost's decision process, while generally consistent with Department Criteria (discussed in the next section of this document), is not discussed here.

1. External Reviews: Formal external evaluations are an integral part of the review process for tenure and for promotion to the rank of associate professor or professor. For that reason, an external review of the candidate will be included in the tenure and promotion review process. Recognizing the Department's mission and commitment, the external review will consider primarily performance in the two areas of scholarship and service/professional activity. If appropriate, the external evaluation may include teaching assessments from on-campus as well as outside workshops and seminars.

External evaluators will be established scholars and professionals in the candidate's discipline; they may or may not be personally familiar with the candidate and his or her work. External evaluators will normally be faculty members at other universities. In cases where the candidate's major body of work has consisted of professional applications, public and private practitioners, officials, or administrators may comprise up to one-half of the external evaluators. Former employers, employees, colleagues, students, or others who have worked directly with the candidate will not be selected as formal external evaluators, although their input may be solicited by the candidate separately. Six external evaluations will be obtained for each candidate. The candidate will be asked to provide a list of up to six possible external evaluators. The candidate may wish to provide a list of referees not appropriate for selection. The criteria for this list should include individuals with a conflict of interest (i.e., thesis advisor, recent coauthors or co-PIs, those with a known prior theoretical objection to the candidate's approach, etc.). The Department chair, in consultation with the Tenure and Promotion Review Committee will select three evaluators from this list and identify three more evaluators. The second list of evaluators may include individuals identified in the candidate's list if deemed appropriate by the chair and Tenure and Promotion Review Committee.

When external evaluators have been identified and have expressed their willingness to participate in the review process, they will be sent a letter from the chair of the Tenure and Promotion Review Committee, a copy of the candidate's curriculum vita, a representative selection (as determined by the candidate) of recent materials, and a copy of the Promotion and Tenure Guidelines. These materials may include publications, manuscripts, professional reports, descriptions or evaluations of service activities, and if appropriate, summaries of teaching evaluations, course syllabi and teaching materials. External review ordinarily will be initiated by June 15th with review materials mailed by August 1st and external reviews returned by October 15th in time for use in the School review process. Copies of letters to external evaluators and their reports will be included in the candidate's file.

2. Department Faculty: The internal review process begins with Department faculty. A Tenure and Promotion Review Committee, consisting of a total of three tenured faculty members, drawn from the Department, will conduct a substantive review of the candidate's record. If sufficient numbers are not available within the Department, faculty from other Schools or Departments within the college or elsewhere on campus will be asked to serve. The Department members of the committee in consultation with the Department Chair, will elect a committee chair and select the outside faculty member(s). The Department Chair will not attend the meetings of this committee during its deliberations.

The candidate will provide a record of performance and back-up materials (specified elsewhere in this document) to the chair of the Tenure and Promotion Review Committee. The recommendation of the Tenure and Promotion Review Committee will be determined in accordance with the criteria section of these guidelines. A letter assessing performance

in each of the evaluation categories addressed in Section II below along with a recommendation from the committee will be transmitted to the Department Chair.

3. Department Chair: The Department Chair will prepare a written recommendation and forward it to the Dean along with the Tenure and Promotion Review Committee report and the complete file of the candidate. A standard university routing slip will be attached to provide a record of the review at all administrative levels.

The Chair shall fully inform the faculty members charged with the peer review about his/her recommendations. The Department Chair shall also ensure that the affected faculty member is promptly informed as to the results of and rationale for both recommendations and shall provide a written summary of both at the request of the faculty member. In the cases of promotion or early tenure consideration, the candidate may withdraw from further consideration at this point.

4. College Dean: The Dean in consultation will review the evidence and prepare a recommendation and rationale that, together with the entire file, will be made available to the candidate. The candidate will have an opportunity to add written comments to the file. The candidate will have the options of continuing the process without comment, of withdrawing, or of continuing the process with his or her written comment on the proceedings and recommendations. The Dean will forward the Executive Summary Document, including the candidate's comments, if any, and all previous reviews, to the Provost. A negative recommendation at any level does not stop the continuation of the review process. A candidate may withdraw at any time.

5. Timing: In order to adhere to university deadlines established each year for reappointment, tenure and promotion action, the Tenure and Promotion Review Committee, the Department Chair and the Dean of the college must have all documentation and approvals in a timely manner. Therefore, faculty applicants seeking tenure or promotion must initiate a request before the end of the spring semester preceding tenure/promotion review and deliver their packages to the Tenure and Promotion Review Committee by the dates established by the college's Associate Dean for Academic Affairs. Note that different dates are established for reappointment, tenure and promotion and that those dates vary by academic year. For tenure and promotion decisions, review documents should be submitted before November 1st. External Reviewers will need to be contacted by June 15th, review packets for External Reviewers will need to be mailed by August 1st to assure that responses are received by October 15th in time to be considered by the Tenure and Promotion Review Committee.

II. CRITERIA

Candidates for promotion and tenure will be evaluated in five categories: credentials and experience, teaching, scholarship, service and professional activity, and personal qualities.

The paragraphs below are intended to give definition to these areas of performance. The intent is to reflect the values and expectations considered important by the Department while simultaneously allowing adequate flexibility for faculty members to achieve their full potential.

A. Credentials and Experience: The Credentials and Experience category refers to the formal education, continued professional development and other areas of preparation that build the foundation for significant scholarly and professional productivity in the designated areas of the candidate's responsibilities. The most relevant aspect of credentials and experience is their relationship to the candidate's specified area of competence and contribution in the Department.

Evidence of credentials and experience may include but is not limited to the following:

- appropriate degrees for the field, discipline or specialization for which the candidate is responsible;
- a terminal degree is required and in some cases a doctorate may be preferred, although a combination of professional degree and experience may be acceptable;
- additional degrees, post graduate education, and other educational accomplishments may be evidence for a specific specialization;
- evidence of continued and targeted professional development and education;
- acquisition and maintenance of professionally relevant credentials, certification, and/or licensing;
- professional practice congruent with specialization;
- election to membership in academies, or specialized professional societies; and
- membership and evidence of participation in appropriate professional organizations.

B. Teaching: All faculty members in the Department are expected to be inspiring, effective teachers. Teaching performance may be demonstrated through credit and non-credit instruction, although all candidates must provide evidence of credit instruction. The instructional process entails a number of elements, all of which merit consideration in the review process. Among these are the individual's skills, abilities, and ingenuity related to: (1) assessing learning needs, (2) designing instructional courses, programs and interventions, preparing instructional materials (e.g., syllabi, study guides, bibliographies, laboratory exercises), (3) selecting and effectively using appropriate instructional strategies and techniques, (4) assessing and providing feedback on student performance, and (5) availability to students, providing accessible, sensitive, and appropriate academic and professional advising to students. Other elements of teaching, of a more subtle and intangible nature, that are less easily assessed but that are of critical importance are: (6) the extent to which essential knowledge and skills are successfully imparted to students, (7) skill in motivating and inspiring students to stretch their minds to do their best work, (8) empathy with student anxieties and frustrations, (9) success in facilitating the process

whereby students are socialized into their profession, and (10) evidence that the candidate stands as a positive role model for students.

To be considered for promotion and/or tenure in each of the program areas, the candidate's dossier must include a detailed evaluation of teaching, advising, and instructional support performance, accompanied by concrete evidence. Such evidence must include student input in some form. Examples of evidence of teaching performance include:

- the results of course evaluations (data should be presented for all courses taught at Clemson since employment, last promotion, or for a minimum of the past four years, except for independent studies, internships, theses, and other instructional formats in which the collection of data may be impractical);
- syllabi and educational materials;
- objective surveys of appropriate groups of present and former students;
- letters from alumni;
- documentation from colleagues who have reason to be familiar with the candidate's teaching skills (through team-teaching, peer review, or other direct observation);
- awards or special recognitions for teaching;
- evidence of special efforts to improve teaching skill and effectiveness;
- data documenting student learning outcomes;
- letters from employers whose employees have attended a course taught by the candidate;
- data documenting the quantity and quality of student advising and support activities;
- data documenting the frequency and significance of academic and professional advising to doctoral and graduate students, specifically thesis, terminal paper, and dissertation supervision;
- incorporation of practical applications and real world experiences into the classroom; and
- reports from project based instruction, documentation of awards received and/or project implementation and client satisfaction
- any other evidence the candidate chooses to present such as enrollment patterns, extent of involvement or supervision of independent studies, etc.

C. Scholarship: Scholarship includes the achievements of an individual in expanding the body of knowledge and contributing to the knowledge of others. In assessing scholarship, attention will be paid not merely to the volume and frequency of output, but also to the quality of the products, the rigor and competitiveness of the media in which they are offered, and their acceptance by and impact on the intended audience. In the College of Architecture, Arts and Humanities, scholarship directed to professional audiences is valued, as is research contributing to the knowledge of other scholars. Faculty members are entitled to freedom in the selection of topics for research and in the publication of any results and conclusions.

The following hierarchical order of scholarly products is meant to communicate the relative contribution each makes to a candidate's body of scholarly work. It is based on the rigor and competitiveness of the media in which the product appears. The quality of the products, their acceptance by and impact on the intended audience can be documented by other means and will be evaluated by the external reviewers and the review committee. Thus any scholarly project may be elevated to a higher tier in this hierarchy based on this qualitative evaluation. For example if prominent external reviewers explain how a second-tier journal article, a non-peer reviewed article, a book chapter, a non-print publication, or a professional project has had a major impact on the field, etc., it will be evaluated as a first-tier scholarly product.

First-tier Scholarly Products

Top peer-reviewed international and national journals in the field (e.g., *JPER*, *Landscape Journal*, *JAPA*, *E&P*, etc.), top peer-reviewed international and national subfield journals (*Journal of Urban Design*, *Housing Policy Debate*, *Planning Theory*, etc.¹), professional projects receiving international and national awards recognition or implementation imprimatur, or recognition in alternative media (films, exhibitions, etc.) that are nationally ranked; and authored books are examples of first-tier scholarly products. These products show that the candidate has been able to produce work that has received acknowledgement at the highest levels of the profession (e.g., the journals that are most selective, the awards that are most difficult to win, etc.).

Second-tier Scholarly Products

Second-tier peer-reviewed journals in the field or subfield (often regionally based, e.g., *Southeastern Geographer*, etc.), monographs, edited books, original book chapters², peer-reviewed conference proceedings, book review essays, symposium editorships, and professional project reports receiving regional awards and/or local commendations and/or implementation imprimatur. Second tier products are respectable scholarly products but they do not generate the impact of the first-tier products.³ However, they will form a substantial part of many successful promotion and tenure cases.

Third-tier Scholarly Products

¹ A list of primary scholarly publication outlets will be developed with the approval of the Chair.

² Reprinted journal articles appearing in books are not a new scholarly product, but rather serve as an indicator of the quality of the original peer-reviewed article and its reception in the field.

³ It is important to note that the peer-review process is the defining line between third-tier scholarly products and first and second tier scholarly products. Books, including edited books, go through the review of the publisher, which sends it out to experts in the field to review. If a book is published through a vanity press, it is not peer-reviewed and should be listed as a third-tier product. Book review essays get reviewed by the book review editor and the editors of the journal, and original book chapters have the review process of the editor of the book and the expert peers that the publisher sends the manuscript to for review.

Non-peer-reviewed publications and proceedings, book reviews, proceedings, conference presentations, invited lectures, funded research projects, non-print publications (film, tape, software), professional project reports, etc. Third-tier products are of relatively minor significance in promotion and tenure cases, but they still show involvement in scholarly activity. They need to be included in the evaluation, but remain supportive in nature.

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

- reviews of candidate's work by external reviewers,
- citation index numbers,
- quotes of candidate's work by others,
- amounts of funding received,
- copies of works sold or in use,
- receipt of prizes or awards,
- election to scholarly societies,
- participation on review panels for funding agencies, and
- impact on practice in the field.

The traditional viewpoint of professional practice in each of the program fields is derived from an accumulation of experience in a professional office setting. This experience still forms a significant contribution of professional activity for faculty development and should be valued in the review process. Considerable emphasis should be placed on how professional experience influences the teaching methods of the faculty member. As a result, the quantity of professional office experience may not be as significant to the educational mission as the quality of professional experience (e.g., impact of experience on the teaching of design and planning process, generation of creative ideas, scheduling of time, project implementation, etc.) The traditional approach to professional activity, however, should not be interpreted as the sole source of professional activity. Each faculty member is expected to develop his or her own unique contribution to practice and activity as it pertains to Department goals. The description of professional activity should also be flexible enough to allow faculty to adapt to changing demands on university faculty. Thus, in addition to the traditional office experience, other professional activities may include:

- writings that affect the profession;
- continuing education activities;
- consultation with practitioners, government agencies, etc.;
- significant contributions to professional organizations and conferences;
- competitions; and
- projects published or reviewed in journals.

The quality of professional practice determines whether such practice contributes to scholarly productivity. The key distinction is whether the professional work (a project)

represents an original contribution to the art and science of planning, development and preservation. Routine professional work (i.e., the application of standard techniques to produce a typical professional product) is not considered scholarly activity. This is not to say that it should not be considered as quality service or as documentation of quality teaching. However innovative professional work can involve a high level of creativity and also should be accorded scholarly credit. This might involve the development of new methodology, application of methodology from another field to a planning, development, or preservation topic, proposing a unique solution to an important problem, or synthesizing ideas in a new format.

The quality of team projects (e.g., CCGC, aLINEment studio projects) and studio class reports determines whether they contribute to scholarly productivity as well as documenting teaching and service quality. The innovative/creative professional work described above can transform professional practice and studio teaching into scholarly products as well.

D. Service and Professional Activity: Service may be performed in a variety of ways. It includes (1) contributions to professional associations and the broader discipline, (2) contributions through applications of professional expertise, (3) contributions to the university through university, college, and Department committees and administrative activity. 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. Special attention will be given to professional work based on the candidate's discipline or profession.

Examples of service and professional activity could be:

- individual effort (as an administrator, innovator, consultant to academic bodies, grant participant, service in designated Department roles, recipient of academic service awards, etc.);
- member of committees or other collective professional and academic bodies and service on national, regional, and state boards;
- professional practice with individuals and groups with letters from these constituents documenting the candidate's competence and quality of work;
- consultation with agencies or organizations (local, state, regional, international) with letters from these groups 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 individuals documenting the nature, quality, and value of the technical assistance;
- chair or leadership role in committees and other collective academic and professional bodies;
- serving on professional juries;

- training of public officials and continuing education short courses;
- public service outside one's discipline; and
- non-research grant activity that directly benefits the School.

E. Personal Qualities: Candidates for 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 in students, fairness toward students, integrity in scholarship, and dependability in meeting professional commitments. Evidence in the form of appropriate items from course evaluations, and letters from students and colleagues may serve as documentation. The candidate is expected to carry out duties and meet professional responsibilities in a spirit of cooperation with colleagues.

F. Levels of Performance: Faculty performance with respect to teaching, scholarship, and service and professional activity shall be rated as excellent, very good, satisfactory, marginal, or unsatisfactory. Credentials and experience along with personal qualities shall be rated as satisfactory or unsatisfactory.

To warrant promotion, candidates must achieve the following ratings:

From Instructor to Assistant Professor

- Appropriate credentials.
- Strong promise of meeting standards for tenure and promotion to associate professor.

From Assistant Professor to Associate Professor

- At least 1 excellent, in teaching or scholarship; 1 very good and no assessment below satisfactory.

From Associate to Full Professor

- At least 2 excellent, and no assessment lower than good.
- At least very good in teaching and scholarship.
- A record of continuing contribution.

To warrant tenure as an Associate or Full Professor, candidates must achieve the same ratings as required for promotion to that level. No faculty member at the rank of Assistant Professor will be advanced for tenure. Faculty members at the rank of Assistant Professor being recommended for tenure shall at the same time be recommended for promotion to Associate Professor.

PERFORMANCE INDICATORS: This section provides examples and indicators of quality performance. It is not intended to prescribe specific numeric standards since appropriate judgment is called for in each case.

A person rated "excellent" in TEACHING might have a record that includes:

- consistently high student evaluations,
- strong support through faculty peer evaluations and alumni comments,
- high quality student work,
- student demand for classes,
- curriculum development,
- innovative teaching materials and approaches,
- awards and other recognition, and
- high ratings in workshops and other professional education activities.

Excellence in teaching must include, but is not limited to, credit instruction.

A person rated "excellent" in SCHOLARSHIP might have a record that includes:

- numerous publications, including refereed journal articles and/or books,
- significant research grants,
- several applied research studies,
- high quality professional practice, and
- awards and other recognition.

Excellence in scholarship is not limited to performance in peer reviewed media, but must include evidence of quality and impact.

A person rated "excellent" in SERVICE AND PROFESSIONAL ACTIVITY might have a record that includes:

- evidence of impact on profession and public;
- outstanding professional practice;
- development of new institutions, e.g., institutes, centers;
- awards and other recognition; and
- significant effort related to curricular or program development or outstanding leadership in curricular revision.

Excellence in service must include, but is not limited to, work that draws upon professional expertise and is an outgrowth of an academic discipline.

ARTICLE XV. Post Tenure Review

Purpose of Review

Faculty members of the Department are expected to be very good teachers, to develop and maintain academic and professional stature in their areas of expertise, and to provide meaningful public service within and outside of the university (*Faculty Manual "Best Practices for Post-Tenure Review"*, Appendix H). Some flexibility must be incorporated into the review process as responsibilities for senior faculty members shift over time.

Post-tenure review (PTR) is intended to evaluate the performance of faculty members in these areas of professional responsibility beyond tenure review. Post-tenure review is not intended as a constraint to academic freedom. Furthermore, sex, age, ethnicity, and other factors unrelated to an individual's professional qualifications shall not be considered in the peer review process.

Persons Under Review

In accordance with the Faculty Manual, all tenured faculty members in the Department will go through post-tenure review on a rotating basis. Initial reviews will be conducted during the Fall Semester beginning with faculty having the greatest seniority with a staggered rotation in subsequent years of the faculty having six years of service since tenure or promotion (*Faculty Manual IV-7*).

Faculty members appointed with tenure will begin the PTR cycle six years after tenure appointment or promotion, whichever is the later date. The year or years that a faculty member is on sabbatical, unpaid leave, and/or extended sick leave shall not be counted in the review time period. Deans and Department chairs are exempt from post-tenure review as they are currently under performance review. If a dean, chair, or other administrative appointee returns to a regular faculty appointment, he/she must undergo PTR during the third year after rejoining the School.

Composition of Post-Tenure Review Committee

The Post-Tenure Review Committee generally shall consist of two or more members of the faculty and an external committee member. Internal faculty members will be nominated by the Tenure and Promotion Review Committee and elected by the faculty. Only tenured faculty members are eligible for election to the Post Tenure Review Committee (*Faculty Manual IV-8*). The external committee member may be either a faculty member or a professional from outside the Department. The external committee member will be selected by the PTR Committee from a list of four names - two of which are submitted by the candidate. The candidate has the option of soliciting reference letters from outside the Department as allowed in the *Faculty Manual IV-9*.

Part I Post Tenure Review.

The PTR committee will review the ratings received on the most recent available series of five years of annual performance reviews, as specified in the Best Practices for Post-Tenure Review (#3). Merit salary increments are based on these annual performance reviews, as is consistent with the Best Practices for Post-Tenure Review (#9). All tenured faculty members receiving no more than one (of five) annual performance rating of “fair,” “marginal,” or “unsatisfactory” in Part I of the Post Tenure Review process receive a Post Tenure Review rating of “satisfactory.” These faculty members are thereby exempt from Part II of Post Tenure Review.

Part II Post Tenure Review.

Part II consists of additional review by the Post Tenure Review Committee and the Department chair of those identified in Part I as subject to further review. All tenured faculty members receiving two or more annual performance ratings of “fair,” “marginal,” or “unsatisfactory” will be reviewed under Part II of Post Tenure Review.

- a. In order to ensure adequate external representation in the Part II Post Tenure Review process, Department must choose ONE of these options in drafting Department personnel policy procedures.

- utilize reference letters submitted from outside the Department on each individual under review,

- add to the PTR committee a faculty member or professional equivalent from outside the Department nominated and elected according to Department bylaws,

- allow each faculty member under review the option of either having external letters solicited or incorporating the external committee member in the review process.

- b. The faculty member undergoing Part II of PTR must provide, at a minimum, the following documents to the PTR committee and the Department chair.

- a recent copy of the curriculum vita (paper or electronic);

- a summary of student assessment of instruction for the last 5 years including a summary of statistical ratings from student assessments of instruction (if appropriate to the individual’s duties).

- a plan for continued professional growth;

- detailed information about the outcomes of any sabbatical leave awarded during the preceding five years; and

- if required by School personnel policy procedures, the names of six referees outside the Department whom the PTR committee could contact for references.

- c. The chair of the academic unit must provide the PTR committee with copies of the faculty member's annual performance reviews covering the preceding five years.
- d. The role and function of each faculty member, as well as the strength of the overall record, will be examined by the PTR committee. If provided in Department bylaws, the PTR committee is required to obtain a minimum of four reference letters of which at least two must come from the list of six submitted by the faculty member.
- e. The PTR committee will provide a written report to the faculty member. The faculty member should be given at least two weeks to provide a response to the committee. Both the committee's initial report and the response of the faculty member will be given to the dean of the academic unit. The Department chair will submit an independent written report to the faculty member who will then have two weeks to provide a response. The chair's original report and the faculty member's response will be forwarded to the college dean. The ratings of either *Satisfactory* or *Unsatisfactory* will be used in all stages of the review by the PTR committee and the chair.
- f. If both the PTR Committee and the chair, or either the PTR Committee or the chair, rates the candidate as satisfactory, the candidate's final rating shall be satisfactory. If both the PTR Committee and the Chair rate the candidate as unsatisfactory, the candidate's final rating shall be unsatisfactory.
- g. If the candidate's final rating is satisfactory, the dean will forward that information to the Provost in summary form without appending any candidate materials. If the candidate's final rating is unsatisfactory, the dean will forward all materials to the Provost.

Remediation

Individuals who receive a rating of *Unsatisfactory* must be given a period of remediation to correct deficiencies detailed in the PTR reports. The chair in consultation with the PTR committee and the faculty member will provide a list of specific goals and measurable outcomes the faculty member should achieve in each of the next three calendar years following the date of formal notification of the unsatisfactory outcome. The university will provide reasonable resources (as identified in the PTR reports and as approved by the chair and the dean) to meet the deficiencies. The chair will meet at least twice annually with the faculty member to review progress. The faculty member will be reviewed each year by the PTR committee and the chair, both of whom shall supply written evaluations. At the end of the three-year period, another post-tenure review will be conducted. If the outcome is again *Unsatisfactory*, the faculty member will be subject to dismissal for unsatisfactory performance. If the review is *Satisfactory*, then the normal five-year annual performance review cycle will resume.

Dismissal for Unsatisfactory Professional Performance

If dismissal for unsatisfactory professional performance is recommended, the case will be subject to the rules and regulations outlined in the *Faculty Manual Section K*.

ARTICLE XVI. Sabbatical Leave

Consistent with the university's Sabbatical Leave Policy (VII-L), Sabbatical leave may be granted to any tenured faculty member who has completed at least six years of full-time service with the University. The purpose of the Sabbatical leave is to facilitate professional growth and development thus contributing in the long run to the mission of the Department and the University. Individual faculty members are required to submit a Sabbatical proposal to the Department chair at least six months prior to the intended leave date. The proposal must indicate the nature of the Sabbatical and justify the experience in terms of professional development and contributions to the Department and University.

Sabbatical leaves may be requested for a half year (at full pay) or a full year (at half pay). The full year Sabbatical is generally preferred for both personal and Department purposes. In all cases, core and priority teaching assignments must be covered within the individual academic programs. A Sabbatical report is required within the first three months that the faculty member returns to campus. This report is to be retained as part of the Tenure/Post-Tenure Review document.

ARTICLE XVII.

Work Load

The primary workload of faculty in the Department of Planning, Development and Preservation are committed to teaching responsibilities. Normal teaching loads are 9-12 credit hours for each of the two regular semesters as indicated in the Faculty Manual (VII-B).

Release time is routinely granted for administrative responsibilities including those of the Department Chair and Program Administrators. Release time may be granted for unusually heavy research and/or service activities. Generally but not always release time for research will be provided through funded research projects. Standard release time for externally funded projects shall follow the university formula of:

- Release from a three hour teaching course in one semester if 25% of the semester salary is charged to the research project.
- Release from a three hour teaching course in one semester if 12.5% of the nine month salary is charged to the research project.
- Release from a three hour teaching course for both semesters if 25% of the nine month salary is charged to the research project.

In unusual circumstances, non-funded research activities may warrant release time. Those circumstances although rare may relate to start-up of research initiatives that are deemed important to the Department as a whole. Heavy service responsibilities also may result in release time such as curricular development or work in an advisory capacity to public or private entities as a representative of the University. In all cases,

- the workload should be commensurate with that of normal work requirements,
- the research or service activity must be of substantial benefit to the Department and university as well as the individual faculty member, and
- teaching responsibilities must be accommodated within the individual academic programs.

ARTICLE XVIII.

Faculty Office Hours

Outside of a faculty members posted office hours, students are expected to call or email their faculty to schedule meetings. In any event, students are advised to confirm meetings

scheduled with faculty, even if they expect to see an instructor during his or her posted office hours.

Appendices

- I. College Statement of Guiding Principles
- II. School of Design and Building's Tenure, Promotion, and Reappointment Framework
- III. Dean's Guidelines for Promotion & Tenure

APPENDIX I

GUIDING PRINCIPLES

COLLEGE OF ARCHITECTURE, ARTS AND HUMANITIES

- **We seek to create community in our college.**

We will be a cohesive community of conceptual, creative, and cultural disciplines committed to inquiry in an open and stimulating environment.

- **We seek unity within diversity.**

As we build the common ground, we will celebrate the diversity of academic cultures, our different definitions of teaching, research, and service, and the unique talents and perspectives of each member of the college.

- **We seek diversity in the composition of our faculty and student body and multicultural understanding through our curriculum offerings.**

We will work to see that our faculty and students represent a cross section of society and that our curriculum truly promotes an understanding of global diversity.

- **We seek a focus on learning.**

We will educate, counsel, and inspire our students as our students educate, counsel, and inspire us.

- **We seek to evolve a curriculum that values both education and application while reflecting our commitment to collaboration.**

We will design a curriculum that recognizes the value of establishing the connections between the life of the mind and applied skills.

- **We seek an appropriate balance between our responsibilities to students in our college and those in the university as a whole.**

We will recognize that we have commitments to a high quality education both to Architecture, Arts and Humanities students and to students in other colleges.

- **We seek the creative connections among teaching, research and service.**

We will pursue the discovery and dissemination of knowledge by appropriately balancing teaching, research, and service.

APPENDIX II

SCHOOL OF DESIGN AND BUILDING

REAPPOINTMENT, TENURE AND PROMOTION FRAMEWORK

The triad of teaching, research and public service has meaning to us. It is not a token triad. It shapes our everyday work and culture. We understand that teaching can best be done when informed by active practice and scholarship (research) and both teaching and research find a strong focus when applied to public service in communities. There are many versions of this triad, but they all grow from this base of commitment.

TEACHING

- Teaching is the first among these three equals. There is no competition with research and public service. Teaching needs research and public service to be stronger, but there is no teaching verses research debate in the School of Design and Building. We have control over our priorities and these priorities put teaching foremost.
- Teaching in the School of Design and Building is broadly defined. Because there is a "studio culture" in place, teaching integrates with advising and is not isolated to the studio, classroom or seminar room. Within the School, teaching is a commitment, a state of mind, and a way of life. Teaching is a series of small actions changing people's lives. It involves a commitment to the whole student, not just the part of the student who comes to class, but the values, the attitudes, the social life and the "soul" of the student. Therefore, teaching occurs in the hallways, in the gallery, on field trips, and in a variety of informal settings. This kind of teaching and advising is seen as an important complement to traditional classroom teaching.
- We believe that we do some of our best teaching in teams. We can and do measure the quality of teaching primarily through our interaction as teachers. We team teach and hold symposia and reviews of student work as a group of teachers. We believe there is real value in this interactive teaching, because it provides a range of perspectives that better prepares our students for the professional environment.

RESEARCH

- While we have great unanimity in our view of teaching, we have great diversity in our view of research. We see this diversity as one of our strengths. We have the full breadth of the University in our perspective of research. At the base of this examination is the commitment to research, not for its own sake, but research that directly strengthens our teaching.

Given the diversity in our view of research, we agree that each School must fashion its own definition of and priorities for research using the following definitions based on pages 16-25 from the book Scholarship Reconsidered by Ernest Boyer:

Scholarship of discovery

...adding to the base of knowledge in a measurable new way.
"It reflects our pressing, irrepressible need as human beings to confront the unknown and to seek understanding for its own sake. It is tied inextricably to the freedom to think freshly, to see propositions of every kind in ever changing light. And it celebrates the special exhilaration that comes from a new idea."

Scholarship of integration

...making connections across disciplines and fitting research into larger intellectual patterns. "The connectedness of things is what the

educator contemplates to the limit of his or her capacity."

Scholarship of application

...engaging knowledge in application to consequential problems. "New intellectual understandings can arise out of the very act of application theory and practice vitally interact, and one renews the other."

Scholarship of teaching

...transmitting, transforming, and extending knowledge. u knowing and learning are communal acts." "Pedagogical procedures must be carefully planned, continuously examined and relate directly to the subject taught." "Teaching is the highest form of understanding" and it must be continuously refreshed through scholarship.

SERVICE

- We believe service reflects a commitment to a sense of community. We define "community" broadly to include: the School, school, college, university, profession, immediate community, state and society in general. We identify both our immediate beneficiary/community and an ultimate beneficiary/community of our service.

Service Beneficiary/Community	Immediate Beneficiary/Community	Ultimate
Public Service (profession-related)	Students Citizens of South Carolina	Society
Service to the Profession	Students/Professors	Society
Institutional Service	University citizens	Profession/Society
Community Service	Local citizens	Society

Each School must fashion appropriate priorities for their service using this framework of definitions.

COLLABORATION

We place great value in our interaction with our peers in the School of Design and Building. While not diminishing our connections across colleges at Clemson University nor our connections with colleagues in our professions around the world, we place special emphasis on our collegiality and our school interSchool connections. We assign value to tenure, promotion, and reappointment criteria that recognize our strengths in collaboration in the School of Design and Building.

APPENDIX III

CLEMSON UNIVERSITY

ARCHITECTURE, ARTS AND HUMANITIES DEAN'S GUIDELINES FOR TENURE, PROMOTION AND REAPPOINTMENT

The Clemson University *Faculty Manual* requires the dean of the college to enter an independent judgment in matters of tenure, promotion and reappointment. This document outlines the criteria that will be used in rendering this judgment.

The mission of Clemson University is composed of three components: teaching, research and service. The college embraces this triad in the determination of tenure, promotion and reappointment. The synergetic relationship of these three mission components is vital to the University and the College of Architecture, Arts and Humanities. In addition, the Guiding Principles of the college place emphasis on collaboration. At the college level, collaboration will contribute to teaching, research and service as an additional component.

Each School or school within the college may consider additional or more restrictive criteria.

Teaching:

In the College of Architecture, Arts and Humanities, there will be no area of assessment with higher priority than the candidate's abilities as a teacher. All faculty should be (at a minimum) very good studio, classroom and/or seminar teachers as judged by the evaluation procedures listed below. No candidate whose teaching ability is deemed inadequate will be appointed, reappointed, promoted or granted tenure.

Supporting evidence will include:

- Development: development of new courses and new curricular pedagogical methods and materials;
- Evaluations: course evaluations, exit interviews, peer evaluations, dean's teaching observations, alumni evaluations;
- Academic and research advising of undergraduate and graduate students;
- Awards: School, college, university, as well as from the profession/discipline.

Research:

In the College of Architecture, Arts and Humanities, research embraces funded and unfunded work including scholarship, creative activity and professional practice. Each of these three forms of research is defined as creative intellectual work producing a tangible product that is validated by peer review and communicated to appropriate audiences.

Given the diversity of activity in research, the Dean will assess research skills using the following definitions (the following are edited from *Scholarship Reconsidered* by Ernest Boyer, pp. 16-25):

Scholarship of discovery.....adding to the base of knowledge in a measurable new way. "It reflects our pressing, irrepensible need as human beings to confront the unknown and to seek understanding for its own sake. It is tied inextricably to the freedom to think freshly, to see propositions of every kind in ever-changing light. And it celebrates the special exhilaration that comes from a new idea."

Scholarship of integration.....making connections across disciplines and fitting research into larger intellectual patterns. "The connectedness of things is what the educator contemplates to the limit of his [/her] capacity."

Scholarship of application.....engaging knowledge in application to consequential problems. "New intellectual understandings can arise out of the very act of application....theory and practice vitally interact, and one renews the other."

Scholarship of teaching.....pedagogical research that transmits, transforms, and extends the knowledge and skills of teaching. The dissemination of one's discoveries and innovations and the like to the larger professional/disciplinary audience. "...knowing and learning are communal acts." "Pedagogical procedures must be carefully planned, continuously examined and relate directly to the subject taught." "Teaching is the highest form of understanding...and it must be continually refreshed through scholarship."

Supporting evidence may include:

- Publications, including but not limited to: articles, essays, short stories, poems, reviews in academic and professional journals; refereed conference proceedings; research monographs, books; chapters in books; published curricular materials; reports; reviews of design projects, electronic publications--in both print and electronic media;
- Research support: from internal and external sponsors;
- Honors and awards: scholarly awards, invited addresses, professional awards, design awards won, design competitions won;
- Participation in professional societies: presentations at meetings (peer reviewed and invited), organization of meetings, commentator, speeches;
- Professional registration;
- Professional practice: public and private consulting, reviews of design projects
- Creative activity: exhibitions, presentations, work in collections, performances, concerts, recognition of original works, design competitions entered, editorial boards, etc.

Service:

In the College of Architecture, Arts and Humanities, service reflects a commitment to a sense of community, defined to include: the School, college, university, discipline/profession and society. The following identifies the immediate beneficiary/community and ultimate beneficiary/community of this service:

<u>Service</u>	<u>Immediate Beneficiary/Community</u>	<u>Ultimate Beneficiary/Community</u>
Public/Community Service (profession-related)	Students Citizens of South Carolina	Society
Service of the Profession/ Discipline	Students/Professionals	Society
Institutional Service (University/college/ dept. committees, and the like)	University citizens	Profession/Society

Collaboration:

The College of Architecture, Arts and Humanities places value on collaboration with peers in teaching, research and service activity evident in the College's Guiding Principles:

PREAMBLE

By exploring the best of what has been built, created, performed, and written, the College of Architecture, Arts and Humanities immerses its students in both the abstract and the practical activities of the human imagination. Architecture, Arts and Humanities educates students in technical and critical skills, providing them with the flexible cultural understanding necessary for sustained professional accomplishment and continued intellectual development. Our college is unique in its composition of diverse disciplines and professions; it is a partnership founded on the principles of collaboration among faculty and between faculty and students; it is a partnership that aspires to nothing less than the education of the thinkers and creators of tomorrow.

GUIDING PRINCIPLES

COLLEGE OF ARCHITECTURE, ARTS AND HUMANITIES

• **We seek to create community in our college.**

We will be a cohesive community of conceptual, creative, and cultural disciplines committed to inquiry in an open and stimulating environment.

• **We seek unity within diversity.**

As we build the common ground, we will celebrate the diversity of academic cultures, our different definitions of teaching, research, and service, and the unique talents and perspectives of each member of the college.

• **We seek diversity in the composition of our faculty and student body and multicultural understanding through our curriculum offerings.**

We will work to see that our faculty and students represent a cross section of society and that our curriculum truly promotes an understanding of global diversity.

- **We seek a focus on learning.**

We will educate, counsel, and inspire our students as our students educate, counsel, and inspire us.

- **We seek to evolve a curriculum that values both education and application while reflecting our commitment to collaboration.**

We will design a curriculum that recognizes the value of establishing the connections between the life of the mind and applied skills.

- **We seek an appropriate balance between our responsibilities to students in our college and those in the university as a whole.**

We will recognize that we have commitments to a high quality education both to Architecture, Arts and Humanities students and to students in other colleges.

- **We seek the creative connections among teaching, research and service.**

We will pursue the discovery and dissemination of knowledge by appropriately balancing teaching, research, and service.

Supporting evidence may include:

- Teaching: team-teaching, guest lectures, guest reviews of student work;
- Research: collaborative projects in scholarship, creative activity, design, professional practice;
- Service: collaborative design projects in public service, collaborative projects in service to the discipline, profession, university, college and School.

Signed

Date