

**Policy and Procedures for Tenure, Promotion and Reappointments [TPR]
School of Architecture
College of Architecture, Arts and Humanities**

ARTICLE I
TENURE, PROMOTION AND REAPPOINTMENT COMMITTEE

The TPR Committee shall define the procedure for evaluation of faculty members for tenure, promotion and reappointment using the guidelines set forth in this procedural document, and shall observe the University deadlines applicable to the process of review and reporting.

A TPR Committee of no less than three members shall be constituted from among all tenured full professors and associate professors in the faculty. Members of the Committee are expected to serve three-year staggered terms. Over the longer term, membership is expected to rotate as much as possible given the number of eligible faculty.

Each year, the Chair will call all qualified faculty members together, and this body shall elect/confirm three members of the TPR Committee, including a Chairperson. The Chairperson shall be a Full Professor.

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. At least one of these members should be a member of the TPR Committee. 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. The School of Architecture Peer Review Committee shall be constituted as indicated elsewhere in these Bylaws. Following procedures elaborated in the Faculty Manual, this Committee reviews matters of appointment, tenure and promotion, and in each case prepares a formal recommendation.

ARTICLE II
SCOPE AND CRITERIA

Clause 1: Scope

Reappointment, promotions and tenure should be based on performance in three (3) basic criteria, as outlined in the university mission statement:

- a) Teaching
- b) **Research**
- c) Service to the school, college, university and the public

Additionally, reappointment, promotions and tenure should be based on the short- and long-term goals of the candidate in the form of a 5-year plan with respect to the objectives of the School.

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

and fairness toward students, integrity in scholarship, dependability in meeting professional commitments, and maintaining total intellectual honesty. Guidelines for promotion should emphasize demonstrable "achievement" rather than "potential".

The primary responsibility for collecting and presenting evidence belongs to the candidate seeking reappointment, promotion and/or tenure. Candidates are advised to be thorough and systematic in preparing their submissions.

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.

Candidates may want to refer to Appendix A, *Checklist for Demonstrating Accomplishments in Research*, as a guide to document Research accomplishments as they prepare for tenure and/or promotion, to assist in making the best case for their achievements according to criteria outlined here and in the checklist. This information should be included in the CV.

The primary responsibility of the peer review committee is to evaluate the material presented by the candidate, not to collect information or testimony. 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.

To guide and answer questions of candidates, the peer review 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 Chair.

Faculty seeking reappointment, tenure or promotion must initiate a request early in the fall semester. The deadlines set forth by the University must be observed. These dates are available each year from the Dean's office.

Each request for reappointment, promotion and tenure requires the uploading of supportive materials through, and as specified by the University's on-line system.

Clause 2: Criteria

The School of Architecture Peer Review Committee feels that all faculty members should be evaluated by their excellence as per the criteria of 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.

To be considered for tenure, candidates must meet requirements for Associate Professor.

Advancement to the rank of Associate Professor requires National Recognition in either Teaching, Research or Service, and at least commendable activity in each of the other two criteria.

An assessment of Excellent in any criterion is indicative of national-level accomplishment and recognition. 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. For

evaluating Tenure and/or Promotion, however, the candidate's cumulative and complete on-line package supporting the bid for Tenure and/or Promotion is the basis for assessment, by which an assessment can be made for the entirety of the period since the Candidate's hire or previous University promotion. Significant accomplishments post-dating the submission of the candidate's e-TPR materials will not be considered. Unsolicited and/or unverified information should not be considered as part of the TPR decision.

The assessment for tenure and/or promotion is made, as for annual reviews, respecting the following notes (as copied from the "Guidelines" referenced here):

1. 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 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).

2. Multi-Year Projects

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.

3. Assessment of Lecturer Ranks

Lecturers and Senior Lecturers are evaluated primarily on Teaching as defined here and in the "Guidelines" referenced here. Senior Lecturers are also expected to achieve at least a "good" in either Research or Service on an annual basis, as defined here and in the Guidelines. Full-time Lecturers will also be expected to offer Service and/or to demonstrate accomplishment in Research annually.

4. Assessment of Research Faculty

Research faculty are evaluated primarily on Research as defined here and in the "Guidelines for Appointment, Reappointment and Promotion of Research Faculty" referenced here. Research faculty support the overall mission and vision of the department, are engaged in full time research or public service, and are supported (including fringe benefits) exclusively from external funds or foundation accounts. This faculty appointment is a professional career track without tenure considerations. Performance goals and expectations are more restricted than those for tenure/tenure-track faculty and must be consistent with the Clemson University Faculty Manual (under special faculty ranks).

Criteria 1: Teaching – To Educate, Counsel and Inspire Students

All School of Architecture faculty members are expected to be competent, 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:

- assessing learning needs,
- designing instructional courses, programs and interventions, preparing instructional materials (e.g., syllabi, study guides, bibliographies, studio exercise),

- selecting and effectively using appropriate instructional strategies and techniques,
- assessing and providing feedback on student performance, and
- 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:

- the extent to which essential knowledge and skills are successfully imparted to students,
- skill in motivating and inspiring students to stretch their minds to do their best work,
- empathy with student anxieties and frustrations,
- success in facilitating the process whereby students are socialized into their profession, and
- evidence that the candidate stands as a positive role model for students.

To be considered for promotion and/or tenure in the School of Architecture, the candidate's submitted materials in the form of a portfolio 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 pre-sorted for all courses taught at Clemson since employment, last promotion, or for 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 students, both present and former;
- 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;
- material collected from senior exit review by department head shall be included;
- 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 graduate students, specifically thesis or terminal paper supervision;
- any other evidence the candidate chooses to present such as enrollment patterns, extent of involvement or supervision of independent studies, etc.; and
- incorporation of practical applications and real world experiences into the classroom – "in what scholarly ways has the individual faculty member brought practical ideas into teaching".

Criteria 2: 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. 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, peer-reviewed written and creative works 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 kinds of products or activities may be documented as evidence of research (not listed in order of priority):

- peer-reviewed monographs
- peer-reviewed book chapters
- peer-reviewed books (author, 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
- professional reports
- completed dissertations

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
- quotes of candidate's work by others
- amounts of funding received
- copies of works sold or in use
- receipt of prizes and awards
- election to scholarly or professional societies
- agency or grantee evaluation of work
- impact on practice in the field
- participation on review panels for funding agencies
- invitations to lecture on current research organizing conferences/proceedings

Criteria 3: Service – Advancing Institutional Objectives and Service Within/Outside University

Service may be performed in a variety of ways. Service includes (1) contributions to scholarly and professional associations and the broader discipline, (2) contributions through applications of professional expertise, (3) contributions to the university through university, college, and departmental committees and administrative activity. Service 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

Clause 3: Workload Benchmarks

On annual basis, all faculty are expected to meet Workload Benchmarks as follows:

- 2 peer-reviewed artifacts or equivalent research/creative activity
- \$0 K research expenditures
- 3/3 teaching load
- Departmental, College, or professional service

Note: Workloads may be adjusted for individuals with scholarship, research expenditures, teaching, advising and/or service in significant excess of the above, so that the resulting composite workload is equivalent to the composite of these benchmarks.

Clause 4: Assessment

A person achieving National Recognition in Teaching might have a record that includes:

- excellent student evaluations
- student demand for classes
- curriculum development
- innovative teaching materials and approaches
- teaching across disciplines
- awards and other recognition
- high ratings in workshops and other professional education activities, and
- amount and range of student counseling activities

A person achieving National Recognition in Research has a body of accomplishments that may include:

- peer-reviewed publications, including refereed journals articles, book chapter and/or books,
- funded research grants,
- peer-reviewed design exhibitions and/or design awards

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

A person achieving National Recognition in Service within and outside the university might have a record that includes:

- evidence of impact on professional and academic bodies and/or the public,
- development and administration of new institutions, e.g., institutes, centers,
- significant effort related to curricular or program development or outstanding leadership in curricular revision, and
- significant impact on the teaching and learning environment

Clause 5: 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.

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. 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 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 School Chair, 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. Copies of letters to external evaluators and their reports will be included in the candidate's file.

APPENDIX A

Checklist for Demonstrating Accomplishments in Research

School of Architecture

Provide the following information for each accomplishment in Research

Title of work: _____

Book; Book Chapter; Journal paper; Conference Paper;

Design Competition; Juried Exhibition; Other: _____

This work is classified as:

Peer-reviewed; Non-peer-reviewed;

International; National; Regional; State; Local

Status of work:

Published/Exhibited; In-press; In-progress

Name of Publisher, Name of Design Competition, Place of Exhibition, or Name of Award/Prize:

Number of submissions: ____ % acceptance rate or number of awards made: ____

Names(s) of Key Members of Jury or Selection Committee: _____

An explanation of your role as author/researcher in the project, if co-authored: _____

URL or citation for this work: _____

Other information concerning the impact of this achievement: _____

APPENDIX B
 Guidelines for Annual Faculty Performance Rating, School of Architecture

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 <u>external</u> funding award for interdisciplinary research; - or – a <u>national/international</u> 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 <u>external</u> funding; a second peer-reviewed artifact; progress on a book chapter, book or significant creative work	RESEARCH: a <u>national/international</u> 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 <u>national/international</u> peer reviewed work-in-progress (e.g. a poster; a short paper); an <u>internal</u> research funding award; submission of a proposal for <u>external</u> 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

- 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.