

**Tenure and Promotion Dossier Profile Tables**

*Timestamp: 6. April 2020 alr cw*

**Required: Tables for Dossiers for Tenure, Promotion to Associate Professor, and Promotion to Professor:**

1. Table 1: Candidate work load report
2. Table 2: External reviewers

**1) Work Load Report**

**Responsible Parties**: Candidate completes the table. Department chair reviews and signs off on the information.

**Status**: Required of all candidates for tenure, promotion to associate professor, or promotion to full professor for AY 2020-21. This table provides a snapshot of workload in relevant review categories over time and facilitates calibration of expectations amongst categories. This report is a simplified preview that serves only as a snapshot to view workload over time. *Evaluations use the full dossier*.

**Timeline**: This table is uploaded before the dossier is completed and uploaded prior to TPR committee review begins.

**TPR Dossier Location**: Upload this table into the “**Top Achievements**” section in DigitalMeasures-TPRworkflow.

**Instructions**: Using the table shown on the page 3, candidates list work load % by semester, starting with the most recent and working backward. The entries should reflect the percentage distribution of time as decided in goals setting with the department chair annually (and edited halfway through the academic year in January when relevant). Entries are to be entered across the major areas of faculty engagement (teaching, research/scholarship, etc.) for each semester in categories described in the TPR document used in review. Note: It is highly likely that several columns are not relevant for a department. Please use the same categories described in the departmental TPR document because this tool is just to help capture if/how contributions in these categories may have changed. Categories used should mirror categories under review (don’t spread out into additional columns… for example, if your department only reviews on Research and Teaching, only have these 2 columns. Entries should reflect goals, not effort.

For example, an individual with work load distributed as 50 percent teaching, 40 percent research and 10 percent service in Fall 2016 that was on a research sabbatical Spring of 2017 would complete the table as follows:

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | | **Work Load Report – [Candidate Name]** | | | | |  |
| **Year\*** | **Semester** | **Teaching** | **Research & Scholarship** | **Service** | **Extension & Outreach** | **Administration** | **Total** |
| 2016-17 | Fall | 50 | 40 | 10 |  |  | 100% |
| 2016-17 | Spring |  | 100 |  |  |  | 100% |

\*for 12 month faculty, ‘Year’ is defined as May 16, 2016 – May 15, 2017

**Item 1: Example definitions of work load distribution categories**

The work load distribution categories should follow departmental TPR guidelines and can be edited by the candidate but generally are defined as follows:

Teaching: All classroom and other instructional activities. Library faculty should use this column to record librarianship.

Research: Includes time allocated to basic and applied research, extension-based research, performances and juried shows, and other scholarly activities and products.

Service: Includes department, college, university, and non-research elements of professional service.

Extension: Includes time allocated to demonstration research, extension-related program (curriculum) development/implementation, and dissemination of unbiased research-based knowledge to stakeholders.

Outreach: Includes activities focused on solving immediate practical problems and issues through direct intervention and interaction with target populations.

Administration: Includes specific administrative positions such as department chair, associate dean, director of graduate studies, director of undergraduate studies, etc.

Use the semesters that cover the candidate’s reviewed workload. For departments where candidates continue research efforts of the summer and report goals for fall and spring semesters (such that summer goals are individual-choice, not negotiated with department chair), just enter fall and spring semesters. This is because you are reflecting goals distributions, not actual effort. A candidate may decide to do MORE than what is written as goals within a category and report this work but they are reviewed under the goals as set up with the department chair annually.

Nine-month faculty report workloads for fall and spring. Twelve-month faculty report workloads for fall, spring, and summer. Candidates for tenure and/or promotion to associate professor report workload for all semesters during which they have worked at Clemson. Candidates for full professor report workload for all semesters they were at the associate professor rank.

FAS “percent effort” entries can be used to populate this table.

For questions about this table, candidates should contact their department chair or dean.

*[See the next page for the Work Load Report Table and Sign Off.]*

**TABLE 1: Candidate Work Load Report**

**(use categories as reviewed and written into the TPR guidelines used to review candidate)**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | | **Work Load Report – Candidate Name: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_** | | | | |  |
| **Year** | **Semester** | **Teaching (%)** | **Research & Scholarship (%)** | **Service (%)** | **Extension &/or Outreach (%)** | **Administration (%)** | **Total** |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 100% |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 100% |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 100% |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 100% |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 100% |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 100% |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 100% |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 100% |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 100% |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 100% |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 100% |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 100% |

**Data Verification**: By signing below, the candidate and department chair affirm the accuracy of the workload report. Electronic signatures are acceptable.

Candidate: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Department Chair: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

**2) External ReviewerS Table**

**Responsible Parties**: TPR Committee chair (in some cases Department Chair) completes and uploads table.

**Status**: Required for all candidates for tenure, promotion to associate professor, or promotion to full professor for AY 2020-21 review cycle.

**Timeline**: This table is uploaded by the TPR Committee before the dossier is forwarded to the Dean.

**eTPR Dossier Location**: Load this table into the “**External Evaluator Letters of Reference**” tab of the eTPR dossier. This tab is not accessible by the candidate.

**Instructions:** List all reviewers and place an “X” in the column for the source of the reviewer: the candidate or the TPR committee/Department (if both sources proposed the reviewer, check both the candidate and department boxes; the final list should be comprised of letters from both the candidate and TPR committee/Department lists).

Notes: The Provost and President require:

-- at least two external letters are from reviewers not nominated by the candidate, have not served in advisory roles to the candidate (e.g. PhD advisor), be from peer or aspiring peer institutions in the discipline, are at least tenured Associate Professors (for tenure and promotion to Associate Professor) or full Professors (for promotion to full Professor)

-- CVs of external reviewers be attached to their evaluative letters

-- any relationship between the candidate and the external reviewer be clearly described within the external evaluator letters (include this in your letter requesting review)

-- names of reviewers and/or their institutions must not be included in internal evaluative letters (anything read by candidate); be very careful to not disclose identity of any reviewers and/or any institutions in evaluative letters by TPR committee, Department chair, or Dean

-- optimum numbers of letters from external evaluators is minimum 3 from candidate, 3 from committee/department list (not more than 4 from either list, not more than 7/8 in total; include all letters received)

-- be as consistent as possible for all faculty candidates under review regarding numbers, types of institutions, and faculty ranks of external evaluations used for candidates

If a letter is from outside academia, include justification with conclusion that evaluator is of high enough stature to represent the appropriate rank of faculty under review. In such cases, use these as supplemental to numbers from academic reviewers (for example, the 4th reviewer from the candidate, with the other 3 being of faculty rank) and only include 1 such evaluator.

Any exception to the above should be explained in writing. For questions about this table, contact your dean.

**Table 2. external reviewers TABLE**

**External Reviewer Table – Candidate Name: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Reviewer Name** | **Institution** | **Candidate’s List** | **TPR Committee/ Department List** |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |

Completed and uploaded by: TPR committee chair \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_