

Internationalizing Tenure, Promotion and Reappointment

Prepared by William Ferrell, Ph.D. Industrial Engineering

May 21, 2014

This document reviews the Tenure, Promotion and Reappointment (TPR) criteria of Clemson as well as those of a selection of other universities. This review was conducted as part of the Internationalization Task Force (ITF) internal review during AY 2013-2014. Assertions that international activities were either disincentivized by the TPR process and/or discouraged by departmental practices were repeatedly made in the ITF review. The research described below examines those assertions and provides a cursory comparison of Clemson's TPR criteria to those of a sample of other institutions.

Summary of Findings

The majority of leading universities in the United States that we reviewed explicitly state that a requirement for promotion to full professor is an "international reputation." Most also require this when any faculty is being hired as a full professor. On the other hand, few include specific international activities in their guidelines. Anecdotal evidence obtained by conversations with faculty and administrators at a few of these universities suggest that the reason for the lack of specificity is because an international reputation can be obtained in many different ways even within a single department. Developing a list is viewed as a potentially "slippery slope" towards a checklist to TPR which is viewed very negatively. As such, these universities allow the TPR committees in the departments to provide guidance and advice to junior faculty in this regard during annual reviews.

At the universities where mention was made regarding specific international activities, the wording appears to have been carefully chosen to have the international activities fully integrated within the broader requirements of teaching, scholarship, and service as opposed to being a special category set apart.

While Clemson clearly has pockets of international activity and many departments have faculty who have successfully integrated international activities into their teaching, scholarship, and service, there is sufficient anecdotal evidence to suggest that this is not the universal norm. In fact, some suggest that international activities are actually held against them during annual evaluations by the department chair and/or TPR committee. We submit that this should be viewed as inappropriate and a situation to be rectified.

As such the committee recommends that the upper administration require that promotion to full professor require an international reputation. We further recommend that each college and department have a meaningful dialog about activities that will increase their international

reputation and formulate a plan to integrate these into the workload of interested faculty. This latter activity must be consistent with TPR guidelines, the broader expectations for international activities and reputation within the discipline, and must be developed in full partnership with the TPR committee. Finally, to encourage the activities that have been vetted by the critical parties, the University should establish a centralized fund that provides a dollar-for-dollar match to pay for these activities. Knowing that there will need to be caps on this funding, we recommend that the colleges be encouraged to establish similar funds to support their faculty beyond the limits of the Clemson-wide funding.

1. Methodology/Process

Current TPR guidelines at Clemson were reviewed to determine if international activities were included and, if so, how. A similar review was also conducted for TPR guidelines at a number of leading universities that were published on their website.

2. Findings

Faculty Survey Responses regarding Recruitment and TPR

A general survey on internationalization was administered to Clemson faculty in the spring of 2014. The data below are drawn from that survey. Fuller results of the survey are available in the general appendices of the Internationalization Task Force Report; and, raw data may be requested from the Office of Global Engagement.

There were 255 responses to the general section of the faculty survey out of 1329 instructional, public service, and research faculty, which is approximately 20% response rate. The faculty respondents comprised 31% Full Professor, 31% Associate Professors, 22% Assistant Professor, 8% Lecturer or Senior Lecturer, and 8% Non-Tenure track teaching/research position and other faculty. The response rate for the faculty survey by college is as follows: 22% - AAH, 19% - BBS, 27% - CAFLS, 14% - E&S, 24% - HEHD.

Respondents were **neutral** to the statements:

- Hiring non-US nationals for tenure line positions is adequately supported and facilitated by Clemson HR and Immigration Service procedures.
- My department actively recruits international faculty when conducting faculty searches.
- My department considers and values international experience in the faculty hiring decisions.
- International service activities are valued in the TPR guidelines and decisions within my college.
- International research activities are valued in the TPR guidelines and decisions within my college.

Respondents **disagreed** with the statements:

- Hiring non-US nationals for academic positions is discouraged at Clemson.
- International teaching activities are valued in the TPR guidelines and decisions within my college.
- International activities (e.g. teaching abroad, research abroad) are credited toward my annual workload.

Current Status of TPR at Clemson University

The TPR processes across the colleges vary in how international activities are considered. For example, the following list identifies where the word “international” appears in the published TPR guidelines:

- AAH (The document that was reviewed is the “Dean’s Guidelines for TPR and PTR.”)
 - In the Research category:
“For promotion to Full Professor, candidates must show clear and convincing evidence of national and/or international recognition.”
- AFLS
 - Level I (must attain), Transfer of Knowledge and Development of New Knowledge, Development and Delivery of New Knowledge (scholarship/research):
“Invited presentations and/or webinars that indicate an individual's national and international reputation”
 - Evaluation of Criteria:
“Promotion to Professor will require consistent and continuous success in meeting the criteria of Levels I and II and the attainment of national and international recognition.”
 - Materials to be Submitted, External Evaluators:
“External evaluators should comment on the national and international stature of the candidate within his or her profession.”
- E&S
 - Article I Criteria, Level I (must attain), Scholarship, possible supporting evidence:
“Presentations at national and international conferences.”
 - Article III Materials to be Submitted.
“List of senior national and international external referees and all external peer review letters that are to be inserted in the portfolio by the TPR Peer Review Committee”
 - Later in Article III:
“External evaluators should comment on the national and international stature of the candidate within the profession”
- HEHD
 - “National/international, peer-reviewed scholarly journals”
 - “Peer-reviewed papers, symposia, or panels at national/international conferences”
- BBS
 - TPR guidelines could not be obtained

Current Status at other Universities

For comparison, several universities were selected either because they were highly regarded in general or because they were regarded as having a strong international tenet to their reputation.

UNC-CH

- The only mention was in the general guidelines for promotion to full professor.
 - External review letters – “The purpose of these letters is to provide an independent and unbiased assessment of the individual’s national and international reputation.”
 - This appears to be implemented consistently because the letter from the department chair to an external reviewer is to ask: “What is the current national and international visibility and standing of the candidate? Set the entries in context.”

Georgia Tech

- There was no mention about international activities or recognition as criteria for faculty promotion and tenure.
- However, if the unit is going to hire a faculty with tenure, that person has to be “already tenured at his or her prior institute and brings a demonstrable national or international reputation to GT.”

University of California at Santa Barbara

- “For promotion to tenure, “superior intellectual attainment” is one of the principle criteria. The phrase ‘superior intellectual attainment’ has the international context of the discipline or area, and the person attaining superior intellectual should be an established figure in the field with international reputation.”
- For promotion to the ranks of Professor VI or above and Professor Above Scale – “great distinction recognized nationally or internationally in scholarly or creative achievement or teaching” is required. Also, the instruction for external reviewers includes the requirement that the above statement be included for faculty being promoted to the above mentioned ranks.”

Rutgers

- Teaching
 - “Special honors courses, interdisciplinary courses or collegiate mission courses taught. Also list international courses taught on campus or abroad.”
 - “Academic advisement (describe role in departmental and collegiate student advisement programs, including international student advising, and approximate number of advisees per year).”
 - “Curriculum development (list textbooks, anthologies or other edited collections, software programs to enhance learning, grant support for curriculum or course development, newly created courses and/or programs, major revisions of existing courses and/or programs, etc.). For textbooks, anthologies and software, indicate scope of dissemination, i.e., local, statewide, national or international.”
- Scholarship

- “Grants Received - International Studies and Programs Grants - Include sponsor, title of grant, period of the award, amount awarded, and role (principal investigator, co-principal investigator or other). If other than principal investigator, indicate percentage effort of the candidate and the identity of the principal investigator or co-principal investigator(s).”
- Service
 - “Contributions to society at large (list significant contributions to local, national, or international communities that have not been listed elsewhere).”

South Florida

- General guidelines for the entire University only specify teaching, scholarship/research, and service. Some departments apparently have published guidelines with more specific requirements. The general guidelines have the following for promotion to Professor:
 - “Unmistakable evidence of significant achievement among peers in one's discipline at the national or international level. True distinction is expected in at least one of the areas of teaching (or comparable activity appropriate to the unit); research/creative work; or service. Any recommendation for promotion to the rank of Professor (or University Librarian) must contain evidence that such distinction has been identified.”

UC – Berkeley

- The minimum time in rank is provided before promotion can be requested with the following caveat: “Advancement to an above-scale rank involves an overall career review and is reserved only for the most highly distinguished faculty (1) whose work of sustained and continuing excellence has attained national and international recognition and broad acclaim reflective of its significant impact; (2) whose University teaching performance is excellent; and (3) whose service is highly meritorious.”

Michigan

- No mention in published documents.

UT- Austin

- No mention in published documents.

Observations and Opinions

- The more highly regarded/ranked universities tend to explicitly mention specific activities the least *except* they require faculty to have an international reputation for promotion to full professor. One possible explanation is that this is purposefully omitted to preserve flexibility across the university so faculty member are free to achieve this reputation in different ways that are valued by their individual college and department.
- Even universities that didn't mention international activities at all like Michigan and UT-Austin had statements similar to Georgia Tech that required an international reputation for any candidate being hired at the level of full professor.

- These universities demand an *international reputation* for their senior faculty. Since a school's reputation is really the sum of the faculty's, a commutative argument is that these universities value an international reputation. This is certainly consistent with our intuition about these universities.
- Based on the small sample of TPR guidelines reviewed, only Rutgers attempts to enumerate international *activities*.
- Ferrell make a phone call to one colleague at Michigan, Berkeley, UT-Austin, and Georgia Tech and asked for off-the-record information on how this really works. Two of the four have served or are serving as department chairs. What I heard was a consistent answer. The departments across colleges, let alone the university, are so diverse that you can't prescribe activities. There are no universal examples of activities so you don't list any so you don't confuse folks. The nitty-gritty of TPR and faculty development is done in the department with the College providing overall, big-picture priorities.

4. Goals

The goal is for Clemson to have an excellent international reputation. This is achieved when faculty members have an excellent reputation among their colleagues around the world. Tenure, Promotion, and Reappointment guidelines should encourage faculty to develop an excellent international reputation while, simultaneously, respecting the diversity of activities required to achieve this across the different colleges and departments.

5. Recommendations

- The TPR guidelines in all colleges should reflect the requirement of an excellent international reputation for promotion to full professor. Each college and department must determine if this can be in teaching, scholarship, or service - or a combination of these.
- While the process required for a faculty member to develop an international reputation varies by discipline and individual, certain activities would seem to promote this outcome like making presentations at international conferences. To encourage individual faculty to participate in these types of activities, two recommendations are proffered:
 - Each department should identify the types of activities that increase the chances their faculty will develop an international reputation, add these to the department's goals, and measure them on an annual basis to evaluation progress. A simple example would be presentations at a conference held outside the United States and the measure might be that 80% of the faculty in the department will do this over a two-year period.
 - A fund should be established at the university level to support these activities. The details can be established at a later time but the committee is thinking about a one-to-one match up to a maximum dollar amount for each department or college. The colleges should be encouraged to set up a similar fund to extend the opportunities to more faculty colleagues. Streamlining the process for approval to travel internationally would also be a tremendous help.