



Guidelines for Tenure, Promotion and Reappointment

Article I: Criteria for Tenure, Promotion and Reappointment

The mission of Clemson University comprises three components: teaching, research, and public service. The primary role of the faculty of the University is to seek and communicate knowledge. Thus the work of each faculty member should be evaluated on the basis of his or her dedication to and effectiveness in scholarship, that is, the discovery, synthesis, dissemination and application of knowledge.

This article lists criteria that are used at the department level review for tenure, promotion, and reappointment (TPR) of Bioengineering faculty, and suggests types of evidence that may be used to support accomplishments under each criterion. The criteria are divided into three levels that indicate their relative importance in the review process.

Level I: Success in meeting both of the following criteria is necessary for promotion or tenure. Success in meeting only the Level I criteria may be sufficient in exceptional cases.

1. Effective teaching that demonstrates ability and commitment, as indicated by the following possible supporting evidence:
 - 1.1. Development: courses, curricula, pedagogical methods, materials.
 - 1.2. Evaluations: course evaluations, exit interviews, peer evaluations, classroom visits, alumni evaluations.
 - 1.3. Honors and awards based on teaching.
 - 1.4. Student mentoring.

2. Scholarship (refereed scholarly work is weighed much more heavily), as indicated by the following possible supporting evidence:
 - 2.1. Publications in journals.
 - 2.2. Publications in conference proceedings.
 - 2.3. Research monographs.
 - 2.4. Books and book chapters.
 - 2.5. Published curriculum materials.
 - 2.6. Patents awarded.
 - 2.7. Presentations at national and international conferences.

2.8. Honors and awards based on scholarly achievement.

2.9. Impact of scholarship (literature citations, keynote addresses, etc.)

Level II: Success in meeting several of the following criteria is normally necessary. Success in meeting all criteria or any subset of these criteria is not sufficient in the presence of Level I deficiencies.

1. Research funding.
 - 1.1. Funding from competitive federal, corporate, or state sources.
 - 1.2. Student support generated.
2. Research direction: Master's thesis, PhD dissertation, and postdoctoral (normally expected).
 - 2.1. PhD graduates, papers first authored by those students.
 - 2.2. Master's graduates, papers first authored by those students.
 - 2.3. Current thesis and dissertation research advisees, papers first authored by those students.
 - 2.4. Undergraduate research students advised.
 - 2.5. Postdoctoral research students and visiting scholars advised.
3. Interdisciplinary Collaboration
 - 3.1. Joint research contracts and grants
 - 3.2. Joint research and grant proposals
 - 3.3. Jointly taught courses
 - 3.4. Co-authored scientific and technical papers
4. Professional service activities and accomplishments (weighed more heavily after tenure has been awarded).
 - 4.1. Elected and appointed leadership positions (officer, committees, boards, etc.).
 - 4.2. Service as editor or on editorial boards of professional journals or monographs.
 - 4.3. Organization of meetings (sessions, programs, proceedings editor).
 - 4.4. Reviewer for funding agencies or for technical papers/manuscripts.
 - 4.5. Service to governmental agencies on policy issues, etc.
 - 4.6. Professional registration.
5. Service to the University and to the public and private sectors.
 - 5.1. Public and private consulting.
 - 5.2. Externally delivered courses and short courses.
 - 5.3. Technical reports and trade publications.
 - 5.4. University, College, and Departmental administration. (post-tenure evaluations only)
 - 5.5. University, College, and Departmental committee service. (post-tenure evaluations only)
 - 5.6. Advisor to student organizations. (post-tenure evaluations only)

6. Academic advising of undergraduate and graduate students

Level III: Success in meeting the following criteria may be considered but is less important than the criteria in Levels I and II.

1. State and regional recognition.
2. Other presentations.
3. Other funding.
 - 3.1. University support.
 - 3.2. Non-competitive gifts and donations.

Article II: Evaluation of Criteria

Reappointment to a tenure-track position will require demonstrable progress toward meeting the criteria of Levels I and II.

Promotion to Associate Professor and/or the award of tenure will require consistent and continuous success in meeting the criteria of Levels I and II, and a reputation outside the University for scholarship. Also required will be a high likelihood of continued success in meeting the criteria of Levels I and II and the expectation of attaining national recognition and prominence for scholarship.

Promotion to Professor will require consistent and continuous success in meeting the criteria of Levels I and II and the attainment of national prominence and recognition for scholarship.

Article III: Materials to be Submitted

As part of the tenure, promotion, and reappointment process, a TPR portfolio is to be compiled in an electronic notebook format submitted through Clemson's eTPR portal for review at the departmental, college, and Provost's level. The notebook is to be well indexed and tabbed with headings and subheadings as specified below, and arranged in the order given. Additional supporting evidence, not included in the portfolio notebook, may be provided by the candidate as separate supplements, which are kept on file at the department level for review, if needed. This supplementary notebook is not forwarded to the College for the dean's review.

In lieu of writing letters of reappointment for first year faculty, the TPR Peer Review Committee (short for TPR Committee hereafter), department chair, and dean complete a standard "*Review for Faculty in the First Year Form*".

1. Letter requesting tenure, promotion, and/or reappointment.
2. Request for Faculty Personnel Action Form, and, if appropriate, Granting of Tenure Form.

3. Letter of recommendation from the TPR Committee. The candidate must sign this letter acknowledging receipt and certifying that it has been discussed with him/her before the portfolio is transmitted to the dean. Copies of all prior year letters of recommendation from the TPR Committee should be inserted following the current year letter by the department chair
4. Letter of recommendation from the department chair, as appropriate. The candidate must sign this letter acknowledging receipt and certifying that it has been discussed with him/her before the portfolio is transmitted to the dean. Copies of all prior year letters of recommendation from the department chair should be inserted following the current year letter by the department chair.
5. Letter of recommendation from the dean. The candidate must sign this letter acknowledging receipt and certifying that it has been discussed with him/her before the portfolio is transmitted to the Provost. Copies of all prior year letters of recommendation from the dean should be inserted following the current year letter by the department chair.
6. Detailed resume in the standard College of Engineering & Science format.
7. Top achievements -- Personal summary of what the candidate considers the top achievements that are pertinent to the TPR decision (3 pages maximum).
8. Teaching.
 - 8.1. Candidate's statement on teaching including philosophy, methodology, materials developed, effectiveness, challenges, etc. (3 pages maximum).
 - 8.2. The original (photocopies are not suitable as they often are illegible) Student Feedback Form (teaching effectiveness evaluation form) submitted by all students for all courses taught during the preceding two regular semesters. Summary instructor statistics provided by the College for each course are to be included in addition to the average departmental and College statistics.
 - 8.3. Any other evidence of teaching effectiveness such as senior exit surveys, alumni surveys, in-class peer visitation reports, etc.
9. Research Activities (not addressed in the resume).
 - 9.1. Research proposal history (optional).
 - 9.2. Impact of research/scholarship including literature citations (excluding self-citations), patents, awards, etc.
10. Service Activity (not addressed in the resume; may be documented in letters of recommendation from TPR Committee, department chair, and dean).
11. Copies of Faculty Evaluation Form 3 for the last five years.
12. Statement of short (1 year) and long-term (5 years) goals.

13. Description of administrative duties, if appropriate.
14. 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 Committee. (Required for tenure and promotion actions only.)
 - 14.1. The candidate should compile and provide to the TPR Committee a list of at least five persons from outside the University as suggested external evaluators (close former associates such as dissertation advisors are not to be included). These external evaluators must be able to evaluate the quality of a faculty member's scholarship. For each suggested evaluator, give his or her name, title, address, phone number, e-mail address, brief justification on why that person should be considered an appropriate external evaluator of the faculty member's performance, and a description of the candidate's relationship to the suggested evaluator. The list must include at least three names with whom the candidate has not collaborated.
 - 14.2. The TPR Committee may solicit evaluations from any name on the list submitted by the candidate, and **must** independently solicit at least two additional external evaluations from persons not on the candidate's list. The review for tenure and/or promotion to Associate Professor must include at least **four** external peer evaluations with at least **two** chosen from the candidate's list. The review for promotion to Professor must include at least **six** external peer evaluations with at least **three** chosen from the candidate's list.
 - 14.3. In an attempt to ensure that external evaluations provide useful and consistent information, the letters (sample provided as Attachment D) from the TPR Committee to the external evaluators should address the three issues identified below. The tenure and/or promotion candidate should provide to the TPR Committee a sufficient number of reprints of at least three refereed journal articles (candidate's choice) for inclusion in the mailing to the external evaluators.
 - 14.3.1. External evaluators should comment first and foremost on the quality of the candidate's scholarship as evidenced by the quality and impact of their research and publications.
 - 14.3.2. External evaluators should comment on the national and international stature of the candidate within the profession.
 - 14.3.3. External evaluators may comment on the candidate's research and graduate advising productivity, and professional service activities, if deemed appropriate.
15. Any clarifying statements or additional information (supplementary to the standard resume) that a tenure, promotion, or reappointment candidate wishes to have included in the TPR portfolio (5 pages maximum). This is optional.

16. Spreadsheet of annual evaluation ratings for the past three years including an indication of how the candidate's evaluations compare with other faculty in that particular rank in his/her unit (completed by the department chair).
17. A copy of the original letter of offer of employment (inserted in the portfolio by the Dean's Office).
18. A copy of the signed Tenure Agreement Form (inserted in the portfolio by the Dean's Office).
19. A copy of all promotion letters, as applicable (inserted in the portfolio by the Dean's Office).
20. Copy of Department Guidelines for TPR (inserted in the portfolio by the department chair).

Article IV: Completion Dates

Dates for completing each level of review in the tenure, promotion and reappointment process are determined each year by the University, the College of Engineering & Science, and the Department of Bioengineering so that adequate time is provided at each level for a thorough and complete review.

Approved by the BIOE Faculty: September 25, 2015