



Department TPR and PTR Documents Routing Sheet
Requirements based on 2020-2021 Faculty Manual

In accordance with the Faculty Manual, each department's TPR document must be approved by the regular departmental faculty, department chair, college dean, and Provost (Chapter V,D1d).

This document is intended to support the documentation of the required approvals.

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

College: \_\_\_\_\_

Department Faculty Meeting at which the attached TPR documents were approved:

Empty checkbox

Faculty Manual Consultant

I have reviewed this document for conformance to the Clemson University Faculty Manual.
Comments are attached immediately following this cover sheet.

Department Chair

Approved Signature \_\_\_\_\_

Revision Required (see comments) Name \_\_\_\_\_ Date \_\_\_\_\_

Large empty rectangular box for Department Chair comments

Dean

Approved Signature \_\_\_\_\_

Revision Required (see comments) Name \_\_\_\_\_ Date \_\_\_\_\_

Large empty rectangular box for Dean comments

Provost

Approved Signature \_\_\_\_\_

Revision Required (see comments) Name \_\_\_\_\_ Date \_\_\_\_\_

Large empty rectangular box for Provost comments

**Requirements for DEPARTMENTAL TPR and PTR DOCUMENTS – 2020-2021 *Faculty Manual***

Department: **Sociology, Anthropology, and Criminal Justice**

Date

3/11/2021

*NOTE:* The TPR document must be approved by the regular departmental faculty, department chair, college dean, and Provost (Chapter V, D1d).

This list may be useful to ensure departmental TPR and PTR documents conform with the *Faculty Manual*. Updated 8/12/2019.

Compliance

NOTE: Principal lecturers must be incorporated into department TPR documents by August 1, 2021

	Requirement	Reference	Yes	No	N/A
0	Consistent otherwise with the <i>Faculty Manual</i> and internally and with departmental bylaws	Ch III, A1c	X		
1	The TPR document is distinct from departmental bylaws	Ch V, D1c	X		
2	Criteria for tenure	Ch V, D1b	X		
3	Process for tenure	Ch V, D1b	X		
4	Consistent with the requirement that tenure applications, once submitted, cannot be withdrawn (New in 2018-2019 <i>Faculty Manual</i> )	Ch V, C3	X		
5	Qualifications (criteria) for reappointment	Ch V, D1c			
5a	* assistant and untenured associate professor	Ch V, D1b	X		
5b	* research faculty	Ch IV, B2e & B2b, i(3)	X		
5c	* extension faculty	Ch IV, B2e & B2b, ii(4)	X		
5d	* clinical faculty	Ch IV, B2e	X		
5e	* lecturer	Ch IV, B2e; Ch V, C2b, i	X		
5f	* senior lecturer	Ch IV, B2e; Ch V, C2c	X		
5g	* principal lecturer (Can delay until Aug 1, 2021)	Ch IV, B2e; Ch V, C2d	X		
5h	* Professor of Practice	Ch IV, B2e	X		
6	Processes for reappointment (annual except as noted below)	Ch V, D1c			
6a	* assistant and untenured associate professor	Ch V, D1b	X		
6b	* research faculty	Ch IV, B2e	X		
6c	* extension faculty	Ch IV, B2e	X		
6d	* clinical faculty	Ch IV, B2e	X		
6e	* lecturer	Ch IV, B2e; Ch V, C2b, i	X		
6e, i	* including feedback from senior and principal lecturers	Ch V, D1g	X		
6f	* senior lecturer	Ch IV, B2e; Ch V, C2c	X		
6f, i	* including feedback from senior and principal lecturers	Ch V, D1g	X		
6f, ii	* at least every three years and in penultimate year	Ch V, C2c, i	X		
6g	* principal lecturer (Can delay until Aug 1, 2021)	Ch IV, B2e; Ch V, C2d	X		
6g, i	* including feedback from principal lecturers	Ch V, D1g	X		
6g, ii	* at least every five years and in penultimate year	Ch V, C2d, i	X		
6h	* Professor of Practice	Ch IV, B2e	X		
7	Qualifications (criteria) for promotion	Ch V, C4a, i			
7a	* to associate professor	Ch IV, B1f, iii	X		
7b	* to full professor	Ch IV, B1f, iv	X		
7c	* research faculty ranks	Ch IV, B1e	X		
7d	* extension faculty ranks	Ch IV, B1e	X		
7e	* clinical faculty ranks	Ch IV, B1e	X		
7f	* to senior lecturer	Ch IV, B1e & B2i, iv(3),(b)	X		
7g	* to principal lecturer (Can delay until Aug 1, 2021)	Ch IV, B1e & B2i, iv(4),(b)	X		
8	Processes for promotion	Ch V, D1c			
8a	* to associate professor	Ch V, D1c	X		
8b	* to full professor	Ch V, D1c	X		
8c	* research faculty ranks	Ch V, D1c	X		
8d	* extension faculty ranks	Ch V, D1c	X		
8e	* clinical faculty ranks	Ch V, D1c	X		
8f	* to senior lecturer	Ch IV, B2i, iv(3),(b)	X		
8f, i	* including feedback from senior and principal lecturers	Ch V, D1g	X		
8g	* to principal lecturer (Can delay until Aug 1, 2021)	Ch IV, B2i, iv(4),(b)	X		
8g, i	* including feedback from principal lecturers	Ch V, D1g	X		

Procedures and committee structure of departmental TPR committees, adhering to *Faculty Manual* requirements to include at least the following:

9	• Procedures the TPR Committee must follow	Ch V, D1c	X		
---	--	-----------	---	--	--

10	• The composition of the TPR committee shall be defined in the TPR document (change from 2018-2019; this committee need not be elected)	Ch V, D1e, i	X		
11	• The TPR committee's members shall not be appointed by the department chair (new in 2019-2020)	Ch V, D1e, i	X		
12	• Voting rights on a committee making tenure recommendations are limited to tenured regular faculty	Ch V, D1e, ii	X		
13	• The Committee shall be composed of full-time regular faculty members excluding individuals who as administrators, have input into personnel decisions such as appointment, tenure and promotion	Ch V, D1e, ii	X		
14	• Voting rights on a committee making a recommendation concerning promotion to rank or appointment at a rank are limited to regular faculty with equivalent rank or higher	Ch V, D1e, iii	X		
15	• The Committee must have a minimum of three departmental members, and a mechanism to elect additional members from outside the unit if not possible that is consistent with Ch V, D2a, ii	Ch V, D1e, iv	X		
16	• Departmental procedures for peer evaluation shall be in writing in the TPR document and shall be available to the faculty, the chair, the dean, and the Provost	Ch V, D1f, i	X		
Guidelines providing details of the PTR process adhering to <i>Faculty Manual</i> requirements to include at least the following:					
17	Post tenure review criteria and processes are documented in the TPR document	Ch V, G3a	X		
18	• Specific guidelines	Ch V, G3a	X		
19	• Specification of ONE option for external representation	Ch V, G6a	X		
19a	• Process for <i>selecting</i> an external PTR member if this is part of the Post-tenure review process	Ch V, G6a, ii			X
19b	• If external letters are required for post-tenure review, there must be at least four letters, two from list of six submitted by faculty member	Ch V, G6e	X		
19c	• Allow each faculty member under review the option of either having external letters solicited or incorporating the external committee member in the review process	Ch V, G6a, iii			X
20	• Procedures for creating the Post-Tenure Review Committee (need not be separate from the TPR Committee; need not be elected)	Ch V, G4a	X		
21	• Only tenured faculty may serve on the PTR Committee	Ch V, G4b	X		
22	• The PTR Committee shall have a minimum of three members	Ch V, G4c	X		
23	• Faculty members in Part II of PTR are not eligible to serve on the PTR committee	Ch V, G4d	X		
24	• The PTR Committee shall elect its own chair	Ch V, G4e	X		

**GUIDELINES FOR FACULTY DEVELOPMENT AND PERFORMANCE**

DEPARTMENT OF SOCIOLOGY, ANTHROPOLOGY AND CRIMINAL JUSTICE

CLEMSON UNIVERSITY

Approved by the Faculty: April 25, 1997

Revised October 1998, January 22, 1999,

February 13, 2009, February 26, 2021

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

\_\_\_\_\_  
Date

\_\_\_\_\_  
Dean

\_\_\_\_\_  
Date

\_\_\_\_\_  
Provost

\_\_\_\_\_  
Date

## FOREWORD

These general guidelines for faculty development and performance have been established jointly by the personnel committee and the chair of the Department of Sociology, Anthropology and Criminal Justice, and have been approved by the Dean and the Provost. The Guidelines present the criteria that are used in annual performance evaluations, and in reappointment, promotion, and tenure decisions. Two major areas are covered: (1) tenure, promotion, reappointment, and post-tenure review; and (2) performance criteria and standards. A major objective of the Guidelines is to clarify and supplement the general policies set forth in the Clemson University *Faculty Manual*.

This document, *Guidelines for Faculty Development and Performance*, provides department faculty at Clemson with specific performance expectations in the areas of teaching, research, and service, consistent with the department vision and mission. This document explains how expectations are applied to the reappointment, tenure, and promotion process for faculty within the department and how faculty might articulate their achievements as aligned with each expectation. Clemson University's Department of Sociology, Anthropology and Criminal Justice adheres to the Clemson University *Faculty Manual* in all matters related to reappointment, tenure, and promotion. If for any reason this document is not in adherence with the Clemson University *Faculty Manual*, the guidance of the *Faculty Manual* will take precedence.

## BASIC PRINCIPLES

The following principles undergird the development of these Guidelines:

- 1) Scholarship is defined broadly. It includes activities that support the instructional and applied missions of the department, as well as the publication of basic and applied research within the discipline. Scholarship may also include the development of theory and the synthesis of existing knowledge to form new perspectives, regardless of discipline.
- 2) Research is broadly defined in the context of a multidisciplinary department, including but not limited to, the systematic gathering or use of data, the analysis and interpretation of evidence, and the peer-reviewed publication or presentation of findings. The department understands that variation exists in research patterns and the time that the complete process of research entails.
- 3) Faculty members have different interests and strengths, and there is no single model of excellence for teaching, scholarship, and service accomplishments.
- 4) Faculty activities are diverse, and any system based on a listing of performance indicators will be incomplete. Consequently, individual faculty may include for consideration any accomplishment or set of accomplishments outside of those listed in the guidelines. Faculty members may also provide evidence that unique circumstances exist for a particular accomplishment or set of accomplishments to be categorized differently or at a higher level than listed. Final determination, however, lies with the department chair and the personnel committee.

5) Conversely, the department chair and/or personnel committee may believe that a particular accomplishment or set of accomplishments ought to be categorized differently or at a lower level than listed. In such cases it is incumbent on the chair and/or personnel committee to provide a written rationale for this different categorization.

6) Extraordinary circumstances such as disciplinary actions, leaves of absence, or personal or family crises that significantly affect teaching, service and/or research trajectories will be incorporated into the performance evaluation system on a case-by-case basis at the discretion of the department chair. The department chair must consult with the personnel committee when extraordinary circumstances affect reappointment, promotion, or tenure decisions.

7) Performance standards for annual evaluations, reappointment, promotion, and tenure may increase or otherwise change in accordance with the university and college missions. Personnel decisions made in a given year with reference to a given candidate are not necessarily precedents for decisions made in subsequent years for that candidate or any other candidate.

## **TABLE OF CONTENTS**

- I.** Performance Criteria and Standards
- II.** Annual Review Ratings
- III.** Levels of Performance
- IV.** Expectations for Performance in Research
  - a.** Dimensions of Research Performance
  - b.** Criteria for Research Performance
- V.** Expectations for Performance in Teaching and Mentoring
  - a.** Dimensions of Teaching and Mentoring Performance
  - b.** Criteria for Teaching and Mentoring Performance
- VI.** Expectations for Performance in Service
  - a.** Dimensions of Service Performance
  - b.** Criteria for Service Performance
- VII.** Process for Reappointment
- VIII.** Criteria for Reappointment as Lecturer
- IX.** Criteria for Promotion to Senior Lecturer
  - a.** Years of service
  - b.** Excellent teaching
  - c.** Significant additional contribution
  - d.** Consistent positive annual reviews
- X.** Criteria for Reappointment as Senior Lecturer
- XI.** Criteria for Promotion to Principal Lecturer
  - a.** Years of service
  - b.** Excellent teaching

- c. Significant additional contribution
- d. Consistent positive annual reviews

**XII.** Criteria for Reappointment as Principal Lecturer

**XIII.** Criteria for Reappointment as Assistant Professor

**XIV.** Criteria for Promotion to Associate Professor with Tenure

- a. Years of service
- b. Contributions for promotion to associate professor
- c. Contributions for tenure
- d. Review process

**XV.** Criteria for Promotion to Full Professor

- a. Years of service
- b. Contributions for promotion to full professor
- c. Review process

**XVI.** Criteria for Reappointment of Other Special Faculty (Research, Extension, Clinical Faculty, Professor of Practice)

**XVII.** Criteria for Promotion of Other Special Faculty (Research, Extension, Clinical Faculty)

**XVIII.** Post-Tenure Review

- a. Procedures
- b. Procedures for Part II of post-tenure review
- c. Post-tenure review committee

**XIX.** Department of Sociology, Anthropology and Criminal Justice Personnel Committee



## **I. Performance criteria and standards**

The performance criteria and standards set forth in these guidelines are intended to outline departmental policy with respect to tenure, promotion, and reappointment decisions. In addition, the guidelines provide information that will be useful for faculty career planning and development. The primary goal of these guidelines is to establish a general set of standards that will consistently promote faculty performance and development, and that will enable the department to achieve regional, national, and international prominence.

Although the department chair and the personnel committee make tenure, promotion, and reappointment recommendations primarily using the listed criteria, a certain element of professional judgment is involved. Assessments of the subjective aspects of a faculty member's performance are based on the professional judgments of the department chair and the personnel committee.

When assembling reappointment materials, faculty members should make certain all information is accurate. In all cases, it is the responsibility of a faculty member to make their best case for reappointment, tenure, and/or promotion.

## **II. Reappointment Reviews**

In all reviews by the personnel committee, the post-tenure review committee, and the department chair, faculty members will be assigned one of 5 ratings (Excellent, Very Good, Good, Fair, or Unsatisfactory) in their various areas of effort (research, teaching, service), based on evidence the faculty members provide of their performance for the period under review.

A given rating derives from the combination of accomplishments of various defined levels presented by the faculty member, as described below:

### ***Excellent:***

- Strong evidence of Level 1 accomplishments                   AND
- Evidence of Level 2 and/or Level 3 accomplishments

### ***Very Good:***

- Evidence of Level 1 accomplishments OR
- Strong Evidence of Level 2 accomplishments

### ***Good:***

- Evidence of Level 2 accomplishments                   AND  
Evidence of Level 3 accomplishments

### ***Fair:***

- Evidence of Level 3 accomplishments

***Unsatisfactory:***

- No evidence of professional accomplishments

What materials qualify as “evidence” or as “strong evidence” depends upon the current standards of the department and the current standards in the faculty member’s discipline and subdiscipline.

Faculty members are welcome to supply additional reasoning that any accomplishment be appropriately categorized as Level 1, 2, or 3, and/or that it represents “evidence” or “strong evidence” of a given level of accomplishment, based on either the quality and/or quantity of the work.

### **III. Levels of Performance**

- Level 1: Accomplishments at this level are of the highest priority and greatest importance. They provide the primary evidence of a commitment to professional success by the faculty member.
- Level 2: Accomplishments at this level are considered important to help demonstrate professional competence.
- Level 3: Accomplishments at this level are valuable and are considered as indicators of professional activity.

Indicators of accomplishments listed throughout the guidelines are illustrative and not exhaustive. Additional indicators may be added to the guidelines at the request of a faculty member with the agreement of the department chair and the personnel committee. The faculty member also may provide evidence that unique circumstances exist for a particular accomplishment or set of accomplishments, which would allow it to be categorized differently than listed in this document. Faculty members may submit a written inquiry in which they describe a proposed or completed accomplishment and request that the personnel committee and chair provide a written opinion as to the expected classification of the specific accomplishment (Level 1, 2, or 3).

### **IV. Expectations for Performance in Research**

Research activities are an integral part of a faculty member's job. These activities advance our basic and applied knowledge in the social sciences and keep the content of education current, pertinent, and challenging to students. Consequently, an important requirement for reappointment, promotion, and tenure is a serious and continuous commitment to the pursuit and application of knowledge and the demonstrated ability to successfully share that knowledge with a broader community.

**a. Dimensions of Research Performance.** The professional reputation of the department is enhanced primarily through its basic and applied research productivity. Research achievement

is imperative. Research achievement may be demonstrated by research that applies scholarly knowledge toward the solution of non-academic problems.

Both the quality and quantity of research funding and publications are important. However, quality of contribution to the body of knowledge in a faculty member's area of interest is the major criterion. Faculty members should develop independent scholarship. Collaboration in research and publications is desirable, but faculty members should develop a balanced publication and funding record that also includes single- and/or lead-authored works.

**Scholarly Activities in Applied Fields.** As a further aid in assessing applied work, the faculty member should document applied work on one or more of the following dimensions: (a) scope - breadth or sweep of the project, sometimes indicated by an applicable constituency, ranging from local to international; (b) duration - the amount of time that the project continues or lasts, ranging from a few weeks to years; (c) reputational enhancements - the degree to which the project is commonly held to be positive from the view of the public or the community of constituents; (d) complexity - the extent to which the project demands an elaborate interweaving of parts (e.g., difficult or intricate sampling, methodological and/or analogous challenges); (e) time requirements - the proportion of demands on the practitioner's time and energy relative to those demands that might be expected normally; (f) benefits to the department - the scale of tangible improvements or advantages directly gained through the project activity; (g) potential for extension - the reasonable frontiers of the project with respect to analogous applications, as well as the use of similar strategies and tactics in the future; and (h) instructional benefits - usefulness of the project in the training of students.

## **b. Criteria for Research Performance**

### **Level 1:**

- Publication of refereed article in first-tier journal as defined by:
  - impact factor; acceptance rate; sponsoring organization or press publishing the work; citation information; distribution information; description of individual contribution to co-authored work
- First-tier, discipline-specific general or review journal
  - First-tier journal within a specific sub-discipline
  - First-tier journal in another field, provided that the publication reflects a contribution consistent with the academic mission of the department
- Competitive and/or peer-reviewed external research funding award
- Receipt of professional or university awards, prizes, or fellowships for scholarship activities
- Scholarly book or monograph that is evaluated as a Level 1 accomplishment according to criteria such as:
  - Reputation of publisher
  - Rigor of professional review undergone
  - Inclusion of original research or a significant theoretical contribution to the field
  - Impact on the field of practitioners or academics

- Book chapter that is evaluated as a Level 1 accomplishment according to criteria such as:
  - Reputation of publisher
  - Rigor of professional review undergone
  - Inclusion of original research or a significant theoretical contribution to the field
  - Impact on the field of practitioners or academics
  - The academic reputation of the editor and other authors in the volume

**Level 2:**

- Publication of refereed articles in second-tier journals
- Book, monograph, or book chapter that does not meet the criteria for a Level 1 accomplishment (and that is not self-published)
- Internal and/or non-competitive research funding award
- Successful submission of competitive and/or peer-reviewed external grant proposal (either unfunded or funding-status pending)
- Scholarly presentations at professional conferences, seminars, workshops, institutes, or special programs
- Receipt of departmental or college awards, prizes, or fellowships for scholarship activities
- Research resulting in a product or outcome such as a technical report, training materials, data set, instructional videos, etc.
- Reports to task forces, policy groups, and other stakeholder groups
- Successful management of awarded grants with large and/or complex grant activities
- Editing of an anthology or other scholarly work published by a commercial or university press

**Level 3:**

- Successful submission of internal and/or non-competitive grant proposal (either unfunded or funding-status pending)
- Submission of a journal article (with the status of rejected, revise and resubmit, or under review)
- Book manuscript or book chapter under review
- Session/paper discussant at professional conference
- Published, scholarly invited book reviews and encyclopedia entries
- Nomination for awards or fellowships for scholarship activities
- Competent management of grant activities for awarded grants

**V. Expectations for Performance in Teaching and Mentoring**

Teaching is a fundamental responsibility of the faculty. Faculty must be evaluated based on the effectiveness of their contributions to student learning both inside and outside of the classroom and their guidance of graduate and undergraduate research.

**a. Dimensions of Teaching and Mentoring Performance.** Department faculty are expected to demonstrate effective (1) instructional design, (2) classroom management, (3) course management, (4) counsel to students outside the classroom, (5) creation and maintenance of classroom cultures of collaborative, collegial learning, and (6) participation in graduate education (where and when appropriate).

**b. Criteria for Teaching Performance and Mentoring**

**Level 1:**

- Excellent overall quality and academic rigor of any teaching activity [Such activities may include classroom teaching, creative inquiry courses, honors contract courses, independent study courses, service-learning courses, or study abroad courses.]
  - Indicators that may be used to demonstrate / document excellence in an activity include, but are not limited to, the following:
    - Teaching portfolio (including syllabi, reading lists, materials, etc.)
    - Student evaluations
    - Active student engagement
    - Peer evaluations
    - External evaluations
    - Student outcomes
    - Student products
    - Feedback from students, peers, and others
- Excellent overall advising and mentoring of students
- Successful chairing of a dissertation or thesis committee, including those in departments other than Sociology, Anthropology and Criminal Justice
- Receipt of professional or university teaching awards
- Textbook that is evaluated as a Level 1 accomplishment according to criteria such as:
  - Reputation of publisher
  - Rigor of professional review
  - Impact on the field of practitioners or academics
- Peer-reviewed, teaching-related publications including articles, chapters, and textbooks (If publication involves research, the faculty member can make a request for consideration as a scholarship indicator.)
- Successful chairing of an honors thesis committee
- Publishing peer-reviewed publications that are co-authored with students

**Level 2:**

- Satisfactory overall quality and academic rigor of any teaching activity [Such activities may include classroom teaching, creative inquiry courses, honors contract courses, independent study courses, service-learning courses, or study abroad courses.]
  - Indicators that may be used to demonstrate / document performance in an activity include, but are not limited to, the following:
    - Teaching portfolio (including syllabi, reading lists, materials, etc.)

- Student evaluations
- Active student engagement
- Peer evaluations
- External evaluations
- Student outcomes
- Student products
- Feedback from students, peers, and others
- Satisfactory overall advising and mentoring of students
- Active service on a master's thesis or dissertation committee, including those in departments other than Sociology, Anthropology and Criminal Justice
- Serving on a comprehensive exam committee for a graduate student
- Teaching publications without peer review, including articles, chapters, textbooks, and instructors' manuals
- Receipt of departmental or college teaching award
- Nomination for professional or university teaching award
- Discipline-related mentoring of individual student or group work on publications, research presentations, or other projects / competitions. (This refers to mentoring that is not related to a specific course.)
- Generating grants or donations of materials or equipment that support the instructional goals of the department
- Expansion of teaching competencies through activities such as teaching, developing, or implementing a new course
- Participation in an international faculty exchange program

### **Level 3:**

- Self-published texts or other curriculum to be used in the classroom
- Member of honors thesis committee
- Collaborative teaching
- Attending teaching-related training courses
- Nomination for department or college teaching award

**VI. Expectations for Performance in Service.** The department serves several constituencies, including its students, the institution, academic disciplines, and the private and public sectors. As part of their scholarly activities, faculty members are expected to contribute in the service area(s) consistent with their type and level of appointment and the mission of the department and the college. Therefore, service activities are to be encouraged and should be important in reappointment, promotion, and tenure decisions. Moreover, service activities should take on more significance through one's academic career.

**a. Dimensions of Service Performance.** Faculty are expected to fulfill service expectations and requirements competently through participation in committee meetings and completion of necessary service tasks. The self-governance model of the university requires the active participation of all members for the unit to function. Faculty should also provide service to their

academic disciplines to advance the field. As a land-grant institution, faculty also have a duty to serve our community and state when possible and appropriate. The level of service performance is based on the impact, scope, and time commitment of the activity.

**b. Criteria for Service Performance**

**Level 1:**

- Superior service to the department, college, or university
- Superior service to our students
- Receipt of significant professional or university service awards
- Serving as a reviewer for an unpublished scholarly book manuscript
- Active participation in significant committee service at the college or university level
- Grant proposal reviewer: panel member for federal, national, or international agency or foundation
- Service and/or leadership position in university faculty governance
- University administrative assignments
- Providing training and policy implementation for practitioners or government agencies that directly utilizes the professional expertise of the faculty member and represents a significant contribution of time and effort

**Level 2:**

- Serving as a reviewer for journal articles
- Grant proposal reviewer: single review or panel member for a state or local agency or foundation
- Organizational contributions at professional conferences, seminars, institutes, or special programs
- Consultant to a public, private, or non-profit endeavor in service to the mission of the university
- Active participation in significant departmental committee service
- Receipt of department or college service award or other professional or university service award
- Nomination for significant professional or university service award
- Acting for the purpose of enhancing the image of the department or assessing the marketability of the discipline
- Assistance and/or responsibility in the governance and continuation of student activities, including honorary societies and service or disciplinary interest clubs
- Coordinating or providing significant service to a faculty development program
- Providing contacts, liaison, or consulting that leads to internships, research opportunities, or placements for Sociology, Anthropology and Criminal Justice students
- Reviews, evaluations, or critiques written with respect to the professional works of others

- Textbook review for a publishing company that entails consultation prior to final publication: consultant for entire book, panel member, or developmental review
- Providing training and policy implementation for practitioners or government agencies that utilizes general knowledge and represents a relatively limited and brief encounter
- Service on committees or boards of professional societies and organizations
- Service on the editorial board of a professional journal or newsletter
- Expert witness in a judicial or regulatory dispute
- Significant or national media representation based on expertise
- Development of media platform/broadcast

### **Level 3:**

- Textbook review for a publishing company that is an end review or review of select chapters
- Acting as resource person for media contacts or external agencies and visits to schools for student recruitment
- Organizing events for students, alumni, or others
- Speaking as a guest or conducting meetings for the general public
- Teaching an extension-like short course or conducting a workshop for which no credit is awarded
- Awards or commendations for service and awards garnered by students or student organizations whose service activities are a result of faculty guidance
- Letters of recommendation written for students
- Nomination for department or college service award

## **VII. Process for Reappointment**

It is the responsibility of each faculty member to make his or her best case for continued reappointment and promotion. The effectiveness of an individual's work and the quality of performance of assigned duties in teaching, research, public service, and/or administration shall be considered, along with knowledge of subject matter, professional stature, contributions to professional societies, and contributions to the university through student counseling, committee work, assigned administrative duties, and public service activities.

- Lecturers will be reviewed for reappointment annually and when seeking promotion to senior lecturer and principal lecturer.
- Probationary, tenure-track faculty will be reviewed for reappointment annually.
- Senior lecturers will be reviewed for reappointment in the penultimate year of their appointment as described in the *Faculty Manual*.
- Principal lecturers will be reviewed for reappointment in the penultimate year of their appointment as described in the *Faculty Manual*.



The university shares with faculty a system for organizing reappointment materials, such as CVs, teaching evaluations, copies of research articles, and so forth. It is important that all required materials are submitted for reappointment by required dates. These materials include items such as previous reappointment letters, copies of evaluations, letters verifying special recognitions, and other materials. It is also vital that all scholarly pursuits (e.g., publications, articles in press, conference papers, and grants) be represented in an accurate manner.

When assembling reappointment materials, faculty members should make certain all information is complete, accurate, and current, including uploading formal course evaluations (rather than summaries), published works, etc. The task is to make a cogent argument for continued reappointment, which is best constructed with a parsimonious letter and a CV indicating accomplishments and pursuits continued from the previous year, as well as inclusion of all required forms and existing letters.

The first-year reappointment process occurs during the first semester of appointment. The goal of the first-year reappointment process is to provide new faculty members with an explanation of the process and requirements for reappointment and tenure in the department. With this goal in mind, faculty members are asked to provide research, teaching, and service goals so that they can receive formative feedback from the committee to guide their activities in the first year of their appointment.

**VIII. Criteria for Reappointment as Lecturer.** To maintain their status as a lecturer in the Department of Sociology, Anthropology and Criminal Justice, lecturers must maintain satisfactory performance in teaching and make contributions in an additional area of research and/or service that contributes to the mission of the department and university.

**IX. Criteria for Promotion to Senior Lecturer.** Promotion to senior lecturer will follow all guidelines and procedures outlined in the Clemson University *Faculty Manual*. To be promoted to senior lecturer status in the Department of Sociology, Anthropology and Criminal Justice, lecturers must meet all the following criteria:

**a. Years of service.** At least four full academic years of employment (regular nine-month annual appointment) as a full-time lecturer in the department (lecturers may apply for senior lecturer status during their fifth year).

**b. Teaching.** Applicants should have strong evidence of Level 1 accomplishments or a combination of evidence of Level 1 accomplishments and strong evidence of Level 2 accomplishments as defined in the Criteria for Teaching Performance.

**c. Contributions in an additional area(s).** Applicants should provide evidence of Level 2 accomplishments as defined in the Criteria for Research and/or Service Performance as evidence of contributions to the mission of the department, college, and university.

**d. Consistently positive annual reviews.** Annual reviews should be positive (i.e., Form 3 evaluations of Very Good or Excellent) for three years prior to the application for promotion to senior lecturer.

**X. Criteria for Reappointment as Senior Lecturer.** To maintain their status as a senior

lecturer in the Department of Sociology, Anthropology and Criminal Justice, senior lecturers must maintain satisfactory performance in the areas of teaching and in an additional area of research and/or service that contributes to the mission of the department and university, consistent with that which led to their promotion to senior lecturer.

**XI. Criteria for Promotion to Principal Lecturer**

**a. Years of service.** At least four full consecutive academic years of employment (regular nine-month annual appointment) as a full-time senior lecturer in the department.

**b. Teaching.** Applicants should have strong evidence of Level 1 accomplishments or a combination of evidence of Level 1 accomplishments and strong evidence of Level 2 accomplishments as defined in the Criteria for Teaching Performance.

**c. Significant additional contribution.** When compared to expectations for promotion to senior lecturer, the additional contributions expectations for promotion to principal lecturer are primarily changed in terms of quality, not necessarily quantity. Applicants should demonstrate significant and consistent contributions that align with the mission of the department, college, and university. Strong candidates for promotion to principal lecturer will demonstrate significant engagement across various levels of the institution (i.e., department, college, and university).

**d. Consistently positive annual reviews.** Annual reviews should be positive (i.e., Form 3 evaluations of Very Good or Excellent) for three years prior to the application for promotion to principal lecturer.

**XII. Criteria for Reappointment as Principal Lecturer**

To maintain their status as a principal lecturer in the Department of Sociology, Anthropology and Criminal Justice, principal lecturers must maintain satisfactory performance in the areas of teaching and in an additional area of research or service that contributes to the mission of the department, college and university, consistent with that which led to their promotion to principal lecturer.

**XIII. Criteria for Reappointment as Assistant Professor**

For tenure-track faculty, reappointment recommendations will be based on the relationship between a faculty member's cumulative performance and the current standards for promotion and tenure. If the criteria change after the third-year reappointment, the faculty member may opt to use the old standards or new standards. A formal reappointment recommendation will be provided by the department chair and personnel committee to the candidate, along with an assessment of overall performance, scholarship, teaching, and service performance, and progress toward promotion and tenure. Positive recommendations for reappointment will be made if the department chair and/or the personnel committee believe that the faculty member has the potential to earn promotion and/or tenure. However, in the case of untenured, tenure-track faculty, *continued reappointment should not be construed to mean that tenure will necessarily be granted*. The tenure decision takes place in the candidate's penultimate year and, although based partly on annual reappointment recommendations, is a separate

decision. This is an unavoidable consequence of the unusually extensive and long-range evaluation that is an integral part of the tenure review.

#### **XIV. Criteria for Promotion to Associate Professor with Tenure**

Promotion to associate professor with tenure will follow all the guidelines and procedures outlined in the Clemson University *Faculty Manual*. To be promoted to the rank of associate professor with tenure, probationary faculty will adhere to department criteria regarding performance in teaching, research, and service. Tenure applications, once submitted, cannot be withdrawn. In the rare instance when a faculty member is hired at the associate professor level without tenure, the length of the probationary period and expectations for tenure will be made clear to the faculty member at the time of hire.

**a. Years of service.** Faculty seeking promotion to associate professor with tenure typically apply for promotion at the beginning of their sixth full year of service. See the Clemson University *Faculty Manual* for information regarding requesting extensions to the probationary period.

**b. Contributions for Promotion to Associate Professor.** Candidates for promotion to associate professor are expected to demonstrate that their work has relevance for other scholars working in their discipline, practitioners, and others in their wider professional communities. The specific materials used to prove evidence of this impact will vary based on the candidate's academic area, methodological approach, and research foci. A record of peer-reviewed scholarship, research impacts, and external review letters are typically considered the "gold standard" for documenting evidence that one's work is used by practitioners working in the candidate's area of expertise.

**c. Contributions for Tenure.** Tenure signifies the continuation of a productive career that brings further promotions and rewards. It is granted for exemplary research, teaching, and service over the period of review, during which significant future potential for growth and advancement is demonstrated. Tenure decisions are separate from reappointment and promotion determinations. When considering a candidate for tenure, the personnel committee examines the record of said candidate for the promise of continued contributions to the department, college, university and discipline. The committee makes its decision in terms of broad and specific scholarly, pedagogical, and service activities.

However, independent of the level of cumulative performance, a faculty member must provide convincing evidence that he or she will continue to engage in quality scholarly activities and grow professionally after tenure has been granted. To some extent, this evaluation must be based on the professional judgment of those making the recommendation. Indicators of future professional growth and scholarship include: 1) a consistent pace of research activities that indicates an increasing quality of scholarship, 2) the development of a research program or agenda that will enable the faculty member to develop a national or international reputation as an expert in an academic specialty area, 3) a demonstrated independence of scholarship; that is, tenured faculty should be

scholarly leaders as well as strong research colleagues, 4) a progressive improvement in teaching endeavors and the use of pedagogical innovations, and 5) the establishment of long-term commitments to one's academic and professional groups and peers.

The principal source for the personnel committee's decision regarding tenure is the candidate's full record of activities as can be known through the official dossier composed by the candidate. This record is examined for the constancy and quality of previous contributions. The dossier is further examined for the trajectory of the candidate's works. Here, "trajectory" refers to any indications of professional growth and maturation in the quality, quantity, or both quality and quantity, of the contributions made thus far. Such a trajectory will be taken as a sign of potential for the future. The committee will also attempt to understand in good faith any slumps or lacunae in the candidate's record and trajectory of contributions. The committee will attempt to take any mitigating circumstances into full consideration when arriving at its tenure decision. There will remain, apart from the objective record in the dossier, a measure of subjective influence in determining a candidate's suitability for tenure.

**d. Review Process.** The department's personnel committee and department chair will conduct separate and independent evaluations of probationary faculty research performance each year, offering feedback to each faculty member regarding his or her progress toward meeting expectations for producing quality research, teaching, and service. It is a faculty member's responsibility to keep the committee and department chair informed of their progress during their probationary period and to meaningfully respond to feedback.

Faculty who are considered as making progress toward tenure will typically achieve a summary rating of Very Good or Excellent for the previous relevant review period for tenure or promotion. The candidate who has not achieved a minimum of a Very Good summary rating by the personnel committee in the year prior to the decision will be unlikely to be competitive for promotion.

External evaluators will evaluate the research portfolio at the close of each faculty member's probationary period (i.e., for tenure and promotion review). The external evaluator is someone knowledgeable of the candidate's field and who has the necessary and relevant experience to evaluate the research quality of the candidate. In the spring semester before their penultimate year, the candidate will provide to the personnel committee chair the names of 6-8 potential referees outside the university who can assess the quality and impact of their research. Ideally, these reviewers should be from R1 or research-intensive units, but other referees can be included with appropriate justification. These referees may not include colleagues with whom the faculty member has a conflict of interest: relatives, former graduate and post-doctoral advisors, co-authors and co-PIs, and former students or post-docs. The faculty member may also choose to provide names of up to three individuals from whom references should not be solicited. The personnel committee members also develop a list of 6-8 potential referees and solicit references from 6-8 external referees. At least four letters are needed in total,

two of which are selected from the candidate's list and two from the committee's list. Each referee receives the candidate's CV, Research/Scholarship Activities statement, publications, and a copy of the departmental Tenure and Promotion Guidelines.

**XV. Criteria for Promotion to Full Professor**

Promotion to professor will follow all the guidelines and procedures outlined in the Clemson University *Faculty Manual*. To be appointed to the rank of professor, faculty will continue to adhere to department expectations regarding performance in teaching, research, and service.

**a. Years of service.** Faculty seeking promotion to professor may typically apply for promotion no earlier than after five years of service as an associate professor.

**b. Contributions for Promotion to Full Professor.** Associate professors preparing for promotion should continue to emphasize excellence in teaching and scholarship, especially research and publications. Effectiveness in service is also expected. A necessary but not sufficient condition for promotion to full professor is evidence of substantive scholarly contributions to one's discipline. Prior to promotion to full professor, a faculty member is expected to have established a national and/or international reputation for their research and professional expertise and to serve as a role model for junior faculty.

**c. Review Process.** The department's personnel committee and department chair will conduct separate and independent evaluations of the faculty member's performance. Promotion to full professor additionally requires at least three years of strong evidence of Level 1 accomplishments in research, teaching, and service since the last promotion.

External evaluators will evaluate the research portfolio for the promotion to full professor for each faculty member. In the spring semester before their penultimate year, the candidate will provide to the personnel committee chair the names of 6-8 potential referees outside the university who can assess the quality and impact of their research. Ideally, these reviewers should be from R1 or research-intensive units, but other referees can be included with appropriate justification. These referees may not include colleagues with whom the faculty member has a conflict of interest: relatives, former graduate and post-doctoral advisors, co-authors and co-PIs, and former students or post-docs. The faculty member may also choose to provide names of up to three individuals from whom references should not be solicited. The personnel committee members also develop a list of 6-8 potential referees and solicit references from 6-8 external referees. At least four letters are needed in total, two of which are selected from the candidate's list and two from the committee's list. Each referee receives the candidate's CV, Research/Scholarship Activities statement, publications, and a copy of the departmental Tenure and Promotion Guidelines.

**XVI. Criteria for Reappointment of Other Special Faculty (Research, Extension, Clinical Faculty, Professor of Practice)**

Reappointment of other special faculty will follow all the guidelines and procedures outlined in the Clemson University *Faculty Manual*. Other special faculty (research, extension, clinical, professor of practice) will be expected to adhere to department expectations regarding performance criteria in teaching, research, and service. Reappointment is based on sustained effort across specific performance criteria outlined above and relevant to the nature of the candidate's appointment.

### **XVII. Criteria for Promotion of Other Special Faculty (Research, Extension, Clinical Faculty)**

Promotion of other special faculty (research, extension, clinical) will follow all the guidelines and procedures outlined in the Clemson University *Faculty Manual*. Other special faculty (research, extension, clinical) faculty will be expected to adhere to department expectations regarding performance criteria in teaching, research, and service.

### **XVIII. Post-Tenure Review**

Post-tenure review (PTR) shall follow all guidelines outlined in the Clemson University *Faculty Manual*. All faculty who receive tenure at Clemson University will be reviewed every five years following the date of tenure. Individual faculty members need not take action to initiate their periodic post-tenure review. For candidates who have received a rating of Good or higher on at least four of the five most recent annual evaluations, the PTR review outcome is satisfactory, and no further action is required. The personnel chair uploads a recommendation letter to the TPR system, and the PTR review clock is reset. If the candidate has received two or more ratings of Fair or below during the five most recent annual evaluations, a Part II PTR review is initiated.

#### **Procedures for Part II of Post-Tenure Review**

If the candidate has received two or more ratings of Fair or below during the five most recent annual evaluations, a Part II PTR review is initiated. The faculty member must provide a Letter Requesting Action, accompanied by the following items:

- A current CV
- Student evaluations for the past five years
- A plan for continued professional growth
- Detailed information on the outcomes of any sabbatical leave awarded during the past five years
- The names of six potential referees outside the department. These referees may not include colleagues with whom the faculty member has a conflict of interest: relatives, former graduate and post-doctoral advisors, co-authors and co-PIs, and former students or post-docs. The faculty member may also choose to provide names of up to three individuals from whom references should not be solicited.

In addition to materials provided by the faculty member, the committee also obtains:

- Four or more external reference letters, including at least two letters from referees on the faculty member's list.
- Copies of the faculty member's five most recent annual performance reviews provided by the department chair.

Tenured faculty members are expected to demonstrate a sustained record of excellence across multiple performance criteria outlined for promotion to their current rank. The PTR committee uses these criteria as the basis for a thorough review of the faculty member's past performance and future potential. The PTR committee assigns the faculty member a rating of Satisfactory or Unsatisfactory and provides a written justification for this rating. The department chair also renders a separate and independent recommendation. The candidate receives copies of both recommendations. He or she may provide written responses to one or both recommendations within two weeks, after which time the recommendations and responses are forwarded to the dean.

If the faculty member is rated Satisfactory by the PTR committee, the chair, or both, then the faculty member's final rating is Satisfactory. The dean forwards this information to the provost in summary form without appending additional candidate materials. If both the PTR committee and the chair rate the faculty member as Unsatisfactory, then the faculty member's final rating is Unsatisfactory, and the dean forwards all candidate materials to the provost.

Faculty members who receive an Unsatisfactory rating are subject to a three-year remediation program overseen by the department chair (see details in the *Faculty Manual*). During the remediation period, the faculty member is reviewed annually by the PTR committee and the chair, both of whom supply separate and independent evaluations as outlined above. At the end of the three-year period, another Part II PTR review is conducted as outlined above. If the outcome is again Unsatisfactory, the faculty member is subject to dismissal for unsatisfactory performance. If the review is Satisfactory, then the normal five-year PTR review cycle resumes.

**c. Post-Tenure Review Committee.** Each faculty member eligible for post-tenure review will be reviewed by all the members of the personnel committee of the same or higher rank, excluding the candidate and any faculty members in Part II of PTR. The PTR committee shall elect its own chair. The PTR review committee must have a minimum of three members for each review. If there are not enough faculty members of appropriate rank to serve on the PTR committee from within the department, the personnel committee shall elect Clemson faculty from other departments to serve on the PTR committee. The department chair shall secure the agreement of any elected committee members from outside the department. If one declines, the department's personnel committee will hold a second election. The outside member of the committee will be selected as follows:

1. Faculty coming up for post-tenure review shall, by October 1 of the year of their review, provide the department members of the PTR committee with a list of 3-5 acceptable outside candidates.
2. The department chair shall secure the agreement of any elected committee members from outside the department. If one declines, the department's personnel committee will hold a second election.

### **XIX. Department of Sociology, Anthropology and Criminal Justice Personnel Committee**

The Department of Sociology, Anthropology and Criminal Justice personnel committee is responsible for peer review of all candidates for reappointment, tenure, and promotion. The personnel committee is composed of all full-time, regular, tenured faculty members holding a majority appointment in the department. For a given personnel decision, only committee members holding at least the rank and tenure status sought by the candidate are eligible to vote. The personnel committee's members shall not be appointed by the department chair.

At least three qualified members are necessary for each personnel recommendation. If fewer than three are available, the personnel committee shall nominate and the regular faculty will vote by simple majority on the members of the appropriate rank from outside the department to create a total of three qualified persons.

An exception involves the reappointment and promotion of lecturer ranks. For the reappointment and promotion of lecturers, the personnel committee solicits input from senior lecturers and principal lecturers. For the reappointment of senior lecturers, the personnel committee solicits input from senior lecturers and principal lecturers. For the promotion of senior lecturers and the reappointment of principal lecturers, the personnel committee solicits input from principal lecturers.

The personnel committee shall operate according to the procedures outlined in the Clemson University *Faculty Manual*. Applying the standards outlined in this document, the personnel committee shall forward its recommendations on all personnel matters involving tenure, reappointment, and promotion to the college dean. The committee shall also make recommendations to the college dean on all appointments with immediate tenure, or with reduced probationary periods, and on initial appointment to a rank higher than assistant professor. The committee may also be involved in additional personnel matters where appropriate.

The chair may be invited to serve as a resource person but may not be present during committee deliberations and voting. In addition, the personnel committee may, upon the request of the chair, serve as a resource for the chair. The chair and the personnel committee issue separate recommendations, free from coercion and interference from any parties.