

TENURE, PROMOTION, AND REAPPOINTMENT GUIDELINES  
DEPARTMENT OF TEACHING AND LEARNING  
CLEMSON UNIVERSITY

Approved by the faculty, April 24, 2015

<u>Lyne Lambert</u>	<u>8-25-15</u>
Department Chair/Head	Date
<u>APR</u>	<u>10-1-15</u>
Dean	Date
<u>Robert S. Jones</u>	<u>3/17/16</u>
Provost	Date

**Department of Teaching and Learning**  
**School of Education**  
**Clemson University**  
Tenure Promotion and Reappointment (TPR) Guidelines

**Approved by the Faculty of T&L**  
**April 24, 2015**

**Department of Teaching and Learning**  
**Guidelines for Tenure, Promotion, and Reappointment (TPR)**

**April 24, 2015**

**Introduction**

In Part IV, Section D, the Clemson University Faculty Manual makes clear the central and primary role of regular departmental faculty in evaluation processes and recommendations relating to appointment, reappointment, tenure, and promotion. The departmental guidelines specified in this document are intended to provide a consistent policy and procedure for tenure, promotion and reappointment. The guidelines are meant to aid the TPR Committee and the Department Chair in formulating recommendations and to aid each regular faculty member or special faculty member in achieving their full potential at Clemson. The procedures and suggested levels of accomplishment should be used for fair and accurate evaluations of a regular or special faculty member's candidacy for tenure, promotion or reappointment, and should also be used to gauge performance and progress toward these goals.

**TPR Committee Structure and Responsibilities**

Letters of faculty appointment should specify that promotion, tenure, and reappointments for tenure-track faculty depend heavily on contributions to, and achievements in, the total program of the department including scholarship, teaching, research, outreach, and procurement of extramural funds for support. Letters of appointment for special faculty ranks should specify the duties and terms of appointment, as required by the Faculty Manual. Responsibilities and duties for special faculty ranks will normally include a subset of those expected of tenure-track faculty.

Committee Structure

The TPR Committee (hereafter "Committee") shall be composed of five (5) full-time regular faculty members (excluding administrators), elected by the faculty to three (3) year staggered terms, at least two of whom must hold the rank of Professor. All members of the Committee shall be tenured and hold the rank of Associate Professor or Professor. The Chair of the Committee must hold the rank of Professor and will be elected by the Committee at the beginning of the academic year for a one-year term. A position on the Committee that is vacated before the completion of a 3-year term will be filled by a temporary appointee of the Chair of the Committee in consultation with the T&L Department Chair. A vacant position will be filled by an appointee for no more than one cycle of the Committee's work, after which time the vacant position must again be filled by a returning or newly elected member.

Each year, a current Senior Lecturer in T&L will be appointed by the Chair of the Committee in consultation with the T&L Department Chair to serve as an ex officio (non-voting) member of the Committee. If no Senior Lecturer in T&L is available or agrees to serve, the Committee and Department Chairs will recruit a Senior Lecturer from another department in the

School or from another academic departmental unit in the University. As an ex officio member, the Senior Lecturer will serve a one-year term as a consultant in discussions pertaining to annual recommendations for reappointment of lecturers, the promotion of Lecturers to Senior Lecturer, and the 3-year reappointment of Senior Lecturers.

It is *required* that a committee of at least three faculty of equal or higher rank to the rank for which a candidate has requested to be considered makes a recommendation. In cases of candidates seeking promotion to Professor, but the Committee's membership consists of two Professors, a Special Committee of a minimum of three faculty members with Professor rank will be established. The Special Committee will consist of the two Professors already elected to the primary Committee, and an additional member elected by the Regular Faculty to meet the requirement of three members. This Special Committee will only review candidates seeking promotion to Professor.

### Committee Responsibilities

The Chair's role, in addition to the responsibilities of any Committee member, is to facilitate the professional and effective functioning of the Committee. The Chair also represents the Committee to all relevant parties internal (e.g., administrators) and external (e.g., evaluators) to the University. The Chair is also responsible for disseminating information, on behalf of the Committee, to all faculty affected by the Committee's work (e.g., responding to questions from individual faculty or organizing open forums for faculty who are seeking clarifications or who wish to comment on issues related to TPR). Finally, the Chair maintains regular communication with the T&L Department Chair to assure that, to the greatest degree possible, there is consistency between the Department Chair's annual evaluation and the TPR Committee's annual reappointment recommendation for each untenured faculty member.

A primary responsibility of the Committee is to uphold the principles and processes necessary to ensure a robust professorate in the unit. The means through which the Committee meets this responsibility is a written recommendation on tenure, promotion or reappointment of each candidate. The recommendation should be carefully prepared to present a professional, accurate, and thorough assessment of strengths and weaknesses as well as recommended actions for improvement. In making a recommendation for tenure and/or promotion, or for reappointment, the Committee will report anonymously the configuration of Committee members' ratings and the Committee's overall vote in research/Scholarship, teaching, and service. Evaluations by the Committee should be accomplished with careful judgment, using information that is as complete as possible. For third-year review of tenure-track candidates, the Committee will provide a summative evaluation of the candidate's progress towards tenure to that point including detailed, specific feedback regarding expectations for improvement.

For tenured or tenure track candidates, to assist in a comprehensive review for tenure and/or promotion, confidential written appraisals of each candidate's accomplishments should be obtained from qualified external evaluators and considered in the recommendation. In the spring semester, the Chair of the Committee will communicate with all T&L faculty, requesting letters of intent from any faculty member seeking to be considered for tenure and/or promotion in the subsequent academic year. Candidates for promotion and/or tenure will submit, with their letters of intent, suggestions for qualified external reviewers using the form in Appendix B. Lecturers seeking promotion to Senior Lecturer will submit suggestions for internal reviewers who hold the rank of Senior Lecturer. For tenured or tenure-track faculty, the Committee will select 3-5

external reviewers for each candidate, with at least two reviewers being suggested by a candidate. For lecturers seeking promotion, the Committee will select 2-3 reviewers, with at least one reviewer being suggested by a candidate. Because external evaluators in a candidate's discipline are able to provide discipline-specific evaluation particular to the candidate's field of scholarship—an evaluative perspective that may not be reflected in the TPR committee, since the committee members may be from different fields of study than the candidate—the TPR committee will give due weight, import, and consideration to the external evaluations.

Candidates submitting suggestions for external reviewers must nominate reviewers who are at or above the rank sought. Candidates must select external reviewers from peer institutions (major research universities) and/or reviewers who are highly regarded in the candidate's field of scholarship. Candidates will provide a justification for each potential reviewer included on the list of suggested reviewers. Candidates may include vitas of suggested reviewers as part of the justification. Also, as specified in Appendix B, candidates must ensure that none of the reviewers hold a close or direct relationship with the candidate such as:

- Major professor
- Committee member, advisor or mentor
- Co-author
- Spouse or other relative
- Fellow graduate student
- Graduate/research assistant, post doc, or advisee/protégé
- Or possesses any other conflict of interest in candidate's attaining promotion or tenure.

Committee members, through a comprehensive, informed, deliberative process, will arrive at one of the following rankings in each of the categories of Scholarship, Teaching and Service: Unsatisfactory, Competence, Achievement, or Achievement with Distinction.

### **Guidelines for TPR Review**

#### **Regular Faculty Ranks:**

**Reappointment:** A vote of at least Competence in the respective areas of scholarship, teaching, and service for tenure-track assistant professors.

**Promotion to Associate Professor and/or Tenure:** Tenure and promotion to Associate Professor affirm the high quality of the faculty member's accomplishments, value to the University, and professional standing. A positive recommendation must be supported by evidence of success at meeting the TPR criteria, a reputation for scholarship outside the University, and the expectation of sustained success and contribution. In terms of rankings, promotion to Associate Professor and tenure require a sustained record of Achievement or higher in the respective areas of scholarship, teaching, and service.

**Promotion to Full Professor:** Promotion to the rank of Professor, the highest academic rank conferred by the University, provides recognition for highly valued contributions in research, teaching, and service, and requires the attainment of national prominence and recognition for scholarship. A vote of Achievement with Distinction in two of the three areas, one of which must be Research, and at least Achievement in the third area is required for promotion to Professor.

Note that a prospective faculty member seeking the rank of full professor and tenure upon appointment must meet the criteria for promotion to professor in order to receive tenure.

### **Special Faculty Ranks:**

**Initial Appointment:** Professor of Practice appointments must be approved by the Committee, in accordance with the faculty manual. All Professor of Practice, Lecturer and Clinical Faculty appointments will be reviewed annually by the Committee.

**Reappointment:** For lecturers, a vote of at least Competence in the respective areas of scholarship, teaching, and service. For assistant clinical professors, a vote of at least Competence in the primary function area(s) (research, teaching, and/or service) as specified in the letter of appointment. For professor of practice, a vote of at least Competence in the primary function area(s) (research and/or teaching) as specified in the letter of appointment.

**Promotion to Senior Lecturer:** A vote of at least Achievement in the area of Teaching and Service. As specified in the FM (Part III, Section E) promotion to Senior Lecturer is contingent on evidence of accomplishment in areas beyond teaching. Although Achievement in Scholarship is not required for faculty seeking promotion to Senior Lecturer, faculty are encouraged to provide evidence of involvement in Scholarship as appropriate to their faculty role. Senior Lecturers are evaluated every three years by the Committee. A sustained record of at least Achievement in the area of Teaching and Service is required to maintain the rank of Senior Lecturer.

**Promotion to Associate Clinical Professor:** A vote of at least Achievement in the primary function area(s) (research, teaching, and/or service) as specified in the letter of appointment. Clinical Professor ranks are not tenurable.

**Promotion to Clinical Professor:** A vote of at least Achievement with Distinction in the primary function area(s) (research, teaching and/or service) as specified in the letter of appointment. Clinical Professor ranks are not tenurable.

### **Scholarship in Research**

Faculty at nationally recognized research institutions are expected to make substantial contributions to the research and scholarship in their fields of specialization. To receive tenure and promotion to associate professor, faculty members must be able to provide evidence that their accomplishments in this area are well recognized by peers and have begun to have had a national impact. Evidence of such contributions includes publication in refereed, nationally distributed, and abstracted/indexed journals; publications of books, book chapters, and monographs (refereed and indexed); external funding for scholarship and research; peer-reviewed presentations at national/international conferences; invited publications in highly regarded outlets; invited presentations or addresses to prestigious groups or organizations. For promotion to full professor, evidence of sustained contributions in the area of research and scholarship of a quality and quantity commensurate with the standards of a research institution is

**required.** In addition to meeting all the requirements for tenure and associate professor, faculty members at this level must be able to provide evidence that their scholarship has been nationally recognized and has had a substantial impact on their field of specialization. Candidates are encouraged to address, in TPR dossiers, these factors that the Committee considers in evaluating the quality of a candidate's research and scholarship:

- Acceptance rates of journals
- Authorship (balance of sole, lead, and co-authorship)
- Frequency with which the candidate's works are cited in the literature (e.g., citation index) or in other prestigious sources
- Circulation and audience of journals
- Impact factor of journals
- Prestige of the organization and/or publisher sponsoring the journal
- Prestige of the editors and/or editorial review board
- Documented reputation in the field of the journal
- Reputation of funding sources, the acceptance rates of funding sources, and the amount of external funding.

Please see Appendix A for several varied examples of evaluative categories in the area of research/scholarship. The examples included in Appendix A are not exhaustive lists of all possible performance indicators in each category, but serve as illustrations of typical scenarios. As such, the examples of evaluative categories are intended to provide guidance for candidates in framing their dossiers. Regardless of the diversity of examples included in the categories, the mainstay of scholarship in research remains peer-reviewed publication.

### **Teaching**

Teaching is the fundamental responsibility of the faculty. Teaching encompasses not only classroom teaching, but also such activities as clinical supervision, advising, mentoring, and service on graduate committees. Additionally, undergraduate and graduate student advising is an important component of scholarship in teaching. Though part of documenting teaching effectiveness includes student evaluations, student evaluations alone are insufficient to indicate teaching quality. Teaching effectiveness is evaluated primarily based on course syllabi, student evaluations, curriculum and course development, and the degree of engagement in pedagogical pursuits. A variety of indicators of teaching effectiveness are included in the following list, which is not exhaustive:

- Demonstrating deep knowledge of and involvement with one's discipline and communicating that knowledge effectively to students.
- Engaging students actively and meaningfully in learning the content, processes, and orientations associated with one's discipline.
- Being responsive to students' individual needs and capabilities (e.g., making oneself available outside of class time or nominating students for special awards).
- Engaging in systematic reflection and analysis concerning one's teaching.
- Stimulating in students an interest and participation in one's discipline.

- Articulating clearly a rationale and justification for one’s approach to teaching and how that rationale is embedded in the design, content, requirements, and assessment procedures for a particular course.
- Developing among students a scholarly inquisitiveness and perspective.
- Preparing students to become educational leaders with a well-developed sense of professionalism.
- Modeling the values and practices associated with professionalism and scholarly inquiry in teacher education.
- Mentoring and advising students successfully.
- Curriculum, course development, and other means of communication aimed specifically at improving teacher education.
- Student awards achieved under the faculty member’s direction (e.g., an advisee whose dissertation wins an award).
- Serving as the advisor to an active student organization related to one’s discipline.
- Evaluation data from participants of presentations, workshops, or other non-course teaching contexts.
- Honors and awards for innovative or effective teaching.
- Written peer and/or administrative evaluations (it is recommended that these evaluations include more than a single class visit and that they comment on more than what occurs during a single observation).
- Course syllabi with a narrative connecting the syllabi to one’s philosophical rationale pertaining to teaching.
- A written statement of the theoretical and/or philosophical rationale for one’s approach to teaching, preferably including an explicit grounding in the appropriate literature.
- Exemplary student products (e.g., a paper, a portfolio).
- Student accomplishments directly related to one’s course(s) (e.g., students’ rate of passing certification examinations or a student’s publication or award that originated in one’s course; a student who achieves an award related to your mentoring).
- Published work or products directly related to one’s teaching.

Please see Appendix A for several varied examples of evaluative categories in the area of teaching. The examples included in Appendix A are not exhaustive lists of all possible performance indicators in each category, but serve as illustrations of typical scenarios. As such, the examples of evaluative categories are intended to provide guidance for candidates in framing their dossiers.

### **Service**

There are three categories of expected service: (a) service to one’s colleagues at Clemson (Department, School, University), (b) service to one’s field or discipline, and (c) service to societal communities, including practitioners in education and related fields. Service to societal communities is only relevant to TPR when it is linked directly to a faculty member’s professional interests and expertise. That is, general public service open to all citizens is not relevant to TPR unless it is related directly to one’s faculty position and expertise. The degree to which any activity in the area of service is judged to be meritorious is based primarily on the



following: (a) the amount of time and effort required, (b) the scope and potential impact of an activity, and (c) the degree to which the service activity complements the Mission of the School of Education. Faculty are encouraged to carefully document service responsibilities, a variety of which are listed below:

*Service to Clemson Colleagues:*

- Member of Search Committee
- Uncompensated program coordinator
- Assigned mentor for a new faculty member
- Member/chair of Departmental/School/University committee, task force, etc.

*Service to Discipline Field:*

- Reviewer of manuscripts for journal/conference papers
- Editor of newsletter, yearbook, themed issue, journal, etc.
- Appointed/elected committee chair, officer, etc. of professional organization
- Mentor to colleagues at other institutions

*Service to Societal Communities and Practitioners*

- Educational outreach to meet a community need
- Conduct workshops, in-service development for teachers or school counselors
- Serve on an advisory board for a community group in the area of one's expertise
- Author a technical manual for practitioners.

Please see Appendix A for several varied examples of evaluative categories in the area of service. The examples included in Appendix A are not exhaustive lists of all possible performance indicators in each category, but serve as illustrations of typical scenarios. As such, the examples of evaluative categories are intended to provide guidance for candidates in framing their dossiers.

## **Appendix A**

### **Examples of Evaluative Categories in Scholarship, Teaching, and Service**

#### Scholarship

The following are representative examples of evaluative categories in the area of research/scholarship. **They are not specific expectations, requirements, or standards.**

#### **Unsatisfactory**

- 1 presentation at state conference
- Book review in state journal.

#### **Competence**

- Presentations at state or regional conferences
- Articles published in state and regional journals
- Technical report
- External grant submitted
- University grant (funded)

#### **Achievement**

- Publications in national refereed professional journals or monographs (abstracted/indexed)
- Chapter in book

- Presentations at national or international professional conferences (evidence of refereed process)
- Principal Investigator or Co-principal investigator on external grant (funded)
- Support doctoral student through external funds
- Invited reviewer for book, book chapter(s) or journal manuscript(s)
- Invited lecture (keynote address or equivalent) at state or regional conference
- Invited review panel member for national conference
- Research and scholarly activity found in citation index
- Electronic media development; e.g. computer software (evidence of national impact)
- Editor, section editor or editorial board member of state or regional professional journal

#### **Achievement with Distinction**

- Sustained contributions in nationally recognized professional journals (refereed and indexed) and edited books
- National recognition for publications (e.g., awards, articles in national newspapers)
- Editorial Board member for nationally recognized, refereed journal
- Author or co-author of book or scholarly monograph
- Principal investigator on major external grants (funded)
- Supports several doctoral students through external funds
- Editor or section editor of a national journal
- Editor of a book (in print)
- Evidence of publication impact- Citation index
- Nationally recognized contributions (sustained) in electronic media development
- Invited presentations at a national or international conferences

#### Teaching

The following are representative examples of evaluative categories in the area of teaching. **They are not specific expectations, requirements, or standards.**

#### **Unsatisfactory**

- Consistently low ratings and many negative comments from students.
- No offsetting evidence for competence or to indicate efforts to improve.
- Inconsistent attendance at meetings to discuss instructional program.

#### **Competence**

- Mostly above average ratings and frequent endorsements from students.
- Evidence presented of seeking improvement in the area of teaching.
- Developed a course, and participated as member of a curriculum committee.
- Rigorous syllabus.

#### **Achievement**

- Consistently above average ratings and highly supportive comments from students.
- Chair of committee to do a major revision of programmatic curriculum.
- Extensive advising, including service on doctoral committees.
- External evaluation of and feedback about teaching.
- Syllabus/course activities/requirements for course that are rigorous and grounded in current understandings regarding teacher education in the field.

#### **Achievement with Distinction**

- Consistently high ratings and highly supportive comments from students.

- Chair of Curriculum Committee.
- Self-study of teaching.
- Nominated for/received teaching award.
- Peer-reviewed publication related to one's own teaching.
- Mentored a student who won award for professional accomplishments.
- Conducted research on own teaching.

### Service

The following are representative examples of evaluative categories in the area of service. **They are not specific expectations, requirements, or standards.**

#### **Unsatisfactory**

- Minimal service requiring little time or effort and having minimal scope and impact (e.g. member of departmental committee with few responsibilities and that rarely meets)

#### **Competence**

- Service on a departmental committee
- In-service workshop for teachers
- Reviewer for conference proposal
- Serves on and contributes to School committees; contributes to area program of study; invited class presentations.
- Belongs to professional organizations, attends local meetings, and contributes to local program of work; invited talks and presentations to professional groups.
- Contributes professional expertise to the community.

#### **Achievement**

- Reviewer for peer-reviewed journal
- Advisor for a student academic organization.
- Officer or board member of a state or regional professional organization.
- Elected or appointed chair of committee for national professional organization
- Section editor of a peer-reviewed journal
- Chair of a University or School committee.
- Has role of responsibility within Department (chairs committees, including service as Program Coordinator); serves on and contributes to College or University committees; represents University at community or regional level.
- Attends state meetings of professional organizations; active in state organization or contributes substantially to state work (i.e., policy-making or professional literature).
- In the area of one's professional expertise, contributes to the resolution of a problem at a state or local level; serves on a state policy-making and/or advisory board.
- Provides consultation or training at the local, regional, or state level.

#### **Achievement with Distinction**

- Service on panel to review major federal grants
- Implementation of innovative statewide or national program of professional development.
- Elected or appointed to office in a professional organization
- Consulting at the national level
- Chair of a search committee at Department

- Editor of a peer-reviewed journal
- Officer or board member of a national or international professional organization.
- President or chair of a state or regional professional organization.
- Attends national meetings and holds national office or contributes substantially to national work (e.g., policy-making, boards, or professional literature; chair or program chair of state organization).
- Has role of responsibility at University level (chairs committees; represents University at state level; chair of accreditation committee; works on University-wide projects; provides statewide or regional training.
- In the area of one's professional expertise, contributes to the resolution of a problem at a national level; serves on a national policy-making and/or advisory board.
- Provides consultation or training at a national level.

## APPENDIX B

## CANDIDATE'S NOMINATIONS FOR EXTERNAL REVIEWERS

Provide the names and qualification of reviewers (NOTE QUALIFICATIONS ON NEXT PAGE)

Name / Rank / Position at University	Institution / Physical Address / Mailing Address	Contact Information		Relationship to Candidate (see Appendix A, following page) and Summary of Reviewer Qualifications
		Email	Phone /Fax	
1.				
2.				
3.				
4.				
5.				
6.				
7.				
8.				

CONTINUED

**APPENDIX B (CONTINUED)**

**Assurances of Reviewer Eligibility**

\_\_\_\_\_ All nominated external reviewers are at or above the rank sought.

\_\_\_\_\_ All nominated external reviewers are at peer institutions (major research university) OR highly regarded in the candidate's field of scholarship. In the case of the latter, provide a justification here for any individual listed above that is not at a peer institution: (i.e., what position does that individual hold and/or what accomplishments has that individual achieved that substantiate that he or she has high status in the field?):

\_\_\_\_\_ None of the reviewers hold a close or direct relationship with the candidate such as:

- Major professor
- Committee member, advisor or mentor
- Co-author
- Spouse or other relative
- Fellow graduate student
- Graduate/research assistant , post doc, or advisee/protégé
- Or possesses any other conflict of interest in candidate's attaining promotion or tenure.

Candidate's signature: \_\_\_\_\_

Date: \_\_\_\_\_