



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:
January 22, 2021

[] 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 _____

[Empty box for Department Chair comments]

Dean

Approved Signature _____

Revision Required (see comments) Name _____ Date _____

[Empty box for Dean comments]

Provost

Approved Signature _____

Revision Required (see comments) Name _____ Date _____

[Empty box for Provost comments]

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

Department: **Education and Human Development**

Date

1/26/2021

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4	Consistent with the requirement that tenure applications, once submitted, cannot be withdrawn (New in 2018-2019 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	*		
6f	* senior lecturer	Ch IV, B2e; Ch V, C2c	X		
6f, i	* including feedback from senior and principal lecturers	Ch V, D1g	*		
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	*		
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	*		
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	*		

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		

Comments

6e,i; 6f,i It appears the special rank faculty member of the TPR committee is intended to provide feedback under the provisions of the requirements noted. But, there 6g, i is a requirement for feedback from the specific ranks listed. If the internal reviewers for special ranks include the specified ranks in the department, then the 8f,i; 8g,i committee composition is fine.

TPR Guidelines EHD

Clemson University
College of Education
Education and Human Development (EHD)
Tenure Promotion and Reappointment Review (TPR)
Guidelines

Approved by EHD Faculty Vote
January 22, 2021

Signatures:

) **EHD**

-

Debi Switzer

College of Education Founding Dean:

George J. Petersen

Executive Vice President and Provost:

....., Robert H Jones

Procedures and Guidelines for Tenure, Promotion, and Reappointment

Department of Education and Human Development College of Education Clemson University January 22, 2021

The Clemson University Faculty Manual (FM) specifies parameters for decisions and processes concerning tenure, promotion, and reappointment (TPR). However, the FM requires each Academic Department to detail the specific procedures and guidelines it will follow within those parameters (e.g., see FM, Part IV, Section D). The purpose of this document is to provide that specificity concerning TPR in the Department of Education and Human Development (EHD). Appendix A contains the guidelines for Post Tenure Review (PTR).

The TPR Committee

1.1 Faculty_ Ranks

Regular faculty are designated as those holding tenured and tenured track positions. Special faculty are designated by the following ranks: Lecturer, Senior Lecturer, and Principal Lecturer; Clinical assistant professor, Clinical Associate Professor, and Clinical Professor

1.2 Membership_

The TPR Committee (hereafter "Committee") will consist of 5 members with at least 4 full professors. Efforts should be made to ensure representation on the committee from each program area. Each member will be elected in accordance with EHD bylaws, serving staggered 3-year terms to ensure continuity. The Committee will elect its own Chair who must be a full professor. A position on the Committee that is vacated before the completion of a 3-year term will be filled by a special election conducted by the EHD Elections Committee. In the event there are not sufficient department members to fill the committee, nominations will be accepted from other departments within the College of Education. A vacant position will be filled by an individual 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.

1.3 Committee Chair

Each year, the Committee will elect or re-elect one of its members to be Chair. The Chair schedules committee meetings and presides over them. 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). The Chair also works with an administrative assistant to ensure that the Committee's work and all formal personnel actions in relation to TPR are carried out in a timely, efficient, and appropriate manner.

1.4 Ex Officio Member

Each year, a current promoted Special Faculty member in EHD will be elected to serve as an ex officio member of the TPR Committee to help review special ranks faculty. If none in EHD is available or agrees to serve, the Department Chair will recruit one from another department in the College or from another academic unit in the University. Special faculty are ex officio, because the Faculty Manual specifies that TPR recommendations are limited to regular faculty (FM Part IV: Section D). As an ex officio member, the Special Faculty will participate only in discussions pertaining to annual recommendations for reappointments and promotions of Special Faculty.

1.4 Process

1.41 Evaluation of Faculty. Until the first promotion, all faculty (regular and special) will be evaluated annually. Tenure-track faculty will be evaluated and eligible for promotion and tenure per timelines outlined in the FM (Part IV.C.3). Special faculty will be evaluated and eligible for promotion per procedures and timelines in the FM. Promoted Special faculty will be evaluated per the following timeline: Rank 2, every three years, Rank 3 every five years (FM Part III.D.2, Part IV.C.2, and Faculty Senate Resolution 2018-05). Post Tenure Review (PTR) of tenured faculty will be carried out after every five years according to the Faculty Manual and the guidelines provided by the Provost's office each year. Tenured faculty should refer to Appendix A for EHD Post Tenure Review Guidelines. Faculty should consult the most recent *EHD eNotebook Guidelines* for procedures and timelines for submission of required TPR materials.

1.42 Deliberation. Independently, each Committee member will first review each candidate's materials submitted in accordance with University and Departmental guidelines. Based on that review each Committee member will independently rate each candidate's accomplishments in the areas of research/scholarship, teaching, and service according to negotiated annual distribution of effort, using the following categories: unsatisfactory, competence, achievement, achievement with distinction. Representative examples of the categories in each area are provided in Appendix A. Committee members will also note evidence in support of their assessment, as well as any feedback, constructive advice, and so forth that may be useful to a candidate's development and subsequent evaluation. Committee members' preliminary independent assessments will be shared with other members of the committee followed by an opportunity for open discussion. After discussion, each Committee member will finalize his or her assessment of a candidate and the Committee will then vote on the rating achieved in each area and on an overall recommendation for reappointment, tenure, and/or promotion, subject to the minimal levels of achievement specified in section 3.0. For reappointment, the ratings will be based on accomplishments since the previous year's TPR evaluation. However, in its comments justifying an individual's ratings and a recommendation on reappointment, the Committee will contextualize the current year's assessment in relation to any previous years and to an individual's trajectory toward tenure and/or promotion. That feedback will be forthright and constructive. On the other hand, the ratings and recommendation for tenure and/or promotion will be based on cumulative accomplishments since an individual's initial appointment or previous promotion.

1.43 Selecting external/internal reviewers. In the spring semester, the Chair of the Committee will communicate with all EHD faculty requesting letters of intent from any faculty member desiring 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 and suggestions for qualified external reviewers in

accordance with the Faculty Manual and guidelines provided by the Provost's office each year. Special Faculty seeking promotion will submit suggestions for internal or external reviewers who hold similar positions to one to which they aspire at the rank sought or above. For Special Faculty seeking promotion, the Committee will select 2-3 reviewers, with at least 1 reviewer being suggested by a candidate. For tenured or tenure-track faculty, the Committee will select a minimum of four external reviewers for each candidate with at least 2 from the list generated by the candidate and at least 2 from the list generated by the committee. All nominated external reviewers must be at or above the rank sought, and are at peer or aspirational peer institutions. A justification must be provided for nominees not at peer institutions.

1.44 Reporting. In making a recommendation for tenure and/or promotion, or for reappointment, the Committee will report anonymously the configuration of Committee members' independent ratings and the Committee's overall vote in research/scholarship, teaching, and service. The Committee will cite evidence supporting its ratings in each area and may provide feedback and advice for the sake of faculty development and to guide faculty towards success in future TPR actions.

2.0 General Principles

Principle 2.1 TPR review in EHD serves two primary and complementary purposes: (a) professional development through feedback to untenured faculty and special faculty about their progress toward promotion, and (b) evaluation leading to recommendations for reappointment, tenure, and/or promotion. In serving both of these purposes, the TPR review aims to make fair, equitable, unbiased, informed, and duly deliberated recommendations that are in the best interest of individual faculty members, their departmental colleagues, the larger university community, the disciplinary fields with which faculty align, and the communities that EHD and the College of Education aim to serve.

Principle 2.2 Deliberation and decisions related to TPR acknowledge the different roles and expectations for regular and special faculty ranks as defined in the Faculty Manual. Tenured/tenure-track faculty are expected to be active, productive scholars, continuously engaged in research and scholarship, which is a fundamental and essential component of their development and evaluation. Special faculty are encouraged to be so engaged, but consideration is given to the approved annual goals and distribution of effort. Special faculty must document contributions based upon their annual negotiated distribution of effort to receive a favorable recommendation for Promotion. Contractual stipulations and yearly variations in workload will be considered in TPR deliberations, feedback, and recommendations.

Principle 2.3 Unlike many fields and disciplines within the University, EHD encompasses applied fields and specialties that imply a greater integration of research/scholarship, teaching, and service; thus the boundaries between these categories often are blurred. Similarly, the Department's constituent fields do not aim to develop and refine knowledge and understanding, for its own sake, nor specifically for the sake of developing commercial products, fixed processes, patents, and decontextualized information. Instead, research/scholarship, teaching, and service are developed and evaluated with the expectations that these activities will substantively advance human wellbeing and promote societal improvement. The TPR Committee respects candidates' well-argued presentations of how their work is integrated across scholarship/research, teaching, and service.

Principle 2.4 In general, expectations for accomplishment in all areas increase with seniority and rank.

3.0 Minimal Standards for a Positive Recommendation Note.

Representative examples of rating categories are provided in Appendix B.

Tenure Track

3.1 Reappointment: A vote of at least Competence in the respective areas of research, teaching, and service. For special faculty a rating of at least Competence in the area(s) of their appointment.

3.2 Promotion to tenured Associate Professor: A vote of at least Achievement in the areas of research, teaching, and service.

3.3. Promotion to Professor : A vote of Achievement with Distinction in the area of research and at least Achievement in teaching or service.

Special Ranks

3.4 Reappointment: A vote of at least Competence in the primary area of appointment.

3.5 Promotion to Associate Clinical Professor: A vote of Achievement and sustained contributions in the faculty ' s primary appointment (e.g., teaching, supervision . . .), and contributions in the areas of service and/or scholarship. This rank may be applied for after four full academic years of service at Assistant Clinical Professor; equivalent experience at Clemson may be counted towards the four-year service requirement. Associate Clinical Professors shall be offered three-year contracts.

3.6 Promotion to Clinical Professor: A vote of Achievement with Distinction and sustained contributions in the faculty's primary appointment (e.g., teaching, supervision ...), and contributions in the areas of service and/or scholarship. *This rank may be applied for after four full academic years of service at Associate Clinical Professor. Clinical Professors shall be offered five-year contracts.*

3.7 Promotion to Senior Lecturer: A vote of Achievement and sustained contributions in teaching, and contributions in the areas of service and/or scholarship. This rank may be applied for after four full academic years of service at Lecturer; equivalent experience at Clemson may be counted towards the four-year service requirement. Senior Lecturers shall be offered three-year contracts.

3.8 Promotion to Principal Lecturer: A vote of Achievement with Distinction and sustained contributions in teaching, and contributions in the areas of service and/or scholarship. This rank may be applied for after four full academic years of service at Senior Lecturer. Principal Lecturers shall be offered five-year contracts.

4.0 Research/Scholarship

4.1 Principles

Principle 4.11 A broad range of activities and products fall under the category of research and scholarship. See section 4.3 for examples.

Principle 4.12 Research, involving data collection, analysis, and interpretation, is methodologically

inclusive. Methods can include, but are not limited to, quantitative and/or qualitative approaches, meta-analyses, survey research, design-based research, discourse analysis, historical research, literature/research reviews, and so forth.

Principle 4.13 Indicators of quality/impact and of quantity are both relevant factors. However, quality/impact is the primary goal and always supersedes quantity.

Principle 4.14 Quality is established fundamentally through peer review and complementary indicators of national/international status, exclusivity, and competitiveness (e.g., a journal's acceptance rate; a chapter in an exclusive handbook; a large federal grant). Impact can be substantiated through a variety of indicators (e.g., journal circulation and published impact factors; adoption and use of the products of one's scholarship).

Principle 4.15 Publication in the top-tier, peer-reviewed outlet(s) in one's field or specialty is expected as a prominent indicator of quality and impact. This expectation increases with seniority and rank. See section 4.2 for factors that might be documented as evidence of the quality and impact of an outlet for published articles in journals.

Principle 4.16 Collaboration in scholarly endeavors is encouraged and valued, but collaborative efforts must evidence at least occasional leadership (e.g., first or sole authorship or principle investigator).

Principle 4.17 The quality and impact of publications in online, open-access outlets will be assessed on the same basis as conventional printed outlets. That is, online, open-access publications will not automatically be discounted simply because they are not in printed form.

Principle 4.18 Effort and success in seeking external funding is expected, preferably to support research and scholarship. However, external funding alone cannot carry the full weight of accomplishment in research/scholarship. It is acknowledged that some fields or sub-specializations inherently have more limited funding opportunities. When that is clearly the case, expectations are adjusted accordingly. However, even in those cases, there is an expectation that faculty will explore diverse sources of funding and seek collaborations with faculty who are in a better position to obtain funding.

4.2 Quality and Impact of Journal Publications

The following factors illustrate the types of evidence that will be considered in determining the quality and impact of journal publications and that candidates are encouraged to address in their notebooks:

- Prestige of the organization and/or publisher sponsoring the journal.
- Prestige of the editors and/or editorial review board.
- Circulation and audience of the journal.
- Acceptance rate for manuscripts submitted.
- Documented reputation in the field.
- Independent evaluation of the journal's impact, for example, through published impact factors.
- Citation of one's article in other prestigious sources.
- Reprints or republication of one's work in prestigious outlets.

4.3 Examples of Other Activities and Accomplishments in Research and Scholarship

The mainstay of scholarship and research is peer-reviewed publication (see Principles 4.12-4.17). Other activities in this area include the following:

- Books and monographs with respected academic publishers.
- Peer-reviewed presentations at national/international conferences.
- Invited publications in highly regarded books or journals.
- Textbooks, curriculum materials, digital media, and other products, that proceed from one's scholarship, particularly when accompanied by evidence that they have been broadly adopted and used.
- Election to high offices in scholarly organizations focusing on research or appointment to prestigious scholarly committees, panels, editorships, review boards, and so forth.
- National awards or competitive fellowships related to scholarship or research.
- Attention to one's scholarship in the popular media at a national level.
- Invited presentations or keynote addresses to prestigious groups or organizations.
- Publications or presentations in less prestigious or less rigorously reviewed venues and of lesser impact such as book reviews, newsletter articles, articles in state journals, and so forth.

5.0 Teaching

5.1 Principles

Principle 5.11 Teaching encompasses a diverse range of activities that go beyond being the instructor of a scheduled class. See section 5.3 for examples.

Principle 5.12 Results of the standard university evaluation questionnaire that students are requested to complete in each course are one source of documentation for a faculty member's accomplishments in teaching. Student evaluations and academic advising must be summarized in materials submitted for TPR.

Principle 5.13 Given Principle 5.12, evaluation and documentation of engagement in teaching activities and of skill and effectiveness must include diverse evidence. See Section 5.4 for examples of evidence.

5.2 Elements of Good Teaching

Within the context of teaching courses, elements of good teaching that might be documented in various ways, include, but are not limited to, the following:

- 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 diligently and successfully.

5.3 Examples of Other Activities and Accomplishments in the Area of Teaching

Although the mainstay of university teaching is in relation to scheduled classes, the following are representative of other activities and accomplishments in the area of teaching:

- Curriculum and course development.
- Advising and mentoring students outside of teaching courses.
- Honors and awards for mentoring or for other aspects of teaching not directly related to courses.
- Grants related to improving one's own teaching or the quality and effectiveness of teaching in the College or University.
- Publications aimed specifically at reporting insights from one's own teaching.
- Student awards achieved under the faculty member's direction (e.g., an advisee whose dissertation wins an award).
- Mentoring one's peers in the area of teaching.
- 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.

5.4 Documenting Accomplishments in Teaching

Beyond questionnaires completed by students, the following are representative ways to document elements of good teaching:

- Items that supplement the standard Clemson University course evaluation and that reflect valued elements of teaching not tapped by the standard evaluation.
- 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 relevant sections highlighted and explained, perhaps in relation to the valued elements of good teaching as outlined in the previous section or to other elements related to one's philosophical rationale pertaining to teaching (see the subsequent item).
- 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 involving your mentoring).

- A personal journal summarizing one's activities and reflections in relation to teaching a course or several courses.
- Published work or products directly related to one's teaching.

)

6.0 Service

6.1 Principles

Principle 6.11 There are three categories of expected service: (a) service to one's colleagues at Clemson (Department, College, and University), (b) service to one's field or discipline, and (c) service to societal communities, including practitioners in education and related fields.

Principle 6.12 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 pertinent to TPR unless it is related directly to one's faculty position and expertise.

Principle 6.13 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 is innovative in its conception and implementation.

Principle 6.14 Untenured faculty are expected to engage in some service, but less than for tenured faculty. Untenured faculty service activities should not detract from a main focus on conducting and publishing research and scholarship that shows their potential to develop a national reputation.

6.2 Examples of Activities and Accomplishments in the Three Areas of Service

Service to Clemson Colleagues:

- Member of search committee
- Uncompensated program coordinator
- Assigned mentor for a new faculty member
- Member/chair of Program/Departmental/College/University committee or task force
- Participant in program-wide activities

Service to Discipline Field:

- Reviewer of manuscripts for journal/conference papers
- Editor of newsletter, yearbook, or professional journal
- Appointed/elected committee chair or officer of a professional organization
- Member of a state policy-making or advisory board
- Consultant Services

Service to Societal Communities and Practitioners

- Creator of school or community-based programming
- Presenter for workshops, in-service, or professional development for teachers or counselors
- Member of advisory board for a community group in the area of one's expertise
- Producer of a technical manual or curricular materials for practitioners

Appendix A

Post Tenure Review Guidelines

Post-tenure review (PTR) serves to evaluate rigorously a faculty member's professional contributions. The review should be used to identify and reward excellent faculty, and, by identifying cases where remediation and support may be required, should ensure that all faculty serve the needs of the students and the institution.

PTR is carried out according to the Faculty Manual and the guidelines provided by the Provost's office each year. This committee consists of three tenured faculty members from the department elected for three year terms. Faculty going through PTR Part II review are not eligible to serve on the PTR committee. In the event there are not sufficient department members to fill the committee, nominations will be accepted from other departments within the College of Education. The PTR committee responsibilities include evaluating those who are going through PTR review each year, as well as serving as the advisory committee to the department chair for sabbatical applications. The PTR Committee shall elect its own chair.

The period for PTR is after every five years. The first five-year period begins at the time that tenure is granted. Promotion during that period does not alter the schedule for review. Periods of sick leave, sabbatical leave, or leave without pay will be excluded from this five-year period. See the Faculty Manual for other valid reasons for requesting an extension.

The PTR process consists of two parts. Those PTR applicants who receive a rating of "satisfactory" in Part I are exempt from Part II. The Department Chair, by May 1, will notify faculty going through the PTR review the following year, and will provide names and ratings (no narrative) to the chair of the PTR committee by October 1.

Post Tenure Review Process: Part I

The PTR committee will review the ratings received on the most recently available series of five years of annual performance reviews (Form 3) as provided by the Department chair. All tenured faculty members receiving no more than one (of five) annual performance ratings of "fair," "marginal," or "unsatisfactory" in Part I of the PTR process receive a PTR rating of "satisfactory." These faculty members are thereby exempt from Part II of Post Tenure Review. The PTR committee will submit a letter to the Department Chair and College Dean identifying the faculty members exempt from the Part II PTR review process. In addition, a letter of notification of the "satisfactory" PTR rating will be sent to each of those faculty members.

Post-Tenure Review Process: Part II

1. Notification. By October 15th, faculty who have been identified as applicants for Part II PTR will be individually notified by letter from the PTR committee chair that they should begin preparing their applications for post-tenure review.
2. Choosing external review process. By November 1st, each faculty member under review will notify the PTR committee chair in writing of his or her choice of external review method: participation by an external committee member, or solicited external support letters (in which case, the names and contact information of at least six potential referees must be included). In the event that this written notification is not received by the PTR chair by the due date, the default will be the use of the external committee member in that applicant's review. If an external committee member is needed for a Part II review, nominations will be accepted from other departments within the College of Education, with the PTR committee members choosing from the nominees the person who will serve.

3. Submission of Complete Application. A notebook containing sections prescribed by the Provost and provided by the College Dean will be given to each PTR Part II applicant by the PTR committee. This notebook may be paper or electronic, as determined by the Provost or Dean. All required application materials must be submitted to the PTR Chair prior to the deadline established by the Committee. These materials will be kept in a secure location available only to PTR Committee members and to the College Dean. During the period before the application deadline, an applicant may address any procedural questions to the PTR Committee Chair, for example, questions regarding the materials to be submitted.

4. External Letters and Additional Materials. If the applicant chooses the option of solicited external support letters, a minimum of 4 reference letters will be obtained by the PTR committee, of which at least two of the references must come from the list submitted by the applicant. The PTR committee, through the PTR chair or designated member, may ask the applicant for additional materials or written clarification at any time before the recommendation is made. If an applicant receives information about an additional distinction prior to the committee meeting at which the committee recommendation is made, the applicant may submit that material to the PTR chair prior to the meeting.

5. Review. Individual PTR committee members will review the applications prior to the committee meeting at which the recommendation will be made. In reviewing materials, the PTR committee will evaluate each applicant using the established criteria. The applicant will be notified of the date of the recommendation meeting with a reminder that the meeting date is also the final deadline for additional information (recent distinctions).

6. Ratings and Recommendation. At a closed meeting of the PTR committee in early spring, at which a designated committee member will take minutes, a rating of Satisfactory or Unsatisfactory will be given to the applicant for each of the three performance areas (Teaching, Research/Scholarship, and Service). In the event that a consensus cannot be reached for a rating, the majority will hold. For each applicant a report will be written by the committee. For each of the three performance areas the report will include a narrative and a rating (Satisfactory or Unsatisfactory). The report will finish with a statement of the overall recommendation of Satisfactory or Unsatisfactory. (See the Faculty Manual for more information.)

Criteria for Evaluating Faculty Performance

In judging post-tenure performance, the Committee will primarily consider the applicant's performance during the period since the last peer review, but performance prior to the latest review will also be considered, as well as plans for future development and potential contributions. EHD faculty at Clemson University receive a formal yearly evaluation ("Form 3") of their contributions to the University, provided by the EHD chair. These Form 3 evaluations accord a very high weight in the PTR decisions.

A. Criteria for Ratings in the Three Performance Areas (Teaching, Research, and Service).

Guided by the EHD TPR Guidelines and Form 3 Criteria, and giving strong consideration to the Form 3 evaluations, the committee will give a rating of Satisfactory or Unsatisfactory to each applicant in each of the three areas of Teaching, Research/Scholarship, and service.

B. Criteria for the Overall Recommendation.

The applicant will receive an overall recommendation of Satisfactory if he or she receives a rating of Satisfactory in all three performance areas (Teaching, Research, and Service). This resets the PTR time clock. If anyone performance area is Unsatisfactory, the overall recommendation will be Unsatisfactory, resulting in remediation to correct deficiencies in the Unsatisfactory performance area(s) (see the Faculty Manual for remediation details).

The PTR Notebook (required for Part II review only).

Materials will be organized in the order specified by the Provost's office. The following materials are required by the EHD PTR committee (even if not required by the Provost):

- ___ 2-page executive summary statement of contributions to the University. The applicant should emphasize post-tenure achievements and include a description of potential future contributions.
- ___ An updated curriculum vita
- ___ Summary statistical sheets for "Student Evaluation of Instructors " (past five years) in reverse chronological order.
- ___ All individual student comments from "Student Evaluation of Instructors" for the past five years.
- ___ 1-to-2-page plan for continued professional growth

- ___ If a sabbatical was taken during the five-year period, detailed information about outcomes of the sabbatical leave.
- ___ Optional: letters of support
- ___ All form 3s since the last PTR review
- ___ Optional: additional documents relative to the review, for example, evidence of teaching effectiveness, research im pacts, or service activity, or letters of support (at the discretion of the involved faculty).

Appendix B: Representative Examples of Ratings by Area and Category

Research and Scholarship.

The following are representative examples of evaluative categories in the area of research/scholarship. **They are not specific expectations, requirements, or standards.** Evaluation decisions are based on the totality and consistency of one's research and scholarship over time, not on singular pieces of evidence. Sustained evidence is required to receive a rating in any given category.

Unsatisfactory

- One 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

Achievement

- Principal Investigator or Co-principal investigator on external grant (funded)
- Publications in national refereed professional journals or monographs (abstracted/indexed)
- Refereed conference proceedings paper for national or international professional conference
- Chapter in book
- Presentations at national or international professional conferences (evidence of refereed process)
- Invited lecture (keynote address or equivalent) at state or regional conference
- Invited to serve on editorial review board of high impact research journal
- Research and scholarly activity found in citation index
- Electronic media development (e.g., computer software and evidence of national impact)
- University funded or internal grant

Achievement with Distinction

- Sustained contributions in nationally recognized professional journals (refereed and indexed) and edited books
- National recognition for publications or research (e.g., awards, articles in national newspapers)
- Elected/appointed editor of high-impact research journal
- Author or co-author of book or scholarly monograph
- Principal investigator or co-investigator on major external grants (funded)
- 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 conference
- Invited national webinar presentation

Teaching

The following are representative examples of evaluative categories in the area of teaching. **They are not specific expectations, requirements, or standards.** Evaluation decisions are based on the totality and consistency of one's teaching over time, not on singular pieces of evidence. Sustained evidence is required to receive a rating in any given category.

Unsatisfactory

- Consistently low course evaluation ratings* in comparison to discipline and/or other negative feedback from students.

- No offsetting evidence for competence or to indicate efforts to improve.
- Inconsistent attendance at meetings to discuss instructional program(s).

Competence

- Mostly average ratings and frequent endorsements from students.
- Evidence presented of seeking improvement in teaching. Developed a course, and participated as member of a curriculum committee.
- Supplemental evidence (beyond teaching evaluations)

Achievement

- Consistently above average course evaluation ratings in comparison to discipline and 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 and othersupplemental evidence (e.g., evidence of efforts to improve)
- Innovative syllabus/course activities/requirements for course.

Achievement with Distinction

- Consistently above. average course evaluation ratings in comparison to discipline, evidence of rigor, and supportive comments from students.
- Chair of Curriculum Committee.
- Nominated for/received teaching award.
- Scholarly activities related to one's teaching. Mentored a student who won award for professional accomplishments.

*Ratings refer to the standard Clemson course evaluation forms.

Service

The following are representative examples of different levels of expectations for evaluative categories in the area of service. **They are not specific expectations, requirements, or standards.** Evaluation decisions are based on the totality and consistency of one's service over time, not on singular pieces of evidence. Sustained evidence is required to receive a rating in any given category.

Unsatisfactory

For all faculty: 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

For untenured and special faculty:

- Service on Program committees
- Conducting a professional development workshop
- Reviewing conference proposals

For tenured faculty:

- Service on Departmental and College committees
- Conducting multiple professional development workshops
- Reviewing proposals for multiple conferences

Achievement

For untenured faculty:

- Service on Departmental and College committees
- Editorial board member for peer-reviewed journal
- Committee member for state or regional professional organization

For tenured faculty:

- Service on College and University committees
- Associate editor of a peer-reviewed journal
- Committee member for national or international professional organization or Board member for a state or regional professional organization

Achievement with Distinction

For untenured faculty:

- Editor for a peer-reviewed journal or associate editor for multiple peer-reviewed journals
- Committee member for national or international professional organization or Board member for state or regional professional organization

For tenured faculty:

- Chair College committee or service on University committees
- Associate editor or editor of multiple peer-reviewed journals
- Chair of a national or international professional committee