CLEMSON
UNIVERSITY

Department TPR and PTR Documents Routing Sheet
Requirements based on 2021-2022 *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:

☐ **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** _____

Dean

Approved   Signature _____

Revision Required (see comments) Name _____ **Date** _____

Provost

Approved   Signature _____

Revision Required (see comments) Name _____ **Date** _____

Requirements for DEPARTMENTAL TPR and PTR DOCUMENTS – 2021-2022 *Faculty Manual*

Department: School of Computing, Division of Computer Science   Date   3/9/2022

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*.   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 *Faculty Manual* 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4	Consistent with the requirement that tenure applications, once submitted, cannot be withdrawn (New in 2018-2019 *Faculty Manual*)	Ch V, C3	X		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 *Faculty Manual* 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 *selecting* 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

Note   The School of Computing has 4 divisions and all lecturer ranks and Professors of Practice are in the Faculty of Instruction. The TPR documents for the other divisions contain details for other ranks.

Tenure, Promotion, and Retention (TPR) Guidelines[1]

Division of Computer Science
School of Computing, Clemson University

I. <u>General</u>

The guidelines and procedures given here apply to the faculty of the Division of Computer Science in the School of Computing at Clemson University. The objective of the Guidelines is to present general criteria for promotion and retention decisions. Individuals with unique collection of strengths and weaknesses will be evaluated on a case-by-case basis to determine their overall accomplishments and contributions to the evolving set of goals of the School, the College and the University.

Authority to the Computer Science TPR Committee is granted by the School of Computing Bylaws (Article VII.C.a). Except as noted, per expectations of Clemson University's Faculty Manual, the Computer Science TPR guidelines within this document are distinct from School bylaws.

This document does not speak to processes for extension or clinical faculty; to lecturers (any rank); or Professors of Practice. If such individuals were to join the Division of Computer Science, their TPR processes would defer to School and/or Faculty of Instruction policies, until such revisions were integrated and ratified within Computer Science TPR Guidelines.

II. <u>Tenure, Promotion and Retention Committee Membership</u>

The Division TPR Committee consists of tenured faculty who have a primary appointment in the Division and who hold the rank of Professor, exclusive of School Officers (Director, Division Chairs, and Chair of the Faculty of Instruction). If there are fewer than three Professors eligible to serve on the TPR Committee, then faculty at the rank of Professor (or Associate Professor, if the case only involves tenure and/or promotion to Associate Professor) in any School Division or University Department, excluding School Officers, may be nominated and elected, by all Professors of the School, to serve on the TPR Committee for one year. The TPR Committee will elect its Chair from members of the Committee who have a primary appointment in the Division.

III. <u>Areas of Evaluation</u>

Consistent with the mission of Clemson University, faculty of the Division have four primary responsibilities: teaching, research, service, and mentorship.

---

[1] Approved by the faculty of the Division of Computer Science, School of Computing as of March 1, 2022.

Teaching

Teaching is one of the essential responsibilities of all faculty members. Promotion to any rank and/or tenure requires demonstrated effectiveness as a teacher. Evaluation will use the following major activities among others:

- classroom teaching,
- writing textbooks, lab manuals, lecture notes or class materials,
- developing new courses, curricula or program,
- directing lab assistants,
- experimenting with innovative teaching methods, and
- participating in university-sponsored teaching development activities.

An effective teacher has a good grasp of the subject, makes efforts to organize and present lectures in a manner useful to students, is responsive to student questions and difficulties and is reasonably available to students outside classroom hours. Teaching effectiveness will be assessed by measures such as student evaluations, exit interviews of graduates, alumni evaluations, peer evaluations of instruction, seminar talks, classroom visits, grade distributions, and course portfolios. A course portfolio documents the course content and organization, and should include a syllabus, tests, quizzes, handouts, and any information about the course that is available on the web. The course assignments, course loads and faculty areas of expertise will be factored into evaluation of teaching.

Research/Scholarly Activities

A fundamental criterion to be considered in retention, tenure and promotion decisions is a faculty member's performance in, and commitment to, scholarship, including research and other creative endeavors. The measure of performance in this category is the significance of the contributions to the discipline as judged by peers. For promotion to any level a faculty member should have a record of producing original work of quality and quantity comparable to that of colleagues of the same rank or higher ranked peer institutions.

Research and scholarly activities include any activity that extends the body of knowledge in computing and application disciplines. These activities should be evidenced by refereed publications in research journals, professional conference proceedings, books, book chapters, reviews, invited presentations, or by the development of innovative and widely used software systems or patents. It is important to point out that proper evaluation by the TPR Committee requires the results of the research or scholarly activity to be available in a complete and carefully written form.

Because the evaluation of research and scholarly publications is based on their significance to the discipline, as judged by peers, the value of different publications will not be considered equally by the TPR Committee. In the absence of evidence to the contrary, a research or scholarly paper will

be valued according to the characteristics of the publication in which it appears. In this regard, the highest level of peer evaluation is usually associated with the refereed research journals and conference proceedings of the discipline. While both the quantity and quality of publications will be considered, quality will be the primary consideration. The quality of a publication can be measured by acceptance rate of journal and conference, citations, and other means that can be used to demonstrate the importance and impact of the publication.

Research activities include the effort to obtain external funding to support research. The evaluation is based on the amount of award funding, the purpose of the funding (e.g. research, equipment or travel) and whether the funding is competitive and student support is generated.

Service

All faculty members will normally have a service obligation as a part of their assigned duties. Service activities include

- any activity related to School, College or University committees or other administrative work,
- participation in professional organizations, special lectures, workshops, or demonstrations,
- participation as a reviewer or editor of a professional publication, or reviewer for research proposals,
- outreach that promote computing or application disciplines at the local or national level, and
- service to the State of South Carolina and the United State of America.

In general, service contributions beyond those assigned, especially those that lead to a high level of external peer recognition, are more important in establishing an excellent record of service.

Student Mentoring

Mentorship is an important duty and an expectation of all faculty. While all faculty are primarily generally expected to mentor graduate students in their research endeavors, mentorship effort at the undergraduate and postdoctoral levels also contribute positively towards a faculty member's mentorship portfolio.

Mentorship is assessed with measurements such as publications co-authored with students, the number of Ph.D. and Masters-level students for whom a faculty member serves as research advisor or member of an advisory committee, supervision of student project teams (e.g., for Creative Inquiry, or for student research competitions), supervision of undergraduate honors theses, honors and awards earned by student mentees and their projects, and leadership in advising student organizations.

IV. <u>Guidelines for Retention Decisions</u>

A decision to retain an untenured faculty member indicates satisfactory job performance and, for faculty at the rank of Assistant Professor or above, the potential for having tenure awarded at the end of the probationary period. A decision to retain an untenured faculty member is the result of a less than satisfactory evaluation and will be accompanied by a list of specific deficiencies and recommendations for improvement.

V. <u>Guidelines for Tenure Decisions</u>

In order to be awarded tenure, a faculty member should have made significant accomplishments and contributions to the School, College and University, consistent with their distribution of assigned responsibilities. Contributions in areas that go beyond the assigned responsibilities are recognized as positive factors but do not reduce the obligations that form the basic assignment. Normally, in order to be awarded tenure, a faculty member should have attained the level of achievement usually required for promotion to Associate Professor

VI. <u>Guidelines for Promotion Decisions</u>

Promotion to Associate Professor

Promotion to the rank of Associate Professor is given in recognition of performance that is considered to be comparable to that of assistant professors who are being promoted to associate professor at same or higher ranked peer institutions. Good performance is expected of an assistant professor in order to be retained at that rank. Promotion to Associate Professor requires effectiveness in teaching and research, and national peer recognition of scholarly and professional accomplishments in computing.

Performance in teaching/mentorship and research/scholarly activity is normally weighted much more heavily than performance in service activities in the evaluation of a candidate's overall performance. It is important that the TPR Committee be presented with a clear record that will enable members to evaluate the candidate's performance in each of these areas.

Evidence of effectiveness in teaching may include consistently high ratings on student course evaluations and peer/administrative teaching evaluations, the design and implementation of new courses, authorship of textbooks, and special awards of teaching recognition.

A successful candidate is expected to show evidence of effective student mentorship, particularly at the graduate level. Specifically, the candidate should show evidence of success in graduating Ph.D. students or advising Ph.D. students who are making good progress towards graduation, as measured by publications and completion of program milestones such as the portfolio and dissertation proposal requirements.

Evidence of effectiveness in research includes publications in refereed journals, conference proceedings, books, and book chapters. Dissertations from supervised doctoral students, the issuance of patents, the achievement of special awards, and citations of one's research are also considered. It is expected that the typical successful candidate will have multiple refereed publications in most years. Both singly and co-authored publications are encouraged. It is important for a faculty member to co-author publications with their students.

An essential component of evidence of effectiveness in research includes funding of research proposals by external funding agencies. It is expected that the typical successful candidate will have secured external research funding as a PI or co-PI with other faculty.

Recognition of an established base of scholarly contribution should extend nationally and internationally. External letters of evaluation from senior researchers at same or higher rank peer institutions are required.

Promotion to Professor

Promotion to Professor is based on the excellent performance as a leader in one or more computing disciplines. As with promotion to Associate Professor, promotion to the rank of Professor is based primarily on performance that is comparable to that of Associate Professors who are being promoted to Professor at same or higher rank peer institutions. Letters of recommendation by senior researchers outside Clemson University are required.

A candidate will have achieved recognition for an international reputation in research through a significant leadership role in the development of a field of study in computing and application disciplines, as evidenced by publications, literature citations, published reviews of one's work, invited presentations, memberships on national level committees or advisory panels, editorships of professional publications.

It is expected that a candidate for promotion for Professor will have a demonstrated record of leadership in obtaining competitive external funding for research. This record should include evidence of the ability to obtain funding through multiple awards over multiple years.

It is expected that a candidate for promotion for professor will attract graduate students, new faculty and visiting scholars to the School for collaborative work. It is expected that they will have excelled in the mentoring of Ph.D. students, the direction of graduate students on research projects, leadership of seminar groups or leadership in some field of study on a national level.

It is expected that a candidate for promotion to Professor will have established a record of consistently high quality in teaching. Normally, the candidate will have also participated in the creation and implementation of one or more new courses and will have played a role in the development of new curricula and/or new programs of study. The evaluation of teaching performance for promotion to Professor will include the same student, peer, and administrative evaluations as for other TPR actions.

Moreover, promotion to Professor requires a consistent record of service, either to the School, the College, the University, the State, and the Nation or to a particular community of computing scholars.

Promotion to Research Assistant Professor, Associate Professor and Professor

Promotion to research faculty is given in recognition of research performance that is considered to be comparable to that of tenure track/tenured faculty members with the same rank.

VII. <u>Changing Guidelines</u>

It is important to recognize that as the School, College and the University change their goals over time these Guidelines for Tenure, Promotion and Retention must also change to better reflect current realities. Consequently, these Guidelines represent a moving and evolving target. The standards that may have existed at the time a faculty member was hired are not frozen in time for that person. Rather, it is expected that the faculty member will similarly change with the times and keep current as well as possible with this moving target. However, all evaluations for tenure, promotion and retention must take into account the conditions that existed at the time the faculty member was hired and during the first several years of employment.

VIII. <u>Procedures</u>

The School procedures for tenure, promotion and retention decisions are as follows. Each candidate is responsible for furnishing up-to-date information in support of tenure, promotion or retention in the format specified by the University and the College. Each faculty member needs to follow the University timeline to submit request files to initial the procedures.

Retention and Evaluation of Untenured Tenure-Track Faculty

A recommendation on the retention of each untenured tenure-track faculty member will be made each year, except during the penultimate year of the probationary period, when a tenure recommendation and promotion must be made. The annual evaluation will conclude with an indication as to what further accomplishments and improvements are necessary for a positive tenure recommendation. In the penultimate year, based on a comprehensive portfolio, the Division Chair, School Director and the TPR Committee will make independent evaluations and make their recommendations to the Dean of the College.

Tenure and Promotion of Faculty

A faculty member who wishes to be considered for tenure and/or promotion during a particular academic year must notify the Division Chair, School Director and TPR Committee Chair by end of July of the previous academic year. Each candidate will submit a comprehensive portfolio and

names of their chosen external reviewers to the TPR Committee by the end of July before the academic year when they wish to be considered for tenure or promotion. Each candidate will follow the timeline specified by School, College and University every year.

All relevant information considered by the TPR Committee will be made available to the candidate for inspection and, if so desired by the candidate, for comment. The only exceptions to this policy are letters of recommendation, which are confidential.

Tenure and Appointment of New Faculty at the Rank of Associate Professor or Professor

It is expected that newly hired faculty will satisfy the tenure and promotion expectations in this document, at a minimum, to be appointed with or without tenure at the rank of Associate Professor or Professor.

For newly hired faculty, the Division Chair and the TPR Committee will make independent evaluations and make their recommendations to the School Director.

Promotion of Research Faculty

The candidate who would like to be promoted to a higher rank will notify the TPR Committee Chair, the Division Chair, and the School Director. The Division Chair and the TPR Committee will independently evaluate the package and make the recommendation to School Director, who will make the final decision.

Post-Tenure Review (PTR)

Post tenure review serves to rigorously evaluate professional contributions of tenured faculty, ensures that all faculty members serve the needs of the students and the institution, and that excellent faculty members are identified and rewarded.

Whenever any faculty member is scheduled for regular post-tenure review or in a period of post-tenure review remediation, a PTR Committee separate from the regular TPR Committee will be constituted. The PTR Committee will be composed of all tenured faculty members with a primary appointment in the Division of Computer Science and who are not being reviewed in the current year, excluding School Officers. If fewer than three members are eligible to serve on the PTR Committee then tenured faculty from any School Division or University Department will be nominated and elected to serve on the PTR Committee for one year at a meeting of all tenured Voting Faculty in the School, so that the committee consists of three members. This committee functions in accordance with the Guidelines and Procedures for PTR and makes recommendations to the Division Chair, School Director and the Dean on the professional contributions of each Faculty member undergoing post-tenure review. The PTR Committee will elect its Chair from the members of the Committee.

Procedures for PTR shall follow these guidelines:

- All faculty members who hold a tenured faculty position shall be subject to PTR generally every five years, beginning at the time that tenure is granted. Promotion during that period does not alter the schedule for review. PTR covering the five-year period is conducted during the Fall semester of the sixth year, when one or more faculty members is scheduled for review. The year or years in which a faculty member is on sabbatical, unpaid leave, and/or extended sick leave shall not be counted in the review period.
- Post tenure reviews are linked to the Annual Reviews and goals outlined by the Division Chair, but the Division Chair, School Director, and the Dean must not be involved directly in the peer review process at the Division level.
- The PTR committee reviews the ratings received on the most recent available series of five years of annual performance reviews. All tenured faculty members receiving no more than one (of five) annual performance rating of "fair," "marginal," or "unsatisfactory" in Faculty Manual's Part I of the Post Tenure Review process receive a Post-Tenure Review rating of "satisfactory." These faculty members are thereby exempt from Part II of Post-Tenure Review. All tenured faculty members receiving two or more annual performance ratings of "fair," "marginal," or "unsatisfactory" will be reviewed under the Faculty Manual's Part II of PTR.
- To ensure adequate external representation in the Part II PTR process, the PTR Committee will solicit four (4) reference letters submitted from outside of Clemson University on each individual under Part II review. The faculty under Part II review will be requested to provide a list of at least four references familiar with their work. Two of these references will be requested to provide letters for PTR review by the chair of the PTR Committee. Two (2) other letters will be solicited by the Chair of the PTR Committee from the individuals outside of Clemson University who have a similar expertise to that of the faculty subject to the Part II review. The academic rank of these references should not be lower than that of the individual subject to Part II PTR. Part II PTR and evaluations should be performed in accordance with the procedures outlined in the Faculty Manual. With these reference letters as guidance, the PTR Committee will assign the faculty subject to Part II review a rating of "satisfactory" or "unsatisfactory" based on expectations in research, teaching, service, and mentoring commensurate with the expectations associated with promotion to the faculty's current rank.
- Individuals who receive a rating of "unsatisfactory" must be given a period of remediation to correct deficiencies detailed in the PTR reports. The Division Chair, in consultation with the PTR committee and the faculty member, shall provide a list of specific goals and measurable outcomes that the faculty member should achieve in each of the three calendar years following the date of formal notification of the unsatisfactory outcome. The School Director has the option of endorsing the recommendation of the Chair, or adding a separate review and recommendation.

Emendation of the Guidelines

These guidelines may be amended by a majority vote of the Division faculty.