

Policies and Procedures for Faculty Evaluation, Promotion, and Tenure

Department of Philosophy
USC Columbia

These criteria fall under the purview of the October 5, 2012 *Faculty Manual*.

Approved as amended by the Philosophy Faculty: 21 November, 2013
Approved by UCTP - October 16, 2013

1. Preamble

As a core discipline of the liberal arts, philosophy involves the critical examination or development of ideas, values, practices, and policies associated with the full range of topics addressed by a modern comprehensive research university. The mission of the Department of Philosophy includes promoting and supporting such critical examination and development. Activities advancing this mission include original and creative research, education of undergraduate and graduate students, training of professionals in practice settings, and service to the university, the broader community, and national and international societies, organizations, and government bodies.

Philosophical research covers a broad array of topics, uses diverse methods, and involves diverse forums and products for presenting the results of research. We thus adopt a broad view of philosophical research, following the American Philosophical Association's statement "*Research in Philosophy*":¹

Research in philosophy is highly diverse, reflecting the diversity of ... kinds of inquiry the discipline subsumes.

Some research in philosophy deals with topics not investigated (or only investigated in limited ways) in other disciplines: for example, truth and knowledge; morality and value; mind, action and language; and the ideas of God, the soul and immortality. Other research deals with various forms of human experience and activity, often under the rubric of "philosophy of X": for example, art, religion, language, science, mathematics, law and politics. Philosophical research also deals with the understanding and assessment of aspects of the thinking of those who have contributed significantly to developments in the history of philosophy or of human thought. Other work in philosophy deals with problems of social policy, normative theory and value theory on a more applied level. The possible ways of pursuing and contributing to these and other such kinds of inquiry are legion, and continue to increase as the discipline grows and evolves.

¹ Committee on the Status and Future of the Profession (1996), "*Research in Philosophy*", *Proceedings and Addresses of the American Philosophical Association*: 70: 119–121.

Methodologically, philosophical research generally involves critical reflection with a view toward clarifying essential concepts, identifying discrepancies or inconsistencies, facilitating systematic understanding, developing more fitting synthetic accounts, or improving policies or practices in professional settings. It is often ‘internal’ – directly engaging the work of other philosophers – but it may also be advanced in interdisciplinary settings, involving dialogue with scientists and professionals in their practice settings, with other humanists outside the discipline of philosophy, with artists, or others. The department values and recognizes the importance of interdisciplinary and multi-disciplinary work.

Reflecting the diversity noted above, philosophical research is communicated in a variety of ways, traditionally focusing on the publication of both invited and peer-reviewed printed articles, chapters, and books, but also including seminars, colloquia, and electronic communications. It may also involve policy development or collaborations oriented toward improvement of practices in professional settings. The department is committed to supporting scholarship in its various forms and acknowledges that substantial effort is required to carry out philosophical research in its various forms. The department also recognizes that the formulation and development of grant proposals can, but need not, be an important component of a research program in philosophy, and that the drafting of the grant proposal, extramural funding of a grant, and the research activity associated with that grant, may count as evidence of research.

Our department evaluates scholarship according to its quality and impact, not according to quantitative measures of productivity alone. Some philosophical projects require extensive time for research and writing, and it is the nature of such projects to require a number of years from inception to publication. Even in the case of such long-term projects, the department bases its evaluations of faculty members’ research on demonstrable and substantial progress, in the form of publication, presentation, and other substantial professional, research-related, activities.

Our department also adopts a broad view of teaching, following the American Philosophical Association’s statement “*The Teaching of Philosophy*”:²

The study of philosophy makes a contribution that is central to the educational enterprise through its demands upon and refinement of a broad range of reasoning skills and intellectual abilities. This centrality endows the preservation and enhancement of the quality of education in philosophy with particular importance....

Philosophical education involves far more than imparting of information about figures and developments in the history of philosophy, training in the latest techniques, getting students to learn the correct answers to philosophical questions, or even teaching them about alternative possible answers to these questions. The development of an appreciation and grasp of philosophical methods, issues and traditions is an important part of it; and another is the cultivation of students’ analytical, critical, interpretive and evaluative abilities in thinking about a variety of kinds of problems, historical texts, and issues....

The primary criteria in terms of which philosophy teachers and courses should be evaluated are indicated by the characterization of “Philosophical Education” above. They defy precise measurement, and must not be reduced to quantitative measures of

2 Committee on Teaching Philosophy (1995), “*The Teaching of Philosophy*”, *Proceedings and Addresses of the American Philosophical Association*: 69, 96-100.

any kind.

Our department values service to the department, university, national and international professional organizations, the broader public, and government. We also recognize that, in some cases, it may be difficult to draw sharp distinctions among research, teaching, and service. While our guidelines and criteria address research, teaching, and service separately, and evaluation of candidates must proceed in that fashion, we recognize that some activities contribute to more than one category.

The Department of Philosophy intends that the procedures and criteria set forth below shall conform to the University of South Carolina *Faculty Manual* (October 5, 2012), which serves as the ultimate authority governing promotion and tenure at the university. The procedures and criteria set forth below are meant to explain how the basic principles of university policy are understood and applied within the Department of Philosophy. These departmental procedures and criteria are aimed at several audiences: candidates for promotion and tenure, voting faculty, administrators and faculty outside the department who will be involved in the process, and outside evaluators.

2. Procedures and Regulations

2.1. The Tenure and Promotion Committee: Membership and Duties.

- 2.1.1. The Departmental Committee for Tenure and Promotion (DCTP) advises the departmental chair on questions concerning evaluation of tenure-track personnel and tenure and promotion, in accordance with the rules and regulations of the university and the College of Arts and Sciences.
- 2.1.2. All active tenured members of the department are *de facto* members of the DCTP and, when eligible, are expected to participate fully in its deliberations and duties.
- 2.1.3. By the first weekday of April of every academic year, the DCTP will select a chair of the committee whose term begins April 15 and ends the following April 15. Selection is by majority vote. It is the responsibility of the chair of DCTP to be familiar with all guidelines, deadlines, and procedures of the department, college, and university regarding evaluation of faculty, third-year review, tenure and promotion, and post-tenure review, and, in consultation with the departmental chair, to ensure that the committee performs its duties in a timely manner.
- 2.1.4. The DCTP conducts an annual review of all members of faculty in accordance with the rules and regulations of the University, including the mandated formal third-year review for all tenure-track Assistant Professors and post-tenure review of tenured faculty. All annual reviews are forwarded to the departmental chair.
- 2.1.5. The DCTP conducts, at appropriate times during the academic year and in accordance with the rules and regulations of the university and the directives and timetables of the College of Arts and Sciences and the University Committee on Tenure and Promotion, evaluation of files put forward for promotion, tenure,

third-year review, and post-tenure review of faculty members. Associate Professors on the committee do not participate in promotion reviews of faculty at the same or higher rank, nor post-tenure reviews of faculty at a higher rank.

- 2.1.6. Faculty are reviewed in one and only one manner each year. In particular, any third-year review, tenure or promotion proceedings, or post-tenure review, stand in for a normal annual evaluation.
- 2.1.7. The DCTP aids the departmental chair as needed to ensure the collection of materials (such as peer teaching evaluations) required for faculty evaluation.

2.2. *Compiling and Evaluating the Candidate's Files*

- 2.2.1. A normal annual review requires only the Faculty Report of Activities, with any required supporting documentation.
- 2.2.2. It is the responsibility of the chair of the DCTP to advise candidates undergoing third-year review or post-tenure review, as well as candidates for tenure and promotion, on the organization of the file, to make the candidate aware of all relevant deadlines, and to ensure that the candidate is made aware of the guidelines under which the file will be evaluated.
- 2.2.3. The DCTP prepares comprehensive summaries of all available student evaluations of the candidate's classes, and these summaries become part of the candidate's file. The department expects that all classes taught by a candidate since the candidate's most recent tenure, promotion, or post-tenure review (or hiring if none of the preceding has yet occurred), will be included.
- 2.2.4. The DCTP collects all available peer evaluations of teaching, which also become part of the candidate's file. It is expected that that all Assistant Professors will receive a peer evaluation at least once per year, that all Associate and Full Professors will receive a peer evaluation at least once every three semesters, and that all such evaluations since the candidate's most recent tenure, promotion, or post-tenure review (or hiring if none of the preceding has yet occurred), will be included in the candidate's file.
- 2.2.5. The deadlines for submission are set by the university, and it is the candidate's responsibility to meet those deadlines. Failure of a potential candidate to submit a file by the deadline will be interpreted as a request by the potential candidate not to be considered.
- 2.2.6. The DCTP selects outside evaluators according to the following requirements and procedures:
 - 2.2.6.1. A candidate's file must include letters from at least five qualified and impartial evaluators who are outside of the university (i.e., do not hold any

position or formal association with the University of South Carolina).

- 2.2.6.2. Candidates may indicate to the DCTP, through written communication with the chair of the DCTP, any potential outside reviewers whose bias might compromise his or her ability to evaluate the candidate's work fairly. It is the responsibility of the chair of DCTP to solicit any such names from the candidate and to share any such written communication with the voting members of the DCTP prior to any solicitation of outside evaluators.
- 2.2.6.3. The DCTP is responsible for nominating at least five outside evaluators who are qualified by rank, expertise, and impartiality to evaluate the candidate's work. Outside evaluators must have a strong record of scholarship, and will normally have an appointment at a peer or aspirant academic or other research institution.
- 2.2.6.4. Outside evaluators must not have close personal and professional ties to the candidate. Co-authorship or other close research collaboration is regarded as disqualifying an outside evaluator. Evaluators will be asked to include in their letter a brief statement explaining the nature of their relationship, if any, with the candidate.
- 2.2.6.5. Incidental professional contact that does not rise to the level of collaboration does not normally, of itself, constitute a close professional tie for purposes of Section 2.2.6.4. For example, having met at a professional meeting, attended a talk, published a paper in a journal edited by the evaluator, and other professional contact that would not normally be seen as collaboration, will not exclude an outside reviewer. However, all other things being equal, potential outside evaluators with fewer such contacts are preferred over those with more.
- 2.2.6.6. Names of potential outside evaluators will not be solicited from the candidate, nor may the candidate submit any names of potential outside evaluators beyond those applicable through Section 2.2.6.2.
- 2.2.6.7. The chair of DCTP, in consultation with the full DCTP and the departmental chair, solicits outside evaluators from the list of nominees and requests more nominees as necessary. The chair of DCTP must retain copies of correspondence with outside evaluators.
- 2.2.6.8. Outside evaluators will be asked to evaluate, in light of the criteria set forth in this document, the quality and influence of the candidate's scholarship, the candidate's actual and potential reputation in the profession, and potential quality and influence of the candidate's future plans for research.
- 2.2.6.9. A copy of the evaluator's curriculum vitae, as well as correspondence between the chair of DCTP and the evaluator, will be submitted with the

evaluator's report on the candidate, which should take the form of a detailed written, letter addressed to the chair of the DCTP.

- 2.2.6.10. Letters from outside evaluators should be in the file at least two weeks prior to any vote. Letters arriving after this time but before the vote may be included if there is a majority vote of the DCTP in favor of including the letter.
- 2.2.6.11. The names of outside evaluators and the content of their evaluations are strictly confidential among the voting members of the DCTP to the fullest extent allowed by law and university policy.

2.2.7. Faculty with Joint Appointments

- 2.2.7.1. Candidates with a primary appointment in the Department of Philosophy will be evaluated according to this department's criteria and procedures.
- 2.2.7.2. Eligible faculty in the secondary unit (normally, those who would be voting members of the DCTP according to Section 2.3.1, including the chair of the secondary unit) will be asked to submit a list of up to three qualified outside evaluators (in accordance with the guidelines in 2.2.6), from which at least one and no more than two will be selected by the DCTP.
- 2.2.7.3. Eligible faculty in the secondary unit will be given the opportunity to comment on the final list of outside evaluators compiled by the DCTP.
- 2.2.7.4. The names of the outside evaluators selected, and the content of their evaluations, is strictly confidential among the voting members of the DCTP and the eligible faculty in the secondary unit, to the fullest extent allowed by law and university policy.
- 2.2.7.5. Eligible faculty in the secondary unit have access to the candidate's file and will be invited to submit evidence and a single joint letter evaluating the candidate's file (to be submitted at least five working days in advance of the primary unit vote). Such letters are treated as confidential in the same manner as letter from outside evaluators (see 2.2.6.11). Any such letter will become part of the candidate's file.

2.3. Evaluation and Voting by DCTP and Tenured Faculty

2.3.1. Voting Faculty

- 2.3.1.1. Only faculty tenured in the Department of Philosophy whose rank is higher than that of the candidate are eligible to vote on that candidate's promotion.
- 2.3.1.2. All faculty tenured in the Department of Philosophy are eligible to vote on

tenure cases.

- 2.3.1.3. Anyone eligible to vote who has a conflict of interest that could affect his or her objectivity is not eligible to vote and is not permitted to view the candidate's file at any stage of the process after it has been submitted to the DCTP. It is the responsibility of the departmental chair, in consultation with college and other university officials, to make the ultimate decision about eligibility to vote. The existence of a familial relationship with the candidate always constitutes sufficient grounds for ineligibility.
- 2.3.2. The candidate's file will be made available to all of the voting members of the DCTP, and only those members, at least two weeks in advance of a meeting of all voting faculty to discuss the candidate. The file is to be considered confidential amongst the voting members of the DCTP to the fullest extent allowed by law and university policy.
- 2.3.3. The DCTP must meet to discuss the candidates and review their files. The departmental chair may be invited by the DCTP to attend this meeting as an observer.
- 2.3.4. Ballots are distributed to all voting faculty following the meeting of the DCTP in which the candidates were discussed. Ballots must be returned within two working days to the chair of the DCTP, who keeps them unopened until they are to be counted. Ballots must be returned using the double-envelope system. The voter places the ballot, with no identifying information, in an envelope. This envelope is placed inside another envelope which is sealed and signed across the seal by the voter.
- 2.3.5. Tenured faculty on leave have the right to vote during their absence, provided that they have notified the departmental chair of a desire to do so before the candidate's deadline for submitting files. The DCTP and the departmental chair will make every reasonable effort to provide information about the candidate's files to faculty on leave, while maintaining reasonable expectation of confidentiality of the material.
- 2.3.6. The departmental chair does not vote as a member of the DCTP.
- 2.3.7. Ballots for tenure and promotion to Associate Professor must indicate that no faculty member may be tenured at the rank of Assistant Professor.
- 2.3.8. Voting options are 'yes', 'no', and 'abstain'. Failure to vote does not count as an abstention. Departmental recommendations for or against tenure or promotion or successful review (third-year or post-tenure) are by majority vote of the eligible voting faculty. Abstentions and failures to vote are not counted in calculating the majority necessary for a decision. However, in the event that abstentions constitute the majority of the votes cast, the 'yes' votes among the votes cast will

not be considered to constitute a majority. An abstention should occur normally only in the event that the voter was unable to assess the candidate's file.

- 2.3.9. A tie is treated as a majority in favor, and the file moves forward.
- 2.3.10. In accordance with University rules and regulations, a written rationale specifying how the candidate does or does not meet the criteria for tenure and promotion must accompany all votes.
- 2.3.11. The votes are opened and counted by the DCTP chair and one other voting member of DCTP, together. In case the DCTP chair is unavailable, the DCTP chair may appoint a second voting member of the DCTP to count the votes. In any case, two voting members of DCTP must be present when the votes are counted.
- 2.3.12. The departmental chair must notify the candidate and the voting members of the DCTP of the recommendation for or against promotion or tenure. The outcome is confidential to the departmental chair, the voting members of the DCTP, and the candidate.
- 2.3.13. All materials in the candidate's tenure and promotion file and all discussions in the department's tenure and promotion meetings are confidential to the fullest extent allowed by law and university policy, as are the specific results of the voting (numbers voting 'yes', 'no', and 'abstain'), and are not to be divulged to candidates.
- 2.3.14. The outcome of the vote as well as all justifications become part of the candidate's file, and in the event of a positive vote (or a tie – see Section 2.3.9), the file is passed on to the departmental chair, who makes a recommendation for or against accompanied by a letter of justification. The file is then forwarded to the appropriate officials in the college.

2.4. *Tenure on Appointment*

- 2.4.1. Where there is exceptional merit involved or there may be competitive demand for a candidate recommended for faculty appointment, the candidate may be recommended for tenure on appointment. In such cases, eligible tenured faculty will be asked to vote on whether to recommend tenure on appointment.
- 2.4.2. No candidate shall be hired at the assistant professor level with tenure.
- 2.4.3. If over half the eligible faculty vote in favor, a positive recommendation shall be forwarded by the DCTP chair to the departmental chair for transmission to the appropriate offices and bodies.
- 2.4.4. A tied vote is treated as a majority in favor.

2.5. *Unfavorable departmental Recommendations*

- 2.5.1. Candidates dissatisfied with the department's recommendation may send a written request to the chair of the DCTP for the file to move forward, and should consult the *Faculty Manual* guidelines on grievance procedures.
- 2.5.2. An unfavorable recommendation is without prejudice with respect to future consideration, if the candidate is eligible for future consideration.

3. Expectations and Criteria Regarding Promotion and Tenure

3.1. *Terminology to describe the level of quality and influence in research, teaching, and service*

- ▲ 'Outstanding': performance is extremely high quality and far above the level expected by the department.
 - Research: A significant national – and for promotion to full professor, international – reputation is evident, with quality and quantity far above the level required for a 'Fair' rating.
 - Teaching: There is clear evidence of significant advancement of the teaching of philosophy in national or international venues, or the candidate has shown consistent excellence of teaching as evidenced, for example, by university-wide teaching awards. In addition, the candidate clearly meets the conditions for 'Excellent', 'Good', and 'Fair' ratings.
 - Service: A significant record of service with positive influence on a national or international scale is evident; in addition, the candidate's service within the university is exemplary in both quality and quantity.
- ▲ 'Excellent': performance is very high quality, and significantly exceeds the level expected annually by the department.
 - Research: There is clear evidence of a developing national – and for promotion to full professor, international – reputation, with quality significantly above the level required for a 'Fair' rating and quantity consistent with the near-term promise of a strong national – and for promotion to full professor, international – reputation. For promotion to full professor, there is already ample evidence of a strong national reputation.
 - Teaching: Classroom performance significantly exceeds the level of competence expected by the department, and the candidate engages in

teaching activities that go significantly beyond competent teaching . Candidates exhibit a record of very high quality teaching as evidenced by course evaluations, peer evaluations, enrollments, syllabi, and other relevant evidence. For promotion to full professor, there is, additionally, significant evidence of continued development as a teacher and of successful teaching and mentorship of students outside of the classroom (for example, in the form of graduate mentorship or supervising undergraduate research).

- Service: There is a consistent record of very strong service significantly beyond what is normally expected of faculty at the same rank as the candidate. In addition, a rating of ‘excellent’ normally requires some substantial service outside the department, especially at the rank of Professor.

▲ ‘Good’: performance is above the level expected annually by the department, with clear potential for future improvement.

- Research: The record of research generates the reasonable expectation of developing a national – and for promotion to Professor, international – reputation, with quality or quantity above that required for a ‘Fair’ rating. For promotion to full professor, there is already evidence of a national reputation.
- Teaching: Classroom performance is clearly above the level of competence required by the department. Candidates exhibit a record of effective teaching as evidenced by course evaluations, peer evaluations, enrollments, syllabi, and other relevant evidence.
- Service: There is a substantial and consistent record of effective service comparable in nature to what is normally expected of faculty at the same rank as the candidate.

▲ ‘Fair’: performance is clearly at the level minimally expected annually by the department, with promise of future improvement.

- Research: The candidate is producing research, and shows clear promise of meeting the criteria for a rating of ‘excellent’ at the time of next promotion or post-tenure review.
- Teaching: Candidates exhibit a record of competent teaching, as evidenced by course evaluations, peer evaluations, enrollments, syllabi, and other relevant evidence.

- Service: Candidates perform competently in their assigned service duties.

△ 'Unacceptable': performance falls below the level of competence.

3.2. Criteria for Promotion and Tenure

3.2.1. Tenure and Promotion to Associate Professor

- 3.2.1.1. The department expects candidates for promotion to Associate Professor with Tenure to demonstrate a record of at least 'excellent' in research and teaching and at least 'good' in service. Candidates are expected also to give evidence of progress toward establishing a national or international reputation in their field. The requirements for tenure are the same as those for promotion to Associate Professor.
- 3.2.1.2. The maximum probationary period for faculty appointed by the University of South Carolina to the rank of Assistant Professor is seven years of service. The mandatory decision year for tenure is the penultimate year of the probationary period, usually the sixth year of service.
- 3.2.1.3. Normally Assistant Professors will apply for promotion and tenure in their decision year and shall not be considered for tenure before their fourth year of service at the University of South Carolina.
- 3.2.1.4. In cases where individuals demonstrate exceptional scholarly merit, have considerable prior experience, or where there may be competitive demand for their services, the department may consider a candidate for tenure or promotion prior to the decision year.

3.2.2. Promotion to Full Professor

- 3.2.2.1. The Department of Philosophy expects candidates for promotion to Professor to demonstrate a record of at least 'excellent' in research and teaching, and at least 'good' in service.
- 3.2.2.2. In order to be promoted to Professor, the university expects a faculty member should normally hold a doctorate and have at least nine years of effective, relevant experience, which may include experience at another institution. The standards for promotion are the same regardless of time in rank as an Associate Professor.
- 3.2.2.3. Because the department's standards for promotion to Professor specify substantial additions to the record of excellence in research and a sustained record of effective teaching and service since promotion to Associate Professor, we expect that achieving such a record will normally involve

several years but we do not impose any strict requirements involving time in rank at the Associate Professor level.

3.3. *Expectations for Tenure and Promotion and Reviews*

3.3.1. The following description of expectations is to be interpreted in light of the Preamble, Section 1, of this document, and is intended to provide additional guidelines about how we understand the criteria specified in section 3.2.

3.3.2. Tenure and promotion are based on the philosophical research of the candidate, the candidate's performance of assigned teaching duties and other professional teaching-related activities, and the candidate's service activities.

3.3.3. Expectations Regarding Research

3.3.3.1. The quality and impact of the candidate's philosophical research (as understood in light of the Preamble, Section 1) are the most important factors. The Department of Philosophy recognizes a variety of ways in which philosophers make their research public but expects of all candidates that they make use of the normal or other equally or more effective means of disseminating research within their sub-discipline.

(a) As a guiding example, a case for promotion or tenure will quite often be made on the basis of a set of original research articles, published in highly visible refereed journals and edited volumes with national or international reputations. While no specific number of articles can be given as an absolute threshold, one substantial research article per year, published in a venue likely to generate an impact on the field, can be used as a rough guideline to what the department considers evidence of excellence in research.

(b) An original, peer-reviewed, research book published by a reputable press of national or international stature can provide the basis of a case for excellence in research. Depending on the nature of the book and particularly the extent and quality of research required to produce it, complementary research may form crucial supplementary evidence. Because of the length of time it can take scholarly presses to produce a book, the Department of Philosophy defines a 'published book' as the familiar bound volume, as well as a book manuscript that has been accepted for publication and is in press, as confirmed by the publisher, and available in a form that can be read by colleagues and circulated to external reviewers.

(c) The department recognizes other forms of research activity as legitimate grounds for tenure and promotion. Such work is to be judged on its own merits, by criteria appropriate to the activity and operative in the field.

Quantity and quality should be comparable to the expectations laid out above.

- (d) The department expects candidates to engage with the relevant research community in the form of conference presentations, consultation, colloquia, or other appropriate means of presenting research.
- (e) Additional research activity may constitute important supplementary evidence to the core research program.
- (f) Candidates are expected to make a case on the basis of a combination of evidence from a variety of types of research activity.

3.3.4. Expectations Regarding Teaching

- 3.3.4.1. Candidates are expected to exhibit a record of excellent teaching in their courses (as specified in section 3.2), supported by course evaluations, peer evaluations, enrollments, syllabi, and other relevant evidence.
- 3.3.4.2. Evaluation of classroom teaching should address the extent to which learning outcomes are achieved.
- 3.3.4.3. In addition, candidates may include evidence of teaching philosophy outside the classroom through student mentorship, research projects, service learning, public lectures, exhibits, or other means.

3.3.5. Expectations Regarding Service

- 3.3.5.1. Assistant Professors in the department of Philosophy are expected to perform effectively in their assigned duties to the department, college, and university.
- 3.3.5.2. The Department of Philosophy also values any service candidates may provide as philosophers to the profession or to the larger community. However, such service is not mandatory for receiving a rating of 'Fair' with respect to service.
- 3.3.5.3. Associate Professors and Full Professors are normally expected to take on a larger service burden within the department, college, or university. In addition, it is normally expected that they will engage in some form of service to the profession. This service can take a variety of forms, including, but not limited to, refereeing articles, books, or grant proposals, editorial work, organizing conferences and workshops, and serving on advisory boards.

3.4. *Reviews*

3.4.1. Annual Reviews

- 3.4.1.1. The DCTP is responsible for producing summaries of research, teaching, and service for each faculty member undergoing annual review.
- 3.4.1.2. In addition to factual summaries, the DCTP should evaluate each faculty member's performance, based on the criteria appropriate to the member's rank. The DCTP should decide on an appropriate rating ('Outstanding', 'Excellent', 'Good', 'Fair', 'Unacceptable') in teaching, research, and service.
- 3.4.1.3. The DCTP forwards both the summaries and proposed ratings for research, teaching, and service, to the departmental chair.
- 3.4.1.4. It is ultimately the responsibility of the departmental chair to accept or change the proposed ratings, justify these ratings, and forward the result, in the form of a letter, to each faculty member prior to the end of the Spring semester in each year.
- 3.4.1.5. Candidates who undergo some other form of review (third-year, post-tenure, tenure, or promotion) are exempted from annual review.

3.4.2. Third-Year Review

- 3.4.2.1. Candidates undergoing third-year review are evaluated by the DCTP based on their progress towards satisfying the criteria for tenure and promotion to Associate Professor.
- 3.4.2.2. The DCTP determines a proposed rating ('Outstanding', 'Excellent', 'Good', 'Fair', 'Unacceptable') for teaching, research, and service. The DCTP also formulates a brief justification for each rating.
- 3.4.2.3. In any area where the proposed rating is 'Unacceptable' or where the research rating is 'Fair' or 'Unacceptable', the DCTP will formulate proposed concrete strategies for improvement. The DCTP may choose to formulate proposed strategies for improvement in any other areas as well, regardless of the proposed rating.
- 3.4.2.4. These ratings, and justifications, and any suggestions for improvement, are forwarded to the departmental chair.
- 3.4.2.5. It is ultimately the responsibility of the departmental chair to accept or change the proposed ratings, justify these ratings, and, in consultation with college officials and following college and university guidelines regarding third-year review, forward the result, in the form of a letter, to the candidate.

- 3.4.2.6. In case the departmental chair changes a rating proposed by the DCTP, this change must be noted and justified in the chair's report to the college.
- 3.4.2.7. In the case of any rating of 'Unacceptable' or a rating of 'Fair' or 'Unacceptable' for research, the departmental chair's letter to the candidate must include concrete strategies for improvement.
- 3.4.2.8. A Third-Year Review is considered 'successful' if the candidate is rated at least 'Fair' in research, with clear promise and prospect of improvement to at least 'Excellent' by the time he or she comes up for tenure, and is given no more than one rating of 'Unacceptable'. In the case of any rating of unacceptable, there must be a clear promise and prospect of improvement.

3.4.3. Post-tenure Review

- 3.4.3.1. For post-tenure review, the departmental chair is considered a normal, voting, member of the DCTP.
- 3.4.3.2. Associate Professors undergoing post-tenure review are evaluated by the DCTP based on their progress towards satisfying the criteria for promotion to Full Professor.
- 3.4.3.3. Full Professors undergoing post-tenure review are evaluated by the DCTP based on their continued satisfaction of the criteria for promotion to Full Professor.
- 3.4.3.4. The DCTP determines a proposed rating ('Outstanding', 'Excellent', 'Good', 'Fair', 'Unacceptable') for teaching, research, and service. The DCTP also formulates a brief justification for each rating.
- 3.4.3.5. A Post-Tenure Review is rated as follows
 - (a) 'Superior': The candidate earns at least one rating above that required for promotion to current rank, and all others at least equal to that required for promotion to current rank.
 - (b) 'Satisfactory': The candidate earns no rating of 'Unacceptable'.
 - (c) 'Unsatisfactory': The candidate earns one or more ratings of 'Unacceptable'.
- 3.4.3.6. In the case of an unsatisfactory post-tenure review, the DCTP must formulate a development plan in accordance with the Faculty Manual.
- 3.4.3.7. The departmental chair will write a letter indicating and justifying the

results of the post-tenure review, including a development plan when necessary. In consultation with college officials and following college and university guidelines regarding post-tenure review, this letter will be forwarded to the candidate.

4. Compiling the File

4.1. Scope of Evidence

- 4.1.1. Past accomplishments: For tenure and promotion to Associate Professor, the department will take under consideration evidence from the candidate's whole record of research and scholarship, including evidence of achievements prior to appointment at the University of South Carolina. Evidence on teaching prior to appointment will not normally be included in the candidate's file.
- 4.1.2. For promotion to Full Professor, only evidence relating to research activity that occurred since tenure and promotion to Associate Professor should be included in the file. Evidence that was part of the case for tenure and promotion to Associate Professor will not be considered as part of the case for promotion to Full Professor.
- 4.1.3. Current and Future Research Plans: Candidates are expected to exhibit a record of consistent and coherent progress in their research and scholarship. All candidates must provide evidence of continuing scholarly activity, including a statement explaining work in progress and future research plans as part of the personal statement (Section 4.2) in the candidate's file.

4.2. Responsibilities of Candidates

4.2.1. Personal Statement

- 4.2.1.1. It is the responsibility of the candidates to prepare a personal statement that justifies the case for promotion or tenure and to prepare the file, including all relevant evidence as indicated below, to support this justification.
- 4.2.1.2. The personal statement should be addressed in clear fashion to non-specialists in the department, the administration, outside evaluators, and faculty in other disciplines involved in the evaluation process.
- 4.2.1.3. The statement should address such components of quality and impact as: the purpose and complexity of the research project; the scope, originality, and depth of scholarship; the reputation or prestige of the venue in which work appears; the size, diversity, and nature of audiences (e.g., local, national, or international); the process of internal and external peer review; and the specifics of contributions to collaborative projects. As appropriate, candidates should explain equivalencies or specific projects in comparison

with peer-reviewed research book or journal article.

- 4.2.1.4. The personal statement relating to research should include a statement on current work in progress and future plans for research. Evidence, including, but not limited to, unpublished manuscripts, grant proposals, and publication proposals, may be included in the candidate's file.
 - 4.2.1.5. The component of the personal statement relating to teaching should explain how the record of teaching meets the criteria for promotion or tenure. It should also explain clearly to non-specialists what subjects they teach and how they teach them and address any teaching in public venues beyond the university.
 - 4.2.1.6. The component of the personal statement relating to service should describe the relevant activities of the candidate relating to service to the department, university, professional organizations, and the society beyond the university and explain how these activities meet the criteria on service as stated above.
- 4.2.2. Compiling and Presenting Evidence
- 4.2.2.1. The department, and especially the Administrative Coordinator and the chair of the DCTP, will make reasonable efforts to help the candidate compile an effective file.
 - 4.2.2.2. Ultimately, except where noted otherwise, the responsibility for collecting and compiling evidence related to the file lies with the candidate.
 - 4.2.2.3. In collecting and compiling evidence, the candidate should follow all departmental, college, and university guidelines related to tenure and promotion procedures.

4.3. *Evidence Related to Research*

- 4.3.1. Copies of all published products of research. These copies will remain a permanent part of the file and will not be returned to the candidate.
- 4.3.2. A list of all published work, indicating the venue of publication and whether the work was peer-reviewed.
- 4.3.3. A list of all non-published research products or activities, such as colloquia given, workshops attended, professional development, consultation, policy statements, and expert testimony. Where applicable, the candidate should provide a title, date, venue, and printed copy if available. The candidate should also provide some description of the nature, scope, and outcome of the activity, if these things are not immediately apparent.

- 4.3.4. Copies of research-related grant proposals and other fund-raising initiative designed to support research. The candidate should provide an indication of the current status of the proposal as well as a description of the candidate's role both in writing the proposal and in carrying out the project.
- 4.3.5. Copies of published (including online) reviews of the candidate's work. Candidates may include evaluator's comments on grant proposals.
- 4.3.6. Honors and awards for research and scholarship.
- 4.3.7. Copies of work in progress that the candidate is willing to have the DCTP peruse and evaluate for the purpose of providing a broader context to the candidate's work and assessing the quality and effectiveness of future work.

4.4. *Evidence Related to Teaching*

- 4.4.1. A summary of qualitative and quantitative student evaluations, prepared by DCTP (required of all candidates). This summary of teaching evaluations must provide: an average rating of overall instructor performance for each course taught in the period under review, comparisons of the average rating of overall instructor performance in the evaluations from faculty who teach other sections of the course, or appropriately similar courses at the same level.
- 4.4.2. Available peer evaluations of classroom visits, collected by DCTP (required of all candidates).
- 4.4.3. Copies of student evaluations (required of all candidates).
- 4.4.4. List of classes taught at the University of South Carolina, with enrollment figures and distribution of final grades (required of all candidates).
- 4.4.5. Representative examples of class syllabi and examinations or assignments at the University of South Carolina (required of all candidates).
- 4.4.6. Graduate research supervision, mentoring, and advising: names of PhD and MA students supervised at the University of South Carolina, titles of dissertations and theses, and dates of completion. Include current students and working titles. Indicate director or reader.
- 4.4.7. Undergraduate research supervision, mentoring, and advising: names, titles of projects, and dates of completion for Magellan Scholars, Honors College and Senior Thesis students, service-learning projects supervised at the University of South Carolina, and any other supervised undergraduate research outside of a classroom context.
- 4.4.8. Planning and participation in educational outreach projects whose audience is

anything other than students taking a course taught by the candidate.

- 4.4.9. Copies of teaching-related grant proposals and other fund-raising initiative designed to support education (to include both education within the university and educational outreach). The candidate should provide an indication of the current status of the proposal as well as a description of the candidate's role both in writing the proposal and in carrying out the project. A statement about the educational benefits of the project may also be appropriate.
- 4.4.10. Evidence regarding the development of new courses and educational programs.
- 4.4.11. Evidence regarding the development of resources or materials for teaching.
- 4.4.12. Description of the candidate's participation in teaching workshops such as those sponsored by the Center for Teaching Excellence at the University of South Carolina.
- 4.4.13. Documented recognition from students, colleagues, community partners, and others for skill and dedication in teaching.
- 4.4.14. List and, where appropriate, description of Honors and awards for teaching.

4.5. *Evidence related to service*

- 4.5.1. Lists of departmental, college, and university committees upon which the candidate has served, with dates and positions as chair (required of all candidates).
- 4.5.2. Lists of service activities in professional organizations, with dates and positions (required of all candidates).
- 4.5.3. Description of administrative responsibilities in the department, college, or university with dates and positions.
- 4.5.4. Evidence related to program-building: initiation, development, and implementation.
- 4.5.5. Evidence of service and civic engagement activities outside the university and the profession – locally, regionally, nationally, and internationally – that the candidate deems relevant to the promotion and tenure decision.
- 4.5.6. Copies of service-related grant proposals and other fund-raising initiative designed to support service-related activities. The candidate should provide an indication of the current status of the proposal as well as a description of the candidate's role both in writing the proposal and in carrying out the project.

4.5.7. List and, where appropriate, description of honors and awards for service.