

## **Policies and Procedures for Faculty Evaluation, Tenure, and Promotion**

Department of Religious Studies  
The University of South Carolina-Columbia  
UCTP Approved – April 2019

*This document falls under the purview of the 19 October, 2018 USC-Columbia Faculty Manual*

The Department of Religious Studies at the University of South Carolina offers interdisciplinary approaches to the academic study of religious beliefs and practices, using a variety of theories and methods. The faculty of the Department recognize that the full understanding of a phenomenon as complex as religion requires a multiplicity of perspectives and strategies. We are therefore committed to forms of scholarly research and teaching ranging from creative engagement with a religious tradition or traditions to critical distance and analysis, and embracing the insights of disciplines as diverse as anthropology, art, film studies, geography, history, linguistics, literature, philosophy, psychology, sociology, and theology.

Underscoring the importance of this range and diversity, a recent examination of the different ways in which religions are researched and taught in contemporary university settings disclosed six "sites where religion and higher education naturally overlap": scholars of religion promote literacy concerning the world's many faiths; they encourage interfaith dialogue and etiquette; they explore the variety of ways in which human knowledge is understood, constructed, and pursued; they support civic engagement; they assist students in clarifying personal convictions; and they offer perspective on moral development and values (Douglas Jacobsen and Rhonda Hustedt Jacobsen, *No Longer Invisible: Religion in University Education* [Oxford University Press, 2012], 4-5). The faculty of our Department agree that "at a time when leaders in higher education are increasingly asking students to engage the large issues of life's meaning and to think critically and responsibly about their role in the world, religious studies offers unique opportunities .... If we truly wish for students to engage the tremendous variety of human understandings of life, death, suffering, love, and meaning, there is perhaps no more direct path than through the study of religion" ("The Religion Major and Liberal Education: A White Paper", *Religious Studies News* [October 2008, Vol. 23, No.4]).

*Research.* The Department supports scholarly research in many forms, and we evaluate such scholarship according to its quality and impact, not according to quantitative measures of productivity alone. We understand that the results of this research may be communicated in several ways, including not only the text-based publication of invited and peer-reviewed articles, chapters, and books, but also by means of seminars, colloquia, and electronic publications and communications. Our faculty also recognize that the formulation and development of grant proposals can be an important component of a research program and that the drafting of such a proposal, the funding of a grant, and the research activity associated with it may count as evidence of research.

*Teaching.* The Department places a strong emphasis on teaching. While the principal forum for instruction is the classroom, we are aware that teaching may include other means of transmitting knowledge, such as textbook development, participation in distributed learning efforts, media

interviews, and maintaining scholarly weblogs. Teaching also takes place in the mentoring of students and their development as scholars, as well as in academic advising, directing independent studies, and leading courses that involve study abroad and other off-campus opportunities.

*Service.* The Department values a wide range of forms of service, whether to the Department, the College of Arts and Sciences, or the University; as well as to professional organizations, the broader public, and government. We recognize that it is sometimes difficult to draw sharp distinctions among the categories of research, teaching, and service. While our guidelines and criteria for promotion and tenure address these separately, and while the evaluation of candidates necessarily proceeds with these distinctions in mind, we recognize that some activities may contribute to more than one category.

The Department of Religious Studies intends for the procedures and criteria set forth below to conform to the University of South Carolina *Faculty Manual* (latest revision: 19 October 2018). This manual serves as the ultimate authority governing promotion and tenure at the University. The following description of procedures, regulations, and criteria is meant to explain how the basic principles of University policy are understood and applied by the faculty of the Department of Religious Studies. This information is intended for several audiences: candidates for tenure and/or promotion, candidates for third-year or post-tenure reviews, voting faculty, administrators and faculty outside the Department who may be involved in the process, and outside evaluators.

## **1. Procedures and Regulations**

### *1.1. Unit Tenure and Promotion Committee: Membership and Duties.*

1.1.1. The Department Committee for Tenure and Promotion (hereafter the DCTP) advises the Department chair on questions concerning the evaluation, tenure, and promotion of tenure-track personnel, in accordance with the rules and regulations of the University and the College of Arts and Sciences.

1.1.2. All active tenured members of the department are *de facto* members of the DCTP and, unless ineligible (see, for example, 1.3.1.3. below), are expected to participate fully in its deliberations and duties.

1.1.3. Until the Department is able to populate its DCTP with a minimum of five tenured faculty, the Department chair, in consultation with the Dean of the College of Arts and Sciences, will invite appropriately ranked faculty from other departments to serve on *ad hoc* tenure and promotion committees when tenure-track Department faculty present themselves as candidates for third-year review or for tenure and/or promotion. The chair of such a committee should normally be a member of the Department.

1.1.4. Post-tenure reviews of Department faculty require a minimum DCTP membership of three tenured faculty members; it is not generally expected that post-tenure review will require the appointment of faculty from outside the Department.

1.1.5. By the first weekday of April of every academic year, the DCTP will select a chair, whose term begins April 15 and ends the following April 15. Selection is by majority vote. It is the responsibility of the chair of the DCTP to be familiar with all the guidelines, deadlines, and procedures of the Department, College, and University for third-year reviews, tenure and/or promotion proceedings, and post-tenure reviews; and, in consultation with the Department chair, to ensure that the DCTP performs its duties in a timely manner.

1.1.6. At appropriate times during the academic year, and in compliance 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, the DCTP conducts an evaluation of all files submitted for third-year review, tenure and/or promotion, and post-tenure review of tenure-track Department faculty. Associate Professors on the DCTP do not participate in promotion reviews of faculty at the same rank or higher or in post-tenure reviews of faculty at a higher rank.

1.1.7. Faculty are reviewed in only one manner each year. Third-year reviews, tenure and/or promotion proceedings, or post-tenure reviews replace annual reviews, which are otherwise undertaken by the Department chair in consultation with other tenured faculty in the Department.

1.1.8. The DCTP aids the Department chair as needed to ensure the collection of all materials (such as peer teaching evaluations) required for faculty evaluation.

## 1.2. *Compiling and Evaluating Candidates' Files*

1.2.1. It is the responsibility of the chair of the DCTP to advise candidates for tenure and/or promotion, as well as candidates undergoing third-year review or post-tenure review, on the organization of their files; to make these candidates aware of all relevant deadlines; and to ensure that they understand the guidelines under which the files will be evaluated.

1.2.2. The DCTP prepares comprehensive summaries of all the available student evaluations of a given candidate's courses, and these summaries become part of the candidate's file. The Department expects that summaries from all courses taught by a candidate since the candidate's most recent tenure, promotion, or post-tenure review (or date of hiring if none of the preceding has yet occurred) will be included.

1.2.3. The DCTP collects all available peer evaluations of teaching, and these also become part of the candidate's file. Assistant Professors will receive a peer evaluation at least once a year, and Associate and Full Professors at least once every two years. All such evaluations since the candidate's most recent tenure, promotion, or post-tenure review (or date of hiring if none of the preceding has yet occurred) will be included in the candidate's file.

1.2.4. The deadlines for submission of files 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 a given deadline will be interpreted as a request not to be considered.

1.2.5. Outside evaluators are selected in accordance with the following requirements and procedures:

1.2.5.1. A candidate's file must include letters from at least five qualified and impartial evaluators from outside the university (i.e., evaluators who do not hold any position or formal association with the University of South Carolina). These evaluators must hold a rank higher than that of the candidate and have a strong record of scholarly research, and they will normally have an appointment at a peer or aspirant academic research institution.

1.2.5.2. The selection of outside evaluators is made by the Department chair in consultation with appropriate faculty in a given candidate's field. Candidates may suggest the names of specialists in their fields, who in turn may be contacted by the Department chair for their recommendations concerning qualified evaluators, but candidates may not propose the names of outside evaluators.

1.2.5.3. Outside evaluators must not have close personal and professional ties to candidates. Serving as a candidate's academic advisor and co-authorship or other forms of research collaboration are regarded as disqualifying an outside evaluator. Evaluators will be asked to include in their letters a brief statement explaining the nature of their relationship, if any, with a candidate.

1.2.5.4. A candidate may indicate to the Department chair up to three potential outside evaluators whose bias might compromise their ability to evaluate the candidate's work fairly. Such indications are limited to cases of severe personal bias that would otherwise be unknown to the Department chair.

1.2.5.5. Incidental professional contact not rising to the level of collaboration does not in itself constitute a close professional tie. For example, a potential outside evaluator need not be excluded because of having attended a talk by the candidate at a professional meeting, or because a paper by the candidate was published in a journal edited by the evaluator. All things being equal, however, potential outside evaluators with fewer such contacts are preferred over those with more.

1.2.5.6. The Department chair, in consultation with the DCTP, contacts potential outside evaluators. Upon their agreement to serve as evaluators, the chair of the DCTP sends them the candidate's *curriculum vitae* together with copies of the candidate's publications and any other supporting research materials, including the candidate's personal statement regarding research.

1.2.5.7. In light of the criteria set forth below, outside evaluators are asked to provide a candid and thorough assessment of the quality and impact of the candidate's scholarship; the candidate's actual and potential reputation in the profession; and the potential quality and impact of the candidate's future plans for research.

1.2.5.8. A copy of an outside evaluator's *curriculum vitae*, as well as all correspondence between the evaluator and the Department chair or the chair of the

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

1.2.5.9. Letters from outside evaluators should be placed in a candidate's file at least two weeks prior to any scheduled vote.

1.2.5.10. The names of outside evaluators and the content of their evaluations are strictly confidential among the Department chair, the chair of the DCTP, and the voting members of the DCTP to the fullest extent allowed by law and University policy.

#### 1.2.6. Faculty with Joint Appointments

1.2.6.1. Candidates with a primary appointment in the Department of Religious Studies will be evaluated according to this Department's criteria and procedures.

1.2.6.2. Eligible faculty in the secondary unit (normally, those who are voting members of the secondary unit's committee on tenure and promotion, but also including the chair of that unit) will be asked to submit a list of up to three qualified outside evaluators (in accordance with the guidelines in 1.2.5 .1), from which at least one and no more than two will be selected by the Department chair.

1.2.6.3. Eligible faculty in the secondary unit will be given the opportunity to comment on the final list of outside evaluators compiled by the Department chair.

1.2.6.4. 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.

1.2.6.5. Eligible faculty in the secondary unit have access to the candidate's file and will be invited to submit a single joint letter evaluating the candidate's file, together with any supporting evidence, at least five working days in advance of the scheduled primary unit vote. Such letters are treated as confidential in the same manner as letters from outside evaluators (see 1.2.6.4). Any such letter will become part of the candidate's file.

### 1.3. *Voting by the DCTP*

#### 1.3.1. Voting Faculty

1.3.1.1. All faculty tenured in the Department of Religious Studies are eligible to vote on tenure cases.

1.3.1.2. Only faculty tenured in the Department of Religious Studies whose rank is higher than that of a candidate are eligible to vote on that candidate's promotion.

1.3.1.3. Faculty with a conflict of interest that could affect their objectivity are ineligible to vote and are not permitted to view a candidate's file after it has been

submitted to the DCTP. It is the responsibility of the Department chair, in consultation with College and other University officials, to make the ultimate decision about eligibility to vote. A familial relationship with a candidate always constitutes sufficient grounds for ineligibility.

1.3.2. A candidate's file will be made available to all voting members of the DCTP, and to those members only, at least two weeks in advance of a scheduled meeting of all voting faculty to discuss the candidate. The file is to be considered confidential among the voting members of the DCTP to the fullest extent allowed by law and university policy.

1.3.3. The DCTP must meet to discuss the candidates and review their files. The Department chair may attend this meeting as an observer, but does not vote as a member of the DCTP.

1.3.4. Ballots are distributed to all voting faculty following the meeting of the DCTP in which the candidate or 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 then placed inside another envelope, which is sealed and signed across the seal by the voter.

1.3.5. Tenured faculty on leave have the right to vote during their absence, provided they have notified the Department chair of a desire to do so before the candidate's deadline for submitting files.

1.3.6. Ballots for tenure and promotion to Associate Professor must indicate that no faculty member may be tenured at the rank of Assistant Professor.

1.3.7. The vote is to be "yes", "no", or "abstain". Failure to vote does not constitute an abstention. Department recommendations for or against tenure and/or promotion, or concerning whether a post-tenure review has been deemed successful or not, are by majority vote of the eligible voting faculty. Abstentions and failures to vote are not counted in calculating the majority needed for a decision. An abstention should occur normally only when the voter was unable to assess the candidate's file.

1.3.8. A tie is treated as a majority in favor, and the file moves forward.

1.3.9. In accordance with University rules and regulations, a written rationale specifying how the candidate does or does not meet the criteria for tenure and/or promotion must accompany every vote.

1.3.10. The ballots are opened and counted by the DCTP chair together with one other voting member of the DCTP. If the DCTP chair is unavailable, the DCTP chair may appoint a second voting member of the DCTP to assist in counting the votes. In any case, two voting members of the DCTP must be present when the votes are counted.

1.3.11. The DCTP chair notifies the Department chair of the results of the vote, and the Department chair in turn notifies the candidate and the voting members of the DCTP

of the recommendation for or against tenure and/or promotion, or in support or not of a successful third-year or post-tenure review. The outcome is confidential to the Department chair, the voting members of the DCTP, and the candidate.

1.3.12. All materials in the candidate's 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.

1.3.13. The outcome of the vote as well as all justifications become part of the candidate's file. If the vote is positive (or a tie; see 1.3.8), the file is given to the Department chair, who makes a recommendation for or against tenure and/or promotion, or in support or not of a successful third-year or post-tenure review, accompanied by a letter of justification. The file is then forwarded to the appropriate officials in the College.

#### 1.4. *Tenure upon Appointment*

1.4.1. In cases of exceptional merit or where there is a competitive demand for a candidate who has been recommended for appointment to the Department faculty, the candidate may be recommended for tenure upon appointment. In such cases, eligible tenured faculty will be asked to vote on whether to recommend tenure upon appointment.

1.4.2. No candidate shall be hired at the Assistant Professor level with tenure.

1.4.3. If over half the eligible faculty vote in favor, a positive recommendation shall be forwarded by the DCTP chair to the Department chair for transmission to the appropriate College and University offices and bodies.

1.4.4. A tied vote is treated as a majority in favor.

#### 1.5. *Unfavorable Department Recommendations*

1.5.1. 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.

1.5.2. An unfavorable recommendation is without prejudice to future consideration, if the candidate is eligible for future consideration.

## **2. Expectations and Criteria Regarding Promotion and Tenure**

### 2.1. *Terminology describing the levels of quality in research, teaching, and service*

"Outstanding": Performance is of an extremely high quality, well above the level expected by the Department.



*Research:* There is clear evidence of an already established national-and, for promotion to Professor, international-reputation, with both the quality and the quantity of research far above the level required for a rating of "Fair".

*Teaching:* The candidate has shown consistent excellence in teaching, as demonstrated, for example, by university-wide teaching awards; or there is clear evidence that the candidate is involved in advancing the teaching of religious studies in national or international venues; moreover, the candidate clearly meets all the conditions for ratings of "Excellent", "Good", and "Fair"

*Service:* There is clear evidence of a significant record of service that has had a positive impact on a national or international scale; in addition, the candidate's service within the University is exemplary in both quality and quantity.

"Excellent": Performance is of a very high quality.

*Research:* There is clear evidence of a developing national-and, for promotion to Professor, international-reputation, with quality significantly above the level required for a rating of "Fair", and with quantity consistent with the promise of a strong national-and, for promotion to Professor, international-reputation in the near future. For promotion to Professor, there is already ample evidence of a strong national reputation.

*Teaching:* Classroom performance significantly exceeds the level of competent teaching. Candidates exhibit a record of very high quality teaching as evidenced by student evaluations, peer evaluations, enrollments, syllabi, and other pertinent measures. For promotion to Professor, there must also be significant evidence of continued development as a teacher as well as successful teaching and mentorship of students outside the classroom (as, for example, in directing theses, supervising independent studies, advising Magellan scholars, etc.); moreover, the candidate clearly meets all the conditions for ratings of "Good", and "Fair".

*Service:* There is a consistent record of very strong service well 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 for those seeking or being reviewed at the rank of Professor.

"Good": Performance is at the level expected annually by the Department, with clear potential for future improvement.

*Research:* There is a reasonable expectation, based on the record of research, that the candidate will develop a national-and, for promotion to Professor, international-reputation, with quality or quantity above that required for a rating of "Fair". For promotion to Professor, there is already evidence of a national reputation.



*Teaching:* Classroom performance is above the level of competence required by the Department. Candidates exhibit a record of effective teaching as evidenced by student evaluations, peer evaluations, enrollments, syllabi, and other pertinent measures; moreover, the candidate clearly meets all the conditions for a rating of "Fair"

*Service:* There is a substantial and consistent record of effective service comparable to what is normally expected of faculty at the same rank as the candidate.

"Fair": Performance is at the minimal level expected annually by the Department, but there is promise of future improvement.

*Research:* Candidates are producing research and show clear promise of meeting the criteria for a rating of "excellent" at the time of their next promotion or post-tenure review.

*Teaching:* Candidates exhibit a record of competent teaching, as evidenced by student evaluations, peer evaluations, enrollments, syllabi, and other pertinent measures.

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

"Unacceptable": Performance falls below the level of minimal expectations.

## 2.2. *Criteria for Promotion and Tenure*

### 2.2.1. Tenure and Promotion to Associate Professor

2.2.1.1. The Department expects candidates for promotion to Associate Professor with tenure to have a record of at least "excellent" in research and at least "good" in teaching and service; or a record of at least "excellent" in teaching and at least "good" in research and service. Candidates are also expected to provide 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.

2.2.1.2. 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. Assistant Professors will normally apply for promotion and tenure in their decision year and will not be considered for tenure before their fourth year of service at the University of South Carolina.

2.2.1.3. If a candidate demonstrates exceptional scholarly merit or has had considerable prior experience, or if there is a competitive demand for the

candidate's services, the Department may consider the candidate for tenure or promotion prior to the decision year.

#### 2.2.2. Promotion to Full Professor

2.2.2.1. The University expects that candidates for promotion to Professor 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.

2.2.2.2. The Department expects candidates for promotion to Professor to have a record that is at least "excellent" in both research and teaching and at least "good" in service. Candidates should provide evidence of substantial additions to their record of research as well as continued high quality teaching since their promotion to Associate Professor. Establishing such a record will normally require several years, though the Department does not impose any strict requirements involving time in rank at the Associate Professor level.

#### *2.3. Expectations for Tenure and Promotion and for Third- Year and Post-Tenure Reviews*

2.3.1. The following description of expectations is intended to provide additional guidelines concerning how the faculty of the Department understand the criteria specified in section 2.2.

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

#### 2.3.3. Expectations Regarding Research

2.3.3.1. The Department recognizes a variety of ways in which scholars of religion make their research public. The quality and impact of a candidate's research are the most important considerations.

2.3.3.2. An original, peer-reviewed scholarly book, published by a reputable press with a national or international reputation, is often used in making a case for tenure and/or promotion. Depending on the nature of the book, and especially 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 publish a book, the Department defines a "published book" as either the familiar bound volume or a manuscript which has been accepted for publication and is in press, as confirmed by the publisher, and which is available in a form that can be read by faculty and administrators reviewing the candidate's file and circulated to outside evaluators.

2.3.3.3. A case for tenure and promotion can also be made based on a set of original scholarly articles published in highly visible refereed journals or edited

volumes having national or international reputations, meaning that the venues are recognized as an important locus of publication in an appropriate field or subfield, and recognized as such by relevant experts in the field, as indicated by qualified reviewers of the file. While no specific number of such articles is expected, at least one substantial research article per year, published in a venue likely to have an impact on the field, can be used as an approximate guideline as to what constitutes "excellent" research.

2.3.3.4. The Department recognizes other forms of research activity as legitimate grounds for tenure and/or promotion, including the following (in unranked and unweighted order): translations and/or critical editions of important source materials; edited anthologies, journals, or series of volumes comprising the work of other scholars, including on-line journals; grants, grant proposals, and other fundraising initiatives in support of scholarly research; papers, lectures, and plenary or keynote addresses delivered at professional meetings or to scholarly audiences; review articles evaluating scholarship in a specific field; peer reviews of book or article manuscripts; publications designed for classroom use; book and magazine articles intended for wider audiences. Such work is to be judged on its own merits by criteria appropriate to the specific activity and normally used in the candidate's field. Quantity and quality should be comparable to the expectations described in 2.3.3.2 and 2.3.3.3.

2.3.3.5. The Department expects candidates to participate in the scholarly activities of their relevant professional associations and research communities through conference presentations, consultations, colloquia, or other appropriate means of presenting research.

2.3.3.6. A case for tenure and/or promotion is often based on evidence drawn from a variety of types of research activity.

#### 2.3.4. Expectations Regarding Teaching

2.3.4.1. Candidates are expected to exhibit a record of high quality teaching in all their courses (as specified in 2.1. above) as evidenced by student evaluations, peer evaluations, enrollments, syllabi, and other pertinent measures.

2.3.4.2. Candidates may include evidence of teaching outside the classroom, including student mentoring; public lectures, symposia, and exhibits; and involvement in research and service learning projects. As noted in the introduction to this document, it is sometimes difficult to draw sharp distinctions among the categories of research, teaching, and service. We recognize that some activities may contribute to more than one category.

#### 2.3.5. Expectations Regarding Service

2.3.5.1. Assistant Professors in the Department are expected to perform effectively in their assigned duties for the Department, College, or University.

2.3.5.2. Associate Professors and Professors are normally expected to accept larger responsibilities for service within the Department, College, or University, and to engage in some form of service to the profession. This service can take a variety of forms, including refereeing book manuscripts, articles, or grant proposals; editorial work; serving as outside evaluators on tenure and/or promotion cases for candidates at other universities; organizing conferences and workshops; and serving on advisory boards.

2.3.5.3. The Department also values contributions to organizations in the wider community, whether local, regional, national, or international, including religious communities and institutions. Such service is not mandatory, however, for receiving a rating of "Fair" for service.

## 2.4. *Reviews*

### 2.4.1. Annual Reviews

2.4.1.1. The Department chair is responsible for producing summaries of research, teaching, and service for each faculty member undergoing an annual review.

2.4.1.2. In addition to factual summaries, the Department chair evaluates each faculty member's performance based on the criteria appropriate to that member's rank and decides on an appropriate rating ("Outstanding", "Excellent", "Good", "Fair", or "Unacceptable") in teaching, research, and service.

2.4.1.3. The Department chair sends a letter with these summaries, ratings, and a brief justification for each rating to each faculty member prior to the end of the spring semester of each academic year.

2.4.1.4. Candidates undergoing some other form of review (third-year, tenure and/or promotion, or post-tenure) are exempted from an annual review (see 1.1. 7. above).

2.4.1.5. Faculty with a joint appointment are evaluated by the Department chair in consultation with the head of the faculty member's secondary unit, as *per* the College of Arts and Sciences "Administrative Guidelines for Joint Appointments", Section III (March 2014).

### 2.4.2. Third-Year Reviews

2.4.2.1. Candidates undergoing third-year reviews are evaluated by the DCTP based on their progress toward satisfying the criteria for tenure and promotion to Associate Professor.

2.4.2.2. The DCTP determines a proposed rating ("Outstanding", "Excellent", "Good", "Fair", or "Unacceptable") for teaching, research, and service, together with a brief justification for each rating.

2.4.2.3. If the rating for research or teaching is "Fair" or "Unacceptable", the DCTP will propose concrete strategies for improvement. The DCTP may choose to propose such strategies for improvement in any area, regardless of the proposed rating.

2.4.2.4. These ratings and justifications, together with any suggestions for improvement, are forwarded to the Department chair.

2.4.2.5. It is ultimately the responsibility of the Department chair to accept or change the proposed ratings, to justify these ratings, and, following College and University guidelines regarding third-year review, to forward the result, in the form of a letter, to a candidate.

2.4.2.6. If the Department chair changes a rating proposed by the DCTP, this change must be noted and justified in the chair's report to the College. If the rating for research or teaching is "Fair" or "Unacceptable", the Department chair's letter to the candidate must include concrete strategies for improvement.

2.4.2.7. Candidates with a joint appointment are reviewed by the DCTP and the Department chair in conjunction with the faculty of the candidate's secondary unit, as *per* the College of Arts and Sciences "Administrative Guidelines for Joint Appointments", Section III (March 2014).

### 2.4.3. Post-Tenure Review

2.4.3.1. For post-tenure review, the DCTP requires a minimum of three tenured faculty members (see 1.1.4.), of equal or higher rank than the candidate. The department will follow Faculty Manual "Mandatory Provisions" regarding post-tenure review.

2.4.3.2. Associate Professors undergoing post-tenure review are evaluated by the DCTP based on their progress toward satisfying the criteria for promotion to Professor.

2.4.3.3. Professors undergoing post-tenure review are evaluated by the DCTP based on their continued satisfaction of the criteria for promotion to Professor.

2.4.3.4. The DCTP determines a proposed rating ("Outstanding", "Excellent", "Good", "Fair", or "Unacceptable") for teaching, research, and service. The DCTP also formulates a brief justification for each rating.

2.4.3.5. A Post-Tenure Review is rated as follows:

"Superior": Candidates earn at least one rating above that required for promotion to their current rank, and all other ratings are at least equal to that required for promotion to their current rank.

"Satisfactory": Candidates earn no rating of "Unacceptable".

"Unsatisfactory": Candidates earn one or more ratings of "Unacceptable".

2.4.3.6. In the case of an unsatisfactory post-tenure review, the DCTP must formulate a development plan in accordance with the *Faculty Manual*.

2.4.3.7. The Department chair will write a letter, indicating and justifying the results of the post-tenure review, and 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 sent to the candidate.

2.4.3.8. Candidates with a joint appointment are reviewed by the DCTP and the Department chair in conjunction with the faculty of the candidate's secondary unit, as *per* the College of Arts and Sciences "Administrative Guidelines for Joint Appointments", Section III (March 2014).

### **3. Compiling the File**

#### *3.1. Scope of the Evidence*

3.1.1. Past accomplishments: For tenure and promotion to Associate Professor, the Department will consider evidence from the candidate's entire record of research and scholarship, including achievements prior to appointment at the University of South Carolina. Evidence concerning teaching prior to this appointment will not normally be included in the candidate's file.

3.1.2. For promotion to 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 Professor.

3.1.3. 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. An explanation of work in progress and future plans for research should be included as part of the personal statement (see 3.2 below) in the candidate's file.

#### *3.2. Responsibilities Candidates*

##### **3.2.1. Personal Statement**

3.2.1.1. Candidates are responsible for preparing a personal statement that justifies their case for tenure and/or promotion and, in support of this case, for preparing a file that includes all relevant evidence as indicated below.

3.2.1.2. The personal statement should be addressed in clear fashion to non-specialists in the Department, the College and University administration, outside evaluators, and faculty in other disciplines who are involved in the evaluation process.

3.2.1.3. The statement should demonstrate the quality and impact of a candidate's scholarly work by addressing such points as the following: the purpose, complexity, scope, originality, and depth of the candidate's research; the reputation or prestige of the venues in which the results of that research has appeared; the size, diversity, and nature of the audiences to whom it is addressed (e.g., local, national, or international); the process of internal and external peer review of the candidate's work; and the specific ways in which the candidate has contributed to collaborative projects. As appropriate, candidates should explain how specific projects compare with a peer-reviewed research book or journal article.

3.2.1.4. The component of the personal statement relating to research should include a description of work in progress and future plans for research. Unpublished manuscripts, grant proposals, and publication proposals may be included in the candidate's file as evidence of this progress and these plans.

3.2.1.5. The component of the personal statement relating to teaching should explain how the candidate's record of teaching meets the criteria for tenure and/or promotion. It should explain clearly to non-specialists what subjects the candidate teaches and how these subjects are taught, and it should describe any teaching in public venues beyond the University.

3.2.1.6. The component of the personal statement relating to service should describe any activities of the candidate relating to service to the Department, to the College or University, to professional organizations, and to communities, organizations, and people beyond the University, and it should explain how these activities meet the criteria for service.

### 3.2.2. Compiling and Presenting Evidence

3.2.2.1. The Department, and especially the chair of the DCTP working with the Department's administrative assistant, will make every reasonable effort to assist the candidate in compiling an effective file.

3.2.2.2. Except where otherwise noted (see 1.2.2. and 3.4.1.), the responsibility for collecting and compiling evidence related to the file lies ultimately with the candidate.

3.2.2.3. In collecting and compiling evidence, the candidate should follow all Department, College, and University guidelines relating to tenure and promotion procedures.

### 3.3. *Evidence Related to Research*

3.3.1. 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.

3.3.2. A list of all published work, indicating the venue of publication and whether the work was peer-reviewed.



3.3.3. A list of all non-published research 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 are not immediately evident.

3.3.4. Copies of research-related grant proposals and other fund-raising initiatives designed to support research. Candidates should provide an indication of the current status of the proposal as well as a description of their role both in writing the proposal and in carrying out the project.

3.3.5. Copies of published (including on-line) reviews of the candidate's work. Candidates may include evaluators' comments on grant proposals.

3.3.6. Honors and awards for research and scholarship.

3.3.7. If candidates wish, copies of work in progress may also be included to provide a broader context for their research and to assist the DCTP in assessing the quality and potential effectiveness of their future work.

#### 3.4. *Evidence Related to Teaching*

3.4.1. A summary of student evaluations, prepared by the DCTP and required for all candidates. This summary must provide an average quantitative rating of overall performance for each of the courses that a candidate has taught during the period under review and a comparison of this average rating to the evaluations of Department faculty who teach other sections of the course, or appropriately similar courses at the same level.

3.4.2. Peer evaluations of classroom visits, collected by the DCTP and required for all candidates.

3.4.3. Copies of all student evaluations (required for all candidates).

3.4.4. A list of all courses taught at the University of South Carolina during the period under review, with enrollment figures (required for all candidates).

3.4.5. Representative syllabi as well as examinations and/or assignments for courses taught at the University of South Carolina (required for all candidates).

3.4.6. 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 the classroom.

3.4.7. Planning and participation in educational projects beyond the courses taught by the candidate at the University of South Carolina.

3.4.8. Copies of teaching-related grant proposals and other fund-raising initiatives designed to support education, whether at the University or elsewhere. Candidates should indicate the current status of the proposal and describe their 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.

3.4.9. Evidence regarding the development of new courses and educational programs.

3.4.10. Evidence regarding the development of resources or materials for teaching.

3.4.11. 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.

3.4.12. Documented recognition from students, colleagues, community partners, and others for skill and dedication in teaching.

3.4.13. List and, where appropriate, description of all honors and awards for teaching.

### *3.5. Evidence Related to Service*

3.5.1. Lists of Department, College, and University committees on which the candidate has served, with dates and positions as chair (required for all candidates).

3.5.2. Lists of service activities in professional organizations, with dates and positions (required for all candidates).

3.5.3. Description of administrative responsibilities in the Department, College, or University, with dates and positions.

3.5.4. Evidence related to program-building: initiation, development, and implementation.

3.5.5. Evidence of service and civic engagement outside the University and the profession (whether regionally, nationally, or internationally) deemed by candidates to be relevant to their tenure and/or promotion decision.

3.5.6. Copies of service-related grant proposals and other fund-raising initiatives designed to support service activities. Candidates should indicate the current status of the proposal and describe their role both in writing the proposal and in carrying out the project.

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