TENURE AND PROMOTION CRITERIA AND PROCEDURES
DEPARTMENT OF INSTRUCTION AND TEACHER EDUCATION

The Department of Instruction and Teacher Education (ITE) Criteria and Procedures were revised using a process that began with a select committee of tenure-track faculty, both tenured and untenured and representing different ranks, reviewing the prior criteria and procedures (2006) and recommending revisions. The revisions were reviewed and amended by the Professors of the unit and a draft was presented to the faculty (all full-time faculty) for discussion and additional revision before a final vote of approval was taken by the unit faculty (the tenured faculty comprising the unit's Tenure and Promotion Committee).

Revision Approved by Unit Faculty on April 1, 2016
Revision based on UCTP Feedback Approved by Unit Faculty on March 3, 2017

Approved by University Committee on Tenure and Promotion on April 19, 2017

CRITERIA

Candidates in the Department of Instruction and Teacher Education are evaluated for tenure and/or promotion on the basis of evidence of their performance in the three primary faculty functions: teaching, scholarship and service. The evaluation scale used for the tenure and promotion process utilizes the same criteria as defined in the USC Columbia Faculty Manual: Outstanding, Excellent, Good, Fair, and Unacceptable. Candidates must demonstrate acceptable levels of performance in these three functions relative to the professional level to which they seek promotion and/or tenure, as specified in Part IV of the Criteria section. All faculty in the department are expected to fulfill the essential duties, responsibilities, and commitments contained in the USC Columbia Faculty Manual that is in force at the time of the UCTP approval of these criteria. Faculty in the Department of Instruction of Teacher Education are expected to fulfill those responsibilities in support of the ITE mission statement which is included in the departmental by-laws and requires faculty to prepare teachers to:

- Respond effectively to the complexity of 21st century schools and classrooms characterized by increasingly diverse populations;
- Use evidence-based strategies and practices to provide equitable and effective opportunities for all people to learn
- Effectively use available technology and resources to reach all learners and connect them to the world beyond the classroom; and
- Promote democratic principles and ideas within all educational settings.

The criteria for **promotion** to the ranks of Associate Professor and Professor for the Department of Instruction and Teacher Education are outlined below and described in detail in sections I, II and III of this document:

Promotion to Associate Professor:		**Promotion to Professor**:	
Teaching	Excellent	Teaching	Outstanding
Service	Good	Service	Good
Scholarship	Excellent	Scholarship	Outstanding

Expectations for **tenure** at the ranks of Associate Professor and Professor are outlined below and described in detail in Section V of this document:

Tenure at the Associate Professor Level:

- Candidate is normally in at least the third year at USC in a tenure track position.
- Candidate demonstrates at least *Excellent* performance in Teaching and Scholarship and at least *Good* performance in Service.
- Candidate demonstrates consistency and durability of performance in teaching, scholarship, and service; and "evidence of progress toward establishing national or international reputation in a field" (Faculty Manual, 2013, p. 23). See definitions for these terms in Section V.A.B.

Tenure at the Professor Level:

- Candidate is normally in at least third year as an Associate Professor at USC or another institution;
- Candidate demonstrates at least *Outstanding* performance in Teaching and Scholarship and at least *Excellent* performance in Service.
- Candidate demonstrates consistency and durability of performance in teaching, scholarship, and service; and "evidence of national or international stature in a field" (Faculty Manual, 2013, p. 23). See definitions for these terms in Section V.A.B.

I. Teaching Function

A. Rationale and Description of Criteria

The Department of Instruction and Teacher Education prides itself on the quality of its teaching and places a high priority on it. A primary consideration in awarding tenure and/or promotion is the candidate's teaching performance and student development activities.

Teaching and student development include all forms of university-level instructional activities on and off campus. It includes preparing for and effective teaching of assigned courses, conducting doctoral and peer seminars, course and program development activities and training for in-service educators and community groups. Further, clinical teaching and supervision are recognized and valued for contributing to effective teaching in the department.

The teaching function also includes academic advisement and counseling, grants and awards that enhance teaching, directing and/or membership on doctoral research committees, guiding undergraduate and master's students' scholarly products, preparing accreditation materials which impact program quality, and the development as well as implementation of course materials.

B. **Sources of Evidence for Meeting Criteria**

The Department of Instruction and Teacher Education examines three indicators of teaching quality: (a) responses from the formal Student Course/Instructor Evaluation using the system approved for the College of Education, (b) reports from the Departmental Peer Review of Teaching, and (c) documentation of contributions to Other Teaching Functions* which may include but are not limited to:

- developing course materials to enhance teaching
- developing teaching-focused professional materials (such as modules) in printed or electronic form
- teaching and advisement awards
- teaching demonstrations in schools and other clinical sites
- supervising at clinical sites to provide superior clinical experiences and training to university students
- developing and teaching special workshops and seminars
- visiting teaching
- doing the work funded by grants that support teaching innovations
- developing and/or revising new courses or programs
- conducting seminars for academic or professional associations
- appointment or election to leadership roles in teaching-related activities of professional associations
- chairing doctoral committees
- serving on doctoral committees
- teaching effectiveness documented by unsolicited student commentary

*For specific expectations regarding these functions, see Criteria for Promotion at each rank.

C. **Criteria for Promotion to Associate Professor**

For promotion to Associate Professor, the faculty member must be rated as *Excellent* in each of the following areas:

1. **Peer Reviews**: The candidate's teaching should have been evaluated as *Excellent* through the formal departmental peer review process. This means that the *Overall Evaluation Rating* for 80% or more of the Peer Reviews should have been evaluated as *Excellent* or higher. This takes into account ITE's commitment to providing constructive feedback as an important purpose of Peer Reviews. Such feedback should not be interpreted as detrimental to a candidate's potential for promotion.

2. **Course Evaluations**: Student Course Evaluations should indicate *Excellence* in teaching evidenced when the single item rating the overall quality of the course (currently Item 3.10: ("Overall this was a very good course") *OR* one of the Global Indices is rated at 4.0 or higher (on a 5.0 scale) for at least 75%

of the courses. This takes into account that there will be items or courses which, for various reasons, are not rated at or above 4.0 by students. For example, new faculty may have lower means at the beginning of their careers, experienced faculty may be experimenting with a new topic or new delivery model, a group of students may be critical of a professor who introduces them to content they consider to be uncomfortable or with which they disagree, students may wish faculty to be available in their offices more than is reasonable (e.g., whenever they happened to be in the building).

3. **Other Teaching Functions**: Recognizing that faculty members may or may not have access to all of the "Other Teaching Functions" listed in I.B., no particular functions are specified as requirements. Instead, for a rating of *Excellent* in "Other Teaching Functions," evidence of *at least two contributions* from, but not limited to, those listed in I.B. is required.

D.   Criteria for Promotion to Professor

For promotion to Professor, since his/her last promotion, the faculty member is expected to show evidence of an *Outstanding* teaching record in three ways.

1. **Peer Reviews**: The candidate's teaching should have been evaluated as *Outstanding* through the formal departmental peer review process. This means that the Overall Evaluation Rating should have been evaluated as *Outstanding* on at least two peer reviews since the last promotion. This takes into account the fact that tenured faculty are required to have peer reviews less frequently than untenured faculty as well as ITE's commitment to providing constructive feedback as an important purpose of Peer Reviews. Such feedback should not be interpreted as detrimental to a candidate's potential for promotion.

2. **Course Evaluations**: Student Course Evaluations should indicate an *Outstanding* rating in teaching, evidenced when when the single item rating the overall quality of the course (currently Item 3.10: "Overall this was a very good course") OR one of the Global Indices is rated at 4.25 or higher (on a 5.0 scale) for at least 75% of the courses taught since promotion to Associate Professor. This takes into account that there will be items or courses which, for various reasons, are not rated at or above 4.25 by students. For example, faculty may be experimenting with a new topic of new delivery model, a group of students may be critical of a professor who introduces them to content they consider to be uncomfortable or with which they disagree, students may wish faculty to be available in their offices more than is reasonable (e.g., whenever they happened to be in the building).

3. **Other Teaching Functions**: For promotion to Professor, a rating of *Outstanding* in "Other Teaching Functions" requires documentation of *leadership* with regard to at *least two* contributions from, but not limited to, those listed in I.B. from the time of the last promotion.

E.   **Definitions of Rating Levels for Teaching**

Outstanding: On the formal College of Education Student Course/Instructor Evaluation, item 3.10 ("Overall this was a very good course") OR one of the Global Indices was rated at or above 4.25 (on a 5.0 scale) for at least 75% of the courses. Ratings for at least two Peer Reviews have been evaluated as *Outstanding*. Documentation is provided for *leadership* with regard to at *least two* "Other Teaching Functions" from, but not limited to those listed in I.B.

Excellent: On the formal College of Education Student Course/Instructor Evaluation, item 3.10 ("Overall this was a very good course") OR one of the Global Indices was rated at or above 4.0 (on a 5.0 scale) for at least 75% of the courses. Rating for 80% of the Peer Reviews have been evaluated as *Excellent*. Documentation is provided for *at least two contributions* from, but not limited to the "Other Teaching Functions" listed in I.B.

Good: On the formal College of Education Student Course/Instructor Evaluation, item 3.10 ("Overall this was a very good course") OR one of the Global Indices was rated at or above 3.75 (on a 5.0 scale) for at least 75% of the courses. Rating for 80% of the Peer Reviews have been evaluated as *Good*. Documentation is provided for *at least two contributions* from, but not limited to the "Other Teaching Functions" listed in I.B.

Fair: On the formal College of Education Student Course/Instructor Evaluation, item 3.10 ("Overall this was a very good course") OR one of the Global Indices was rated at or above 3.25 (on a 5.0 scale) for at least 75% of the courses. Rating for 80% of the Peer Reviews have been evaluated as *Fair*. Documentation is provided for *at least one contribution* from, but not limited to the "Other Teaching Functions" listed in I.B.

Unacceptable: On the formal College of Education Student Course/Instructor Evaluation, item 3.10 ("Overall this was a very good course") OR one of the Global Indices was rated below 3.25 (on a 5.0 scale) for 75% or more of the courses. Rating for 80% of the Peer Reviews were evaluated as *Unacceptable*. Documentation is not provided for *contributions* with regard to "Other Teaching Functions."

II.   **Scholarship Function**

A.   **Rationale and Description of Criteria**

The Department of Instruction and Teacher Education expects each faculty member to establish a sustained record of research and scholarship that contributes to the advancement of the knowledge base in their discipline. Each

faculty member is expected to maintain an active, high quality scholarship record as evidenced by accomplishments that contribute to the continuing improvement of education. Scholarship may take various forms including original research, clinical research, scholarly analyses, curriculum research and development activities, and policy theory development.

Teacher education scholars have a unique role to perform in informing educational policy and practice in their various fields of specialty, e.g. in preK-12 education, or in community, adult, or higher education. Thus, applied research that informs policy in these areas is valued equally with theoretical work. The diversity of issues the faculty members investigate requires a broad range of research methods that include experimental, descriptive, narrative, historical, analytic, and interpretive. Thus, research and scholarly products may take various forms e.g. books, journal articles, chapters in books, monographs, policy documents, grants, clinical research and development reports, curriculum material and textbooks, and may be directed to either a peer or teacher audience. The Department of Instruction and Teacher Education values collaboration in the development of scholarly products, for example, co-authored pieces reflecting collaborative work with university colleagues, doctoral students, and/or practitioners. First-authored pieces are not necessarily valued over second or third authorship, however, scholarly leadership is expected in the form of some first- or single-authored pieces as indicated in the promotion criteria that follow.

B.   **Sources of Evidence for Meeting Criteria**

Each faculty member in the Department of Instruction and Teacher Education must develop, maintain, and document a scholarship record of accomplishments of the quality indicative of membership in a comprehensive research university. The following list of scholarly products, while not exhaustive, is indicative of the forms of scholarship faculty may use as evidence of their work.

Category One

- *Externally-reviewed books (authored or edited) published by a respected press and that build new knowledge or influence practice
- Refereed journal articles (paper or electronic) that are respected and known to impact either a theoretical or a practical knowledge base
- *Externally-reviewed research grants funded by a national, state, or local agency; or scholarly projects with awards based on a competitive proposal review process comparable to that of refereed journals.
- Chapters in refereed books or yearbooks including those that are edited that build new knowledge or influence practice
- Invited articles for a journal for peers or teachers
- Reprints of articles in books of readings that are peer reviewed
- Peer-reviewed monographs that build new knowledge or influence practice

*Because the publication of an externally peer-reviewed book (edited or authored, published by a respected press) or the award of a substantial externally-reviewed grant funded by a national agency requires significant time and effort and bring substantial recognition to our institution and the author(s), *they may be considered as equivalent to multiple Category One products.* It is incumbent on the candidate to provide rationale and evidence for why books or grants should be considered as equivalent to multiple Category One products.

Category Two

- Research grants (including internal grants) or scholarly projects based on a review process that is either not competitive or not comparable to that of refereed journals.
- Chapters in non-refereed books or yearbooks
- Research grants or scholarly projects with awards based on non-competitive processes not comparable to that of refereed journals
- Activities emanating from research grants or funded projects (the work of actualizing funded projects aside from writing grant proposals and receiving funding which falls within Category One, for example, writing annual, periodic, and final reports to the funding agency; reviewing, selecting and supervising support personnel; developing curriculum and other scholarly work to support the project's goals; managing budgets and personnel; facilitating meetings with grant members; data analysis and dissemination that results in non-refereed publications; professional development activities that do not fall under "Teaching"; managing summer programs).
- Presentations at professional and scholarly meetings (refereed or invited)
- Publications within conference proceedings
- Colloquia at other universities and academic conference presentations
- Editorship of professional journals and book series
- Grant reports and other technical documents
- Government and agency publications
- Evidence of clinical research site development
- Original curriculum products (e.g., online materials, videos, tests, textbooks, clinical instruction documents)
- Membership on review boards for professional associations
- Book reviews published in journals and other scholarly venues.
- Book and journal article *manuscript* reviews.
- Non-refereed professional publications
- Fellowships in national organizations
- Writing papers as discussant for national conference session
- Scholarly blogs written for research- or practitioner-focused blog sites.

C.   Criteria for Promotion to Associate Professor

For promotion to Associate Professor, the candidate must demonstrate an *Excellent* record of scholarship, considering both the quantity and the quality of the research

and scholarly products with evidence of national involvement that has the possibility of leading to the establishment of a national/international reputation. The quality of the candidate's scholarly work and the potential for a national/international reputation will be determined by unit faculty and those invited to complete external reviews.

An *Excellent* record of scholarship means that the candidate's record significantly exceeds minimally effective expectations, output is of high quality, and attainment of national/international stature is clearly possible (Faculty Manual, p. 24) if not likely. The candidate's record includes: (a) an average of 1.4 quality products per year from Category One (see II.B.) – at least 7 Category One products in a five-year period; (b) a consistent record of presentations at national and/or international professional meetings *OR* extensive and high quality work distributed across Categories One and Two. Work in both categories may be theoretical or practical in nature, single or co-authored. Evidence of scholarly leadership must be provided by first- or single-author status on at least two scholarly products.

D.   Criteria for Promotion to Professor

For promotion to Professor, since his/her last promotion, the candidate must demonstrate an *Outstanding* record of scholarship, considering both the quantity and the quality of the research and scholarly products and the attainment of national or international stature in the field. The unit faculty members play an important role in the evaluation of quality; however, a critical element to determining national and international stature lies in the judgments made by external peer reviewers of the candidate's scholarly work.

An *Outstanding* record of scholarship means that the candidate is judged by unit faculty and external peer reviews as far above the minimally effective level, output is of high quality as judged by unit faculty and external reviews and *national and/or international stature* is evident. The candidate's record includes: (a) an average of 1.4 high quality products per year from Category One (see II.B.)*; (b) a consistent record of presentations at national and/or international professional meetings *OR* extensive and high quality work distributed across Categories One and Two. Work in both categories may be theoretical or practical in nature, single or co-authored. Evidence of scholarly leadership must be provided by lead- or single-author status on at least two scholarly products. The difference between *Excellent* and *Outstanding* ratings is the requirement of national and/or international stature for an *Outstanding* rating.

*Depending on the number of years since the previous promotion, this may mean 5 products across a four-year period or other extrapolations of 1.4 products per year over other periods of time.

E.   Definitions of Rating Levels for Scholarship

Outstanding: The candidate's record of scholarship is judged by unit faculty and external peer reviews as far above the minimally effective level (see "Fair" below), output is of very high quality, and national/international stature is evident. The candidate's record includes: (a) an average of 1.4 high quality products per year from Category One (see II.B.)*; (b) a consistent record of presentations at national and/or international professional meetings *OR* extensive and high quality work distributed across Categories One and Two. Work in both categories may be theoretical or practical in nature, single or co-authored. Evidence of scholarly leadership must be provided by first- or single-author status on at least two scholarly products.

*For example, 5 Category One products across a four year-period, or other extrapolations of the 1.4 products per year over other periods of time.

Excellent: The candidate's record of scholarship significantly exceeds minimally effective expectations (see "Fair" below), output is of high quality, and attainment of national/international stature is clearly possible if not likely. The candidate's record includes: (a) an average of 1.4 quality products per year from Category One (see II.B.) – at least 7 Category One products in a five-year period; (b) a consistent record of presentations at national and/or international professional meetings *OR* extensive and high quality work distributed across Categories One and Two. Work in both categories may be theoretical or practical in nature, single or co-authored. Evidence of scholarly leadership must be provided by first- or single-author status on at least two scholarly products.

Good: The candidate's record of scholarship exceeds minimally effective expectations because it includes at least four products across Categories One and Two in a five-year period; however, products are primarily state, local, or unrefereed with less than 50% contribution per product.

Fair: The candidate's record of scholarship is minimally effective because it includes at least three products across Categories One and Two in a five-year period; however, products are primarily state, local, or unrefereed with less than 50% contribution per product.

Unacceptable: The candidate's record of scholarship is below minimally effective because reflects fewer than three scholarly products across Categories One and Two in a five-year period.

III.   **Service Function**

A.   **Rationale and Description of Criteria**

The faculty of the Department of Instruction and Teacher Education in the College of Education recognizes a strong obligation to provide the University, the community, and the profession service through the expertise of its faculty. Faculty seeking promotion and/or tenure in the Department, therefore, are expected to

demonstrate a record of sustained, effective service to the University of South Carolina (at the program, department, college, or university levels), to professional organizations, and to community constituents (children and school personnel, local and state agencies).

As an academic unit within the University, it is essential that Department faculty participate in a broad range of campus intellectual, social, and governance activities. It is also essential that Department faculty lend their expertise to service activities that support their profession and their professional development. And because the Department of Instruction and Teacher Education combines the functions of a professional school and a traditional academic department, it is essential that faculty engage in a broad range of community service activities that help to connect the Department to schools and other service agencies and that contribute to providing University students with excellent clinical experiences and training.

B.   **Sources of Evidence for Meeting Criteria**

Faculty contributions in the service area fall into three basic categories: 1) service to the university, the college, the department, and the program area; 2) service to national professional organizations and 3) professional service to community constituents (i.e., children and school personnel, local and state agencies).

1.   **Service to the university, college, department and program** is evidenced by a continuous record of faculty contributions in the form of (a) sustained and effective participation in and contributions to service activities in support of the program and/or department, and (b) active participation on committees (membership and chair roles on standing and ad hoc committees/task forces), administrative work related to accreditation and in the form of administrative roles (associate dean, department chair, program coordinator, or other administrative roles within the university).

2.   **Membership in and service to national professional organizations** includes but is not limited to serving on committees and holding elected offices.

3.   **Professional service to community constituents** is evidenced by a record of faculty contributions to public and private schools, other colleges and universities, business and industry, governmental units and local/state agencies and professional organizations, and the community at large. Faculty are expected to assume diverse roles in this regard that would include, but not be limited to:

   ▪ working in professional consultancies and advisory roles
   ▪ creating and conducting professional institutes, conferences, symposia, and workshops
   ▪ establishing and implementing centers or other agencies/programs for the delivery of professional education services

- developing materials to assist educational improvement.

C. Criteria for Promotion to Associate Professor

For promotion to Associate Professor, the candidate is expected to demonstrate an *Good* record of service evidenced by: (a) sustained and effective participation in and contribution to service activities in support of the program and/or department; (b) membership in at least two national professional organizations; (c) at least two contributions of professional service to local, state, or national organizations to include but not exclusive to professional service to community constituents through but not exclusive to examples outlined in III. B.3.

D. Criteria for Promotion to Professor

For promotion to Professor, the faculty member is expected to demonstrate an *Excellent* record of service evidenced by (a) sustained and effective participation in, contributions to, and *leadership* in program, department, college or university committees, program coordination, and other service activities; (c) membership at least two professional organizations; (d) *active leadership* in state or national organizations (this can include service as external reviewer for other institutions); and (e) active professional service to community constituents through but not exclusive to examples outlined in III. B.3.

E. Definitions of Rating Levels for Service

Outstanding: The candidate's service documentation includes: (a) sustained and effective participation in, contribution to, and *leadership* in *multiple* program, department, college or university committees, program coordination, and other service activities; (c) membership in at least two professional organizations; (d) *leadership activities* in state or national organizations that can include service as external reviewer for other institutions; and (e) *extensive* professional service to community constituents through but not exclusive to examples outlined in III. B.3.

Excellent: The candidate's service significantly exceeds minimally effective expectations (see "Fair") because, on an annual basis it includes: (a) sustained and effective participation in and contributions to program, department, college or university committees, program coordination, and other service activities; (c) membership in two or more professional organizations; (d) *active service or leadership* in state or national organizations that can include service as external reviewer for other institutions; and (e) *active* professional service to community constituents through but not exclusive to examples outlined in III. B.3.

Good: The candidate's service exceeds minimally effective expectations (see "Fair") because, on an annual basis, it includes: (a) sustained and effective participation in service activities in support of the program and/or department; (c) membership in two or more national professional organizations; (d) at least two contributions of professional service to local, state, or national organizations to

include but not exclusive to professional service to community constituents through but not exclusive to examples outlined in III. B.3.

Fair: The candidate's service is minimally effective because, on an annual basis, it includes work for only one program, department, college, or university committees; membership in one state or national organization; and one instance of service to community constituents.

Unacceptable: The candidate's documentation of service is below minimally effective level because it includes little or no service to the program, department, college, university, community, or the profession.

IV.   Eligibility for Promotion

A.   Promotion at the Associate Professor Level:

For promotion to the rank of Associate Professor, it would normally be expected that a candidate:

1.   Is in at least his or her fourth year at USC in a tenure track position; and

2.   Demonstrates *Excellent* performance in Teaching and Scholarship, and *Good* performance in Service as defined in the criteria for promotion to Associate Professor.

3.   Evidence of progress toward establishing a national or international reputation in a field (Faculty Manual, 2013, p. 23).

B.   Promotion at the Professor Level:

For promotion to the rank of Professor, it would normally be expected that a candidate:

1.   Is in at least his or her fourth year as an Associate Professor at USC; and

2.   Demonstrates *Outstanding* performance in Teaching and Scholarship, and *Excellent* performance in Service as defined in the criteria for promotion to Associate Professor.

3.   Evidence of national or international stature in a field (Faculty Manual, 2013, p. 23)

V.   Eligibility for Tenure

Faculty appointments may be with tenure if the candidate meets criteria.

A. Tenure at the Associate Professor Level:

For tenure at the rank of Associate Professor, it is normally be expected that a candidate:

1. Will not be recommended for tenure until they are in their fourth year at USC. However, time and accomplishments at other institutions may be considered as an exception to what is normally expected and as equivalent to years in rank at USC.

2. Demonstrates Excellent performance in Teaching and Scholarship and Good in Service; and

3. Demonstrates consistency and durability of performance in teaching, scholarship, and service. Consistency is defined by a record that is sustained across multiple years. Durability is defined as the expectation that the candidate would continue to meet minimum criteria for promotion in the areas of Teaching, Scholarship, and Service upon the award of Tenure.

B. Tenure at the Professor Level:

For tenure at the rank of Professor, it would normally be expected that a candidate:

1. Is in at least his or her third year as an Associate Professor at USC or at a peer institution;

2. Demonstrates *Outstanding* performance in Teaching and Scholarship and *Excellent* performance in Service; and

3. Demonstrates consistency and durability of performance in teaching, scholarship, and service. Consistency is defined by a record that is sustained across multiple years. Durability is defined as the expectation that the candidate would continue to meet minimum criteria for promotion in the areas of Teaching, Scholarship, and Service upon the award of Tenure.

Notes:
1. *Whenever an exception is made from applying criteria as normally expected, an explanation to justify the deviation will be included in the candidate's file.*

VI. Joint Appointment:

In situations in which a faculty member holds a joint appointment, the criteria for granting tenure or promotion to the jointly appointed faculty member shall be those of

the primary unit. For faculty members holding joint appointments, each secondary unit must be given an opportunity to propose outside evaluators and to comment on evaluators proposed by the primary unit. Primary and secondary units should work together to obtain a suitable and representative group of evaluators. An evaluation must be solicited from at least one evaluator nominated or approved by each secondary unit. Thus, when a jointly appointed faculty member's primary unit is the Department of Instruction and Teacher Education, the faculty member will follow the Department's criteria for tenure and promotion. When a jointly appointed faculty member's secondary unit is the Department of Instruction and Teacher Education, the Department's Tenure and Promotion Committee will work collaboratively with the primary unit to select a suitable and representative group of evaluators.

PROCEDURES

The Department of Instruction and Teacher Education is committed to fulfilling the vision and mission of the College of Education (http://www.ed.sc.edu/). As a professional school, with all programs accredited by the National Council for the Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE) or the Council for Accreditation of Educator Preparation (CAEP), the College of Education has a special responsibility to its constituency, especially within South Carolina. A network of Professional Development Sites (PDS) facilitates and assures the continuous and simultaneous renewal of teacher education at USC and K- 12 education in South Carolina.

This document, in conjunction with the University's Faculty Manual and guidelines established by the University Tenure and Promotion Committee, constitutes a uniform set of procedures to be followed by the Tenure and Promotion Committee within the Department of Instruction and Teacher Education in the College of Education as it makes recommendations for tenure and promotion through appropriate channels to the University Committee on Tenure and Promotion. This process will be accomplished by the Tenure and Promotion Committee herein described.

I.   **Tenure and Promotion Committee:** This Committee is composed of all tenured faculty members within the Department of Instruction and Teacher Education and is charged with the decision-making process as it pertains to departmental faculty members who are seeking tenure at the associate professor or professor levels and/or promotion. Members of the Tenure and Promotion Committee will be eligible to vote as follows:

All tenured faculty members are eligible to vote on candidates seeking tenure and/or promotion to Associate Professor.

All tenured associate professors and tenured professors are eligible to vote on candidates seeking tenure at and/or promotion to the associate professor level.

All tenured professors are eligible and expected to vote on candidates seeking tenure at and/or promotion to the professor level.

Tenured faculty members of the appropriate rank who are in residence are automatically included as members of the Tenure and Promotion Committee. Faculty members who are on sabbatical, sick leave, etc., may choose to serve and should communicate such a decision in writing to the Committee Chairperson. Two-thirds of the membership of the

Tenure and Promotion Committee will constitute a quorum. Sub-committees require a minimum of five members voting on tenure and/or promotion applications.

If any one of the sub-committees within the Tenure and Promotion Committee has fewer than five tenured members at the associate professor or professor rank, the sub-committee will nominate a slate of faculty from the College of Education who possess the relevant expertise to evaluate the candidate's file properly. The Dean of the College of Education will designate committee members from the sub-committee's slate.

II. **Committee Functions:** The members of the Tenure and Promotion Committee will participate in the decision-making process as follows:

A. Elect a tenured professor as Committee Chairperson by April 15. In the event that three or more faculty members apply for tenure or promotion during one year, an Assistant Chairperson may be elected by the faculty by May 15.

B. Assist the chair of the committee in the identification of external reviewers when a candidate's expertise is in their area of expertise.

C. Prior to the meeting at which the candidate is discussed, eligible (see note #1) Committee members, in an *initial,* independent review of a candidate's file, will seek evidence of quality of performance in each of the three primary functions of the Department: (a) teaching, (b) scholarship, and (c) service. The Committee member will then complete an Initial Evaluation Form (IEF) in which he or she rates the candidate's performance in each area. The Committee member is encouraged to include a written rationale for these evaluations on the IEF. The faculty member submits the IEF to Committee Chairperson by a set deadline, It should be hand delivered in a sealed, unsigned envelope inside a sealed, signed envelope identified as to contents or electronically delivered in a manner that preserves anonymity (full instructions provided by the Committee Chairperson).

D. Attend the meeting at which the candidate is discussed.

E. Within five days of the meeting, submit a vote for or against the action requested (e.g. promotion and tenure or promotion only. Only under unusual circumstances will a committee member to allowed to cast an absentee ballot. This privilege is at the discretion of the committee.

   Note #1: The phrase "eligible" as used above refers to eligibility to vote, i.e., Committee members of equal or higher rank are eligible to vote on tenure requests and members of higher rank are eligible to vote on promotion requests.

   Note #2: The phrase "unusual circumstances" refers to persons on sabbatical or sick leave, conducting professional duties out-of-state, on assignment to a foreign country, or dealing with family emergency, etc.

III.   Faculty Mentor Responsibility

A mentor is assigned to the candidate by the Department Chair at the time of appointment to the USC faculty as Assistant Professors or when a faculty member seeks promotion to Associate Professor. Mentors assist the Tenure and Promotion Committee Chairperson by communicating with candidates about the process (including providing supportive guidance about file preparation, preparing a teaching summary which includes comparative data, and presenting the candidate's file to the Tenure and Promotion Committee) and assists the T&P Chair and Department Chair in identifying and selecting External Reviewers.

Recognizing that the Teaching Summary carries substantial weight, the candidate's mentor will work with the T&P Chair to ensure that the summary includes the following data clearly described in terms of unit criteria for tenure and/or promotion:

- A list of all courses taught by semester and year;
- Comparative data with other sections of the course or comparable courses;
- Student evaluations (numerical ratings and student comments);
- Peer teaching evaluations; and
- Other evidence of teaching as specified in unit criteria.

IV.   Tenure and Promotion Committee Chair (and Assistant, if elected):

The Chair (and Assistant, if elected) of the ITE Committee on Tenure and Promotion shall assume responsibility to:

A. Collaborate with the dean and department chair's offices on an official list of individuals applying for tenure and/or promotion indicating the nature of the application. The dean submits this list to the Office of the Provost by the deadline indicated in the University Tenure and Promotion calendar.

B. At a special meeting of departmental faculty (usually held after the April department meeting):

1.   Submit the names of candidates and the decision to be rendered (tenure and/or promotion) to all members of the Department faculty and

2.   Announce the date of the Fall T & P meeting (based on ITE procedures and consistent with the University's T&P calendar for that year)

C. Attend a university-wide meeting to learn about the tenure and promotion process and any changes in procedures. This meeting is traditionally held on Reading Day at the end of the Spring semester. The same meeting is often held in August.

D. Establish departmental deadlines in coordination with the University Committee on Tenure and Promotion calendar of deadlines.

E. Meet with candidates to provide specific guidance in the areas of:

- deadlines,
- categories of support to be solicited,
- specific responsibilities of the chair of the T/P Committee,
- specific responsibilities of the candidate,
- guidelines and advice for preparing external review packets,
- guidelines and advice for developing the primary file in accord with the USC template found on the Provost's website;
- guidelines and advice for preparing secondary files.

F. Ensure a well coordinated External Reviewer process:

1. Work with the candidate(s)' appointed mentor(s) and other tenured faculty with knowledge of the candidates' field(s) to identify at least 10 outside specialists in the candidates' fields from whom a review may be requested and, with the mentor and other knowledgeable faculty, determine if there are potential conflicts of interest or other issues that would prevent a fair review; then, in consultation with the Department Chair, select the required referees and alternates.

2. Contact potential reviewers and ask them if they are willing to review the file of a particular candidate using the unit criteria for scholarship. Ascertain whether, from their perspective, there would be a conflict of interest and if there is a conflict, withdraw the invitation to review. Inform the selected reviewers of the date by which the review is needed and ask that a short vita be sent along with the review. In this fashion, compile a list of reviewers for each candidate with a summary of their ranks, institution, and brief information about how and why they were selected.

3. As needed, provide feedback to candidate on the packet that the candidate has prepared for external review.

4. Compose a letter for reviewers that outlines expectations and includes criteria. Letters to outside referees should include the following language:

    We are including a copy of the unit criteria along with materials that we ask you to use to evaluate scholarship and research according to these criteria. Your evaluation need not be limited to the materials we have provided. We would also appreciate a statement describing your relationship, if any, with this candidate.

    Please be advised that the University cannot guarantee the confidentiality of letters prepared by external referees. The University will maintain the confidentiality of your letter to the extent allowed by South Carolina law.

5. Provide the department's administrative assistant with the names and addresses of all external reviewers and the letter that goes to reviewers so that packets provided by the candidate can be mailed to reviewers in June. Coordinate with department administrative assistant to ensure all packets are mailed by pre-determined deadline.

6. Complete the university form, currently the "External Reviewers Summary Template" and summarize the qualifications of the reviewer; explain how and why they were selected on the form after the name and affiliation.

7. When letters from external reviewers are received, ensure that they are on the reviewers' institutional letterhead, signed and dated and address the expectations including a statement on the relationship, if any, between external reviewer and candidate.

8. Thank the reviewers.

G. Establish a secure, electronic space for candidate's primary files (and secondary files if the candidate chooses to submit them electronically) which faculty will use when reviewing those files.

H. Designate an area for storage of secondary files for each candidate when they are submitted in hard copy. Arrange a system with the department chair that will allow the department administrative assistant to provide secure use of the files by faculty.

I. Review carefully each candidate's completed file with respect to organization, form, and appearance. Give feedback on the quality of the overall preparation of file.

J. Remind mentors to submit Teaching Summary with comparative data.

K. Coordinate the faculty review and ballot process:

1. Inform faculty of the process for reviewing files.

2. Complete the Unit Ballot Form.

3. Update **Instructions for ITE Tenure and Promotion Review.**

4. Throughout the process, receive and organize materials from students, faculty, mentors and outside referees. Prior to making files available to faculty, double check to make sure that all letters from external reviewers, the teaching summary and the voting summary pages are appended to the primary file.

5. Post the Primary Files on Blackboard at least two weeks prior to the Tenure and Promotion Committee Meeting.

6. Notify faculty that the files are available. Remind faculty of the date and time of the T & P meeting and send out information about how to access files on BB, how to prepare and submit an Initial Evaluation Form and how to submit a ballot with justifications. Provide them, in separate emails, with a password for the files and another one for the justification form. Remind them where the directions are.

7. Chair the Tenure and Promotion meeting. Begin the meeting by conducting a preliminary vote (e.g., Yes, No, Not Sure) and determine the order in which candidates will be discussed. Prior to the presentation of the candidate's file by the mentor, report the preliminary vote for that candidate. After the presentation and discussion of all candidates, remind faculty that ballots with justifications are due within five days.

8. After the ballots have been received and counted, communicate in writing to the candidate whether the Committee's decision was positive or negative (exclusive of the actual vote count) on his/her application for promotion or tenure.   In the event of a negative vote, inform the candidate that he/she may appeal the Committee's decision. This written appeal is directed to the Committee Chairperson.

9. Update the Voting Summary Page and insert the ballots with written rationale supporting them in the files before they go forward to the Department Chair. Provide a rationale for any tenured faculty member who did not vote.

10. Upon a positive recommendation for tenure or promotion, send a memorandum to all College of Education faculty members inviting letters of reference related to the candidate's application be sent to the Department Chair or Dean for inclusion in the file as part of the next stages of review.

11. Forward to the Department Chairperson the files and vote counts of those candidates receiving positive recommendations and those appealing negative decisions prior to the deadline mandated by the University calendar

V.   Candidate Responsibility

Each candidate will:

A. When notified by the ITE Department Chair, advise the Department Chair in writing of his/her decision to apply for tenure and/or promotion. Notification should come from the Department Chair "no later than May 1 (or within two weeks of the candidate's date of initial appointment) of the timetable for the submission and consideration of files. This early notification of candidates will be in addition to the official notification of prospective candidates by the . . . Department Chair . . . at least one month in advance of the date when the file is due" (USC UCTP Guidelines for Units).

B. Attend a university or college-wide meeting at which procedures for tenure and promotion are reviewed.

C. Attend a meeting called by the Chair of the ITE Committee on Tenure and Promotion to review and clarify various aspects of the tenure/promotion process.

D. Select and package scholarly products to be mailed or sent electronically to reviewers once they have been selected by the appropriate individual(s). Get feedback from mentor and T and P chair about the content and form of those materials. This package should include a personal statement, a CV and as sampling of at least 5 but not more than 10 publications.

E. Give those materials to the department administrative assistant by the date set by the T & P chair.

F. Prepare primary and secondary files for internal review, following guidelines and dates provided. The primary file is based on the template provided by the Provost's Office and consistent with the expectation of the University Committee on Tenure and Promotion. Submit both primary and secondary files. Ensure internal consistency across all components of the primary file and between primary and secondary files. Provide clear statements supported by evidence about why a particular activity or component of an activity falls under teaching, service, and scholarship.

G. Submit primary and secondary files on date provided.

VI.   General Framework

Listed below are major elements within the general framework of the Tenure and Promotion process.

A. Consistent with the University's T&P Calendars, the Dean of the College of Education will notify (a) all non-tenured faculty members who will be considered for tenure, and (b) all faculty members below the rank of professor who will be considered for promotion. Faculty members so notified will be considered as candidates for tenure and/or promotion unless they decline, in writing, prior to the calendar deadline. Such letters should be directed to the Chairperson of the Tenure and Promotion Committee. Decisions to decline seeking tenure and/or promotion will be without prejudice for future consideration; however, a faculty member may not decline to seek tenure in the year that a decision must be made regarding his or her tenure.

B. All candidates for tenure and/or promotion have the responsibility of ensuring (a) that their vitae are current, (b) that their files contain the materials that are relevant, and (c) that the Committee Chairperson receives the file on or before the deadline for submitting it. The Committee Chairperson will provide advice and assistance in the creation of the file if requested to do so by the candidate. Upon receipt of the file the

Committee Chairperson will add a Voting Summary Page, a copy of the criteria relevant to the candidate's request, the Teaching Summary, and the letters from outside referees.

C. The Department faculty, as appropriate, make initial (see [1] below) recommendations according to the Mechanics of Decision-Making specifications described below. Positive recommendations will require that more than 50 percent of the individual ballots cast were "yes" votes (abstain votes will not be counted in this reported ballot); therefore, a tie vote will not constitute a positive recommendation. All Committee deliberations regarding decision-making are confidential. The Committee Chairperson will notify candidates of Committee decisions regarding their applications. The actual vote count is NOT to be reported to the candidate.

D. A candidate may appeal a negative decision. A candidate's decision to appeal shall in no way prejudice future consideration.

E. Files of candidates who receive positive recommendations, with all ballots and written justifications, are forwarded through normal administrative channels by the Committee Chairperson. The files of candidates who appeal also will be sent forward by the Committee Chairperson and will follow appropriate channels for endorsement to the President of the University.

F. In any matters not covered specifically herein, the Department of Instruction and Teacher Education will adhere to rules and policies included in the USC Faculty Manual.

VI. Mechanics of Decision-Making

A. Final Voting

1. At the Candidate Review Meeting, the Committee Chairperson will first determine that a quorum exists and then present the ratings for each function to the appropriate groups.

2. After a presentation of the ratings for each candidate, the Mentor will present biographical information on the candidate, indicate whether the candidate is in the year that a decision must be made regarding his or her tenure, review the ratings, review the external referee letters, summarize any written comments from the Initial Evaluation Forms, review the criteria and standards which apply to the decision, and open the floor for discussion.

3. When discussion has ceased, the meeting will adjourn. The Committee Chairperson will send electronic templates for the set of ballots appropriate to the decision(s) in question. The ballot will allow the Committee member to vote "yes," "no," or "abstain" and will have an ample space for the written rationale. The ballot will contain the name of the candidate and the nature of the decision

regarding tenure or promotion. Completed ballots must be submitted to the Committee Chairperson within five calendar days of the meeting. Submission and vote counting procedures outlined above in the discussion of the Initial Evaluation Forms will be repeated. Only "yes" and "no" votes will be counted in determining whether a recommendation is favorable or unfavorable (an abstention vote does not count toward the existence of a majority vote). A record of all votes will be forwarded as explained in the Faculty Manual. A favorable recommendation will require that more than 50 percent of the "yes/no" votes cast were "yes." Only under the unusual circumstances (see note on page 2) will a committee member who did not attend the Candidate Review Meeting be allowed to cast an absentee ballot. This privilege is at the discretion of the Committee.

4. Faculty unable to attend the Candidate Review Meeting for unusual circumstances (see note on page 2) will be provided with a ballot by the Committee Chairperson. The absentee ballot must be cast and submitted to the Committee Chairperson within 5 calendar days of the scheduled Candidate Review Meeting.

5. When the voting is complete, two Committee members assigned by the Chairperson will count the ballots and report the results to the Department Chair.

6. The Committee Chairperson will report results to the committee.

B. Referees from Outside the USC System

The Department requires at least five external evaluations of a candidate's scholarly or creative achievements or other professional activities. The candidate's Mentor and other tenured faculty in the department will assist the Department Chair in identifying appropriate referees. A proposed list of at least ten potential referees will be developed by the candidate's Mentor, the T & P chair, and other tenured faculty who have knowledge of the candidate's field. The list will include information describing the qualifications of each referee that includes academic rank, institution, affiliated department/college and contact information. Consistent with the Faculty Manual and to ensure impartiality, it is not acceptable to solicit external written evaluations from those with close personal or professional ties to the candidate (e.g. dissertation advisers, co-authors, former professors, classmates, or colleagues with whom the candidate served at other institutions). The reviewers must have academic rank higher than that of the candidate and should be active scholars at peer or aspirant institutions. The majority of referees must be faculty members at institutions for which USC is a peer or aspirant. Reviewers who are not at peer or aspirant institutions or who are non-university specialists must have extraordinary scholarly qualifications (leading scholars in a particular field) to justify an invitation to review. Before finalizing the list, the T&P Chair will seek information from the candidate's mentor and tenured faculty who have knowledge of the candidate's field about potential conflicts of interest and the qualifications of the reviewers. The Committee Chairperson in consultation with the

Department Chair will select at least ten referees to ensure alternates if some potential referees decline the invitation.