

APPENDIX V: FILE PREPARATION FOR PROMOTION AND TENURE

A5.0 General Information

- All files will be uploaded electronically into the University's ePortfolio system. Our current contract is with Chalk and Wire. Faculty members can access Chalk and Wire directly or through the CAIFS organization on Blackboard. Instructions can be found in Appendix VIII.
- Faculty members in their penultimate year of a probationary appointment must submit a file to be considered for tenure and promotion to Associate Professor/Librarian.
- Faculty members wishing to be considered for promotion to Professor/Librarian must submit a file.
- The due date for Promotion and Tenure files is the first day of classes in fall semester.
- The Promotion and Tenure file consists of two sections: Summary Documents and Supporting Materials. Files are organized in the manner listed below. The purpose of these guidelines is to assist faculty members in presenting an organized and accurate presentation of their accomplishments in teaching or librarianship, scholarship/creative pursuits, and service.
- The general instructions for file organization are the same for Classroom Faculty and Library Faculty with the exception of the sections on Teaching Effectiveness and Librarian Effectiveness. The Summary Tables for Teaching or Librarian Effectiveness in the Summary Documents section also differ.
- The electronic candidate file will be forwarded to USC to the Office of President for review by the Board of Trustees.

A5.1 Rationale for ePortfolios

An ePortfolio is a collection of digital artifacts that together paint a picture of a faculty member's accomplishments at a point in time that can be archived and documented as a guarantee of the quality of our academic programs. EPortfolios have the capacity to include all materials typically required in review files, ranging from CVs and case narratives that summarize that summarize and highlight faculty work to form-based data collection tables that allow the institution to generate timely reports about publications, service, public scholarship, consulting, grants, undergraduate research, course development, professional development, awards and honors, and so on. An ePortfolio has the capacity to accommodate conventional uploaded files and digital links to samples of faculty accomplishments.

In addition, ePortfolios are inherently flexible and portable, allowing faculty members to build on

annual portfolios that can be imported directly into larger summative portfolios at key benchmarks in the faculty member's career. They are also adaptable to multiple purposes and can be reshaped and reused to form the basis of award applications for internal or external purposes. By using eportfolios, USC Upstate facilitates the recognition of faculty achievements and promotes a culture of data-based continuous improvement.

A5.2 Organization of Summary Documents

PART ONE: OVERVIEW

- I. **Prefatory Material**
 - a. **USC Upstate Mission:** Provided on Chalk and Wire.
 - b. **Unit Mission:** Select appropriate unit mission statement on Chalk and Wire.
 - c. **Unit Criteria:** Faculty applying for tenure and promotion to Associate Professor/Librarian may select the unit criteria to use and must state this selection on the Candidate Information Form: Unit criteria in effect at the time you were hired for a tenure-track position at USC Upstate, **or** Unit criteria currently in effect. Faculty applying for promotion to Professor/Librarian may select either of the following and must state this selection on the Candidate Information Form: Unit criteria currently in effect, or the most recent of the following two options: Unit criteria in effect at the time of your promotion to Associate Professor/Librarian, or unit criteria in effect five years prior to this application for promotion to Professor/Librarian.
- II. **Letter(s) of Appointment:** Upload initial letter of appointment (with salary redacted) and all subsequent letters of Tenure and/or Promotion.
- III. **Candidate Information Form/Voting Summary:** Candidates fill out information fields in Chalk and Wire. Voting summary tallies are added by the chairs of the Peer Review and Promotion and Tenure Committees and appropriate administrators at each level of the promotion and tenure process.
- IV. **One-page Curriculum Vitae (CV):** Since this is one of the documents the Board of Trustees reviews, make sure that it highlights the strongest evidence for your application for tenure and/or promotion, heavily weighted toward your current review period. Template Located in Appendix VIII (Forms). The CV should be neat, readable, grammatically correct, and well organized. Font cannot be less than 11 pt.
- V. **Full CV:** The full CV represents your entire professional career. There is no template but consult your unit on whether there is a preferred structure. Organize your accomplishments into categories that correlate well to the summary tables. Place accomplishments in reverse chronological order. Each accomplishment should be included in one category (no double dipping). Use black font for achievements during the review period and a lighter font for accomplishments outside the review period. This will assist reviewers in counting and evaluating accomplishments during the review period. If you were hired with credit toward P&T, the accomplishments during that period count as part of your review period and should be in black font.

- VI. **Summary Tables (Teaching/Librarianship, Scholarship/Creative Pursuits, and Service):** Choose the Teaching Effectiveness or Librarian Effectiveness table as appropriate.

PART TWO: DETAILS OF TEACHING/LIBRARIANSHIP, SCHOLARSHIP/CREATIVE PURSUITS, AND SERVICE

A5.3 Overview of Teaching Effectiveness (Classroom Faculty)

- I. **Teaching Philosophy:** Explain the underlying beliefs and ideas, personal and professional, that shape your approach to teaching. Demonstrate beliefs about your teaching and learning in your discipline through selected examples.
- II. **Brief Description of Program or Course Development, or Course Design/Redesign**
 - a. If you have worked on new program proposals or new course proposals, include information about that here.
 - b. If you have modified existing programs or courses, include that here.
 - c. Other focal points in this section could address significant improvements and your approach to selected courses listed in *Teaching Summary: Courses Taught and Enrollment*.
- III. **Brief Description of Undergraduate Research Projects, Independent Study Projects, internships, and other Special courses**
 - a. This can include partnering with undergraduates in your own research,
 - b. Mentoring undergraduates in their independent research,
 - c. Sponsoring undergraduates for travel grants to present research at conferences,
 - d. Traveling with undergraduates to conferences, or
 - e. Being the instructor of record for independent studies, internships, unscheduled courses, or study abroad courses.
- IV. **Teaching Evaluations: Three Mandatory Documents**
 - a. **Mandatory Evaluation of Teaching Effectiveness by Immediate Supervisor**
 - i. Tenure-track faculty members applying for tenure and promotion to Associate Professor are responsible for inviting immediate supervisors to attend/observe a class period (or, in the case of online teaching, to view a course on Blackboard) before the penultimate year for use in the supervisor's evaluation of candidate's teaching.
 - ii. Supervisors will base these evaluations on class observation, trends in learning experience surveys, administrative reviews, and other appropriate measures.
 - iii. When considering evaluations/learning experience surveys, reviewers should consider biases related to gender, race, sexual orientation, content rigor, and other factors established in the academic literature.
 - b. **Mandatory Peer Evaluation of Teaching Effectiveness (Classroom or Online)**
 - i. Minimum of one during the review period
 - ii. Tenure track faculty members applying for promotion and/or tenure will be responsible for selecting a tenured faculty member who is not in a rating administrative role to provide a minimum of one evaluation of classroom, online, or clinical/lab teaching.

- iii. Recommended components for classroom teaching include evaluation of the instructional plan, communication of learning goals for a class session, time management, classroom climate, level of student engagement, responsiveness to students, course syllabus, and overall design.
 - iv. Recommended components for evaluation of online courses include Blackboard formatting for clear and accessible navigation, course content and workload, efforts to motivate student motivation and engagement, and/or sample instructor-student communication.
 - v. Peer evaluators should consult USC Upstate’s web materials on [Support for Peer Observation](#) of Teaching.
 - vi. Faculty members will select the peer evaluation method (e.g., narrative, rubric, template)—in consultation with unit administrator—that aligns best with unit criteria to make a fair and informative assessment of teaching quality.
- c. Candidate’s Comment on Teaching**
- i. Create a table, graph, or other effective methods of compiling relevant learning experience survey scores from the review period.
 - ii. Develop a narrative that demonstrates the quality of teaching, including but not limited to the following components:
 1. Description of teaching strengths and goals,
 2. Summary of trends in learning experience surveys, peer evaluation, and other relevant measures of teaching quality, as well as actions taken to maintain or improve the quality of teaching,
 3. Representative quotations from learning experience surveys,
 4. Short- and long-term impact of teaching quality on students (e.g., job placement, graduate school placement, enhancement of intellectual curiosity and/or overall quality of life)

A5.4 Overview of Librarian Effectiveness (Library Faculty)

- I. **Statement of Philosophy of Librarianship**
Explain the underlying beliefs and ideas, personal and professional, that shape your approach to librarianship.
- II. **Brief Description of Effectiveness as a Library Faculty Member**
Provide a brief description of your duties and accomplishments in the principal activities that directly support the university's educational mission: reference work, information literacy, collection development, and coordinating activities. The description should include demonstrated interest in and awareness of the importance of cooperation among libraries.
- III. **Brief Description of Significant Library Innovation**
List and briefly describe your most important innovations during the review period that have improved library services, processes and procedures.
- IV. **Mandatory Evaluations of Effectiveness as a Library Faculty Member**

- a. Mandatory evaluation summary of Effectiveness as a Library Faculty Member by the Dean of the Library, covering activities in reference, information literacy, collection development and coordinating area, based on unit criteria.
- b. Mandatory peer observations (one from a tenured librarian required; additional peer observations from any library faculty may be included)
- c. Candidate's comments on evaluations of Effectiveness as a Library Faculty Member
 - i. Develop a narrative based on the evaluation of the Dean of the Library, peer observations, student and faculty feedback forms for library instruction, learning experience surveys for the credit course, feedback for reference questions, and previous annual and peer reviews.
 - ii. Demonstrate growth and adjustments to your activities in response to student and faculty feedback and other evaluations.
 - iii. Include comments from students, faculty and peers where they support your narrative.
 - iv. Consider including a table, graph or other method of presenting data such as the averages of student or faculty feedback forms for information literacy.

A5.5 Overview of Scholarly and Creative Pursuits

In this section, faculty will provide a brief description of scholarly and creative activities.

Annotated List of Scholarly and Creative contributions

- a. Consider organizing the information to correlate to the summary table.
- b. Indicate relevance or impact of each item. Units may provide guidance on appropriate or effective methods of demonstrating relevance/impact.
- c. Noting/describe any themes or unifying threads that emerged in your scholarly/creative activities during the review period.
- d. Write for a general academic audience; faculty outside your discipline should be able to understand your work based on your descriptive and broadly accessible language.
- e. For collaborative work, describe your role in the project.
- f. Optional: Describe your ongoing/future research agenda.

A5.6 Overview of Service Activities

In this section, faculty will provide a brief description of service activities.

Annotated List of each item from the Service summary table.

- a. Consider organizing the information to correlate to the summary table.
- b. Include primary responsibilities, notable achievements, and general time demands (not necessary to specify hours per activity).
- c. Reminder: faculty with administrative duties during the review period are permitted to include administrative initiatives and accomplishments as service activities. Consult unit criteria for more guidance on this component.

A5.7 PART THREE: ASSESSMENT, EVALUATIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

- I. **Case Narrative:** The purpose of the case narrative is to present the candidate's case for promotion and/or tenure, referencing unit criteria and addressing in narrative from the candidate's philosophical perspective, goals, and accomplishments in each of the three assessment areas: teaching/librarianship, scholarship/creative pursuits, and service. Suggested length of the narrative is 1-3 pages, single-spaced. Keep in mind that teaching/librarianship is the most highly valued of the three areas of assessment at USC Upstate. Develop a case narrative that reflects that institutional priority. Faculty members holding administrative positions during the review period may address that work under service or as a fourth area of the narrative.
- II. **Reviews and Letters**
- a. **Third-Year Review:** For faculty seeking promotion to Associate Professor. Uploaded by the candidate.
 - b. **Annual Administrative Reviews:** Provided by the candidate and uploaded in reverse chronological order for the review period.
 - c. **List of Letters Requested by Candidate:** Faculty member will provide a list of requested support letters to the Peer Review Committee Chair with the confidentiality indicated. Faculty members cannot request letters from any member of the current Peer Review or P&T committees.
 - d. **Internal Letters:** Letters should be written within one year of file submission. Peer Review Committee (PRC) Chair receives/uploads internal letters to candidate ePortfolio.
 - e. **External Letter(s):** USC Upstate requires a letter of evaluation by an individual external to USC Upstate of the candidate's scholarly or creative achievements and other professional activities (e.g., service to professional societies or professionally related community engagement). Letters should be written within one year of the file submission. Guidelines for external reviewers follow:

Guidelines for the Selection of External Reviewers

1. The candidate and rating administrator will jointly create a list of potential external reviewers.
2. External reviewers must be tenured faculty members at accredited institutions and should be of the candidate's equal or greater rank. They must also be active scholars, artists, or librarians in the field of research for which the candidate is being evaluated.
3. External reviewers may not have been the candidate's co-author, research collaborator, or dissertation committee member. The reviewers should acknowledge and describe any relationships with the candidate in the written letter.
4. A minimum of one letter from an external reviewer is required. However, two letters should be solicited from external reviewers to guard against unexpected circumstances that might prevent external reviewers from completing this task.
5. Letters must be written in the calendar year of application for promotion and/or tenure.

Guidelines for Contacting External Reviewers

1. The rating administrator will make all contacts with the external reviewers, using the templates below and available on the Promotion and Tenure Committee's website.
2. Neither the rating administrator nor anyone else should make informal contacts beforehand to determine willingness. Instead, the formal request with a partial packet of materials attached should be the first contact. Maintaining this practice avoids the appearance that the chair is picking particularly positive or negative reviewers. Should the reviewer agree to assist, a second standard letter with all the review materials will be sent.
3. It is the responsibility of the rating administrator to provide the external review letter along with the CV and Acceptance Form to the Peer Review Committee Chair who will upload the documents to the ePortfolio.
4. Letter templates can be found on the Promotion and Tenure Committee website.

III. Recommendations/responses to reviewers of promotion and tenure file

Recommendations

- a. **Peer Review Committee Recommendation and Justifications** (form to be completed, signed by all members of the committee, and uploaded by the Peer Review Committee Chair)
- b. **Unit Chair Recommendation and Justification** (completed, signed, and uploaded by the unit chair on university letterhead)
- c. **Dean's Recommendation and Justification** (completed, signed, and uploaded by the dean on university letterhead)
- d. **Promotion and Tenure Committee Recommendation and Justifications** (form to be completed, signed by all members of the committee, and uploaded by the Promotion and Tenure Committee Chair)
- e. **Provost's Recommendation and Justification** (completed, signed, and uploaded by the Provost and Senior Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs on university letterhead)
- f. **Chancellor's Recommendation and Justification** (completed, signed, and uploaded by the Chancellor on university letterhead)

Responses: The appropriate reviewer uploads all the candidate's responses relating to the application for promotion and/or tenure. Candidates may send copies of all responses to the Chair of the Promotion and Tenure Committee.

File Submissions are shared using the Chalk and Wire Platform. Go to Appendix VIII for further instructions on electronic submission.

A5.8 Organization of Supporting Materials

- I. **Comprehensive List of Supporting Materials.** Organize materials in three major sections—Teaching/Librarianship, Scholarship/Creative Pursuits, and Service—and list the items in each section.

It is recommended to group documents into larger files corresponding to these sections or logical divisions within them and to choose file names that relate to these sections. Cross-referencing from documents in the Summary section of the file to specific supporting materials is encouraged.

- II. **Scope:** Representative samples of teaching/librarianship, scholarship/creative pursuits, and service activities should be placed in this section of the file. This instruction to include “representative samples” represents a significant paradigm shift in the understanding of documentation for promotion and tenure files at USC Upstate, initiated in 2019, to create reasonable expectations for faculty undergoing the P&T process and manageable file sizes for reviewers.
- a. Toward that end, the Supporting Materials section is **not** an exhaustively detailed record of every activity undertaken during the review period. Instead, supporting materials should highlight the candidate’s most significant activities which align with their unit criteria and provide the most substantial possible evidence to support the candidates’ justification for promotion and/or tenure. Refer to unit guidelines and seek mentoring for specific guidelines on appropriate type and amount of materials to make the most robust case.
 - b. Focus in particular on providing documents referenced in your case narrative.
 - c. As the documentation file is not intended to capture every illustrative detail of the review period, it is no longer appropriate, for example, to include a letter from every committee chair the candidate ever served on, every iteration of a course syllabus, or every learning experience survey in Supporting Materials.
 - d. However, if a candidate feels that, for example, including selected learning experience surveys will address concerns surrounding teaching effectiveness, that particular candidate may elect to include relevant learning experience surveys.
 - e. Ultimately, the candidate must determine which evidentiary components are the most compelling for the application and include only those materials.

Appendix VI: File Review for Promotion and Tenure

- A. Candidate's Responsibilities
 1. Candidates are responsible for submitting an electronic portfolio that thoroughly documents accomplishments as prescribed by the unit criteria and the university promotion and tenure guidelines, according to the prescribed timeline (See Master Review Calendar and P&T Website)
 2. Candidates should meet with the PRC Chair to prepare and submit their promotion and tenure file.
 3. Candidates prepare their file according to the promotion and guidelines (See Appendix V: File Preparation).
- B. Peer Review Committee Chair Responsibilities: PRC Chair Duties are indicated in Chapter 5: Faculty Review. The following guidelines elaborate on the recommended relationship between the PRC Chair and the Candidate.
 1. The Chair of the Peer Review Committee works with the Candidate to ensure that the files are in the required format for promotion and tenure review.
 2. During the support and guidance period after the submission of the file, the PRC Chair collaborates with the Candidate to incorporate recommendations of the PRC into the file.
 3. The PRC Chair and the Candidate have joint responsibility for ensuring that Candidate's file is in the required format for promotion and/or tenure review.
 4. All communications between the Peer Review Committee and the Candidate go through the PRC Chair.
 5. At any time before formal deliberation and final vote of the Peer Review Committee, candidates may review and revise their files, except for letters solicited by the Candidate and sent directly to the Chair of the Peer Review Committee. Once the evaluation and deliberation period begins, Candidates cannot revise or add to their files.

C. Peer Review Committee Member Duties and Responsibilities

1. Review ethical guidelines of peer reviewing in Chapter 5: Faculty Review.
2. Review Candidate documents presented in the submitted file and evaluate the effectiveness of the Candidate's accomplishments in teaching/librarianship, scholarship, and creative activities and service. Review recommendations and support letters.
3. Evaluate file based on the unit criteria and P&T guidelines. Only material present in the file may be considered.
4. Complete an individual, unsigned copy of the Faculty Review form and submit the form to the Chair for summary and communications with the Candidate.
5. Vote and electronically sign the voting form.

II. Chair/Rating Administrator Responsibilities

- A. In the months prior to file submission, the chair/rating administrator solicits external review letters, collects the external reviewer CV, and completes the Acceptance of Outside Reviewer form.
- B. Provide the CV and Acceptance of Outside Reviewer form to the PRC Chair prior to the deadline for submitting the file.
- C. After the PRC Chair finalizes the PRC's recommendation, the Candidate's rating administrator reviews the file, writes a letter assessing the Candidate's qualifications, and makes a recommendation on promotion and/or tenure to be included in the Candidate's summary file.
- D. Notify Candidate of decision in writing, along with an explanation, and provide instructions for optional response letter. The Candidate response must be made in writing to the rating administrator within five working days after receiving notification of their recommendation.
- E. The rating administrator adds the Candidate's response to the file.
- F. Forward file, including the rating administrator's letter of recommendation, to the school or college dean.

III. Procedures for the Dean

- A. Review the file, write a letter assessing the Candidate's qualifications, and make a recommendation on Promotion and/or Tenure to be included in the Candidate's file.

- B. Notify the Candidate and provide instructions for optional response letter from Candidate. The response must be made in writing to the Dean within five working days after receiving notification of their recommendation.
- C. If optional response letter is submitted, add the Candidate's response to the file and forward file to Promotion and Tenure Committee.

IV. Procedures for the Promotion and Tenure Committee

- A. Calendar: The Promotion and Tenure Committee publishes the Master Review Calendar in Spring. The Promotion and Tenure calendar includes deadlines for file submission to the Peer Review Committees and recommendations from Peer Review Committees, Chairs/rating administrators, Deans, the Promotion and Tenure Committee, the Provost, and the Chancellor. This calendar will be consistent with the general calendar in Appendix VII and the calendar maintained on the P&T website.
- B. Confidentiality: Review ethics of reviewing faculty files in Chapter 5: Faculty Review, with special attention to rules of confidentiality and the instruction to limit discussion to material in the file.
- C. Additions to File: Any member of the Committee may introduce in writing any matter into the Candidate's file for consideration, provided the material submitted is given to the Candidate, and the Candidate is allowed to respond in writing at least five working days before the Committee's formal vote on Promotion and/or Tenure. The Chair of the Promotion and Tenure Committee is also responsible for notifying the Committee that additional material has been introduced into the file.
- D. File Review: Once submitted to the Promotion and Tenure Committee, the committee members electronically review all files. Each committee member is assigned individual files to review and discuss. The Chair of the Promotion and Tenure Committee provides committee members a list of candidates to be reviewed and designates the order in which the files will be reviewed. Each file is assigned to a Committee member from an academic unit other than the Candidate's own. The committee member has the responsibility of presenting the designated Candidate's file to the committee; all members must read and be prepared to discuss the file of every Candidate.
- E. File Presentation: When the Committee is ready to deliberate on the Candidate's application, the assigned member presents the Candidate's file, giving the Candidate's name, a summary of the file contents in relation to the unit criteria for Promotion and/or Tenure, and the recommendations of the Peer Review Committee, the rating administrator, and the Dean. The floor is then open for discussion. To vote, there must be eight (8) members present to discuss any candidate or vote. If only eight (8) members are present and a tied vote results, the vote is considered negative.

- F. Voting on File: After the presentation of the Candidate's file and discussion, each Committee member votes and writes a justification for his or her vote. Each vote is taken in the presence of the full Committee. All Committee votes are confidential. The Chair of P&T will tabulate the votes, synthesize the comments, and upload the votes and summary of the comments. Each member will review the tabulation and affirm the vote tabulation and summary of comments.
- G. Candidate Notification and Optional Response Letter: The P&T Chair notifies the Candidate in writing of the Committee's recommendation and provides instructions for the optional response letter. The candidate does **not** receive the numerical vote.
- H. Reconsideration: A candidate may request reconsideration of the Committee's recommendation. The request must be made in writing to the Chair of the Promotion and Tenure Committee within three working days of receiving the Committee's initial recommendation notification. After reconsideration, a candidate may respond in writing to the Committee's second recommendation. Reconsideration of files must be completed five working days before the files' time due to the Provost. After evaluating any request for reconsideration, the Promotion and Tenure Committee adds its final recommendation to the file on the Promotion and Tenure Committee Reconsideration Form for Candidates Requesting Promotion [and/or Tenure].
- I. Candidate Notification of Reconsideration: The Chair of the Promotion and Tenure Committee notifies the Candidate and the rating administrator and/or Dean. Within three working days, the Candidate may send a written response to the Committee to be uploaded to the eportfolio.
- J. Upload Materials: The P&T Chair uploads into the file all written responses made by the Candidate and forwards the file to the Provost.
- K. Announcing Outcome: The Chair of the Promotion and Tenure Committee announces the number of positive recommendations of the Committee for Promotion and/or Tenure in the Committee's Spring Report to the General Faculty.

V. Procedures for the Provost

- A. The Provost reviews the file and make a recommendation regarding Promotion and/or Tenure. The recommendation is added to the ePortfolio, and the Candidate is notified in writing with an explanation for the decision.
- B. The Provost notifies candidate of decision with explanation and provides instructions for optional response letter.
- C. Copies of the Provost's final recommendation are sent to the Candidate, the Candidate's rating administrator and/or Dean, and the Chair of the P&T Committee.
- D. The Candidate may write a response to be included in the file within three working days of notification of the Provost's recommendation. The Candidate has the option of a personal meeting with the Provost. The Provost then forwards the file to the Chancellor.

VI. Procedures for the Chancellor

- A. The Chancellor reviews the file and makes a recommendation regarding Promotion and/or Tenure. The recommendation is added to the Candidate's file, and the Candidate is notified in writing with an explanation for the decision
- B. Candidate Notification and Optional Response Letter instructions
- C. Copies of the Chancellor's final recommendation are sent to the Candidate, the Candidate's rating administrator and/or Dean, Chair of the Promotion and Tenure Committee, and the Provost and Senior Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs. The Candidate may write a response to be included in the file within three working days of notification of the Chancellor's recommendation. The Candidate has the option of a personal meeting with the Chancellor. The Chancellor uploads the Candidate's written response to the file.
- D. If there are differences between the recommendations of the Promotion and Tenure Committee and the Chancellor, the Chancellor meets with the Promotion and Tenure Committee to discuss the differences; the Promotion and Tenure Committee may add to the Candidate's file a written response addressing the Chancellor's recommendations before the Chancellor forwards a recommendation to the President.
- E. No later than March, the entire electronic portfolio (summary documents and supporting materials, including all recommendations and responses), is sent to the President of the University, who sends a recommendation to the Board of Trustees. The President informs the Chancellor of this recommendation to the Board of Trustees. The President of the University of South Carolina and the Board of Trustees make the ultimate decision regarding all faculty requests for Promotion and/or Tenure.

- F. The President notifies, in writing, candidates who have not been recommended. In the event of a negative recommendation by the President, the Candidate may appeal the recommendation to the USC Upstate Faculty Welfare Committee. Such appeal shall follow the published grievance procedures Chapter 6. The President of the University makes the final decision concerning a grievance.
- G. The Chancellor reviews the file and makes a recommendation regarding Promotion and/or Tenure. The recommendation is added to the Candidate's file, and the Candidate is notified in writing with an explanation for the decision
- H. Candidate Notification and Optional Response Letter instructions
- I. Copies of the Chancellor's final recommendation are sent to the Candidate, the Candidate's rating administrator and/or Dean, Chair of the Promotion and Tenure Committee, and the Provost and Senior Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs. The Candidate may write a response to be included in the file within three working days of notification of the Chancellor's recommendation. The Candidate has the option of a personal meeting with the Chancellor. The Chancellor uploads the Candidate's written response to the file.
- J. If the Chancellor's recommendations vary from those of the Promotion and Tenure Committee, the Committee may add to the Candidate's file a written response addressing the Chancellor's recommendations.
- K. No later than March, the entire electronic files (summary and supporting documents), including all recommendations and responses, are sent to the President of the University, who sends his/her recommendation to the Board of Trustees. The President informs the Chancellor of his/her recommendation to the Board of Trustees. The President of the University of South Carolina and the Board of Trustees make the ultimate decision regarding all faculty requests for Promotion and/or Tenure.
- L. The President notifies, in writing, candidates who have not been recommended. In the event of a negative recommendation by the President, the Candidate may appeal the recommendation to the USC Upstate Faculty Welfare Committee. Such appeal shall follow the published grievance procedures Chapter 6. The President of the University makes the final decision concerning a grievance.

APPENDIX VII – GUIDELINES FOR FILE PREPARATION FOR ALL OTHER REVIEWS

A7.1 Annual Administrative Review

Purpose. The annual administrative review provides an opportunity for faculty members to receive constructive feedback from their rating administrator on their performance across a single academic year. Faculty members should consult their unit criteria to learn the performance indicators for work that is valued by their unit.

I. File Preparation

- A. Faculty members are responsible for compiling their annual administrative review files and submitting them electronically on Chalk and Wire by the dates indicated in Chapter 5: Faculty Review.
- B. Tenured and Tenure-track faculty will compile materials in accordance with unit criteria and promotion and tenure guidelines.
- C. Faculty members undergoing peer review (third-year, tenure and/or promotion, post-tenure) may import material from their peer review files for annual administrative review to avoid unnecessary duplication of faculty labor in documenting their work.
- D. Non-tenure track members of the faculty prepare a narrative statement (1-2 page) highlighting the faculty member's accomplishments in the following areas:
 1. Teaching/librarianship (see above for examples) and
 2. Service (see above of examples) **or**
 3. Scholarship/Creative Pursuits (In other words, non-tenure-track faculty can choose to be evaluated on two categories rather than three).
- E. Faculty members should compile materials to demonstrate their work in all areas of assessment.
- F. All materials will be shared electronically with the reviewers.
- G. Review instructions can be found at <http://www.uscupstate.edu/facultyreview>.

II. File Review

- A. The tenured rating administrator reads and evaluates annual administrative reviews.
- B. The rating administrator completes the Faculty Review Form and presents the review to the faculty member.
- C. Either the faculty member or the rating administrator may request an interview.
- D. The faculty member confirms receipt of the Faculty Review Form.
- E. The faculty member has 5 days to upload an optional written response and submit it to the rating administrator.
- F. A copy of the Faculty Review Form and any optional response (as applicable) are submitted by the rating administrator to the Dean, Provost, and Office of Academic Affairs HR coordinator.

A7.2 Third-Year Review

Purpose. The purpose of the third-year review is to provide an opportunity for faculty members to receive constructive feedback from peers within their units about the rate of degree of progress toward tenure and promotion based on their first three years in a tenure-track position at USC Upstate.

- I. File Preparation
 - A. The third-year review is due in the fall of the candidate's third year.
 - B. Faculty members are responsible for compiling their third-year review files and submitting them electronically on Chalk and Wire by the date indicated on the Master Review Calendar. Include the following:
 - i. Annual administrative reviews from the preceding three years in reverse chronological order.
 - ii. A current Curriculum Vitae
 - iii. Completed Summary Tables
 - o Teaching Summary/ Librarian Effectiveness Summary Table
 - o Scholarly and Creative Pursuits Summary Table
 - o Service Activities Summary Table
 - iv. A case narrative (2-3 page) highlighting faculty's accomplishments in teaching or librarianship, scholarly/creative activity, and service to the unit, the university, the community, and the profession. Describe how your activities and accomplishments have contributed to the mission of USC Upstate.
 - v. A list and representative samples of supporting evidence for accomplishments in: teaching or librarianship, scholarly/creative activity, and service.
- II. File Review
 - A. Peer Review Committee members read and evaluate the file in Chalk and Wire during the time period specified by the PRC Chair.
 - B. The Committee meets (in person or virtually) to discuss and deliberate over the rankings of each file.
 - C. The PRC Chair's duties, the peer review process, and the ethics of peer reviewing are described in detail in Chapter 5: Faculty Review
 - D. The Faculty Review Form for the third-year review should explicitly address the candidate's status in meeting the unit criteria and identify developmental needs to prepare the candidate for a successful tenure and promotion file. In cases of misalignment between the file and unit criteria, the candidate must receive specific instructions to shift emphasis to meet the unit's needs and expectations.
 - E. The Faculty Review Form is uploaded by the PRC Chair and submitted to the faculty member through Chalk and Wire.
 - F. The faculty member confirms receipt of the Faculty Review Form.
 - G. The faculty member has 5 days to send an optional written response to the PRC Chair who uploads the file into Chalk and Wire.

- H. A copy of the Faculty Review Form and any optional written response (as applicable) are submitted by the PRC Chair to the rating administrator, the dean, the provost, and Office of Academic Affairs HR Coordinator.

A7.3 Post- Tenure Review Procedures

[skipping PTR appendix section here: provided for approval in separate packet]

A7.4 Promotion to Senior Instructor/Senior Instructor Librarian

Purpose. The process of promotion to senior instructor or senior instructor librarian provides an opportunity for the university to recognize ongoing high-quality performance among full-time non-tenure-track faculty members with an increase in rank and salary.

I. File Preparation

- A. Faculty members in full-time instructor positions for six consecutive years can request promotion to the rank of senior instructor or senior instructor librarian.
- B. Requests are made directly to the rating administrator and dean by email and do not need to be submitted through Chalk and Wire.
- C. To support the request, eligible instructors should include a current CV, a narrative statement (1-2 pages) highlighting accomplishments in Teaching/Librarianship and Service **or** Scholarship/Creative Pursuits, annual administrative reviews from the past five years. This statement should describe how the instructor's work has contributed to the mission of USC Upstate. Individual units may require additional documentation.
- D. Any assigned administrative duties can be included under service.
- E. Individual units may require additional documentation.

II. File Review

- A. The rating administrator reviews the file and makes a recommendation in letter form addressed to the Office of the Provost, copying the Dean.
- B. The Office of the Provost will issue a letter to the instructor indicating a decision on the request.
- C. If the promotion is approved, the instructor's salary will be increased accordingly.

APPENDIX VIII – UNIT CRITERIA GUIDELINES AND FACULTY REVIEW FORM

A8.1 Unit Criteria Guidelines

Standards for Unit Criteria: Each Unit will develop its criteria according to its accreditation, unit needs, and discipline standards while remaining aligned with University policy, mission statement, and employment responsibilities.

- A. Unit criteria should be aligned with the University's evaluative terms for review.
 - 1. Excellent
 - 2. Highly effective
 - 3. Effective
 - 4. Less than Effective
 - 5. Ineffective
- B. Unit criteria should address three categories of faculty work.
 - 1. Teaching/Librarianship
 - 2. Scholarship (scholarly and creative pursuits)
 - 3. Service (Unit, University, profession, and community)
- C. Unit criteria should indicate appropriate activity levels and define the evidence to support promotion and tenure based on rank eligibility.
 - 1. Tenure
 - 2. Associate Professor/Librarian
 - 3. Professor/Librarian
 - 4. Post-tenure
- D. Unit Criteria must meet the following additional conditions:
 - 1. Criteria must specify how faculty can demonstrate that they have met the University's standards for promotion and tenure, including specific examples of appropriate evidence.
 - 2. Criteria should be internally consistent and consistent with the university and state rules and laws.
 - 3. Criteria should closely relate to the appropriate department/school, program, college, and university mission.
 - 4. Criteria should be realistic, such that they can be achieved by talented and dedicated faculty within the constraints of available and attainable resources.
 - 5. Criteria should be easily understood by those in the academic community who will employ them in making judgments. They should be equally clear to those who will be evaluated by the criteria.
 - 6. Criteria should be as complete and explicit as possible, addressing the broadest possible range of activities to which faculty can be assigned and on which they can be evaluated.
 - 7. Criteria should be fair, providing all faculty with equal opportunity to be objectively judged on their accomplishments.
 - 8. Learning Evaluation Surveys (formally SOPs) are a criterion, please consider including this statement: "When considering student opinion polls, the peer review committee will acknowledge that biases may exist in student evaluations based on, but not limited to, sex,

race, sexual orientation, and content rigor, and that these biases are established in the academic literature.”

9. No Item Counts Twice. Some activities may qualify as two activities. Unit criteria should make clear that the candidate must present evidence under only one area of assessment.

A8.2 Process for Changing Criteria: Unit criteria are faculty-driven and specific to the discipline(s) represented within the unit. These documents are faculty-driven and are therefore approved primarily by faculty members within the unit and on the Promotion and Tenure Committee.

A. Drafting the College/School Unit Criteria

1. Tenured and Tenure-track faculty are responsible for developing Unit Criteria.
2. Units may use the Peer Review Committee or may establish a Unit Criteria Committee or other tactic for composing a draft of this document and submitting it to the department/unit for consideration.
3. Eligible faculty review, make recommendations, and approve a draft of the unit criteria at the departmental/unit level.

B. Chain of Approval

1. P&T committee
 - i. A departmental/unit representative submits this draft of Unit Criteria to the P&T Committee.
 - ii. The Promotion and Tenure Committee evaluates the proposed criteria to ensure they are consistent with the Faculty Manual and are sufficiently clear. The Promotion and Tenure committee approves the criteria and forwards them to the Provost for review.
 - iii. If the Promotion and Tenure Committee observe deficiencies in this draft, the proposal will be returned to the Unit with an explanation and suggested changes. The Chair of P&T works with unit representative on appropriate improvements.
 - iv. The Unit will revise its proposed criteria and resubmit them to the P& T Committee.
 - v. If the Unit and the P&T committee cannot reach an agreement, the Chair of the P&T Committee will convene a meeting with the Unit and selected members of the P&T Committee to resolve the issues. If there continues to be unresolved aspects of the Unit Criteria, the Provost will endeavor to resolve the differences.
2. Provost reviews and approves or returns to the Unit for additional changes.
3. Once approved, the Unit Criteria will be Published on the P&T Website by the Faculty Governance Webmaster.

C. Implementation and Review

- a. The approved Unit Criteria become effective immediately. For details on choosing which unit criteria to follow, see Procedures for Tenure and/or Promotion in Chapter 5.
- b. Unit criteria should be reviewed every 3-5 years), or when: the unit mission has changed, there are problems with/confusion about the criteria, or unit faculty wish to modify them.

A8.3 Faculty Review Form—Classroom Faculty

Faculty Member:	Academic Unit:
Review: Annual () Peer () Tenure and/or Promotion () Post-Tenure ()	Date:

Notes: Definitions of terms below. Additional pages may be attached.

1. Teaching effectiveness. Refer to unit criteria for indicators of teaching effectiveness.

Excellent	Highly Effective	Effective	Less than effective	Ineffective
-----------	------------------	-----------	---------------------	-------------

Comments:

2. Service. Refer to unit criteria for indicators of service.

Excellent	Highly Effective	Effective	Less than effective	Ineffective
-----------	------------------	-----------	---------------------	-------------

Comments:

3. Scholarly Achievement and Creativity. Refer to unit criteria for indicators of scholarly achievement and creativity.

Excellent	Highly Effective	Effective	Less than effective	Ineffective
-----------	------------------	-----------	---------------------	-------------

Comments:

4. Overall Performance. Narrative assessment must be included. For candidates at Assistant Professor level, narrative must include statement about progress toward tenure and promotion.

Excellent	Highly Effective	Effective	Less than effective	Ineffective
-----------	------------------	-----------	---------------------	-------------

Comments:

DEFINITION OF TERMS

Excellent. Persons considered to be excellent significantly exceed the normal requirements of their position; the quality of their performance is such to make it worthy of special note. Their level of performance indicates extra thought, time, effort, and imagination; they make important contributions to the University and its mission. Refer to the individual unit criteria for examples of specific performance indicators.

Highly Effective. The category of highly effective is reserved for persons whose performance exceeds the normal requirements of their position. The quality of their performance makes significant contributions to the University and its mission. Refer to the individual unit criteria for examples of specific performance indicators.

Effective. The category of effective is reserved for persons whose performance clearly meets the requirements of their position. Their accomplishments support the mission of the University. Refer to the individual unit criteria for examples of specific performance indicators.

Less than Effective. Less than effective is applied to those persons whose performance falls slightly short of meeting the requirements of their position. Continued performance at this level risks impeding the mission of the university. Refer to the individual unit criteria for examples of specific performance indicators.

Ineffective. Ineffective is applied to those faculty members whose performance falls far short of the requirements of their position. Continued performance at this level would certainly impede the mission of the University. Refer to the individual unit criteria for examples of specific performance indicators.

RELEVANT SIGNATURES	DATE
Unit Administrator	
Chair, Peer Review Committee	
Member, Peer Review Committee	
Member, Peer Review Committee	
Member, Peer Review Committee	
Member, Peer Review Committee	
Dean	
Provost	
Candidate	

A8.4 Faculty Review Form – Library Faculty

Faculty Member:	Academic Unit:
Review: Annual () Peer () Tenure and/or Promotion () Post-Tenure ()	Date:

Notes: Definitions of terms on reverse. Additional pages may be attached.

2. Effectiveness as a Library Faculty Member. Refer to unit criteria for indicators of effectiveness.

Excellent	Highly Effective	Effective	Less than effective	Ineffective
-----------	------------------	-----------	---------------------	-------------

Comments:

2. Service. Refer to unit criteria for indicators of service.

Excellent	Highly Effective	Effective	Less than effective	Ineffective
-----------	------------------	-----------	---------------------	-------------

Comments:

3. Scholarly Achievement and Creativity. Refer to unit criteria for indicators of scholarly achievement and creativity.

Excellent	Highly Effective	Effective	Less than effective	Ineffective
-----------	------------------	-----------	---------------------	-------------

Comments:

4. Overall Performance. Narrative assessment must be included. For candidates at Assistant Professor level, narrative must include statement about progress toward tenure and promotion.

Excellent	Highly Effective	Effective	Less than effective	Ineffective
-----------	------------------	-----------	---------------------	-------------

Comments:

DEFINITION OF TERMS

Excellent. Persons considered to be excellent significantly exceed the normal requirements of their position; the quality of their performance is such to make it worthy of special note. Their level of performance indicates extra thought, time, effort, and imagination; they make important contributions to the University and its mission. Refer to the individual unit criteria for examples of specific performance indicators.

Highly Effective. The category of highly effective is reserved for persons whose performance exceeds the normal requirements of their position. The quality of their performance makes significant contributions to the University and its mission. Refer to the individual unit criteria for examples of specific performance indicators.

Effective. The category of effective is reserved for persons whose performance clearly meets the requirements of their position. Their accomplishments support the mission of the University. Refer to the individual unit criteria for examples of specific performance indicators.

Less than Effective. Less than effective is applied to those persons whose performance falls slightly short of meeting the requirements of their position. Continued performance at this level risks impeding the mission of the university. Refer to the individual unit criteria for examples of specific performance indicators.

Ineffective. Ineffective is applied to those faculty members whose performance falls far short of the requirements of their position. Continued performance at this level would certainly impede the mission of the University. Refer to the individual unit criteria for examples of specific performance indicators.

SIGNATURES:

RELEVANT SIGNATURES	DATE
Unit Administrator	
Chair, Peer Review Committee	
Member, Peer Review Committee	
Member, Peer Review Committee	
Member, Peer Review Committee	
Member, Peer Review Committee	
Dean	
Provost	
Candidate	