



Unit Criteria

DEPARTMENT OF INFORMATICS AND ENGINEERING SYSTEMS

The Department of Informatics and Engineering Systems adheres to the university-wide criteria for promotion and tenure as described in the *Faculty Manual*. Evaluation of a candidate's evidence of achievements in teaching, scholarly activities, and service will take into account the professional record of the candidate and the quality of the evidence. The record must show significant achievements and give promise of continuing accomplishments.

The Department acknowledges that the diverse nature of what is being evaluated does not easily lend itself to quantification in the assessment process. Therefore, no fixed minimum number of products will be an absolute condition of receiving promotion and/or tenure. At the same time, concrete evidence of progress and continuity of effort in all categories is required. Teaching effectiveness is the most important element in considerations of promotion and tenure at USC Upstate; nevertheless, engagement in scholarly activities is expected for promotion and/or tenure.

Promotion and tenure decisions should take into account the continuity of the candidate's entire professional record, with emphasis placed on achievements during the probationary period (Assistant Professor to Associate Professor) or review period (Associate Professor to Professor).

The lists of examples on the following pages demonstrate opportunities for achievement in the areas of teaching, scholarship and creativity, and service. These lists are not exhaustive; other evidence may be provided and will be considered and ranked by the unit Peer Review committee based upon its quality and contribution to the field, university, or community. Further, the lists are not to be considered checklists, as it is not expected that any one candidate would be able to achieve all items and/or all rankings listed. Items are ranked hierarchically according to their significance and impact in determining the candidate's suitability for promotion and/or tenure. However, the items are non-ranked within each value category. It is expected that successful candidates for tenure and promotion to Associate Professor (*highly effective* rank in teaching and *effective* in scholarship and service) or promotion to Professor (*excellent* in teaching, *highly effective* contributions to service or scholarship and creativity, and *effective* contributions to the other category) should demonstrate a clear record of accomplishments. This follows the guidelines for each category as provided in the "Alignment with *Faculty Manual* evaluative terms" section below. In all instances, reasonable documentation of workload and effort must be provided.

TEACHING EFFECTIVENESS

During the evaluation of teaching effectiveness, consideration will be given to the type of course, the number of preparations per semester, course enrollments, and/or the number of new preparations. As workload for many of the items listed below may vary from year to year, the candidate is encouraged to describe the level of effort and resource involvement for items. The Peer Review committee may make adjustments to the rankings for items based on the workload documentation. For example, an item ranked as *highly valued* may be adjusted to *most highly valued* if the workload over a given time period were inordinately high, and vice versa.

Uniquely valued

- Teaching award of recognized value and significance (e.g., USC Upstate or professional society)
- Receipt and completion of a Fulbright Scholarship primarily focused on teaching

Most highly valued

- Favorable teaching evaluation by an administrator or peers
- Finalists for the Excellence in Teaching & Advising Award, beyond the teaching presentations and interviews, and have certification of such
- New course development (including online development)
- Significant redesign or enrichment of existing courses or laboratories for the purposes of improving student learning, service-learning, retention, community engagement, or rigor
- Teaching service-learning courses
- Undergraduate independent studies/theses mentored by the faculty member (every three credit hours counts as a separate project, even if with the same student) *Scholarship produced as a result of this work can be counted in teaching or research. It is up to the candidate to decide where it is best suited.
- Graduate independent studies/theses mentored by the faculty member (every three credit hours counts as a separate project, even if with the same student) *Scholarship produced as a result of this work can be counted in teaching or research. It is up to the candidate to decide where it is best suited
- Program or curriculum development
- Peer-reviewed publication in a national or international journal, book, or book chapter

Highly valued

- Teaching award nominations (excluding self-nominations)
- History of positive or improving Student Opinion Polls, factoring in the type of course taught
- Implementation of innovative teaching techniques- (e.g., flipped classroom, Bring Your Own Device [BYOD], etc.)

- Professional development related to innovation or improvement in teaching methodology (e.g., Member of Experiential teaching cohort or STEP-UP QEP cohort)
- Being invited as a guest lecturer at another university, institution, or another campus in the USC system
- Present at an event held on-campus in support of teaching such as by the Center for Excellence in Teaching and Learning, QEP annual symposium, or other university events in support of teaching
- Effective and engaged academic advising
- Online course certification through the University or recognized professional bodies

Valued

- Availability to students
- Guest lecturer in another course at USC Upstate
- Letters/communications of support from students
- Securing local professionals as course guest lecturers
- Minor modification of existing courses or laboratories to update or modernize material, content, or presentation for the purpose of improving student learning, service learning, community engagement, or retention
- Courses audited, workshops attended, or other measures taken to increase one's knowledge base or teaching skills
- Attend event held on-campus in support of teaching such as by the Center for Excellence in Teaching and Learning
- Co-teach a course, particularly an interdisciplinary initiative
- Internships directed by the faculty member

Teaching Evidence

The following are examples of evidence (unranked) that may be used to document activities of teaching effectiveness as outlined in the previous section, "Teaching Effectiveness" section. The following list is not exhaustive, and not all are required. Additional items may be provided as warranted.

- Administrative reviews
- Student opinion poll forms from courses
- Screenshots of online courses to demonstrate the level of development
- Analysis and interpretation of and/or response to student evaluations to put them into context with course or campus events that may have influenced the results
- Teaching comment which may include a narrative of teaching philosophy and techniques or activities used in the classroom
- Sample of syllabi, reading lists/course calendars, policy statements, grade rubrics, course goals and objectives
- Samples of supplementary course materials

- Samples of tests, exams, or other assignments
- Samples of graded student work
- Peer review statements of teaching written by colleagues and/or administrators
- Teaching awards or acknowledgments
- Evidence of attendance at professional meetings or workshops outside of the USC Upstate related to teaching
- Correspondence from students or alumni-related to teaching
- Evidence of international teaching exchange, sabbatical, or consulting contracts
- Samples of classroom pedagogy, especially innovative uses, including photographs of activities, boards, and student work done in the classroom

SCHOLARLY AND CREATIVE PURSUITS

The Department acknowledges the value and necessity of collaboration in scholarly endeavors in the Department of Informatics and Engineering Systems. Faculty members are expected to find attainable outlets for productive scholarship, which may include collaboration with colleagues, either within or across disciplines, as well as the scholarship of teaching. As a regional, comprehensive university, the Department also recognizes the value of publicly engaged/community-based scholarship. Such scholarship may involve collaborations with public or private entities to enhance public knowledge or to serve the public good. Scholarly and creative products resulting from collaborations and/or shared intellectual contributions should be valued as equal or similar to individual scholarly works. Because authorship order may be listed according to seniority instead of the level of contribution, authorship order should have no bearing on the evaluation of the contribution of the candidate's work. The candidate should state their level of contribution to the work.

Peer-reviewed publications are expected for promotion and/or tenure, but it is recognized that in Informatics and Engineering Systems, peer-reviewed abstracts and presentations at professional conferences carry equal weight to peer-reviewed publications.

The candidate is encouraged to describe the level of effort, resource involvement, and outcome for items related to scholarly and creative pursuits. The Peer Review Committee may make adjustments to the rankings for items based on such documentation. For example, an item ranked as *highly valued* may be adjusted to *most highly valued* if the effort or significance were inordinately high, and vice versa.

Uniquely valued

- External (non-USC system) grant awarded to the candidate exceeding \$30,000, excluding indirect costs
- Peer-reviewed publication in a top-tier journal
- USC Upstate Scholarship and Creativity Award

- Receipt and completion of a Fulbright Scholarship primarily focused on research/scholarship

Most highly valued

- Peer-reviewed publication in a national or international journal, book, or book chapter
- Peer-reviewed abstract/presentation/paper in international, national, or regional professional conference proceedings
- Invited review article
- Obtaining external funding (non-USC system) less than \$30,000
- Obtaining USC system funding (e.g., RISE, ASPIRE, primary mentor for a Magellan Scholar, etc.)
- Actively involving students in research endeavors that leads to presentation at scholarly conferences or peer-reviewed publications
- Invited presentation at scholarly conference
- Publication/intellectual achievement of significant value to the community
- Advisor/supervisor to students (every three credit hours counts as a separate project/count in the summary table, even if with the same student)

Highly valued

- Peer-reviewed publication in a regional journal, book or book chapter
- Submitting proposal for external funding (non-USC system)
- Peer-reviewed publication submission
- Peer-reviewed abstract/presentation/paper in state-wide/local professional conference proceedings
- Obtaining internal (USC Upstate) funding (e.g., TAPS, Academic Program Enhancement, Course Reallocation, etc.)
- Industry/government report
- Actively involving undergraduate or graduate students in research endeavors
- Scholarly work, such as a journal article, that has been accepted, but required a revise and resubmit
- Reviewing manuscripts to further peers' scholarly work based on one's research expertise, standing in the field, or research program. Manuscripts here may include reviewing for journals, conferences, annual meetings, workshops, internal or external grants, or any other peer-review process.

Valued

- Submitting proposal for internal funding
- Work in progress
- Attending conferences, workshops, or seminars related to one's scholarly research program
- Peer-review an abstract in your field
- Attending or participating in continuing education related to one's scholarly research program such as webinars, on- or off-campus events, or training

Notes on Discipline-Specific Rationale for Scholarly Activities Evaluation:

- The conference submissions of the Department often require peer review. The submission can be selected to appear in the proceedings but may not be invited for conference presentation or vice versa. If accepted for both, then the candidate will receive credit for each activity individually. If the author presents the paper at a conference and has their paper published in the proceedings, these activities can be counted in all of the following categories on the summary table: “Conferences, Workshops, & Seminars Attended,” “Manuscripts Submitted for Review,” “Papers Presented at Professional Meetings,” and “Other Professional Activities (for the papers published in conference proceedings).” If the author does not present, this cannot be counted in the summary table under “Papers Presented at Professional Meetings,” but can be counted under “Manuscripts Submitted for Review” and in “Other Professional Activities” if the paper was published in the proceedings. It can also be counted under “Journal Articles” or “Book Chapters” if the conference issues a special publication beyond the conference proceedings. This is unique as compared to some disciplines and should be taken into account by the Promotion & Tenure Committee.
- For the column “Manuscripts Submitted for Review,” count by the manuscript, not the submission. Thus, the same manuscript submitted to three different journals would count as one manuscript submitted, not three. This helps to ensure an unbiased number count across the faculty. However, if the manuscript has significant changes and is submitted to another venue (i.e., conference workshop, journal), it can be counted multiple times.
- Some faculty within the Department might conduct scholarly activities for a government publication. If a candidate is an author on a publication generated as a report disseminated by the federal government, such as a technical report or white paper, etc., it may count under the following categories: “Other Professional Activities” and “Manuscripts submitted for Review.” It is recognized that the government requires multiple iterations of revisions as a result of peer-review and it is considered a significant contribution to the field to achieve this type of publication. In addition to a technical report, the information may be used to develop a separate manuscript for peer-review in a scholarly journal. If a manuscript is developed separately from the report and submitted for peer review and accepted, it can count in the following categories: “Other Professional activities,” and “Manuscripts submitted for review” (technical report and external publication).
- Textbooks generally count as teaching and service to the profession; if categorized as scholarly and creative activities, they must be justified on the basis of their original scholarly or creative contribution and significance to the field based on the press, reception, and other factors.

- Peer-reviewed work contributing to promotion from Assistant to Associate Professor cannot be used again in promotion from Associate to Full Professor. However, the overall trajectory from one rank to the next (Associate Professor to Professor) should demonstrate a continued contribution to the field by remaining productive in their scholarly, creative, and professional pursuits.
- In addition to peer-reviewed publications, presentations at international, national, and regional conferences constitute another vital measure of scholarship and creative activity, and tenure-track and tenured faculty are expected to participate in the organizations relevant to their fields of study.
- Presentations and similar activities that take place at USC Upstate must be justified credibly as being distinct from contributions to service or teaching.
- If the same research is presented multiple times in nearly identical forms--such as a conference paper published in proceedings or oral presentations---it may be declared no more than twice if it has been accepted through a peer-review process. If revisions are made and accepted through an additional peer-review process, it may be counted again, as long as the paper is not in identical form. It is common that the title may only slightly change from one publication to the next.

SERVICE

Service can be defined as activities that benefit various constituents, to include the USC system, the University, the faculty member's unit, the community, and their profession. The Department recognizes that service activities reflect a faculty member's skills and interests, so the distribution of service activities may vary among candidates. Therefore, emphasis should be placed on the number of activities, level of responsibility, amount of effort contributed, and (where appropriate) level of engagement. As the workload for many of the items listed below may vary from year to year, the candidate should clearly document the effort and resource involvement for items. The Peer Review Committee may make adjustments to the rankings for items based on the workload documentation. For example, an item ranked as *highly valued* may be adjusted to *most highly valued* if the workload over a given time period were inordinately high, and vice versa.

Candidates in their first year may have a lower expectation for service; this should not affect reviews of their performance in the first year. The candidate's service demands may also be considered in the evaluation of overall effectiveness.

UNIVERSITY SERVICE

Uniquely valued

- Faculty Senate Chair
- USC Upstate Service Award
- Receipt and completion of a Fulbright Scholarship primarily focused on service

Most highly valued

- Chair of a university or system-wide committee (standing, ad hoc, search, etc.)

Highly valued

- Faculty Senate representative
- Member of a university or system-wide committee (standing, ad hoc, search, etc.)
- Undertaking a study for university benefit
- Advisor to a university student organization

Valued

- Membership in faculty grievance and/or student Honors Council pools
- Discipline-related presentations to university clubs and organizations

UNIT SERVICE

Uniquely valued

- Department Chair

Most highly valued

- Department Assistant Chair
- Program Coordinator within Department
- Program Director within the Department
- Chair of a unit committee (standing, ad hoc, search, etc.)
- Discipline assessment coordinator

Highly valued

- Member of a unit committee (standing, ad hoc, search, etc.)
- Undertaking a study for the unit benefit
- Effective and engaged in advising
- Participation in summer recruitment and advising activities while not under contract
- Acquisition and/or maintenance of departmental resources (e.g., software, instruments, models, hardware, etc.)

Valued

- Producing departmental reports
- Peer mentoring
- Participation in recruitment activities while under contract

COMMUNITY SERVICE/ENGAGEMENT

Uniquely valued

- Chair of a local board or commission or discipline-related major event (e.g., Science Fair)
- Service award from a discipline-related organization

Most highly valued

- Active membership in and contribution of discipline-related expertise to community programs and organizations
- Engaging students in service learning or other service to the community as representatives of the university
- Serving on community or business boards or commissions
- Serving as a consultant or expert witness
- Providing information in field of expertise for media outlets

Highly valued

- Serving a community organization as a representative of the university
- Discipline-related presentations for community clubs, organizations, or schools
- Judging discipline-related competitions

Valued

- Active involvement in community programs and civic organizations in a non-university-related capacity

PROFESSIONAL SERVICE

Uniquely valued

- Editor of a scholarly journal
- Chairing or organizing a regional or national meeting at the highest level of faculty involvement
- Leadership role in a national or international professional society
- Service award from a national or international professional society

Most highly valued

- Leadership role in a regional professional society
- Chairing or moderating a session at a professional society meeting
- Chair of a national or international professional society committee
- Grant proposal reviewer for major funding agency (e.g., NIH, NSF, Gates Foundation, etc.)
- Organizing a session, symposium, or workshop at a professional society meeting

Highly valued

- Grant proposal reviewer
- Peer-reviewer for scholarly journal or other publication/conference
- External reviewer for a promotion and tenure file
- Member of a national or international professional society committee

Valued

- Textbook/textbook chapter reviewer

- Participation in activities of a professional society
- Serving on graduate student committees

ALIGNMENT WITH THE FACULTY MANUAL EVALUATIVE TERMS

The descriptors for the rankings used in the Unit Criteria differ from the ratings in the *Faculty Manual* and on the *Peer Review* forms. The following guidelines are meant to help align the two conventions for each category. Because the items provided in the lists above are ranked hierarchically, those rated higher than others carry more weight, so an increased number of these in a candidate's record should positively impact their rating. For example, a record with several *most highly valued* items would generally receive a higher rating than one with no such items.

TEACHING

Less than satisfactory: The candidate fails to demonstrate an ongoing and sustained record of effective teaching as evidenced by very few or no accomplishments from any of the rankings.

Effective: The candidate's teaching record consists primarily of items categorized as *highly valued* with some *valued* accomplishments.

Highly effective: The candidate's teaching record exceeds the criteria from the ranking above. It should consist of a mixture of items categorized as *highly valued* and *valued* with at least one *most highly valued* item.

Excellent: The candidate's teaching record exceeds the criteria from the rankings above and consists of an overall balance of accomplishments, including multiple items categorized as *most highly valued* with a sufficient number from other rankings, indicating performance at the highest level. A candidate with a *uniquely valued* item is to be considered to have earned a ranking of *excellent* in this category.

SCHOLARSHIP

Less than satisfactory: The candidate fails to demonstrate an ongoing and sustained record of scholarship as evidenced by very few or no accomplishments from any of the rankings. This may include a lack of peer-reviewed publications.

Effective: The candidate's scholarship record consists primarily of items from the *highly valued list*, with some *valued* accomplishments. In addition, to be rated *effective*, the candidate must publish in peer-reviewed regional, national, international journals, or conference proceedings as categorized in the *most highly valued* list. Typically, one peer-reviewed publication is not sufficient for a rating of *effective*. If the candidate has only one peer-reviewed publication, substantial evidence of additional scholarship activity is required to support the *effective* rating.

Highly effective: The candidate's scholarship record exceeds the criteria from the ranking above. It should consist of a mixture of items categorized as *highly valued* and *most highly valued*.

Excellent: The candidate's scholarship record exceeds the criteria from the rankings above. It should consist of accomplishments indicating performance at the highest level, including multiple items categorized as *most highly valued*. Multiple peer-reviewed publications in regional, national, international journals or conference proceedings are necessary to achieve this rating. A candidate with a *uniquely valued* item is to be considered to have earned a ranking of *excellent* in the scholarship category if the requirement for a peer-reviewed publication under the *effective* ranking has been achieved.

SERVICE

Less than satisfactory: The candidate fails to demonstrate an ongoing and sustained record of service to the university, the unit, the community, or one's profession as evidenced by very few or no accomplishments from any of the rankings.

Effective: The candidate's service record consists primarily of items categorized as *highly valued* with some *valued* accomplishments. At least one of the items must be university or unit committee service.

Highly effective: The candidate's service record exceeds the criteria from the ranking above. It should consist of a mixture of items categorized as *highly valued* and *most highly valued*, in addition to the university or unit committee service required for the *effective* rating.

Excellent: The candidate's service record exceeds the criteria from the rankings above. It should consist of accomplishments indicating performance at the highest level, including multiple items categorized as *most highly valued*. A candidate with a *uniquely valued* item is to be considered to have earned a ranking of *excellent* in the service category if the requirement for university or unit committee service under the *effective* ranking has also been achieved.

Submitted for review: July 12, 2018

Approved by IES faculty: July 30, 2018