Integrated Information Technology Department Tenure and Promotion Procedures and Criteria

Approved by the IIT faculty April 5, 2019

Approved by the University Committee on Tenure and Promotion April 2019

The mission of the University of South Carolina is the education of the state's residents through teaching, research, creative activity, and community engagement.

The Board of Trustees of the University delegates the authority to the faculty in matters pertaining to tenure and promotion criteria and procedures. Voting members of the faculty have approved general procedures governing faculty promotion and tenure, which are documented in *The USC Columbia Faculty Manual. The Faculty Manual* is the final authority on all matters pertaining to tenure and promotion. For any procedure or policy on tenure and promotion not documented here, refer to *The Faculty Manual.*

Though *The Faculty Manual* provides guidelines for department policy, it is the responsibility of each unit to formulate specific procedures and criteria for tenure and promotion. This document details the procedures and criteria to be used by the Integrated Information Technology (IIT) Department to implement University guidelines. These procedures and criteria are consistent with *The Faculty Manual* in force at the time of their approval by the University Committee on Tenure and Promotions (UCTP).

The IIT Department is committed to the policy and practice of affirmative action and equal opportunity in education and employment for all qualified persons regardless of race, color, religion, gender, national origin, age, disability, veteran status, or sexual orientation.

The Unit Tenure and Promotion Committee

I. Tenure and Promotion Committee Composition

The IIT Department has a Tenure and Promotion Committee comprising all tenured faculty members of the Department. However, neither the Dean of the college in which the department is located nor the IIT department chair shall serve as a member of the committee. All tenured faculty of a rank equal to or higher than that of the candidate will comprise the committee to evaluate faculty members for tenure. All tenured faculty members of higher rank than the candidate will comprise the committee to evaluate faculty members for promotion.

No committee may have fewer than five voting members. The department will add members of appropriate rank and tenure from other academic units within the college when this minimum number is unavailable from its own faculty.

By April 15 of each year, the Tenure and Promotion Committee will elect a chair and secretary for the upcoming year and report the chair's name to the Provost and Faculty Senate office. Both must be tenured full professors. If the chairperson is unable to fulfill the duties of the position, the secretary will do so.

II. Duties of the Chairperson and Secretary

The chairperson is responsible for the following duties:
- Call meetings as necessary to conduct committee business;
- Appoint a committee member to assist in preparing candidates' files;
- Select a committee member to summarize candidates' teaching evaluations and write the teaching summary to be included in the candidate's file. Details on the content of the required teaching summary are provided below;
- Maintain the security of files;
- In a timely manner, oversee selection of and secure letters from candidates' external referees. In addition, include copies of the invitation letters sent to referees and review letters received from referees in candidates' files;
- Make electronic files of the candidates available to all eligible committee members for examination. Require Tenure and Promotion Committee members to initial a written statement indicating that they have reviewed candidates' files. Committee members complete this statement during the Tenure and Promotion Committee meeting before any candidates' files are discussed. The completed form is then provided to the IIT department chair;
- Conduct the voting meeting prior to the deadline mandated by the University calendar;
- Arrange for any absentee voting;
- Forward completed files and ballots to the IIT department chair;
- Promptly notify candidates of committee decisions, whether positive or negative;
- If the committee vote is negative, upon request by the candidate, the committee chairperson will provide the candidate (without attributions) a synopsis of the discussion and an indication of the distribution of the vote of the committee;
- If the committee vote is negative, notify the candidate of the ability to request in writing to the chair of the Tenure and Promotion Committee that the file go forward through all appropriate channels;
- Whether the committee vote is negative or positive, if the file is to go forward, notify the IIT Department faculty members and invite them to submit letters;
- Keep adequate files of the Tenure and Promotion Committee, including past and current minutes, criteria, and procedures; information on referees; University documents related to tenure and promotion; and letters; and

- Assure that any letters or other materials that must remain confidential are filed in a manner and place that ensures confidentially.

The secretary is responsible for the following duties:
- Record minutes at meetings;
- In company with two other Committee members, count ballots; and
- Serve as the chair if the chairperson is unable to fulfill the duties of the chair.

Procedures for Third-Year Review, Tenure and Promotion

I. Right to Be Considered

Faculty members who are hired after serving on faculty at another institution. Faculty members from another institution who are hired into an Assistant Professor faculty position must serve at least one year in the IIT Department before being considered for tenure or promotion.

Faculty members appointed with tenure. Faculty members from another institution who are hired into an Associate or Full Professor faculty position may be recommended for tenure at the time of appointment if the file demonstrates performance that meets the criteria in all areas (scholarship, teaching, and service) for the rank in which they are being hired. The recommendation for tenure shall be made by a vote of the Tenure and Promotion Committee. For joint appointments, the procedures of the secondary unit will apply for appointment to that unit. Ballots shall be reported to the Department chair and Dean and the vote recorded.

II. Tenure Progress Review of Faculty: Annual and Third Year Review

Annually, each tenure-track or tenured faculty member shall prepare and submit a cumulative tenure and promotion file for an annual performance review. The file should follow the format specified in Section III. Information for the current year should be clearly identified within the file to facilitate the annual review process. During this review, the faculty member's progress in the areas of review will be assessed. Information on publications and grants should specify the faculty member's percentage of contribution to each publication or grant proposal, and indicate any co-authors who are graduate students.

The criteria outlined in Section IX will be used for annual reviews. Performance will be evaluated separately by the department chair and members of the IIT Department Tenure and Promotion Committee of appropriate rank.

In the third year after appointment, all untenured tenure-track faculty members must be given a written comprehensive evaluation of their progress toward tenure and promotion. The IIT Tenure and Promotion Committee will perform this evaluation. The Committee will recommend to the department chair whether or not the untenured faculty member should be reappointed.

Also see University Policy ACAF 1.05 *Tenure Progress Review of Faculty: Third Year Review.*

III. Assembling the File

It is the responsibility of the candidates to assemble their files in accordance with *UCTP Guidelines for Units: Preparing Criteria and Files*. The committee chair shall appoint a committee member to be available to assist the candidates in preparing his or her file according to the correct format. The candidates should submit their files to the committee chair for review before the final submission.

In addition to the material required by the *UCTP Guidelines for Units: Preparing Criteria and Files*, the file must include a personal statement. It may also include:
- supporting documentation;
- letters of reference;
- creative works;
- annual progress toward tenure and promotion reviews;
- annual administrative reviews;
- letters of appointment, memoranda of understanding, or other documentation of administrative appointment or workload (with salary redacted); and
- any additional information the candidate chooses to include.

In addition to the complete file, the candidates will prepare documentation of their scholarship for review by external referees. The documentation must include:

- the criteria under which the scholarship is to be reviewed;
- a current curriculum vitae;
- the personal statement; and
- copies of publications and other scholarly efforts as determined by the candidate.

The candidates must deliver one complete set of electronic files for external referees to the Tenure and Promotion Committee Chair by the due date specified by the Tenure and Promotion Committee. The candidates should notify the chairperson of the Tenure and Promotion Committee when this is done.

All requested and received letters from external referees will be included in the candidate's tenure and promotion file.

The candidates may not insert additional materials in the file after the due date, but may provide updates about any work referenced in the curriculum vitae, such as acceptance of manuscripts under review. The chair of the Tenure and Promotion Committee shall add the updates to the file.

After the unit has voted, only the following items may be added to the file and

accompany the file to the next steps of the procedure:

> a. Unit faculty vote justifications, and statements from the department chair, dean, and Provost.

> c. Material information arising as a consequence of actions taken prior to the unit vote, for example (a) letters from outside evaluators solicited before but received after the unit vote; (b) notifications of acceptance of manuscripts referred to in the file; (c) publication of books or articles which had been accepted prior to the unit vote; and (d) published reviews of a candidate's work which appear after the unit vote.

> d. Letters from faculty members in the unit. Each faculty member, whether or not authorized to vote, may write to the department chair, and/or the dean and/or the Provost. Each of these letters will become part of the file at the addressee's level. In the case of joint appointments, letters from the secondary units will also be included.

IV. Selection of Referees and Obtaining Letters

Early in the semester preceding consideration of tenure and/or promotion, Tenure and Promotion committee members will begin to generate a list of appropriate external referees for each candidate. Suggested referees should be recognized scholars in relevant areas from peer institutions of high merit. Normally, referees will be tenured and hold the rank of professor. Referees should be as objective and as independent of the candidate as possible. To avoid any conflict of interest, referees should not include the candidate's former instructors, dissertation directors, fellow students, colleagues with whom the candidate has served at other institutions, co-authors, or co-investigators. In addition, in accordance with *The Faculty Manual*, during the referee selection process, referees will be asked to state their relationship with the candidate. Referees will also be required to indicate their relationship with the candidate in their written letters.

Five referees will be chosen by the committee to review the files of each candidate. If the initial five requests do not result in five referees agreeing to serve, the chairperson will request new names from the Committee, and the process will be repeated until five referees are obtained. Approval of any referees will require a majority vote of the committee.

The chairperson will send the documentation prepared by the candidates to the referees. The role of the referees will be to review and evaluate only the candidate's scholarship and research.

V. Consideration of and Voting on Files

The Tenure and Promotion Committee will meet to consider and discuss files before the deadline dates for unit votes based on the appropriate University tenure and promotion calendar. It is the responsibility of each committee member to carefully review the candidate's file before the meeting and to indicate so by initialing the log.

The tenure portfolio is considered first by the Tenure and Promotion Committee and then by the department chair. The Tenure and Promotion Committee will assess the candidate's research, teaching, and service, and vote on the recommendation for or against tenure and/or promotion. The ballots are then added to the candidate portfolio and forwarded to the department chair.

Voting. All committee members voting, including those voting absentee, must initial a written statement indicating that they have reviewed the candidates' files. Discussion of each candidate's file during the unit committee meeting will be followed by a secret-ballot vote by all eligible committee members. Any member who has a legitimate conflict of interest must vote "abstain." Legitimate conflicts of interest include a family or other close personal relationship with the candidate. Other extraordinary circumstances (for example, involving legal or human resources actions) may represent a legitimate conflict of interest. Legitimate conflicts-of-interest must be disclosed to the department chair prior to consideration of the file by the unit committee. If legitimate conflicts-of-interest reduce the unit committee to fewer than five members, then additional members must be recruited as described earlier.

Committee members without conflict of interest may vote "yes" or "no" on each candidate presented. In addition, committee members are required to give written justifications of their ratings of research, teaching, and service, specifically related to the criteria, to support their votes. Lack of familiarity with a candidate's field of scholarship or academic discipline does not justify an abstention. Ballots with written justifications are to be turned in to the secretary within three business days of the discussion of each candidate.

Absentee Voting. Any committee member who will be on official leave or travel (sabbatical leave, maternity leave, short term disability, leave without pay, or approved travel on university business) during the proceedings of the Tenure and Promotion Committee retains the right to vote by notifying the committee chair in writing before beginning the leave or travel. Members voting absentee must be familiar with the evidence. Proxy votes are not allowed. Votes received after the deadline will be counted as abstentions. Oral votes, and votes of faculty absent from the meeting and not voting absentee, will not be counted.

Tallying the Vote. The secretary (or, in the absence of the secretary, a committee member appointed by the chairperson) and two other committee members will count the votes. Abstentions will be recorded but not counted in the total number of votes in determining if the candidate has a majority.

A favorable recommendation for tenure or promotion requires a positive vote from at least a majority of eligible voters, exclusive of those not voting or abstaining.

VI. Post-Meeting Activities

Following the meeting in which a vote is taken, the committee chair will forward the candidate's file, the committee report, and ballots to the IIT department chair by the date specified in the appropriate tenure and promotion calendar.

The committee chair will notify candidates in writing of the recommendation of the Committee. If the recommendation is favorable for tenure and/or promotion, the committee chair will also notify in writing all faculty members and will invite them to submit letters for inclusion in the candidate's file. If the vote is negative, the committee chair will notify the candidate of the ability to make a written request to the committee chair that the file go forward through all appropriate channels. If the vote is negative, the committee chair will notify in writing all faculty members and invite them to submit letters for inclusion in the candidate's file if the candidate has indicated that the file should move forward through all appropriate channels.

The department chair will write a recommendation that reflects his or her own view and assessment, which should address research, teaching, and service as well as an overall recommendation for or against tenure and/or promotion. The department chair then forwards the file, including the committee report and ballots, to the Dean of the college.

VII. Time Lines

At the time specified by the University Tenure and Promotion Calendar, the Department chair will notify all eligible faculty members in writing asking them to send written notification within two weeks whether or not they will request tenure and/or promotion during the coming academic year. Upon notification by a faculty member, the Department chair immediately notifies in writing the Department Tenure and Promotion chairperson. "Eligible faculty" means all faculty members who are not tenured and are eligible for tenure and all faculty members below the rank of professor eligible for promotion.

As soon as candidates have been determined, the Tenure and Promotion Committee Chair will notify all committee members eligible to vote on the candidate asking that they consider potential referees. Faculty will be asked to provide names, academic institutions, ranks, and areas of expertise for the referees they suggest.

For faculty on the regular tenure and promotion cycle, the committee will meet at least one month before the end of the spring semester to select five referees (and alternates) for each candidate. This will allow the chairperson to begin contacting referees before the end of the spring semester.

For faculty on the mid-year tenure and promotion cycle, the committee will meet in September to identify and select five referees (and alternates) for each candidate. This will allow the chairperson to begin contacting referees before the end of the fall semester.

See the University's annual tenure and promotion calendar
(http://www.sc.edu/tenure) for additional dates.

VIII. Safeguarding Information

All deliberations, records, letters, and individual votes in relation to tenure and or promotion decisions are highly confidential. To ensure confidentiality:

1. Committee members shall not divulge, orally or in writing, any information outside the tenure and promotion committee meeting regarding individuals' files, deliberations, or decisions;
2. Votes of individual committee members are anonymous; and
3. Any record of deliberations will be kept in a locked file or protected by password.

See *UCTP Guidelines for Units: Preparing Criteria and Files* and the *USC Columbia Faculty Manual* for additional information.

IX. Criteria for Tenure and Promotion

The IIT Department is committed to achievement in scholarship, teaching and service. The evaluation of candidates for tenure and/or promotion is based on their performance in these three areas. Scholarship and teaching are weighed most heavily in tenure and promotion decisions. Service is necessary but not sufficient for tenure and promotion.

All candidates for tenure and/or promotion should have a record of consistent and durable accomplishment indicative of continuing development in scholarship, teaching, and service. This record should provide evidence of a coherent and unique body of work integrating teaching, scholarship, and service. The candidate's performance should be consistent with that of faculty members of comparable rank in a similar unit at major research universities. The Department recognizes that individual candidates will exhibit different strengths and does not expect each candidate to demonstrate outstanding achievement in all three of these areas.

The entire academic record of a candidate is important to consider. Work performed during the time on tenure track at the University of South Carolina will be given highest priority consideration in tenure and promotion review; productivity in scholarship, teaching, and service prior to coming to USC will be given secondary consideration.

Consistency and durability are relevant factors in evaluating faculty members for tenure. Thus, length of service that a faculty member has completed at a given rank is a valid consideration in making recommendations.

Faculty members are expected to demonstrate continuous professional development in research, teaching, and service. Professional development may include developing relationships with industry professionals, attendance at professional or technical meetings or workshops, and other appropriate activities.

The department does not offer tenure at the rank of assistant professor. Requirements for tenure at the level of associate professor or professor are the same as for promotion to those ranks.

The ratings of outstanding, excellent, good, fair, and unacceptable will be used to rate the performance of candidates for tenure and/or promotion.

Promotion to and/or Tenure as Associate Professor. The candidate for promotion to and/or tenure at the rank of associate professor must demonstrate at least **excellent** performance in teaching or scholarship and at least **good** performance in the other areas. The candidate must show evidence of progress toward establishing a national or international reputation in the field. The candidate must demonstrate strong potential for further development as a teacher and scholar.

Promotion to and/or Tenure as Professor. The candidate for promotion to and/or tenure at the rank of professor must demonstrate at least **excellent** performance in scholarship and teaching, and at least **good** performance in service. The candidate must show evidence of an established national or international reputation in the field.

Indicators of levels of performance in scholarship, teaching and service are described below.

Research and Scholarship. Candidates for tenure and/or promotion are expected to have developed a sustained program of research and scholarship. The Department also values leadership and independent thought in scholarly productivity. The candidate should demonstrate development of a clearly focused original research agenda. Collaborative, interdisciplinary, and solo works are highly valued. When a candidate produces work collaboratively, the percentage and nature of the contribution made by the candidate to the work should be indicated in the research and scholarship section of the primary file. A broad variety of disseminated products may be offered to provide evidence of quality research productivity.

In evaluating the quality of evidence presented in the portfolio, considerations include the rigor of the peer review involved and the appropriateness and status or reputation of the journal, publisher, conference or other outlet. Indicators may include the acceptance rate of the journal or conference, the impact factor or ranking of journal, and the level of the conference (e.g., international, national, or regional). Other evidence may include commentary from outside reviewers on the importance and impact of the work; the reputation of those outside reviewers; judgments of the value and impact of a work by eligible faculty colleagues; applications for and receipt of external or internal funding; and indications that the work is cited by others and/or has had an impact on the field.

Indications of the quality of research may also include: innovative research methods that offer new solutions to problems encountered in the field; substantive, new critical insights on a subject that enable others to view it with greater clarity or new perspectives; integration and synthesis of large amounts of existing data or information in a new framework that clarifies how different aspects of knowledge

relate; and other conceptual and theoretical innovations that generate new ways of thinking about existing topics or problems.

Considerations in evaluating the quantity of research include whether the number of publications is appropriate to the rank, and whether the record demonstrates a regular and sustained flow of peer-review contributions (after due consideration for the nature of the work and review/publication timetables). The quality of the work is more important than quantity, but the continuity and pace of the research output are to be considered in context with the quality or value of the work.

Indicators of the professional reputation of the faculty member may include presentations at regional, national, and international meetings; invitations to lecture at other universities and a national or international meetings; invitations to organize symposia or panels at meetings; grants or contracts; awards by national or international organizations; memberships on editorial boards; editorships of journals, books, or other scholarly venues; and leadership positions in scholarly societies. In assessing these indicators, the reputation of the organizations, conferences, journals, scholarly societies, and grant making or contracting agencies, as well as the nature and rigor of any peer review process involved, are relevant considerations. Measures of research impact may include measures such as the number of citations of published work, the h-index score, the Research Gate RG score, and the number of digital downloads of work.

To receive an **outstanding** rating in research and scholarship, a candidate must demonstrate performance that is far above the minimally effective level. The candidate must maintain a continuing record of extensive peer-reviewed scholarly activity and external research funding, show evidence of national or international stature in the field, and have a clearly defined focus for scholarship that has brought recognition as an expert.

To receive an **excellent** rating in research and scholarship, a candidate is expected to show a sustained program of research, with quality and quantity appropriate to the rank sought. The candidate's body of work as a whole significantly exceeds the minimally effective level of performance. It should be evident that the candidate can achieve a national/international reputation in the field**.** The candidate has secured external funding to support a research program.

A rating of **good** will be given to candidates who clearly exceed the minimally effective level. A rating of good requires an average of at least one quality peer-reviewed journal publication per year. The candidate shows evidence of vigorous pursuit of research funding and promise of securing future funding.

A rating of **fair** will be given to candidates whose research meets the minimally effective level of performance. There is a concerted effort in research, but output does not average at least one quality peer-reviewed journal publication per year. There is evidence of pursuit of external funding.

A rating of **unacceptable** will be given to candidates who demonstrate less than the minimally effective level of performance.

Teaching. A record of sustained performance in teaching is required of all tenure and promotion candidates. The Department values teaching in the classroom and online and the supervision of student research and experiential learning. The Department values the ability to translate knowledge to practice through diverse teaching methods that produce demonstrable student competencies. Faculty members are expected to demonstrate increasing leadership in curriculum development and delivery methods as they gain teaching experience.

To receive an **outstanding** rating for teaching, a candidate must far exceed the minimally effective level, maintaining a continuing record of growth as an educator, and demonstrating leadership in curriculum development, innovation, evaluation, and mentoring of other educators.

To receive an **excellent** rating for teaching, a candidate significantly exceeds the minimally effective level of performance and shows evidence of growth as an educator. The candidate has made a consistent impact on the improvement and evaluation of the curriculum and contributed to individual student development through activities such as advisement, mentoring, supervision of student research, and/or participation in doctoral committees.

A rating of **good** will be given to candidates whose teaching is clearly above the minimally effective level. Teaching shows evidence of continuous improvement and is consistently evaluated positively by peers and students.

A rating of **fair** will be given to candidates whose teaching meets the minimally effective level of performance. The candidate demonstrates competence in the delivery of instruction and is generally evaluated positively by peers and students. Instructional content shows expertise in the subject.

A rating of **unacceptable** will be given to candidates who demonstrate less than the minimally effective level of performance.

Teaching includes the full range of instructional activities engaged in by the faculty member. The following activities fall within this area. Candidates need not present accomplishments in all these areas.

- Teaching of undergraduate and graduate courses;
- Supervising comprehensive research projects and honors theses;
- Supervising independent study projects;
- Supervising theses or dissertations, or serving on dissertation committees;
- Establishing and maintaining effective relationships with students, including effective professional advisement and maintaining adequate office hours or appointment opportunities for students;
- Participating in course development, which includes innovative teaching methods, preparation of new courses, and participating in course organization;
- Developing and appropriately using technology in the classroom and otherwise supporting teaching through course management software, web sites, and other technologies; and

- Engaging in professional development activities to improve teaching effectiveness.

The following items are evidence of teaching performance required of all candidates:

- A statement of teaching philosophy;
- Documentation of the teaching activities listed above;
- Peer teaching evaluations completed by a tenured faculty member are required annually for all faculty members; and
- Student evaluations for all course sections taught.

Additional evidence of teaching performance may include the following, not in order of significance. Candidates need not present all these items.

- Number and quality of completed theses or dissertations chaired;
- Supervision of student research;
- Supervision of internships or practica;
- Receipt of teaching awards;
- Evidence of contributions to curriculum and/or course innovation, development, implementation, and/or evaluation;
- Contributions to certificate programs and other specialized courses of study;
- Faculty development contributions to the university community;
- Advising students;
- Mentoring students;
- Written statements from former students regarding significant contribution to their professional development;
- Nomination for teaching awards; and
- Documentation of participation in activities designed to improve teaching effectiveness such as ongoing specialized teaching cohorts, summer fellowships, or receiving professional certifications or licensure.

Teaching Summary. The Tenure and Promotion Committee prepares a narrative summary and evaluation of the faculty member's classroom teaching, based on the criteria, above, which is included in the faculty member's promotion and/or tenure file. This summary will provide information about the typical teaching load in the unit, a summary of peer evaluation of teaching, and documentation for any course releases.

If the candidate's teaching load deviates significantly from that which is typical, an explanation should be given. The teaching summary will also give context to student evaluations of the faculty member's classroom teaching. The context may include noting whether evaluations of a particular class historically have been low; in a multi-section course, how the faculty member's evaluation scores compare with those in the other sections; or whether poor evaluation scores are correlated to a faculty member's strict grading standards, or if it is thought that the student

evaluations do not accurately portray the quality of the candidate's teaching. Also included is a complete explanation of numerical ratings when numerical ratings are used. Information should be presented concerning the instructional responsibilities to undergraduate and graduate students and the number of thesis or dissertation students supervised by the candidate.

Service. A record of sustained, good performance in the area of service is required of all tenure and promotion candidates. Providing good service is a fundamental act of community building and an essential part of being a faculty member. The Department encourages an increasing level of responsibility and leadership with increasing rank. Service includes contributions to the Department, the College, the University, the profession, and the larger society at the community, state, national and/or international levels.

To receive an **outstanding** rating for service, a candidate must far exceed the minimally effective level, demonstrating participation or leadership in the profession at the national or international level as well as to the department, college, university, and larger society.

To receive an **excellent** rating for service, a candidate must significantly exceed the minimally effective level of performance, and must demonstrate productive and sustained leadership in service to the college, university, profession, or larger society.

A rating of **good** will be given to candidates whose service is clearly above the minimally effective level. The candidate demonstrates active and productive service to the department and also the college, university, profession, or the larger society.

A rating of **fair** will be given to candidates whose service meets the minimally effective level of performance. The candidate provides service to the department, college, university, profession, or the larger society.

A rating of **unacceptable** will be given to candidates who demonstrate less than the minimally effective level of performance.

Primary evidence of Department, College and University Service includes the following. Candidates need not present evidence in all these categories.

- Participating on or chairing a Department, College, or University committee;
- Directing or otherwise contributing to a Department, College or University initiative, program, clinic, center, lab, or institute;
- Providing significant formal and informal support and assistance to faculty colleagues, the College, or University; and
- Mentoring faculty colleagues.

Primary evidence of professional, community, or societal service includes the following items. Candidates need not present accomplishments in all these areas.

- Providing consultation to local, state, federal, or international agencies;
- Making presentations to community groups;

- Serving on a board of directors or community committee;
- Serving on a national or state professional task force or committee;
- Engaging in professional practice or consultancy which advances the candidate's teaching and scholarly competence;
- Serving as an officer of international, national, regional, or state professional organizations or associations;
- Serving as a committee chair or member of international, national, or state professional associations;
- Providing leadership in a professional or academic conference or institute;
- Serving as editor or on a journal editorial board;
- Reviewing manuscripts for refereed conferences or journals;
- Serving on a research review panel; and
- Providing external reviews of faculty members at other universities.

Revisions to these Policies and Procedures

Any tenured or tenure-track faculty member of the Integrated Information Technology Department may propose revisions to the Guidelines. Any revisions must be approved by a two-thirds vote of all tenured faculty members.

Acknowledgements

In addition to *The Faculty Manual*, the following tenure and promotion guidelines were consulted in the drafting of this document:
- The University of South Carolina College of Hospitality, Retail and Sport Management 2007 guidelines;
- the November 2015 Tenure & Promotion Criteria and Procedures of the College of Social Work at the University of South Carolina;
- the Criteria for Tenure and Promotion, Department of Chemical Engineering, University of South Carolina, December 5, 2012;
- the Indiana University School of Informatics and Computing, Bloomington Campus Promotion and Tenure Policies & Guidelines;
- the University of Connecticut School of Business Criteria for Promotion;
- the University of Georgia Terry College of Business Criteria and Procedures for Promotion and Tenure;
- the University of Kentucky School of Library and Information Science Guidelines for Tenure and Promotion;
- the University of Maryland Robert H. Smith School of Business Criteria for Appointment/Promotion to Faculty Ranks;
- the University of Missouri System Policy 320.035 Policy and Procedures for Promotion and Tenure;
- the University of North Carolina Kenan-Flagler Business School Guidelines for Tenure and Promotion;

- the Rutgers University Policy 60.5.14 Criteria for Academic Appointments, Reappointments and Promotions;
- the University of Tennessee College of Business Administration Faculty Evaluation Policy Document and Procedures; and
- the University of Virginia McIntire School of Commerce Appointment, Reappointment, Promotion, and Tenure Document.