

**University of South Carolina School of Medicine
Columbia**

**Tenure and Promotion Procedures and Criteria for
Tenure-Track Basic Science Faculty**

University Committee on Tenure and Promotions Approval Date: April 23, 2025
Criteria Effective Date: August 16, 2025

See final page for faculty revision and approvals history

University of South Carolina School of Medicine

Tenure and Promotion Procedures and Criteria for Tenure-Track Basic Science Faculty

I. Introduction

The mission of the University of South Carolina School of Medicine (SOM) is to improve the health of the people of South Carolina through the development and implementation of programs for medical education, research, and the delivery of health care. The faculty of the Basic Science departments support this mission primarily through teaching of the basic biomedical sciences to medical, undergraduate, graduate and post-graduate students, performing biomedical research and other scholarly activity, and providing service to the academic, scientific and lay communities.

This document provides a structure for evaluating candidates for tenure and promotion in the Basic Science departments of the School of Medicine.

II. Procedures

All School of Medicine procedures will comply with the University of South Carolina procedures (the current versions of the Faculty Manual and UCTP Guidelines) and the Fall and Spring Tenure and Promotion Calendars.

All tenured faculty in the Basic Sciences Departments are members of the USC SOM Basic Science Tenure & Promotion Committee.

The USC SOM Basic Science T&P Committee elects a Chair for a two-year term by April 15, on alternate academic years. The T&P Committee Chair can serve no more than two consecutive terms (four years). A former T&P Committee Chair can be re-elected after a one term break (2 years). The Unit Chair must be a tenured professor but cannot be a Department Chair or an administrative officer (Assistant or Associate Dean, Vice Dean or Dean) of the School of Medicine. A simple majority vote can remove the Chair from office.

- A. All non-tenured faculty members in the tenure track are considered for tenure and all tenure-track faculty members below the rank of Professor are considered for promotion each year. Candidates for tenure and/or promotion who are considered according to the fall tenure and promotion calendar will receive written notification before April 1. Those candidates who are considered according to the spring tenure and promotion calendar will receive notification before October 1. The Dean is responsible for notification of the individual faculty members under consideration (with a copy to the Department Chair).
- B. Individual faculty members under consideration must notify the Dean's office and their Department Chair in writing whether or not they wish to be considered in a given year by the 15th calendar day after they receive notification. Faculty in the decision year must be considered. The faculty member desiring consideration must submit a file

electronically, using forms provided by the Provost's office, to the School of Medicine Basic Science T&P Committee Chair at least one week before the University deadline, established every year in the Tenure and Promotion calendar. The T&P Committee Chair will solicit sufficient evaluation letters from external reviewers to secure a minimum of five evaluations of the candidate's research and scholarship. Reviewers will be impartial scholars within the candidate's field at peer or aspirant institutions outside the University of South Carolina. A reviewer may also be recruited from a non-peer institution if he/she is a leading scholar in the candidate's field. Non-university specialists may be used as outside evaluators if applicable; however, the evaluators will normally be persons with academic affiliations. Reviewers must be able to write an objective review: therefore, persons who have co-authored publications, collaborated on research, or been colleagues or advisors of the applicant normally should be excluded from consideration as outside evaluators. All evaluators will be asked to disclose any relationship or interaction with the candidate.

The reviewers will be sent (a) the criteria for tenure and promotion of Basic Science faculty members, (b) the candidate's curriculum vitae, (c) the candidate's personal statement, and (d) representative publications of the candidate. In the personal statement, the candidate should address his/her contribution to collaborative work. Reviewers will be asked to comment on whether the candidate meets the unit criteria for tenure and/or promotion with regard to research/scholarly activity. Reviewers will also be asked to indicate the candidate's contribution in the field of research or scholarly activity and to state if the candidate is developing a national reputation with the likelihood of continued success or, for promotion to Professor, has attained a national or international reputation. A biographic paragraph that states the reviewer's qualifications to comment on the candidate or a copy of the reviewer's abbreviated *curriculum vitae* should be placed in the candidate's file with each letter.

The T&P file will be assembled by the candidate with the help of his/her department chair, mentors, and/or staff, utilizing the common template available on the Provost Office website.

In addition to the items and information requested in the template, the following items will be added to the primary file:

- 1) The Department Chair will provide a description of what the candidate's position has been within the department from the date of hire or the date of prior promotion, and a statement of the distribution of the candidate's time and effort in teaching, research/scholarly activity and service.
- 2) The primary file will also include a teaching summary, solicited by the T&P Committee Chair and prepared by a tenured faculty member who is familiar with the candidate's teaching activities. This summary should include a synthesis of student and peer teaching evaluations and a comparison of the candidate's teaching evaluations with those of others obtained in the same or similar courses in the School of Medicine.

- 3) The primary file should also contain copies of the student evaluation form and peer evaluations of teaching.
- C. Following the deadline for submission of the file, the Basic Science Tenure and Promotion Committee of the School of Medicine will meet to discuss the candidate. The Tenure and Promotion Committee consists of all tenured faculty members with primary appointments in the School of Medicine Basic Science Departments, as follows:

Only tenured members of the unit may vote on an application for tenure or promotion. Faculty members of equal or higher rank may vote on a candidate for tenure but only faculty of higher rank may vote on promotion. Emeriti professors may not vote. A faculty member on leave may vote only upon written notification to the Chair of the Tenure and Promotion Committee or Dean of a desire to do so before beginning the leave.

Exceptions include any otherwise eligible faculty member who has a conflict of interest or a family or other close personal relationship with the candidate that could affect his or her objectivity: these individuals shall not vote or otherwise participate in the process. Department Chairs or other administrators, who have written or will write or advise in the writing of a Chair's or Dean's letter for the file, may not vote as part of the Tenure and Promotion Committee. They also may not attend the Tenure and Promotion Committee Meeting unless invited by the Committee Chair.

At the meeting of the unit Tenure and Promotion Committee, the candidate's file will be presented to the committee by the Chair of the committee or his/her designee.

Voting will be conducted electronically by a system that ensures anonymity. Written ballot justifications are mandatory and must address how the candidate either meets or fails to meet unit criteria.

Votes will be recorded as favorable, unfavorable, or abstain. **A favorable decision will require a simple majority of the justified "yes" or "no" votes of all members.** Written justification of the votes is mandatory. Ballots marked "abstain" will not be counted in determining a majority. The Chair of the Tenure and Promotion Committee (or a designee) will compile and send to the Dean a list of all eligible faculty casting ballots and of those failing to vote. The Chair of the Tenure and Promotion Committee will forward all recommendations to the Department Chair with supporting material. The Department Chair will submit his/her own letter to be added to the file after the Unit has voted.

- D. It is the responsibility of the Chair of the Tenure and Promotion Committee to notify the faculty member under consideration and the faculty member's Departmental Chair of the favorable or unfavorable recommendation by the Committee. In the case of an unfavorable recommendation, the unit T&P chair (or if the chair is not privy to the unit proceedings, a designated senior faculty member who was) will notify the candidate promptly and shall, upon request by the candidate, without attributions, provide the candidate with a synopsis of the discussion and an indication of the strength of the vote of the unit.

A faculty member receiving a negative recommendation by the Tenure and Promotion Committee may appeal the recommendation by notifying, in writing, the Chair of the Tenure and Promotion Committee of the intention to file an appeal within the schedule given in the University Tenure and Promotion Calendar. If the candidate appeals the committee's recommendation, the Chair of the Tenure and Promotion Committee will invite further written comments from the faculty.

The Dean will review the files of all candidates receiving a positive recommendation from the Tenure and Promotion Committee, candidates who are appealing a negative recommendation from the Committee, and candidates for tenure in their decision year. The Dean will add an assessment and recommendation to these files and forward the file with his or her recommendation to the Provost.

- E. Additions to the file initiated by the candidate or by unit faculty members after the Tenure and Promotion Committee's vote has occurred are limited to the following (per UCTP Guidelines):
 - a. Unit faculty vote justifications, and statements from the unit administrator, dean, and Provost accompanying the file to the next steps of the procedure.
 - b. 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; (d) published reviews of a candidate's work which appear after the unit vote; (e) notices of award for grant proposals that were pending when the file was submitted.
 - d. Letters from faculty members in the unit. Each faculty member, whether or not authorized to vote, may write to the unit administrator, 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.
- F. Failure to recommend favorably at a particular time, except in the case of tenure in a decision year, is without prejudice with respect to future consideration.
- G. The procedures for appeals to the University Grievance Committee are presented in the most current version of The Faculty Manual.

Criteria for Tenure and Promotion

A. General Guidelines

1. Criteria will comply with those of the University of South Carolina as outlined in the current versions of *The Faculty Manual* and *The University Committee on Tenure and Promotions Guide to Criteria and Procedures*.

2. In agreement with *The Faculty Manual*, the award of tenure and promotion will depend upon the candidate's level of performance in teaching, research or scholarly activity, and service. Candidates must provide evidence that their work consistently meets the standards established in this document.

a. **Teaching.** We adopt the definition of teaching published by the Association of American Medical Colleges in their 2007 summary report entitled, *Advancing Educators and Education: Defining the Components and Evidence of Educational Scholarship*. It states, "Teaching is any activity that fosters learning, including direct teaching and creation of associated instructional materials. Examples of direct teaching include lectures, workshops, small-group facilitation, role modeling in any setting (such as ward attending), precepting, demonstration of procedural skills, facilitation of online courses, and formative feedback." It also states, "Instructional materials are included in the teaching category when they are developed to specifically enhance instructors' own presentations, such as media, handouts, or interactive materials." Active participation in teaching laboratories in courses in which laboratories constitute a primary method for teaching is considered direct teaching.

b. Graduate education is defined as teaching of all post-baccalaureate students in certificate or degree programs in basic biomedical or allied health sciences.

Faculty members in the Basic Sciences are responsible for educating and training students in at least one of the following categories, as assigned or as defined by the terms of their contract with the School of Medicine:

- medical students
- graduate students
- undergraduate students
- residents and fellows
- biomedical science certificate students
- students in other professional programs

Thus, the teaching portfolio of a faculty member should be evaluated on the basis of the teaching duties assigned to the candidate by his/her department, and/or those specified in contractual agreements between the Faculty and the School of Medicine, or, in case of joint hires between the School of Medicine and another Unit, as detailed in the job description agreed upon by both Units.

Although the number of contact hours may be less than those typical of academic units with responsibility for undergraduate teaching, assigned teaching loads for Basic Science faculty members in the School of Medicine are consistent with those at medical schools of major research universities. Faculty members are

expected to contribute significantly to the teaching mission of the School of Medicine and to be at least good teachers.

Faculty who are successful in obtaining grants from external agencies that restrict teaching such as NIH type K grants may be expected to teach less than other faculty. However, they are expected to teach to some extent ($\geq 10\%$ effort) and demonstrate at least good accomplishments in teaching, prior to being considered for tenure or promotion to Associate or Full Professor.

- c. **Research or scholarly activity.** A record of original scholarship supported by substantial extramural funding, sufficient to produce peer-reviewed publications that make a major intellectual contribution to the candidate's field, is the foremost criterion for award of tenure and promotion. Usually, at least 50% of a faculty member's effort should be devoted to this area if tenure and promotion are desired.

Although independence of the faculty member from graduate, postdoctoral and other advisors is generally required for tenure and promotion, it is recognized that biomedical research increasingly involves collaborative efforts. Candidates for tenure or promotion may have conducted their research/scholarly activity in collaboration with other investigators. Nevertheless, the candidate must be recognized by collaborators, internal peers and external reviewers as an independent, original and substantive investigator who has made critical contributions to, and served as a full participating member of, the collaborative effort. The nature of the candidate's contribution to collaborative grants and publications should be included in the lists of these items and documented in the candidate's personal statement. Where possible, this should also be addressed in the letters of reviewers.

Independence is demonstrated to a greater extent by being the Principal Investigator on a grant award rather than being a co-Principal Investigator which, in turn, demonstrates greater independence than being a co-investigator. First authorship and senior or corresponding authorship (which is often the last author listed on publications) generally demonstrate greater contribution to the work than placement of authorship elsewhere in publications with three or more authors.

- d. **Service.** Faculty members are expected to perform service in support of the missions and goals of the School, the University and the scientific community.
- e. **In each area.** The level of performance necessary for award of tenure and/or promotion in each area is given below. The minimum required evidence of accomplishment for each area is listed. Documentation of performance (copies of publications, teaching aids, award letters, chair's statement of departmental service, record of committee service, letters outlining collaborative efforts etc.) should be included in the candidate's supplemental file. Student and peer evaluations of teaching must be included in the primary file.

H. Tenure and Promotion to Associate Professor

The criteria for promotion to Associate Professor and for award of tenure are the same with the exception of early promotion based on service at another institution, as indicated below.

For tenure at the Associate Professor level and for promotion to Associate Professor, the primary criteria are excellent accomplishment in the candidate's area of research with evidence of a developing national reputation and the promise of continued success. Good accomplishments in medical and graduate teaching and good accomplishment in service must also be shown. The faculty member is expected to hold an earned doctoral degree and to have at least four years of independent teaching and research.

1. Teaching

a. Required as evidence of at least good teaching

- i. All direct teaching is considered in evaluating faculty for tenure and promotion. Positive evaluations of assigned direct teaching in didactic (versus primarily research) courses documented with student and peer evaluations are necessary to support the assessment of good teaching. Student and peer evaluations must be provided periodically since appointment to the tenure-track. Where available, comparative data for other instructors in the same course, or comparable courses in the School of Medicine, should be provided. A mean, overall student evaluation rating (on the statement pertaining to "Overall effectiveness as a teacher" or "Overall effectiveness as a facilitator") of at least "good" (on a scale of 1-5 with 1 = poor, 2 = fair, 3 = good, 4 = excellent, and 5 = outstanding) is expected. Similarly, a minimum overall peer evaluation of "good" on the above 5-point scale is expected.
- ii. Other teaching functions are important but do not substitute for good evaluations of direct teaching. For example, faculty members being considered for tenure and/or promotion are expected to have participated in one or more of "other teaching functions." The following indicators are representative of other teaching functions:
 - (a) Direction of student dissertation or thesis research.
 - (b) Direction of other research projects involving undergraduate, graduate or postdoctoral students.
 - (c) Development and teaching of undergraduate, graduate, professional or postgraduate courses in addition to assigned teaching.
 - (d) Serving as course director for a medical or graduate didactic course.
 - (e) Creation of instructional materials.

- (f) Advisement of students and student organizations
- (g) publication of peer-reviewed articles on educational issues;
- (h) publication of textbooks, laboratory manuals, web sites or other teaching aids;
- (i) receipt of School of Medicine or University teaching awards;
- (j) receipt of teaching grants;
- (k) acting as a principal investigator for a training grant awarded to the department or graduate program;
- (l) service on student thesis committees;
- (m) participation in national/international medical teaching symposia;
- (n) attendance at teaching workshops
- (o) other efforts to improve teaching quality

2. Research

a. Required as evidence of excellent accomplishment

- i. A record of original research in recognized, peer-reviewed publications having a national or international scope. Publications should be judged by quality as well as by quantity and their indication of the development of a national or international reputation. There is no mandated minimum expected number of publications, as each field has its own standards in this area. Publications should reflect work accomplished since appointment and should have been conducted primarily at the University of South Carolina. The candidate should indicate clearly his/her role in each published report as well as the role of collaborators. Articles in which the candidate has made a substantial contribution will be given more consideration than articles in which the candidate played a minor role. Copies of all articles published before and after appointment to the faculty of the University of South Carolina School of Medicine should be included in the secondary file.
- ii. Demonstration of the ability to sustain a high quality research program. Current funding, awarded to the candidate as Principal Investigator or co-Principal Investigator, from federal granting agencies or national funding organizations or comparable funding from contracts or fees from license of intellectual property, sufficient to accomplish the research objectives, is expected. The candidate should add a summary of his/her contribution to grants/research projects on which he/she is not principal investigator.
- iii. Presentation of results at scientific conferences (voluntary posters or oral presentations), invited presentations at regional or national symposia or invited seminars at institutions other than USC.
- iv. Positive evaluations and a recommendation for tenure/promotion by a majority of the external reviewers. Letters should indicate excellent research accomplishment by the candidate with a developing national reputation and the probability of continued success. Sufficient guidance

should be provided to the external reviewers in order to allow them to assess the candidate's performance by the Unit's guidelines.

- b. Additional evidence of excellent accomplishment might include authorship of review articles or other articles in books and journals lacking peer review; authorship or editorship of an academic or scholarly book or monograph; elected membership in a scientific or professional society; patents; awards or special recognition for research accomplishments.

3. Service

- a. Required as evidence of good accomplishment:
 - i. Participation in departmental and School of Medicine activities and performance of assigned departmental service.
 - ii. Current or previously completed service on at least two School of Medicine or University committees.
 - iii. Professional service including one or more of the following:
 - (a) Committee member or officer in a scientific or professional organization.
 - (b) Organization of symposia, conferences, etc.
 - (c) Professionally relevant university or community service.
 - (d) Review of manuscripts for scientific journals.
 - (e) Review of grant applications for regional or national funding organizations.
- b. Additional evidence of good accomplishment in service might include service in an administrative capacity in the School of Medicine or the University; publications on service/administrative issues; consultation; and awards for School of Medicine, University of South Carolina or relevant community service.

C. Promotion to Professor

For promotion to the rank of Professor, outstanding, sustained scholarship is required. The candidate must have made a major intellectual contribution in the area of specialization and have attained a national or international reputation for research/scholarly activity. Excellent accomplishments in teaching and good accomplishments in service are also required.

Most candidates will have specialized in biomedical research, but specialization in biomedical education is also acceptable if the candidate's performance meets the criteria for outstanding research/scholarly activity. Outstanding performance in teaching at the

local level alone is *not* sufficient for promotion to Professor. However, a sustained, outstanding performance in School of Medicine education programs (an unusually high percentage of effort in teaching, successful directorship of major medical or graduate courses as evidenced by outstanding course evaluations, receipt of multiple awards for excellence in teaching, consistently outstanding teaching evaluations by students and peers) *combined with* evidence of a national or international scholarly reputation *and* excellent research/scholarly activity would be acceptable for promotion to Professor.

Evaluation will include the entire professional record, but will emphasize performance since promotion to (or appointment at) Associate Professor. Usually, the faculty member is expected to hold an earned doctoral degree and to have at least nine years of excellent accomplishment in teaching and excellent accomplishment in research.

1. Teaching

a. Required as evidence of excellent accomplishment

- i. Direct teaching (as defined under “General Guidelines” above) is considered primarily in evaluating faculty for promotion to Professor. Positive evaluations of assigned direct teaching in didactic (versus primarily research) courses documented with student and peer evaluations are required. Student and peer evaluations must be provided periodically since appointment to the tenure-track. Where available, comparative data for other instructors in the same course, or comparable courses in the School of Medicine, should be provided. A mean, overall student evaluation rating (on the statement pertaining to “Overall effectiveness as a teacher” or “Overall effectiveness as a facilitator”) of at least 3.5 (on a scale of 1-5 with 1 = poor, 2 = fair, 3 = good, 4 = excellent, and 5 = outstanding) is expected. Similarly, a minimum overall evaluation of 3.5 by peer evaluators is expected. These minimum ratings should be consistent for the period since tenure.

ii. Two or more of the following indicators:

- (a) Direction of student dissertation or thesis research.
- (b) Direction of research projects involving undergraduate, graduate or postdoctoral students.
- (c) Direction of a major, multi-instructor course for medical or graduate students. Results of course evaluations in comparison with other courses taught at the School of Medicine should be included in the file.
- (d) Receipt of School of Medicine or other awards for excellence in teaching.
- (e) Development and teaching of undergraduate, graduate, professional or postgraduate courses in addition to assigned teaching.

- b. Additional evidence of excellent accomplishment might include receipt of teaching grants; acting as a principal investigator for a training grant awarded to the department or graduate program; service on student thesis committees; and development of significant teaching aids such as textbooks, web sites or computer-aided instruction.

2. Research/Scholarly activity

- a. Required as evidence of outstanding, sustained scholarship:
 - i. A sustained record of original scholarship in recognized, peer-reviewed publications having a national or international scope. Publications should be judged by quality as well as by quantity. There is no mandated minimum expected number of publications, as each field has its own standards in this area. Publications should reflect work accomplished primarily at the University of South Carolina. The candidate should indicate his/her role in each published report. Articles in which the candidate has made a substantial contribution will be given more consideration than articles in which the candidate played a minor role. Copies of the articles should be included in the secondary file.
 - ii. Demonstration of the ability to sustain a high quality program of research or other scholarly activity. Sustained and substantial funding, awarded to the candidate as Principal Investigator or co-Principal Investigator, from federal granting agencies or generation of funding through other external grants or other sources such as contracts or fees from license of intellectual property, sufficient to accomplish the research/scholarly objectives, is expected.
 - iii. Presentation of results at scientific conferences (voluntary posters or oral presentations), invited presentations at regional or national symposia or invited seminars at institutions other than USC.
 - iv. Positive evaluations by the majority of the external reviewers. Letters should indicate outstanding accomplishment in scholarly activity by the candidate with attainment of a national or international reputation.
- b. Additional evidence of outstanding, sustained scholarship might include authorship of review articles; authorship/editorship of an academic or scholarly book or monograph; awards or special recognition for research/scholarly accomplishments; patents; receipt of career development awards, senior faculty fellowships or grants.

3. Service

- a. Required as evidence of good accomplishment

- i. Active leadership within the department or graduate program. Examples are service as a course director, graduate director or committee chair.
 - ii. Active (present or past) participation in at least three School of Medicine or University committees. At least one of these must be a major committee (e.g., Curriculum Committee, Admissions Committee, Graduate Committee, Institutional Review Board, Institutional Animal Care and Use Committee). Service should also include appointment or election to chair or other office for at least one such committee.
 - iii. Professional service of one or more of the following types: leadership in scientific or professional organizations, organization of symposia or conferences, service on national grant review panels or editorial boards, or consultation with government or industry.
- b. Additional evidence of good accomplishment might include service as a student advisor; service in an administrative capacity in the School of Medicine or the University; peer-reviewed publications on service/administrative issues; professionally relevant community service; and awards for School of Medicine, University of South Carolina or professionally relevant community service.

D. Evaluation of faculty hired with or without tenure at the Associate Professor or Professor level

The whole career of persons hired to the faculty of the School of Medicine at the level of Associate Professor or above, with or without tenure, will be evaluated under the same criteria described above.

Faculty appointments at the level of Associate Professor or Full Professor may be recommended for tenure at the time of their appointment. However, external candidates must go through the same sequence of procedures and document that they have satisfied the most recent criteria equivalent to that for both the award of tenure and for the appointment at the level of Associate or Full Professor as internal candidates within the basic science unit of the school of medicine. The time frame for voting and approval of the recommendations by faculty and administrators will be expedited to accommodate hiring of the candidate. Recommendations are subject to final approval by the Board of Trustees.

E. Faculty with Joint Appointments

In the case of joint appointments, the SOM Basic Sciences Unit Chair will contact the Chair of the T&P Unit at the secondary department who will distribute the file to faculty eligible to vote in the secondary unit, asking for written comments on the file and an overall recommendation.

Comments and recommendation provided by the secondary unit will be placed in

the candidate's file at least five working days prior to the unit's vote on the application. Faculty who are members of both the primary and secondary unit can only vote in the primary unit. In cases in which the secondary unit does not achieve consensus regarding a file, the secondary unit may submit two letters for inclusion in the candidate's file: a majority and a minority report.

A secondary unit may choose to recommend external reviewers from whom to solicit letters of support: In such a case, the secondary unit should work with the Chair of the primary unit to coordinate the request for outside references.

Faculty Revision and Approvals History

- Approved by the School of Medicine Basic Sciences Tenure and Promotion Unit Faculty on June 29, 2022
- Approved by the University Committee on Tenure and Promotions on January 22, 2025
- Additional revisions approved by School of Medicine Basic Sciences Tenure and Promotion Unit Faculty on January 31, 2025
- Approved by the University Committee on Tenure and Promotions on April 23, 2025