
<p style="text-align: center;">CRITERIA AND PROCEDURES FOR TENURE AND PROMOTION DEPARTMENT OF ELECTRICAL ENGINEERING UNIVERSITY OF SOUTH CAROLINA</p>
--

APPROVED BY UNIVERSITY COMMITTEE ON TENURE AND PROMOTIONS – MARCH 7, 2018

1. INTRODUCTION

Tenure and promotion procedures, general guidelines, and policies are set forth in the Faculty Manual, specifically the Faculty Manual dated 10 June 2016 (http://www.sc.edu/policies/facman/Faculty_Manual_Columbia.pdf). This document details the specific criteria and procedures used by the Department of Electrical Engineering to implement University guidelines. When conflicts exist, the latest edition of The Faculty Manual will take precedence.

Decisions to recommend faculty for promotion and/or tenure are extremely important because they ultimately determine the quality and stature of the Department. The basis for these decisions shall be the candidate's claims of achievement and the evidence presented to substantiate those claims in the areas of teaching, research and scholarship, and service.

Copies of all available versions of the Tenure and Promotion criteria are kept by the department of Electrical Engineering and on the Provost's website (http://www.sc.edu/about/offices_and_divisions/provost/faculty/tenure/). This document supersedes all prior versions.

2. PHILOSOPHY AND BACKGROUND

The duties of faculty members in the Electrical Engineering department are in three primary areas: (1) teaching, (2) research and scholarship, and (3) service. For promotion or tenure, the performance of candidates in the three primary areas will be reviewed over their entire academic career, with more emphasis given to the period at the current rank. The Department expects that the candidate's performance will reflect continuous and consistent professional development. Granting tenure or promotion in rank represents recognition of past achievement as well as a clear confidence of future progress and further professional development.

The Department is committed to excellence and to the attainment of distinction; accordingly the tenure and promotion criteria are intended to stimulate professional growth, to promote faculty excellence, and to ensure that each tenure or promotion decision is made solely on the grounds of professional merit. We recognize that every case is unique and that application of an absolute set of guidelines is difficult. Therefore these criteria represent a minimum set to be achieved to receive a favorable recommendation from the Electrical Engineering Unit.

2.1 Teaching

Teaching encompasses the whole range of activities that relate to transferring knowledge to others. It includes not only the traditional classroom experience, but also the training and mentoring of graduate students, and development of new courses and course facilities.

2.2 Research and Scholarship

Research entails scholarly inquiry that produces new knowledge, and that culminates in dissemination of that knowledge through appropriate venues. It broadens the candidate's competence and professional ability, and furthers the general objective of expanding the horizons of knowledge. Research and Scholarship should entail work recognized as being of lasting value by peers.

2.3 Service

Service entails all of the activities that promote the purposes and functioning of the department, the college, the university, and the electrical engineering profession. Service at the department, college and the University, community, or professional levels is considered.

3. TENURE AND PROMOTION IN THE DEPARTMENT

3.1 Eligibility for Tenure and/or Promotion

Faculty members in a tenure track position must hold an earned doctorate in Electrical Engineering or a related field. All Electrical Engineering tenure and promotion criteria conform to the guidelines as set forth in the University Faculty Manual as regards minimum years of service.

For a faculty appointment at the rank of Associate Professor or higher, the Electrical Engineering Criteria allow a recommendation for tenure on appointment. The Criteria also allow for consideration of time and accomplishments in a faculty position at another educational institution in evaluating a candidate for tenure or promotion.

3.2 T&P File Preparation and Contents

The candidate is responsible for the preparation of the tenure and promotion file that is presented to the Unit Committee. The candidate's file must include all materials specified in the UCTP template.

The candidate will submit her/his file to the departmental T&P chair according to the calendar published by the Provost's Office. Once the file has been considered and voted on by the unit T&P committee no new materials can be added to the file by the candidate. In case where some significant accomplishment is achieved after file submission—for example the candidate receives a new grant/contract or a paper of hers/his is accepted or published—the candidate may send a written letter providing complete information on such an update to the departmental T&P Chair. The T&P Chair will forward that letter for inclusion in the file to the “current” location of the file.

3.3 Composition of the Unit Committee

3.3.1 Basic Committee

The tenured faculty in the Department of Electrical Engineering will act as a Unit Committee of the whole. All committee members are eligible to review files, meet, discuss, and vote on the candidates for tenure so long as they are of academic rank equal to or higher than that of the candidate. However only committee members of higher rank will be allowed to review the files, meet, discuss, and vote on candidates for promotion. In case of consideration of hiring a full professor with tenure, only full professors will participate in the procedures.

3.3.2 Abstentions

- A member of the basic committee may abstain for a conflict of interest.
- A member of the basic committee may abstain for extraordinary circumstances.
- Faculty on sabbatical leave may elect to abstain.
- A member of the basic committee who holds an administrative position that enables them to make separate recommendations on the candidate (Department Chair, Dean, Provost, or President) must be removed from the committee for any voting.
- The basic unit committee will be diminished by all of those who abstain.

3.3.3 Augmentation

If the basic or diminished basic unit committee consists of fewer than five members, then the existing members of the committee will select sufficient additional tenured faculty members from other units who meet the eligibility criteria stated in section 3.1.1 so that the Unit Committee has at least five members to vote on each file.

3.3.4 Chairmanship

One person will be selected by the T&P committee to Chair all of the unit T&P committees. The T&P Committee Chair must be eligible to vote on all cases to be considered by the unit committee. The T&P Committee Chair for the upcoming academic year will be elected or will have his/her appointment renewed by the tenured members of the unit according to the University calendar for tenure and promotion.

3.4 Procedures and Voting

- Only faculty eligible to vote (and administrative assistants appointed by the Department Chair) are eligible to view the file.
- The unit committee shall deliberate concerning the tenure or promotion of any individual, and these deliberations shall be strictly confidential.
- Eligible voters must vote "yes," "no," or "abstain" on tenure and promotion ballots.
- At least two-thirds of the "yes"/"no" votes must be "yes" for the candidate to receive a positive recommendation from the unit. Abstentions are not included in the final count.

-
- Each vote must be accompanied by a written justification.
 - Each abstention must be justified via one or more of the justifications specified in Section 3.1.2.
 - Voting must be by secret ballot
 - Absentee ballots are counted as regular ballots.
 - The candidate will be notified by the T&P Chair whether the unit recommendation is positive, or negative, or partially positive, for example positive for promotion but negative for tenure, or vice versa.
 - In the case of a positive recommendation from the unit, the candidate's file, containing all votes and justifications, will move forward through the process, e.g., chair, Dean, Provost, etc.
 - In the case of a negative recommendation, the candidate's file will normally not move forward unless the candidate notifies the unit T&P chair, in writing, to do so. In that case, the candidate will write a letter to the unit T&P Chair explaining her/his reason to move the file forward.

3.5 Joint Appointments

For faculty holding joint appointments, the candidate's file will be made available to eligible faculty of each secondary unit, and formal input will be obtained from the eligible faculty of each secondary unit. This input will be placed in the candidate's file at least five working days prior to the unit's vote on the application.

For faculty holding joint appointments, each secondary unit must be given an opportunity to propose outside evaluators and to comment on evaluators proposed by the primary unit. Primary and secondary units should work together to obtain a suitable, representative group of evaluators. In any event, an evaluation must be solicited from at least one evaluator nominated or approved by each secondary unit.

3.6 External Evaluation

The candidate's file must include external evaluations of the candidate's research and scholarship to enable the Unit Committee to judge the strengths and weaknesses of the candidate's scholarship. The documents for outside reviewers should include the following:

- The department tenure and promotion criteria.
- An up-to-date curriculum vita.
- Other materials that show evidence of the candidate's research or a portion of the candidate's research that the evaluator is being asked to evaluate. The candidate's entire primary file, along with the next item, suffices for this.
- Copies of selected refereed publications.

At least five outside reviewers will be asked to evaluate the candidate's performance with respect to the tenure and promotion criteria. As per the Faculty Manual, "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 must be asked to disclose any relationship or interaction with the applicant." The Unit Committee Chair, in consultation with the Unit Committee, will select the outside reviewers that will be contacted by the Department Chair or the Unit T&P Committee Chair, and will send the required documents listed above to the reviewers. All letters received will be included in the candidate's file. At least five outside review letters must be included in the file; if the candidate has a joint appointment, procedures of Section 3.4 must be followed.

4. CRITERIA FOR TENURE AND PROMOTION

4.1 Promotion to and/or Tenure at the rank of Associate Professor

Promotion to the rank of Associate Professor requires ratings of at least *Excellent* in Research, *Good* in Teaching, and *Good* in Service. A candidate for tenure at the rank of associate professor must also demonstrate consistent and durable performance. The normal time in rank as an Assistant Professor is six years (submission of Tenure or Promotion file at the end of five years). The normal minimum time for earning tenure at the rank of Associate Professor is four years (submission at the end of three years). Earlier consideration may be given only in the case of *Outstanding* performance in Research and at least *Excellent* performance in Teaching.

Consideration may be given to the time and accomplishments in a faculty position at another institution when evaluating a candidate for tenure or promotion.

4.2 Promotion to and/or Tenure at the rank of Professor

Promotion to the rank of Professor requires consistent ratings of at least *Excellent* in Research, *Excellent* in Teaching, and *Good* in Service.

Consideration may be given to the time and accomplishments in a faculty or equivalent position at another institution when evaluating a candidate for tenure or promotion.

A candidate for tenure at the rank of professor must also demonstrate consistent and durable performance. The normal minimum time for earning promotion from Associate Professor to Professor is four years (submission at the end of three years). Earlier consideration may be given only in the case of *Outstanding* performance in Research and at least *Excellent* performance in Teaching.

4.3 Definitions of the Terms used in the above Criteria for Promotion to and/or Tenure at the rank of Associate Professor

Research

Outstanding – Significantly exceeds the requirements for *excellent* defined below. For example, significantly larger numbers of publications, funding, and invited presentations. Other strong evidence will also be considered, such as, if the candidate is successful in developing and

building substantial research infrastructure, standards for industries or federal agencies, authorship of books that are widely adopted etc.

Excellent – the candidate is developing an independent sustainable research program as evidenced by external funding (sufficient to support at least 2 Ph.D. students for research/year), high quality refereed journal publications, and presentations. External referees attest to the high quality of the candidate’s publications. Candidate is being recognized as an emerging scholar in her/his field. The quantity and type of publications are appropriate for the sub-discipline within electrical engineering. (For example, in a specific sub discipline there may be fewer longer length papers than more shorter length papers.) In general, at least 2 published or accepted referred journal papers/year are expected.

Good – The candidate publishes 1 or 2 journal or conference papers/year in average-good quality journals and conferences and regularly writes proposals but has limited success in receiving funding, e.g., mostly funding from internal sources. The candidate generally supervises graduate students who are either self-funded or are funded by scholarships or fellowships. Sustainability of research has not been demonstrated.

Fair – The candidate writes only a few publications or proposals (1 or fewer per year). Sustainability of research is in serious doubt.

Unacceptable – performance is below the minimum effective level of *Fair*.

Teaching

Outstanding – in addition to fulfilling all the requirements for *Excellent* listed below, the candidate has gone well beyond this, and has, for example, received university level or national level teaching awards, or has developed new pedagogical methods that have been widely adopted.

Excellent - The candidate’s teaching will be rated *Excellent* if: (1) peer evaluations consistently rate the candidate as excellent. (2) the candidate’s student course evaluation ratings (especially the overall instructor rating) are consistently on par or above the departmental average. This is evidenced from a summary of all of the course evaluations prepared by a tenured faculty member in the department or college. Isolated cases of lower student evaluation values may occur, but a clear trajectory towards higher attainment is evident. (3) The candidate is successfully mentoring and supervising MS and Ph.D. students who are progressing toward graduation and publishing 2 to 3 high-quality journal papers with their advisors (generally 3 Ph.D.s graduated by the time the tenure and/or promotion file is submitted).

Good - The candidate’s teaching will be rated *Good* if the following are satisfied: (1) peer evaluations consistently rate the candidate as good. (2) the candidate’s student course evaluation ratings (especially the overall instructor rating) are in general on par with the departmental average. This is evidenced from a summary of all of the course evaluations prepared by a tenured faculty member in the department or college. In isolated cases of lower student evaluations a clear trajectory towards higher attainment must be evident. (3) The candidate is successfully mentoring and supervising MS and Ph.D. students who are progressing toward graduation and publishing with their advisors. It is expected that the candidate has normally graduated at least one Ph.D. student.

Fair – performance is significantly below what is listed for the *Good* rating.

Unacceptable – performance is below the minimum effective level of *Fair*.

Service

Outstanding – Not applicable.

Excellent – above and beyond the requirements for *good*, the candidate plays a highly visible role in a committee assignment, is an associate editor of a journal, is a member of a conference committee, helps showcase department or college outreach efforts, etc.

Good – The candidate effectively serves as a member of a committee in the department or college if assigned. Regularly serves as a reviewer of journals and conferences. May judge student papers and presentations, etc.

Fair – performance is below the *good* rating or minimal service activity.

Unacceptable – Negligent in assigned service duties.

4.4 Definitions of the Terms used in the above Criteria for Promotion to and/or Tenure at the rank of Professor

Research

Outstanding – Significantly exceeds the requirements for *excellent* defined below. Indicative factors could include: the candidate has successfully led large research initiatives, mentored junior faculty in research, made many invited presentations, or authored books that are widely adopted.

Excellent – the candidate has already developed an independent sustained research program as evidenced by substantial external funding (normally, consistently supporting at least 3 Ph.D. students for research), high quality refereed journal publications, and presentations. External referees attest to the high quality of the candidate's publications. Candidate is already recognized as a scholar in her/his field and has national or international stature in her/his topic area. The quantity and type of publications are appropriate for the sub-discipline within electrical engineering. (For example, in a specific sub discipline there may be fewer longer length papers than more shorter length papers.) In general, at least 2 published or accepted referred journal papers/year are expected.

Good – the candidate regularly writes proposals and has limited success in receiving funding, e.g., funding from internal sources, small external grants. The candidate supervises graduate students who are either self-funded or are funded by scholarships or fellowships. The candidate publishes 1 or 2 journal or conference papers/year in average-good quality journals and conferences. Sustainability of research has not been demonstrated.

Fair – The candidate writes only a few publications or proposals (1 or fewer per year). Sustainability of research is in serious doubt.

Unacceptable – performance is below the minimum effective level of *Fair*.

Teaching

Outstanding – in addition to fulfilling all the requirements for *Excellent* listed below, the candidate has received university level or national level teaching awards, or developed new pedagogical methods that have been widely adopted, or the candidate's students have received "best paper" or "best presentation" awards in professional journals and conferences, etc.

Excellent The candidate's teaching will be rated *Excellent* if: (1) peer evaluations consistently rate the candidate as excellent. (2) the candidate's student course evaluation ratings (especially the overall instructor rating) are consistently on par or above the departmental average. This is evidenced from a summary of all of the course evaluations prepared by a tenured faculty member in the department or college. Isolated cases of lower student evaluation values may occur, but a clear trajectory towards higher attainment is evident. (3) The candidate is successfully mentoring and supervising graduate students who are progressing towards graduation and publishing 2 to 3 high-quality journal papers with their advisors (in general, at least 0.6 Ph.D.s graduated per year).

Good - Candidate's teaching will be rated *Good* if the following are satisfied: (1) peer evaluations consistently rate the candidate as *good*. (2) the candidate's student course evaluation ratings (especially the overall instructor rating) are consistently on par with the departmental average. This is evidenced from a summary of all of the course evaluations prepared by a tenured faculty member in the department or college. Isolated cases of lower student evaluation values may occur, but a clear trajectory towards higher attainment is evident. (3) The candidate is successfully mentoring and supervising graduate students who are progressing towards graduation and publishing 2 to 3 high-quality journal papers with their advisors (in general, at least 0.4 Ph.Ds graduated per year)

Fair – performance is significantly below that of what is listed for the *good* rating.

Unacceptable – performance is below the minimum effective level of *Fair*.

Service

Outstanding – Not applicable.

Excellent – the candidate may have already received award(s) for excellent service from the department, college or university or professional society for excellent service.

Good – the candidate seeks after and plays a leading role in a committee assignment, e.g., serves as the graduate director or ABET chair or T&P chair or undergraduate program director, or other committee chairing that requires significant responsibilities. For candidates not having such opportunities this can be compensated by her/his having a significant role or exposure in the professional community, such as editorship of a journal, conference organizing, serving on the technical program committee in a leading role, etc.

Fair – performance is below the *good* rating or minimal service activity.

Unacceptable – Negligent in assigned service duties.

4.5 Hiring without Tenure

A candidate for appointment without tenure at a rank of Associate Professor or Professor must meet the criteria for promotion to the rank at which they will be hired. In instances where an individual comes from a non-academic background, other evidence of teaching ability will be considered.

4.6 Hiring with Tenure

A candidate for appointment with tenure at the rank of Associate Professor or Professor is required to meet the performance criteria for tenure and promotion at the rank at which they will be hired. Very rarely will it be appropriate to consider hiring, with tenure, a candidate from a non-academic background. But in such instances, other evidence of teaching ability will be considered.

4.7 Criteria for Research Faculty

4.7.1 Initial Appointment Criteria

Research Faculty at ranks of Assistant Professor, Associate Professor, and Professor are eligible for appointment based upon qualifications and requirements as specified in the Faculty Manual, with the omission of any teaching qualifications and requirements.

4.7.2. Promotion to the rank of Associate Research Professor

Promotion to the rank Associate Research Professor requires ratings of at least *excellent* in Research, and at least *good* in professional Service, when measured with respect to the criteria in Section 4.3. The teaching of courses can be considered as another element of professional service for research faculty.

4.7.3 Promotion to the rank of Research Professor

Promotion to the rank Research Professor requires consistent ratings of at least *excellent* in Research, and at least *good* in professional Service when measured with respect to the criteria in Section 4.4. The teaching of courses can be considered as another element of professional service for research faculty.

5. THIRD-YEAR AND ANNUAL REVIEWS

5.1 Third-year Reviews

All untenured faculty members, regardless of rank, will undergo a performance review in the third year of their appointment. This review will follow procedures outlined in the Faculty Manual and according to the Criteria defined in Section 4. During such reviews, the candidate's progress ("trajectory") in the areas of review will be assessed.

The candidate should prepare the third year review file as described in Section 3. A select committee of faculty members at rank equal to or above that of the candidate will meet to review the file. This committee must contain at least three members, and will be appointed by the Department Chair. This committee will report their findings and recommendations in the form of a letter to the full T&P committee. The letter must contain a recommendation whether or not the untenured faculty member should be retained. Upon concurrence (at least 2/3rd majority) from the full T&P committee this recommendation will be forwarded to the Department Chair.

Research faculty will also receive 3rd year reviews according to the Criteria defined in Section 4.7 for research faculty. The file contents are identical to that for tenure track faculty, with omission of material on department, college, and university service; if the candidate has taught courses, material on teaching should be included. The select committee evaluating research faculty must also include other research faculty at rank equal to or above that of the candidate. The tenure-track faculty supervising the research faculty member must be a member of the select evaluation committee. Committee procedures are otherwise identical to those for tenure track faculty.

5.2 Annual Reviews

Each tenure-track or tenured faculty member shall prepare and submit a cumulative T&P file for his/her annual performance review. Information for the current year should be clearly identified within the file to facilitate the annual review process. During such reviews, the candidate's progress ("trajectory") in the areas of review will be assessed. The specific format recommended is to use red font color to identify current-year material. Additional specific file requirements include

- Identifying the faculty member's contribution (%) to each publication,
- Identifying the faculty member's contribution (%) to each research grant (both funded and pending),
- Identifying the faculty member's graduate student co-authors via italics font in citations.

The criteria outlined in Section 4 will be used to do this review. The performance of tenured professors will be evaluated by their department chair if they are working within the department and by their immediate supervisor if they are working outside the department. The performance of all others will be evaluated by eligible Unit T&P Committee members and the Department Chair.

Research faculty will also undergo annual reviews according to the Criteria defined in Section 4.7 for research faculty. The file contents are identical to that for tenure track faculty, with omission of material on department, college, and university service; if the candidate has taught courses, material on teaching should be included. Research faculty annual reviews will be

conducted by a select committee that must also include other research faculty at rank equal to or above that of the candidate, and the tenure-track faculty supervising the research faculty member.

6. POST TENURE REVIEWS

6.1 Eligibility

As per the Faculty Manual, each tenured faculty member, regardless of rank, and including those in administrative positions, will be reviewed every six years, unless, during the previous six-year period, the faculty member is reviewed and advanced to or retained in a higher position (e.g., Dean or chaired professorship). However, post-tenure review (PTR) will be waived for any faculty member who notifies the unit chair, in writing, of an impending retirement within three years of the next scheduled review. Tenured faculty holding joint appointments undergo PTR by the primary unit.

6.2 PTR Review Committee

The review committee will consist of a select committee of tenured faculty members at rank equal to or higher than that of the faculty member undergoing PTR. The committee will be appointed by the Department Chair, and must contain at least three members.

6.3 PTR File

The faculty member undergoing PTR shall prepare and submit a cumulative T&P file for her/his PTR. This file must follow the annual review file format (i.e., the UCTP template).

6.4 PTR Evaluation Criteria

PTRs are for development purposes. As per the Faculty Manual, the PTR must contain: “(i) an assessment of teaching based upon student and peer evaluations, (ii) an assessment of research or creative activities; and (iii) an assessment of service.” The criteria outlined in Section 4 will be used to conduct the review.

6.5 PTR Procedures

The PTR will be conducted according to the calendar specified by the Provost. Based upon the candidate’s file (UCTP template format), augmented with annual performance reviews accumulated since the initial tenure review or since the last post-tenure review, the PTR committee members will review the PTR file. The committee will then meet to agree upon and compose the final PTR document. The candidate’s performance must be assessed as superior or satisfactory or unsatisfactory.

The unit will provide the faculty member under review written copies of all previous annual performance reviews, post-tenure reviews, and development plans. As per the Faculty Manual, “if the unit post-tenure review report assesses the faculty member’s overall performance as superior, or satisfactory, the unit shall provide the faculty member with a written summary of the unit post-tenure review report. The summary must provide specific evaluative information on the faculty member’s

performance in the categories of teaching, research/creative activities, and service. The summary must be sufficiently detailed to aid the faculty member in professional growth and development.”

If the unit post-tenure review report concludes that the faculty member’s overall performance is unsatisfactory, the unit shall recommend a development plan for restoring the faculty member’s performance to a satisfactory level. In this case, as per the Faculty Manual, “the unit shall provide the faculty member a copy of the unit post-tenure review report, redacted to remove references that would identify any external reviewers, along with any recommendations for a development plan.”

When the PTR is complete, the department chair and dean will also receive a copy of all post-tenure review reports (and any recommendations for development plans). The department chair will add his/her evaluation to the PTR and forward all to the dean.

7. REVISION OF CRITERIA AND PROCEDURES

This document will be periodically reviewed and revised according to policies and procedures specified in the Faculty Manual. The Unit T&P committee is responsible for any revision of this document, and approval of the revised document requires a two-thirds majority vote of the committee.