

PROMOTION AND TENURE CRITERIA

Approved by Sociology Faculty, September 4, 2013

Approved by the University Committee on Tenure & Promotion, March 5, 2014

Typographical errors corrected September 19, 2016

Our general criteria for promotion and tenure require the evaluation of a candidate's record of performance and achievement in three domains of activity: teaching, research and scholarly activity, and service. In going up for the first promotion, candidates may use either the criteria in place when the candidate was hired or the criteria in place when the candidate seeks promotion. For the second promotion, the candidate must use the criteria in effect when he/she seeks promotion. Specific criteria for each domain appear below.

1. Teaching

For promotion to professor (and tenure for untenured candidates for professor) an outstanding record of teaching is required. For promotion to associate professor and for tenure a record of excellent teaching is required. Excellent teaching is indicated by well-organized course materials systematically presented in an atmosphere conducive to learning; periodic peer evaluations that indicate highly effective teaching; and a peer summary of student evaluations that indicates excellent teaching. The peer summary includes the average of student evaluations of the instructor's performance for each course and comparisons of these evaluations to: (1) the historical average of student evaluations for the course and (2) the student evaluations of colleagues currently teaching the same course. Outstanding teachers, in addition to meeting the standards of excellent teaching, mentor students in various ways, such as through supervision of theses and dissertations, participation in the classes of others, supervision of student internships, advisement, or counseling; and they are innovative through such activities as the incorporation of new research findings into course content, the creation of new courses and new preparations for existing courses, or their interest in and exploration of advanced instructional technologies.

Candidates shall place in their files any materials they think provide evidence of their teaching contributions. The committee views as especially compelling, evidence based on peer review and student judgments from the following types of items: peer evaluations, peer visitations to classes, observations at talks and seminars, inspections of files and class materials, student evaluations, being sought out by students who have strong academic records, having students who undertake successful academic careers and who identify the candidates as persons who have significantly contributed to their academic development, and supervising and directing graduate student research that culminates in a successfully defended thesis or dissertation. It is not necessary that a candidacy be supported by all the items listed.

2. Scholarly Activity

For promotion to professor (and tenure for untenured candidates for professor) an outstanding record of scholarship indicating attainment of national or international stature is required.

For promotion to associate professor, a record of excellent scholarship which shows the candidate's likelihood of becoming a scholar of national or international stature is clearly possible. For promotion to associate professor with tenure, the candidate must also have sufficient time in rank so as to establish a foundation for a career-long pattern of productivity.

The criterion for an "excellent record of scholarship" is satisfied by evidence that the candidate is able to garner resources to conduct his or her research, to document his/her research efforts through peer-reviewed publications, and to publish at least some of that work in the discipline's most highly-regarded, peer-reviewed outlets. The criterion for an "outstanding record of scholarship" is satisfied by evidence of broadening peer recognition and an unabated record of excellent scholarship sustained over a significant span of time, usually the most recent 9-12 years subsequent to earning the doctorate. Candidates may place in their files any materials they think provide evidence relating to the quality and quantity of their scholarly achievements. Of primary importance are the formulation, successful conduct and dissemination of high-quality original research and scholarship. The committee views as especially compelling evidence, documentation based on peer reviews and judgments, in particular:

- a. A sustained, high quality record of publications in esteemed academic outlets: books published by companies that employ rigorous peer review in the selection of manuscripts and/or scholarly papers published in journals or other publishing outlets that employ rigorous peer review of submissions.
- b. A record of support for the candidate's research from agencies that subject proposals to rigorous

peer review.

c. Written evaluations of scholarly activity from nationally recognized scholars which indicate that the candidate has met the standard for the promotion sought.

d. A growing list of citations of the candidate's work by other scholars.

It is not necessary that a candidacy be supported by all the items listed.

Performance of other activities also contributes to the evaluation of scholarship. Examples of these scholarly activities include, but are not limited to:

a. Publishing edited collections of the work of colleagues and peers; textbooks that are regarded highly and adopted by colleagues and peers; chapters in collections edited by colleagues which do not involve rigorous peer review; and/or book reviews and other scholarly commentary.

b. Giving scholarly presentations and lectures to lay and/or professional audiences.

It is not necessary that a candidacy be supported by all the items listed.

3. *Service*

A record of activity which facilitates the teaching and scholarly activities of colleagues, or which promotes the general welfare of the discipline, the department, the college, the university and the community is required of all promotion and tenure candidates. Such service is to be related to the candidate's discipline. For promotion to professor (and tenure for untenured candidates for professor) a good record of service is required. For promotion to associate professor or for tenure a record of good service is required. Candidates may place in their files any materials they think provide such evidence. The standards that contribute to producing a record of good service include, but are not limited to:

a. Holding positions in the department with significant administrative duties.

b. Participating on departmental, college and university committees.

c. Participating on committees, organizations and groups that serve the community.

d. Service as an officer of a state, regional, national or international professional association.

e. Service as an organizer or presider at scholarly and professional association meetings.

f. Reviewing manuscripts for journals, monographs for publishers and grant proposals for funding agencies.

g. Service as an editor or associate editor of scholarly journals.

It is not necessary that a candidacy be supported by all the items listed.

Individuals hired at the Associate or Full Professor level from outside the University may be required to serve a probationary period before a decision on tenure is made. During such a probationary period, the individual must demonstrate a record of continued performance at the level defined as necessary for tenure, as defined above. On a case-by-case basis, it is possible that no such probationary period will be required. This implies that, on a case-by-case basis, there may be no required minimum time of service at the University of South Carolina for faculty hired from another institution to be considered for tenure or promotion. On a case-by-case basis, time and accomplishments in a faculty position at another educational institution may be considered in evaluating a candidate for tenure or promotion.

PROMOTION AND TENURE PROCEDURES

(Approved by Sociology Faculty, September 4, 2013)

The Committee

The Committee consists of all tenured members of the department. Departmental decisions regarding Promotion and Tenure are made by the Committee members. The Committee's two officers are a Chair and a Recording Secretary elected by secret ballot each Spring semester for the forthcoming academic year. The Chair must be at the rank of full professor, while the Recording Secretary can be chosen from members eligible to serve on the Committee without regard to rank. (Note: If the person chosen as Recording Secretary is not a full professor, that person will not serve when consideration for promotion or tenure is being given to a candidate of equal or higher rank or tenure status. In that event a Recording Secretary for those considerations will be elected by secret ballot from among the full professors.) The duties of the Chair are to: organize the faculty files; call the meetings, notify the department Chair, the Dean, and the faculty of the meetings; and general organizational duties. The Recording Secretary's duty is to keep minutes of the meetings of the Committee. The Committee functions as a committee of the whole.

The Promotion, Tenure, and Reappointment Committee is required to employ its published criteria in making all promotion and tenure decisions. The criteria are the ones adopted by the Committee and forwarded to, and approved by, the University Tenure and Promotion Committee.

Each Spring the Tenure and Promotion Committee will elect a Teaching Evaluation Committee consisting of a Chair and two other members. The Teaching Evaluation Committee will review and evaluate materials and information provided by any candidate for promotion and tenure. The report of the committee will be submitted to the Tenure and Promotion Committee and when approved will become part of a candidate's file, serving as the Tenure and Promotion Committee's report on the candidate's teaching.

Procedures

1. The procedures described below are in effect until revised by a simple majority of the tenured faculty and approved by the University Tenure and Promotion Committee.

2. The procedures are consistent with those in the *Faculty Manual* 2012, October 5.

3. Consideration and recommendation of tenure will be separate from consideration and recommendation of promotion.

4. Faculty members appointed at the rank of assistant professor who have not previously held tenure-track positions at another institution of higher learning normally will not be recommended for tenure until they are in at least their fourth year at the University of South Carolina. Faculty members appointed at the rank of associate professor or professor who have not previously held tenure-track positions at another institution of higher learning normally will not be recommended for tenure until they are in at least their third year at the University of South Carolina. There is no difference between the standards applied to faculty who apply for tenure in the penultimate year of the probationary period and those who apply for tenure prior to the penultimate year.

All tenure-track faculty who have completed the minimum years of service are considered for tenure, and all faculty members below the rank of professor are considered for promotion each year. However, a faculty member may decline in writing to be considered for tenure and/or promotion. The exception is that an untenured faculty member cannot decline to be considered for tenure in his/her penultimate probationary year.

Potential candidates for tenure and promotion shall be advised in writing of their eligibility for tenure or promotion by the Dean, Department Chair or other appropriate administrator by the date stated on the university calendar posted on the provost's Web site. The department and candidates for tenure and/or promotion will follow the appropriate dates posted on this calendar. Submission of all material will follow the electronic submission guidelines provided by the UCTP Electronic Forms and Process documents posted on the provost's Web site.

5. The maximum probationary period for all full-time faculty members appointed at the rank of associate professor or professor is service for six years at the University of South Carolina. The maximum probationary period for all full-time faculty members appointed at the rank of assistant professor is service for seven years at the University of South Carolina. Calculation of the probationary period follows the *Faculty Manual*, 2012, October 5.

6. Candidates' responsibilities with respect to Tenure and Promotion are as follows:

a. Establish and maintain an Open File. The Committee recommends that the file contain two copies of the following:

- (1) A statement of academic interest and development.
- (2) A current vita.
- (3) A report on teaching activities.
- (4) Relevant research, writing, and teaching materials.
- (5) Any other materials the candidate deems relevant.
- (6) A list of the contents of the file signed by the candidate.

b. Prior to the construction of the official list of outside reviewers (see 7b below), the candidate may submit a list of no more than two potential reviewers whom the candidate believes inappropriate for either professional or personal reasons.

c. Meet with the Committee Chair to review current departmental criteria and procedures concerning tenure and promotion.

7. Committee responsibilities regarding Tenure and Promotion are as follows:

a. Meet in early September and as needed to review and/or recommend revisions in the criteria and procedures for tenure and promotion, recognizing that all proposed changes are subject to approval through appropriate channels as provided by the *Faculty Manual*.

b. Evaluations for promotion and tenure will be obtained from at least five outside reviewers. In constructing a list of potential outside reviewers, the committee shall consider whether or not to include among the outside reviewers any scholars on the candidate's list of potential reviewers whom s/he believes inappropriate (see 6b above). The outside reviewers will conform to the standards put forth in the *Faculty Manual*, 2012, October 5. The list is confidential and the reviewers should be recognized scholars at research institutions. The list will be constructed by the Chair of the Tenure and Promotion Committee and the Chair of the department in consultation with members of the Tenure and Promotion Committee. The resulting list will be circulated to the Tenure and Promotion Committee for approval. If simple majority approval is not gained, a meeting will be held to revise the list as needed. The Chair of the Committee will send the appropriate material (e.g., a vita, copies of the candidate's relevant publications, the department's tenure and promotion criteria) to the outside reviewers. Language in the letter sent to the outside reviewers will conform to *University Committee on Tenure and Promotions: Guide to Criteria and Procedures*, 2012, January, page 28.

c. Through the department's Chair, provide the Dean and department faculty members the names of individuals to be considered for tenure and promotion so that any of these will have an opportunity to place appropriate material in the Tenure and Promotion File of any candidate.

d. Meet to consider all relevant materials submitted by the candidate and others, and to give all members of the Committee opportunity to speak for or against each candidacy.

e. Vote by secret ballot on the candidacy following consideration and discussion. A simple majority of those qualified and voting for the candidacy is required for recommending promotion or tenure, provided that two-thirds of the relevant committee members (a quorum) are present. For tenure decisions those eligible to vote are all tenured committee members of equal or higher rank than the candidate. For promotion decisions those eligible to vote are all members of higher rank than the candidate. A faculty member on leave may vote only upon written notification to the department Chair or Dean of a desire to do so before beginning the leave. Abstentions are not included in calculating the simple majority required to send the file forward. The Chair of the department does not cast a vote with the members of the Committee. Rather, the Chair of the department makes known his/her recommendation in a letter to be made part of the candidate's file, and in the appropriate places on the University P/T forms. In this letter, the Chair of the department will provide an extensive justification of their evaluation of the candidate. The evaluation process will conform to the university policy on nepotism (*Faculty Manual* 2012, October 5).

f. Give written justifications of votes. Each member of the Committee who votes is required to fill out a form and return it to the Committee Chair for inclusion in the candidate's file, on which form the member indicates how the member voted in the meeting and the member's justification of the vote the member cast.

g. In the case of a favorable recommendation, all materials collected and considered in the review go forward as part of the candidate's file.

h. Committee recommendations against either promotion or tenure and materials considered by the Committee are not forwarded unless the candidate appeals the Committee's recommendation in writing. If the candidate appeals, the Committee's recommendation and all relevant materials are forwarded as above. The names of candidates considered but not recommended for promotion or tenure are sent by way of the department Chair to the Dean.

i. As soon as possible following the vote of the Committee, the Chair of the department shall orally inform the candidate of the Committee's recommendation. The Chair of the department shall also send a letter to the candidate confirming the statement given orally. At the same time the Chair of the department shall inform the department faculty of the Committee's recommendation.

j. Keep the proceedings and records of the Committee in confidence. The only officers and committees having access to these are explicitly given in these procedures or in the *Faculty Manual*, 2012, October 5.

8. Committee recommendations and all materials it considers are reviewed by the Dean, Provost, University Tenure and Promotion Committee, and the President. Following these reviews the candidate and the faculty are informed of the President's recommendation to the Board of Trustees.

9. Consistent with the *Faculty Manual*, 2012, October 5, when a candidate files a grievance regarding the tenure and/or promotion decision, the vote count of the UCTP will be revealed to the candidate. However, the vote counts at the unit level, as well as the recommendations of the Department Chair, Dean and Provost cannot be revealed to the candidate.

10. Faculty with Joint Appointments. Upon Sociology and another unit agreeing on a joint appointment, Sociology should ask for a memorandum of understanding (MOU). The MOU will include (1) identification of the tenuring unit; (2) teaching load and split of teaching load between the primary and secondary units; (3) formula and criteria for sharing indirect cost return (IDCR) among the units; and (4) service responsibility load and split between the units. The MOU should include signatures of the jointly appointed faculty member, the unit heads of the primary and secondary units, the deans of the colleges in the units reside, and the provost. The teaching load for a joint appointment should not be greater than for a faculty member of the same rank in the primary unit. The service load for a joint appointment should be comparable to normal service load of a faculty member of the same rank in the primary unit. This MOU serves to inform the tenure and promotion process.

The criteria for granting tenure or promotion to a jointly appointed faculty member shall be those of the primary unit. For faculty holding joint appointments, each secondary unit must be given an opportunity to propose outside reviewers and to comment on reviewers proposed by the primary unit. An evaluation must be solicited from at least one reviewer nominated or approved by each secondary unit.

If Sociology is the secondary unit for one or more faculty members with joint appointments, the views of all Sociology faculty of appropriate rank for evaluating the candidate will be solicited and provided for inclusion in the candidate's file, as a summary of faculty comments.

If Sociology is the primary unit for one or more faculty members with joint appointments, the secondary department or program will be asked to provide a list of appropriate outside reviewers for consideration by the primary unit. The Chair or Director of the outside unit will have the same access to the candidates' file as the Committee members of the primary unit. Members of the secondary unit of appropriate rank will be invited to review the candidate's file. The Chair/Director and their colleagues of appropriate rank within the outside unit will be invited to submit formal input to the candidate's file.

Similar procedures, as appropriately modified, should be followed with regard to the Third Year Review and the Post-Tenure Review of faculty with joint appointments.