

Tenure and Promotion Guidelines
College of Pharmacy
University of South Carolina

Revised April 28, 2005

Tenure and Promotion Guidelines
College of Pharmacy
University of South Carolina

Introduction

The College of Pharmacy is an academic unit of the University of South Carolina. As such, the policies and procedures outlined in this document are designed to be consistent with those of the University as published in the Faculty Manual. Throughout this document, “Unit” refers to the College of Pharmacy, and “Unit Chair” refers to the Chair of the College of Pharmacy Tenure and Promotion Committee.

Tenure and promotion is a process that serves both university and individual. The university is committed to the conduct of research and dissemination of knowledge, the imparting of knowledge through teaching, and service to community, state, and nation through the contribution of faculty time and expertise. The process of tenure and promotion ensures that the university, through its faculty, will perform in these areas at the highest level. It is a system of accountability that assures quality research, teaching and service. The individual benefits by having the procedures and criteria for tenure and promotion stated clearly. The university’s response to faculty performance will be based on the degree to which performance meets criteria, with decisions for tenure or promotion being made without regard to age, sex, race/ethnicity, creed, or religion.

Eligibility for tenure and/or promotion

To be eligible for tenure or promotion, the candidate must have his or her primary appointment or tenure line within the College of Pharmacy. Faculty who hold the rank of Assistant Professor normally will not be recommended for tenure and/or promotion until they are at least in their fourth year as Assistant Professor at USC. Faculty who hold the rank of Associate Professor or Professor normally will not be recommended for tenure and/or promotion until they are at least in their third year as Associate Professor or Professor.

The File

The candidate’s tenure and promotion file constitutes the evidence provided by the candidate to support the claim that the record satisfies the criteria. It is the responsibility of the candidate to develop and maintain his or her tenure and promotion file, and to submit it to the Unit Tenure and Promotion Chairman according to the published University timetable when being considered for tenure and/or promotion. This includes maintaining an accurate record of teaching responsibilities and evaluations, research and scholarly activities, and service functions. The entirety of the candidate’s file should be considered in any tenure or promotion decision. However, greater emphasis should be placed on activity reported in the file from last appointment or promotion to the present. The file will be comprised of a primary file that includes the designated university form for tenure and promotion, and a secondary file that includes copies of materials that the

candidate wishes to provide to support the candidacy. A teaching portfolio may be submitted by any faculty member in support of their file. The unit is responsible for providing a synthesis of evaluations of the candidate's teaching performance.

Committee on Tenure and Promotion

Composition: The College of Pharmacy Committee on Tenure and Promotion will be comprised of all tenured faculty within the College. The Chair must be a tenured professor, and may not concurrently hold an administrative position, such as Dean, Assistant or Associate Dean, Provost, or Department Chair.

Voting Privilege: Only tenured faculty may vote on tenure or promotion decisions at the unit level. Faculty members of equal or higher rank may vote on a candidate for tenure. Only faculty of higher rank may vote on a candidate for promotion. Emeriti professors are not eligible to vote. Faculty on leave, e.g., sabbatical, may vote only if written notification of the desire to vote is provided to the Dean or Unit Chair prior to the beginning of the leave. Faculty who have an opportunity to vote separate from the Unit Tenure and Promotion Committee, e.g., Department Chair and Dean, have restrictions placed on their voting privilege at the tenure and promotion committee level, although they can participate in the discussion of the candidate prior to the vote. Deans are precluded from voting at the tenure and promotion committee level on all candidates; Department Chair are precluded from voting at the tenure and promotion committee level only for those candidates within their departments for whom they will vote in their capacity as Department Chair.

Notification and Schedule

Each year, in accordance with USC Faculty Manual, all tenure-track, non-tenured faculty are eligible for tenure consideration. Likewise, all faculty below the rank of professor are eligible for promotion consideration. Based on the published university schedule, the Dean of the College of Pharmacy will notify each eligible faculty of the option for tenure and/or promotion during the following academic year. Faculty who wish to be considered must notify the Department Chair and Dean in writing of their intention by the date listed in the university schedule, typically about seven days after the Dean's notification. Faculty who wish not to be considered for tenure and/or promotion must notify their Department Chair and Dean in writing of their intention following the same schedule. Names of faculty who have indicated in writing their intention to be considered for tenure and/or promotion the following year will be forwarded by the Dean to the Chair of the Unit Tenure and Promotion Committee by the date included in the university schedule, typically about seven days after receipt of names by the Dean. All faculty in the penultimate year of their probationary period must be considered for tenure by the Unit Tenure and Promotion committee.

The Provost's Office publishes a schedule, including deadlines, for the tenure and promotion process each year. The Chair of the Unit Tenure and Promotion Committee will provide that timetable to all faculty who wish to be considered for tenure and/or promotion. Candidates are responsible for meeting those deadlines on matters over

which they have control, e.g., submission of file, and submission of names of potential outside reviewers. The Unit Chair has responsibility in meeting deadlines in all other matters.

Soliciting Letters from External Reviewers

For all decisions of tenure and or promotion, a candidate's file must include five letters from outside reviewers. Names of prospective reviewers will come from the following sources: 1) the candidate; 2) a senior member of the candidate's department; and 3) the department chair. The candidate must provide five names prioritized by preference to the Unit Chair, who will request and obtain letters from two of the five people indicated on the list. A senior member of the department at or above the candidate's rank must provide three names prioritized by preference to the Unit Chair, who will request and obtain letters from two of the three people indicated on the list. The Department Chair must provide three names prioritized by preference to the Unit Chair, who will request and obtain a letter from one of the three people indicated on the list. External reviewers should not include the candidate's dissertation advisor or close personal friend. External reviewers from academic settings must have achieved a rank at or above the rank to which the candidate aspires. External reviewers from nonacademic settings, e.g., government, industry or associations, must be in a position considered commensurate with academic rank to which the candidate aspires. External reviewers should disclose any relationship to the candidate and also provide a brief CV or biography.

The Unit Chair will send a packet to individuals who have agreed to serve as external reviewers. The packet should include the following: 1) a letter requesting evaluation of the candidate's research/scholarship, teaching/clinical activities and service; 2) relevant unit Tenure and Promotion Criteria; 3) candidate's primary file; 4) selection of five samples of research/scholarship selected by the candidate (articles, book chapters, grant proposals, etc.); and 5) Teaching and Practice Portfolios, where applicable. The letter should not include a request that the reviewer determine if the candidate should be promoted or tenured. The purpose of the external review is to obtain an assessment of the candidate's research, teaching and service based on unit criteria. It is the responsibility of the Unit Chair to follow the university schedule in securing the letters from external reviewers, and placing the obtained letters in the candidate's primary file.

Meeting and Voting Procedure

Minimum Needed to Vote: The unit vote on a candidate's tenure or promotion must be made by at least five tenured faculty. If the unit does not have five eligible faculty for the vote, the unit must submit to the UCTP for approval a policy to establish a five-member committee, using faculty of eligible rank from other academic units. If the unit has at least five eligible faculty, it is the Chair's responsibility to ensure that at least five eligible faculty participate in the unit vote.

Meeting Participation: Meetings at which candidates are considered for tenure or promotion are closed to everyone except members of the Unit Tenure and Promotion Committee. If the candidate's department is not represented on the Unit committee, the

Unit Chair will invite the candidate's department chair. In the event the Chair cannot attend, he or she may send a representative from the department. The representative should be at or above the rank to which the candidate aspires. In addition, by motion, the meeting may be opened to anyone other than the candidate the body wishes to have present. The invited department chair, or any other invited individual, will participate in the discussion of the candidate for which he or she was invited, and will be excused for any other discussion. The invited person will not vote.

Voting Procedure: Unit committee votes concerning tenure and/or promotion must be based on the evidence presented in the tenure and promotion file and the relevant criteria for that candidate. All votes on candidates' tenure or promotion will be conducted by secret ballot. All votes must be accompanied by a written justification of the vote. The justification must be either written on the ballot itself or written on a separate paper affixed to the ballot. Ballots need not be signed, although faculty are not prohibited from doing so. Each ballot will provide opportunity for committee members to vote in one of three ways: 1) Yes; 2) No; or 3) Abstain. Justification must accompany all ballots, regardless of vote cast. The unit chair will inform all voting committee members of the date that all votes must be submitted.

Vote and Recommendation by Unit Tenure and Promotion Committee: Votes will be counted by the Unit Chair and the College Dean. The College Associate Dean or Assistant Dean may serve in the Dean's absence. Abstention votes are not counted. The committee's vote will be considered supportive of tenure and/or promotion if "yes" votes comprise at least two-thirds (2/3) of all votes counted, i.e., the sum of all "yes" and "no" votes (abstentions are not included in the denominator). The committee's vote will be considered not supportive of tenure and/or promotion if the yes votes comprise less than two-thirds (2/3) of all votes counted, i.e., the sum of all "yes" and "no" votes.

Notification of Committee's Vote: The Unit chair will notify all candidates in writing as to whether the Unit tenure and promotion committee supported or did not support their application for tenure and/or promotion. The Unit Chair will also provide written notification to the Dean and all Tenure and Promotion committee members of the committee's decision to support or not support the candidate's application. Under no circumstance should the numerical vote count be divulged to candidates or committee members.

Positive decision: If the Unit Committee vote yields a positive recommendation, i.e., "yes" votes comprised at least at least two-thirds (2/3) of "yes" and "no" votes cast, the Unit Chair supervises the insertion of votes and justifications into the candidates file. The entire file, including primary file, secondary file, and teaching portfolio (if applicable), is hand-delivered by the Unit Chair to the candidate's Department Chair according to the timetable established in the University tenure and promotion calendar. The Department Chair will read the file in its entirety, vote "yes" or "no", and justify the vote decision with a letter. The ballot and letter will be placed in the candidate's file by the Department Chair, who will then hand-deliver the entire file to the Dean of the College. Likewise, the Dean will read the file in its entirety, vote "yes" or "no", and justify

the vote decision with a letter. The ballot and letter will be placed in the candidate's file by the Dean, who will then forward the entire file to the Provost according to the timetable established in the University tenure and promotion calendar.

Negative Decision: If the Unit Committee vote yields a negative recommendation, i.e., "yes" votes comprised less than at least two-thirds (2/3) of "yes" and "no" votes cast, the file will not be considered further by the Department Chair or Dean unless the candidate provides written notification of intent to appeal to the Unit Chair within the timetable established by the University tenure and promotion calendar. If such a letter is received by the Unit Chair within the appropriate time period, the Unit Chair will invite written comments from all faculty concerning the candidacy. Faculty letters should be sent directly to the Unit Chair who will insert them into the file. The file will then proceed as described above, moving to Department Chair, Dean, and Provost.

Probationary Period and Three-Year Review

All faculty in the tenure track who have not been granted tenure are considered to be in a probationary period. 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. 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. All tenure-track probationary faculty must undergo a full review during their third year of service. They must submit their tenure and promotion file for review by the unit tenure and promotion committee according to the timetable established by the University. Letters from external reviewers are not required. Third-year faculty must be given a written comprehensive evaluation of their progress toward tenure and promotion. The tenure and promotion committee Chair will forward the evaluation to the Dean.

Switching from Non-tenure to Tenure Track

Only faculty appointed or promoted to the Assistant Professor rank in the non-tenure track may request a change to the tenure track *within four years* of initial hiring and prior to promotion to Associate Professor within the non-tenure track. Notification of the desire to switch must be made in writing to the Department Chair and Dean. The decision to permit such a switch in status resides with the Dean, in consultation with the Department Chair. For these individuals, the tenure clock begins on the date of appointment to a tenure track position. Absent the letter requesting the switch and approval by the Dean, faculty will be considered as remaining in the non-tenure track. Any faculty appointed to the tenure track cannot switch to the non-tenure track.

Definition of Terms

The following terms are used in the Criteria section of the Guidelines. Where these terms are used, they have the following definitions.

Coherent: Refers to a description of one's research program. Coherence can be demonstrated a variety of ways, e.g., consistency of topic examined, application of similar methods across different areas, logical growth and direction of research, etc. Coherence of research program should be evident in the file, or should be explicitly addressed by candidates in their personal statement.

Consistent: Refers to the description of one's research and/or scholarship. A record of research that shows some activity each year would be considered consistent. A record of research that shows occasional gaps over time would still be considered consistent, given inevitable variability caused by activities with extended timeframes. A record of research that shows large gaps in which no or little activity is demonstrated, followed by flourishes of activity surrounding tenure and/or promotion decision times, would be considered "not consistent".

Important: Refers to a description of one's research and/or scholarship. Research and/or scholarship that addresses issues discussed and debated in the literature would be considered important. Importance can also be inferred in a number of ways, e.g., the quality of journals that publish one's work, acquisition of external funding to support one's work, invitation to present one's work to outside groups, external reviewers describe it as important, etc. In the absence of this supportive evidence, the candidate is encouraged to use the candidate's narrative section in the tenure and promotion file to make the case for the importance of one's work.

National reputation: Examples of evidence to support a national reputation are provided below. The list should not be considered exhaustive. There is no expectation that candidates will show activity in all areas.

- a. Quality of letters from external reviewers
- b. Membership on grant review panels
- c. Participation on abstract review panels for professional meetings
- d. Manuscript reviewer for journals
- e. Membership on journal editorial advisory board
- f. Membership on organizational advisory board
- g. Election to national office within professional organization
- h. Chairing paper or panel discussion sessions at national meetings
- i. Invited testimony at governmental, scientific, or legal proceedings
- j. Invited presentations at national meetings
- k. Work listed in national or international compendium
- l. Awards given by national organizations or associations
- m. Election as Fellow in professional organizations
- n. Editorship of scientific or professional journal
- o. National certifications
- p. Appointment as visiting professor at another university
- q. Appointment as visiting scientist at a research-based organization
- r. Reviewer for universities' tenure and promotion files

Substantial: Refers to a description of one's research and/or scholarship. Work can be assessed as substantial in a number of ways, e.g., it is found in the leading journals in the discipline or field, it is supported by multiple publications on the same topic, the author is considered a major contributor in the field of research by virtue of his or her work, the works are cited frequently, outside reviewer describe it as substantial, etc. Generally, several of the criteria for a national reputation could be used to support one's work being substantial.

Teaching Portfolio: An optional teaching portfolio developed by a candidate is intended to document the full range of activities related to the candidate's teaching. It should include at least three components: 1) materials and processes that the candidate produces, e.g., course syllabi, examinations, course reading lists and packets, student mentoring and advisement, seminars attended or given 2) materials that others produce that assist in evaluation, e.g., peer and student evaluations, honors and recognitions, letters or other narratives, and 3) reflective statements concerning goals, assumptions, and methods. The reflective statement should also include documentation of efforts by the candidate to continually evaluate the courses taught to maintain up-to-date content and methods.

The teaching portfolio provides the opportunity for teaching effectiveness to be assessed from multiple perspectives. Reliance on any one type of evaluation can produce a biased or slanted assessment of the candidate's effectiveness. The teaching portfolio allows a fuller and richer assessment of teaching effectiveness.

Excellence in Research/Scholarship: Excellence is defined a record of consistent activity that makes an important contribution to one's academic discipline or profession. There should be evidence that the candidate has established a coherent research program, that the candidate is establishing a national reputation of scholarship, and that the candidate's work is of high quality, as indicated by journal reputation, level and type of funding, and outside reviewers' comments. Generally, the candidate's record should include the following: a) on average, at least three activities per year from the list found under *Evidence of Research and/or Scholarship*, b) over the period of evaluation there should be, on average, at least 1.5 publications per year in refereed journals, and c) evidence of sufficient external funding to support the candidate's research agenda. It is expected that publications will be of high quality and in reputable journals, a substantial portion of which appear in the candidate's area of expertise.

Outstanding in Research/Scholarship: The candidate's record in the area of research and scholarship must be consistent and durable, and make a substantial contribution to one's academic discipline or profession. The record should show growth that exceeds the criteria for promotion or appointment to the rank of Associate Professor. There should be evidence that the candidate has enhanced a coherent research program, and that the candidate has established a national or international reputation of scholarship. The candidate's work should be of high quality, evidenced by journal reputation, level and type of funding, and outside reviewers' comments.

Good Teaching/Clinical Activities: Good is defined as a record of positive peer reviews and student teaching evaluations as judged from the quantitative and narrative evidence. Quantitative evidence of good teaching is an average score of at least 4.0 on a 5 point scale; OR, an average score at or above the College faculty average. An optional teaching portfolio may be included in support of good teaching.

Additional activities listed under *Evidence of Teaching* will support the file. Where applicable, clinical activities will be examined, and the candidate should present a record of competence and effectiveness in developing and maintaining a clinical site. Evidence of competence and effectiveness includes those activities listed below under *Evidence of Practice Effectiveness*. Because practice sites differ, it is not the expectation that each candidate would be able to provide evidence of competence in all categories listed. However, the activities of practice effectiveness, when taken as a whole, should clearly support the candidate's claim of clinical competence and effectiveness.

Excellence in Teaching/Clinical Activities: Excellence is defined as a record of positive peer reviews and student teaching evaluations as judged from the quantitative and narrative evidence. Quantitative evidence of excellent teaching is an average score of at least 4.0 on a 5 point scale; AND, that is above the College faculty average. An optional teaching portfolio may be included in support of teaching excellence.

As with a *Good* rating, additional activities listed under *Evidence of Teaching* will support the file. Where applicable, clinical activities will be examined, and the candidate should present a record of competence and effectiveness in developing and maintaining a clinical site. Evidence of competence and effectiveness includes those activities listed below under *Evidence of Practice Effectiveness*. Because practice sites differ, it is not the expectation that each candidate would be able to provide evidence of competence in all categories listed. However, the activities of practice effectiveness, when taken as a whole, should clearly support the candidate's claim of clinical competence and effectiveness. The record should show growth that exceeds the criteria for promotion or appointment to the rank of Associate Professor.

Where applicable, clinical activities should be examined. The candidate should present a record of competence and effectiveness in developing and maintaining a clinical site. Evidence of competence and effectiveness should include activities listed below under "Practice Effectiveness." Because practice sites differ, it is not the expectation that each candidate would be able to provide evidence of competence in all categories listed. However, the activities of practice effectiveness, when taken as a whole, should clearly support the candidate's claim of clinical competence and effectiveness.

Good Service: Good is defined as demonstration of leadership in the service provided to the College and to either the state, University, national or professional organizations. This may take many forms, including chairmanship of College committees, and positions of influence and responsibility at the university, state, national, or professional level.

Criteria

The College of Pharmacy recognizes that faculty activity typically falls under one of three categories, namely, research or scholarship, teaching or clinical activities, and service. Each of these activities is multi-faceted. Evaluation of performance will necessarily rely on various types of evidence. Valid assessment should not depend on any one type. It is more the preponderance of evidence that supports or does not support a particular rating in each of these areas. *Regarding research/scholarship*, while a quantitative assessment provides one indication of productivity, the requirement for a specific number of activities can be offset by work of exceptional quality. *Regarding teaching*, while student and peer assessments are important, quality teaching can co-exist with less than exceptional assessment due to class size, the elective or required nature of the course, the degree of challenge inherent in the course, and others. *Regarding service*, passive participation on multiple committees is not the same as active participation and leadership on fewer. In all instances, an appropriate assessment requires that the file be considered in its entirety, with each component contributing to an overall assessment.

It is the expectation of the College of Pharmacy that faculty participate fully in the three activities of research/scholarship, teaching/clinical activities, and service. To be eligible for promotion to Associate Professor or tenure at Associate Professor, a candidate must be rated as excellent in research/scholarship, and good in teaching/clinical activities, and service. To be promoted to the rank of Professor or tenured at the rank of Professor, a candidate must be rated as outstanding in research/scholarship and excellent in teaching/clinical activities, and good in service.

Promotion to Associate Professor or Tenure at Associate Professor

Research/Scholarship: The candidate must be rated at least **excellent** in research/scholarship.

Teaching/Clinical Activities: The candidate must be rated at least **good** in teaching.

Service: The candidate must be rated at least **good** in service.

Promotion to Professor or Tenure at Professor

Research/Scholarship: The candidate must be rated **outstanding** in research/scholarship.

Teaching/Clinical Activities: The candidate must be rated at least **excellent** in teaching.

Service: The candidate must be rated at least **good** in service.

Evidence of Research and/or Scholarship

This section describes the evidence presented in the tenure and promotion file to be used in assessing the candidate's research and/or scholarship. The following categorization of research and/or scholarship serves several purposes. First, it ranks activities in order of importance. Second, it identifies the level of activity considered appropriate for candidates given their rank and primary responsibility. Third, it provides a framework to evaluate the importance and relative contribution of research and scholarly activities undertaken by the candidate but not listed explicitly below.

Published Works

- Articles in refereed journals.
- Refereed scholarly books.
- Refereed book chapters.
- Patents.
- Editor of book.

Grants and Contracts

- Research grants or contracts from sources external to the College.
- Competitive training or development grants or contracts from sources external to the College.

Presentations

- Presentation of competitively selected research at national or international meeting.
- Invited research presentations at national or international meetings.
- Invited research seminars at other institutions, industry, or government.

Evidence of Teaching Effectiveness

Examples of evidence to support a teaching effectiveness are provided below. The list should not be considered exhaustive. There is no expectation that candidates will show activity in all areas.

- a. Revision and updating of course material
- b. Incorporation of technology to facilitate learning
- c. Participation in teaching seminars
- d. Leadership within the faculty for curricular development and revision
- e. Collaboration with other departments/colleges regarding content or methodology
- f. Invitation as guest lecturer outside the College of Pharmacy
- g. Peer evaluation by faculty
- h. Student evaluation, both numeric and narrative
- i. Letters from current and former students attesting to the teacher's effectiveness and course or clerkship value
- j. Performance of students on sections of standardized tests
- k. Membership on accrediting bodies and commissions related to teaching
- l. Participation on panels or review boards related to teaching

- m. Presentation, articles, grants or books related to teaching
- n. Participation in special topics electives
- o. Selection of student work for presentation or publication
- p. Honors or recognition related to teaching.

Evidence of Practice Effectiveness

Examples of evidence to support practice effectiveness are provided below. The list should not be considered exhaustive. There is no expectation that the candidate will show activity in all areas.

- a. Numeric or narrative assessment of care provided by patients.
- b. Numeric or narrative assessment by administrators or professional colleagues.
- c. Written reports related to practice authored or co-authored by the candidate (e.g. DUR reports, P&T Monographs, DUE reports).
- d. Adoption of pharmacist-developed clinical protocols.
- e. Development and maintenance of clinical contracts.
- f. Participation on practice site committees.
- g. Assuming greater responsibility for patient care or system administration.
- h. Objective assessment of patient or system well-being that can be attributed to the candidate's practice, e.g., adverse event avoidance, reduced length of stay, reduced cost of operation, patient medication adherence, pharmacy parameters with system report cards, etc.
- i. Dissemination and adoption of practice model beyond one's department or institution.
- j. Requests for collaboration by other clinicians.
- k. Presentations to colleagues within one's practice site.
- l. Presentation or publication of work performed at one's practice site.
- m. Recognition or award for practice excellence.
- n. Requests for professional consultation at our outside practice site.
- o. Selection as expert witness in legal matters.
- p. Grants to support or expand one's clinical practice or conduct research in the practice.
- q. Election to professional offices or boards related to clinical practice.