SCHOOL OF PUBLIC HEALTH
BASIC POLICIES & PROCEDURES FOR EVALUATING FACULTY PERFORMANCE

The policies/procedures contained in this guide are in addition to the basic policies on tenure and promotion outlined in the USC Faculty Manual.

1. Evidence supporting the qualifications of a faculty member for promotion and/or tenure may be solicited and submitted from many sources. All such evidence shall be submitted in written form and signed by the author. Hearsay or personal opinion outside the context of the following policies and criteria, whatever the source, may not be any part of the decision making process. The Chair of the Tenure and Promotion Committee (TPC) shall remind the members of the Committee of this rule at the beginning of each meeting.

2. Consideration for promotion and/or tenure shall not be influenced by the age, sex, race/ethnicity, creed, religion, or the educational institution from which the candidate was graduated.

3. The School of Public Health (SPH) is considered to be the "unit" for tenure and promotion and the tenured faculty of the School acts as a committee of the whole regarding tenure and/or promotion.

4. Members of the SPH TPC will elect a chair at the spring annual review meeting for a two-year term. The chair will be a tenured full professor and a member of the SPH faculty. All tenured faculty of the SPH holding equal or higher academic rank than the candidate are eligible to vote on tenure; only those tenured faculty of higher rank than the candidate are eligible to vote on promotion.

5. Those to be tenured and/or promoted will normally hold an earned doctoral degree and must show evidence of achievement in teaching, research, publication and service appropriate to the rank to which they aspire.

6. Evidence submitted will be judged according to the overall pattern of performance. Decisions regarding tenure and promotion will depend primarily on evidence of a consistent pattern of achievement since the date of appointment to present rank and/or tenure in the SPH at the University of South Carolina (USC).

7. Each year, in accordance with the USC *Faculty Manual*, all tenure-track faculty members who are not tenured are considered for tenure and all faculty members below the rank of professor are considered for promotion. Each such candidate shall be given notice in writing by the Dean, well in advance of consideration, so that the candidate may provide relevant materials for a file to be available for consultation by appropriate faculty. A decision to seek early tenure and/or promotion should only occur after consultation with the department chair, senior faculty and the Dean's Office. It is the University policy that a faculty member, not in the penultimate year, may waive full consideration by written request to the Chair of the SPH TPC.

    The names of those persons considered or who decline consideration shall be forwarded through the appropriate channels for the record, except for those who decline consideration in the final decision year. An unfavorable recommendation prior to the penultimate year shall not prejudice future consideration for tenure and/or promotion.

8. In all cases, individual files relevant to tenure and promotion matters shall be maintained in the Dean's office. Access to individual tenure and promotion files shall be governed according to official University policy. Confidentiality is required in all aspects of the deliberative process when considering the candidate's file.

9. The Chair of the SPH TPC will request the candidate to submit at least two months (60 days) prior to the file submission date a list of names, titles, addresses and phone numbers of five *(5)* potential external reviewers. From the list at least two (2) and no more than three (3) will be chosen by the SPH TPC Chair in consultation with the department chair. Three (3) additional external reviewers, not listed by the candidate, will be selected by the Chair of the SPH TPC in consultation with the candidate's department chair and appropriate voting faculty of the SPH TPC. In order to eliminate any conflict of interest, it is important that none of those chosen should have close association with the candidate, e.g., dissertation advisor, co-author, or co-principal investigator. It is generally expected that the external reviewers will be nationally recognized in the candidate's area of expertise, or a closely related area, and must be at or above the desired rank, or equivalent status of the candidate. The Committee may choose to place additional names on the list.

    The Chair of the SPH TPC will contact each external reviewer and forward the candidate's current curriculum vitae and copies of publications selected by the candidate.

    The external reviewer will receive the *SPH Criteria and Procedures for Tenure and Promotion* document as a guide and will be asked to comment **only on scholarship activities**. The Chair of the SPH TPC will place in the candidate's file a copy of the letter requesting the reviewers' responses. The reviewers' letters and a brief sketch of each reviewer's background will be prepared by the SPH TPC Chair, in consultation with the candidate's department chair.

10. Each eligible Committee member shall vote by secret ballot, "yes", or "no", or "abstain." A vote of "abstain" would usually occur only in cases of conflict of interest. A favorable recommendation shall mean a vote to recommend the candidate for tenure and/or promotion by a majority of the SPH TPC, excluding those who abstain. All votes, including "abstain", must be justified in writing.

    It is the duty of the Chair of the SPH TPC to compile and record votes in the candidate's file. The Chair informs the candidate whether the vote was positive or negative. The numerical count shall not be revealed. Any further discussions of the decision shall be between the candidate and the Dean.

    All SPH TPC members are notified about the recommendation of the candidate but the numerical count shall not be revealed.

    All materials, including the recording of votes and all written comments, are forwarded to the Dean. The Dean must write a letter to be included in the file after the SPH TPC vote and forward the recommendations, statements and endorsements through appropriate channels.

11. The department chair, if tenured and in keeping with previously mentioned guidelines, must vote as a faculty member as well as write a letter of evaluation. The letter must be placed in the file after the SPH TPC vote. The chair's letter should assess the candidate's file and be written in the context of the SPH TPC policies and procedures.

CRITERIA FOR TENURE AND PROMOTION

TEACHING

SPH faculty members are expected to be effective teachers. In this context, teaching refers not only to classroom performance, but also to the full range of activities which enhance student development. Each candidate at mid-point of the tenure process, i.e. third-year review, and at the time of a request for tenure and/or promotion, will submit **a narrative peer review evaluation** of all teaching activity. The previous peer evaluation, i.e. third-year review, will be included in the candidate's file and will be taken into consideration when rating the candidate's teaching record as excellent, good, or poor. Materials which may be submitted for peer evaluation of teaching are listed below. The peer evaluator will be chosen by the SPH TPC Chair in consultation with the department chair and the candidate. The peer evaluator will use the evidence shown below to compile a thorough presentation of the candidate's teaching effectiveness. It is understood that faculty of various departments may not have the opportunity to perform in all the areas listed.

Evidence

- Student evaluations of the candidate's teaching performance in all classes taught during the period reflected must be in the candidates file. Absence of any evaluation record must be justified.

- Peer evaluations of a candidate's classroom teaching performance by an evaluator outside the department. This should occur at least once per year.

- Direction of dissertations and theses.

- Direction of students in practica/projects and independent studies.

- Teaching as reflected by number of courses taught per year, course level (undergraduate, masters, or doctoral), required vs. elected courses, number of students (class size) and number of different courses taught.

- Demonstration of activities to improve teaching effectiveness.

- Student advisement.

- Development and/or revision of new courses, curriculum, and instructional material and methods.

- Teaching awards.

- Course syllabi.

- Any other documentation to support teaching effectiveness.

- Service on dissertation and thesis committees and service on examination committees.

Evaluation Criteria

Excellent: Based upon all teaching activity, including student and peer reviews, the candidate's teaching record indicates that teaching and promotion of student development is **very effective**. Evidence may include above average student evaluations, teaching awards, excellent peer reviews and significant contributions to curriculum development.

Good: Based upon all teaching activity, including student and peer reviews, the candidate's record indicates that teaching and promotion of student development is **effective**. Evidence may include average student evaluations, good peer reviews and demonstrated activity to improve teaching performance.

Poor: Based upon all teaching activity, including student and peer reviews, the candidate's record indicates that teaching and promotion of student development is **ineffective**.

SCHOLARSHIP

School of Public Health faculty members are expected to be continually involved in scholarly activities that advance their specific discipline. A record of scholarship is expected for promotion and/or tenure at all ranks. **The candidate must demonstrate an appropriate level of leadership in conducting and reporting research. The most direct evidence of a scholarly contribution is a consistent record of publication in peer reviewed journals**. In addition, the external reviewers' comments will be used by the SPH TPC in evaluating the scholarly performance of the candidate. The following activities may be used to support scholarly research contributions.

Evidence

- Publication in peer reviewed journals.

- Publication of specialized reference books or publication of chapters in these books, or publication of textbooks that have passed editorial boards.

- Publication of monographs.

- Securing funding of research grants or contracts as principal investigator, co-principal investigator, or significant participant. Documentation should include number of projects, dates, funding sources, amount of awards, role in projects and percent of effort funded on projects.

- Publication of papers in proceedings. Refereed proceedings carry more weight than non-refereed proceedings. Refereed proceedings of national/international meetings carry more weight than those of regional or local meetings.

- Receiving an honor or award that recognizes the quality and contribution of one's research.

- Submitting research grants/contracts as principal investigator, co-principal investigator, or significant participant. Documentation should include number of submissions, dates, funding sources, amounts requested, and role in projects.

·   Participation in professional meetings by presenting papers, or by serving as a session chair or discussant. National/international meetings generally carry more weight than regional or local meetings.

- Publication of articles in non-refereed professional journals.

- Publication of abstracts that are presented.

- Invitations to participate in specialized workshops, lectures, or colloquia, especially at other institutions.

- Editing of books.

·   Book reviews.

·   Citation of candidate's work by other scholars.

<u>**Evaluation Criteria:**</u> The candidate shall have established a program of scholarly activity that makes an important contribution to the body of knowledge in their discipline.

Excellent: Overall, the candidate's record of scholarship **forms a continuous and consistent record of important contributions at the national level**. It is expected that the candidate's scholarly performance be **comparable in quality** to that of individuals at the candidate's present rank if seeking tenure at that rank, or rank desired if seeking promotion, in nationally recognized programs.

Good: Overall, the candidate's record of scholarship **demonstrates a valuable contribution at the national level**. It is expected that the candidate's scholarly performance **be comparable in quality** to that of individuals at the candidate's present rank if seeking tenure at that rank, or rank desired if seeking promotion, in nationally recognized programs.

Poor: Overall, the candidate's record of scholarship **does not compare favorably in quality to individuals at the candidate's present rank** if seeking tenure, or rank desired if seeking promotion, in nationally recognized programs.

SERVICE

Faculty members are expected to make a contribution to the operation and governance of the University, their profession and the public-at-large. The list below, while not all-inclusive, is illustrative of many ways a faculty member can contribute professional service.

Evidence

Service to the Academic Community

- Administrative responsibility and function which includes key University, School and/or department committees.

- Continuing education programs.

- Training grants/contracts.

- Performance on committees at the University, School and/or department level.

- Special projects for the University, School and/or the department.

- Initiating and cooperating in efforts to improve programs at the University, School and/or department, level.

Service to the Profession

- Editorial and review work for academic publications.

- Leadership roles in the administration of professional organizations.

- Assisting colleagues to improve teaching.

- Assisting students in job placement.

- Reviews of papers of academic organizations.

- Service as session chair or discussant at professional meetings.

- Service on government committees or task forces.

Professional Service to the Community

- Consulting that is related to the candidate's professional activity.

- Leadership role in not-for-profit organizations.

- Presentations to community professional groups.

- Serving on advisory boards, societies or councils, etc.

· State agencies with a public health mission.

Evaluation Criteria

Excellent: The candidate's record of service activities and functions demonstrates leadership and is recognized as being **very effective**. Examples may include holding state or national offices, membership on key university committees, consulting with state or national activities and editorships.

Good: The candidate's record of service demonstrates that performance of all expected and requested service activities and functions is **effective**. Examples may include local and state offices, membership on committees at state and national level and review for professional publications.

Poor: The candidate's record demonstrates that performance of service activities and functions is **ineffective**.

EVALUATION FOR TENURE AND PROMOTION

Tenure is granted only at the ranks of, or coincident with promotion to, Associate Professor and Professor. A recommendation for tenure and/or promotion will require performance at the level specified for the rank at which either or both is being sought. University policy requires that separate ballots and votes be taken for tenure and promotion. The performance requirements are indicated under the guidelines described below.

TENURE AND PROMOTION

The required maximum time in the ranks are described in *The Faculty Manual.*

Tenure at or **promotion** to **Associate Professor** requires that the candidate be rated:

1. as **excellent** in **scholarship** <u>or</u> **teaching** and

2. as **good** <u>or</u> **excellent** in other areas.

Tenure at or **promotion** to **Professor** signifies that a candidate has made a significant contribution to the mission of the University, School and profession.

Usually, the candidate must have at least four years or a longer period of service, including the review year, as an Associate Professor and be rated:

1. as **excellent** in **scholarship** and

2. as **excellent** in either **teaching** <u>or</u> **service** and **good** <u>or</u> **excellent** in the other category.