

TENURE AND PROMOTION CRITERIA AND PROCEDURES
DEPARTMENT OF BIOMEDICAL ENGINEERING
MOLINAROLI COLLEGE OF ENGINEERING AND COMPUTING
UNIVERSITY OF SOUTH CAROLINA, COLUMBIA
DEPARTMENT APPROVAL DATE: AUGUST 8, 2024
UCTP APPROVAL DATE: NOVEMBER 22, 2024

TABLE OF CONTENTS

PREAMBLE.....	4
Department of Biomedical Engineering Mission Statement.....	4
Eligibility for Tenure or Promotion.....	4
Description of Rank.....	5
Movement of Faculty Between Tenure and Professional Tracks.....	6
PART 1: PROCEDURES.....	6
1.1 Introduction.....	6
1.2 The Department Tenure and Promotion Committee.....	6
1.3 Establishing Candidacy.....	7
1.4 External Referees.....	7
1.5 Department Voting.....	8
1.6 Establishing Tenure and Promotion Primary and Secondary Files	8
1.6.1 Composition of Primary and Secondary Files.....	8
1.6.1.1 Duties of the Tenure and Promotion Committee Chair.....	8
1.6.2 Materials in the Primary and Secondary Files.....	9
1.6.3 Confidentiality.....	9
1.6.4 Joint Appointments.....	9
1.6.5 Voting.....	9
1.6.6 Notification.....	9
1.6.7 Appeal Procedures.....	10
1.7 Third Year Review.....	10
1.8 Annual Review.....	10
1.9 Procedures for Recommending Changes in this Document.....	11
PART 2: CRITERIA FOR TENURE AND PROMOTION.....	11
2.1 Standards.....	11
2.1.1 Value of Innovation.....	11
2.1.2 Interdisciplinarity.....	11
2.2 General Criteria for Teaching, Research/, and Service.....	11
2.2.1 Teaching.....	12
2.2.1.1 Definition of Teaching.....	12
2.2.1.2 Documentation of Teaching.....	12
2.2.1.3 Evaluation of Teaching.....	12
2.2.2 Research.....	13
2.2.2.1 Definitions.....	13
2.2.2.2 Documentation of Research.....	13
2.2.2.3 Evaluation of Research.....	14
2.2.3 Service.....	14
2.2.3.1 Definitions.....	14
2.2.3.2 Documentation of Service.....	14
2.2.3.3 Evaluation of Service.....	15

PART 3: TENURE AND PROMOTION IN THE DEPARTMENT OF BIOMEDICAL ENGINEERING.....	15
3.1 Background.....	16
3.2 Eligibility for Tenure and Promotion.....	16
3.3 Awarding Tenure.....	17
3.4 Criteria for Promotion to Associate Professor.....	17
3.5 Criteria for Promotion to Full Professor.....	17
3.6 Definitions of Key Descriptive Terms Used in the Criteria.....	17
3.6.1 Teaching.....	17
3.6.2 Research	18
3.6.3 Service.....	19

Abbreviations used include:

AC AF = University Policies and Procedures: Academic Affairs

MOU = Memorandum of Understanding

UCTP = University Committee on Tenure and Promotion

PREAMBLE

This document is intended to assist candidates in their preparation for tenure and promotion in the Department of Biomedical Engineering, Molinaroli College of Engineering and Computing. These criteria and procedures are consistent with the Faculty Manual and the guidelines established by the University Committee on Tenure and Promotion (UCTP), University of South Carolina. In the event of inconsistency between these criteria and the faculty manual, the Faculty Manual is to be considered the final authority (see Faculty Manual).

Candidates are responsible for familiarizing themselves with this department's criteria regarding tenure and promotion as well as those set forth in the Faculty Manual and in the University Committee on Tenure and Promotion Guidelines.

Department of Biomedical Engineering Mission Statement

The Department of Biomedical Engineering at the University of South Carolina prepares its graduates technically and professionally to meet the growing demands for positions in the biomedical engineering industry and academia or continuing studies in graduate programs and medical schools. By continuously improving the undergraduate and graduate programs, the department responds to the rapidly changing field of biomedical engineering to serve as an effective resource and partner for industry, government, and academia.

Eligibility for Tenure or Promotion

The department's policies related to tenure and promotion are subject to those set forth in the Faculty Manual.

Faculty below the rank of full professor are to be considered annually for promotion and/or tenure. Candidates for promotion to associate professor may elect to be evaluated by the Department of Biomedical Engineering tenure and promotion guidelines in effect at the time of their appointment in the Department of Biomedical Engineering.

Candidates who apply for promotion to full professor must use the criteria and standards in effect at the time of their application, as stated in the Faculty Manual. By offering themselves for consideration, candidates acknowledge that they have read the requirements for promotion and tenure in the Faculty Manual and have satisfied probationary requirements.

Faculty who seek tenure and or promotion may be solely appointed in the Department of Biomedical Engineering; jointly appointed with a tenure home in the Department of Biomedical Engineering; or jointly-appointed with a primary appointment in another department. Candidates who are joint appointments with a tenure home in the Department of Biomedical Engineering or another unit must include a copy of their Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) in their tenure and promotion primary file. In cases where the faculty have a primary appointment in another unit, the Department of Biomedical Engineering will provide a secondary evaluation, abiding by the MOU with the tenure home unit, using the Department of Biomedical Engineering procedures, as described in the Faculty Manual and University Committee on Tenure and Promotion Guidelines. As directed by the Faculty Manual, if the Department of Biomedical Engineering is the secondary unit, we must be given an opportunity to propose external referees and to comment on those proposed by the primary unit. Primary and secondary units should work together to obtain a suitable and representative group of referees. An evaluation must be solicited from at least one referee nominated or appointed by each secondary unit.

Description of Rank (Faculty Manual)

The written approval of the appropriate chief academic officer is required prior to initiating a search for any tenured or tenure-track faculty position. (AC AF 1.00) The AC AF is the University Policies and Procedures: Academic Affairs Document.

Professor: To be eligible for appointment at the rank of professor, a faculty member is expected to hold an earned doctorate degree or equivalent and have a record of (at least) excellent performance in both teaching and research. The written approval of the president is required before an offer can be extended for a hire with tenure and/or for a position at the rank of professor. (AC AF 1.00)

Associate Professor: The faculty member normally is expected to hold an earned doctorate degree or equivalent and must possess strong potential for further development in teaching and research. To be eligible for appointment at the rank of associate professor, a faculty member must have a record of (at least) excellent performance in both teaching and research, as well as be recognized for professional accomplishments. For a hire with tenure, offer letters must state that tenure is contingent on the approval of the Board of Trustees. (AC AF 1.00)

Assistant Professor: To be eligible for appointment at the rank of assistant professor, a faculty member is expected to hold an earned doctorate degree or its equivalent and must demonstrate strong potential for development in teaching and research. The maximum probationary time as assistant professor is 7 years, with possibilities for extension as outlined by the Faculty Manual. Time in rank may be shortened if hired as an advanced assistant professor or, by agreement of the tenured department faculty, in light of demonstrated scholarly/research excellence. (See below for more information, Standards.)

Instructor: To be eligible for appointment at the rank of instructor, a faculty member is expected to hold at least an earned Master's degree in the teaching discipline or a Master's degree with a concentration in the teaching discipline (a minimum of 18 graduate semester hours in the teaching discipline).

The qualifications for appointment to these positions and positions bearing other titles, such as lecturer, clinical professor, or research professor, are specified in policy AC AF 1.06 Academic Titles for Faculty and Unclassified Academic Staff Positions.

Faculty with Joint Appointments: Jointly appointed faculty are faculty members whose tenure home is in one unit (the "primary unit") and who have a part time appointment, with some combination of teaching, research, and service obligations, in one or more unit or program (the "secondary unit").

Each joint appointment of a new hire or an existing faculty member should be formalized by an MOU that specifies the responsibilities of the faculty member to the primary and secondary units. The MOU shall stipulate procedures for faculty evaluation and agreements regarding the allocation of resources. It should also address how the joint appointment can be rescinded at the request of the faculty of either academic unit. Faculty members holding joint appointments will have full rights and privileges of the primary department except as otherwise agreed in the MOU. (AC AF 1.00)

Movement of Faculty Between Tenure and Professional Tracks (Faculty Manual)

The following actions may not be taken without approval of the tenured and tenure-track faculty of the affected unit: (1) movement of a professional-track faculty member to the tenure track

absent a competitive national search; or (2) movement to a professional-track faculty position of a tenure-track faculty member who withdraws from the tenure track during the penultimate year without applying for tenure. For purposes of this section, a tenure-track faculty member who achieves tenure is referred to as a tenured faculty member. See also policy AC AF 1.18 Change of Status to and from Tenure-Track Faculty.

Part 1: Procedures

1.1 Introduction

These procedures are intended to provide candidates and unit committees with a clear outline of steps to be followed in reaching all decisions regarding tenure and/or promotion within the Department of Biomedical Engineering. Candidates and committee members should, however, familiarize themselves with the Tenure and Promotion Regulations of the current Faculty Manual, with the Tenure and Promotion Calendar for the current year, and with the current UCTP Guidelines.

For joint appointments, the candidate's primary and secondary files will also be made available to eligible faculty of the secondary unit. In this case, a written evaluation from the eligible faculty of the secondary unit will be solicited and placed in the candidate's primary file at least five working days prior to the unit's vote on the application. Faculty who are members of both the primary and secondary unit can only vote in the primary unit. The UCTP guidelines also state that secondary units must develop written procedures for evaluation of joint appointees. Such evaluations should be conducted in accordance with the MOU developed by the two units for the joint appointment. For joint appointments where the Department of Biomedical Engineering is the primary unit, the chair of the department will solicit a statement of the evaluation procedures from the secondary unit and make them available to the candidate at the start of the University appointment.

1.2 The Department Tenure and Promotion Committee

All tenured faculty of the Department of Biomedical Engineering supervise all matters related to tenure and promotion, including development and revision of the Departmental Tenure and Promotion Criteria and Procedures. The chair of the department shall not serve as chair of the Department's Tenure and Promotion Committee but may be present at the meetings of the committee.

- The Department committee for tenure and promotion shall be comprised of at least five (5) members.
- The chair of the Department of Biomedical Engineering Tenure and Promotion Committee will be selected by election or acclamation by the tenured faculty of the department. The committee chair shall serve for a three-year term, which may be renewed upon approval of the faculty.
- In the event that the Department does not contain a sufficient number of qualified members to constitute a committee, the chair of the committee, in consultation with the dean's office, shall recruit additional members from the tenured faculty of related disciplines.

1.2 Establishing Candidacy

The chair of the department shall, annually, in writing, ask all tenure track faculty who are eligible for tenure or promotion whether or not they wish to be considered for tenure and/or promotion by the deadline stipulated in the Tenure and Promotion Calendar. The Tenure and

Promotion Calendar is published on the provost's website and provides dates for those faculty hired in August or January of any given year.

All eligible faculty shall convey their intent to seek tenure and/or promotion to the chair in writing by the deadline date stipulated in the tenure and promotion calendar for that year. All eligible faculty, save those who do not wish to be considered, shall be regarded as candidates for tenure and promotion.

Candidates, except for those who are in their penultimate year, may waive candidacy for tenure and promotion. Non-tenured faculty must submit a primary file for a review during their third year as described in AC AF 1.05.

- After establishing candidacy, candidates may at any time withdraw from further consideration without prejudice save that imposed on nontenured faculty by university regulations bearing on allowable time in rank.
- After a candidate declares intent, the chair of the department committee shall call a preliminary meeting of the committee, during which the candidate will be interviewed, and their case discussed, emphasizing the necessary components for the primary file. Prior to the tenure and promotion committee selecting a slate of referees, candidates may indicate any potential external referees who would not be appropriate due to real or perceived conflicts.

1.4 External Referees

At a separate meeting, the department tenure and promotion committee shall discuss selection of external referees. The candidate may not be part of this selection process. The committee shall then select at least five individuals to provide referee letters, with the unit of a jointly appointed faculty member determining one of the five. All solicited external evaluations must be included in the Primary File.

Referees will be impartial scholars within the field, outside the University of South Carolina. The majority of referees normally must be persons with academic affiliations. However, up to two non-university specialists may be selected as external referees if consistent with the candidate's field of discipline.

Specialization in biomedical engineering may come from a variety of disciplines suited to the candidate's expertise. Persons who have co-authored publications or have been colleagues or advisors of the applicant or have collaborated on research should be excluded from consideration as external referees. All referees must be asked to disclose any relationship or interaction with the applicant.

For tenure and promotion to associate professor, the outside referee must hold a rank higher than that of the candidate. For professorial candidates, the outside referee must hold a rank of professor. Emeriti and persons of higher rank than the tenure and promotion candidate may be used, or else a person of equal rank to a professor for promotion to professor.

External referees are charged primarily with evaluation of a candidate's research and should be provided with publications and other relevant materials for this purpose. The unit tenure and promotion chair must also send each evaluator a copy of the department's tenure and promotion requirements for research by which the candidate's work is to be evaluated.

It is the responsibility of the unit tenure and promotion committee chair to secure evaluations from external referees selected by the unit committee. Curricula vitae should be solicited from

all referees and included in the primary file, and they should be asked to provide statements about any relationships that exist between themselves and the candidate. The chair of the tenure and promotion committee shall provide a capsule biography of such individuals as part of the primary file.

The majority of five (5) external reviewers' responses must be construed as positive when the department's tenure and promotion committee evaluate the candidate's primary file.

1.5 Department Voting

- All tenured faculty members at the rank of associate or full professor who are not excluded for reasons identified below may vote on tenure and promotion to associate professor. Only tenured professors who are not excluded for reasons identified below may vote on a candidate's case for promotion to professor. Exclusions: Any otherwise eligible faculty member who has a conflict of interest or a family or other close personal relationship with the candidate that could affect their objectivity shall not vote or otherwise participate in the process.
- Only the voting members of the department and the department chair, who may not vote, may participate in deliberations leading to such votes or have access to confidential files bearing on the evaluation of the candidate..
- The department vote is by secret ballot.
- Department votes will utilize the Department of Biomedical Engineering tenure and promotion criteria.
- Faculty who are on sabbatical or leave are eligible to vote.
- All faculty in the Department of Biomedical Engineering are welcome to write a letter, beyond the ballot, to be included in the candidate's primary file.
- Any otherwise eligible faculty member who has a conflict of interest or a family or other close personal relationship with the candidate that could affect their objectivity, shall not vote or otherwise participate in the process. No one may vote on the candidacy of a domestic partner.
- In the case of joint appointments, a representative from the secondary unit will be invited to participate in the deliberations. They may have access to the candidate's primary and secondary file, but they are not eligible to vote.

1.6 Establishing Tenure and Promotion Files

1.6.1 Composition of Primary and Secondary Files

The candidate has responsibility for the preparation and contents of their own primary and secondary files, including a page listing the contents of each file. Specific contents of the primary and secondary files are listed in the UCTP Guidelines and generally include documentation of teaching, research, and service as well as the candidate's curriculum vitae and a personal statement. Information specific to the Department of Biomedical Engineering on documentation for the primary and secondary files is defined in Sections 4, 5, and 6 below.

- Confidential material (such as letters from outside referees or letters of support) is added by the chair of the tenure and promotion committee.
- The format for the primary file is published on the website <http://www.sc.edu/tenure/>. While there is some flexibility in the precise format of the tables, depending on the specific discipline, the aim is for the greatest clarity for the candidate's case.
- The unit committee may establish a reasonable deadline for the provision of documents and information, subject to requirements of the Tenure and Promotion Calendar.
- The candidate shall not be required to provide any materials not described in the criteria.

1.6.1.1 Duties of the Tenure and Promotion Committee Chair

- The chair shall work shall advise the candidate on formatting the primary and secondary files.
- The chair shall advise the candidate on enhancing and clarifying the file.
- The chair shall send each external referees a copy of the department's tenure and promotion requirements for research by which the candidate's work is to be evaluated.
- The chair shall secure evaluations from external referees selected by the unit committee.

1.6.2 Materials in the Primary and Secondary Files

Any evaluations that may have negative impact may not be removed by the candidate or any other person. After the department has voted, only limited materials may be added to the primary and secondary files in specific cases. (UCTP Guidelines, p. 6-7)

1.6.3 Confidentiality

All letters submitted at the request of the unit committee as well as the deliberations of the committee are to be held in the strictest confidence allowable under the law.

1.6.4 Joint Appointments

For joint appointments, the MOU must be included in the candidate's primary file . The secondary unit will provide a written evaluation for inclusion in the candidate's primary file.

The chair of the department tenure and promotion committee shall make the candidate's primary and secondary files available to committee members 14 days prior to taking a vote. In the case of joint appointments, the candidate's primary and secondary files will also be made available at the same time to the eligible faculty in the secondary unit.

1.6.5 Voting

The chair shall call at least one additional meeting of the unit committee for discussion of the candidate's case after committee members have been given an opportunity to review the complete primary and secondary files . The chair shall work in association with the committee to closely review and deliberate the candidate's case as presented in the primary and secondary files.

The Department of Biomedical Engineering tenure and promotion committee will, on or before the date specified for such action in the UCTP calendar, conduct a secret ballot vote on tenure and/or promotion, having informed the candidate of their intention to do so. All votes by committee members must be accompanied by written justifications citing the departmental tenure and promotion criteria under which the committee is obligated to reach decisions.

If 2/3 or greater of the department committee's voting members, excluding abstentions, vote in favor of tenure and/or promotion, the vote shall be recorded as positive and, together with the candidate's complete primary and secondary files, shall be conveyed to the unit chair and later to the dean of the Molinaroli College of Engineering and Computing for further consideration.

If fewer than 2/3 vote in favor of tenure and/or promotion, excluding abstentions (or if all abstain) the committee will not forward the candidate's case for further consideration except on written appeal from the candidate.

The chair of the department will not vote as a member of the tenure and promotion committee but will provide a letter evaluating the candidate's case.

1.6.6 Notification

The tenure and promotion committee chair will notify the candidate and the committee in writing of the recommendation. Upon request from the candidate, the department chair shall provide an oral summary of vote justifications without attribution to specific individuals. No written summary of the tenure and promotion committee action -- whether favorable or unfavorable -- will be provided to the candidate.

1.6.7 Appeal Procedures

A candidate may appeal a negative decision of the department's tenure and promotion committee and -- upon written request to the tenure and promotion committee chair - shall have the primary and secondary files sent through all appropriate channels (the original committee, the department chair, the dean, the provost, and the UCTP), and finally, to the president for action. The candidate's written request of appeal must be made to the tenure and promotion committee chair before the primary and secondary files are officially due at the dean's office. The letter of appeal should address issues raised in justifications outlined to the candidate. (See Faculty Manual)

In the event of a vote forwarded to the dean, all tenure track faculty of the Department of Biomedical Engineering will be informed of the decisions and invited to additional remarks in writing to the dean.

1.7 Third Year Review

All untenured faculty, regardless of rank, will undergo a performance review in the third year after appointment. This review will follow the procedures outlined in the Faculty Manual and those stated below.

This review will be carried out by the proper Tenure and Promotion committee as outlined in Section 1.2. The candidate under review will follow the procedures outlined in Section 1.6 when submitting a file for third year review.

A majority vote of the tenure and promotion committee members voting will be necessary for a recommendation whether the untenured faculty member should be retained. Abstentions are not included in the vote count. This recommendation will be forwarded to the department chair.

1.8 Annual Review

The criteria for tenure and promotion in the Department of Biomedical Engineering will be used by the tenure and promotion committee (see Section 1.2) and department chair to evaluate both the (a) annual performance and (b) overall performance of faculty in their current rank/position.

All untenured faculty and tenured faculty below the rank of full professor shall submit annually a cumulative tenure and promotion file. The cumulative file will be used each year for consideration of promotion and/or tenure, as outlined in the Faculty Manual, as well as for the annual review. Information for the current year should be clearly identified (e.g. underlined) within the cumulative file to facilitate the annual evaluation.

A majority vote of the total number of the tenure and promotion committee members voting will be necessary for recommending whether the untenured faculty member should be retained.

Abstentions are not included in the vote count. This recommendation will be forwarded to the department chair.

1.9 Procedures for Recommending Changes in this Document

To recommend changes in this document, a positive vote of at least 2/3 of the faculty eligible to vote on a given case will be necessary. The voting process will be by written ballot. Proxy votes and oral votes are counted as abstentions. Abstentions are not part of the total vote count. The procedure for approval of criteria as outlined in the Faculty Manual (latest revision) will be followed.

Part 2: Criteria for Tenure and Promotion

2.1 Standards

2.1.1 Value of Innovation

Quality research, teaching excellence, and a commitment to service are important areas of evaluation by the faculty of the Department of Biomedical Engineering. In addition to long-standing criteria for such evaluation, innovative faculty work in these areas should also be considered when germane. The candidates should articulate the nature and value of the innovative work in their primary file .

2.1.2 Interdisciplinarity

Interdisciplinary studies provide opportunities for creating knowledge in new and unanticipated ways, often representing cutting-edge research and teaching. Since many challenges and problems require skills and perspectives from multiple academic professional disciplines, evidence of innovative interdisciplinary research, teaching, and service should therefore be valued in a candidate's promotion and tenure dossier.

2.2 General Criteria for Teaching, Research, and Service

Achievement in each area of professional activity will be judged in terms of the criteria outlined below. Each candidate is expected to have made a substantial contribution in the areas of teaching and research, and a contribution to service suitable to their roles and rank in the department.

The Faculty Manual mandates the use of the following adjectival standards:

- Outstanding: The candidate's performance is far above the level required by the department, is of extremely high quality, conferring a significant national or international reputation.
- Excellent: The candidate's performance exceeds the level required by the department, is of high quality, with evidence of a developing national or international reputation.
- Good: The candidate's performance is at the level required by the department, with promise of a future national or international reputation.
- Fair: The candidate's performance is below the level required by the department, but there is promise of future improvement.
- Unacceptable: The candidate's performance falls below the level required by the department. No promise of future improvement is evident.

The following sections provide general definition, documentation, and evaluation information for teaching, research, and service. Specific considerations for tenure and promotion for assistant professors and promotion for associate professors are delineated in Part 3.

2.2.1 Teaching

For teaching, the unit tenure and promotion committee shall evaluate a candidate's overall effectiveness as a teacher.

2.2.1.1 Definition of Teaching

Teaching shall be defined as all instructional activities conducted within the university. These activities shall include, but not be restricted to, the categories below. In assessing the quality of the candidate's teaching record, particular importance will be attached to the first two items.

- Classroom instruction
- Integration of teaching and research
- Advisement and mentoring of students
- Course and curriculum development
- Chairing or co-chairing theses and dissertations, and supervision of student projects

2.2.1.2 Documentation of Teaching

It is incumbent upon the candidate to provide documentation evidential to the criteria cited in the questions below. Minimally, this documentation should include:

- A short narrative describing and summarizing the candidate's involvement with teaching, advising, and mentoring (this may include a statement of the candidate's philosophy of teaching).
- A list of courses taught during the period since the last assignment of rank.
- A list of theses, dissertations, chaired or co-chaired, and projects supervised.
- Peer evaluations of teaching.
- Evidence of curriculum development activities, at the department or college level.
- Student evaluations for courses taught during the period under review.

2.2.1.3 Evaluation of Teaching

A summary evaluation of the candidate's teaching must be prepared by the tenure and promotion committee and submitted as part of the primary file. These evaluations should be framed within the department's courses. Evidence for these evaluations include:

- A summary of peer and student evaluations conducted periodically throughout the member's tenure-track (or tenured) appointment at the university. For joint appointments, peer and student evaluations from the secondary unit must be included in the summary.
- While student evaluations are important, greater weight is given to the peer evaluations. Peer evaluations of teaching give a wider view of the candidate's work, analyzing course content, syllabi, communication, classroom presence, etc. of each candidate. Therefore, it is important that each candidate has at least two peer evaluations each year. For jointly appointed faculty, the secondary unit should have at least one additional peer review each year.
- A table that contains the average rating of overall instructor performance for each course, specific information related to teaching evaluation criteria, and a comparison with selected other courses in the discipline at the same level.

2.2.2 Research

2.2.2.1 Definitions

Biomedical engineering as a discipline has both applied and original research. Original research is defined as an innovative expansion of the existing knowledge base through theoretical developments and/or experimentation and/or original thought. Applied research involves the constructive application of existing principles to current problems. Both applied and original research in biomedical engineering is inherently interdisciplinary, typified by the integration of concepts in biology/physiology with approaches derived from one or more engineering domains (i.e. mechanical engineering, chemical engineering, materials engineering). Therefore, scholarly activity may involve (a) the formulation and dissemination of new knowledge and (b) the sound application of existing principles to solve modern problems. Scholarly activity is judged in terms of both quality and quantity of the work presented by the candidate. Support for the quality of scholarly activity may be evidenced by (1) statements from the tenure and promotion committee members, (2) statements from external referees, (3) statements from members of the Department of Biomedical Engineering, and (4) other appropriate items. As an essential part of the research/scholarly activity process, it is important that the candidate demonstrates the ability to develop and sustain a research program for their area(s) of interest.

2.2.2.2 Documentation of Research

The following items may serve as evidence for the quality and quantity of scholarly activity. This list is not exhaustive and candidates need not be supported by all items listed. However, each candidate must give evidence of peer-reviewed publications and presentations of scholarly work.

In roughly decreasing order of importance, the items are;

- publication of high quality, peer-reviewed articles in professional journals,
- publication of monographs, books or book chapters,
- publication of high-quality, national laboratory research reports,
- documentation of presentations at professional and/or scholarly meetings, research seminars, and/or colloquia at universities,
- supervision of completed theses and dissertations,
- written evidence for the quality of the candidate's work by other authors, including citations of the candidate's work, evaluations of the candidates' scholarly work by recognized researchers from academia, industry, or government, and/or proposal reviews from grant agencies that use peer review of proposals,
- activities related to advising and mentoring of graduate students and/or faculty and/or supervision of completed independent study projects and comprehensive projects,
- awards for scholarly research work,
- publication in reviewed media such as podcasts and digital media
- minimally refereed publications such as abstracts, extended abstracts, and some conference proceedings, and
- editing of published books or book reviews.

2.2.2.3 Evaluation of Research

The following items may serve as evidence that the candidate is developing and maintaining a research program in the department (this list is not exhaustive, and candidates need not be supported by all items listed). However, funding and sincere efforts to obtain funding of a candidate's research program must be evident.

The items are:

- continued development of expertise by the candidate, either through work with graduate students or through personal development, in his/her areas of research,
- list of research and/or training grants/awards from non-department sources for which the candidate has written the proposal, including an indication of the status of each grant/award,
- list of useable educational/research equipment obtained from non-departmental sources, and
- financial support for graduate students on research projects.

2.2.3 Service

Service is comprised of activities in three areas: university service, public service, and professional service. Because individuals differ in their abilities and interests, because they are given different opportunities, and because varying demands are made on their time, candidates are not necessarily expected to make similar contributions in all areas of service.

2.2.3.1 Definitions

- Department/University Service shall include but not be restricted to: administrative positions; University committees; College committees; Departmental committees; formal mentoring of faculty or students; program/curriculum development; laboratory and equipment development and management; and supervision of student organizations.
- Public Service constitutes contributions utilizing the candidate's professional expertise to communities or groups outside a strictly academic environment, reflecting the University's mission and goals. These external groups may be local, statewide, national, or international.
- Professional Service is composed of academic activities that serve the particular disciplines of the candidate. These may include: participation in professional organizations; referee for research granting agencies, journals, and publishers; editorship of journals, proceedings, etc.; organization of symposia and conferences; and advisory services to other academic institutions.

2.2.3.2 Documentation of Service

A documented record of sustained, effective service is required of all tenure and promotion candidates. Documentation of the quality of the service can be of several forms, including but not limited to the following items:

- documentation by the candidate that may include reports from individuals who were the recipients of the service or who were otherwise knowledgeable about the service,
- local, state, national or international award or recognition for service, and
- recognition by election or appointment to a leadership position in a professional or community organization.

In general, the Department of Biomedical Engineering encourages an increasing record of service with increasing rank. Examples of service activities are provided below. The list is not exhaustive; a candidate's primary file need not be supported by all items listed.

Professional

The items are;

- appointment to serve as an editor of professional/scientific journal,
- appointment to serve on a grant review panel requiring technical expertise,
- election or appointment to serve as an officer of international, national, regional or state professional organization or association,
- election/appointment to serve on state/national/international technical committees,

- appointment/election to serve as committee chair or member for international, national or state professional association, and
- demonstrated leadership in professional conference or institute.

Public Service

The items are;

- professional consultation,
- engagement in professional practice in the community which advances the candidate's teaching and scholarly competence,
- uncompensated participation in agency board of directors, community task force and/or committee,
- presentation to a community group, and
- participation on a national or state professional task force or committee.

Department/University

The items are;

- participation in or chair of a departmental/college/university committee,
- director of department/college/university program, clinic, center, or institute,
- advising and mentoring of students and/or faculty, and
- other service activities.

2.2.3.3 Evaluation of Service

It is expected that the assistant professor will focus more on research and teaching in comparison to service, although some level of service is required and will be evaluated using the provided criteria. Beyond the assistant professor rank, a faculty member's expertise should be reflected in more substantive service. Each of these will be discussed in more detail below, for assistant to associate, and associate to professor criteria.

Much of the service expected of those in the Department of Biomedical Engineering blends into and emerges from what can be considered also research and teaching. The candidate should make distinctions and connections between these three areas in the primary file, especially in the personal statement.

Part 3: Tenure and Promotion in the Department of Biomedical Engineering

3.1. Background

Faculty in the Department of Biomedical Engineering have duties in three primary areas; teaching, research, and service. Therefore, evaluation of each faculty member's performance in these three areas will be considered in any decision regarding retention, promotion, or tenure of faculty members in the Department of Biomedical Engineering.

It is the explicit intent of these criteria that excellence in all these areas be encouraged, while recognizing that equal excellence in all areas for each individual is often the exception. However, tenure and/or promotion will be awarded to those candidates that present evidence of high quality in teaching and research and scholarly activity, while maintaining a good record in service and contributing positively to the Department of Biomedical Engineering. Hence, it is the intent of these criteria that high quality in performance be rewarded.

In all three of the major areas of consideration, the performance of the applicant will be reviewed for the entire academic career of the candidate with primary attention given to the period during which the candidate was at the current rank. It is the expectation of the Department of Biomedical Engineering that performance of the candidate reflects consistent growth and improvement over the years.

In addition, the candidate's contribution to the unit and cooperation in performance of tasks in the unit may be considered.

3.2 Eligibility for Tenure and Promotion

It is generally assumed that faculty members in a tenure-track position hold an earned doctorate in biomedical engineering or in a closely related field. To be awarded tenure and/or promotion, faculty members shall have had relevant experiences in a college or university. The Department of Biomedical Engineering follows the guidelines in the Faculty Manual relative to time in rank.

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. A candidate applying for early consideration (before their fourth year at the University of South Carolina) must include a letter from the tenure and promotion committee chair justifying the exception.

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. A candidate applying for early consideration (before their third year at the University of South Carolina) must include a letter from the tenure and promotion committee chair justifying the exception.

Faculty members may be hired into the Department of Biomedical Engineering at any rank; tenure can only be awarded at the rank of associate or full professor for new hires. The granting of tenure for a newly hired faculty member must be in accordance with the Faculty Manual and each prospective faculty member must meet the requirements set forth in this document to be hired into the Department of Biomedical Engineering with either tenure or any rank above assistant professor.

The department may recommend a candidate for promotion and tenure before the expiration of their probationary period if the quality of the candidate's record meets the standards and makes a compelling case for an early recommendation. A candidate's prior record in a tenure track or equivalent position at another institution of higher education may form part of a compelling case for an early recommendation, which should be determined and designated at time of hire.

It is expected that the candidate should have at least one year at the rank in which they are hired, with two terms of teaching, student evaluations, and peer reviews, before applying for an early recommendation.

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. Evaluation will be based on the candidate's entire professional record but will emphasize performance since being hired at the University of South Carolina as a tenure track faculty member.

3.3 Awarding Tenure

For the award of tenure, it is normally* expected that a candidate demonstrates either (a) outstanding performance in research, excellent performance in teaching, and good performance in service, or (b) excellent performance in research, excellent performance in teaching, and excellent performance in service. The candidate should also show evidence of progress toward establishing a national or international reputation in a field. Furthermore, the candidate must show promise for continued growth and development in quality of professional performance in the areas of research, teaching, and contributions to the quality of the Department of Biomedical Engineering for the balance of the candidate's academic career.

3.4 Criteria for Promotion to Associate Professor

For promotion to the rank of associate professor, it is normally* expected that a candidate has demonstrated either (a) outstanding performance in research, excellent performance in teaching, and good performance in service, or (b) excellent performance in research, excellent performance in teaching, and excellent performance in service. The candidate should also show evidence of progress toward establishing a national or international reputation in a field.

3.5 Criteria for Promotion to Full Professor

For promotion to the rank of full professor, it is normally* expected that a candidate has demonstrated outstanding performance in research, excellent performance in teaching, and excellent performance in service.

* Whenever an exception is made from applying the criteria in the manner normally expected an explanation of the reason for the deviation from the normal procedure must be included in the candidate's primary file.

3.6 Definitions of Key Descriptive Terms Used in the Criteria

The following definitions for the descriptive terms used in the criteria noted above will be consistently applied to evaluate teaching, research, and service.

3.6.1 Teaching

The assessment of teaching performance is based on the tenure and promotion committee's evaluation of the candidate's total teaching record documented in the primary and secondary files, including summaries of student ratings, peer evaluations, and other relevant data.

- Outstanding: The candidate's performance is among the best in the Department of Biomedical Engineering. The candidate is involved in a wide variety of teaching-related activities and assumes leadership in the development of courses and curriculum matters, including the development of multidisciplinary courses that expand the scope of the Department of Biomedical Engineering. The candidate is performing their teaching duties effectively and well-above the level that is expected for faculty in the Department of Biomedical Engineering.
- Excellent: The candidate significantly exceeds the minimally effective level of performance. The candidate is involved in a wide variety of teaching-related activities and is performing their teaching duties effectively and above the level expected for faculty in the Department of Biomedical Engineering.

- Good: The candidate marginally exceeds the minimally effective level of performance. The candidate is performing their teaching duties effectively and at the level expected for faculty in the Department of Biomedical Engineering.
- Fair: The candidate meets the minimally effective level of performance. Candidate's teaching is assessed to be below the level expected for faculty in the Department of Biomedical Engineering.
- Unacceptable: The candidate has not achieved the minimally effective level of performance. The range of teaching activities is very limited. The faculty member is not performing their teaching duties at the level of effectiveness expected for faculty in the Department of Biomedical Engineering. No promise of future improvement is evident.

3.6.2 Research

The assessment of performance in this area is based on evaluations of the candidate's total record for research documented in the primary and secondary files by both the tenure and promotion committee and external referees, with particular emphasis placed on peer-reviewed articles (including book chapters) and presentations at conferences/meetings.

- Outstanding: The candidate's performance is among the best in the Department of Biomedical Engineering. Output is of very high quality, highly innovative, and a national/international reputation is evident. Candidate is actively and consistently engaged in original and/or applied research. The candidate's publication and presentation record should include high productivity (quality and quantity), including (a) published articles in recognized, peer-reviewed publications, and (b) presentations at conferences of national or international scope. In addition, the candidate has clearly shown the ability to develop and maintain a research program in his/her area of expertise. External referees should indicate that the candidate's publications, presentations, and grant award record (a) align in quality and quantity with that of their better colleagues of the current rank, and (b) is consistent in quality and quantity with the entry-level performance of most colleagues at the rank to which the candidate aspires in the Department of Biomedical Engineering.
- Excellent: The candidate significantly exceeds the minimally effective level of performance. Output is already of high quality, and a national/international reputation is clearly possible, if not likely. Candidate is actively and consistently involved in original and/or applied research. The candidate's publication and presentation record should include substantial productivity both in publication of articles in recognized peer-reviewed publications and in presentations at conferences of national or regional scope. In addition, the candidate has begun to demonstrate the ability to develop and maintain a research program in his/her area of expertise. External referees should indicate that the candidate's publication, presentation, and grant record is consistent in quality and quantity with the entry-level performance of most colleagues at the rank to which the candidate aspires in Department of Biomedical Engineering.
- Good: The candidate marginally exceeds the minimally effective level of performance. The candidate shows promise of high-quality research in the future.
- Fair: The candidate meets the minimally effective level of performance. Candidate is somewhat involved in research. The candidate's publication and presentation record include some publications in peer-reviewed publications and some presentations with national, regional or state scope, with many of candidate's papers in non-refereed publications. In addition, it is not clear that the candidate will be able to develop and maintain a research program in an area of interest. External referees indicate that the candidate's publication, presentation, and/or grant record does not compare favorably in

quality and quantity of scholarly production with most colleagues of the same rank in Department of Biomedical Engineering.

- Unacceptable: The candidate has not achieved the minimally effective level of performance. Candidate's involvement with research is deficient. Publication and presentation record is less than minimal and/or limited primarily to non-refereed publications, monographs, reports, and presentations. In addition, there is minimal documented evidence that the candidate has begun developing a research program in an area of interest. External referees indicate that the candidate's publication, presentation, and/or grant record is recognizably less in quality and quantity than that of colleagues of the same rank in Department of Biomedical Engineering. No promise of future improvement is evident.

3.6.3 Service

The assessment of service performance is based on the tenure and promotion committee's evaluation of the candidate's total service record documented in the primary file.

- Outstanding: The candidate's performance is among the best in the Department of Biomedical Engineering. Candidate's service record in quality and quantity is demonstrably among the best in the Department of Biomedical Engineering in scope and recognition. The candidate's service record indicates a contribution to both the profession and practice which has significance at the national and/or international level as well as the state and local level.
- Excellent: The candidate significantly exceeds the minimally effective level of performance. Candidate's service record in quality and quantity is above average in the Department of Biomedical Engineering and indicates a contribution to the profession and to practice and which has significance at both the state level and local level.
- Good: The candidate marginally exceeds the minimally effective level of performance. Candidate's service record in quality and quantity is consistent with the Department of Biomedical Engineering average contribution and is predominantly at the local level, with either professional or community agencies.
- Fair: The candidate meets the minimally effective level of performance. Candidate's service is assessed to be below the level expected for faculty in the Department of Biomedical Engineering.
- Unacceptable: The candidate has not achieved the minimally effective level of performance. Candidate's service record in quality and quantity is recognizably much lower than the average in the Department of Biomedical Engineering. No promise of future improvement is evident.