

# TENURE AND PROMOTION CRITERIA

## DEPARTMENT OF ELECTRICAL ENGINEERING

---

### 1. GENERAL

The evaluation of candidates for tenure, promotion, and annual evaluation is based upon: *(i) teaching, (ii) scholarship, and (iii) service*. Contributions in the areas of teaching and service are evaluated as *superior, good, or unacceptable*. Scholarship is evaluated as *superior, excellent, good, fair, or unacceptable*. The terms *superior, good, and unacceptable* represent similar levels of performance in all four areas and provide firm anchor points. A rating of *superior* requires recognition at a national or international level. A rating of *good* means a consistently acceptable, not a marginal, level of performance in all three areas. Guidelines for the rating in each area are given in Appendix 1.

For evaluating teaching and service the department is the reference group. For evaluating scholarship, peer review by outside referees is used in addition to the use of the department as a peer group. *The highest rating in scholarship, superior, requires a substantial agreement among the outside reviewers that this is an appropriate rating.*

The candidate should refer to the “Regulations and Policies,” section 3, in the *Faculty Manual* or on the University website, [www.sc.edu/policies/facman/fmhome.html](http://www.sc.edu/policies/facman/fmhome.html), for specifics of procedure and policy.

#### 1.1 Teaching

Teaching refers to classroom-related performance as opposed to scholarship. The bases for evaluation of teaching performance are *(i) coverage of appropriate material, (ii) effective classroom presentation, and (iii) reasonable evaluation of the student's performance*. Item *(i)* is particularly important in the context of the mission of the Department of Electrical Engineering. Items *(i)* and *(iii)* are generally handled by peer evaluation of appropriate materials, such as class syllabi, notes, and examinations. Some information on these two items may also be obtained from student evaluation. Evaluation of classroom performance is done by student and peer evaluation. Student evaluation is mandatory in all classes, in accordance with University policy. Other assessment tools used are senior and alumni surveys. Mediocre teaching is not acceptable; members of the faculty are expected to be effective and enthusiastic teachers.

#### 1.2 Scholarship

Effective teaching involves imparting knowledge gained from scholarship. There is a close connection between teaching and scholarship, in that achieving distinction as a teacher implies achieving distinction as a scholar. Active production of scholarly work is expected and necessary for promotion and tenure. In addition, scholarly work should be appropriate in the context of supporting the mission of the Department of Electrical Engineering. Pursuit of scholarship can be accomplished in teaching, research, or professional activities. A shared characteristic of each of these areas is the production of peer-evaluated work. Scholarly activities are those which should result in refereed publications or refereed conference presentations. Publications in refereed journals (e.g., *IEEE Transactions*) carry the greatest weight, publications in proceedings of international or national conferences

(refereed) rank second, and presentations and publications in regional conferences rank last. In evaluation of publications, emphasis is placed upon the quality of the work.

### ***1.2.1 Scholarly Activities in Teaching***

Scholarship in teaching means scholarly works on the theory or techniques of teaching. Evidence of scholarly works in teaching includes papers in appropriate journals, conference presentations, a textbook that is adopted in peer schools, and external funding for laboratory equipment or course development. It is expected that scholarly work in teaching will generally be done by more senior faculty.

### ***1.2.2 Scholarly Activities in Research***

Scholarly activities in research include sustaining a high-quality research program and having refereed publications in distinguished journals, transactions, or international conferences and symposia.

External funding is an important ingredient in sustaining a high level of scholarly research productivity. While funding alone is not sufficient evidence of scholarship, it provides a means for scholarly publications and a springboard for future research. Success in obtaining large, highly competitive grants or contracts carries a substantial weight in both tenure and promotion decisions. A serious effort should be made to secure sufficient non-university funds for summer support, graduate student support, course buy-out, and equipment for research. Submission of a minimum of one peer-reviewed proposal per year is necessary, unless the candidate succeeds in securing multi-year funding. Reviewers' comments on proposals are an important measure of the quality of the candidate's scholarship, whether funding is received or not, and may be included by the candidate in the submitted file.

### ***1.2.3 Scholarship in Professional Activities***

The EE department is part of a professional school with responsibilities of a professional nature, in addition to those of traditional academic departments. Technology changes rapidly, and it is the responsibility of this faculty to insure inclusion of emerging technologies in the curriculum. Likewise, successful development and implementation of new design tools and creation of short courses aimed at updating practicing professionals in a given professional area are further examples of scholarly work in professional activities. Activities that represent scholarly work in engineering also include participation in writing of codes and international standards, as well as contributions to improved design, reliability, efficiency, usability, cost, etc., of devices and systems. Those who take this route to promotion and tenure are expected to publish their work in refereed journals and symposia, such as those sponsored by IEEE and ASEE. As with scholarship in teaching, these activities are more likely to be done by senior faculty.

## **1.3 Service**

Service includes service to the department, the university, or the profession, and must be appropriate in the context of the mission of the Department of Electrical Engineering. Serving as chair of major committees represents a leadership role and contributes to a *superior* rating in service. Typical service activities at each of these levels are given below.

*Department:* Serving on committees, developing laboratories, supervising technical or clerical personnel, activities associated with recruiting students, and supervising the use and maintenance of departmental resources.

*University:* Serving on thesis or dissertation committees, on college or university committees, on search or advisory committees, as a representative of the university as an expert in a specialized area; assisting in student recruitment; engaging in special projects and conducting in-depth studies.

*Professional:* Organizing national or international symposia or workshops; serving as a member of boards of international or national symposia, an officer in professional societies, referee or reviewer for funding agencies, professional journals, or text book publishers; and participating in editorial boards of journals or text books and grant review panels.

## **2. PROMOTION ELIGIBILITY**

### **2.1 Promotion from Assistant Professor to Associate Professor**

The candidate will normally hold an earned doctoral degree, have a record of achievement in both teaching and scholarship, and have a demonstrated capacity for continuing professional development.

#### **2.1.1 Teaching**

The candidate must have a record of effectiveness and growth as a teacher, achieved in both graduate and undergraduate courses. New faculty are expected to seek advice from senior colleagues or perhaps select a mentor for guidance in becoming effective teachers. The candidate should achieve a rating of *good or superior* in teaching.

#### **2.1.2 Scholarship**

Establishing a record as a scholar should be a major focus for this promotion. Scholarship is normally pursued in the area of research. The candidate should achieve a rating of *excellent or superior*.

#### **2.1.3 Service**

At the level of assistant professor, the candidate is not expected to engage heavily in service-related activities, since establishing excellence in research and proficiency in teaching should be the primary foci. The candidate should, however, display a willingness to engage in service activities. The candidate should achieve a record of *good or superior*.

#### **2.1.4 Summary**

The candidate must have a rating of *good* or better in teaching and service and *excellent* or better in scholarship. The expected time in rank before promotion is six years. Promotion before six years in rank occurs only in rare circumstances.

### **2.2 Promotion to Professor**

The candidate's entire professional career is assessed, with particular emphasis placed on development while serving in the rank of associate professor, at which rank there should be a record of sustained performance. The candidate must have demonstrated evidence of high and sustained professional standing in teaching and research. Promotion to the rank of professor requires higher levels of performance, measured in both quality and quantity,

than that required for promotion to associate professor, and requires evidence of national or international stature. Service, leadership, and maturity are relatively more important. The candidate should have reached the stature needed to serve as a mentor to junior faculty. In addition, sustained performance in scholarly publications and external funding is required. Securing and sustaining funding is relatively more important for this promotion.

### **2.2.1 Teaching**

The teaching record should include a continuing commitment to quality teaching, innovation in teaching and laboratory development, and supervision of projects and theses at both the undergraduate and graduate level. The candidate should have achieved a sustained record of *good* or *superior*.

### **2.2.2 Scholarship**

The candidate must have a sustained record as a productive scholar, as judged by refereed publications in reputable journals and symposia. The candidate's total scholarly record is measured by citations of the candidate's work by other scholars in the field and by other things such as honors and awards for scholarship and invited talks and presentations.

In order to be promoted at the end of the minimum time in rank, the candidate should have achieved a record of *superior* while serving as an associate professor. Alternatively, the candidate must have sustained a record of *good* or *excellent* for an extended period (at least ten years).

### **2.2.3 Service**

Service at this grade is expected to include a leadership role and active participation in the university or professional community. The candidate should have achieved a sustained record of *good* or *superior*.

### **2.2.4 Summary**

For promotion to Professor, the candidate is expected to be widely accepted as a scholar by peers in the technical profession. In addition, sustained performance in scholarly publications and external funding is required. Securing and sustaining funding is relatively more important for this promotion.

The candidate must have continued to attain distinction as a scholar. The candidate must have attained a *good* or better rating in classroom teaching and service, and either (i) a consistent *superior* rating in scholarship to be promoted in the minimum time or (ii) a sustained *good* or better rating in scholarship to be promoted after an extended period (at least ten years in rank). In the exceptional case, a *superior* rating in teaching and service over a sustained period may be given a substantial weight for this promotion.

## **3. TENURE**

The tenure decision is based on the same criteria as promotion and annual review; however, it is fundamentally different in that it implies an assessment of future performance as well as an evaluation of past performance. Consistency and durability of performance are relevant factors in evaluating faculty for tenure. The criteria for tenure are:

- A *sustained* rating of *good* or better in teaching, scholarship, and service.
- Evidence that the candidate will reasonably continue to contribute to the mission of the University and the Electrical Engineering Department.
- Evidence of national or international stature, which is required for tenure at the rank of professor.

The normal required minimum times in the ranks are as follows:

- Tenure as an assistant professor: six years (submission at the end of five).
- Tenure as a professor or associate professor: four years (submission at the end of three).

A recommendation for tenure at the assistant professor rank without a recommendation for promotion at the same time is rarely made and must have special justification based on a showing that the candidate was unable to satisfy all requirements for promotion because of extraordinary circumstances and that the candidate fills a special departmental need.

## **4. EXCEPTIONS**

### **4.1 Deviations from Criteria**

Deviation from the criteria should require extraordinary circumstances and is not likely to occur.

# APPENDIX I

## Explanation of Ratings Used

### 1. TEACHING, SCHOLARSHIP, AND SERVICE

As shown in the table below, the areas of teaching and service use the ratings *superior*, *good*, and *unacceptable*; the area of scholarship uses the ratings *superior*, *excellent*, *good*, *fair*, and *unacceptable*. These areas are applicable to decisions on tenure, promotion, and annual evaluation.

APPLICABLE RATINGS			
Rating	Teaching	Scholarship	Service
Superior	•	•	•
Excellent		•	
Good	•	•	•
Fair		•	
Unacceptable	•	•	•

### 2. TEACHING:

**Superior** - The *superior* rating in teaching requires evidence that the candidate ranks among the best teachers in the department. It requires clear evidence of additional sustained activities beyond the three basic areas required for the *good* rating, such as curriculum or laboratory development, securing external funds for laboratory equipment, teaching awards, or effective use of alternative media.

**Good** - The requirements for a rating of *good* in teaching are that the candidate (i) covers material appropriate to the course, (ii) has effective classroom presentation, and (iii) provides for effective evaluation of the student's performance. In addition, the candidate should show enthusiasm in teaching.

**Unacceptable** - Does not meet standards in one or more of the designated areas, (i), (ii), or (iii) above, for teaching effectiveness.

### 3. SCHOLARSHIP:

**Superior** - The *superior* rating requires an established record of successful funded research and resulting scholarly publications. The candidate's record *must* be evaluated as *superior* by top scholars in the appropriate area. This rating requires substantial support from *external* reviewers as well as exceeding the Target Levels of Performance. It cannot be awarded without this support. The *superior* rating is not given for annual review since external reviewers are not used.

**Excellent** - Success in securing research funding in addition to the requirements for the *good* rating given below. Target funding levels are: (i)  $\geq \$200,000$  per year (this includes a defined share of grants and contracts where the candidate is a Co-PI, though some funding by the candidate as PI is desirable) for Professors, (ii)  $\geq \$100,000$  per year (this includes a defined share of grants and contracts where the candidate is a Co-PI) for Associate Professors, and (iii)  $\geq \$50,000$ /year by the 4th year (this includes a defined share of grants and contracts where the candidate is a Co-PI) for Assistant professors.

*Target Performance Levels are provided as a guide, not mandatory requirements, to the performance expectations at each rank.*

**Good** - A consistent record of journal quality refereed publications and attempts to secure funded research through submission of refereed proposals. There should be success in securing funded research, though not necessarily at the Target Levels as described above.

**Fair** - The candidate's scholarly output is deficient in quality or quantity: for example, a record consisting entirely of unrefereed or regional conference publications.

**Unacceptable** - No consistency in refereed publications and submission of proposals.

#### **4. SERVICE:**

**Superior** - A record in quality/quantity which is recognizably among the best in the unit. Leadership role in the university and the profession.

**Good** - Performs all expected and requested service activities or functions in an effective and conscientious manner.

**Unacceptable** - Does not perform expected or requested service activities in an effective and conscientious manner.