



Tenure and Promotion Guidelines

Approved by UCTP: April 1, 2026

Table of Contents

INTRODUCTION.....	2
COMMITTEE ON TENURE AND PROMOTION.....	2
PROBATIONARY PERIOD	2
ELIGIBILITY, NOTIFICATION AND SCHEDULE	3
FILE PREPARATION.....	3
SOLICITING LETTERS FROM EXTERNAL REVIEWERS	4
MEETING AND VOTING PROCEDURE.....	4
GUIDELINES FOR APPOINTMENT WITH TENURE AND/OR AT RANK OF PROFESSOR	6
ASSESSMENT AND EVALUATION	6
DEFINITION OF TERMS.....	7
GENERAL CONSIDERATIONS.....	7
EVALUATION OF SCHOLARSHIP	9
EVALUATION OF TEACHING/EDUCATIONAL ACTIVITIES	13
EVALUATION OF SERVICE.....	15
RELATED UNIVERSITY POLICIES AND DOCUMENTS	16
HISTORY OF REVISIONS.....	16

INTRODUCTION

The College of Nursing (CON) is an academic unit of the University of South Carolina (USC). As such, the policies and procedures outlined in this document are designed to be consistent with those of the university as published in the [USC Columbia Faculty Manual](#) and with the [Tenure and Promotion Calendar](#), published by the Office of the Provost. Throughout this document, “unit” refers to the USC CON, and “T&P chair” refers to the chair of the CON Tenure and Promotion Committee (herein referred to as T&P Committee).

The CON and the university are committed to conducting scholarship and disseminating knowledge, imparting knowledge through teaching, and serving the community, state, nation, and world through the contribution of faculty time and expertise. Tenure and promotion serve the university and the individual faculty members by recognizing a faculty member’s achievements and signifying that the individual can continue to grow professionally and contribute to the missions of the CON and the university. Promotion recognizes the cumulative productivity of the faculty member; tenure is a status granted typically after a probationary period to a faculty member that gives protection from summary dismissal. The tenure and promotion process ensures that the CON and the university, through its faculty, will perform in these areas at a level consistent with college and institutional goals. It is a system of accountability that assures quality scholarship, teaching, and service. The faculty member benefits by having the procedures and criteria for tenure and promotion stated clearly.

COMMITTEE ON TENURE AND PROMOTION

Composition. The CON T&P Committee comprises all tenured faculty within the unit. The T&P chair must be a tenured professor who does not concurrently hold an administrative supervisory position over tenure-track faculty, such as dean, associate dean, or department chair. Members will elect a chair-elect, who will serve as committee chair-elect for one year, then as chair for one year, and past chair in an advisory role for one year. The chair-elect will work with the chair to learn the internal policies and procedures concerning tenure and promotion and will be available to chair a meeting if requested. The chair will preside at all committee meetings, coordinate activities with the Office of the Dean, and communicate with tenure and promotion candidates about the application process and the committee recommendation. The past chair will be available in an advisory role to the chair and chair-elect as needed.

Voting Privilege. Only faculty tenured in the CON 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. Faculty with joint appointments can only vote if the USC CON is the primary unit. 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 T&P chair prior to the beginning of the leave. The dean and the candidate’s department chair are precluded from voting at the T&P committee level.

PROBATIONARY PERIOD

All faculty in the tenure track who have not been tenured 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 seven years at USC unless a tenure clock extension is approved by the dean and Office of the Provost as described in policy [ACAF 1.31 Extension of Faculty Tenure-Track Probationary Period and Scheduled Post-Tenure Review](#). The maximum probationary period for all full-time faculty members appointed at the rank of associate professor or professor without tenure is six years at USC, adjusted for any tenure clock extensions. For all faculty, the penultimate year is adjusted for any approved tenure clock extensions.

ELIGIBILITY, NOTIFICATION AND SCHEDULE

To be eligible for tenure or promotion, the faculty candidate must have a primary appointment as a tenure-track faculty member within the CON. Faculty appointed at 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 when their file is submitted. Faculty appointed at 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 when their file is submitted. Faculty members appointed at the rank of associate professor or professor who have held an appointment at another university may be considered for tenure at the time of appointment.

Each year, in accordance with the USC Columbia Faculty Manual, all pre-tenure faculty who have completed the minimum years of service are eligible for tenure consideration. Likewise, all faculty below the rank of professor are eligible for promotion consideration. Based on the published university calendar, the dean of the CON will notify eligible faculty of the option for tenure and/or promotion during the following academic year. Faculty who intend to be considered must inform the dean and their faculty supervisor in writing (email or letter) of their intention by the date listed in the university schedule, typically about seven days after the dean's notification. 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 T&P chair by the date included in the university calendar, typically about seven days after receipt of names by the dean. The list must include all who are in their penultimate year, including any faculty members in their penultimate year who have not stated an intent to apply for tenure.

The Office of the Provost publishes a calendar, including deadlines, for the tenure and promotion process each year. The CON may have additional deadlines that do not conflict with the published schedule. The T&P chair will provide that calendar and the date of the University Committee on Tenure and Promotion annual Spring Orientation to all faculty who wish to be considered for tenure and/or promotion. Candidates are responsible for meeting the deadlines on the tenure and promotion calendar on matters over which they have control (e.g., submission of the primary and secondary files). The T&P chair is responsible for meeting tenure and promotion deadlines in all other matters.

FILE PREPARATION

The candidate's tenure and promotion file provides evidence documenting that their performance meets or exceeds the CON unit criteria. When being considered for tenure and/or promotion, it is the responsibility of the candidate to develop and maintain a tenure and promotion file using the most recent guidance provided by the Office of the Provost, and to submit it to the T&P chair according to the published university calendar. This file will include a primary file prepared using the designated university template for tenure and promotion, and a secondary file that includes

electronic copies of materials the candidate provides to support the candidacy. Collectively, the tenure and promotion file includes 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 since the last appointment or promotion. The T&P chair is responsible for obtaining a candidate teaching summary from a tenured member of the CON.

SOLICITING LETTERS FROM EXTERNAL REVIEWERS

A candidate's tenure and promotion file must include at least five letters from external reviewers obtained from impartial scholars, generally at peer or aspirant institutions within the field. At least ten external reviewers will be nominated by the T&P committee members and selected by the T&P chair. The T&P chair will work with the Office of the Dean to send invitations for review. In cases where the candidate has a joint appointment, the secondary unit will also be consulted. External reviewers should not include the candidate's dissertation advisor or a close friend. In addition, persons who have co-authored publications, collaborated on research, or been colleagues or advisors of the applicant should be excluded from consideration as outside evaluators. External reviewers from academic settings must have achieved a rank at or above the rank to which the candidate aspires. External reviewers from non-academic settings (e.g., government, clinical care settings, industry, or associations) must be in a position considered commensurate with the academic rank to which the candidate aspires. External reviewers should disclose any relationship to the candidate and provide a brief CV.

The T&P chair, supported by the designated staff in the Office of the Dean, will send a packet to individuals who have agreed to serve as external reviewers. The packet should include the following: 1) a letter from the dean requesting an evaluation of the candidate's research and scholarship in accordance with the unit criteria provided; 2) the CON tenure and promotion criteria; 3) the candidate's curriculum vitae; and 4) copies of 3-5 peer-reviewed publications that showcase the candidate's scholarly contributions. The purpose of the external review is to obtain an assessment of the candidate's research and scholarship, based on the CON criteria. It is the responsibility of the Office of the Dean to follow the university calendar in securing the letters from external reviewers and placing the obtained letters and the reviewers' brief CVs in the candidate's primary file.

MEETING AND VOTING PROCEDURE

Each file to be considered will be made available to the T&P Committee a minimum of five (5) working days before the T&P Committee meeting. If the candidate holds a joint appointment, the file will be made available to tenured faculty in the secondary unit at the same or higher rank as the candidate.

Meeting. Meetings at which candidates are considered for promotion and tenure are closed to everyone except those eligible to vote on the candidate, with the following exception. Meetings may by rule, motion, or invitation of the committee chair, be opened to any individual(s) the body wishes to be present at the meeting and/or be heard. To facilitate an independent evaluation of the candidate, the department chair (even if they are tenured members of the committee) will not attend this meeting; however, at the discretion of the T&P committee, they may be asked to be available for a separate question/clarification session. Department chairs who are not members of the T&P

Committee may be invited to clarify any evidence provided by the applicant but will not have voting privileges at these meetings.

Minimum Needed to Vote. A unit vote on a candidate's tenure and/or promotion application must be made by at least five tenured faculty. If the CON does not have five eligible faculty for the vote, the T&P chair will invite appropriately ranked faculty from other units, preferably other health science units, to serve on the unit committee for this review and 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 a candidate's tenure or promotion will be sent confidentially to the Office of the Dean for counting. Written justifications must accompany all votes. Ballots need not be signed, although faculty are not prohibited from doing so.

Each eligible committee member shall vote "yes," "no," or "abstain" separately for tenure and promotion. Justification must accompany all ballots, regardless of the vote cast. If a committee member votes "abstain," they should provide a rationale for the abstention but should not offer evaluative comments about whether the candidate meets or does not meet T&P criteria. The T&P chair will inform all voting committee members of the date by which all votes must be submitted.

Vote and Recommendation by T&P Committee. Votes will be counted by the designated staff in the Office of the Dean. Abstention votes are not counted; however, if a committee member intends to abstain and the abstention would drop the total number of members voting below five, this intention must be confirmed with the T&P chair so that arrangements can be made to ensure there will be five committee votes. The committee's vote will be considered supportive of tenure and/or promotion if "yes" votes comprise more than one-half (1/2) of all votes counted, i.e., the sum of all "yes" and "no" votes (abstentions are not included in the denominator). If there is a tie of 50% "yes" and 50% "no" votes, the outcome is considered not supportive of tenure and/or promotion.

Notification of Committee's Vote. The T&P 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 according to the university calendar. The T&P chair will also provide written notification to the department chair, dean, and all T&P committee members regarding 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 T&P Committee vote yields a positive recommendation, i.e., "yes" votes comprised greater than one-half (1/2) of "yes" and "no" votes cast, the designated staff in the Office of the Dean inserts the ballots with justifications into the candidate's primary file.

Negative Decision: If the unit fails to give the candidate a favorable vote, the unit's T&P chair will notify the candidate promptly and shall, upon request by the candidate and without attributions, provide the candidate with a written synopsis of the discussion and an indication of the strength of the vote of the unit (the exact vote should not be disclosed). Only if the candidate files a written appeal will the file be forwarded to the next level of review.

Additional CON Reviews. The entire electronic file, including the primary file, secondary file and the recording of votes and all written justifications, is delivered by the T&P chair to the candidate's department chair. The department chair is required to write a letter of evaluation and recommendation in the role of faculty supervisor. The letter is placed in the file after the CON T&P committee vote. The chair's letter should assess the candidate's file and be written in the context of the CON T&P policies and procedures. If the department chair is a tenured faculty member in the CON, their ballot must be marked "abstain" with an appropriate justification.

All materials are forwarded to the dean. The dean will read the entire file and write a letter that justifies supporting or not supporting the candidate's request for tenure and/or promotion. The dean will place the letter in the candidate's file and then forward the entire electronic file to the Office of the Provost according to the University Tenure and Promotion Calendar.

GUIDELINES FOR APPOINTMENT WITH TENURE AND/OR AT RANK OF PROFESSOR

Initial appointment of faculty with tenure and/or at the rank of professor requires a positive vote of eligible members of the CON committee and recommendations from the dean and provost to the president with a final recommendation to and vote by the USC Board of Trustees.

During recruitment and negotiation, a search committee or department chair may request an appointment with tenure and/or appointment at the rank of professor for a highly qualified candidate who satisfies the rank-specific criteria presented below. The candidate's full curriculum vitae and letters of recommendation must be available for consideration by eligible members of the CON committee. This documentation must include relevant information about teaching, scholarship, and service activities.

A letter offering appointment with tenure or the rank of professor requires attaining the stated approvals through the president prior to making the signed, written offer; the offer can be contingent on Board of Trustees approval.

Because a request for an initial appointment is often time-sensitive, the CV and request for voting can be distributed electronically, without a meeting for discussion.

ASSESSMENT AND EVALUATION

CON faculty members are expected to contribute to the success of the college by working to achieve an environment in which shared values and collegial relationships facilitate the achievement of its missions. CON faculty members are united in a community dedicated to ideals beyond their discipline, individual interests, and short-term rewards. They share their experience and expertise by encouraging new ideas and concepts, teaching, and providing constructive criticism for students and their colleagues. The effectiveness of the CON depends on the ability of its faculty to excel in teaching, scholarship, and service. It is critically important that CON faculty effectively engage in collaborative and translational research and educational efforts and be recognized and rewarded for doing so in the promotion and tenure processes.

DEFINITION OF TERMS

According to the [USC Columbia Faculty Manual](#), a candidate's performance in scholarship, teaching/clinical activities, and service, will be rated using the following terminology: outstanding, excellent, good, fair, and unacceptable:

Outstanding	The candidate's performance is far above the minimally effective level. In regard to research and scholarship, output is of very high quality, and a national/international reputation is evident.
Excellent	The candidate significantly exceeds the minimally effective level of performance. In regard to research and scholarship, output is already of high quality, and a national/international reputation is clearly possible, if not likely.
Good	The candidate's performance is clearly above the minimally effective level. In regard to research and scholarship, he or she shows promise of high quality in the future.
Fair	The candidate meets the minimally effective level of performance.
Unacceptable	The candidate has accomplished less than the minimally effective level of performance.

GENERAL CONSIDERATIONS

The College of Nursing has a mission of advancing science, practice, and policy through scholarship and education to optimize health for all. The American Association of Colleges of Nursing's (AACN's) position statement on Defining Scholarship for Academic Nursing Task Force Consensus was published in March 2018. In this document,¹ it is acknowledged that "the time is right to reconsider the role of the faculty in an increasingly complex learning environment where research, teaching, practice, and service are all of crucial importance." To incorporate diversity and inclusivity into the CON's academic setting, scholarship should be inclusive and applicable to scientists and to practice, education, and policy scholars. The current national nursing academic landscape should strive to create a system of recognition for nursing faculty who are scholars in research, practice, policy, and/or education.

The CON values leadership and independent thought in scholarly productivity. The candidate should demonstrate the development of a focused original research agenda. Collaborative and solo scholarship are both highly valued. The percentage and unique nature of the contribution made by the candidate's work should be indicated in the research and scholarship section of the primary file. It is expected that the results of these scholarly activities will be published, presented, and influence other investigators in that field outside of the CON.

According to the AACN, "nursing scholarship is the generation, synthesis, translation, application, and dissemination of knowledge that aims to improve health and transform health care."

¹ American Association of Colleges of Nursing. (2018). *Defining Scholarship for Academic Nursing: Task for Consensus Position Statement*. Retrieved from: <https://www.aacnnursing.org/Portals/0/PDFs/Position-Statements/Defining-Scholarship.pdf?ver=SWHlav1tRNMfYL5xPvjklA%3d%3d>

Scholarship of discovery “takes the form of primary empirical research, analysis of large data sets, theory development and testing, methodological studies including implementation science, health services research, and philosophical inquiry and analysis. Furthermore, the scholarship of discovery results in new knowledge, refines or expands existing knowledge, and is translatable into practice.”

The scholarship of practice “is a critical component in shortening the theory to practice gap (Boyer, 1990²). The scholarship of practice interprets, draws together, and brings new insight to original research. Nursing’s broad understanding of theory based in multiple disciplines and its long history of collaboration allows for the interconnection of ideas to change practice and solve problems. The practice scholar applies evidence to practice, incorporating implementation and translation science. Scholarship is guided by a multitude of innovative methods of inquiry that are informed through clinical practice with the aim of improving and transforming healthcare delivery and patient outcomes.”

The *scholarship of teaching* “focuses on the transmission, transformation, and extension of knowledge (AACN, 2018). Teaching scholars develop, evaluate, and improve nursing curricula, student learning, and teaching methodologies. The scholarship of education focuses on the understanding, describing, and teaching of learning endeavors as well as controlling, predicting, and disseminating outcomes of teaching-learning processes.”

According to AACN, “threaded through the three domains of nursing scholarship is an emphasis on healthcare policy, which is critical to generating support for healthcare innovation and improvement in the public domain. The *scholarship of healthcare policy* includes problem identification, problem analysis, stakeholder engagement, policy development, policy enactment (designing programs, influencing rules and regulations), policy implementation, policy/program evaluation, and the dissemination of evidence-based best practices.”

RANK-SPECIFIC CRITERIA

The CON recognizes that faculty activity typically includes effort in multiple areas, including scholarship, teaching, service to institution and profession, and for many faculty members, professional practice. In all instances, an appropriate assessment of a faculty member’s professional effort requires that the activities be considered in their entirety, with each component contributing to an overall assessment. Time and accomplishments in a faculty position since initial appointment at USC and/or at another educational institution will be considered when evaluating a candidate for tenure and/or promotion. For tenure at any rank, evidence of consistency and sustained performance in their primary activity at USC is required.

Table 1 summarizes the minimum requirements for promotion to or tenure at the rank of associate professor and professor. Following general descriptions for each rank, the specific performance expectations for each rating in the three domains are detailed.

² Boyer, E. (1990). *Scholarship reconsidered: Priorities for the professoriate*. Princeton, NJ: The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching.

Table 1. Requirements for Promotion and/or Tenure in the CON:

	Scholarship	Teaching	Service
Associate Professor	Excellent	Good	Good
Professor	Outstanding	Excellent	Excellent

Assistant Professor. The assistant professor rank typically applies to the first appointment in a faculty capacity at the college. Individuals with substantial, relevant experience may receive an initial appointment at a higher rank. An individual appointed as an assistant professor 1) presents evidence of educational background and teaching experiences that affirm interest and capabilities as a promising educator of nursing students; 2) presents evidence of an identified focus area for a program of scholarship in nursing research, education, or practice with strong potential for obtaining consistent extramural funding for scholarly activities; and 3) demonstrates professional service as evidenced by active membership in a professional organization.

Associate Professor. The associate professor rank represents the next level after assistant professor. Promotion to, or appointment at, the rank of associate professor is appropriate for those individuals who have documented significant accomplishments that demonstrate at least **excellent** performance in research and **good** performance in both teaching and service. To meet the criteria for tenure, candidates must demonstrate consistency and durability in their performance.

Professor. The rank of professor is reserved for those individuals who are advanced in their area(s) of academic emphasis and have evidence of national or international stature in a field. Promotion to or appointment at the rank of professor is based on demonstration of significant and sustained impact of the individual's work. The record should show growth in the quantity and quality of professional activities since promotion or appointment as an Associate Professor that demonstrates at least **outstanding** performance in research/scholarship and at least **excellent** performance in teaching and service. This profile is reflected by a body of scholarly work consistent with sustained excellence to establish a reputation of leadership that is national or international in scope. Ongoing participation at a high level of performance in scholarly teaching, service, and practice (as appropriate) is also essential for faculty at the rank of professor.

EVALUATION OF SCHOLARSHIP

A candidate seeking appointment or tenure at the rank of associate professor should demonstrate **excellent scholarship**. A candidate seeking appointment or tenure at the rank of professor should demonstrate **outstanding scholarship**. The following guidelines are used to evaluate the candidate's progress and accomplishments in research and scholarship:

- Being consistently and effectively engaged in creative activity of high quality and significance is a basic requirement for maintaining and enhancing professional achievement of any faculty member. While a quantitative assessment provides one indication of productivity, it is recognized that exceptional quality can also be a strong indicator of productivity. First, the measures of quantity and quality of published refereed manuscripts are used as indicators of excellence in the candidate's scholarship. Second, academic investigators are expected to generate consistent and sufficient national extramural funding to support and grow a competitive research program.

- National, competitive, peer-reviewed grants and contracts are considered a major indicator of effective scholarship. External (public or private) funding is preferred over internal (USC system and affiliates) funding, and federal funding is preferred over private funding. For purposes of these criteria, a large grant has total direct costs over \$500,000 and a moderate-sized grant has total direct costs over \$250,000.
- Collaborative and translational activities are encouraged. As described by the NIH, translational research encompasses activities in the bench-to-bedside and bedside-to-practice arenas.
- Faculty entrepreneurship is encouraged. Such initiatives bring economic resources and visibility to our universities, contribute to the public welfare in South Carolina, and are tangible benchmarks demonstrating the successful application of university research to healthcare needs. Examples of entrepreneurship include submission of invention disclosures, receipt of patents or licenses on behalf of the university, small business innovation awards, and other translational research grants.
- Publications of tenure track faculty should primarily comprise reports of original research. Publications can also include original case reports and evaluative descriptions of practice and teaching innovations. Original reports of fundamental and applied research, evaluations of teaching and practice innovations, and original case reports are weighted more heavily than review articles, repetitive case reports, and book chapters which are, in turn, weighted more heavily than abstracts and monographs. The candidate's role in multi-authored publications should be described. Progression in rank should enable the candidate to progress in their rating of scholarship. The quality of publications will be demonstrated by the importance of the journal to the field (as evidenced by impact factors, ranking in the candidate's subfield, or other quality metrics). The candidate should indicate publications such as monographs, papers in proceedings, or invited commentaries and not include them in the list of peer-reviewed publications unless truly peer-reviewed. Publications related to dissertation research and post-doctoral activities can be considered.
- Presentations at national and international meetings are valued higher than presentations at regional and state meetings. Invited presentations are valued higher than contributed presentations. Peer-reviewed podium and panel presentations are valued higher than poster presentations.
- In general, a requirement for promotion and/or tenure is the demonstration of an increasing national stature of the candidate. Expertise and recognition are evidenced by citation of the candidate's work by other scholars. Metrics such as the candidate's g-index, h-index, i-index, i10-index, and total citations should be included. Candidates are advised to quote such index measures from multiple sources (e.g., Google Scholar, Web of Science, ResearchGate). Other examples of evidence to support national recognition include: reviewer or editorship of scientific or professional journals, awards given by national organizations or associations, election as a Fellow in professional organizations, membership on professional societies' committees or election to national office within professional organizations, membership on journal editorial advisory boards, membership on national grant review panels, invited presentations at national meetings, other universities, or scholarly institutes, chairing sessions at national meetings, national certifications, reviewer for universities' tenure and promotion files, and invited testimony at governmental, scientific, or legal proceedings. There is no expectation that candidates will show activity in all these areas. External reviewers must address evidence of national recognition.

Outstanding scholarship is defined by the candidate demonstrating a consistent record of scholarship that is distinguished and makes a substantial contribution to one's academic discipline or profession. The record should show growth that substantially exceeds the criteria for promotion to or appointment at the associate professor level and that of excellent scholarship. There should be evidence that the candidate has established a national or international reputation of scholarship. The candidate's work should be well established in a particular field, evidenced by productivity (publication number) and very high quality (publications in peer-reviewed journals), type and source of research funding, and outside reviewers' comments. In particular, the candidate's work since promotion to or appointment at the current rank should satisfy the following criteria.

1. Submitting and receiving multiple grants from foundations, industries, and/or federal agencies. The role, substantive contribution, and work effort on grants should be delineated to document the candidate's consistent and sustained productivity in their area of scholarship. Either one awarded grant should be large (greater than \$500,000 total direct costs), or two or more awarded grants should be moderate-sized (greater than \$250,000 total direct costs). Serving in the PI/MPI/co-PI or equivalent role would generally be expected on at least one received grant that is moderate or larger.
2. A minimum of eighteen (18) published peer-reviewed publications, most of which should be data-based and in the area of the candidate's programmatic line of research. The candidate is expected to be the first, second, or senior author on at least ten (10) peer-reviewed publications.
3. A minimum of ten (10) peer-reviewed presentations or posters at national and international conferences; the candidate is expected to be the first, second, or senior author on at least five (5) of these presentations.
4. National/international recognition in the candidate's scholarship program area (e.g., national awards, increasing H index, grant review requests, fellowships). Further, a majority of the external referees must judge that the candidate has attained national and/or international recognition in their area of scholarship.
5. Successful mentorship of other faculty in their scholarship/research endeavors.

Excellent scholarship is defined as a record of consistent and durable 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 the journal reputation of the candidate's publications, level, and type of funding, and outside reviewers' comments. There should be evidence of consistent national extramural funding to support and grow a competitive research program.

1. Demonstrate expertise in a substantive or methodological area of scholarship. Role, substantive contribution, and work effort on grants should be clearly delineated. The candidate may serve as a co-investigator or PI/MPI/Co-PI on multiple national, peer-reviewed, extramural research grants within their program of research. Serving in the PI/MPI/co-PI or equivalent role would generally be expected on at least one received grant that has at least \$100,000 total direct costs; example NIH grants include K and R03 grant mechanisms.
2. Consistently submits competitive grant applications to internal funding opportunities, foundations, industries, and/or federal agencies as principal investigator, co-principal investigator, or having a significant role (with indication of contribution and time commitment). The quality of unfunded grants and contracts will further be demonstrated by summary statements (or other review documentation).

3. A minimum of ten (10) total published peer-reviewed publications, most of which should be data-based. The candidate is expected to be first, second, or senior author on at least five (5) peer-reviewed publications.
4. A minimum of five (5) peer-reviewed presentations or posters at national and international conferences. The candidate is expected to be the first, second, or senior author on at least three (3) presentations.
5. National recognition of the candidate's scholarship program area, (e.g., national awards, increasing H index, grant review requests, fellowships). Further, a majority of the external referees must judge that the candidate could be considered to be attaining emerging national recognition in their area of scholarship.

Good scholarship is defined as a record of activity that has contributed to one's academic discipline or profession. There should be evidence that the candidate is working to establish a coherent research program that could translate into a national reputation of scholarship; the candidate's work is of high quality, as indicated by journal reputation of the candidate's publications and outside reviewers' comments.

1. Submits internal grant applications as principal investigator. Submits competitive external grant applications as co-investigator.
2. At least five (5) published peer-reviewed publications, most of which should be data-based. The candidate is expected to be first, second, or senior author on at least three (3) peer-reviewed publications.
3. A minimum of three (3) peer-reviewed presentations or posters at national and international conferences. The candidate is expected to be first, second, or senior author on at least two (2) presentations. Peer-reviewed podium, panel or invited presentations are valued higher than poster presentations.
4. Minimal evidence of national recognition of the candidate's scholarship program area. Mixed assessment by the external reviewers with respect to attaining emerging national recognition.

Fair scholarship is defined as a record of activity that could lead to contributing to one's academic discipline or profession.

1. Minimal activity with internal grant applications as principal investigator. Minimal activity with external grant applications as co-investigator
2. At least two (2) published peer-reviewed publications, most of which should be data-based. Candidate is expected to be first, second, or senior author on at least one (1) peer-reviewed publication.
3. A minimum of two (2) peer-reviewed presentations or posters at national and international conferences. The candidate is expected to be first, second, or senior author on at least one (1) presentation. Peer-reviewed podium, panel or invited presentations are valued higher than poster presentations.
4. Minimal evidence of national recognition of the candidate's scholarship program area. Negative or mixed assessment by the external reviewers with respect to attaining emerging national recognition.

Unacceptable scholarship is defined as having serious concerns that the candidate's accomplishments do not meet a minimally effective level of performance as defined by fair scholarship above.

EVALUATION OF TEACHING/EDUCATIONAL ACTIVITIES

A candidate seeking appointment or tenure at the rank of associate professor should demonstrate at least **good teaching**. A candidate seeking appointment or tenure at the rank of professor should demonstrate **excellent teaching**. The following guidelines are used to evaluate the candidate's progress and accomplishments in teaching/educational activities:

- Performance in teaching is documented by student evaluations, peer-reviews of teaching and self-evaluations. The CON utilizes quantitative student evaluations as one measure of a faculty member's teaching effectiveness. However, it is recognized that while student and peer assessments are important, quality teaching can occur in the presence of less-than-optimal student evaluations due to class size, the elective or required nature of the course, the degree of challenge inherent in the course, and additional factors. Peer evaluations are also useful for evaluating effective teaching. Copies of peer evaluations conducted within the unit are required to be included in the candidate's primary file. Note: metrics related to student course evaluation of classroom teaching are based on the current teaching and class evaluation questionnaires (TEQ and CEQ). The university is transitioning to a new course experience survey in 2025; metrics related to the new survey are not available yet. Criteria related to the student experience survey will be adopted when benchmark data are available.
- The primary file must include a teaching summary, prepared by the unit. The teaching summary shall include a summary of the candidate's peer and student evaluations, conducted throughout the faculty member's tenure-track or tenured appointment at the university with particular emphasis placed on the teaching which occurred during the review period. The summary should give context to student evaluations of the faculty member's classroom teaching by noting whether evaluations of a particular class historically have been low; how a faculty member's evaluation compares with other faculty members who have taught the same course, or whether poor evaluation scores are correlated to a faculty member's strict grading standards or some other standard.
- Other elements of teaching performance include, but are not limited to, such issues as teaching load, service as a coordinator of team-taught courses, involvement in inter-professional education, course development, and curricular development,
- Mentoring students at various levels constitutes an important component of teaching. In the CON, this includes but is not limited to non-traditional teaching within the professional degree programs (e.g., mentoring honors or independent study students in a scholarly setting) and the training of graduate students, fellows, and residents outside the classroom setting, as well as participation in other forms of student mentoring relationships such as thesis or dissertation advisory committees, constitute important areas of teaching.
- Faculty are expected to mentor early career faculty to help them develop their research, scholarship, teaching, and mentorship skills.

Outstanding teaching is defined as a record of exceptional peer reviews and student teaching evaluations as judged from the qualitative and quantitative evidence. Quantitative ratings should average the highest rating on the scoring range. Other evidence includes innovative teaching awards or peer-reviewed publications regarding the scholarship of teaching.

1. Demonstrates strong teaching effectiveness as evidenced by average TEQ scores consistently above 3.5 on a 4-point scale. For student course evaluations, this is currently operationalized as the overall teaching rating based on 14 designated items on the teaching effectiveness questionnaire (TEQ). Earns positive peer reviews of teaching.

2. Maintains and updates didactic courses for compliance with relevant accreditation criteria and university/college QM/QSOC standards for online education as applicable.
3. Leadership in course development/redevelopment and curricular development and revision.
4. Chairs at least one dissertation committee through the student's graduation. Serves as co-chair, chair, or major advisor for doctoral, Magellan, and/or Honor's scholar committees, and member of student committees. Student mentorship should result in dissemination (e.g., publications and presentations), and successful grant application submissions.
5. Mentors faculty in the development of their teaching roles, giving formal peer teaching reviews, participating in the design and development of pedagogical approaches, participating in program review, evaluation, or acting as a formal teaching mentor for faculty.
6. Mentors faculty in doctoral committee leadership.

Excellent teaching is defined as a record of positive peer reviews and student teaching evaluations as judged from the qualitative and quantitative evidence. Quantitative ratings should consistently exceed the minimal requirements of the college. Candidates should show evidence of effective and sustained mentorship to students, trainees, and other faculty.

1. Demonstrates strong teaching effectiveness as evidenced by average TEQ scores consistently above 3.5 on a 4-point scale. For student course evaluations, this is currently operationalized as the overall teaching rating based on 14 designated items on the teaching effectiveness questionnaire (TEQ).
2. Maintains and updates didactic courses for compliance with relevant accreditation criteria and university/college QM/QSOC standards for online education as applicable.
3. Leadership in course development/redevelopment. Participates in curriculum development.
4. Chairs at least one doctoral committee. Serves as committee member, or co-chair, chair, or major advisor for doctoral, Magellan, and/or Honor's scholar committees. Student mentorship should result in dissemination (e.g., publications and presentations) and/or grant application submissions.
5. Mentors faculty in the development of their teaching roles, giving formal peer teaching reviews, participating in the design and development of pedagogical approaches, participating in program review, evaluation, or acting as a formal teaching mentor for faculty.
6. Mentors faculty in doctoral committee leadership.

Good teaching is defined as a record of positive peer reviews and student teaching evaluations as judged from the qualitative and quantitative evidence. Quantitative ratings should average minimal requirements of the college with many evaluations exceeding minimal requirements.

1. Demonstrates strong teaching effectiveness as evidenced by average TEQ scores consistently above 3.0 on a 4-point scale. For student course evaluations, this is currently operationalized as the overall teaching rating based on 14 designated items on the teaching effectiveness questionnaire (TEQ).
2. Maintains and updates didactic courses for compliance with relevant accreditation criteria and university/college QM/QSOC standards for online education as applicable.
3. Participates in course development/redevelopment and curricular development as appropriate.
4. Serves as a committee member, or co-chair, chair, or major advisor for doctoral, Magellan and/or Honor's scholar committees.

5. Demonstrates teaching effectiveness as evidenced by satisfactory teaching evaluations from students and peers. and/or Honor's scholar committees
6. Mentors faculty in the development of their teaching roles, giving formal peer teaching reviews, participating in the design and development of pedagogical approaches, participating in program review, evaluation, or acting as a formal teaching mentor for faculty.

Fair teaching is defined as a record of average peer reviews and learner evaluations as judged from the qualitative and narrative evidence. Quantitative ratings should meet the minimal requirements of the college.

1. Demonstrates strong teaching effectiveness as evidenced by average TEQ scores consistently above 3.0 on a 4-point scale. For student course evaluations, this is currently operationalized as the overall teaching rating based on 14 designated items on the teaching effectiveness questionnaire (TEQ).
2. Maintains didactic courses for compliance with relevant accreditation criteria and university/college QM/QSOC standards for online education as applicable.
3. Minimal effort toward substantive course or curricular development
4. Minimal student mentoring activities

Unacceptable teaching is defined as serious concerns with instructional activities such as quantitative ratings consistently below minimal requirements of the college or qualitative and narrative evidence documenting serious concerns for instructional competence, reflecting accomplishments that do not meet a minimally effective level of performance as defined by fair teaching above.

EVALUATION OF SERVICE

A candidate seeking appointment or tenure at the rank of associate professor should demonstrate at least **good service**. A candidate seeking appointment or tenure at the rank of professor should demonstrate **excellent service**. The following guidelines are used to evaluate the candidate's progress and accomplishments in service activities:

Outstanding service is defined as demonstrating continued leadership in service provided to the college and university and continued leadership at national/international professional organizations.

1. Continued contributions at the community, college, university, and national/international levels with additional service through activities such as grant reviews, professional activities, and participation in national health policy endeavors.
2. Sustained leadership at the college and university; serves in positions of influence and responsibility at the national/international level for at least one professional organization.

Excellent service is defined as demonstrating leadership in the service provided to the college and to either the university, state, or national professional organizations. This may include chairing college committees and serving in positions of influence and responsibility at the university, state, or national professional level.

1. Continued contributions at the community, college, university, and national levels with additional service through activities such as grant review and participation in national health policy endeavors.

2. Service in a leadership position for at least one area, e.g., college/university, community, or professional organization.

Good service is defined as demonstrating active participation in service provided to the college and to either university, state, or national professional organizations. This may include active membership on college, university, state or national professional society committees or task forces.

1. Demonstrates engagement in community, CON and university service through committee membership or committee leadership.
2. Demonstrates engagement in a national professional organization through committee membership or committee leadership.

Fair service is defined as limited participation in service provided to the college or to either university, state, or national professional organizations.

1. Demonstrates minimal engagement in the community, CON, and university service.
2. Demonstrates minimal engagement in a national professional organization.

Unacceptable service is defined as having serious concerns that the candidate's accomplishments do not meet a minimally effective level of performance as defined by fair service above.

RELATED UNIVERSITY POLICIES AND DOCUMENTS

- USC Columbia Faculty Manual
https://sc.edu/about/offices_and_divisions/provost/docs/faculty_manual/facultymanual_colu_mbia.pdf
- Tenure and Promotion Calendar
https://www.sc.edu/about/offices_and_divisions/provost/faculty/tenure/tenureclockcalendars.php
- ACAF 1.31 Extension of Faculty Tenure-Track Probationary Period and Scheduled Post-Tenure Review <https://www.sc.edu/policies/ppm/acaf131.pdf>

HISTORY OF REVISIONS

Approved by College of Nursing T&P Committee May 13, 1997

Presented to the College of Nursing Faculty Fall 1997

Approved by UCTP June 10, 1997

Revisions Approved by College of Nursing T& P Committee December 1, 2000

Revisions Approved by UCTP, May 2001

Approved By College of Nursing T&P January 2008

Presented to the College of Nursing Faculty February 2008

Approved By College of Nursing T&P February 2010

Revised and presented to the College of Nursing Faculty, May 12, 2010

Approved by College of Nursing T&P March 21, 2011

Approved by College of Nursing Faculty March 28, 2011

Approved by UCTP April 6, 2011

Approved by College of Nursing T&P February 17, 2025

Approved by UCTP April 1, 2026