

**University of South Carolina School of Medicine
Greenville**

**Appointment and Promotion
Procedures and Criteria
for Non-Tenure-Track Faculty
in the Clinical Departments**

**APPROVED
JULY 28, 2011
Christine Curtis, Ph.D
Senior Vice Provost**

I. Preamble

The University of South Carolina School of Medicine-Greenville (USC SOM-Greenville) recognizes the need for full-time faculty members (salaried by the USC SOM-Greenville or its affiliated institutions) who do not pursue traditional tenure-track faculty appointments. These clinicians constitute a vital component of the teaching programs of the medical school, provide service to the community, and manage essential administrative responsibilities. Clinician faculty members often contribute to the teaching of medical school students outside of the classroom through clinical practice in the delivery of patient care. Likewise, their contributions to scholarship and academic excellence to the institution often involve the practice of medicine or other clinical services in place of or in addition to more conventional forms of teaching, research, and scholarship typical of other university faculty. Non-tenure-track faculty are appointed on an annual or multi-year basis. Faculty may change from non-tenure to tenure track and vice versa (see ACAF 1.18 <http://www.sc.edu/policies/acaf118.pdf>); however, service in a non-tenure-track appointment is not considered part of a probationary period for tenure consideration. University Policies ACAF 1.06 (<http://www.sc.edu/policies/acaf106.pdf>) and ACAF 1.16 (<http://www.sc.edu/policies/acaf116.pdf>) specify general requirements pertaining non-tenure-track faculty.

Academic rank is determined in large part by the faculty member's achievements and reputation as a scholar, and contributions to the overall mission of the institution. Standards for rank and promotion are intended to be consistent across Units and tracks insofar as it is possible. Expectations for academic ranks are described in the University of South Carolina Columbia (USC Columbia) Campus *Faculty Manual*. In the event of conflicting standards or principles between this document and the USC Columbia *Faculty Manual*, the USC Columbia *Faculty Manual* takes precedence.

The following procedures and criteria provide a structure for appointing, evaluating, and promoting faculty members in clinical departments who do not occupy tenure-track positions, but who are full-time members of the School of Medicine-Greenville faculty. Evaluation of performance should be based on both quantitative and qualitative estimates of activities relevant to the candidate's work.

Procedures for the evaluation of teaching require peer and student evaluations, conducted periodically throughout the faculty member's appointment at the University. A summary and evaluation of the faculty member's teaching, based on clearly specified criteria, must be included in the faculty member's promotion file. This summary should give context to student evaluations of the faculty member's teaching by noting, e.g., whether evaluations of a particular class historically have been low; in a multi-section course, how the faculty

member's evaluation scores compare with those in the other sections; or whether poor evaluation scores are correlated to a faculty member's strict grading standards.

Unit procedures for the evaluation of the research component of the file must require that at least five evaluations of the candidate's research and scholarship be obtained from impartial scholars at peer or aspirant institutions within the field, outside the University of South Carolina. If a person can be shown to be one of the leading scholars in a particular field, that person may be used as an outside evaluator even if he or she is at an institution that is not peer or aspirant. Non-university specialists may be used as outside evaluators; however, the majority of evaluators normally must be persons with academic affiliations. Persons who have co-authored publications, collaborated on research, or been colleagues or advisors of the applicant normally should be excluded from consideration as outside evaluators. All evaluators must be asked to disclose any relationship or interaction with the applicant. The outside evaluators must be selected by the unit except as provided below for jointly appointed faculty.

Each evaluator should be provided with a letter requesting the evaluation and informing the evaluator of the unit's relevant criteria for appointment or promotion, the candidate's vita and publications, and other materials evidencing the candidate's research or such portion of the candidate's research as the evaluator is being asked to evaluate. The evaluator will be asked to evaluate the quality of the research, including the quality of publication venues. Where appropriate, the evaluator will be asked to evaluate the quantity of the candidate's research and scholarship.

A summary of the professional qualifications of each outside evaluator or a copy of each evaluator's curriculum vita must be included in the file, along with a copy of the letter sent to the evaluator.

II. Appointment and Promotion Committee and General Standards

A. The Committee

The Appointment and Promotion Committee for non-tenure track faculty from the Clinical Departments of the USC SOM-Greenville Campus will consist of all Associate Professors and Professors of the Clinical Departments, plus one Associate Professor and one Professor from the Biomedical Sciences Department who have been elected by the Appointment and Promotion Committee for Biomedical Sciences faculty. The Chair of the Appointment and Promotion Committee will be elected annually by the members of the Committee and should be a Clinical Professor from one of the clinical departments. Decisions of the Appointment and Promotion Committee will be by majority vote of all members. A quorum shall be defined as a simple majority of those present physically or through various forms of communication. Those absent from the committee meeting may not vote. Both Associate Professors and Professors may vote at the level of an Associate Professor while only Professors may vote at the level of Professor.

Voting may be conducted via mail or secure electronic communications at the discretion of the Committee Chair. A majority vote is defined as at least one vote more than half of the total votes cast as “in favor” or “against” (i.e., abstentions do not count toward the determination of a majority).

B. Qualifications & Requirements for Appointment

Qualifications for appointment, as set forth in the *Faculty Manual* (listed below) are not intended as justification for automatic promotion; conversely, justified exceptions may be made.

Professor. To be eligible for appointment at the rank of professor, a faculty member must have a record of superior performance usually involving both teaching and research, or creativity or performance in the arts, or recognized professional contributions. The faculty member normally is expected to hold the earned doctor's degree and have at least nine years of effective, relevant experience.

Associate Professor. To be eligible for appointment at the rank of associate professor, a faculty member must have a record of strong performance usually involving both teaching and research, or creativity or performance in the arts, or recognized professional contributions,. The faculty member normally is expected to hold the earned doctor's degree and must possess strong potential for further development as a teacher and scholar.

Assistant Professor. To be eligible for appointment at the rank of assistant professor, a faculty member normally is expected to hold the earned doctor's degree or its equivalent and must possess strong potential for development as a teacher and scholar. For practicing physicians and other doctoral level clinicians, certification by the appropriate certifying medical board (if applicable) is required.

Instructor. To be eligible for appointment at the rank of instructor, a faculty member normally is expected to possess a 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 the University Policy ACAF 1.06 Unclassified Academic Titles and are subject to periodic change.

C. Appointment Procedures

Appointment of non-tenure-track faculty of the Clinical Departments at the Associate Professor or Professor level will require review by the Appointment and Promotion Committee of the Clinical Departments. The curriculum vitae, application materials, and the rank recommended by the Departmental Chair for candidates for appointment will be submitted to the Committee. The Committee will evaluate the curriculum vitae and

application materials and make a recommendation concerning the most appropriate faculty rank for the candidate. The Chair of the Appointment and Promotion Committee of the Clinical Departments will forward the recommendation to the Dean along with supporting material. The Dean will solicit input about prospective appointees from the Departmental Chair prior to forwarding his/her recommendation along with that of the Appointment and Promotion Committee to the Provost. Appointments at all ranks must be approved, through academic channels, by the Provost.

A separate appointment and promotion process will apply to Volunteer Clinical Faculty.

III. Promotion Procedures

- A. Promotion of non-tenure-track clinical faculty to Associate Professor or Professor will require review by the Appointment and Promotion Committee
- B. The procedure for promotion of non-tenure-track clinical faculty will follow the University timetable for promotion of tenure-track faculty. The departmental chair will be notified of the timetable each year. The departmental chair will then notify the chair of the Appointment and Promotion Committee of their desire to have a particular faculty member considered for promotion. Each faculty member has the right to request consideration for promotion in any year, and can do so by notifying the departmental chair at any time prior to the deadline for inclusion of the promotion cycle.
- C. The departmental chair (or equivalent) will forward the candidate's promotion file materials, including all current promotion forms, a current curriculum vitae, representative publications, job description for the candidate, a statement of the distribution of the candidate's time and effort in teaching, scholarship/research, and service/patient care, and the Departmental Chair's letter of recommendation to the Chair of the appropriate Appointment and Promotion Committee.
- D. Consideration of promotion requires that at least five evaluations of the candidate's scholarship and research be obtained from impartial scholars at peer or aspirant institutions within the field, outside the University of South Carolina. The Appointment and Promotion Committee, in consultation with the departmental chair and faculty from the unit with similar specialties, will solicit five letters of support from qualified referees for the candidate. Referees shall be chosen by the chair of the Appointment and Promotion Committee in consultation with the Dean and the candidate's departmental chair, and should not normally be former teachers, co-authors, co-investigators, or other individuals with potential conflicts of interest.

Referees should be provided with: (a) the specific criteria for promotion under which the candidate is being considered; (b) the candidate's most current curriculum vitae; and, (c) representative publications of the candidate that have been selected by the candidate in consultation with the departmental chair and/or mentor.

- E. The candidate may solicit additional letters of support which will be filed in a separate section from that of the external referees' letters.
- F. Following the deadline for submission of the above information, the Appointment and Promotion Committee will meet and make its recommendations. The chair of the Appointment and Promotion Committee will forward the vote and ballot justifications to the Dean along with the candidate's file. The Dean may solicit additional input about individuals being considered for promotion from appropriate clinical chairs of the USC SOM-Greenville. The vote and ballot justification of the Committee and the recommendation of the Dean are then forwarded to the Provost for consideration..
- G. The Provost will review the candidate's file, make a decision and will notify the candidate of the outcome.
- H. Additions to the file initiated by the candidate or faculty after the file has been sent to the Appointment and Promotion Committee are limited to the following:
 - 1. Candidates may add to the list of awarded proposals and/or published articles those titles which were shown as submitted or in process when the file was prepared.
 - 2. Letters submitted directly to the Dean or as part of an appeal may be entered in the appropriate section of the candidate's file.
- I. Failure to recommend favorably at a particular time is without prejudice with respect to future consideration.

IV. Appeals for the Denial of Promotion

Appeals for denial of promotion must be based on one or more of the following allegations: inadequate consideration of promotion criteria, use of impermissible criteria, denial of procedural due process, or denial of academic freedom. The petition shall state the factual basis for the allegations and the relief requested.

The first recourse of the faculty member shall be to request an immediate oral explanation from the member's Department Chair for the denial of promotion.

If the faculty member does not receive an oral explanation or believes that it is unsatisfactory, the faculty member may request a written summary from the dean of the evaluations and reasons advanced regarding the decision to deny promotion. The written request must be submitted to the dean within seven days of notification of denial of promotion. The dean will provide a summary within fifteen days of the request. The dean, after consultation with the provost, shall respond with a detailed summary of the evaluations included in vote justifications, in letters from external referees, and in administrative reviews, and with the vote of the A&P Committee. The summary will be prepared in such a manner as to protect the identity of the referees and voting faculty members.

Within seven days of receiving the dean's summary of the case, if the faculty member believes there are grounds for reconsideration of the case, the member may state in writing the grounds for this belief and submit them to the Provost. The Provost may order a review, at any faculty or administrative level, on the grounds for reconsideration set forth by the faculty member if the Provost believes the findings of the review could substantially alter the basis upon which the initial decision of denial of promotion was reached.

V. Criteria for Promotion

A. Eligibility Criteria

1. Earned doctoral or discipline terminal degree.
2. Current USCSOM-Greenville non-tenure track faculty appointment from a clinical department.
3. For physicians, board certification or satisfactory eligibility or equivalent experience base and clear licensure status with the South Carolina Department of Labor, Licensing, and Regulation Board of Medical Examiners.
4. For PhD clinicians, board certification or satisfactory eligibility or equivalent experience base and clear licensure status (if applicable).

B. General Guidelines

Faculty members are responsible to meet all elements of the criteria under which they are applying for promotion. If the candidate is eligible under more than one set of criteria, the candidate must designate which set of criteria they have elected. For promotion from Assistant Professor to Associate Professor, the candidate may choose either the promotional criteria in effect at the time of their initial hiring, or the most current promotion

criteria at the time of their application for promotion. For promotion from Associate Professor to Professor, the faculty member shall be responsible for meeting A&P criteria and University standards in effect at the time of their application for promotion.

1. The general performance in the areas of teaching, scholarship/research, and service/patient care comprise the basis for evaluation for promotion. A numerical system is shown under C2 as a means to rate achievement levels across these performance areas.
2. The USCSOM-Greenville Appointment and Promotion Committee requires that the percentage of “effort” assignments, among the three areas of teaching, scholarship/research, and service/patient care be made by the candidate’s departmental chair. A candidate’s percentage of effort assignment is determined by averaging the percentage of effort assignments recorded in the candidate’s Annual Faculty Evaluation for the years under consideration. It is recognized that achievements in a given area may be limited by the effort assigned, i.e., by limits imposed by the candidate’s job description. For example, a candidate assigned 20 percent time for scholarship/research will not be expected to achieve the same quantity of scholarly works, as one who is assigned 70 percent for scholarship/research. Minimum standards stated below should be met by all candidates, with higher expectations for candidates with unusually high % effort in any specific category.

C. Promotion Criteria

Qualifications & Requirements

Qualifications for appointment, as set forth in the *Faculty Manual* (listed below) are not intended as justification for automatic promotion; conversely, justified exceptions may be made.

Professor. To be eligible for appointment at the rank of professor, a faculty member must have a record of superior performance usually involving both teaching and research, or creativity or performance in the arts, or recognized professional contributions. The faculty member normally is expected to hold the earned doctor's degree and have at least nine years of effective, relevant experience.

Associate Professor. To be eligible for appointment at the rank of associate professor, a faculty member must have a record of strong performance usually involving both teaching and research, or creativity or performance in the arts, or recognized professional contributions,. The faculty member normally is expected to hold the earned doctor's degree and must possess strong potential for further development as a teacher and scholar.

Assistant Professor. To be eligible for appointment at the rank of assistant professor, a faculty member normally is expected to hold the earned doctor's degree or its equivalent and must possess strong potential for development as a teacher and scholar. For practicing physicians and other doctoral level clinicians, certification by the appropriate certifying medical board (if applicable) is required.

Instructor. To be eligible for appointment at the rank of instructor, a faculty member normally is expected to possess a 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 the University Policy ACAF 1.06 Unclassified Academic Titles and are subject to periodic change..

Evidence of progressively effective performance is required for advancement through faculty ranks. Members of the Appointment and Promotion Committee will be guided by the following criteria in making their recommendations:

1. Assistant Professor to Associate Professor

Promotion from the rank of Assistant Professor to the rank of Associate Professor should be requested only if individuals show real promise that they will become leading teachers, scholars/researchers, or clinicians. Promise should be substantiated by tangible, developing evidence. A candidate at the rank of Associate Professor must possess maturity of judgment, personal and professional integrity, highly motivated productivity, potential for leadership, and commitment to institutional and professional goals. The USC Columbia *Faculty Manual* (25 June 2010) specifies: “*Unit criteria for promotion to associate professor and for tenure at the rank of associate professor shall require, at a minimum, evidence of excellence in either research and/or creative activities or teaching, accompanied by a good record in the other areas, and evidence of progress toward establishing a national or international reputation in a field*”, and thus the accrual of a minimum of seven points is required to qualify for this promotion.

Accomplishments in a faculty position at another educational institution may be considered in evaluating a candidate for promotion to Associate Professor, however, work accomplished at USC is to be weighted more heavily than work performed elsewhere, prior to joining the University faculty. There is no absolute minimum time of service at USC for faculty hired from another institution to be considered for promotion to the rank of Associate Professor.

2. Associate Professor to Professor

Promotion from the rank of Associate Professor to the rank of Professor should be based upon promise fulfilled. A move to the rank of Professor should be accompanied by evidence of attainment of national or international stature in a field. Additionally, a candidate for promotion at the rank of Professor must demonstrate maturity of judgment, personal and professional integrity, leadership skills, administrative abilities, and commitment to institutional and professional goals. Promotion from the rank of Associate Professor to the rank of Professor generally requires, at a minimum, evidence of excellence in research and/or creative activities and teaching, accompanied by a record in the other area that is at least good, and evidence of national or international stature in a field with an accrual of a minimum of nine points.

Accomplishments in a faculty position at another educational institution may be considered in evaluating a candidate for promotion to Associate Professor, however, work accomplished at USC is to be weighted more heavily than work performed elsewhere, prior to joining the University faculty. There is no absolute minimum time of service at USC for faculty hired from another institution to be considered for promotion to the rank of Professor.

Performance Categories Levels	Teaching	Scholarship/Research	Service/Patient Care
Unacceptable	0	0	0
Fair	1	1	1
Good	2	2	2
Excellent	3	3	3
Outstanding	4	4	4

D. Criteria for Achievement

1. Criteria for “Fair” Achievement

- Teaching

There must be recognition as an effective teacher of medical students and residents. Documentation will include a rating of at least “Fair”

on the majority of student and peer evaluations and favorable letters from the clerkship and/or training director(s).

- Scholarship/Research

It is not possible to give a precise, quantitative criterion for the number of publications, since the scope and influence of the work must be weighed in each case. Ordinarily the candidate would be expected to have published a minimum of 3 articles in refereed journals or the equivalent. Work that is published in high impact journals or venues should be given more weight. Articles counted in the teaching category may not be counted again under scholarship/research or service/patient care. (Book reviews, letters to the editor, abstracts of oral presentations and papers submitted but not yet accepted will not be considered in meeting this requirement). Documentation will include copies of published work and drafts of work that have been accepted by a journal or are in press.

- Service/Patient Care

Recognition as effective in carrying out assigned roles as leader or coordinator of programs, committee assignments, and/or counterpart activities in the community (e.g., participation in local, state or national professional organizations). There must be evidence of effective participation in assigned patient care activities. Documentation will include a favorable letter from the principal clinical program supervisor and the individual(s) to whom the candidate is accountable for committee work and public service assignments.

2. Criteria for “Good” Achievement

- Teaching

There must be recognition as a very effective teacher of medical students and residents. Documentation will include a rating of at least “Good” on the majority of student and peer evaluations and favorable letters from the clerkship and/or training director(s).

- Scholarship/Research

There must be publications of merit and significance as senior author or principal collaborator. It is not possible to give a precise, quantitative criterion for the number of publications, since the scope and influence of the work must be weighed in each case. Ordinarily

the candidate would be expected to have published a minimum of 6 articles, acting as senior author of at least 2 in refereed journals or the equivalent. Work that is published in high impact journals or venues should be given more weight. Articles counted in the teaching category may not be counted again under teaching or service/patient care. (Book reviews, letters to the editor, abstracts of oral presentations and papers submitted but not yet accepted will not be considered as having met this requirement). Documentation will include copies of published work and drafts of work that have been accepted by a journal or are in press.

- Service/Patient Care

Recognition as effective in carrying out assigned roles as leader or coordinator of programs, committee assignments, and/or counterpart activities in the community (e.g., participation in local, state or national professional organizations). There must be uniformly effective participation in assigned patient care activities. Documentation will include a favorable letter from the principal clinical program supervisor and the individual(s) to whom the candidate is accountable for committee work and public service assignments.

3. Criteria for “Excellent” Achievement

The criteria below are in addition to those above required for “Good” achievement:

- Teaching

Documentation will include a rating of “Excellent” on the majority of student and peer evaluations and favorable letters from the clerkship and/or training director(s) for a significant teaching load. In addition, publication in a refereed journal on educational issues; teaching awards from residents or medical students; peer (CME) teaching beyond the institution at regional, state, or national professional meetings; or receipt of a career teacher grant or award, or serving as principal investigator for a training grant awarded to the department will also be evidence of proficiency in this area.

- Scholarship/Research

An “Excellent” publication record is required. While this is impossible to quantify precisely, it would ordinarily be expected that

the candidate has published 10 or more articles, acting as senior author of at least four (4), in refereed_journals or the equivalent. Documentation will include copies of publications and favorable review of the significance of the candidate's scholarship in outside letters of reference. Work that is published in high impact journals or venues should be given more weight. Articles counted the teaching category may not be counted again under scholarship/research or service/patient care. In addition, funding of a competitive research grant with candidate as the principal investigator or collaborating investigator on a federally funded grant; editorship (can be associate or assistant editor, or member of the editorial board) of a refereed professional or scientific journal; reviewer of several manuscripts for refereed journals or of several grant proposals for a study section; scientific task force, or advisory group for the National Institutes of Health (NIH) or equivalent; or several refereed scientific presentations at regional, state, national, or international meetings will also be evidence of proficiency in this area. Outside letters should attest to the candidate's achievement of a state, regional or national_reputation in some area in his or her field.

- Service/Patient Care

Candidate will have served effectively on medical school, University, or Greenville Hospital System Medical Staff Committees, Academic Committees, and/or Hospital Standing Committees; or the candidate will have documented an "Excellent" patient care record in any of several ways.

Documentation of an "Excellent" patient care record requires that the candidate is known, at least within the South Carolina medical community for expertise and innovation in the diagnosis and/or treatment of a particular disease or of a particular group of patients. Or, the candidate might have developed a substantial reputation as a clinician treating a broad range of patients in support of the clinical mission of the department. The best documentation of these clinical contributions would come from letters written by the major clinical supervisor; faculty of other clinical departments; and, if the reputation of the clinician has gone beyond the institution, outside letters as well.

Documentation of an "Excellent" service record will include a favorable letter from the principal clinical or academic supervisor and committee chairs, as appropriate.

In addition to the above, refereed publications on administrative or patient care issues; presenting one or more workshops or

demonstrations on diagnosis or treatment at a regional, state, or national meeting; appointment to a state, regional or national task force or committee addressing administrative, organizational, service delivery, or patient care issues; serving as a principal investigator for a training, clinical program, or public service grant awarded to the department; receipt of a grant or award for research on patient treatment or participation in a multi-center collaborative treatment study; or department receipt of a national recognition award for excellence of a clinical program in which the candidate has devoted significant effort will also be evidence of proficiency in service/patient care.

4. Criteria for “Outstanding” Achievement

The criteria listed below are in addition to those above for “Outstanding” achievement:

- Teaching

Documentation will include a rating of “Outstanding on a majority of student and peer evaluations and favorable letters from the clerkship and/or training director(s) for a very significant teaching load. Further evidence of proficiency in this area can be demonstrated as in the criteria for “Excellent” achievement.

- Scholarship/Research

A minimum of 15 papers, 7 as senior author, published in refereed journals, or the equivalent. Expectations for publications may be higher, depending on the percent of the candidate’s effort assigned to research/scholarship. Work that is published in high impact journals or venues should be given more weight. Articles counted in the teaching category may not be counted again under scholarship/research or service/patient care. Outside letters should indicate that the candidate has a national or international reputation in some area in his or her field. Further evidence of proficiency in this area can be demonstrated as in the criteria for “Excellent” achievement.

- Service/Patient Care

Candidate will have served the department in a major administrative role (e.g., with oversight for a clinical, teaching, or research program that has multiple program elements, typically requiring supervision of the work of junior faculty or comparable personnel, or a similar major

role or roles, continuing over several years, in a regional, state, or national professional organization); or the candidate will have demonstrated an “Outstanding” patient care record. In addition, the candidate’s administrative leadership will have received regional, state, or national recognition by peers, or the candidate will have achieved regional, state, national or international prominence in some aspect of patient care.

An “Outstanding” service record also requires that the candidate will have served effectively on at least three hospital, Medical Staff or Academic committees. Documentation of an “Outstanding” service record requires a favorable letter from committee chairs and from the major supervisor or CEO of organizations in which the candidate has had major roles, as appropriate. Outside letters will give favorable comment on the candidate’s regional, state, national or international reputation as an outstanding organizational leader.

Documentation of an “Outstanding” patient care record requires that the candidate will have a regional, state, or national reputation for expertise and innovation in the diagnosis and/or treatment of a particular disease or of a particular group of patients. Outside letters will give favorable comment on the candidate’s regional, state, national or international reputation as an outstanding clinician.

In addition to the above, further evidence of proficiency in the area of service/patient care can be demonstrated as in the criteria for “Excellent” achievement.

E. Appendix: Additional Suggested Sources for Documentation of Performance

1. Teaching

Contribution to:

a. Curriculum development

- Undergraduate medical education: give course number and type of activity
- Graduate medical education: describe curriculum, type of student, goals of program
- Postgraduate education: describe curriculum, type of student, goals of program
- Continuing medical education: describe curriculum, type of participants, goals of program

- b. Undergraduate, graduate, postgraduate, and continuing medical education
- Classroom lecture: give course number, number of contract hours, number of students
 - Case conference: give frequency, number and type of participants, topic area
 - Clinical teaching and supervision: give frequency, number of students, type of activity
 - Course coordination: give course number, number of contact hours, number of students
- c. Participation in training and educational curricula of affiliated hospitals of the School of Medicine and other schools and departments of the University of South Carolina
- Programs of affiliated and cooperative hospitals
 - Other schools and departments of the University of South Carolina and departments of the Medical University of South Carolina
- d. Evidence of teaching quality and quantity of teaching load
- Peer evaluations
 - Student evaluations
 - Student performance on objective tests (e.g., National Board Exams)
 - Evaluation by department chair
 - Evaluation by faculty of higher rank
- e. Development of teaching methods or aids
- Computer simulation
 - Audio-visual presentations
 - New media applications, presentations or tools
 - Medical illustrations
 - Handouts
 - Models (anatomical, biochemical, etc.)
 - Other (weekend symposium, etc.)

2. Scholarship/Basic and Applied Research

a. Publications (in assessing the level of achievement attained, reviewers should take into account the reputation and impact of journals, whether the work is refereed or not, and whether or not the work represents work that was invited based on the reputation of the faculty member)

- Refereed journal articles
- Books
- Book chapters
- Clinical and case reports
- Invited reviews
- Non-refereed journal articles

b. Presentations

- Invited talks at scientific and professional meetings
- Non-invited talks
- Seminars given
- Sessions chaired at national or international meetings

c. Grants

- Applications submitted, approved, and/or funded, and grant renewals

d. Development and supervision of student research projects

- Medical student research projects
- Resident research projects
- Membership on dissertation committees, oral examination Committees

e. Attendance at and participation in professional and scientific meetings

3. Service/Patient Care

Service

a. To students:

- Faculty advisor

- Student counseling
 - Advisor to student organizations
 - Membership on student-faculty committees
- b. To the department:
- Course coordination
 - Committees and subcommittees (e.g., honors, practice plan, curriculum development, etc.)
 - Administrative responsibilities
- c. To the school:
- Regular committees and subcommittees (e.g., admissions, library, curriculum, etc.)
 - Ad hoc committees (e.g., promotion and tenure criteria development, etc.)
 - Administrative responsibilities
 - Mentoring relationships
- d. To affiliated hospitals and institutions:
- Committees and subcommittees (e.g., quality assurance, medical staff, etc.)
 - Administrative responsibilities
- e. To the University of South Carolina and other collaborating universities and colleges:
- Committees and subcommittees
 - Faculty Senate
 - Faculty committees
 - Provost committees
 - Task forces
 - Administrative responsibilities
- f. To the profession:
- Presentations at professional meetings
 - Development of symposia, professional meetings, etc.
 - Chair at professional meetings
 - Professional organization/society officer
 - Service on ethics boards, boards of examiners
 - Editorial board membership

- Professional organization/society memberships and activities
 - Research and grant review panels
 - Membership on accreditation committees
 - Development of grants
- g. To the community:
- Professional services
 - Program development (e.g., programs for specific reference groups, such as the handicapped, etc.), patient education
 - Support and assistance to existent community groups (e.g., burn victims, the blind, epileptics, etc.)
 - Advisor to federal, state, and local decision-making groups (e.g., regarding health care to the indigent, crisis intervention, disaster preparedness, utilization of medical care, etc.)
 - Consultations to hospitals, nursing homes, etc.
 - Other: Civic activities
 - Presentation to schools, civic groups and agencies
 - Membership on governing boards of voluntary agencies, schools, churches
 - Talks and participation in activities to schools, clubs

Patient Care

- a. Participation in clinical services of the School of Medicine or affiliated institutions
- b. Publications in refereed journals on patient care
- c. Presentations at professional meetings on patient care
- d. Membership on regional or national task force or committee on patient care
- e. Grant for research on patient care
- f. Participation in multi-center collaborative treatment study
- g. Award for excellence in clinical services
- h. Reputation among peers as an excellent clinician