

November 26, 2011

COHFA EXPECTATIONS FOR SUSTAINED AND OUTSTANDING PERFORMANCE

Teaching

In teaching, *sustained* activity is determined by submitted evidence that the faculty member is a reflective teacher who regularly reviews classroom practices in the light of student learning outcomes. This may be documented in a variety of ways including, but not limited to, accounts of peer visitations, explanations of new teaching methods and learning assessments, summaries of student evaluations, descriptions of independent study courses/internships, and records of effective advising. Of major importance in this area is that the faculty member's activities typically show a clear impact on student learning, which may involve participation in the assessment processes of the department and/or the mentoring of students in the successful completion of grant proposals, graduate and professional school applications, auditions or presentations, and/or publications.

Outstanding teaching can be demonstrated by student evaluations, reports of peer visitations, development of new courses and curricula, mentoring student-centered activities and research, mentoring faculty, and/or a faculty member's activity as a peer reviewer of teaching for the department and college. It is expected that an *outstanding* teaching record would include annual reports that contain citations of performance in teaching that is superior to typical levels of achievement as established by departmental or disciplinary norms.

Scholarship/Creative Activities

In scholarship/creative activities (defined in the Faculty Manual as "intellectual/professional contributions to the discipline"), *sustained* activity can be established by a pattern of periodic competitive adjudication of work by journals and presses and regular participation in conferences, symposia, exhibitions or performances that are recognized competitive venues in the candidate's discipline. Sustained scholarly/creative activities could also be demonstrated by the successful completion of grant proposals, participation in auditions, and pursuit of research with students leading to regular publication or presentation, or the organization of and participation in professional-level, discipline-specific activities. A *sustained* record of achievement and/or progress should be evident in annual reports submitted to support the promotion application.

Outstanding scholarly/creative activity would entail the candidate's successful entry into arenas that valorize disciplinary accomplishment through peer review, juries, extended invitations, refereed selections, and/or expert adjudications. While there are expectations that all faculty attempt to participate in the professional activities of their disciplines, *outstanding* performance as a scholar or artist includes dissemination, publication, performance and/or exhibition that locates the candidate authoritatively within his/her disciplinary context. The documentary evidence of such outstanding performance would generally be publications, programs, recordings, books, articles, reviews, special recognitions, awards and/or professional testimonials elicited from leaders in the candidate's area of specialization. The candidate's teaching load should be considered as a significant factor in the evaluation of the candidate's scholarly and creative activity.

Because of the variability in kinds of recognized productivity in the humanities and arts, it is not possible to establish a universal standard for the mark of "outstanding." However, in the recommendation letters from the department's peer review committee and the candidate's chair, field-specific measures must be cited to establish that the level of productivity of a particular faculty member exceeds ordinary research expectations. These measures may include comparisons of productivity with faculty in similar fields at peer and aspirant institutions, data on the quality and impact of the journals or exhibition/performance venues, citation analysis of the faculty member's articles, and/or review letters from outside evaluators. Whatever discipline-specific standards are employed, it is expected that an *outstanding* record would include annual reports and/or reviews that include evidence of superior performance in scholarly/creative activity and/or professional contributions to the discipline.

Service

In service, *sustained* activity is demonstrated by annual participation in department, college and university committees, organs of faculty governance, and/or in disciplinary or academic societies and organizations. Coastal Carolina University also recognizes participation in discipline-related extra-curricular community and/or institutional activities as having the potential to help fulfill a faculty service commitment.

Outstanding service can be demonstrated through leadership. Chairing committees, holding offices, building new programs, and/or successfully collaborating with peers to launch or organize new initiatives are but a few examples of actions that can help the candidate differentiate *outstanding* service from "caretaker" roles and lower-impact participation. It must be demonstrated in the letters of evaluation of the department peer-review committee and the candidate's chair that the service activities of the faculty member made a substantial positive difference in the outcome, function, or operation of the department, college, university, discipline and/or community.

Overall

In the application for promotion, the candidate's letters of review must cite the specific examples used in establishing levels of "outstanding" and make a clear and positive differentiation between the candidate's level of accomplishment and routine departmental expectations as expressed in existing promotion and tenure standards and elaborations.

Additions to the Edwards College Promotion Elaborations

Adopted Spring 2016

Introduction

These questions, formulated in the context of the Edwards College Promotion and Tenure guidelines, the *Faculty Manual*, and departmental performance elaborations, are intended to assist candidates seeking promotion and/or tenure as well as the individuals charged with making recommendations in the promotion and tenure process.

The Coastal Carolina University *Faculty Manual* sets the overall standards for promotion and tenure and calls upon each college to develop "Faculty Performance Expectation Evaluation Elaborations and Procedures." These college-level elaborations are in turn supplemented with departmental elaborations that provide discipline-specific guidance.

These questions, incorporated into the college elaborations document, provide individuals participating in the review process a means to encourage comparable levels of rigor across all departments while also respecting individual disciplinary practices. Successful candidates will assemble files that allow reviewers to respond positively to many or most of these questions. The weight and relevance of each question will vary based on the context of the promotion file. Not every question applies to every promotion candidate.

Candidates are encouraged to assemble promotion files that provide reviewers with sufficient reason to answer as many of these questions as possible in the affirmative. The faculty cover letter, vita, and documentary evidence should highlight elements of the record that bear most directly upon the promotion criteria as expressed in the *Faculty Manual*, the college expectations, and the departmental elaborations.

Teaching

1. As a teacher, does this individual make a unique contribution to the department's potential for excellence in teaching to the extent that the candidate's absence would diminish the quality of instruction in the department or the college?
2. Has the candidate established a pattern of engaged instruction and effective advising, with examples of students whose successes can be attributed to the efforts and skills of the candidate?
3. Has the candidate presented evidence of effective participation in activities such as curriculum development, program assessment, and the creation of special projects that engage students in discipline-specific activities?

4. If asked to cite an individual who has the potential to contribute to a department's reputation for teaching excellence, would a reasonable person choose this candidate as an example and thus worthy of emulation?
5. Does the candidate's scholarship/creative activity enhance the candidate's teaching as is consistent with the Teacher-Scholar model?
6. Has the candidate presented specific examples of currency in teaching practices, technologies, and advancements in the candidate's field and has the candidate used this knowledge to improve instruction?
7. Has the candidate taken responsibility for assembling a teaching record that provides evidence of effectiveness that goes beyond institutional teaching evaluations?
8. Does the candidate have a clearly-articulated and defensible teaching philosophy and is that philosophy reflected in the teaching materials submitted for review?
9. Where appropriate, does the candidate make use of the university's professional development resources to improve teaching effectiveness?
10. Has the candidate presented evidence of a self-reflective and self-critical approach to teaching and shown a pattern of developing or sustained effectiveness during the review period?

Scholarly/Creative Activity

1. Could the candidate be considered an accomplished practitioner in the discipline and thus have the potential to contribute to the university's public engagement mission?
2. In circumstances where significant institutional support (internal grants, course reassignments, professional development funds, and scholarly reassignments) has been provided for scholarly/creative activity, is the outcome of the support commensurate with the resources provided?
3. Has the candidate sought opportunities for peer review, adjudication, and affirmation by disciplinary peers, and does the pattern of scholarly/creative activity suggest either potential or actual excellence is present?
4. Is there a trajectory in the candidate's CV and narrative that demonstrates integration of professional activities/conferences/recitals and publication/performances/installations?

5. Is there evidence of scaling or translation of scholarly/creative/professional output into teaching initiatives or pedagogical innovation as is consistent with the Teacher-Scholar Model?
6. Does the candidate provide evidence of a productive process of professional accomplishment, with projects initiated, developed, adjudicated, and disseminated in a mature form appropriate to the discipline?
7. Does the candidate's narrative describe challenges encountered in the scholarship/creative activity area, and include explanations as to how those challenges were overcome?
8. Is there a clear presentation and delineation of the quality of research/creative activity so that individuals participating in the review process are able to distinguish between major, minor, and negligible scholarship/creative activity?
9. Does the candidate state clearly the nature of the review/adjudication/evaluation of projects, and provide an explanation of scale, tiers, and/or impact factors as is customary in the given discipline?
10. Does the candidate present a record of scholarship/creative activity that is likely to establish or maintain the candidate's reputation as an outstanding and productive member of a scholarly/creative community?

Service

1. Has the candidate presented an overall record of service accomplishments of such a nature that the positive impact of such service can be articulated?
2. Does the candidate's service benefit the department and is there evidence the candidate undertook, at minimum, a proportionate level of service necessary for departmental success?
3. Has the candidate sought service at the college level, and does that activity reflect a sense of responsibility for the shared service burdens of the academic community?
4. Has the candidate made university-level service contributions and has that service made a positive impact on the operations of the institution?
5. Did the candidate take advantage of opportunities to serve the local and university community in his/her area of expertise and was that community service performed effectively and/or with distinction?

6. Does the candidate's service reflect leadership potential as indicated by serving as a chair or in another responsible position that requires engaged participation in the service project, as appropriate to time at rank?
7. Does the candidate present a service record of specific contributions that would be missed and difficult to replace in the absence of the candidate?
8. Does the candidate's narrative describe challenges encountered in the service area, and include explanations as to how those challenges were overcome?
9. Has the candidate distinguished him- or herself in the area of faculty leadership and advocacy, setting an example of constructive engagement in shared governance?
10. Does the candidate present a record of service to the profession or to a discipline through participation in and leadership of professional organizations?