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INTRODUCTION

The Coastal Carolina University Faculty Manual serves as the basis for The College of Science (COS) Faculty Handbook. The COS Faculty Handbook details the policies and procedures specific to the College of Science. The College of Science follows the policies and procedures outlined by the University, Faculty Senate, and University’s Student Handbook.

If questions arise concerning apparent differences between these documents, University documents supersede the COS Faculty Handbook.

Changes to the COS Faculty Handbook are made by a majority vote by the College of Science faculty. Proposed changes must be submitted in writing to the Dean’s Office. The Dean will inform all faculty members in writing of proposed changes. Changes to policies will be voted on by COS faculty.
COLLEGE OF SCIENCE MISSION STATEMENT

The primary mission of the College of Science is to educate our students in their chosen disciplines by providing them with excellent educational experiences in the classroom, and with research, internship, field experience, mentoring, and service learning opportunities. Further, the College is committed to preparing our majors to excel in graduate and professional programs and to be competitive in the job market.

In recognition of science as a foundation of modern society and of a comprehensive liberal arts education, our mission includes providing quality science education for all students of the University so that they become scientifically literate and productive citizens.

Finally, the College recognizes its important role as the University's focal point for scientific scholarship and expertise, and as an active contributor to the advancement of science. Centers and Initiatives serve to facilitate basic and applied research in areas where college research directions and regional needs are well matched.
COLLEGE OF SCIENCE ADMINISTRATORS

The COS administrators include the Dean, Associate Dean, Assistant Dean and the Department Chairs. For each of these the policy, terms of appointment, and the responsibilities are given.

Dean
In addition to University Academic policy ACAD–112, the COS Dean’s responsibilities include:
1. submitting the College and departmental budgets for approval;
2. recommending faculty salaries in conjunction with recommendations from department chairs;
3. recommending matters relating to faculty appointments, retention, promotion, and termination in conjunction with recommendations from department chairs and/or departmental peer review committees;
4. submission of course offering schedules based on schedules developed by department chairs and the Assistant Dean;
5. promotion and monitoring of effective academic advising;
6. developing the education programs of the University in conjunction with the faculty;
7. supervising faculty and staff;
8. providing a written evaluation of each pre-tenure faculty member at the conclusion of their annual faculty conference;
9. fostering excellence in teaching; and
10. working with the University President and the Vice President for Philanthropy in external fundraising.

Associate Dean
In addition to University Academic policy ACAD-116, the Associate Dean’s responsibilities include:
1. providing information and assistance to students concerning College and University academic policies and procedures;
2. assisting the Dean in the initiation and maintenance of new academic programs including the graduate program;
3. representing the College in the Dean's absence; and
4. performing other duties and projects as assigned by the Dean.

Assistant Dean
In addition to University Academic policy ACAD-116, the Assistant Dean’s responsibilities include:
1. providing information and assistance to students concerning College and University academic policies and procedures;
2. coordinating with department chairs and the Registrar in constructing and submitting semester and summer class schedules;
3. maintaining records and submitting requests to the office of Academic Affairs for employing and compensating part-time faculty and full-time faculty teaching on an overload basis;
4. serving on the University scholarship committee;
5. preparing a draft, in coordination with the Dean, of the College's annual report;
6. representing the College in the Dean's and Associate Dean’s absence; and
7. performing other duties and projects as assigned by the Dean.

**Department Chairs**

In addition to University Academic Policy ACAD–114, Department Chair’s responsibilities include:

1. coordinating the daily operation of the academic unit;
2. scheduling courses in coordination with other department chairs and supervising instruction within the department;
3. recruiting, mentoring and retaining departmental faculty;
4. evaluating faculty with annual recommendations to the Dean by June 1;
   a. Tenure-track faculty in the pre-tenure period are evaluated by the departmental peer-review committee with a recommendation for renewal/non-renewal, using the **Reappointment Recommendation form**. This evaluation is reviewed by the Chair who also provides their own written evaluation utilizing the **College form**.
   b. Tenured faculty are reviewed annually by the Chair utilizing the **College Performance Expectations**. Chairs report their evaluations utilizing the **College form**.
   c. Non-tenure track faculty (Instructors, Lecturers, Teaching Associates) are evaluated utilizing the **College Performance Expectations** that refer to teaching – there is no scholarly or service expectations for these faculty. Chairs report their evaluations utilizing the **Non-Tenure Track Evaluation form**.
5. preparing letter for Promotion and Tenure file of applicant(s) from the department;
6. coordinating departmental requests for library acquisitions;
7. reviewing, evaluating, and modifying departmental courses and curriculum;
8. preparing and maintaining current departmental and pre-professional brochures;
9. cooperating with the Director of Admissions in the recruitment of excellent students;
10. modeling the university’s teacher/scholar model to the faculty of the department; and
11. informing faculty of the Departmental and College procedures relating faculty evaluation to merit salary increases;

**Evaluation of the Department Chair**

Because the Department Chair has a significant role as a model for faculty (instruction, research and service responsibilities), evaluation of Chairs in the College of Science consists of two major components: evaluation as a faculty member and evaluation as an administrator.

**Procedure:**

1. The Department Chair submits to the Dean an annual report of their “faculty” activities at the same time their faculty's annual reports are due. This report uses the College's standard form for faculty annual reports.
2. In addition to the above report, the chair also submits to the Dean an annual report of their administrative activities following the College's form for administrative activities.
3. Evaluation by the Dean is accomplished on both forms and returned to the chair by July 15. Chairs have an opportunity to meet with the Dean concerning the evaluation before salary increases are determined.
4. The administrative function of Department Chairs in the College of Science is evaluated by the Dean in each of the following areas of responsibility:
   a. Representation of the Department
      • Effectiveness in representing the department and its programs on campus and in the community
      • Effectiveness in representing and supporting the department faculty and programs within the university
      • Effectiveness in the interaction with public relations and admissions
   b. Interaction with Faculty
      • Effectiveness in mentoring faculty
      • Effectiveness in supporting all faculty in the department
      • Effectiveness of communication within the department and between the faculty and other offices on campus
   c. Leadership
      • Effectiveness of planning and assessment of the department's strategic plan
      • Knowledge of trends in the discipline, both in teaching and research
      • Effectiveness in building a departmental team
      • Effectiveness in making timely decisions and building consensus
   d. Handling of Budget
      • Effectiveness in planning budget in conjunction with departmental strategic plan
      • Effectiveness in use of budget and spending within the budget
      • Effectiveness in use of the budget in obtaining additional funds on campus
   e. Enrollment Management
      • Effectiveness of management of departmental space in cooperation with other departments and the Dean's office
      • Effectiveness in the management of course schedules to maximize efficiency in planning the number of required courses and sections to serve the students in a timely fashion
      • Effectiveness in recruitment of excellent students in cooperation with the Admissions Office
   f. Focus on Students
      • Effectiveness in the direction and management of departmental advising, both in schedule making and in career planning
      • Effectiveness as an advisor for both faculty and students
      • Effectiveness in building a user-friendly atmosphere in the office and in the department
      • Effectiveness in streamlining various procedures to reduce the paperwork and time for students seeking registration, undergraduate research, addition and withdrawal from classes, etc.
      • Effectiveness in stimulating esprit de corps
   g. Support of College and University Administration
      • Effectiveness of assistance to the administration in strategic planning
      • Effectiveness in communication with other College administrators (Chairs and Dean's office personnel) in solving problems
      • Willingness to assist in the improvement of the College's administration with constructive criticism and advice.
The Dean and the Department Chairs must discuss and mutually agree upon the criteria used for evaluating each of the above.

**Selection of the Department Chair**

For the College of Science:

1. Terms of Appointment
   a. Reappointment, for a maximum term of three years after completion of the initial term is initiated by the Dean who consults the Departmental Faculty and secures the approval of the Provost. The Dean should initiate these consultations at the beginning of the Fall semester of the Chair’s third or sixth year. The Dean consults with the faculty of the department and a vote for reappointment is taken. The Dean then consults with the Chair as to the results of the vote and the Chair’s desire for reappointment.
   b. Reappointment beyond the second term is initiated by the Department. If a majority of the faculty in the department decide by vote that reappointment of the Chair beyond the second term is in their best interest they inform the Dean in writing who then informs the Provost. If the Dean and Provost concur with the Department the Chair is reappointed for another three-year term. If the Dean and Provost disagree with the departments’ decision a new Chair will be selected using the procedures described in the next section.
   c. The appointment may be terminated at any time by the Dean after consultation with the faculty in the department and with the approval of the Provost.

2. Selection Procedure
   a. When a vacancy or new position occurs, the Dean informs the faculty of the department in writing. The Departmental Faculty may request to seek an internal candidate or an external candidate.

   **Internal Search**
   1) The Dean:
      a) meets with the potential candidate(s)
      b) describes the duties of the Chair.
      c) consults with the Department as to the suitability of the candidate(s). A vote is taken in the department to record the department’s recommendation.
   2) If the Dean and the department find the candidate to be suitable, the Dean recommends the appointment to the Provost.
   3) In accordance with the Faculty Manual the Dean and Provost have final decision-making authority in hiring candidates.

   **External Search**
   Departmental Faculty form a Search Committee that consists of six individuals: four tenure-track faculty in the department (one of whom is appointed by the Dean); a junior or senior student; and the Chair of another Department (appointed by the Dean) who will act as Chair of the committee. The Search Committee determines the student’s role in the search. If the department does not have the required number of faculty, then the tenure-track faculty, in consultation with the Dean, may elect tenured
faculty from another department. The outgoing Department Chair may not serve on the Search Committee.

b. The Dean, with the approval of the Provost, requests the Human Resources office to place a notice of vacancy in the appropriate professional journal or personnel newsletter and in one general publication such as the Chronicle of Higher Education.

c. The search committee receives vitae and references for all candidates and, after consulting with the Dean, conducts interviews with promising candidates. The number of external candidates may not exceed three, except with the specific approval of the Provost.

d. Examples of written materials are a part of each candidate's application and file. Each candidate makes at least one oral presentation as part of the interview process. This presentation should be a report on previous or current research, and/or a teaching presentation and be made before faculty and, when possible, students.

e. When the interviews have been completed, the Search Committee solicits feedback from the Department and recommends in writing at most three candidates to the Dean. All letters of recommendation and other materials received are also given to the Dean. In the College of Science, the Search Committee ranks the candidates as to the Search Committee’s preference. The Dean submits this ranking to the Provost.

f. The Dean has the option of requesting a written justification of the committee’s recommendations or instructing the committee to resume the search.

g. The Dean recommends an appointment and forwards all materials to the Provost. The Provost either approves the appointment or asks the Search Committee to submit additional names.


**FACULTY**

Faculty organization, responsibilities and rights, appointments, promotion and tenure are specified in this section.

**Faculty Organization**
Faculty membership is defined, the functions of the faculty are given, and details for regular faculty, University-wide and ad hoc committees are specified in the University’s [Faculty Manual](#).

**Responsibilities and Rights**
The University’s [Faculty Manual](#) gives faculty responsibilities, rights, and privileges. The faculty grievance procedures are also explained. Specific to the COS are the following:

**Faculty Responsibilities**

**Classroom Procedures for Faculty**
1. Write and distribute syllabi for each class taught every semester. Syllabi must include instructional objectives, student learning outcomes, grading procedures, a statement of the relationship to a laboratory and to laboratory safety procedures if appropriate, and attendance policies. (Refer to the University Catalog statement on “Class Attendance”). Syllabus must be filed in the Department. The Department will send copies to the Dean’s office within the first week of each semester.
2. Meet classes regularly, beginning and ending classes at stated times. No classes may be canceled without prior approval of the Department Chair. In the case of illness or emergency, faculty must notify the Department Chair before the scheduled class meeting;
3. Schedule and post reasonable office hours for student conferences. The minimum number of expected office hours per week is determined in consultation with the Department Chair.
4. Assist in providing program accessibility to self-identified qualified students with disabilities by making reasonable accommodations for their disability. Faculty members should consult with appropriate personnel in Office of Accessibility and Disability Services.
5. Participate, as needed, in the on-going assessment activities of the Department.
6. Provide a work and educational environment free from harassment. Policies are located on the policy website for sexual harassment ([UNIV-467](#)) and sexual assault/violence ([UNIV-465](#)).

**Work Responsibilities**
Specific to the COS are the following:
The [Faculty Manual](#) stipulates the normal load. In the College, variations exist in teaching loads that are determined by the faculty member, Department Chair, and the Dean. Faculty teaching a 600-level graduate course or overseeing a graduate student’s thesis will have a teaching load of 9 contact hours or less per semester.

Recognizing that a faculty member’s professional responsibilities include more than time spent in the classroom, the University expects faculty to use the time afforded them within
their normal working day to engage in University-related activities including committee assignments and scholarly pursuits. To permit these activities to be accomplished in a reasonable manner, the Department Chair should assign a teaching schedule that allows for student access to faculty, permits adequate time for preparation and travel to/from off-campus assignments, and takes into account other special circumstances unique to the courses taught.

Ideally, faculty scholarship should be indistinguishable from teaching and instructional activities. Scholarly activity and teaching are mutually supportive imperatives and good inspired teaching should be the impetus for the creation of an inquiry driven learning environment. Thus, providing time for faculty to pursue research and to mentor undergraduate and graduate students involved in research are desirable objectives.

**Examination and Grading Policy**

In addition to the University Faculty Manual, policies specific to COS are as follows:

In any course which meets three times per week, no quiz, test, or examination may be given during the last two class meetings prior to the regularly scheduled examination period. In any course which meets once or twice a week, no quiz, test, or examination may be given during the last class meeting prior to the regular examination period.

**Student Complaints and Grievances**

The University policy for student complaints is given in STUD-330.

The faculty and administration of the College of Science are sensitive to student complaints and grievances. By definition, student complaints involve teaching, classroom performance, advising and other instructor-related problems exclusive of issues involving cheating, plagiarism or related to harassment. Complaints are vocalized and not initiated in writing. Grievances are typically more serious than complaints and should be initiated in writing following the policies outlined in the Student Handbook (this includes incidents of plagiarism and harassment). Grievances (in writing) may also result from complaints that the student feels have not been addressed by the Instructor, Department Chair, or Dean. The faculty and the administration of the College will address complaints and grievances in the following manner:

1. Complaints concerning teaching, grading, advising or classroom techniques (not involving cheating, plagiarism or harassment) should be initiated with the instructor. College Administrators (Deans and Chairs) should direct the student to talk with the instructor first.
2. Complaints that are not resolved by discussions involving the faculty member and the student (as viewed by either party) should be verbally brought to the attention of the Chair. If the Chair, in meeting separately with the faculty member and the student, cannot solve the problem the Chair should inform the student of the right to submit a written grievance. If the problem is not resolved from the faculty member's point of view, the faculty member should refer to the Faculty Manual of the University for procedures related to grievances.
3. Grievances presented to the Chair are first investigated as completely as possible by the Chair including separate interviews with the faculty member and student and any other individuals who have firsthand knowledge of the grievance. The Chair then calls a meeting with the faculty member and the student together in an attempt to resolve the problem. If the problem cannot be resolved, the student should be advised to present the grievance to the Dean.

4. Grievances presented to the Dean are first investigated as completely as possible by the Dean including separate interviews with the faculty member and Departmental Chair and with the student and any other individuals who have firsthand knowledge of the grievance. If the grievance involves specific serious problems such as cheating, plagiarism, or harassment, the Dean will instruct the student and/or faculty member as to procedures included in other university documents. If the grievance has resulted from a complaint that was not settled at the department level, the Dean will attempt to solve the problem by calling a meeting with the faculty member and Departmental Chair and with the student. If not settled by this meeting, the Dean will advise the student that they have the right to continue the grievance in writing with the Provost.

Office of Academic Integrity
The Office of Academic Integrity handles all issues pertaining to academic dishonesty including plagiarism, cheating, forging, altering, and misusing information, and furnishing false information. Faculty and students who become aware of academic dishonesty violations should contact the Academic Integrity Officer to report the violation. The resolution process of academic violations and more information about how this office can help faculty and students can be found at: [https://www.coastal.edu/academicintegrity/](https://www.coastal.edu/academicintegrity/).

Appointments, Promotion, and Tenure
Faculty appointments, promotion and tenure are detailed in the Faculty Manual.

Faculty Ranks and Titles
COS titles may include the following:
- Teaching Associate
- Instructor *
- Senior Instructor *
- Teaching Lecturer
- Senior Teaching Lecturer
- Visiting Assistant, Associate or Professor
- Adjunct Assistant, Associate or Professor
- Research Assistant, Associate or Professor
- Assistant, Associate or Professor

*Faculty are no longer hired or awarded these titles.
Graduate Faculty in the College of Science
The College of Science selects faculty to teach at the graduate level based on degree earned and record of quality in teaching and scholarship. Approval of faculty to teach, advise, and/or direct thesis research or professional internships/experiences at the graduate level rests with the faculty through the uniform application of the following expectations.

1. Faculty who teach at the graduate level are expected to hold the terminal degree, in the teaching discipline or a related discipline.
2. Faculty who teach at the graduate level are expected to demonstrate a high level of competence in teaching and scholarship and to be active research scholars or involved in creative productivity.
3. In unusual cases an individual without a terminal degree may be selected to teach at the graduate level if they have demonstrated exceptional scholarly or creative activity and/or noteworthy professional experience. In such cases, the Department acting through the Chair where such a faculty member is selected will justify this appointment in writing to the Dean for approval. Once approved, the justification will be added to the faculty member’s permanent file.
4. In most cases, individuals who teach at the graduate level are selected from the tenure-track, full-time faculty at the University. In some cases due to special curricular needs or high enrollment, all instructional needs cannot be met by faculty members who are employed by the University on a full-time basis. In such instances, additional individuals are employed on a part-time or adjunct basis using the aforementioned criteria for the selection of individuals to teach at the graduate level and normal hiring practices of the University being followed.

Tenure
The following are specific to the COS.

Tenure Criteria
Faculty in the College of Science holds that the most important evaluation of untenured faculty for promotion and tenure is at the departmental level. Therefore, peer review at the departmental level should provide ongoing mentoring and evaluation throughout the probationary period. A file illustrating progress towards tenure should be maintained by the faculty member and should include activity reports, the departmental peer review committee performance evaluations, Department Chair evaluations, Dean evaluations, teaching evaluations, and other supporting documentation.

A faculty member applying for tenure is evaluated according to the following categories and their relative weights (faculty in the College of Science should also refer to the Performance Expectations Document as well as the document titled Framework for Tenure Decisions).

Teaching Effectiveness (60 Percent)
   a) Academic advisement
   b) Experience
   c) Instructional techniques
   d) Knowledge of materials
Scholarship and Professional Activities (40 Percent)
   a) Accomplishments in the arts, where applicable
   b) Active participation in professional organizations
   c) University committee service
   d) Presentations at professional meetings
   e) Professional contributions to the Community
   f) Scholarly publications
   g) Support of student activities
   h) Other professional pursuits

Promotion and Tenure Procedures
Procedures specific to the COS are as follows:
1. Departmental Peer Review Committee
   a. Composition
      The composition of the Departmental Peer Review Committee is determined by each department. The Department Chair may not serve on this committee. Departments may also form individual peer mentoring committees for each tenure-track faculty member in addition to the Departmental Peer Review Committee.
   b. Annual Duties
      i) Evaluation
         During the probationary period of an untenured faculty member in the College of Science, the Departmental Peer Review Committee evaluates a faculty member’s progress toward promotion and tenure. The components and scheduling of the review (classroom visitation, review of scholarship, meetings, etc.) are determined by each department.

      ii) Continuing Appointment Recommendation and Performance Evaluation Letter
         During the probationary period of an untenured faculty member in the College of Science, the Departmental Peer Review Committee is responsible for the annual submission of a Reappointment Recommendation form. This form requires “a summary of the committee’s comments and/or written statement,” i.e., a Performance Evaluation Letter. The committee submits the letter and the form, including a record of the vote on the candidate, to the Department Chair. Following any written comments by the Chair, the Continuing Appointment Recommendation form and the Performance Evaluation Letter is submitted to the Dean for additional comments. The untenured faculty member is required to provide the committee with a current curriculum vitae and annual activity report, and to meet with the Chair and the Dean each year of the probationary period for review of the candidate’s progress toward tenure.

      iii) Tenure Year Duties
         The Chair of the Department Peer Review Committee (elected by the committee) convenes a meeting of the Committee after the candidate’s tenure file has been available to all eligible faculty members. After a review of the tenure file, the Committee votes whether to support the candidate’s tenure and/or promotion.
The results of that vote are reported to the Department Chair in writing with a brief written summary of the committee’s findings.

Also, the Departmental Peer Review Committee writes a letter of review which is then added to the candidate’s tenure file. Thus, in the College of Science, a candidate’s file includes a letter from both the Departmental Peer Review Committee and the COS Promotion and Tenure Committee.

2. **College of Science Promotion and Tenure Committee (COS P&T)**
   The purpose of the committee is to review and evaluate all faculty member application files for tenure, promotion, and post-tenure review. This committee is comprised of one tenured faculty member elected from each of the Departments in the College. Faculty serve one to three-year staggered terms. Tenured faculty in related disciplines may also be elected if necessary at the discretion of the electing department. All full-time faculty in each Department are eligible to vote in the election of a COS P & T representative from their department.

   The Chair of the COS P & T Committee is elected by the members of the committee during the first meeting of each academic year.

   Upon receipt of faculty files from the Dean, the committee establishes a time frame for completion of its work. Each committee member reads and reviews each faculty file. The committee members discuss the results and the rationale of their assessments of each candidate after each member has had the opportunity to review the file and make the appropriate observations.

   The committee then writes a letter to the Dean who evaluates and addresses the following on the basis of the Departmental and College guidelines for promotion and tenure:
   - a. Teaching Effectiveness
   - b. Scholarship and Professional Activities
   - c. Service to the University and Community

   The letter must provide a clear and unambiguous justification for the recommendation by enumerating how the candidate met or failed to meet the particular criteria. If the recommendation is against the candidate, the letter must provide steps for the candidate to correct this situation for future P&T applications. The letter from the COS P & T Committee will be placed in the candidate’s file, including the numerical vote on the candidate, and all materials will be returned to the Dean of the College.

3. **Submission of Tenure Files**
   The Provost notifies tenure eligible faculty members in writing to prepare their files. Faculty members have the responsibility to initiate their own candidacies for promotion and/or tenure by submitting their files to their Department Chairs by the published deadline for that academic year. No files are accepted after the published deadline. Candidates announce to their Dean and Department Chair or equivalent as early as possible their intent to apply for promotion and/or tenure. At this time the Department
Chair and the candidate will establish a timeline for file submission to the Department Chair.

The Departmental Peer Review Committees and all other tenure-track faculty in the department will have one week to review and comment on the file (held in a secure fashion and checked out to faculty by the department chair). Before submission it is the candidate’s responsibility to check that the file is complete and in order.

Post Tenure Review
Procedures for post tenure review are described in the University's the Faculty Manual.

Third Year Review within the COS
Purpose
The Third Year Review assesses the progress of a tenure-track faculty member toward meeting the performance criteria for tenure and promotion to associate professor.

Timeline and Process
In the spring of a faculty member’s third year, he/she prepares a Third Year Review Promotion and Tenure file. The file is to include, but is not limited to:

1. A cover letter addressed to the Dean describing their progress and future plans.
2. Updated vitae.
3. Letter of Expectations
4. Annual Faculty Activity Reports
5. Chair’s evaluations
6. Dean’s evaluations
7. Departmental Peer Review Committee letters (Reappointment Recommendations)
8. Teaching statement and evidence of outcomes
9. Research statement and evidence of outcomes
10. Service statement and evidence of outcomes

The Departmental Peer Review Committee will review the file and write a letter addressing the performance criteria for promotion and tenure. The Department Chair will also produce a written comprehensive analysis of the faculty’s progress. After both of these letters are included in the file, the faculty member will meet and discuss these assessments with the Chair. The faculty member will have the opportunity to respond to the assessments and add material to the file if he/she so desires before the next step.

The next step is for the file to be sent to the Dean and COS Promotion and Tenure Committee by the deadline determined in advance by the Dean. First the COS P&T Committee will review the file and provide written feedback for the candidate. Next the Dean will review the file and write a summation for the faculty member of his/her progress towards tenure and promotion to associate professor.

All letters should address the evidence presented for meeting the performance criteria for tenure and promotion to associate professor and for demonstrating ongoing growth as a teacher and a scholar.
Sustained and Outstanding Defined within the COS for Promotion to Professor

Teaching

In teaching, the primary metric for determining sustained activity is the regular presentation of a reflective piece in the annual faculty report, leading to changes in the teaching approach. The change in teaching approach may be documented in several ways, including peer visitation and attendance at CETL workshops, but the key issue is that the changes are clearly identifiable as responses to previous evaluations. These changes should be interpretable as part of a teaching philosophy that can be understood through the framework presented in the reflective portion of the annual faculty report.

Outstanding teaching can be demonstrated by the faculty member emerging as a leader of the pedagogical activities in the Department and College. This could be demonstrated by overall scores on student evaluations, reports of peer visitations, or the faculty member’s activity as a peer-reviewer of teaching for the Department and College. Additional evidence of leadership in the department may arise through the development of new courses and curricula.

The letters of review of the faculty member from Chair, Committee and Dean must cite the specific examples used in establishing this level of “outstanding”, particularly indicating how their activities exceed the level of other faculty in the department. Of major importance in this area, is that the faculty member’s activities can show a clear impact on student learning—which may involve participation in the assessment processes for the department.

Scholarship

In scholarship, sustained activity can be established by a pattern of regular participation in meetings, conferences, symposia, etc that are the usual venues for the formal and informal dissemination of information to the scholarly or educational community. For example, in the field of neuroscience, yearly attendance at the Society for Neuroscience annual meeting, along with a poster presentation, could indicate sustained participation in one’s scholarly community. Sustained activity in scholarship could also be demonstrated by the regular submission of grant proposals, as well as student mentoring leading to regular presentation and publication.

Outstanding scholarly activity, within the same field of neuroscience, would be the submission of articles—often developed from these poster presentations—to “archival journals” in the field. Given the nature of Coastal Carolina University’s teacher-scholar model, a journal submission every other year would be expected in the area of neuroscience. Articles published in higher quality journals (Journal of Neuroscience, for example) occurring at less-frequent intervals, could indicate outstanding productivity.

Because of the variability in the level of productivity in the various areas of science, it is not possible to establish a universal standard for the rank of “outstanding.” However, in the recommendation letters from Chair, Committee, and Dean, field-specific metrics must be cited to establish that the level of productivity of a particular faculty member is at the appropriate level. These metrics may include comparisons of productivity with faculty in similar fields at peer and aspirant institutions, data on the quality and “impact” of the journals, citation analysis of the faculty member’s articles, and review letters from outside evaluators.
Service
In service, sustained activity is demonstrated by continual participation in university and community activities and committees that further the interests of the Department, College, and University. It is presumed that this participation is regular and extensive, with the faculty member actively contributing to the progress of the group.

Outstanding activity can be demonstrated by the faculty member achieving a leadership position in their service activities to the college, university, community, or professional field. Furthermore, this leadership position must move an agenda forward such that the duties, scope, or performance of the activity changes, and improves, over time. Service in a “caretaker” role would not constitute outstanding performance. It must be demonstrated in the letter of evaluation by Chair, Committee, and Dean, that the service activities of the faculty member made a substantial positive difference in the outcome, function, or operation of the group.

Collegiality
All faculty are expected to maintain sound professional relationships with colleagues, staff and students.

Sabbatical Leaves (Scholarly Reassignment)
The College of Science enthusiastically supports sabbatical leaves. Such leaves are absolutely critical to the performance of the teacher/scholar. Procedures for granting sabbatical leaves are described in the University's the Faculty Manual.
COMMITTEES

COS Assessment Committee
The purpose of the COS Assessment Committee is to review and assist Departments with assessment plans and reports for each program.

Duties
- Review program assessment reports each Fall. Provide feedback to the departments prior to final submission of their program reports.
- Review program assessment plans each Spring. Provide feedback to the departments prior to submission deadline of their program plan.
- Oversee and provide guidance for updating curriculum maps for each program.

Membership
The COS Assessment Committee is composed of one or more representatives from each Department, including a representative for each graduate program. The College Assistant and Associate Deans will serve in an ex-officio capacity. The College of Science Assessment Coordinator will serve as chair of the committee.

Members are elected within the Departments. Mid-term vacancies will be filled by appointment of the Department Chair. Departments with multiple programs may send a representative for each program.

Terms of Service
Each representative will serve for 3 years.

Meetings
The committee meets as necessary to discuss program assessment.

COS Course Evaluations Committee
The purpose of the COS Course Evaluations Committee is to ensure that course evaluation forms used by the College of Science provide useful information to individual faculty members about areas of strengths and weaknesses in their teaching and to Chairs and the Dean for the evaluation of the faculty member’s teaching performance.

Duties
- Assess the effectiveness of the course evaluations and report the results of these assessments to the Chairs and Dean of the College.
- Review requests from faculty members for changes in the course evaluations.
- Make recommendations for changes in the course evaluations for approval by the Dean.
- Inform the members of the College of Science about the proper administration and uses of course evaluations.

Membership
The Course Evaluations Committee will be composed of one member selected by each Department. All full-time faculty members are eligible to serve on this committee.
Members are elected by each Department before the beginning of the Fall Semester. The Committee Chair will be chosen by vote of the committee at the first meeting of the academic year.

Terms of Service
Each representative will serve a term determined by the individual department. Mid-term vacancies will be filled by an election from the department with the vacancy.

Meetings
The committee meets at least once each academic year, or on an ad-hoc basis as called for by the Dean of the College.

COS Undergraduate Curriculum Committee
The purpose of the COS Undergraduate Curriculum Committee is to provide a forum and oversight for undergraduate curriculum development within the College of Science.

Duties
• Hear and discuss broader curriculum issues (e.g., assessment procedures) and then present these issues back to the various departments for consideration.
• Make recommendations regarding curriculum proposals from the departments within the College of Science.
• Recommend departmental requests for additions, deletions, or changes in courses or programs and also evaluate proposals for new programs.
• Submit proposals meeting approval of both the department and the COS Undergraduate Curriculum Committee to the Academic Affairs Committee and/or the Core Curriculum Committee of the Faculty Senate.

Membership
The COS Undergraduate Curriculum Committee is composed of one representative from each department in the College of Science; one representative (ex-officio, voting) from the Dean’s office; and the College Assessment Coordinator (ex-officio, nonvoting). The chair of the committee will be elected from among the members of the committee.

Terms of Service
Each member serves a three-year term. Approximately one third of the committee rotates off each year. The chair of the committee will serve no more than two consecutive years as chair. Replacements, if needed, are elected immediately and serve as stipulated by the electing department. Representatives may be re-elected but should not serve more than six consecutive years. The committee reports to Academic Affairs and Academic Affairs reports to Faculty Senate.

Meetings
Meetings are held each month during the academic year. Additional meetings may be called by the committee chair. Attendance is required at each meeting. If a representative is not able to attend a meeting, the representative must select a faculty substitute.
COS Graduate Committee

The purpose of the COS Graduate Committee is to provide review and oversight for curriculum development of new graduate courses and new graduate programs within the COS. The committee makes recommendations regarding curriculum proposals of new graduate courses and new graduate programs from the departments/schools within the COS. Proposals that meet the approval of both the department/school and the COS Graduate Committee are then submitted to the Graduate Council.

Duties

• Provide a forum and oversight for the review and recommendation of new graduate courses and new graduate programs.
• Forward recommendations of new graduate courses and new graduate programs to the Graduate Council.

Membership

The COS Graduate Committee is composed of Dean/Associate Dean; two at-large COS representatives from the graduate faculty (these representatives will be elected by the COS graduate faculty and will also serve on the Graduate Council); and one representative from each of the graduate degree programs within the COS.

Terms of Service

Each representative serves a three-year term. The membership terms will be staggered among representatives as decided by the committee. Replacements for the at-large representatives, if needed, are elected immediately and serve the remainder of the prior representative’s term. Replacements for the representatives from each graduate degree program will be appointed immediately by the unit offering the graduate degree program.

Meetings

Meetings are held each month during the academic year. Additional meetings may be called by the committee chair. Attendance is required at each meeting. If a representative is not able to attend a meeting, the representative must select a graduate faculty substitute within the COS.

College Handbook Committee

The purpose of the College Handbook Committee is to keep the COS faculty handbook current with the University Faculty Manual. University policies and to propose changes and amendments as needed with college approval.

Duties

• Annually update the current version of the handbook so that it is in compliance with the University Faculty Manual and University policies.
• Annually update the current version of the handbook according to any COS approved additions or changes.
• Propose handbook changes to the COS general faculty, if needed.
Membership
The COS Handbook Committee will be composed of four members from different departments. The Assistant or Associate Dean will serve as ex-officio. Members will be elected at-large by the COS faculty. Members of the committee will elect a Chair for each academic year.

Terms of Service
Each representative will serve 3 years with at least one member of the committee rotating annually. Mid-term vacancies will be filled at the discretion of the Dean.

Meetings
The committee will meet a minimum of once per semester; however, additional meetings may be required during the COS handbook updating process.

COS Promotion and Tenure Committee
(See page 16)

COS Technology Committee
The purpose of the College Technology Committee is to compile an annual list of faculty technology requests for the use of student technology fee monies. The list is submitted for approval to the Dean of the College of Science and the Executive Director of Information Technology Services.

Duties
• Solicit technology requests from faculty within their department for the use of funds collected from the student technology fee of students majoring in science.
• Meet with committee representatives from all departments to prioritize all requests.
• Forward the ranked list to the Dean of the College of Science for approval.
• Forward the ranked list to the Executive Director of Information Technology Services for approval.
• Notify faculty within their department of approval or non-approval of their requests.

Membership
The College Technology Committee is composed of one member from each Department. Members are elected by the Departments.

Terms of Service
Each representative will serve a term determined by each individual department. Mid-term vacancies will be filled by an election from the department with the vacancy
Meetings
The committee will meet shortly after the Executive Director of Information Technology Services requests an annual list of faculty generated uses of the student technology fees. The committee will continue to meet until the list of technology requests obtains final approval.

COS Faculty Senators
The COS Faculty Senators represent the College of Science at Faculty Senate.

Membership
Senators are elected for three-year terms. The number of COS faculty senators is equal to fifteen percent of the COS faculty members. The COS Departments elects one or two members depending on two factors:
1. The number of senators representing the COS on Faculty Senate (The number for any given year is determined by Faculty Senate.).
2. The size of each Department within the COS. Small Departments may have only one senator.

Duties
It is the responsibility of the COS Faculty Senators to be present and represent the College in Faculty Senate meetings. COS Faculty Senators are expected to:
1. Inform the College faculty of issues brought before Faculty Senate.
2. Solicit input from the College faculty on issues.
3. Vote as representatives of the College.

GRANTS AND CONTRACTS

Grants are handled through the Office of Sponsored Programs and Research Services.

Contracts must receive approval from the Dean, University Counsel, and the Provost.
APPENDICIES
APPENDIX A:
College of Science Performance Expectations Document

PARTIAL LIST OF CRITERIA CONSIDERED IN EVALUATING TEACHING EFFECTIVENESS

- Student Evaluations this past year and relative pattern over time.
- Awards.
- Alumni evaluations.
- Peer evaluations.
- Evaluations by Department Chair.
- Development of new teaching methods, laboratory exercise, demonstrations and other educational experiences.
- Personal programs of study.
- Other inputs into teaching, e.g., preparing lab manuals/developing new courses.
- Professional development.

PARTIAL LIST OF MANIFESTATIONS OF RESEARCH / SCHOLARSHIP / PROFESSIONAL ACTIVITIES

- Publications (journals articles, books, etc., give complete citations) including published articles on educational methodology.
- Presentations by you or your students. (Give complete citations.)
- Grant proposals submitted and/or funded. (Give agency, project title, submission date, amount of funding requested/received.
- University-level colloquia and/or seminars presented. (Give places, dates, titles.)
- Undergraduate research under direction and/or completed. (List student, title, dates begun and expected date of completion.)
- Service as a grant proposal reviewer for a funding agency.
- Service as a reviewer/editor for a periodical.
- Consulting in field of expertise.
- Production of instructional material, e.g., computer programs, lab manuals, lab experiments, demonstrations, anything that “breaks new ground” and “transcends ordinary instructional materials” and that ideally involve some peer interaction/review.
- Participation in workshops. (Give location/nature of workshop.)
- Courses completed. (Give institution, dates.)
- Sabbatical leaves/summer leaves. (Give location/nature of activity.)
- Professional development.

PARTIAL LIST OF CREDITABLE UNIVERSITY / PUBLIC SERVICE

- Work on University committees. (List committee, nature of contributions, dates.)
- Work on commissions, task forces, etc., outside the university wherein your contribution is directly related to your fields of expertise. (List group, nature of contribution, dates.)
- Service to schools, e.g., science fairs, talks, workshops conducted, etc.
- Other administrative duties within the University.
- Other public service, e.g., talks to service groups. (Dates, titles, groups.)
- Advising of students.
- Advising club/organizations.
- Unpaid consultantships.
The faculty of the College of Science abide by the Teacher-Scholar model for the annual review of faculty and for evaluation for promotion and tenure. In addition, the College affirms that the most important evaluation of untenured faculty for promotion and tenure is at the departmental level. Therefore, peer review at the departmental level should provide ongoing mentoring and evaluation throughout the probationary period in a way that is consistent with the criteria used for promotion and tenure. A file illustrating progress toward tenure should be maintained by the faculty member and should include activity reports, the departmental peer review committee performance evaluations, departmental chair evaluations, Dean evaluations, teaching evaluations, and other supporting documents (as explained below).

A faculty member applying for tenure will be evaluated according to the general categories of Teaching, Scholarship, and Service. Faculty are expected to perform well in all three areas, and their effectiveness can be demonstrated through a number of different activities as listed below. Of course, no individual will document all activities in all categories, but most successful individuals will be able to demonstrate significant accomplishments in multiple activities under each of the three general areas. This document should not be interpreted as constraining faculty from developing activities not mentioned in the elaborations within each section. Along with appropriate supporting data, faculty have the freedom to present their activities following the general guidelines of University and College procedures that may not follow the specifically prescribed categories listed below. It should be noted that in some cases the area under which a specific activity is listed is arbitrary. Depending upon the way in which an activity is developed, it may be evaluated as either teaching or scholarship.

The general guideline for the three areas is outlined in the University’s Faculty Manual.

1) Teaching Effectiveness:
Consistent with the University Mission Statement, the College of Science values quality educational experiences above all, and excellence in teaching is expected. Additionally, reflective practice that demonstrates continued growth as a teacher is highly valued; this is demonstrated by the yearly reflective assessment of teaching (performed as part of the yearly faculty evaluation process) coupled with peer observation and student evaluation of teaching. Effective teachers: 1) act as learners, and value input that can positively impact their practice, and students’ learning; 2) treat all interactions with students as an opportunity for learning, including situations such as mentoring students in research experiences; 3) are available to students; and 4) provide timely feedback to students. Teaching effectiveness can be demonstrated using the indicators listed below. This list is not intended to be complete and inclusive; other measures may be appropriate for evaluating a faculty members’ approach toward their teaching.
**Student evaluations**
Formal course evaluations should be available for all the courses taught by the faculty member. Student evaluation data should be gathered in an objective fashion, supported by college and departmental standards. The preponderance of the evaluations when viewed over time should indicate that faculty are committed to the quality of their teaching. Written comments should supplement student survey data and inform the interpretation of the student evaluations.

**Peer evaluations**
Classroom visitations should be made on a regular basis coordinated by the departmental chairs. These reports should include the opportunity for the faculty member to respond to the comments; reflective practice is one hallmark of an effective teacher.

**Teaching awards**
These types of award can provide evidence that the faculty member is viewed by students and colleagues as performing well in the classroom.

**Evaluations by Department Chair and/or Departmental Peer Review Committee**
Chair/PRC evaluations of faculty teaching performance should support and expand on the evaluations provided by students and peer evaluators. These evaluations could also provide context for the candidate’s teaching duties within the department/curriculum as a whole. A distinction should be made concerning teaching performance at graduate and undergraduate courses.

**Direction of student research**
The teacher-scholar model presumes that one’s scholarly expertise is passed on to the next generation of scholars. In this regard, it is important that undergraduate students (and graduate students, where appropriate) are actively involved in the scholarly enterprise. This interaction with students should effectively demonstrate the complete process of scientific inquiry from research design, data analysis, writing, and potentially presentation and/or publication.

**Alumni evaluations/testimonials**
Supporting letters or formal alumni surveys can provide extremely valuable insight on how a faculty member’s teaching has been a transforming event. Often the value of an educational approach is not appreciated until a student enters the “real world.”

**Development of new courses**
Efforts toward the development of new courses/curricula serve to demonstrate the faculty member’s currency with trends in the field. Course development also indicates a willingness to ensure that students are educated to the best of their/our abilities.
Development of new teaching materials, laboratory exercises, demonstrations, and other educational experiences
New materials added to existing courses also indicate a desire to maintain the currency of our educational offerings and ensure that our students are up to date in their chosen fields of study. Furthermore, attention to course development may improve the effectiveness of one’s teaching and deepen the learning of one’s students. Materials that are used widely are especially effective for demonstrating faculty commitment toward teaching/learning development.

2) Scholarship/Research:
As mentioned above, the College and University value the teacher-scholar model; effective teaching coupled with continued development as a scholar is expected. In this area, an effective scholar: 1) builds on previous experiences, and 2) demonstrates continued and sustainable scholarly growth. It is expected that these efforts lead to peer-evaluated contributions to a field of study. Emphasis is placed on the quality of these contributions, versus quantity. Additionally, student involvement in these pursuits is highly valued. Scholarly activity can include the scholarship of teaching and learning. In all cases, a well-documented body of quality scholarly activity should exist. Criteria for determining effectiveness in the area of scholarly activity are listed below. This list is not intended to be complete and inclusive; other indicators may be appropriate in some scholarly fields.

Publication in peer-reviewed journals/peer-reviewed proceedings
The development of a research program that leads to scholarly publication in peer-reviewed volumes is one standard for evaluation of scholarship. Consideration should be paid to the impact of the journal—measurable by different criteria in different fields—as well as citations of the work by others. Care should be taken to assure the establishment of indicators that are field specific, as well as taking into account the research environment at the institution. In some fields, the preparation of published proceedings is considered equivalent to traditional peer-reviewed journal publications.

Publication of a book
The publication of a book (such as a scholarly volume, textbook, or study guide), or of a chapter within a book provides good evidence that a faculty member is engaged with their field. The impact of the book upon the field could be evaluated through several criteria.

Awarding of a patent
In several areas of the sciences—particularly the applied sciences—the preparation of a patent application and the awarding of the patent can constitute an end point of scholarly activity equivalent to the preparation and publishing of articles and/or the preparation and awarding of research grants.
Conference presentations/workshops and invited talks
A positive evaluation of scholarship can also be made upon the regular presentation at conferences, including conference presentations by the faculty member’s students. In many cases regular presentation at general meetings can result in a body of work suitable for publication. The quality of the scholarship may be further indicated by peer review in the selection of abstracts or by peer-reviewed publication in conference proceedings. Invited presentations (individual or panel) at regional, national and international conferences also indicate scholarly “reputation” as do invited presentations at scholarly and university symposia and seminars. As mentioned above, in some fields publication in select conference proceedings may carry similar weight to peer-reviewed journal publications.

Technical reports and policy papers
In some fields of study the standard for scholarly output is the preparation of policy papers and technical reports. These are sometimes the expected outcome of funded grants and contracts. These reports should be evaluated using similar standards for quality used in the evaluation of other publications.

Dissemination of non-traditional scholarly activities
Dissemination of non-traditional materials including: engineering projects, software engineering projects, scholarly PowerPoint presentations, web sites, algorithms, e-books, and other contemporary forms can provide evidence that a faculty member is engaged in the discipline. Adoption of these materials by the academic community can be used as a criterion for evaluation of the quality of the contribution.

Production of teaching materials
Scholarly activity is not just a result of traditional inquiry-based scholarship. The dissemination of new pedagogical techniques, materials, and approaches, through publication in peer-reviewed journals, presentation at conferences, or other highly effective dissemination venues, is consistent with the university’s teacher-scholar model of faculty responsibility.

Research awards
Research awards (and nominations for these awards) provide evidence that the faculty member is recognized as a scholar and his/her contributions are important to the field.

Invited membership on conference program committees
Serving on conference program and planning committees or as a session organizer or session chair can be evidence of scholarly reputation and involvement.

Grant proposals submitted/funded
The preparation and revision of grant proposals provide evidence that a faculty member’s scholarly activities are developing/expanding. The tangible and measurable output of these activities could include: 1) grants awarded, 2) the creation of a body of scholarly work leading to scholarly publications, 3) attendance and presentations at scientific meetings, or 4) other recognized scholarly products.
Consulting in field of expertise
The ability for faculty members to establish themselves as expert sources of information, contracted by outside parties, should be considered a valuable indicator of their scholarly reputation. For consulting to be considered as part of the evaluation of scholarly activity it should be consistent with the faculty member’s interests and abilities.

University-level colloquia and/or seminars presented
Activity within the CCU community of scholars indicates a strong desire to make one’s expertise broadly available to the betterment of our students and colleagues. Faculty should be viewed as “local experts” in their chosen field of study.

Professional development/licensure
Just as formal course work or progress toward an advanced degree can provide evidence that a faculty member is developing as a scholar, so can the presence at workshops and colloquia that seek to develop research/scholarly skills. In some fields progress toward licensure can be used to demonstrate scholarly development.

3) University/Public Service:
A teacher-scholar should be a contributing member within many communities, both on and off campus. Faculty members should demonstrate positive contributions to department, college and university committees. Service to the local community and region through professional contributions is valued, as are discipline-specific contributions to professional organizations. Evidence of service should demonstrate a commitment to active participation in campus governance and to improvement of the communities to which they come in contact. Indicators for demonstrating effectiveness in the area of service include, but are not limited to, the areas listed below.

Service as a grant proposal reviewer for a funding agency
The recognition by one’s peers as an authority in an area of scholarly activity can provide evidence that a faculty member is making an impact. These reviews can be either individual single proposals, or a continual term of service on a standing committee. Service in this area may also be of particular utility in evaluating scholarly reputation.

Service as a journal editor/reviewer for a periodical
Just as service on a grant review committee provides evidence that the faculty member is a recognized authority, service as a journal editor and reviewer can do the same. Appointment to an editorial board is also evidence of scholarly reputation within a faculty member’s field.

Work on University committees
Effective committee work is perhaps the best way to demonstrate an interest in developing a service orientation toward the furtherance of university goals. Evidence of this effectiveness can be provided by a presentation of the work accomplished by the committee, as well as testimonials from committee leadership.
Work on external task forces/commissions related to field of expertise
The use of personal expertise to further community goals can be effectively used to expand the external mission of the university. Tangible results from the task-force can be used to assess the quality of the contribution.

Service to schools
The students who enter our university are often faced with challenges that are a consequence of the nature of the preparation provided by their primary and secondary school systems. Efforts to reach out with their expertise to the local educational community can demonstrate faculty members’ commitment to professional service.

Administrative duties within the University
The operation of a university requires the efforts of faculty, often working outside of a formal committee structure. Faculty can demonstrate their commitment to their service responsibilities by serving in any of a number of administrative capacities at the Department, College, and University level.

Other public service
Local commissions, boards, and service organizations may require faculty expertise. While statements from community board members can argue for the value provided by a faculty member toward the operation of the organization, other indicators may also document effective public service.

Student advising
Helping students mature as learners and scholars, such that they can take ownership of their academic program, develop their intellectual potential, clarify their educational options, and discern career and life goals, is an important part of the faculty role. This can be accomplished through several mechanisms, including (but not limited to) one-on-one meetings and the organization of formal co-curricular activities. Effective advising could be demonstrated by a range of indicators, such as demonstrations of availability, student testimonials, and formal service as a mentor, among others.

Advising student clubs/organizations
While the primary mission of the faculty should focus on the more formal activities described in the several paragraphs above, student organizations are an important part of the overall university environment. In order to ensure the effective functioning of these organizations, faculty interest and expertise is often required.

Consulting
Consulting, and other volunteer work, can effectively promote the mission of the University within the community.
APPENDIX C:
College of Science Reappointment Recommendation

For use by Departmental Peer Review Committee (Promotion/Tenure Committee and/or Tenured Faculty)

Faculty Member__________________________________________Tenure Track:___Yes___No

Effective Date of Appointment to Tenure Track______________________________

Year of Tenure Review__________________________

Professional Development Status:
  □ Has Terminal Degree.
  □ Making Satisfactory Progress toward Terminal Degree.
  □ Lacks Terminal Degree.

Attach complete up-to-date curriculum vitae and current annual activity report.

Describe below the evidence considered in the reappointment decision.
A. Cumulative record of teaching effectiveness. (See faculty activity report form for a partial listing.)

B. Cumulative record of scholarly productivity. (See faculty activity report form for a partial listing.)
C. Cumulative record of public/university service. (See faculty activity report form for a partial listing.)

The Departmental Peer Review Committee (and/or tenured faculty) met to review this record on _______________. The result of that review was_______________.

(Date) (Votes: Yes, No, and Abstained)

➢ Attach a summary of the Committee’s comments and/or written statement and deliver to the Department Chair.

Department Chair’s Review

☐ Reappointment Recommended

☐ Reappointment **Not** Recommended

______________________________  ______________________
Department Chair  Date

➢ Attach a summary justifying reappointment decision.

Dean’s Review

☐ Reappointment Recommended

☐ Reappointment **Not** Recommended

_________________________________  ______________________
Dean  Date
APPENDIX D:
College of Science Tenure Track Faculty Evaluation

College of Science
TENURE TRACK FACULTY EVALUATION
FOR CALENDAR YEAR 20___

Name:
Department:
Rank:
Date of Hire:
Date of Last Promotion:
Tenure Status: Pre-Tenured □ Tenured □

TEACHING

☐ OUTSTANDING ☐ NEEDS IMPROVEMENT
☐ GOOD ☐ UNSATISFACTORY
☐ SATISFACTORY

FACTORS CONSIDERED AND BASIS FOR JUDGEMENT
SCHOLARSHIP/RESEARCH

☐ OUTSTANDING   ☐ NEEDS IMPROVEMENT
☐ GOOD           ☐ UNSATISFACTORY
☐ SATISFACTORY

FACTORS CONSIDERED AND BASIS FOR JUDGEMENT

UNIVERSITY/PUBLIC SERVICE

☐ OUTSTANDING   ☐ NEEDS IMPROVEMENT
☐ GOOD           ☐ UNSATISFACTORY
☐ SATISFACTORY

FACTORS CONSIDERED AND BASIS FOR JUDGEMENT.
OVERALL CONTRIBUTION

- [ ] OUTSTANDING
- [ ] GOOD
- [ ] SATISFACTORY

**COMMENT**

ASSESSMENT OF PROGRESS TOWARD TENURE AND/OR NEXT PROMOTION

- [ ] Making excellent progress
- [ ] One or more areas need attention
- [ ] Not applicable

DEPARTMENT CHAIR’S RECOMMENDATION REGARDING NEXT YEAR’S EFFORT

_____________________________  ________________________________
Department Chair Signature            Date

FACULTY MEMBER

I have been given an opportunity to read this evaluation and I have the following comments. (Use back of this sheet as necessary.)

_____________________________  ________________________________
Faculty Member Signature            Date
# APPENDIX E:
College of Science Non-Tenure Track Evaluation

## College of Science
Non-Tenure Track Evaluation
(Teaching Lecturers, Instructors, Visiting Faculty, Adjunct/Teaching Associates)
For Calendar Year 20___

Name:  
Department:  
Rank:  
Date of Hire:  

### TEACHING

- [ ] OUTSTANDING  
- [ ] NEEDS IMPROVEMENT  
- [ ] GOOD  
- [ ] UNSATISFACTORY  
- [ ] SATISFACTORY

**FACTORS CONSIDERED AND BASIS FOR JUDGEMENT**

---

### OTHER ASSIGNED ACTIVITIES
(e.g. Scholarship, University or Public Service, as applicable)

- [ ] OUTSTANDING  
- [ ] NEEDS IMPROVEMENT  
- [ ] GOOD  
- [ ] UNSATISFACTORY  
- [ ] SATISFACTORY  
- [ ] NOT APPLICABLE

**FACTORS CONSIDERED AND BASIS FOR JUDGEMENT:**
### OVERALL CONTRIBUTION

- □ OUTSTANDING
- □ GOOD
- □ SATISFACTORY
- □ NEEDS IMPROVEMENT
- □ UNSATISFACTORY

*COMMENT*

---

### ASSESSMENT OF PROGRESS TOWARD PROMOTION

- □ Making excellent progress
- □ One or more areas need attention
- □ Not applicable

---

### DEPARTMENT CHAIR’S RECOMMENDATION REGARDING NEXT YEAR’S EFFORT

Department Chair Signature ___________________________ Date ___________________________

---

### FACULTY MEMBER

I have been given an opportunity to read this evaluation and I have the following comments. (Use back of this sheet as necessary.)

Faculty Member Signature ___________________________ Date ___________________________
APPENDIX F:
College of Science Undergraduate Student Course Evaluation (Lecture)

For each of the following statements about this course, please indicate whether you Agree Strongly, Agree, Disagree, or Disagree Strongly. If the statement does not apply to the course, please indicate that in the last column.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course:</th>
<th>Term:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Instructor Name:</td>
<td>Enrollment:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please Respond to the Following Statements:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Disagree Strongly</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Agree Strongly</th>
<th>Does Not Apply</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Student responsibilities in the course were well defined.</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. The instructor related topics to other areas of study, real-world examples or current issues.</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. The instructor exposed students to diverse approaches to problem solving.</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. The instructor's use of examples helped to get points across in class.</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. The instructor used an appropriate variety of teaching methods to help students learn.</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. The instructor's explanations were clear.</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. The instructor's teaching methods were effective.</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. The instructor seemed genuinely interested in what he/she was teaching.</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. The instructor was concerned with whether or not the class learned the material.</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. The instructor promoted an atmosphere of mutual respect.</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. The exams and/or other assignments were graded fairly.</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. The instructor gave feedback on assignments and exams quickly enough to benefit me.</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. The course content was appropriately reflected in the exams.</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Sufficient assistance from the instructor was available outside of class.</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. The instructor efficiently used class-time for helping students learn the course content.</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. This course engaged me intellectually and made me think.</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

THANK YOU FOR COMPLETING THIS SURVEY
APPENDIX G:
College of Science Undergraduate Student Course Evaluation (Lab)

For each of the following statements about this course, please indicate whether you Agree Strongly, Agree, Disagree, or Disagree Strongly. If the statement does not apply to the course, please indicate that in the last column.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course:</th>
<th>Term:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Instructor Name:</td>
<td>Enrollment:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Please Respond to the Following Statements:</td>
<td>Disagree Strongly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Student responsibilities in the course were well defined.</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. The instructor related topics to other areas of study, real-world examples or current issues.</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. The instructor exposed students to diverse approaches to problem solving.</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. The instructor's use of examples helped to get points across in class.</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. The instructor used an appropriate variety of teaching methods to help students learn.</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. The instructor's explanations were clear.</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. The instructor's teaching methods were effective.</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. The instructor seemed genuinely interested in what he/she was teaching.</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. The instructor was concerned with whether or not the class learned the material.</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. The instructor promoted an atmosphere of mutual respect.</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. The exams and/or other assignments were graded fairly.</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. The instructor gave feedback on assignments and exams quickly enough to benefit me.</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Sufficient assistance from the instructor was available outside of class.</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. The instructor efficiently used class-time for helping students learn the course content.</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. This course engaged me intellectually and made me think.</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. The use of laboratory equipment was satisfactorily explained.</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. The laboratory instructor adequately explained experimental procedures and assignments.</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. The laboratory increased my competence in manipulating laboratory materials.</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. Generally, the equipment used in lab was adequate and reliable.</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

THANK YOU FOR COMPLETING THIS SURVEY
APPENDIX H:
College of Science Handbook Approvals, Additions, and Updates

Approved: May 2007
Revised: January 2008
   Elaboration of tenure (p.28)
Revised: May 2010
   Change name of College (multiple locations)
Revised: September 2010
   Elaboration of Chairs’ review of faculty (p.4)
   Role of Dean in Faculty evaluation (p.3)
   Role of faculty in assessment – match appointment letters (p.9)
   Addition of faculty evaluation form (p.34)
   Editorial revision of Mission Statement (p.19)
   Updating charge of the Curriculum Committee (p.19)
   Alteration of number of departments (p.16 & 21)
Revised: May 2011
   College of Science Graduate Committee (p. 21)
Revised: September 2011
   “Sustained and Outstanding” for promotion to Professor defined
Revised April 2012
   Aligned and Updated COS Handbook to the University Faculty Manual
   New Items specific to the COS in this revision
      Graduate Faculty within the COS
      Third Year Review within the COS
      COS Assessment Committee
      COS Course Evaluation Committee
      COS Curriculum Committee membership
      COS Handbook Committee
      COS Technology Committee
      Faculty Senate Representatives
      Non-Tenure Track Evaluation
Revised Fall 2014
   Updated and corrected pages numbers in the table of contents
   Clarified changes that require COS faculty vote (p. 2)
   Updated syllabi requirements in Classroom Procedures for Faculty (p. 11)
Revised Fall 2015
   Updated description of COS Undergraduate Curriculum Committee
   Updated description of COS Graduate Committee