

EDWARDS COLLEGE OF HUMANITIES AND FINE ARTS

Expectations for Tenure and Promotion and Post-Tenure Review

The decision about tenure is one of the most important decisions we make. It is a decision that combines an assessment of the record to date and a projection of a career into the future.

Each academic department in the College of Humanities and Fine Arts has developed performance expectations to be used in evaluating faculty performance in teaching, scholarly/creative activity, and service appropriate to its discipline. These expectations are listed on the College web site and on individual departmental web sites.

The Edwards College of Humanities and Fine Arts adheres to the following guiding principles in teaching, scholarly/creative activity, and service:

Teaching Effectiveness

The College is committed to excellence in teaching and learning. Clear standards of evaluation shall be established by every department in terms it believes appropriate to its discipline(s). Departmental standards should include guidelines for evaluation of teaching and should be formulated to include mechanisms intended to assist faculty members in improving their teaching.

All courses should be evaluated and should include opportunities for students to provide written comments. At the same time, letters or comments from individual students are not considered reliable as an index of teaching effectiveness, and reviewers should be cautious about giving them too much weight in the process of evaluating teaching. Similarly, written comments from mid-term evaluations of teaching effectiveness should not be included, since their purpose is assistance rather than evaluation. Departments should periodically review and revise or redesign their student evaluation procedures.

In addition to student evaluations, faculty members should employ other approaches to evaluate teaching effectiveness. These may include peer evaluation, Chair evaluations, teaching portfolios, exit exam results, review of syllabi, student research or creative activities, and other approaches.

Peer evaluation by colleagues is especially valuable in assessing teaching effectiveness. Peer evaluations allow a focus on course content as perceived by peers and can describe the unique expertise, types of instruction, courses, or other activities which the individual contributes to the unit's curriculum or teaching program as a whole. Self-evaluation by the individual faculty member is encouraged as a helpful component to this process.

An academic unit in the College should use the same method(s) for all evaluations so that uniform standards are applied. The Chair should not have the sole responsibility for conducting the evaluation, and evaluators need not all be senior faculty. Active participation by the individual being evaluated is encouraged. Appropriate methods might include collegial review of

one or more of the following: teaching materials, student evaluations, classroom performance, and student performance. The last may be particularly appropriate in visual and performing arts.

Scholarly/Creative Activity

In the Edwards College, scholarly/creative activity is usually (though not always) identified with the publication of research in peer-refereed books or scholarly journals and by its formal oral presentation at meetings of international, national, or regional scholarly associations. Oral presentations will not compensate for a lack of publication.

In such disciplines as the arts, or in research of an applied nature, it is understood that a faculty member's scholarly/creative activity may not lead to a peer-refereed published article or book but rather to an original, peer-reviewed performance, work of art, or accomplishment.

The receipt of internally or externally funded research grants is also a mark of scholarly/creative activity in certain areas. Grants in support of scholarly/creative activity should yield completed work that is published or publicly performed or exhibited. As a result, the receipt of grants alone cannot substitute for publication, performance, or exhibition.

The College recognizes that in certain disciplines scholarly/creative activity can include various forms of public engagement or involvement related to the faculty member's field of expertise, including developing community-oriented projects, workshops, and presentations, and the securing of grants for contracts or consultancies with community organizations, institutions, or agencies. Although such activity is an extension of scholarly expertise, work that is published or publicly performed or exhibited is of primary importance for tenure and promotion decisions.

In evaluating scholarly/creative activity, the College will place a premium on quality rather than quantity. Candidates for tenure and/or promotion are expected to develop a clearly documented record of a body of scholarly/creative activity. Quality of scholarly/creative activity shall be given strong consideration, and those closest to the fields are in the best position to evaluate it.

Criteria that can usually be applied to published research include the quality and reputation of the journal or publishing venue; whether or not a rigorous procedure for refereeing submitted research is conducted; and a critical review of how the published work has been received by peers within and outside the University. This review should include written evaluations by experts on the candidate's scholarly/creative activities, judging their overall contribution to the field of study. Research formally accepted for publication but not yet in print may be included in an individual's record, as long as proper verification of acceptance can be attested to and an attempt is made to evaluate it as if published. Such publications cannot be counted as new work in subsequent applications for promotion or post-tenure review.

In the arts and in the area of knowledge-based public engagement, evaluative criteria comparable to that for published research shall be employed. In many cases, reviews of such activity by peers within and experts outside the University offer a sound means for judging quality, importance, or relevance. Departments shall establish written evaluative criteria for such creative or community-

oriented activity. The criteria shall reflect a rigor comparable to the standards applied to published research.

Institutional, Scholarly/Creative, and Community Service

Faculty are expected to serve on various committees at the departmental, College, and University level throughout their academic careers. In addition, faculty members are encouraged to provide community or scholarly/creative service related or relevant to their field of expertise.

Community service that is not related to a faculty member's scholarly or professional expertise will not in most cases be considered for tenure and promotion, though it may be included in the annual report for merit evaluations. If institutional, scholarly/creative or community service is to be considered as a significant factor for promotion, the case should be clearly presented and documented by the candidate and the candidate's department.

Further Elaborations on CCU Faculty Manual's Qualifications for Academic Ranks

Associate Professor

The faculty member must hold the appropriate terminal degree. Promotion to the rank of Associate Professor is coupled with recommendation for tenure, and tenure in the Edwards College will not be granted without promotion.

Professor

The standards for accomplishments in teaching, scholarly/creative activity, and service are substantially higher for full Professor than those standards expected of candidates for Associate Professor. There should be confidence in continued performance at a high level.

Procedures

For purposes of evaluation for advancement from untenured Assistant or Associate Professor to tenured Associate Professor, it is recommended that a vote of all tenured members of the department be taken. The results of the vote will be incorporated into the Chair's recommendation. That recommendation will include the number of tenured faculty eligible to vote, the number of affirmative votes and negative votes, the number of abstentions, the number of faculty absent or not participating, and a note about whether the Chair's vote is included in the count of votes. The accuracy of the summary will be attested to by the signatures of the tenured faculty.

The Chair's recommendation will be a separate one and will include a description and critical evaluation of the candidate's teaching, scholarship/creative activity, and service. This statement will address not only the significance and quality of the candidate's teaching and scholarship/creative activity, but also the importance of the role which the candidate is expected to play in the Department and College in the future. The Chair will explain specific items in the record that might be unfamiliar to persons outside the field. Examples include: significance and availability of outlets for publication/exhibition/performance; significance of specific journals,

presses, edited books, etc.; significance and availability of specific galleries, exhibition venues, theaters, concert halls, etc.; significance of invited and contributed oral presentations; significance of the order of authors listed on multi-authored publications.

Elaborations Adopted January 2008

Edwards College Expectations for Sustained and Outstanding Performance

For those areas specified in the Faculty Manual where “Sustained and Outstanding” performance is a condition for advancement, the Edwards College sets the following expectations:

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 extracurricular 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.

“Sustained and Outstanding” section adopted November 2011

Additions to the Edwards College Promotion Expectations

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 expectations are in turn supplemented with departmental elaborations that provide discipline-specific guidance.

These questions, incorporated into the college expectations 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?

Additions adopted April 2016