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**Summary Document**

**Excerpts on Promotion and Tenure for Gupta College of Science TT Faculty**  
(p. 13-14, 27-33 2023 GCOS College Handbook)

(From the 2023 GCOS Faculty Handbook, p. 13)

**Appointments, Promotion, and Tenure**

Faculty appointments, promotion and tenure are detailed in the Faculty Manual. (p. 50-65, 2023-2024 Faculty Manual) [https://www.coastal.edu/academics/facultysenate/manuals/](https://www.coastal.edu/academics/facultysenate/manuals/)

(From the 2023-2024 Faculty Manual, p. 51)

**Associate Professor:** To be eligible for the rank of Associate Professor, a faculty member must have a record of effective performance over a probationary period usually involving teaching, intellectual contributions, other recognized professional contributions in the discipline, and University service. The faculty member must possess strong potential for further development as a teacher and as a scholar. It is expected that the faculty member will hold the appropriate terminal degree or meet the established alternative qualifications.

(From the 2023 GCOS Faculty Handbook, p. 14)

**Tenure**

The following are specific to the GCOS.

**Tenure Criteria**

Faculty in the Gupta 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 Gupta College of Science should also refer to the Appendix A. Performance Expectations Document as well as the document titled Appendix B. 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  

APPENDIX A:  
Gupta 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 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.

APPENDIX B:
Gupta College of Science Framework for Tenure Decisions

The faculty of the Gupta 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 several 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 Gupta College of Science values quality educational experiences 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 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 ensure the establishment of indicators that are field specific, as well as considering 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 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 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 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 several 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. 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.
Excerpts from CCU Faculty Manual: Procedures for Promotion to Professor

Professor: To be eligible for the rank of Professor, a faculty member must compile a sustained record of outstanding performance at the rank of Associate Professor that reflects 1) effective teaching; 2) intellectual contributions/professional contributions to the discipline; and 3) ongoing University service. Promotion to the rank of Professor requires outstanding performance in two of these areas, one of which must be intellectual contributions/professional contributions to the discipline and, at a minimum, satisfactory performance in the third area. Definitions of “outstanding” and “satisfactory” are contained in departmental and College performance expectations elaborations documents. (CCU 2023-2024 Faculty Manual, section 6.3.1.1, p. 51)

External Review: The candidate will submit a list of at least three but not more than five possible referees in the candidate’s discipline from outside the University (along with contact information for each referee on the list) to the Dean/University Librarian. The Dean/University Librarian will meet with the Chair/Supervisor from the candidate’s area to discuss appropriate referees for the file. At that meeting additional referees will be considered in addition to those supplied by the candidate in keeping with College/Library policies and procedures. Three referees will be chosen, with at least two coming from the list supplied by the candidate. If an insufficient number of the outside referees from the candidate’s list are available, the candidate will be asked to submit additional names until two referees proposed by the candidate agree to review the file. (CCU 2023-2024 Faculty Manual, section 6.6.9, p. 62)

The Dean/University Librarian will handle all communication with external referees and will be responsible for the timely submission of their reports and their inclusion in the file as per College/Library policies and procedures. The cover letter sent to the referees will indicate the performance criteria under which the candidate will be evaluated as well as the normative teaching and service responsibilities of faculty. Within this context the referees will only evaluate the intellectual contributions/professional contributions to the discipline aspects of the file. The reports will be general assessments in the same sense that professional scholars referee grant applications and manuscripts. The nature of the materials forwarded to the external reviewers and the deadlines for submission will be determined by College/Library policies and procedures. (CCU 2023-2024 Faculty Manual, section 6.6.10, p. 62)
“Sustained and Outstanding” defined within the Gupta College of Science for Promotion to Professor
(p. 17, 2023 GCOS College Handbook)

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 CETEAL 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 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.