The proposed changes are to provide clarification regarding several aspects of our tenure and promotion processes and expectations. They consist of the following:

- Clarifying that the Departmental Evaluation Panel Chair should proactively seek a sufficient number of responses (at least twenty) from recent graduates.
- Adding a requirement that the Departmental Evaluation Panel specify how each external reviewer was selected.
- Clarification that service as chair counts as professional service.

What follows is an excerpt of the 2014-15 *Faculty/Administration Manual* (mid-year edition), with the intended changes marked.

**VI. EVALUATION OF FACULTY**

**A. Third-year Review, Tenure and Promotion of Tenure-Track and Tenured Instructional Faculty**

(Rev. April 2012)

The President retains the power of approval for third-year review determinations, conferrals of tenure, and promotions. The Provost, acting in accordance with the provisions stated in this *Faculty/Administration Manual*, is responsible for making the final recommendation to the President in respect to all such matters.

Tenure and promotion require substantial evidence of consistently high professional competence in teaching, research and professional development, and service. In addition, evidence of either exemplary performance in at least one of the three specified professional competency areas or significant achievement in the two areas of teaching and research and professional development is required. Tenure is a long-term commitment by the College; it is not merely a reward for work accomplished, but it is an award given with the expectation that consistently high professional competence will continue.

(Rev. April 2009)

A third-year review should substantiate whether satisfactory progress toward tenure has been made. There should be evidence of effective teaching, a continuing research program, and active participation in service. A candidate should be informed in detail of any weakness that, if not corrected, might lead to a negative tenure decision. If there are serious doubts as to whether the candidate will be able to meet the criteria prior to a required tenure decision, a recommendation against retention should be given.

A tenure decision is made only once, no later than the sixth year. Up to two years credit toward tenure and promotion may be awarded at the time of initial
appointment for teaching and research on a full-time basis at other four-year and graduate colleges and universities or for full-time employment at faculty positions of special status at the College of Charleston. A person receiving the maximum of two years credit would be eligible for consideration for tenure during the fourth year at the College. A person receiving one year of credit would be eligible for consideration for tenure during the fifth year at the College.

(Rev. April 2007)

Six years in rank is normally required for an Assistant Professor to be eligible for tenure and promotion to Associate Professor. Seven years in rank is normally required for an Associate Professor to be eligible for promotion to Professor.

In exceptional cases a faculty member may wish to petition for early tenure or promotion provided the action has the prior written approval of the Provost, the Dean and the Departmental Chair.

Faculty are evaluated in the three categories of Teaching Effectiveness, Research and Professional Development, and Professional Service to the Community. Because teaching is the primary responsibility of any faculty member, evidence of effective teaching is expected for tenure and for promotion. Because research and professional development are essential to the mission of the College, evidence of a sustained research program and a continuing scholarly commitment must be provided for tenure and for promotion. Because faculty should be contributing members of the College community and, where appropriate, the community at large, evidence of service to the community is expected.

While quantifiable data (numerical items from student evaluations, numbers of papers published, number of committees, etc.) are important, decisions about tenure and promotion must ultimately rely on sound professional judgment.

What follow are the general standards and evidence that remain constant throughout the four levels of institutional evaluation, namely third-year review, tenure, and promotion to Associate Professor and Professor.

1. Teaching Effectiveness

   a. **Standard**

      Teaching is the primary responsibility of faculty at the College of Charleston. Teaching involves communicating knowledge to students and fostering in them the intellectual curiosity necessary to continue the quest for knowledge. The effective teacher exhibits a sustained concern for teaching, which is reflected in teaching materials, classroom performance, academic advising, critical evaluation of students, and adequate preparation of students for later undergraduate and/or graduate work. Course materials should
be well-conceived, well-organized and well-written. Students should be exposed to current scholarship or research in the field, if appropriate. Student evaluations should be consistently good. A teacher should be prepared to provide sound advice to students and to newer colleagues on academic matters.

b. **Evidence** (while in rank at the College of Charleston) should include:

1. Chair’s evaluations since faculty member has been in rank. Chair must provide an annual evaluation the year prior to the candidate’s being considered for promotion/tenure.

2. i. Departmental colleague letters evaluating teaching are required.

    ii. Letters from extra-departmental colleagues at the College of Charleston and/or at other institutions evaluating teaching are optional.

    (Ins. April 2007)

3. Evaluatee’s narrative of teaching philosophy, methodology, and accomplishments in teaching, advising and other similar activities.

4. Recent graduate evaluations on teaching: either all majors or a sample of at least 40 students selected randomly from among all majors in the department who have graduated within the past five years and whom the candidate has taught; additional students whom the candidate has taught, who need not be majors in the department, may be added by the candidate in consultation with the Chair. Students must list all courses taken from the evaluatee and the grade(s) received in these courses. In addition, the student must sign the form or letter used for evaluation. The Chair must designate which students are recommended by the evaluatee. In cases where a faculty member undergoing review has taught fewer than 40 graduates, the Department Chair should indicate that this has occurred. In these cases it may be appropriate to substitute evaluations from non-majors. **The Chair should endeavor to collect at least twenty responses from recent graduates, keeping in mind that it is appropriate to send reminders or solicit feedback from more than forty students if response rates are low.** (Rev. Aug. 2015)
Without exception, each Department’s graduate evaluation form shall include a standardized section designed only to provide and solicit demographic information about each individual graduate completing the form. This standardized section of the form shall be designed and distributed each year by the Office of Academic Affairs and must be used without alteration by each department.
(Ins. April 2007)

Recent Graduate Evaluations are optional for Third-Year Review and may be requested by the departmental evaluation panel or the candidate.
(Rev. April 2007)

(5) Student ratings and summaries:

(a) Student ratings from all courses evaluated. Student course evaluations will be completed for every section of every course, every semester, with the exception of a course that has only one student enrolled. If it is a department’s policy to require the inclusion of the comments portion of the student ratings, the department must develop procedures for collecting and reviewing this portion of the student ratings form. A copy of the procedures should be on file in the Provost’s Office. In the absence of these procedures, a faculty member undergoing review may choose to include these comments as part of the packet, having explained in his or her narrative about teaching whether all the comments or a selection of the comments have been included.

(b) The Summary Rating for all courses in the Department for each semester will be included in the evidence in the Executive Binder with the summary student evaluations. The summary ratings for the department will be distributed to the faculty in the department each semester.
(Rev. April 2007)
Evidence of teaching effectiveness may also include but is not limited to:

(a) Syllabi, reading lists or bibliographies, policy statements, grading procedures, course goals and objectives.

(b) Samples of evaluatee-prepared and/or supplementary course materials.

(c) Samples of tests, exams, essays or other assignments.

(d) Participation in curriculum development.

(e) Participation in interdisciplinary courses and programs.

(f) Participation in peer coaching activities and/or observation of classroom performance by colleagues.

(g) Participation in pedagogical conferences, workshops and field trips.

2. Research and Professional Development

a. **Standard**

Research and professional development are essential to a professor’s ability to carry out the College’s educational mission. Research and professional development involve the various activities that increase the faculty member’s knowledge and that exemplify scholarly or artistic expertise. It includes, but is not limited to, original contributions to the discipline, creative activities in practice and performance in the fine arts, research in pedagogy, and appropriate studies within and outside one’s specialties. The professional educator undertakes research for scholarly or creative production, to maintain currency in the content of courses taught, and to improve pedagogical techniques. The professional educator sustains professional contact with colleagues and engages in continuing professional activities to upgrade and augment existing skills or develop new ones.
b. **Evidence** (while in rank at the College of Charleston) should include:

(1) Evaluatee’s narrative of research and professional development activities.

(2) i. Departmental colleague letters evaluating research and professional development are required.

ii. Optional evaluation of research and professional development includes:

- letters from extra-departmental colleagues at the College of Charleston evaluating research and professional development and (Rev. April 2012)

- independent external reviews of research. Departments that choose to conduct such external reviews must follow the process outlined here.

Instructions for External Reviews of Research: Candidates should submit the names of at least three professionals from outside the College by late August. Evaluation panel chairs, in consultation with departmental panel members, should present additional names of external reviewers in order to obtain no fewer than two independent reviews of the quality of the candidate's research and/or creative achievements. The Departmental Evaluation Panel chair may solicit names of potential additional reviews from people named on the candidate’s list. No more than half of the reviews should be secured from the candidate's own list. The candidate is allowed to strike one name from the panel chair's list. The external reviewers chosen should be appropriately qualified to conduct an independent review of the candidate's research and/or creative achievements. The Panel Chair should specify in writing, for inclusion in the packet, how each reviewer was selected.
After the external reviewers have been determined, a cover letter from the panel chair should accompany the review materials sent to them, stating that the College seeks a review of the quality of a candidate's research and professional development and not merely a testimonial to the candidate's accomplishments. A copy of the candidate's academic curriculum vitae and copies of the relevant scholarly and/or creative works agreed upon by the candidate and evaluation panel chair should be sent to each of the outside reviewers. Copies of the relevant portions of the Faculty/Administration Manual about research and professional development as well as any additional departmental criteria on file in the Office of the Provost should be included. Additional supporting review materials may also be submitted by the panel chair or the candidate, provided that these materials are included in the packet.

Reviewers should be asked to identify what relationship, if any, they have with the candidate and to return their review in a timely manner for the deliberations of the departmental panel. To make it possible that reviews are available prior to those deliberations, external reviews must be solicited sufficiently in advance of panel deliberations.

The panel chair must include in the candidate's packet: (1) a description of the process by which the outside letters were obtained, (2) each reviewer's institutional and departmental affiliation, and rank or other institutional title, a description of the academic specialization of the reviewer, and other relevant information about the reviewer, which may be useful to those unfamiliar with the field, (3) a copy of the
(3) Chair’s evaluations since faculty member has been in rank. Chair must provide an annual evaluation the year prior to the candidate’s being considered for promotion/tenure.

(4) Evidence of **scholarship** may include but is not limited to:

(a) professionally published scholarly books

(b) academic journal articles

(c) chapters in scholarly books

(d) edited volumes

(e) review essays

(f) creative literary and artistic works and other creative works

(g) research grants

(h) conference papers

(i) reviews of candidate’s books, performances, etc.

(j) scholarly reviews by candidate of books, performances, etc.

(k) invited or juried exhibits, concerts, performances, etc.

(l) technical reports

(m) textbooks, workbooks, study guides and other published pedagogical materials

(n) draft manuscripts

(o) professional bibliographies
Evidence of professional activities may include but is not limited to:

(a) serving as an officer or a member of a board or committee of an international, national, regional or state professional organization

(b) serving on an editorial board of a scholarly journal

(c) reviewing manuscripts for journals and publishers; evaluating proposals for granting agencies

(d) chairing or serving as a discussant on a panel at a professional meeting

(e) preparing grant proposals and reports

(f) conducting professional workshops, seminars, and field trips

(g) participating in professional meetings, seminars, workshops, field trips, etc.

(h) undertaking post-doctoral studies

(i) receiving fellowships and awards

(j) serving as a professional consultant

(k) serving as Department Chair, Program Director, or Associate Dean (Rev. Aug. 2015)

3. Professional Service to the Community

a. Standard

Service to the College and/or community falls within the responsibilities of a faculty member and is essential to the fulfillment of the College’s responsibilities to the academic community and to the attainment of institutional goals. Each faculty member is expected to cooperate in supporting the mission and the goals of the department and the College. Service includes involvement in standing or ad hoc committees of the College faculty, in departmental committees or offices, and in special committees or task forces.
Service includes working with student organizations and non-academic advising; working with community, state, regional or national organizations; utilizing professional expertise; and working on institutional advancement projects.

b. **Evidence** (while in rank at the College of Charleston) should include but is not limited to:

1. Evaluatee’s narrative of service activities.

2. Departmental and extra-departmental colleague letters:
   
   i. Departmental colleague letters evaluating service are required.

   ii. Letters from extra-departmental colleagues at the College of Charleston and/or at other institutions evaluating service are required.

   (Ins. April 2007)

3. Chair’s evaluations since the faculty member has been in rank. Chair must provide an annual evaluation the year prior to the candidate’s being considered for promotion/tenure.