

COLLEGE of CHARLESTON

Summary of Changes to the By-laws and *Faculty/Administration Manual* for 2023-2024 edition

Last Revised: September 1, 2023

Changes to Faculty By-Laws

- **Article IV, Section 2.H, Reapportionment**

Added an item 2 to this section addressing reapportionment precipitated by the creation of a new academic school.

- **Article V, Section 3.B.14, Honors Committee**

Changes to reflect splitting of School of Education, Health, and Human Performance into School of Education and School of Health Sciences.

- **Article V, Section 3.B.15, Committee on Assessment of Institutional Effectiveness**

Number of committee members changed from nine to seven.

Changes to Administrative Sections

- **Sections VI.A, Third-Year Review, Tenure, and Promotion of Tenure-Track and Tenured Instructional Faculty**

Please see attached for a cover memo announcing these finalized changes, along with a mark-up of *Manual* pages. The changes included the following:

- Modified teaching effectiveness standard reflected in subsection 1.a to reflect final version of language proposed by the *ad hoc* Committee on Teaching Effectiveness. See attached for details.
- Proposed list of characteristics of teaching effectiveness were not added to the *Manual*. Instead, those have been provided via the resource page of the tenure, promotion, renewal, and third-year review site in SharePoint, where they can serve as a resource for faculty colleagues working on departmental guidelines.
- Insertion in subsection 1.a. to note that “Departments and programs that expect faculty members to demonstrate specific characteristics of effective teaching that are aligned with this standard should articulate those in their departmental or program guidelines.”

- Subsection 1.b on evidence was lightly revised to reflect the new standard and was reorganized to reflect which materials are optional and who collects which materials for the major faculty review. See attached for details.

- **Section VI.B on Third-Year Review and Promotion of Instructors and Senior Instructors**

Please see attached for a cover memo announcing the finalized changes, along with a mark-up of *Manual* pages. The changes included the following:

- Modified performance criteria for promotion to Senior Instructor (Section VI.B.1) and for renewal as Senior Instructor (Section VI.B.2), consistent with the proposal unanimously endorsed by the Faculty Senate in April 2023. See attached for details.
- Modified teaching effectiveness standard (in newly renumbered Section VI.B.3) to reflect final version of language proposed by the *ad hoc* Committee on Teaching Effectiveness. See attached for details.
- Proposed list of characteristics of teaching effectiveness were not added to the *Manual*. Instead, those have been provided via the resource page of the tenure, promotion, renewal, and third-year review site in SharePoint, where they can serve as a resource for faculty colleagues working on departmental guidelines.
- Insertion in subsection 1.a. to note that “Departments and programs that expect faculty members to demonstrate specific characteristics of effective teaching that are aligned with this standard should articulate those in their departmental or program guidelines.”
- Subsection 1.b on evidence was lightly revised to reflect the new standard and was reorganized to reflect which materials are optional and who collects which materials for the major faculty review. See attached for details.

- **Throughout *Faculty/Administration Manual***

- Removal of “School of Professional Studies” throughout *Manual*.
- Replaced “School of Education, Health, and Human Performance” with “School of Education” and “School of Health Sciences” throughout *Manual*.
- Changed “School of Sciences and Mathematics” to “School of Sciences, Mathematics, and Engineering” throughout *Manual*.

MEMORANDUM

TO: Permanent faculty
Josette Pelzer, Chair, 2023-2024 Committee on Bylaws and FAM
Jenna Abetz, Chair, 2023-2024 Faculty Welfare Committee
William Veal, Speaker of the Faculty

FROM: Deanna M. Caveny, Associate Provost for Faculty Affairs

DATE: July 14, 2023

RE: changes to Faculty/Administration Manual regarding major faculty reviews

This memo articulates how two proposals, heard by the Faculty Senate during their 2022-2023 session, will be incorporated into the 2023-2024 edition of the *Faculty/Administration Manual*, and how these changes will impact major faculty review processes. This memo will be published with the 2023-2024 *Manual* change log, along with mark-up of the actual changes. That mark-up is attached.

Proposal regarding promotion to and renewal as Senior Instructor

This proposal, in its final form, received a unanimous endorsement by the Faculty Senate. It will be incorporated, in whole, into the 2023-2024 edition of the *Faculty/Administration Manual*, with only minor non-substantive revisions for clarity. Because this revision expands the options for positive reviews, it is being fully implemented with 2023-2024 reviews.

Teaching effectiveness proposal (applicable to tenured/tenure-track faculty and instructors and senior instructors)

This proposal, in its final form, received endorsement by the Faculty Senate with a 21-16 vote.

- Standard – The new teaching effectiveness standard will be incorporated in whole into the 2023-2024 edition of the *Faculty/Administration Manual*. During the 2023-2024, 2024-2025, and 2025-2026 academic years, candidates for major faculty reviews may use the “old” teaching effectiveness standard, as reflected in the 2021-2022 edition of the *Manual*, or the new standard, as reflected in the 2023-2024 *Manual*. Annual versions of the Joint

Memo on Tenure, Promotion, and Third-Year Review will reflect these two options. The new teaching effectiveness standard will be fully in effect with 2026-2027 faculty reviews.

- As reflected in the final proposal, the following language will be incorporated into the *Manual*: Departments and programs that expect faculty members to demonstrate specific characteristics of effective teaching that are aligned with this standard should articulate those in their departmental or program guidelines.
- The proposed list of criteria will not be incorporated into the 2023-2024 edition of the *Manual*. Instead, those criteria have been posted in SharePoint, alongside approved departmental guidelines and pandemic statements, accessible from <https://cofc.sharepoint.com/sites/tp/resource>. These criteria may serve as a resource for faculty colleagues working on departmental guidelines that address teaching effectiveness.
- Evidence – The sections on teaching evidence will be modified to reflect the relationship between the candidate’s narrative and their evidence.
 - The preambles of the evidence sections will reflect a blend of the proposal and the 2021-2022 *Manual* language.
 - The evidence is being separated into three categories: required evidence provided by the candidate, required and optional evidence provided by the Chair, and additional evidence that the candidate may submit.
 - No evidence items will be added or removed, but the descriptive text for several items (syllabi, course materials, and student reviews of teaching) is being revised to reflect the proposal or current practices.
 - As proposed by the *ad hoc* committee, guidelines on the process for surveying recent graduates will be moved to the Joint Memo.
 - These details are reflected in the attachments.

It should be clearly understood by all faculty members that promotion does not come automatically after the passage of a fixed period of time, but it is recognition of outstanding performance and service at the College.

B. Third-Year Review and Promotion of Instructors and Renewal of Senior Instructors

The President retains the power of approval for third-year review determinations, promotions, and renewals. 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

A third-year review should substantiate whether satisfactory progress toward promotion to Senior Instructor has been made. A candidate should be informed in detail of any weakness that, if not corrected, might lead to a negative promotion decision. If there are serious doubts as to whether the candidate will be able to meet the criteria prior to a required promotion decision, a recommendation against retention should be given.

Promotion to Senior Instructor is awarded to eligible instructors at the College of Charleston for meritorious achievement in the three areas: teaching, professional development and service. A promotion decision is made only once normally in the sixth year. A review for renewal as Senior Instructor normally takes place every seventh year³¹.

(Inst. Apr. 2011; Rev Aug. 2014)

1. Specific Criteria for Promotion to ~~and Renewal as~~ Senior Instructor (Rev. Apr. 2011; Aug. 2023)

The following criteria are necessary, though not sufficient, for promotion to ~~and renewal as~~ Senior Instructor: Evidence of exemplary performance in teaching or performance at the level of significant achievement in the two areas of teaching and professional development is also required.

- a. Promotion to ~~and renewal in~~ the rank of Senior Instructor requires sustained effectiveness ~~exemplary performance~~ in teaching.
- b. Continued vitality as a teacher is intimately related to professional development. There must be clear evidence of promise for continued development in pedagogy.
- c. There should be active and sustained participation in service to the College, and, where appropriate, to the community.

2. Specific Criteria for Renewal as Senior Instructor (Ins. Aug. 2023)

The following criteria are necessary, though not sufficient, for renewal as Senior Instructor. Additionally, evidence of one of the following is required: exemplary performance in teaching; performance at the level of significant achievement in teaching

³¹In 2014-15, Senior Instructors eligible for renewal in the fifth year under previous rules and procedures may decide, in consultation with their chair, whether to proceed for renewal in the fifth or to defer renewal till the seventh year. A Senior Instructor formerly eligible for renewal in 2015-16 may request through their chair and dean an evaluation in that year.

and professional development; or performance at the level of significant achievement in teaching and professional service.

- a. Renewal at the rank of Senior Instructor requires sustained effectiveness in teaching.
- b. Continued vitality as a teacher is intimately related to professional development. There must be clear evidence of promise for continued development in pedagogy.
- c. There should be active and sustained participation in service to the College, and, where appropriate, to the community.

32. 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 work. Course materials should be well conceived, well organized and well written. Instructors should be accessible to students both inside and outside of class, provide frequent constructive feedback to students, and involve them actively in the learning process. Instructors should attempt to use a variety of teaching techniques including innovations involving modern technology, where appropriate, and maintain currency in the pedagogy of their disciplines. Students should be exposed to current scholarship or research in the field, if appropriate. Student evaluations should be consistently good. An instructor should be prepared to provide sound advice to students and to newer colleagues on academic matters.

Effective teaching is the primary responsibility of faculty, as well as the hallmark of the institution, and reflects three broad elements: a student-focused approach, appropriate disciplinary or interdisciplinary content, and reflective practices. It fosters intellectual curiosity and motivation, promotes inclusivity, encourages deep learning, and nurtures active listening, all of which promote lifelong learning. As teachers and academic advisors, faculty members are expected to meet the needs of diverse learners by designing courses with transparent expectations and in a format that is accessible and easily navigated by all types of students. Students should be exposed to current and past developments in the field if appropriate, be taught to access and analyze relevant disciplinary information, and be provided opportunities to prepare for subsequent courses in the curriculum. Instructors should engage peer and student feedback and the scholarship of teaching and learning in their disciplines, regularly reflecting on and evaluating current practices and implementing alternative approaches in response. (Rev. Aug. 2023)

Departments and programs that expect faculty members to demonstrate specific characteristics of effective teaching that are aligned with this standard should articulate those in their departmental or program guidelines. (Ins. Aug. 2023)

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

- (1) ~~Chair's evaluations since faculty member has been at the College.~~
- (2) ~~Internal and/or external colleague statements on teaching.~~
- (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; departments may choose to use a sample of at least 40 graduates selected randomly from among students in service courses taught by the evaluatee. Additional students whom the candidate has taught 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 students 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.~~
- (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 their narrative about teaching whether all the comments or a selection of the comments have been included. (Rev. Aug. 2018)~~
 - (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.

(Inst. Apr. 2011)

- (6) 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 other supplementary course material.
 - (c) Samples of tests, exams, essays or other assignments, including some graded work.
 - (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. Each department will develop a procedure for peer observations of candidates for promotion to Senior Instructor.
 - (g) Participation in pedagogical conferences, workshops and field trips.
 - (h) Participation in departmental advising as directed by the Department Chair.

b. Evidence (while in rank at the College of Charleston)

The faculty member should provide a narrative that includes a critical self-reflection of their teaching philosophy and methodology, as well as their accomplishments in teaching and in related efforts, including advising and mentoring, as appropriate. The candidate should provide evidence in support of their narrative, associated with courses taught during the review period, including the following:

- (1) Syllabi, including course objectives and student learning outcomes, grading policy, and other required content, per Policy 7.6.10, *Policy on Course Syllabi*.
- (2) Samples of course materials, including assessments (such as tests, exams, essays, or other assignments), and as appropriate, evaluation rubrics, materials from course websites, projects, and evaluated student work.
- (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.
- (4) Student reviews of teaching:
 - (i) Student Course-Instructor Evaluation quantitative ratings from all course sections for which they were administered. These surveys

will be administered for every section of every course, every semester, with the exception of a course that has only one student enrolled. A faculty member undergoing review may choose to also include student free responses as part of the packet, having explained in the written narrative about teaching whether all the comments or a selection of the comments have been included. Departments may require inclusion of the student free responses. Any such requirement should be articulated in approved departmental guidelines. (Rev. Aug. 2018)

- (ii) An aggregate rating for each semester for all courses in the department will be included in the evidence submitted by the candidate. (Rev. Apr. 2007)

The chair of the Departmental Evaluation Panel will also collect the following evidence:

- (1) Departmental colleague letters evaluating teaching, which are required.
- (2) Letters from extra-departmental colleagues at the College of Charleston and/or at other institutions, if candidate elects or if department or program requires. (Ins. Apr. 2007)
- (3) 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; departments may choose to use a sample of at least 40 graduates selected randomly from among students in service courses taught by the evaluatee. 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.

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

Additional evidence submitted by the candidate may include but is not limited to:

- (1) Samples of evaluatee-prepared and/or supplementary course materials.
- (2) Participation in curriculum development.
- (3) Participation in interdisciplinary courses and programs.
- (4) Participation in peer coaching activities and/or observation of classroom performance by colleagues.
- (5) Participation in pedagogical conferences, workshops and field trips.

(6) Participation in departmental advising as directed by the Department Chair.

(Rev. Aug. 2023)

43. Professional Development

a. Standard

Professional development is essential to an instructor's ability to carry out the College's educational mission. Professional development involves the various activities that increase the faculty member's knowledge and exemplify pedagogical or artistic expertise. It includes, but is not limited to, research in pedagogy, appropriate studies within and outside one's specialties, and creative activities in practice and performance in the fine arts. Instructors maintain currency in the content of courses taught and in pedagogical techniques. They sustain professional contact with colleagues and engage in continuing professional activities to maintain, 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 professional development activities.
- (2) Internal and/or external colleague statements on professional activities.
- (3) Chair's evaluations since faculty member has been at the College.
- (4) Evidence of professional development may include but is not limited to:
 - (a) serving as an officer or a member of a board or committee of a local, state, regional, national or international professional organization;
 - (b) chairing or serving as a discussant on a panel at a professional meeting;
 - (c) preparing grant proposals and reports;
 - (d) conducting professional workshops and seminars;
 - (e) participating in professional meetings, seminars, workshops, et cetera;
 - (f) completing graduate studies or course work relevant to professional competency;
 - (g) receiving fellowships and awards;
 - (h) serving as a professional consultant;

K. Modification of Duties Procedure

The Modification of Duties Procedure for the College of Charleston is available at the Academic Affairs Web site.

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. A separate evaluation process, with its own standards and evidence, is used for the honorary rank of University Professor (see Art. VI, Sect. I). (Rev. Aug. 2015)

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. Effective teaching is the primary responsibility of faculty, as well as the hallmark of the institution, and reflects three broad elements: a student-focused approach, appropriate disciplinary or interdisciplinary content, and reflective practices. It fosters intellectual curiosity and motivation, promotes inclusivity, encourages deep learning, and nurtures active listening, all of which promote lifelong learning. As teachers and academic advisors, faculty members are expected to meet the needs of diverse learners by designing courses with transparent expectations and in a format that is accessible and easily navigated by all types of students. Students should be exposed to current and past developments in the field if appropriate, be taught to access and analyze relevant disciplinary information, and be provided opportunities to prepare for subsequent courses in the curriculum. Instructors should engage peer and student feedback and the scholarship of teaching and learning in their disciplines, regularly reflecting on and evaluating current practices and implementing alternative approaches in response. (Rev. Aug. 2023)~~

Departments and programs that expect faculty members to demonstrate specific characteristics of effective teaching that are aligned with this standard should articulate those in their departmental or program guidelines. (Ins. Aug. 2023)

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

The faculty member should provide a narrative that includes a critical self-reflection of their teaching philosophy and methodology, as well as their accomplishments in teaching and in related efforts, including advising and mentoring, as appropriate. The candidate should provide evidence in support of their narrative, associated with courses taught during the review period, including the following:

- (1) Syllabi, including course objectives and student learning outcomes, grading policy, and other required content, per Policy 7.6.10, Policy on Course Syllabi.
- (2) Samples of course materials, including assessments (such as tests, exams, essays, or other assignments), and as appropriate, evaluation rubrics, materials from course websites, projects, and evaluated student work.
- (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.
- (4) Student reviews of teaching:
 - (i) Student Course-Instructor Evaluation quantitative ratings from all course sections for which they were administered. These surveys will be administered for every section of every course, every semester, with the exception of a course that has only one student enrolled. A faculty member undergoing review may choose to also include student free responses as part of the packet, having explained in the written narrative about teaching whether all the comments or a selection of the comments have been included. Departments may require inclusion of the student free responses. Any such requirement should be articulated in approved departmental guidelines. (Rev. Aug. 2018)
 - (ii) An aggregate rating for each semester for all courses in the department will be included in the evidence submitted by the candidate. (Rev. Apr. 2007)

The chair of the Departmental Evaluation Panel will also collect the following evidence:

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.

- (1) Departmental colleague letters evaluating teaching, which are required.
- (2) Letters from extra-departmental colleagues at the College of Charleston and/or at other institutions, if candidate elects or if department or program requires. —evaluating teaching are optional. (Ins. Apr. 2007)

(Ins. April 2007)

- (3) Evaluatee's narrative of teaching philosophy, methodology, and accomplishments in teaching, advising and other similar activities.
- (3) 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 the Provost 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. Apr. 2007)[DMC5]

- (45) Student ratings and summaries:
- (i) ~~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 the written narrative about teaching whether all the comments or a selection of the comments have been included. (Rev. Aug. 2018)~~
- (ii) ~~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. Apr. 2007)~~

Additional evidence submitted by the candidate may include but is not limited to:

- (1) Samples of evaluatee-prepared and/or supplementary course materials.
- (2) Participation in curriculum development.
- (3) Participation in interdisciplinary courses and programs.
- (4) Participation in peer coaching activities and/or observation of classroom performance by colleagues.
- (5) Participation in pedagogical conferences, workshops and field trips.

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

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

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

~~(iv) Participation in curriculum development.~~

~~(v) Participation in interdisciplinary courses and programs.~~

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

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

(Rev. Aug. 2023)

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