



COLLEGE of
CHARLESTON

Tenure and Promotion Reviews of Instructional Faculty



Expectations and Processes

April/May 2020

Disclaimer

- Materials are updated each year; changes have been reviewed for accuracy before finalizing this year's presentation.
- No slide deck can incorporate every detail of the tenure-and-promotion process.
- If there is any inconsistency between this slide deck and the *Faculty/Administration Manual* or departmental criteria, the *Faculty/Administration Manual* and the departmental criteria shall prevail.

Advisory Committee on Tenure, Promotion, and Third-Year Review

- Iana Anguelova, Professor, Mathematics
- Doug Ferguson, Professor, Communication
- Marvin Gonzalez, Associate Professor, Supply Chain and Information Management
- Margaret Hagood*, Professor, Teacher Education
- Anton Vander Zee, Associate Professor, English

*Continuing from 2018-2019 as regular or alternate committee member

Alternates

- Bonnie Devet, Professor, English
- Chris Fragile, Professor, Physics and Astronomy
- Irina Gigova, Associate Professor, History
- Brian Lanahan, Associate Professor, Teacher Education
- Namjin Lee, Associate Professor, Communication

Expectations and Process are Articulated in the *Faculty/Administration Manual*

- Available at: academicaffairs.cofc.edu/FAM.pdf
- See Part VI, sections A-D, of the *Manual*.
- Some departments and programs have additional criteria.

Other Essential Documents

- PowerPoint slides from Spring candidate sessions, reflecting the *Manual* while highlighting performance expectations and outlining the review process
- Joint Memo, issued annually by the Provost and the Chair of the Advisory Committee on Tenure, Promotion, and Third-Year Review, containing:
 - Process Calendar
 - Detailed packet guidelines
 - Information regarding electronic sites
 - Packet Checklist

Review Process

- List of candidates is finalized (Aug. 15)
- Process begins when candidate submits packet by announced deadline (Sept. 15)
- Review by Departmental Evaluation Panel
- Review by Dean
- Review by the Advisory Committee (third-year review cases will be reviewed only when required or requested)
- Review by Provost
- Review and final decision by the President

Online Packets

- For 2020-2021, candidates will again be required to use online packets.
- Exceptions require the Provost's approval.
- Exception requests will be considered only in cases where the nature of the bulk of the candidate's work does not allow for good presentation online.
- URLs for candidate sites to be provided shortly.

General Considerations

- All evaluations will involve a rigorous review of the quality of the candidate's work.
- The review does not consist of demonstrating that some minimum threshold has been met.
- Work in all three competency areas must be of sufficient quality: Teaching Effectiveness, Research and Professional Development, and Service.

Candidate Responsibilities

Preparation of a packet of materials demonstrating how and to what extent the standards have been met in the three competency areas:

- Teaching
- Research and Professional Development
- Service

Candidate Responsibilities

- The burden rests with the candidate to demonstrate with the packet that she or he is in full and complete compliance with the standards and criteria for tenure, promotion, retention, or third-year retention.
- Careful preparation of a packet - including the narrative and appropriately selected supporting evidence - is critical in demonstrating that the standards and criteria have been met.



Expectations for Each Level of Review (as articulated in the *Manual*)

Third-Year Review

- Substantiates whether satisfactory progress toward tenure and promotion to Associate Professor or promotion to Senior Instructor has been made.
- For tenure-track faculty, must show evidence of effective teaching, a continuing research program, and active participation in service.
- Points out any weaknesses that, if not corrected, might lead to a negative tenure or promotion decision.

Note: A positive third-year review does not determine a positive tenure decision

Tenure and Promotion to Associate Professor

- Normally during the sixth year at the College.
- Only in exceptional cases may a faculty member petition for early tenure and promotion review (and such requests must be approved by the Chair, Dean, and Provost).
- Requires substantial evidence of consistently high professional competence in teaching, research and professional development, and service.
 - In addition, one of the three areas must be rated exemplary **OR** the candidate must demonstrate significant achievement in the two areas of teaching and research & professional development.

Promotion to Professor

- Eligible for review for promotion to Professor in seventh year as Associate Professor at the College.
- Only in exceptional cases may a faculty member petition for early promotion (and such requests must be approved by the Chair, Dean, and Provost).
- Requires substantial evidence of continuing high professional competence in teaching, research and professional development, and service.
 - In addition, one of the three areas must be rated exemplary **OR** candidate must demonstrate significant achievement all three areas.

Promotion to and Renewal as Senior Instructor

Promotion to (and renewal as) Senior Instructor requires:

- sustained exemplary performance in teaching;
- clear evidence of promise for continued development in pedagogy; and
- active and sustained participation in service.



Questions about Expectations?

PACKET*:

Items Supplied by Candidate

Front Material

- Curriculum Vitae;
- List of all courses taught during evaluation period;
- Latest faculty appointment letter or promotion letter (*as applicable*);
- Tenure clock modification letter (*only if applicable*);
- Annual Evaluations;
- Departmental Evaluation Panel letter from Third-Year Review (*only for reviews for tenure and promotion to Associate Professor or promotion to Senior Instructor*);
- Narrative (10 pages maximum).

Questions about these packet items?

Teaching Expectations (as articulated in *Manual*)

- Effective teaching is the primary means by which faculty achieve tenure, promotion, and successful third-year review at the College of Charleston.
 - Tenure and promotion to Associate Professor requires “sustained effectiveness in teaching.”
 - Promotion to Professor requires “sustained high quality and effective teaching.”
 - Promotion to Senior Instructor requires “sustained exemplary performance in teaching.”

Teaching – Advice to Candidates

- Use your narrative to demonstrate the quality of your teaching
- Consider addressing how you teach, explaining why you choose specific approaches, and reporting on the effectiveness of your approaches
- Use your narrative to help reviewers at each level orient themselves in your evidence
- Be attentive to questions that your evidence may raise

Packet Items to be Provided by Candidate

- Sample syllabi from 3 representative courses;
- Selected representative sample of teaching materials -- assignments, exams, handouts -- from the same 3 courses;
- Samples of graded student work from the same 3 courses (*optional*);
- Summary table of Course-Instructor Evaluation averages for each course taught during the evaluation period, including comparisons of the candidate's averages to departmental averages (these tables may be requested by the candidate via irp.cofc.edu/submit-a-request);
- Summary sheets from Course-Instructor Evaluation reports for each section taught by the candidate during the evaluation period (from Course-Instructor Evaluation software, Blue, accessible from home page in OAKS);
- Non-confidential reports of classroom observations (*optional*).

Summary Course-Instructor Evaluation Tables for Each Course (from IR)

Candidates may request these tables from Institutional Research online via “Submit a Request.” Please see annual Joint Memo from Provost and Advisory Committee chair for additional details.

College of Charleston							
Term Means Summary Report of Course Evaluation Data							
All Fall/Spring Courses Evaluated between -Spring 2015							
Instructor: Comparison Department							
crslist=							
		Term		Candidate Avg - This Course	Candidate Median - This Course	Candidate Standard Deviation - This Course	Dept Avg /All Courses
		Spring 2013	Section				
Organization	Course materials were well prepared and carefully explained.	4.00	3.75	3.83	4.50	1.60	3.99
	Course objectives were clearly stated and pursued.	4.00	3.75	3.83	4.50	1.60	4.07
Assignments	Assignments, tests and written work in the course reflected the content and emphasis of the course.	4.00	3.75	3.83	4.50	1.60	4.09
	Required readings/texts were valuable.	4.00	3.75	3.83	4.50	1.60	3.85
Grading	Methods used for evaluating student work were fair and appropriate.	4.00	3.75	3.83	4.50	1.60	4.07
	Feedback on graded assignments was valuable.	4.00	3.75	3.83	4.50	1.60	3.93
Learning	I found this course intellectually challenging and stimulating.	4.50	4.00	4.17	5.00	1.60	4.08
	I have developed my skills and knowledge.	5.00	4.00	4.33	5.00	1.63	3.99
	Students were encouraged to share knowledge and ideas.	5.00	4.00	4.33	5.00	1.63	3.98
	This course increased my interest in the subject.	5.00	4.00	4.33	5.00	1.63	3.99
Instructor	The instructor showed enthusiasm for teaching the subject.	5.00	4.00	4.33	5.00	1.63	4.35
	The instructor showed interest in the learning and development of students.	5.00	4.00	4.33	5.00	1.63	4.17
	The instructor was adequately accessible to students during office hours or after class.	5.00	4.00	4.33	5.00	1.63	4.10
Overall	Overall, this instructor is an effective teacher.	5.00	4.00	4.33	5.00	1.63	4.03
	Overall, this is a good course.	4.50	4.00	4.17	5.00	1.60	3.90

Summary Sheets from Course-Instructor Evaluation Reports for Each Section Taught (from Blue)

First-Year Seminar for ()

College of Charleston Course-Instructor Evaluations

Raters	Section
Responded	
Invited	
Response Ratio	%

Summary

Question	Section			Department			Overall		
	Mean	Median	Standard Deviation	Mean	Median	Standard Deviation	Mean	Median	Standard Deviation
Course materials were well-prepared and carefully explained.	4.8	5.0	0.4	4.3	4.0	0.9	4.2	5.0	1.0
Course objectives were clearly stated and pursued.	4.8	5.0	0.4	4.2	4.0	0.9	4.3	5.0	1.0
Assignments, tests, and written work in the course reflected the content and emphasis of the course.	4.6	5.0	0.9	4.2	4.0	1.0	4.4	5.0	0.9
Required readings/texts were valuable.	4.4	5.0	0.9	4.0	4.0	1.1	4.1	4.0	1.0
Methods used for evaluating student work were fair and appropriate.	4.8	5.0	0.4	4.2	5.0	1.1	4.3	5.0	0.9
Feedback on graded assignments was valuable.	5.0	5.0	0.0	4.2	5.0	1.0	4.2	4.0	1.0
I found this course intellectually challenging and stimulating.	4.8	5.0	0.4	3.9	4.0	1.2	4.2	4.0	1.0
I have developed my skills and knowledge.	4.8	5.0	0.4	4.1	4.0	1.1	4.2	4.0	1.0
Students were encouraged to share knowledge and ideas.	5.0	5.0	0.0	4.4	5.0	0.9	4.3	5.0	1.0
This course increased my interest in the subject.	4.2	4.0	0.8	3.8	4.0	1.2	3.9	4.0	1.2
The instructor showed enthusiasm for teaching the subject.	4.8	5.0	0.4	4.7	5.0	0.6	4.6	5.0	0.7
The instructor showed interest in the learning and development of the students.	4.6	5.0	0.9	4.5	5.0	0.8	4.4	5.0	0.9
The instructor was adequately accessible to students during office hours or after class.	4.8	5.0	0.4	4.5	5.0	0.8	4.4	5.0	0.9
Overall this instructor is an effective teacher.	4.8	5.0	0.4	4.2	5.0	1.0	4.3	5.0	1.0
Overall, this is a good course.	4.6	5.0	0.5	4.0	4.0	1.2	4.2	4.0	1.0

Questions about teaching expectations or
required packet items addressing teaching?

Research and Professional Development Expectations (as articulated in *Manual*)

A record of consistent productivity is an indicator of promise for continued high quality scholarship and professional activity.

- Tenure and promotion to Associate Professor requires “clear evidence of high promise for continued high quality scholarship and professional activity.”
- Promotion to Professor requires “clear evidence of continuing quality scholarship.”
- Promotion to Senior Instructor (or retention as Sr. Instructor) requires “clear evidence of promise for continued development in pedagogy.”

Research and Professional Development Expectations for Tenure and Promotion in Professorial Ranks (as articulated in *Manual*)

Peer refereeing is one criterion of scholarly quality. The evidence [for professorial ranks] must include scholarly books or journal articles (or otherwise juried publications or professionally evaluated performances or exhibits in the arts).

Research and Professional Development – Advice to Candidates

- Clearly indicate which accomplishments (e.g. publications) are being presented as evidence of having met the expectations.
- Use the narrative to describe your evidence and connect it to your CV.
- Be attentive to quality as well as quantity.
- Provide the requested evidence, as outlined in Joint Memo and on the following slides.
- For work that was not fully produced during your review period, clearly indicate what portion was done during the review period.

PACKET*:

Evidence to be Provided by Candidate

(for tenure and promotion to Associate Professor and promotion to Professor)

- 3 sample publications to be included in primary area of packet;
- For co-authored publications, candidate should clearly articulate their contribution;
- For each publication, provide evidence of the nature of any peer refereeing or other review for publication;
- Provide evidence about the quality of each journal or press.

PACKET*:

Evidence to be Provided by the Candidate

Professional Development (for Senior Instructors)

- Participation in workshops, conferences, etc.;
- Production of scholarly or creative works that are pedagogical in nature;
- Chairing or serving as a discussant on a panel at a professional meeting;
- Serving as an officer or board member of a professional organization.

Questions about research and professional development expectations or required packet items?

Service

- Tenure and promotion to the rank of Associate Professor requires “active and sustained participation in service to the College or active and sustained service in the candidate’s professional role to the local, state, regional, or national community.”
- Promotion to the rank of Professor requires “active and sustained service to the College. **Leadership** should be demonstrated either in college service or in the candidate’s professional role to the local, state, regional, or national community.”
- Promotion to Senior Instructor requires “active and sustained participation in service to the College.”

Service – Advice to Candidates

- Use your narrative and your CV to clearly indicate your service contributions.
- Be attentive to articulating your notable contributions through your narrative or via briefly annotated entries on your CV.

PACKET*:

Evidence to be Provided by the Candidate

List of service activities, with brief explanation of duties involved in each



Questions about service expectations or
required packet items?

Required and Optional Supplementary Materials

- Sample syllabi for all other courses taught during review period;
- Additional selected representative course materials, organized by course;
- Additional publications or creative works, including documentation of review;
- Externally funded grant proposals;
- Written comments from Course-Instructor Evaluations (if only selected comments are included, the selection process should be explained; the objectivity of selection has recently been the subject of discussion by the Advisory Committee)



Questions about required and optional
supplementary materials?

Notes on Additional Documentation

- Additional documentation generally may not be added to the candidate's packet after the departmental panel has completed its deliberations and, in no case, after the deadline for forwarding packets to the dean.
- The only exceptions are:
 - To allow for updates on the status of manuscripts that were both included in the packet and submitted for publication review prior to packet submission.
 - At the dean's level and above, requests for information concerning factual matters of the record necessary for the determination of a recommendation.
 - Requests for correction of errors of fact in Panel letter, Dean's letter, or Advisory Committee's letter.

Requests for Correction of Factual Errors

- If the written letter provided to the candidate by the Panel, Dean, or Advisory Committee contains an error of fact, the panel chair, Dean, or committee chair may correct this error through an addendum to the original letter (with notice to the candidate).
- **OR** the candidate may provide a written correction for the inclusion in the packet for consideration at higher levels of review within five working days of the provision of the recommendation.
- The written correction should not address matters of professional judgment and cannot alter the record presented in the packet or submit new evidence.



Questions?

Panel Chair Responsibilities - Summary

- Solicit and collect Recent Graduate Surveys (undergraduate and graduate) for tenure, promotion, and Senior Instructor renewal reviews;
- Arrange for an appropriate external member to serve on *all* of the department's panels according to the protocol in the *FAM*;
- Arrange for optional External Review of research according to the *FAM*;
- Solicit extra-departmental colleague letters (required regarding service for tenure and promotion reviews);
- Collect colleague letters;
- Conduct the interview of the candidate with the Panel;
- Draft and finalize the Department Evaluation Panel letter;
- Provide candidate with a copy of the Departmental Evaluation Panel letter (*All* candidates must sign panel letter); and
- Provide requests for correction of errors of fact in panel letter submitted by candidate or panel chair.

Panel Chair Responsibilities - Recent Graduate Surveys

- By August 1, a minimum of 40 surveys should be sent out. As of 2014-2015, panels must endeavor to receive at least 20 responses from recent graduates.
- In cases where there is a graduate program in the discipline, “majors” should be interpreted to include both undergraduate and graduate students in the major discipline.
- Recent graduate surveys are optional in third-year reviews.
- These surveys should be administered electronically.*
- All departments must use the uniform demographic form, available in Qualtrics, along with questions that solicit feedback on the candidate’s performance.

* Effective with 2020-2021 reviews.

Panel Chair Responsibilities - Recent Graduate Surveys

- Recent graduate responses should be provided in both summary form and as individual responses, rather than being provided only as a collection of individual responses.*
- Panel chairs should include (in the Confidential Materials portion of the candidate's packet) an explanation of how Recent Graduate Opinions were collected.
- Panel Chairs should also include a list of graduates contacted, identifying any that were added to the list by the candidate.

* Effective with 2020-2020 reviews.



Questions?

Panel Chair Responsibilities - Optional External Reviews of Research

- The *Manual* outlines the procedure to follow for soliciting external reviews of research.
- Reviewers must be asked to identify their relationship (if any) to the candidate.
- The panel chair should describe in the panel portion of the packet how the external reviewers were chosen.
- The panel chair should provide the letter used to solicit the reviews.
- Panels should avoid using close collaborators or thesis advisors of the candidate as external reviewers.



Questions?

PACKET*:

Items Supplied by Panel Chair

Confidential Portion of Electronic Packet

- Recent Graduate Surveys – both summary data and individual responses (*optional for third-year review*);
- Peer Reviews of Classroom Performance (*optional*);
- Explanation of how Graduate Surveys were solicited (*these surveys are optional for third-year review*);
- Extra-departmental Colleague Letters addressing the candidate's performance in the area of Service (*optional for third-year review*);

PACKET*:

Items Supplied by Panel Chair (continued)

Confidential Portion of Packet (continued)

- External Reviews of Research (*optional*);
 - Accompanied by explanation of how external reviews of research were solicited, including:
 - the creation of panel and candidate lists of potential reviewers,
 - specific process for selecting reviewers from those two lists,
 - copies of the solicitation letters, and
 - reviewers' credentials.



Questions?

PACKET*:

Items Supplied by Panel Chair

Confidential Portion of Electronic Packet

- Departmental Colleague Letters (*required from all tenured faculty in the department except the department chair or other members undergoing review for the same rank*);
- Departmental Evaluation Panel Letter (with a copy of this letter also provided to the candidate);

Panel Responsibilities - Colleague Letters

Chairs should advise Departmental Evaluation Panel members that:

- Letters written by individual panel members should be evaluative;
- Letters should explain how and to what extent the criteria have been met;
- Colleague letters should be written after studying the packet and before formal departmental deliberations take place;
- A separate colleague letter by the department chair is optional (though welcome);
- Colleague letters by untenured faculty members are optional.

Panel Responsibilities - Departmental Evaluation Panel Letter

The Departmental Evaluation Panel Letter should:

- Summarize all of the panel discussion, positive and negative;
- Address how and to what extent the candidate meets the criteria in each competency area, paying attention to the specific criteria for each rank; *e.g.* the criterion of leadership in service for promotion to Professor;
- Discuss how and to what extent the candidate meets the criterion of exemplary performance in at least one specified competency area, or significant achievement in both Teaching and Research (for tenure), or in all three areas (for promotion to Professor);
- Include a thorough assessment of the quality of a candidate's refereed or juried works;
- Include an assessment of the quality of a candidate's invited publications or creative works;
- Include discussion of external (to the College) evaluations of scholarly work, when solicited.



Questions?

Dean's Role

- Conducts independent evaluation of the candidate.
- May request additional factual information necessary for the determination of a recommendation.
- Interviews third-year review candidates and may choose to interview other candidates.
- Provides the candidate and the chair of the Departmental Evaluation Panel a copy of his/her assessment of the merits of the case and recommendation to the Provost.
- Provides correction of errors of fact in Dean's letter (by candidate or Dean).

Advisory Committee's Role

- Makes an independent assessment of the candidate's record.
- Reviews all evidence and all prior level recommendations.
- May request additional factual information necessary for the determination of a recommendation.
- Makes a written recommendation to the President with copy to candidate.
- Provides corrections of errors of fact in Advisory Committee's letter submitted by the candidate.

Recommendation of the Provost

- When the Provost's recommendation is negative or reverses an earlier decision, the Provost will provide the candidate a copy of his/her recommendation to the President.
- Without exception, and in the spirit of creating greater transparency in the tenure and promotion process, since 2014-2015, each candidate has received a copy of the Provost's recommendation to the President.

Calendar

- By **August 15**: List of candidates undergoing major review is finalized
- By **September 15**: Candidates' packets are due.
- By **November 1**: Panel deliberations *for tenure and promotion candidates* are finished, panel letters are signed and packets are made available to the Dean.
- By **December 1**: Deans complete their reviews and letters *for tenure and promotion candidates* and make packets available to Provost.
- By **January 15**: Panel deliberations *for third-year review cases* are finished, panel letters are signed and packets are made available to the Dean.
- By **February 1**: Deans complete their reviews and letters *for third-year review cases* and make packets available to Provost.
- By **February 25**: Advisory Committee gives recommendations to the Provost and the President.

Questions