

DENISE R. SHAW EXCELLENCE IN SCHOLARSHIP AWARD PALMETTO COLLEGE CAMPUSES

INFORMATION ABOUT THE AWARD

The Denise R. Shaw Award in Scholarship is a University of South Carolina Palmetto College award given to recognize outstanding scholarship.

1. The award will be accompanied by a monetary stipend of \$2500.00
2. The award will be presented at the University of South Carolina Columbia Honors and Awards Ceremony and will be announced at the last Palmetto College Faculty Senate meeting of the academic year.
3. The award file covers the previous three (3) years of service. For example, for the 2020 Award, candidates would include service information from Fall 2017 up through Fall 2020.

ELIGIBILITY REQUIREMENTS

1. Nominees must be full-time Palmetto College faculty (FTE).
2. All full-time faculty members are eligible for the award, even with less than three (3) years of service to Palmetto College, except for the following:
 - a. Chair of the Palmetto College Campuses Faculty Senate Welfare Committee
 - b. Previous Shaw Award recipients are not eligible for nominations for a period of three (3) years after receiving the award.
3. Recipients of other Palmetto College campus awards are eligible for nomination for the Shaw Award.

REQUIRED MATERIALS FOR NOMINEE FILES

1. A two (2) page Curriculum Vitae, specific to scholarship
 - a. Vitas should be single-spaced, Times New Roman 12-point font
2. A narrative summary of qualifications (5 page maximum please)
 - a. Narrative Summary: The narrative should present the nominee's scholarly agenda as part of her or his overall career as an academic. It should be written for a review panel composed of reviewers from a variety of disciplines and should explain the normal expectations for scholarship in the nominee's discipline as well as the specific area of expertise in which the nominee works.
 - b. Narrative summaries should be double-spaced, Times New Roman 12-point font
 - c. Suggestions for narrative summary:
 - i. For journal publications, the nominee may wish to detail a journal's readership, prestige, rate of acceptance, peer review practices, and

- indexing (or other method of gauging reach and reception). The nominee may also include citations of the article in other publications.
- ii. For book publications, the nominee may wish to detail the publisher's significance for the field or general prestige, as well as note positive reviews.
 - iii. For conference presentations, the nominee may wish to highlight the significance of the conference for the field and the reception of the presentation. Similar information should be included for exhibitions and panel participation.
 - iv. For grants, the nominee may want to detail the competitiveness of the grant process and the impact on the nominee's scholarship.
 - v. NOTE: This is not an exhaustive list, nor is there any requirement for a candidate to speak to each suggestion on this list. Please see the Faculty Manual for criteria for scholarship.
3. Nominees should include a Cover Sheet to their file containing the following information:
 - a. Title of Award
 - b. Candidate's name, campus affiliation, and contact information
 4. Title page, CV, and Narrative/Summary should be saved and submitted as one PDF file to the committee.
 5. A separate file containing support or documentation materials may be submitted as well. The submission of documentation or support materials must be submitted as one PDF file, separate from the other required materials, to the committee.
 6. The Committee will not consider applications that do not follow the guidelines provided above.

NOMINATION PROCESS

Nominations will be submitted by each Palmetto College Campus to the Chair of the Palmetto College Faculty Senate Welfare Committee. There is a maximum of one (1) nominee per campus for this award.

Suggested Nomination Process for Campuses:

It is strongly recommended that final campus nominations are endorsed by faculty organizations on each campus using the suggested process below rather than being solely selected by campus administrators.

1. Nominations for the Shaw Award should be sent to one of the following: Academic Dean, Dean, or Faculty Organization Chair.
2. All nominations should be submitted prior to the November Faculty Organization meeting, or prior to a time decided on by the local campus Faculty Organization.
3. Nominations should include the name of the award, the nominee's name, and a one (1) page summary of the nominee's achievements in the area of scholarship.

4. The Academic Dean, Dean, or Faculty Organization Chair will contact nominees to see if they accept the nomination and will commit to submitting the application.
5. Should more than one candidate be nominated for this award at one campus, the Academic Dean, Dean, or Faculty Organization Chair will distribute the one (1) page summaries submitted by nominees to faculty prior to voting so that faculty can make an informed decision.
6. The Academic Dean, Dean, or Faculty Organization Chair will then present a ballot of all nominations to the faculty at the November Faculty Organization, or the time decided upon by the local campus Faculty Organization.
7. The Academic Dean, Dean, or Faculty Organization Chair will count the completed ballots and announce the winner at the end of the meeting.
8. The Academic Dean, Dean, or Faculty Organization Chair will submit campus nominations to the Chair of the Palmetto College Campus Faculty Senate Welfare Committee.

TIMELINE

- **September 1: Nominations open**
- **Last Day of Fall Semester Classes: Campus nominations due to chair of PCCFS Welfare Committee**
- **December: Nominees contacted by the PCCFS Welfare Committee**
- **January 31: Due dates for nominees to submit PDF files to PCCFS Welfare Committee Chair**
- **February: PCCFS Welfare Committee votes on files, committee decision is forwarded to the chancellor's office**
- **April (last PCCFS Meeting of the academic year): Award winner announced**

FACULTY AWARD SELECTION CODE OF CONDUCT

1. All proceedings and communications about nominees and the award process should be confidential. No individual may discuss names, content of files, or any details about nominees outside of the Welfare Committee. All nomination documents and files will be destroyed once the award process has ended (a winner decided by committee and accepted by the Chancellor).
2. The Chair of the Welfare Committee cannot be nominated for an award.
3. Members with conflicts of interest should abstain from votes and discussions and may remove themselves from the committee. Conflicts of interest include, but are

not limited to, a close personal relationship with any applicant such as spousal, partner, or other types of collaborative relationships.

4. If a member of the Welfare Committee is nominated by his/her campus for the Shaw Award, the member will **not** be privy to the files of other Shaw nominees and will be excused for that portion of the committee meeting in which Shaw nominees are being discussed and voted on. In this case, files for Shaw nominations will be sent out individually to committee members, except for the nominee, rather than housed on a shared site such as the PCCFS Welfare Committee Blackboard page.
5. Committee Members will read all nominees' files and will attend all meetings dedicated to the selection process.
6. Committee Members will judge files based on the criteria for scholarship as outlined in the PCC Faculty Manual. Accordingly, candidates will be judged based on their scholarship in the following areas:
 - a. Refection of a clear scholarly agenda
 - b. Relative consistency of output
 - c. Contribution to the candidate's field
 - d. Prestige of the venues for publication or presentation of scholarship
7. If any member of the committee feels that an error or impropriety has occurred during any part of the selection process, the committee member should notify the Chair of the committee. The member and chair will then bring the issue to the Chancellor and Provost's offices for resolution. The decision of the Chancellor will be final.

DENISE R. SHAW EXCELLENCE IN SCHOLARSHIP AWARD

Rubric for Evaluating Candidate Applications

(Modeled on GLD Portfolio Rubric)

CATEGORY	ELEMENT	MARGINAL ACHIEVEMENT 1	SOME ACHIEVEMENT 2	STRONG ACHIEVEMENT 3	EXCEEDS EXPECTATIONS 4
Professionalism <i>(Please consider the e-portfolio in its entirety when scoring this category.)</i>	1. <i>Comprehensiveness, organization, and formatting</i>	Does not include required sections of candidate file.	Includes all sections but sections are not clearly labeled or organized.	Includes all sections. They are clearly labeled and organized.	Includes all required sections, clearly labeled, and organized with exceptional clarity.
	2. <i>Candidate vita highlights scholarship-related accomplishments (awards, honors, successes, etc.)</i>	Vita does not help reviewers gauge candidate's achievements.	Vita, narrative, & file insufficiently compelling for top marks.	Vita, narrative & supporting file very strong. [note what could have made this a 4]	Vita, narrative, & supporting file demonstrate clear evidence of superior scholarship.
Core Areas	3. <i>Record of outstanding scholarship as defined in PCC Faculty Manual: Clear scholarly agenda; consistency of output; Contribution to the candidate's field(s); Prestige of venues for publication and or /presentation.</i>	Insufficient evidence for scholarly excellence. Some areas may be missing or under-developed	Documented evidence of scholarly achievement in at least 3 areas. Significance of contribution and/or prestige may not be evident.	Documented evidence of scholarly achievement in all 4 areas. Clear description of contribution to the field and of prestige of venues for publication/presentation	Documented evidence of strong scholarly achievement: Scholarship is well-recognized within field(s) by peer scholars; scholarship innovates and/or shapes field.
	4. <i>Narrative explains clearly and persuasively how the candidate's scholarship models outstanding achievement in all four areas.</i>	The candidate may have documented evidence of scholarship, but the narrative is not sufficient for explaining significance.	The narrative adds a bit more to the vita and list, but items are left under-explained; impact hard to determine	The narrative provides some explanation for the strength and value of scholarship, showing that the candidate sees their work in the larger context of the whole.	The narrative clearly explains significance to development of field(s), and establishing candidate as authority.

CATEGORY	ELEMENT	MARGINAL ACHIEVEMENT 1	SOME ACHIEVEMENT 2	STRONG ACHIEVEMENT 3	EXCEEDS EXPECTATIONS 4
	5. <i>Clearly demonstrated ability to inspire, promote, and sustain scholarly development at campus, university, professional, and community levels.</i>	It is unclear from this file that the candidate has a well-developed scholarly agenda, or helps foster peer scholarship.	Candidate may have a solid scholarly agenda; file may not be clear on how that connects with scholarly community.	Narrative demonstrates a comprehensive agenda; candidate shows evidence of participation in scholarly communities	This file gives strong evidence for a comprehensive research agenda, strong participation and leadership in scholarly communities.
	6. <i>Clear evidence of innovative, creative, and engaging scholarship.</i>	Impact of scholarship may not be clear to those outside the discipline; minimal evidence of innovation or creativity	Clear evidence of scholarly achievement; there may not be strong evidence of creativity or innovation	There is notable evidence of significant scholarly achievement. It may not be as innovative or creative. It may not be as clearly explained to those outside the discipline.	Innovative nature of scholarship is persuasively explained. Impact of scholarship is fairly easy to understand, regardless of field.
	7. <i>Detailed current and future goals for continued scholarly development and growth, including participation in scholarly communities within the U of SC system and within their field.</i>	Marginal indication of plans for improvement, vision for future, or goals for participation in scholarly community	File shows evidence of scholarly growth over time frame measured.	Narrative shows clear trajectory of growth and indicates further plans for development. Evidence of emerging leadership in scholarly community.	Not only clear trajectory and future plan, but also evidence of leadership within scholarly community
	8. <i>File demonstrates strong grasp of campus, PCC, university, and professional values; those values are well-represented in the file.</i>	Marginal connection to values of campus / university as a whole.	Some connection to values of campus and / or university as a whole. Not as well developed or present.	PCC/U of SC mission values are present in the file, and significantly developed. Connection between scholarship and pedagogy is present.	Mission-orientation is rich and well-developed. Connection between scholarship and pedagogy is clear.
COLUMN TOTALS					
GRAND TOTAL					

NOTES: Have some notes to explain your scores, particularly with reference to specific items/page numbers in candidate files.