

**Tenure and Promotion Task Force: Response to Chancellor Carter
January 2014**

Below is an abridged text of Chancellor Carter's memo of May 2013, with the response of the Task Force embedded below each specific response.

I think most of you know that the concept of tenure is being discussed in Raleigh. Although the legislature is primarily concerned with K-12, the same sentiment that makes K-12 tenure a topic in Raleigh has found its way to the BOG. I learned this week that BOG will be discussing tenure at its June meeting during the Education Planning Committee. Suzanne Ortega has taken the position that ALL Campuses have a rigorous, independent (unbiased) multi level review process that holds faculty accountable to rigorous standards. She is trying to use campus' rigor and unbiased processes to keep the BOG from mandating something of their own design—or discussing tenure's elimination. So far, she has been successful. However, beginning July 1st, we have 16 new BOG members who are even more prone to question tenure. It's clear that we will have additional rounds of justification going forward as new members come with a predisposition to question tenure's contribution to education.

The Task Force has discussed, debated, and voted to suggest a number of changes to the current model to meet Suzanne Ortega's critical threshold, with the express purpose of ensuring that tenure and promotion process is rigorous and unbiased. These changes are discussed in more detail below. We have done this with the conviction that tenure should be preserved as the basic model of rewarding academic achievement in teaching, scholarship, and service.

First of all, I appreciate all of the hard work you have done to review the policy. I know some seemed frustrated because you hadn't reached a final recommendation on some items. However, that is to be expected. We've been living with the current policy and procedures since 1988. So, change is going to be difficult and perhaps controversial in some areas. That said, I believe you have made substantial progress in identifying issues and moving toward recommended solutions. I am confident that we will be able to finalize the recommendations next year and meet the overall goal to create a consistent, and fair review process that measures faculty performance against clear standards related to disciplinary standards that fit the expectations of a regional comprehensive institution.

Here is the work that I believe needs to be done. You may identify additional items as you go along, but please address each of these.

(1) As I mentioned at the meeting, there is no reason to wait to develop a set of procedures and expectations to take into account Richard Gay's white paper. We can implement these recommendations administratively without making it a part of the policy. Therefore, I would like for you Ken to work with the Deans this summer to develop a set of expectations and procedures that addresses Richard's concerns. These procedures can be implemented this fall.

Tenure and promotion concerns have been addressed at Chair Workshop's throughout the year. In addition, Dean and chair responsibilities relative to tenure and promotion are discussed in several documents prepared by this taskforce. Mentoring language has been drafted or the Faculty Handbook.

(2) Spend some time on the university statement on the expectations of faculty work. As shown in Appendix A, this statement was approved in 1988. Does it still apply today? We need to have a common understanding of what the university expects of all faculty in general terms. Since excellence in teaching, scholarship and service may differ by discipline, we should develop specific criteria from disciplinary standards.

The task force has discussed, debated, and voted to recommend the implementation of disciplinary statements for departments to draft and submit for approval to Deans and the Provost not only to create a model for common understanding of university expectations for faculty but also as a model and guide for faculty as they negotiate the path towards tenure and promotion and for the campus wide tenure and promotion committee as they evaluate applications in a rigorous and unbiased manner.

(3) Revise the manner in which membership is selected for the departmental peer evaluation committee. The current method fails to meet the criteria of independence and, at minimum, creates the perception that candidates are held to different standards.

The task force has discussed, debated, and voted on a number of substantial changes to the current model. Instead of the usual Peer Evaluation Committee as detailed in the current Handbook, peer evaluation of tenure and promotion applications will be conducted by a Departmental Evaluation Committee (DEC). Documents will be submitted which will fully outline these changes, but in brief they will constitute the creation of a DEC that will be composed of all tenured faculty within departments, while preserving the department chair's independent role within the tenure and review process at the department level.

(4) Expand the size and scope of the university promotion and tenure committee. Wherever I have been, the university review committee has had at least 10 and as many as 12 members. Although the size may seem large, it has been my experience that the size is quite manageable. Increasing size allows the university to increase representativeness of disciplines which helps to create a better understanding of disciplinary values, thereby eliminating a systematic bias toward valuing one type of disciplinary work over another.

The task force has discussed, debated, and approved a proposal to expand the size and scope of the campus wide tenure and promotion committee to twelve members, with seven elected and five appointed by the Provost. In addition, we are recommending that the Provost sit on the committee as a non-voting member.

(5) Involve the Provost at the university review. The Provost needs to safe guard the process and assure that the university promotion and tenure committee is representative and follows the rules. I would like to see the Provost involved in making a portion of the appointments to assure representativeness of discipline, gender and rank. [I know recent history may weigh heavily on the minds of the committee. However, I urge you to move beyond that concern and develop a system that insists upon a Provost helping to insure the integrity of the process.]

As stated above, we have recommended that the Provost sit on the campus wide tenure and promotion committee as a non-voting member.

When you gather in the fall, I suggest you discuss how you will continue to tackle the project. My personal belief is that you should try to develop a full set of recommendations before you engage faculty focus groups. Since I have charged you to review our current policy and suggest improvements, it seems logical that you should do that yourselves and then seek feedback from faculty before you finalize your recommendations and submit them to me. We can then discuss the next steps, but I would assume we would modify the current policy document and I would have Ken, as Provost, submit a red-lined version to the Faculty Senate for review. Ken, we can discuss the procedures with Judy as incoming Senate Chair since she will be in office by the time you are ready to get feedback.

The task force will brief the Chancellor on its recommendations and plans for taking the proposals to the faculty..

Appendix A: Current University and Tenure Preamble

Tenure and Promotion Criteria

On November 2, 1988, the Faculty Senate unanimously approved the following criteria to be used in tenure and promotion considerations.

Recognizing that the quality of an institution rests largely on the quality of its faculty, it is imperative that there be at least minimal criteria to assist in tenure and promotion decisions. Faculty members need to be informed and to understand from the beginning of their employment that neither tenure nor promotion is a right or an automatic consequence of years of service, that each is earned through demonstrated excellence. In tenure decisions, consideration must be given additionally to the faculty member's potential for future contribution and institutional needs and resources. The terminal degree is required for all professorial ranks beginning with the Assistant Professor level. While the criteria for tenure and promotion are largely the same and while tenure and promotion decisions might be made at the same time, it should be understood that they are separate decisions.

The task force has discussed, debated and approved recommendations concerning criteria relating to terminal degrees and tenure and promotion decisions.

Candidates for tenure and/or promotion will be evaluated using the criteria of scholarship and professional growth, University and community service, and, most importantly, excellence and effectiveness in teaching. As a minimum standard, candidates should be evaluated as satisfactory or above in all categories. So far as possible, evidence of performance in these areas is to be objective and documented, with evaluations conducted by the candidates' peers and appropriate administrators. Each department's ranking of each of the following categories of evaluation will be used.

As stated above, the task force is recommending the adoption and implementation of department-approved disciplinary statements to aid in the documentation of objective departmental evaluations at various stages of the review and tenure and promotion process.

Scholarship and Professional Growth

All faculty are expected to engage in forms of scholarship appropriate to their discipline, their continuing professional growth, and the mission of the University. Scholarship is a valuable component in the makeup of a good teacher. Evaluation of scholarship and creative activity considers the contributions to the field or discipline, the quality of the work, and its significance or impact, with particular emphasis on accomplishments since the last appointment or promotion. It also includes consideration of the continuity, range, focus, and aggregation of productive work in the field.

Reflection on scholarship in the evaluation process ideally moves it beyond a simple listing of accomplishments or compilation of documents. Evidence of scholarship includes activities, artifacts documenting those activities, and a narrative containing reflective discussion from the candidate. The reflective narrative should demonstrate the pattern of scholarly activity and link it to the mission of the University that emphasizes dedication to engaged scholarship.

Faculty members are encouraged to continue to pursue opportunities for growth and development throughout their professional lives. Faculty members should engage in appropriate activities that will enhance their teaching effectiveness, keep them abreast of developments in their academic fields, and/or add new areas of expertise to the existing programs of the University.

University Service: is a criterion for tenure and promotion, the concept of service includes but may go beyond routine duties. Candidates should show evidence of participation and leadership in projects on and off the campus that contribute to advancing the mission of the University, service to one's discipline, and community involvement.

Teaching: though teaching is, in many ways, a highly individualized profession and though there are continuing debates over the most effective techniques, there is little disagreement over the importance of exceptional teaching as the major criterion for tenure and/or promotion. Clearly, exceptional teachers will show command of their subject, be creative and imaginative, be enthusiastic, promote critical thinking, stimulate their students to improved performance, engage in and use research, and be outstanding communicators.

All of the above issues (scholarship, service, teaching) are reflected in the task force's recommendations concerning departmental-approved disciplinary statements.