

**Minutes of the Promotion and Tenure Review Committee**  
**September 26, 2005**  
**Old Main: Room 241**

Members Present: Sharon Bell, Sherry Edwards, Holden Hansen, Liz Normandy, David Ziegler

Members Excused: Kay McClanahan, Bill Gash, Karen Stanley, Bruce DeHart

The meeting was called to order at 3:00 p.m. by Liz Normandy, Chair.

Liz Normandy opened the meeting by discussing the background concerning a letter dated June 23, 2005 to former Senate Chair Jesse Peters from the Chair of the UNCP Board of Trustees, Carl Meares, Jr. The letter "...requests that the Faculty Senate make it a **top priority** to review and recommend revisions to clarify the promotion and tenure requirements published in the Faculty Handbook..." Dr. Normandy advised the Promotion and Tenure Review Committee that issues had been raised in particular about the evaluation of scholarship when deciding to support or overturn rulings for promotion to Full Professor. The Board of Trustees found that there was no way to substantiate decisions made by the Promotion and Tenure Committee (P & T), the Provost, or the Chancellor, due to the vagaries of language in the Faculty Handbook, and "concluded that revision, especially clarification..." was needed.

Dr. Normandy then led a discussion surrounding issues and challenges implicit in the charge for the committee. They are summarized as follows:

**Who should be consulted during this process?**

The deadline for proposed revision is February 15. A question was raised as to whether or not the proposal should go through the Faculty Evaluation Review (FER) Committee or should it come straight from the Promotion and Tenure Review Committee. FER would have to receive and approve this proposal at their November meeting. The calendar presents a challenge. To what degree and when should FER be involved in this process?

The P & T committee is heavily involved in the promotion and tenure process. Should someone from that committee be consulted as we begin developing the proposal? Sandra Cross is the current Chair.

Department Chairs and College Deans appear to have widely varying definitions of what constitutes "legitimate" scholarship. How will these differences be accounted for during the process?

At what point should Provost Harrington be invited in to the discussion?

### **What methodology should be used in revising and revising criteria for scholarship?**

UNCP has historically placed a heavier emphasis on teaching, as opposed to scholarship. Promotion from Associate to Full Professor may have been historically viewed as a mere extension from Assistant to Associate Professor in that there has not been a significant increase in quality and quantity of scholarly activity between promotions.

Is there a reason to consider placing more stringent requirements on scholarly accomplishment in order to be promoted to Full Professor? If so, is it reasonable to grant aspiring Full Professors more release time than is currently in place to accommodate more stringent scholarly achievement criteria?

Should scholarly achievement be considered for the entire career of the candidate?

Should promotion be considered together with tenure, or should these remain separate decisions? Should we consider this question at all, or are we confining ourselves to the revision of promotion to full professor as it relates to scholarship criteria?

Should the promotion review process be confined to the schools or colleges?

What constitutes legitimate scholarship? How do we reconcile the widely divergent departmental views on the definition of scholarship? Should we develop a list of criteria naming examples of what “counts” and what doesn’t? How do we define quality and quantity of scholarship? Should it be based upon how “busy” the candidate is? In other words, how much time should a candidate spend on scholarship? Does pursuit of training count as scholarship?

Should promotion to Professor be more rigidly defined in terms of percentages set on the self-evaluation?

Provost Harrington has expressed a vision that expands the definition of scholarship. How does this vision affect our revision and clarification?

### **Initial Plan of Action**

Committee members are charged to examine every mention of scholarship in the Faculty Handbook, focusing particularly on sections 4 and 5, and come to the next meeting prepared with questions and critical comments. Sherry Edwards will compile and electronically distribute to the committee all Faculty Handbook references to “scholarship.” We will meet October 3 at 2:30, and begin the process of revising the language in hopes of getting a document to FER by their November meeting. Another meeting is planned for October 17, to which the Provost will be invited to share his views.

The meeting was adjourned at 4:25 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted by  
Holden Hansen