MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF
THE UNIVERSITY OF NORTH CAROLINA AT PEMBROKE (UNCP)
PROMOTION AND TENURE TASK FORCE
Wednesday, October 31, 2012, 11:30 a.m.

PRESENT
Dr. Charles Beem, Associate Professor, History
Dr. Susan Cannata, Professor, English/Faculty Senate Chair, Co-Chair
Dr. Elizabeth Denny, Professor, Psychology
Dr. Thomas Dooling, Professor, Chemistry and Physics
Dr. Richard Gay, Associate Professor, Art
Dr. Kenneth Kitts, Provost and Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs, Co-Chair
Mr. Joshua Malcolm, University Attorney
Dr. Marisa Scott, Assistant Professor, Educational Specialties

STAFF
Alicia Jiles, Administrative Support Associate, Academic Affairs, Recorder

1. CALL TO ORDER
• Co-chair Cannata called the meeting to order at 11:33 a.m.

2. REVIEW AND APPROVAL OF MINUTES
• Amendments to previous minutes approved.

3. HANDOUTS
• Information on five comparison universities

4. DISCUSSION
• Minutes from P&T Task Force meetings will be put on website for public viewing.
• Chancellor’s P&T memo will also be placed on website once the chancellor grants his approval.
• Difficult to meet goal of having P&T recommendations ready by first Faculty Senate meeting in April.
• Dr. Cannata hopes to invite general faculty to an open forum for input on P&T policy in the spring.
• Members presented and discussed their findings since the last meeting.

4. a. Discussion Items from Chancellor’s Memo:

Item One—University Standards and Expectations--S. Cannata
• Item One findings were emailed to members prior to meeting
• Item One included the university’s mission, vision, core values, and ten pages of the Faculty Handbook that address the standards and eligibility criteria for the promotion and tenure process.

• The task force discussed whether departments should set their own criteria for scholarship and service. Members recognized the difficulty in using a uniform standard to measure scholarship and service within the various departments due to divergent disciplines and values.

• Western Carolina, one of our comparison universities, has gone furthest to establish criteria for scholarship, service, and teaching within the departments; but there is still a question of how they judge percentages.

• The Faculty Handbook gives the P&T committee a directive to take percentages into account when grading faculty. The task force is concerned that the committee is not following the Handbook’s instructions.

• Chairs are having conversations with junior faculty about what is expected of them, but the conversations are on an individual basis and there is nothing systematically enforced. Criteria in certain departments may not be understood by the Promotion and Tenure Committee, the provost, or the chancellor.

• Members questioned what being a “teaching university” now means for UNCP. Should emphasis still be on teaching in regards to promotion and tenure or is the tide shifting in favor of scholarship and service?

**Item Two—Promotion and Tenure Degree Requirements—M. Scott**

• One of two documents was emailed to members prior to meeting.

• Second document was handed out during meeting.

• Dr. Scott interviewed the academic deans regarding what degrees were held by their faculty members who have been eligible to participate in the promotion and tenure process.

• In the School of Education, only faculty members who have held the terminal degree of Ph.D. and Ed.D. have been eligible. Education faculty members are required to complete the minimum of six years of employment before seeking promotion and tenure. Only occasionally have Education faculty pursued early tenure. Only in one instance was an Education faculty member granted tenure at time of employment.

• In the College of Arts and Sciences, the majority of faculty have a Ph.D. degree. Some have an MBA or MFA. In Mass Communications, the Accredited in Public Relations (APR) designation was observed for faculty who had MBA degrees. Work in the corporate world was also taken into consideration when gauging professional work experience in the Mass Communications department.

• In the School of Business, doctorate degrees, i.e., Ph.D. and DBA are the only acceptable terminal degrees.

• Library and Theatre faculty have different standards of what constitutes an acceptable degree.

• The Comparable Professional Distinction can only be used for promotion. Department chairs can decide to accept degrees comparable to terminal degrees for tenure-track appointments, but need approval to do so from the dean and provost.
Item Three—Peer Evaluation Committee (PEC)—C. Beem

- Item Three findings were emailed to members prior to the meeting.
- Dr. Beem asked the department chairs at the university to divulge how peer evaluation committees are picked for promotion and tenure.
- Department processes for peer committees vary because of size and other factors.
- Task force also discussed how some of our peer institutions have a standing PEC, or that all members are appointed by the chair with no input from the candidate.
- Members discussed whether a standing PEC would lend more objectivity to the process; it was countered that a PEC evaluation from members within the candidate’s field is important because the PEC members will know the discipline.

Item Four—P&T Roles of Chairs and Deans—R. Gay

- Item Four findings were emailed to members prior to the meeting.
- Dr. Gay explored the roles and responsibilities of the department chairs and deans in relation to mentoring faculty and assisting in the promotion and tenure process.
- The roles of chairs and deans must be clearly defined, and they should be held accountable for both mentoring faculty to be successful in reaching promotion and tenure, but also being held accountable when they do not.
- Roles of department chairs seem to be more clearly defined in the Faculty Handbook than that of the deans.
- Task force suggested increasing accountability of chairs and deans and possibly recommending training.

Item Five—Promotion and Tenure Committee—T. Dooling

- Item Five findings were emailed to members prior to meeting.
- Dr. Dooling outlined the varying operations and structure of other universities’ promotion and tenure committees.
- He researched UNC Charlotte, Frostburg State, UNC-Chapel Hill, UNC-Wilmington, Elizabeth City, and NC State.
- At UNCP, the Board of Trustees makes the final decision about promotion and tenure.
- How effective the P&T committee is depends on its members and its chair; but it is difficult for some members to judge the scholarship of candidates outside of their discipline.
- The task force questioned whether the P&T committee should be expanded to include members from all disciplines.
- Task force also reiterated the possibility of eradicating the university-wide P&T committee and going to a college-level, or keeping the university-wide committee but have it function as an oversight committee.

Item Six—Disciplinary Statements—K. Kitts

- Item Six findings were emailed to members prior to meeting.
• Dr. Kitts included highlighted passages from the Faculty Handbook that speak about the varying needs and traditions of different academic disciplines.
• The Model encourages flexibility in applying the principles and criteria from each area of faculty evaluation, allowing for the varying needs and traditions of different academic disciplines.
• Western Carolina uses the Boyer principles in their promotion and tenure process and has crafted discipline-based statements at the department level.
• Task force agreed that greater clarity is needed about expectations of faculty in the promotion and tenure process.

5. **ACTION**

• Task force members are to revisit the six items discussed;
• Look at overall flow chart of the P&T process;
• Talk with faculty and find any written material to identify the source of conflicting ideas about what constitutes required performance for promotion and tenure, and present their findings by email before the next meeting;
• Determine what UNCP’s values are. Get coordinated with these values and the university’s mission;
• Look at training slide from the Teaching and Learning Center to discover what new faculty members are learning; and
• Attempt to crystalize things in next meeting and come up with action plan for P&T changes.
• The next P&T Task Force meeting has been scheduled for Wednesday, November 28 at 11:15 a.m. in Lumbee Hall Room 436.

6. **ADJOURNMENT**

• Meeting was adjourned at 1:48 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Alicia Jiles
Recording Secretary