

Faculty Senate Minutes
May 6, 2014
President Lugo presiding

Call to Order
Quorum confirmed

Agenda: Revising Chapter 4D. The RPT Document

- A. The Evaluations section will be sent back to the Steering committee. They have not seen this yet and Richard Laws has made suggestions to fix the wording of this section.
- B. Chapter 4A. Policies of Academic Freedom and Tenure has been disposed of already. Academic freedom and tenure. Pass this and it was sent to the provost office, he has not gotten back to us yet. It is likely that it will come back to the senate. This document has not gone to the board of trustees.
- C. Changes suggested by the committee for the post-tenure review.
President Lugo suggests making a motion that we would revert back to the previous edition and come back to revise it first thing next year so that the new policies from the board of governors may be considered.
- D. Recommendation 15 – 4D3. RPT Additional Guidelines:
It was previously approved to change the Section 4Dc wording of “probationary” by “tenure.”

MO1 made to replace “explicit” with “written.”

The statement shall now read, “In addition to the university’s criteria for reappointment, tenure, and promotion, each department must develop written criteria for RTP that are shared with faculty at the time of initial hire.

The question was called. **MO1 accepted.**

- E. Recommendation 29 – 4D4a. Election of CRTP

MO2 was offered to change composition of the CRTP to only allow full tenured professors instead of having assistant and associate professors included. Currently there must be at least one member of each rank on this committee.

Summary of discussion points:

- Associate and assistant professors have valuable input on the decisions to promote to full tenure and are capable of rendering this judgment
- The decision to promote should only be made by professors at the promoting level or higher

- Some departments with a lack of full tenured professors may be under represented in the university committee if this motion is passed
- There are department chairs who are associate professors making decisions about tenured professors already

The question was called. **M02 rejected.**

F. Recommendation 20 – 4D4c. External Reviews of Candidates for Tenure and/or Promotion

MO3: Are extended reviews required for promotion to full professor?

Summary of discussion points

- This requirement should be made for promotion to associate professor because this is a very significant promotion. The jump to a full professor is easier to assess because the faculty member has already been in the department for 10+ years. Either way, the review is a good idea.
- This motion represents a change in the current policy. The current policy states that each department should develop a policy that specifies under what circumstances external reviews are required for tenure reviews and promotions. This motion makes it requirements for all associate professors to be reviewed.
- This requirement is not very effective because it amounts to the candidate's friends and colleagues writing biased letters.
- A review would be redundant
- Department colleagues make the best evaluators
- External evaluators would be more appropriate
- This adds extra administrative burden and cost
- We are not a research university, we are a comprehensive university and so the policies at ECU and Chapel Hill need not be considered.
- External reviews can be seen as an external validation of the academic processes at UNCW

The question was called. **MO3 rejected.**

G. Recommendation 21 – 4D4c subheading. External Reviews of Candidates for Tenure and/or Promotion: External Reviewer Selection Process & Timeline

Summary of comments about the process of external reviews:

- The person being reviewed should not be allowed to develop his or her own list of potential reviewers. Allowing this would lead to biased friends and close colleagues on the committee.
- Who should the departments select to review? Bias seems unavoidable.
- The candidate could pick three reviews and the department chair could pick three reviewers.
- Board of governors is suspect of internal procedures that are not uniform. This could be a potential public relations problem.

No objections to accepting this process. **Approved.**

H. Recommendation 9, 12 - 4D4d. Process for Faculty RPT Applications

A senior faculty member who serves on the university CRTP shall vote at the department level only.

M03 offered to strike the ban on allowing proxy votes.

Summary of discussion points:

- This is the most important thing a department does and the faculty needs to be there. Faculty misses out on the discussion when allowed to vote by proxy and therefore are not fully informed. There must be responsibility in the votes.
- For a large department, proxy votes limit quorum due to scheduling conflicts
- With modern technology, there are many ways to virtually attend the discussion of a meeting. Virtual presence is counted as presence.
- This is an issue that comes up often in the Faculty Senate and is addressed by words of order; proxy votes are looked down upon.

The question was called. **MO3 rejected.**

I. Recommendation 11, 31 - 4D4d. Process for Faculty RPT Applications

A senior faculty member who serves on the university CRTP shall vote at the department level only. They do not get to vote twice.

No objections. **Approved.**

J. Recommendation 13 – 4D4d. Process for Faculty RPT Applications

MO4 offered to revise the following the sentences, “As such, the chairperson provides his/her recommendation to the candidate and not to the departmental faculty. It will, however, go forward to the next levels of review.” The modified statement would read, “As such, the chairperson provides his/her recommendation to the candidate and forward to the next levels of review.”

Summary of discussion points:

- The letter of recommendation is shown to the candidate and not to the department.
- This is incompatible with the below sentence which states if the senior faculty does not agree with the chair’s recommendation, they can write their own version. However, if they do not see the chair’s letter, they would not know if they fully agreed or disagreed with the strength of actual letter.
- The rationale for the letter of recommendation not being shown to the senior faculty is that the letter is a part of the private personnel file of the candidate.
- The senior faculty is already involved in this private personnel issue.

- Perhaps we should have legal clarification in this matter
- There is no clarity in the language of intent of the chair's letter. Is the intent to present a summary of the faculty's discussion and feedback, or is it to merely record the vote and provide the chair's independent evaluation informed by the discussion? An alternative would be to combine the chair's independent evaluation along with a narrative of the faculty's discussion.

The question was called. **MO4 approved.**

K. Recommendation 1, 6 – 4D4d. Process for Faculty RPT Applications
The RTP candidate's dossier (1).

There are 3 levels of reviews: Dean, Chair, RTP committee (6).

There is a question of using a letter from the senior faculty in addition to the letter from the chair. This issue will remain unresolved until further advice from legal council is obtained.

L. Recommendation 26 - 4D4d. Process for Faculty RPT Applications

If the status of publications/artistic activities changes after the meeting of the senior faculty, documentation of that change (i.e., letter from editor, publication/activity date) may occur up to and including the dean's level of evaluation. The dean's office should insert the documentation of the change in the dossier before transmitting to Academic Affairs. After the dossier leaves the colleges/school, the dossier will not be changed.

Summary of points discussed:

- Recommendation from the Deans and Provost is to hold to the deadline of the RPT application and accept no further documentation after this deadline. This allows reviewers to have the benefit of seeing and evaluating the same materials.
- If a publication is accepted after the RPT deadline, it could strengthen the case for the candidate.
- Members in the department would already be familiar with any pending, unpublished works by the candidate.
- The application has to be closed at some point and this is a good stopping point
- Faculty should not consider works that have been submitted and not accepted

A vote is called. **Accepted.**

M. Recommendation 27 - 4D4d. Process for Faculty RPT Applications

MO5 is offered to strike "and notify the dean, chairperson, and candidate. At the request of the candidate, the chairperson of the CRPT must share the information and

its source with the candidate” from the following statement:

The CRTP may request clarification of information in a candidate’s dossier only from the department chairperson. If the CRTP receives any additional information regarding a candidate’s application, other than what appears in the official dossier, the CRTP must disregard this information and notify the dean, chairperson, and candidate. At the request of the candidate, the chairperson of the CRTP must share the information and its source with the candidate.

Summary of discussion points:

- The CRTP would not have to be involved in any “tattle-tailing.”
- There has been a case where a student has made a comment about the unprofessionalism of a professor. This statement could be disregarded. But if the statement was not addressed at all, this could be a potentially escalate into a significant problem.

The question is called. **MO5 rejected.**

N. Recommendation 32 - 4D4d. Process for Faculty RPT Applications

All other recommendations, whether positive or negative (and including a tie vote of senior faculty) are forwarded to the next deliberative entity.

No objections. **Approved.**

O. Recommendation 12 - 4D4d. Process for Faculty RPT Applications

The department chairperson and dean must provide an elaborated written explanation of their recommendations; however, subsequent deliberative entities may forward their recommendations with or without elaboration, except that any negative recommendation that follows a positive recommendation or any positive recommendation that follows a negative recommendation at the previous level must be elaborated.

The question is to retain the phrase, “or any positive recommendation that follows a negative recommendation” from the statement.

No objections. **Approved.**

P. Recommendations 1, 19 – 4D5b. Applications for RTP: Instructions. Content

These issues will remain unresolved pending further review of the document.

Q. Recommendation 14 – 4D5b. Applications for RTP: Instructions.
i3IIA. Content

All of the candidate's IDEA student evaluation reports organized in reverse chronological order. The reports must include the most recent two year period.

The question is called to replace the limitation of two years with the date of previous advancement in rank, or since hiring. The statement: “Additional reports documenting the period since the last personnel action at UNCW may be included if the candidate chooses to do so,” will be added for clarity.

Summary of discussed points:

- There is great value in seeing the evaluation of candidate over time. Two years is too short to capture data for courses taught only occasionally.

No objections. **Approved.**

R. Recommendation 38 – 4D5b. Applications for RTP: Instructions.
i3IIB. Content

All refereed publications published since the candidate was appointed at the present rank. Give complete bibliographic references for materials already published or accepted.

MO6 is offered to add, “or under review for publication,” to the end of this statement.

Summary:

- This information is already in the C.V.
- This could strengthen the case for reappointment
- The application has a category for materials under review

The question was called. **MO6 approved.**

Next year the Faculty Senate will lose a few members of the Steering Committee and we need potential candidates for this committee, particularly for the vice president position.

Motion to adjourn. No objections.