

**UNIVERSITY OF NORTH CAROLINA WILMINGTON**

**PROCESS FOR REVIEW OF TENURE AND REWARD  
SYSTEM**

**December 1, 2008**

## I. COMMITTEE MEMBERSHIP

Mark Galizio, Psychology, co-chair  
Nelson Reid, Social Work, co-chair  
Manny Avalos, Academic Affairs  
Sue Cody, Randall Library and Faculty Senate Steering Committee  
Steve Demski, Public Service and Continuing Studies  
Vance Durrington, Department of Instructional Technology, Foundations and Secondary Education  
Carol Ellis, Academic Affairs  
Andy Jackson, Psychology and Faculty Senate Steering Committee  
Gabriel Lugo, Mathematics and Statistics and Faculty Senate Steering Committee  
Bruce McKinney, Communications and President, Faculty Senate  
Steve McNamee, Sociology and Criminology  
Mark Spaulding, History and former President, Faculty Senate  
Curt Stiles, Management and Faculty Senate Steering Committee

---

---

## II. COMMITTEE CHARGE

The Committee was created in response to recommendation 5.3 of the University of North Carolina Tomorrow Final Report (December 2007) indicating that each campus should consider “refinement and adjustment of the tenure, promotion, and incentive system to place greater value on faculty involvement and engagement in applied research and outreach.” As the first step in carrying out this recommendation the Provost formed the committee to recommend a process, in accord with existing UNCW faculty governance by-laws, to review current faculty expectations, incentives, and evaluation systems and related policy and process in tenure and promotion.

The charge for the committee by Provost Brian Chapman, August 15, 2008:

*The UNC Tomorrow Commission has recommended that the University of North Carolina refine and adjust its “tenure, promotion, and incentive system to place greater value on faculty involvement and engagement in applied research and outreach that will enhance the state’s competitiveness without decreasing support for teaching, basic research and scholarship.” UNC has therefore charged UNCW to outline a process to review its tenure, promotion, and incentive systems to determine if they appropriately value faculty involvement and engagement in applied research, outreach, and public service consistent with the Commission’s recommendations. Additionally we are to outline a process by which we will adopt changes to these systems as necessary. These outlines are to include the mechanisms we use to insure faculty involvement and timelines for these reviews and changes.*

*These reviews are intended to encourage faculty to address important societal issues and identify rewards for such activities; engage in applied research,*

*scholarship, and public service; continue support and rewards for basic research, theoretical scholarship, and creative activities; make faculty more accessible to small business owners, nonprofit organizations, K-12 schools, and community groups; use the tenure process to validate faculty as highly qualified experts in their fields; reward faculty in the development of online and distance education programs; and affirm and reward quality teaching, student advising, and student mentoring.*

*With this charge in mind, I am appointing you to the UNC Tomorrow Tenure and Reward Systems Review Committee. The specific objectives of this committee are to outline the process for these reviews, identify mechanisms to insure faculty involvement, and create a timeline for conducting these reviews and adopting changes.*

With this report the committee will:

1. Comment on the state of UNCW faculty “involvement and engagement”
2. Suggest a definition of ‘engagement’ that we believe should guide consideration of policy issues
3. Comment on the general adequacy of language in current UNCW promotion and tenure policy as included in the UNCW Faculty Handbook
4. Propose the composition, charge, and timeframe for the full review committee to follow.

---

---

### **III. STATE OF UNCW FACULTY “INVOLVEMENT AND ENGAGEMENT”**

The UNC Tomorrow Commission recommendation in regard to “involvement and engagement” is an expression of the belief that a public university has a responsibility to extend knowledge, and its application, beyond the traditional classroom and usual boundaries of the campus and “engage” aspects of the public and private sectors to enhance the cultural, economic, and social development of the state. This commitment to “public” service, through knowledge dissemination and application, is clear in the overall UNC mission statement that guides all campuses stating that the system of multiple campuses is “Dedicated to the service of North Carolina and its people”.

UNCW, as an important constituent institution of the UNC system, has both reflected and expanded this service commitment in its mission statement, with explicit reference to “... enriching the quality of life through scholarly community engagement in such areas as health, education, the economy, the environment, marine and coastal issues, and the arts”( <http://www.uncw.edu/planning/mission.htm>). Further, five of the seven Strategic Goals of the university have a distinctive regional engagement and service implication with Goal V specifically detailing Regional Engagement

(<http://www.uncw.edu/planning/documents/StrategicPlan.pdf> ). Goal V notes that at UNCW engagement is “embedded in both our history and mission” and refers to public and private sectors, service learning and dissemination and application of research.

The UNCW faculty is extensively involved and engaged in a broad range of activities for and with the community, the region, the state and the nation. Faculties are directly involved with governmental and social services, schools, health services, art and cultural groups, and many professional organizations and regional business entities. From Public Sociology’s involvement with the Wilmington Housing Authority, Nursing’s involvement with regional services in Bolton, the Watson School’s educational laboratory project, STEM faculty teaching Summer Ventures courses, Social Work’s extensive set of field practice partnerships, the Cameron school’s professional development services to regional businesses to the application and development processes through MARBIONC and the Center for Marine Science, or the UNCW Memory Assessment and Research Services Center and the Psychology involvement with the Tileston Clinic, the activities are varied and impressively extensive. These activities are documented well in both the campus UNC Tomorrow Phase I Report (especially Committee G ( Engagement), Committee E (Health); Committee D (Economic Development), and Committee C (Public Education) ([www.uncw.edu/tomorrow/](http://www.uncw.edu/tomorrow/)). The recently submitted UNCW application seeking Carnegie Classification for Community Engagement also provides extensive documentation of faculty engagement.

The length and breadth of the engagement activities in UNCW suggest that Academic Affairs and the College of Arts and Sciences, the Cameron School of Business, the Watson School of Education, and the School of Nursing have encouraged and supported such engagement. Whatever might be said about the degree of focus, the character of organization, or the level of consequence and impact, the evidence is clear that the university is no ivory tower. The bulk of these engagements, as they logically should, occur in the professional programs and in disciplines that have extensive and necessary external partnerships with professional associations and with professional service providers or in disciplines with a primary or notable tradition of application. They also occur, as would be expected, in those contexts where external demand for knowledge development and application has been organized through external research or grant support.

---

#### **IV. DEFINITION OF ‘ENGAGEMENT’**

The concept of engagement, according to the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, “describes the collaboration between higher education institutions and their larger communities (local, regional/state, national, global) for the mutually beneficial exchange of knowledge and resources in a context of partnership and reciprocity.” Engagement implies a relationship that goes beyond the traditional one of the “expert” faculty imparting knowledge to student or external consultant to a model of partner and

facilitator in the application of knowledge. In the Carnegie model there is an embedded ideal of the “unique capacities of the citizenry” and the notion that universities can positively influence civil society and promote social development broadly. Engagement may encompass the well-established idea that universities should seek contracts within the public and private sectors to apply intellectual resources in specified areas and to seek grants for projects that have socio-economic impact, but it also includes the less-defined areas of Service Learning, Community-based scholarship, and Civic Engagement.

Because much “involvement and engagement” on the part of faculty may go on outside of the more established contexts of grants and contracts, with the attendant elements of organizational and financial accountability, the concept of “scholarly engagement” has come to be commonly used to mean engagement that is clearly knowledge-based, within the faculty member’s area of research and teaching, and that meets rigorous standards for peer review and documentation of methods and impacts.

As a guiding example the Faculty Senate Outreach Council at UMASS commissioned a White Paper ([http://www.umass.edu/outreach/scholarly\\_engagement/index.html](http://www.umass.edu/outreach/scholarly_engagement/index.html)) organized around the following definition to promote a consistent understanding of Scholarly Engagement on that campus:

*Scholarly Engagement is the creation, integration, application and transmission of knowledge for the benefit of external audiences and the University and occurs in all areas of the University Mission: research, teaching and service. The quality and value of Scholarly Engagement is determined by academic peers and [with advice from] community partners.*

The strength of this definition is its emphasis on presumably substantive knowledge, the fusion of teaching research and service, the mutual benefit of campus and “community”, and clear accountability to both academic peers and external partners. The White Paper places considerable emphasis on the necessity to ground Scholarly Engagement in the disciplines. Each of the faculties of the university has its own terminology, standards, and expectations with its own structure of relationship with external constituencies and partners, local, regional, national and international. Scholarly engagement must grow, and is being grown at UNCW, on the basis of departmental faculty involvement that engages individuals, associations, and communities external to the university. Each department must define what Scholarly Engagement means in the disciplinary context and what standards are to be used in recognizing, evaluating and rewarding it. This does not imply that cross-disciplinary structures such as centers and institutes cannot create a focus and mobilize resources to apply intellectual talent to matters of regional development. Indeed, this is essential, but each faculty must develop and apply as much clarity of purpose in the area of “service” as it does now to “teaching” and “research.” Inevitably, the substance of the service mission in each of the disciplinary areas will vary and reflect the culture of those disciplines. As the university prioritizes, organizes, and resources its “engagement and involvement” activities there will be, necessarily, differential involvement of academic units and individual faculty within those units.

In the UNC Tomorrow context the underlying concern is that the UNC campuses have not facilitated faculty engagement because they have neither developed the mechanisms that create partnerships and articulate and refine external “demand” nor created a context of opportunity, incentive and reward for faculty engagement. The result, from the view of the Commission, is that we have inadvertently locked up a great deal of intellectual capital that might be applied “directly and proactively to the 21<sup>st</sup> Century challenges facing North Carolina.” It is important to note that this application is neither general nor random in the UNC Tomorrow report. It is specifically in regard to (1) economic development in a global context, (2) the expansion of higher education opportunity for “underserved, underrepresented, and non traditional students”, (3) the reform of NC’s public educational system, (4) the “economic transformation” of the NC economy, (5) the health of NC citizens and the improvement of health services; (6) the energy and environmental challenges facing the state. The report calls for the campuses to evaluate themselves in regard to how well configured they are to address these areas in their instructional and degree programs, in their research activities and capacities, and in their public service. Thus, engagement and involvement of faculty should be consistent with university, college, school and departmental purposes and objectives as they are defined in light of the UNC system priorities outlined in the UNC Tomorrow report.

**RECOMMENDATION #1:**

*The Committee recommends that the proposed UNCW review of its “tenure, promotion, and incentive system” in regard to engagement and involvement be based on the definition cited above, that it include departmental-based deliberation of discipline-specific standards, and that the review take place with consideration of the specific issues and priorities established by UNCW through the UNC Tomorrow process.*

---

---

**V. CURRENT UNCW PROMOTION AND TENURE POLICY**

University policies for faculty evaluation, including tenure and promotion, are sufficiently broad and flexible to allow evaluation at every academic level to incorporate service, engagement, and knowledge application standards. The extent of faculty involvement with the region provides evidence that current RPT policies have not inhibited faculty engagement in those departments and schools that have adopted engagement as part of their mission. However, on the UNCW campus, as nationally, there is recognition that the policies and procedures of faculty evaluation and tenure and promotion may not support optimally the more complex and externally focused role of the modern university.

The policies in place reflect the traditional tri-part “teaching, scholarship, service” model typical for institutions similar to UNCW and reflect the tradition that a member of a university faculty is, first and foremost, a member of a disciplinary or professional body and recognition and reward comes from attaining the standards and conforming to the expectation of such bodies. While such policies may not yet reflect the clarity of relationships between teaching, knowledge development, application, and service that would be ideal they have not, and do not, inhibit the university from expecting, recognizing and rewarding engagement and service.

The UNCW Faculty Handbook in the “Criteria for Reappointment, Promotion and Reward of Tenure” (section II.D.

[http://www.uncw.edu/fac\\_handbook/employment/RTP/criteria.htm](http://www.uncw.edu/fac_handbook/employment/RTP/criteria.htm)) states:

*The university encourages and expects its faculty members to apply their talents and abilities in service to the university, to organizations and to the community at large. {It is} ... appropriate for faculty members to serve in an educational advisory or informational capacity at the local, regional, state, national, and international levels.*

The Faculty Handbook (Criteria RTP “Introduction”) expressly endorses flexibility in faculty evaluation, saying that:

*It is essential that the university faculty be composed of individuals with a variety of strengths. Thus in the following guidelines the examples of the ways in which contributions to teaching, scholarship and research, professional development, and service may be shown should be taken as indicating the variety of ways in which excellence may be demonstrated rather than as a fixed and exclusive set of common desired activities. Fixed weightings to be used in determining the relative importance of these different areas should be avoided in making reappointment, tenure, and promotion decisions.*

Thus, current documents permit but do not expressly encourage community service, outreach, or engagement.

**RECOMMENDATION #2:**

***The Committee recommends that the permanent committee consider a number of changes to these documents that would incorporate the language of scholarly engagement and service learning and that that service be defined in terms of knowledge dissemination and application with specific reference to the state and region.***

The UNC Code Policy incorporated into the UNCW Faculty Handbook ([www.uncw.edu/fac\\_handbook/governance/ac\\_freedom/IV\\_appoint.htm#IV](http://www.uncw.edu/fac_handbook/governance/ac_freedom/IV_appoint.htm#IV)) specifies that: “The terms and conditions of each faculty appointment shall be written.”

**RECOMMENDATION #3:**

***We recommend that the permanent committee consider that faculty appointments, in appropriate cases, be explicit as to service and engagement expectations.***

It should be noted that the UNCW faculty has modified RTP procedure in recent years. In 2001 the Faculty Senate appointed an RPT review committee composed of Allan Gray, Hathia Hayes, Kevin Sigler, Kathleen Berkley, Bob Blundo, Frank Bongiorno, Reid Griffin, and Barbara Waxman. Dean Larry Clark and Senate President Lynne Snowden were ex-officio, and Andy Jackson, Ken Spackman and Roger Lowery were Resource Consultants. The Committee Chair Berkeley reported, as recorded in the minutes of April 2002 that the Committee,

*...reviewed RPT documents in a wide array of universities in and out of the UNC system, particularly the newly revised one at NC State; held open meeting for the Faculty in March 01; gathered information from departments and other universities; and met over the fall and winter to formulate these recommendations. ....the committee had been struck by the great diversity of standards and procedures in the different departments and schools; some seemed eminently fair and appropriate, others not.*

The committee recommended a number of changes in procedure which were ultimately implemented subsequent to GA approval in September 2006 and 2007. It should be noted that the UNC Code (<http://www.northcarolina.edu/content.php/legal/policymanual/contents.htm>) has been revised necessitating revisions to our current documents that will be due March 1, 2009.

---

---

## **VI. COMPOSITION, CHARGE, AND TIMEFRAME FOR FULL REVIEW**

This report is the product of a broadly inclusive “UNC Tomorrow Tenure and Rewards Review Committee” with the charge to “outline a process” for a review of RTP policy and related “rewards.” That review may lead to recommended policy changes.

The current committee incorporates extensive representation of the Faculty Senate, Academic Affairs, Public Service, faculty-based administration, and UNC Tomorrow participants. The committee is broadly representative of the College of Arts and Sciences and the professional schools (with the exception of Nursing).

**RECOMMENDATION #4:**

*Given that the current committee has engaged thus far in the process of reviewing RTP policy in light of UNC Tomorrow expectations we believe the current committee should be continued. In the event that any member of the current committee cannot continue we would recommend that the current structure of representation be maintained. We would also recommend that a representative of the Nursing faculty be added to the Committee.*

**RECOMMENDATION #5:**

*Timeline: The new UNC Tomorrow Tenure and Rewards Systems Committee should be formed by January 2009 and charged to submit its report with recommendations for RTP policy or “faculty reward” changes by Nov. 2009 so that any changes can be considered by the Faculty Senate at its Dec. 2009 meeting and subsequently submitted to an early 2010 BOT meeting.*

**RECOMMENDATION #6:**

*Prior to any permanent change of UNCW policy on reappointment, promotion and tenure and/or the Faculty Handbook related to engagement, public service, outreach and applied research, each UNCW department would be asked to review the proposed changes in light of their own discipline and department purpose and mission. Importantly, departmental review would establish standards of rigor and review for scholarly engagement and service that reflect the unique criteria of the discipline or professional area involved.*