College and Departmental Best Practices for RPT: Recommendations for Revisions

<u>Originating Committee:</u> Faculty Equity Audit Working Group (Ad Hoc subcommittee of FESC formed by the Provost in Fall 2020)

>Members: Yvette Huet, ADVANCE Faculty Affairs and Diversity Office, Chair; Beth Auten, Library (FESC Representative); Craig Depken, Economics (FESC Representative); Othelia Lee, Social Work (FESC Representative); Chance Lewis, Middle, Secondary, and K-12 Education, Faculty Council Committee Representative; Clare Merlin-Knoblich, Counseling (FESC Representative); John Stogner, Criminal Justice and Criminology (CLAS Committee Representative); Leslie Zenk, Academic Affairs (ex-officio)

<u>Reviewing Committees</u>: FESC (Spring 2021) and FEC (Fall 2021). Both endorsed. Presentations about work made to Chancellor's Leadership Team (April 2021) and Dean's Council (April 2021).

Background: In Fall 2020, the Provost created and charged the Faculty Equity Audit Working Group with the task to:
- Consider continuing impact of the pandemic on faculty work
- Examine policies/procedures that may have differential impacts on faculty based on discipline, gender, and race/ethnicity.

The Faculty Equity Audit Working Group has made the following recommendations. The recommendations have been reviewed and endorsed by the FESC and FEC. The recommendations have been drafted into four motions.

Motion 1:

Requires all individuals who participate in annual reviews and RPT reviews sign an attestation prior to discussion and voting stating:

"I have read and reviewed all the assessment guidelines and materials provided. I am aware of potential biases both in my review and the review of others including letters and student evaluations of teaching."

Motion 2:

Asks the Provosts and Deans to build greater alignment of RPT guidelines and processes within the college and across the university for faculty dossiers submitted to the University for review in reappointment, promotion, and tenure. This may require revision to the RPT guidelines for colleges. RPT dossier contents across the university should include, but are not limited to, the items on the following list. Departments should

not require materials, like tables, that duplicate previously provided information and should strive to create a clear and streamlined set of parameters for faculty. This list was informed by the *Review for Reappointment, Promotion, and Conferral of Permanent Tenure information* provided by the Office of the Provost: https://provost.charlotte.edu/academic-budget-personnel/handbook/c-review-reappointment-promotion-and-conferral-permanent-tenure

- Current *Curriculum Vitae*.
- Personal statement of no more than 12 pages that describes significant areas of focus through accomplishments, current progress, and future potential in all three areas of review.
- Evidence to support contributions in all three areas of review:
    - Scholarly Research, Creative, and Other Professional Activities
    - Teaching, Advising, Curriculum and/or Instructional Development (course evaluations, syllabi, peer reviews, etc.)
    - Service to the University, the Public, and/or the Profession (appointment letters, etc.)
    - Evidential materials should not simply replicate content provided in the CV, but demonstrate the quality and significance of contributions in each area. Additional materials that merely duplicate the identified content above should not be included.
    - Please note that community engagement is inherent in all three areas of review. For clarification see the academic-budget-personnel/handbook which states: Community engagement refers to research/creative activities, teaching, and service activities that are collaboratively undertaken by faculty members with community partners, staff, and/or students through processes that exemplify reciprocity in partnerships and public purposes.
- Letter from a secondary unit if applicable.
    - If the faculty member has provided significant service and/or teaching to a secondary unit, they have the opportunity to include a letter from the secondary unit head in the file. This letter should be in the file at the start of the review process.
- Copies of annual evaluation letters to the candidate for the period since the last appointment, reappointment or promotion decision for the candidate.
- External Evaluation Letters for cases involving promotion and/or tenure.

Motion 3:

RPT guidelines should be reviewed at this time and revised as needed. When RPT criteria are updated they will be reviewed <u>outside</u> of the unit by the College and/or Academic Affairs.

Motion 4:

When revising RPT guidelines, the following additional items should be considered to promote equity as we review for excellence in research and education. Achievement(s) should be reviewed with respect to opportunities and restrictions faced by faculty (e.g. pandemic) and with an asset-based focus.

- Flexibility - regarding time frames for meeting expectations (productivity over a longer time frame and not a specific year); types of activities; productivity should be identified in ranges
- Expectations - reviewed with respect to context (opportunities available)
- Percent Effort - Faculty have different roles and responsibilities within a department and the context of these are important to understand in the review process. We should strive to make invisible work that is valuable, visible and reviewed.
- Impact of scholarship. These items should be clearly delineated and be broadly based because individuals are more likely to engage in work that is described as valued by the institution.
    - Peer-reviewed articles, presentations, exhibitions, performances, etc.
    - Grants or contracts
- Other avenues through which scholarship impacts communities (public engagement or community engaged scholarship) based on the person's academic credentials, reputation and knowledge but not necessarily a grant or even subject to peer review.
    - non-academic press books
    - talks to the general public
    - Interviews with the media
    - Podcasts, Blogs, or Social media content
    - consulting (paid or not paid) work with agencies, institutions, non- profits, etc.
- Other measures of impact: adoption of work products by academic or non- academic institutions, policy influence, and resonance with identifiable communities.