

University Reappointment Promotion and Tenure Committee (URPTC) 2024-2025 Annual Report

URPTC Members:

1. Shannon Pratt-Phillips, College of Agriculture & Life Sciences (Co-Chair)
2. Kofi Boone, College of Design (Co-Chair)
3. Ken Adler, College of Veterinary Medicine
4. Mark Beasley, Poole College of Management
5. Tarek Echehki, College of Engineering
6. Mette Olufsen, College of Sciences
7. Walter Robinson, College of Sciences
8. Mary Anne Drake, College of Agriculture & Life Sciences
9. Ahmed El-Shafei, Wilson College of Textiles
10. Nora Haenn, College of Humanities & Social Sciences
11. Soonhye Park, College of Education
12. Sunkyu Park, College of Natural Resources
13. Ghada Rabah, College of Sciences

PREFACE

Purpose of the URPTC

The University Reappointment, Promotion and Tenure Committee provides advice to the Executive Vice Chancellor and Provost for maintaining the Reappointment, Promotion and Tenure process that supports faculty excellence for Tenure Track Faculty and the Reappointment and Promotion process that supports the Professional Track faculty. One of the ways the URPTC offers advice is through the review of Mandatory (Automatic) and Non Mandatory (Random) cases (through the formal dossier) selected by the Provost for examination. The URPTC is advisory only and does not vote on any proposed action. A second way the URPTC offers advice is through suggestions/recommendations about the overall review processes related to Policies, Regulations and Rules (PRR) for Tenure Track and Professional Track faculty.

Investment of Faculty Effort in 2024-2025 URPTC

The URPTC held 8 formal committee meetings, beginning on January 15, 2025, and continuing through March 18, 2025. The Committee reviewed a total of 19 dossiers.

Four (4) of the dossiers were identified as “Automatic” (“Mandatory”) for Committee review, meaning that a Dean had denied the proposed action; 15 of the dossiers were

identified as “Random” (“Non Mandatory”), meaning they were reviewed to assure that RPT processes across the campus were conducted in compliance with the published PRR at each level (Department, College and University). Each meeting was 2 hours in duration, representing a total of 12 hours. The committee has 13 members; just the formal meetings consumed 156 hours of professional time, or the equivalent of almost 4 weeks, using the standard 40-hour work week. This does not represent the countless hours of investment reviewing each of the assigned dossiers, developing the written assessments, and the interactions of the committee members outside the formal meeting formats. As the co-chairs of the 2024-2025 URPTC, we are including this data in the Preface to underscore that the faculty have invested substantial effort and taken very seriously the scope of the responsibilities with which the Committee was charged.

Several recommendations from last year are reiterated and need to be emphasized once again

RECOMMENDATIONS

1. Each dossier should conform to the template in University [REG 05.20.20](#) regarding organization. Department Heads and Deans should be reminded to confirm the accuracy of the votes before submitting the dossiers. **We recommend that all department heads and deans be reminded to confirm numbers.**
 - **The system processing between Template and Automatically generated first page do not always align**
 - **We recommend that all administrative letters are signed**
2. [On its website](#), the Provost’s office directs the following: “Nonmandatory reviews are not triggered by a prescribed time. Nonmandatory review categories are: Early Promotion and Conferral of Tenure: Early promotions and conferral of tenure of Assistant Professors are those cases for which the action is recommended at a time earlier than the required mandatory review. This raises two points of concern: (a) in the three (3) cases we reviewed that were identified as “early,” neither the Department Head or the Dean included an explanation for the action in their Written Assessment; and (b) requiring only the administrators to “explain” the action means they are using criteria that are different from the DVF who are not required to address the issue of “early” in their Written Assessment. **We recommend the elimination of the word “Early” in these Nonmandatory actions and the requirement for administrators to “explain” the action.** The real question for all levels of review should be the same, “Does the individual’s record meet the Standard for Associate Professor with Tenure” in the Department’s Rule and in the College’s Rule. It is unfair to require administrators to render an explanation that is different from that of the DVF or the CRPTC. Candidates, the DV and the CRPTCF are

disadvantaged if there are no written rules or information related to the criteria that their Department Head or Dean should apply to “explain” the “early” decision. **Non-mandatory promotions should be communicated in advance with the Department Head and DVF to avoid any surprises.**

3. The directions provided to each group with voting authority (DVF and CRPTC) in the review process need to be emphasized about how to report the number of votes accurately and consistently in each designated category. There appears to be a particular difficulty in understanding the differences between *Abstain*, *Recuse*, *Ineligible* and *Missing* as categories. Explanations of Ineligible and Missing votes should be included in the written assessments of the DVF, DH, and CRPTC. **We recommend that the cover sheet (page 1) of the dossier include these definitions as a reminder about how to accurately record the results of each voting group. It would be helpful for the RPT committees to know exactly how to define these terms.**
4. Faculty members often take on administrative roles within their departments (e.g., department chair, program director, undergraduate coordinator). These roles involve significant responsibilities that are distinct from teaching, research, and traditional service. However, sometimes these administrative duties are either lumped into one of the traditional categories (often "service") or are not clearly delineated at all. This can lead to several problems including inaccurate workload representation and difficulty to examine performance. **We recommend clearly defined SFR category be defined for Administration.** Care should also be taken at RPT voting for someone who has had a leadership role as they move forward in the RPT process.
5. Faculty with large teaching roles have pages upon pages of Class Evaluations. These could be moved to an Appendix. Cases from CALS used an effective and concise summarization of Class Evaluation reports. **We recommend alternative strategies to summarize and streamline course evaluation reporting, possibly examining CALS as a model.** We think that reviewing alternative reporting strategies could reduce the overall length of dossiers and improve the review process.
6. Faculty are required to present evidence of research productivity in their dossiers via an automated RED report. However, the format and length of RED reports in the dossiers reviewed were extensive and impaired the ability to review them effectively. In some cases, the RED report presented confusing and sometimes conflicting information that made it difficult to discern candidate productivity in the review period. **We recommend alternative strategies to summarize and streamline research productivity reporting, possibly revisiting the automated output guidelines for RED.** We think that reviewing alternative reporting strategies could reduce the overall length of dossiers and improve the review process.
7. Faculty members often have diverse roles that extend beyond traditional teaching and research. Roles such as Extension, Service, and Clinical work are often poorly understood by faculty in different departments or colleges. This lack of understanding

can lead to these roles being undervalued or misclassified in faculty workload documents like the Statement of Faculty Responsibilities (SFR). **We recommended that if a faculty member's SFR includes >5% effort in Extension, Service, or Clinical roles, these roles should be clearly and comprehensively defined.** The documentation of activities related to these roles should include specific metrics and information, such as the number of attendees at each event, impact statements, and program evaluations. This approach, similar to the practices used in CALS (College of Agriculture and Life Sciences), ensures that these diverse roles are evaluated rigorously and consistently.

7. Several faculty had changes in their position that affected how they were evaluated. **We recommend that if there are changes in a faculty's position, there package includes:**

- **Clear Documentation of Changes:** All changes in faculty responsibilities, including those due to changes in leadership or job descriptions, should be clearly documented in the faculty member's dossier. This documentation should include the date of the change, the reason for the change, and the impact of the change on the faculty member's SFR.
- **Explanation of Impact on SFR:** The dossier should explicitly explain how changes in responsibilities affected the faculty member's ability to meet the requirements of their SFR. This explanation should be detailed and provide context for departmental and college review committees.
- **Thorough Track Record of Activities:** Candidates should provide a thorough and detailed track record of their activities, including those that may have been affected by changes in responsibilities. This record should include evidence of their accomplishments and contributions, even in the face of changing expectations.

8. The number of DASA cases reviewed in this URPTC period suggests an opportunity to engage DASA collegially and to be more effectively in navigating the promotion and tenure process. **We recommend that a qualified representative from DASA should be added to the URPT Committee.**

9. **We recommend more clarity for scholarly activity reports.** ORCID-ID should be provided for faculty with Scholarly activity. A statement about the faculty member's input to the paper/activity should be included.

10. While there is improved detail regarding the backgrounds of the External Evaluators, there remained some concern. Not all packages included an external reviewer's invitation letter. **We recommend the inclusion of more information about why an external writer/institution was selected.** We recommend the inclusion of an explanation in the case where multiple reviewers were selected from the same

institution. We recommend an explanation be provided if external reviewers were solicited from a lower tiered institution. We would like to see explanations for non-academic letter writers. Additionally, **we recommend providing guidelines for**

Department heads regarding who should write letters

- Ideally not two letters from the same institution (or provide explanation)
- Encourage diversity in letters
- Include a table regarding how many letters were sent out, if they were the candidate or department's suggestion, and if there was no response or letter obtained
- Guidelines for number of letters suggested by candidate vs. Department head vs. DVF

11. We recommend that DVF and College letters should include an explanation for negative votes (anonymously, when discussed). It should be reiterated that all voting and discussions are confidential. If a Department head or Dean has a different opinion than the voting committees, an explanation should be provided. Increase consistency and transparency in how voting committees are built or recruited across Departments & Colleges

12. The Provost's office needs to develop more effective training for administrators (Department Heads and Deans) in the PRRs related to the procedures and processes for both Tenure Track and Professional Track faculty. Regular training should be required for anyone who serves in either role, including updated training on an annual basis, A requirement to serve as the Chair of any CRPTC should require completion of university training for the role. We recognize that training modules are available, but they do not seem to be effective, based on the dossiers under review this year (and in the opinion of the Committee members who also served last year). This is especially necessary for administrators who are recently appointed to their role or who come from outside NC State. Many of the dossiers we reviewed this year included multiple and inexcusable errors that either escaped the attention of or were ignored by the DVF, DH, CRPTC and Dean. In some cases, it damaged the image of the candidate, the Department, and the College as guardians of accurate scholarship and their ability to follow the *Regulation* of the University, or their Departmental and College *Rule* or the *Guidelines* and *Directions* that are available on the Provost's website. An example of the importance of training for Department Heads is directly related to Recommendation #1 in this Report.

13. We strongly recommend that, if a department has mentoring as part of its RPT procedures, there should be acknowledgement that mentoring took place and explanation as to how that aided the candidate.

Recommendation to subsequent URPTC:

The 2024-2025 URPTC considers the benefits of meeting in person rather than online. The in-person meetings of the 2023-2024 URPTC have been highly productive

and facilitated excellent and informed discussions among the members. The workload moved smoothly and efficiently because the members were in a room discussing each case and responding to each other's questions. This format avoided the failures of technology that often impede work of this kind that requires interaction among the members. The in-person format also allowed the members to become acquainted with each other in more robust ways as colleagues than would have been possible with an online meeting format.

The URPTC wishes to express its deep gratitude to Amy Jinnette:

Amy Jinnette, Associate Vice Provost for Academic Affairs, for her ability to expertly manage every aspect of the multitude of tasks for which she is responsible. She has an uncanny ability to understand the challenges of working with a diverse group of faculty and their personalities without losing her equanimity or sense of humor. She is relentless in making certain every detail is properly attended from coordinating and scheduling complex calendars of multiple individuals and groups to providing for their comfort. In particular, her effort to reserve the Executive Board Room in the Talley Student Center for our meetings and to arrange much-needed beverages to sustain us during our weekly late Wednesday afternoon meetings is appreciated. As Co-Chairs of this year's Committee, we are indebted to Amy for her patience, wisdom, and responsiveness to all inquiries from us on behalf of our colleagues.

Respectfully Submitted

[Shannon Phillips](#) and Kofi Boone