

**EAST CAROLINA UNIVERSITY
2003-2004 FACULTY SENATE**

The first regular meeting of the 2003-2004 Faculty Senate will be held on **Tuesday, September 16, 2003**, at 2:10 in the Mendenhall Student Center Great Room.

FULL AGENDA

(For your convenience, please print this agenda prior to the meeting.
Only a limited number of agendas will be available during the meeting.)

I. Call to Order

II. Approval of Minutes

April 22, 2003, and April 29, 2003

III. Special Order of the Day

A. Roll Call

B. Announcements

C. William Muse, Chancellor

D. William Swart, Provost

E. Rick Niswander, Chair of the Faculty

F. David Dosser, Chair
University Athletics Committee and Academic Integrity Subcommittee

G. Question Period

IV. Unfinished Business

V. Report of Committees

- A. Faculty Governance Committee, Dee Dee Glascoff
1. Proposed Revision to the *ECU Faculty Manual*, Part I. (attachment 1).
 2. Proposed Revisions to the *ECU Faculty Manual*, Part VI. (attachment 2).
 3. Proposed Revision to the *ECU Faculty Manual*, Appendix C. (attachment 3).
 4. Proposed Revisions to the *ECU Faculty Manual*, Appendix D. (attachment 4).
 5. Proposed Revisions to the *ECU Faculty Manual*, Appendix J. (attachment 5).
 6. Proposed Revisions to the *ECU Faculty Manual*, Appendix L. (attachment 6).
 7. Proposed Revisions to the *ECU Faculty Manual*, Appendix X. (attachment 7).
 8. Proposed Revisions to the *ECU Faculty Manual*, Appendix Y. (attachment 8).

- B. Faculty Information Technology Review Committee, Karl Wuensch
Resolution Requesting an Alternative Identification System (attachment 9).
- C. Unit Code Screening Committee, Garris Conner
Approval of the following revised Unit Codes of Operation:
 - 1. College of Education
 - 2. Health Sciences Library
 - 3. Department of Chemistry
- D. Commission on Scholarship, Bob Morrison
Final Report for information and discussion (attachment 10).

VI. New Business

FACULTY GOVERNANCE COMMITTEE REPORT
Proposed Revision to the *ECU Faculty Manual*, Part I.

Revise Part I. to read as follows:
(additions are noted in **bold** print.)

*“East Carolina University is committed to equality of educational opportunity and does not discriminate against applicants, students, or employees based on race, color, national origin, religion, sex, age, sexual orientation, **creed, handicap, political affiliation,** or disability.”*

FACULTY GOVERNANCE COMMITTEE REPORT
Proposed Revisions to the *ECU Faculty Manual*, Part VI.

Revise Part VI. Section I. to read as follows:
(additions are noted in **bold** print.)

1. Employment Policies

*It is a policy of the university throughout the campus and all its branches, divisions, departments, facilities, and activities that firm and positive steps be taken by all supervisory and management personnel to prevent any discriminatory employment practices; and that affirmative action will be taken to ensure that applicants for employment will be considered and employed based on actual job requirements; and that all personnel matters pertaining to employment, placement, training, upgrading, promotion, demotion, transfer, layoff, termination, and salary administration will be conducted in a nondiscriminatory way without regard to race, color, national origin, religion, sex, age, sexual orientation, **creed, handicap, political affiliation,** or disability.”*

Revise Part VI. Section VI. to read as follows:
(additions are noted in **bold** print.)

“VI. Equal Employment Opportunity/Affirmative Action Policy (Formerly Appendix K)
*East Carolina University is committed to equal opportunity for all members of the university community. In addition, it will take affirmative action to increase recruitment and hiring of black and female faculty and staff. The following is the Equal Employment Opportunity Policy as it appears in the East Carolina University Affirmative Action Plan (1983-1986). East Carolina University is committed to equality of educational opportunity and does not discriminate against applicants, students, or employees based on race, color, national origin, religion, sex, age, sexual orientation, **creed, handicap, political affiliation,** or disability. “*

FACULTY GOVERNANCE COMMITTEE REPORT
Proposed Revision to the *ECU Faculty Manual*, Appendix C.

Revise Appendix C, Section I.D. to read as follows:
(additions are noted in **bold** print and deletions are noted by ~~strikethrough~~.)

“D. Specific Criteria for Appointment

Among the many qualifications which may be considered when making appointments, the following are essential:

~~Instructor - Evidence of character traits which contribute decidedly to the professional advancement of the well-trained person; Evidence of a sound educational background for the specific position, including as a minimum the master's degree or equivalent as evaluated by the academic unit and affirmed by the appointing officer; and evidence of teaching capacity.~~ “

FACULTY GOVERNANCE COMMITTEE REPORT
Proposed Revisions to the *ECU Faculty Manual*, Appendix D.

Revise Appendix D, Section I. to read as follows:
(addition is noted in **bold** print.)

“I. Tenure

*Academic tenure serves to insure academic freedom by guarding faculty members against negative consequences of expressing unpopular points of view. Academic tenure refers to the conditions and guarantees that apply to a faculty member's professional employment. Tenure protects a faculty member against involuntary suspension or discharge from employment or reduction in rank except upon specified grounds and in accordance with the procedures provided in Section VI.; or against termination of employment except as provided for in Section VII. During the term of such guarantees, the faculty member may be discharged or suspended from employment or diminished in rank only for reasons of incompetence, neglect of duty, misconduct of such a nature as to indicate that the individual is unfit to continue as a member of the faculty, **demonstrable, bona fide institutional financial exigency or major curtailment or elimination of a teaching, research, or public service program.** “*

**Faculty Senate Agenda
Attachment 4.
Faculty Governance Committee Report (continued)**

Revise Appendix D, Section II.A.3. to read as follows:

(addition is noted in **bold** print.)

“3. Terms and Conditions for Appointment and Reappointment

*The chancellor or the chancellor's designee shall set out in writing, with a copy to the faculty member, the terms and the conditions of each appointment, including fixed-term appointments, and each reappointment. Prior to initial appointment the unit administrator shall provide a copy of the unit's criteria for evaluating faculty performance to persons offered a faculty appointment in the unit. Criteria for evaluating faculty performance shall be discussed by the unit administrator in a meeting with each fixed-term and probationary-term faculty member at the beginning of the first term of employment. Criteria for evaluating faculty performance shall be discussed by the unit administrator in a meeting with each probationary-term faculty member at the beginning of an academic year in which a reappointment or tenure decision is made. A record of the discussion shall be placed in the faculty member's personnel file. The terms shall incorporate by reference appropriate sections of the Faculty Manual and shall state any conditions placed on the appointment or reappointment. The responsibility for initiating the inclusion of special terms and conditions in documents of appointment is with the unit administrator. Notice of reappointment or non-reappointment to probationary-term persons shall be written. The decision not to reappoint probationary term faculty shall not be based upon (1) the faculty member's exercise of rights guaranteed by either the First Amendment to the United States Constitution or Article I of the North Carolina Constitution; (2) discrimination based upon the faculty member's race, color, national origin, religion, sex, age, sexual orientation, creed, handicap, political affiliation, **or disability**; or (3) personal malice.”*

Revise Appendix D, Section V.D.2. as follows:

(additions are noted in **bold** print and deletions are noted by ~~strikethrough~~.)

“2. Conduct of the Hearing

*The chair of the Hearing Committee is responsible for conducting the hearing and for maintaining order during the hearing. Except as provided for herein, the hearing shall be conducted according to the latest edition of Robert's Rules of Order, Newly Revised. Attendance at the hearing is limited to the committee's members and alternates, the complainant, one person who may advise the complainant but who may not take an active part in the proceedings, the respondents, an East Carolina University faculty member (with or without administrative appointment) selected by the chancellor to represent the respondents in the conduct of the hearing, an East Carolina University attorney who shall advise the respondents and their representative but who may not take an active part in the proceedings, the chancellor, and an East Carolina University attorney representing the chancellor. Other persons (witnesses) providing information to the committee shall not be present throughout the hearing, but shall be available at a convenient location to appear before the committee as appropriate. ~~An audio recording or a "court reporter's" transcript of the proceedings shall be made.~~ **For any hearing from which an appeal may be taken, a court reporter must be used to record and transcribe the hearing.”***

Revise Appendix D, Section V.E. as follows:

(deletions are noted by ~~strikethrough~~.)

“~~Within 10 working days of finishing its deliberations the committee shall provide the complainant, respondents, and the chancellor with a copy of the committee's report and a copy of the audio recording or court reporter's transcript of the hearing.~~”

**Faculty Senate Agenda
Attachment 4.
Faculty Governance Committee Report (continued)**

Revise Appendix D, Section VI.F.2. as follows:

(additions are noted in **bold** print and deletions are noted by ~~strikethrough~~.)

“2. Conduct of Hearing

*The hearing shall be on the written specification of reasons for the intended penalty. The chair of the Due Process Committee is responsible for conducting the hearing and for maintaining order during the hearing. Attendance at the hearing is limited to the committee's members and alternates, the faculty member requesting the hearing, counsel for the faculty member, the vice chancellor with supervisory authority, and counsel for the vice chancellor. Other persons (witnesses) providing information to the committee shall not be present throughout the hearing, but shall be available at a convenient location to appear before the committee as appropriate. ~~An audio recording or a "court reporter's" transcript of the proceedings shall be made.~~ **For any hearing from which an appeal may be taken, a court reporter must be used to record and transcribe the hearing.**”*

Revise Appendix D, Section VI.G. as follows:

(deletions are noted by ~~strikethrough~~.)

“Within 10 working days of finishing its deliberations the committee shall provide the faculty member and the chancellor with a copy of its report, including materials entered as evidence, and a copy of ~~the audio recording or court reporter's transcript of the hearing.~~ In its report the committee shall state whether or not it recommends that the intended penalty be imposed.”

Revise Appendix D, Section VII.7.b. as follows:

(additions are noted in **bold** print and deletions are noted by ~~strikethrough~~.)

“b. Conduct of Hearing

*The Reconsideration Committee's review of the faculty member's appeal shall be limited solely to determining whether the decision to terminate employment was arbitrary or capricious. The chair of the Reconsideration Committee is responsible for conducting the hearing and for maintaining order during the hearing. Attendance at the hearing is limited to the committee's members and alternates, the faculty member requesting the hearing, counsel for the faculty member, the chancellor or the chancellor's delegates (hereinafter, the chancellor), and counsel for the chancellor. Other persons (witnesses) providing information to the committee shall not be present throughout the hearing, but shall be available at a convenient location to appear before the committee as appropriate. The faculty member and the committee shall be given access, upon request, to documents that were used in making the decision to terminate the faculty member's employment after the decision was made that the position must be terminated. ~~An audio recording or a "court reporter's" transcript of the proceedings shall be made.~~ **For any hearing from which an appeal may be taken, a court reporter must be used to record and transcribe the hearing.**”*

Revise Appendix D, Section VII.8. as follows:

(deletions are noted by ~~strikethrough~~.)

“Within 10 working days of finishing its deliberations the committee shall provide the faculty member and the chancellor with a copy of its report, including materials entered as evidence, and a copy of ~~the audio recording or court reporter's transcript of the hearing.~~”

FACULTY GOVERNANCE COMMITTEE REPORT
Proposed Revisions to the *ECU Faculty Manual*, Appendix J.

Revise Appendix J. Section I. to read as follows:
(additions are noted in **bold** print.)

"I. Preamble

*East Carolina University is committed to the principle of equal opportunity for all faculty regardless of rank, temporary or permanent employment status, and tenure or nontenure status. Therefore, it is university policy that no member of the faculty will suffer discrimination in his or her employment status as a member of the faculty on the basis of based on race, color, national origin, religion, sex, age, sexual orientation, creed, handicap, political affiliation, **or disability**. If any faculty member believes that he or she has experienced discrimination on the basis of any of the above factors, he or she is encouraged to seek redress of the grievance by informal administrative corrective action."*

Revise Appendix J. Section II. to read as follows:
(additions are noted in **bold** print.)

"II. Steps in the Faculty Informal Grievance Procedure

*If any faculty member has a grievance with regard to his or her employment relationship with the university alleging discrimination on the basis of race, color, religion, sex, sexual orientation, age, national origin, creed, handicap, political affiliation, **or disability**, he or she should comply with the following procedure. "*

FACULTY GOVERNANCE COMMITTEE REPORT
Proposed Revisions to the *ECU Faculty Manual*, Appendix L.

Revise Appendix L, Section C.3.g. to read as follows:
(additions are noted in **bold** print and deletions are noted by ~~strikethrough~~.)

"g. procedures for the unit's faculty members to indicate in a timely fashion and by vote their approval or disapproval of the unit's ~~SACS report~~, major planning documents, **assessment documents**, and other **major reports** ~~assessments of unit operations~~ prior to their submission in **final form** to person(s) outside the unit."

Revise Appendix L., Section D.3.c. to include the following:

"The unit administrator will not participate in this vote."

FACULTY GOVERNANCE COMMITTEE REPORT
Proposed Revisions to the *ECU Faculty Manual*, Appendix X.

Revise Appendix X. Section VII.D. to read as follows:
(additions are noted in **bold** print.)

"The hearing shall begin with an opening statement by the Chair of the Board. This statement shall identify the purpose of the hearing, the contents of the complaint, the identity of complainants, respondents, and witnesses to be called, and the procedures to be followed during the hearing. The Board shall specifically note that only testimony and other information clearly bearing on the grievance at hand shall be admissible as evidence. It shall be the Chair's responsibility to reject immediately, stop the presentation or introduction of, or question the relevance of information having no clear bearing on the grievance. However, at any time during a hearing the Board may, by a majority vote, override the Chair's decision regarding admissibility and/or relevance of testimony, written evidence, or other material presented to the Board. It shall also be the chair's responsibility to maintain control of the Hearing so that an orderly exchange of information can be accomplished. **For any hearing from which an appeal may be taken, a court reporter must be used to record and transcribe the hearing.**"

Revise Appendix X. Section VII.E. to read as follows:
(additions are noted in **bold** print.)

*"Within ten working days of the Board's reaching a determination to sustain or not to sustain a grievance of sexual, racial, or ethnic harassment or discrimination, or conflict of interest against East Carolina University faculty members, or administrators with faculty status, the Board's determination and a summary of the basis for its decision will be communicated in writing to the complainants, the respondents, the Grievance Officer, the relevant unit administrator, the University attorney, and the Chancellor. **The Board shall provide the faculty member and the chancellor with a copy of the court reporter's transcript of the hearing.**"*

FACULTY GOVERNANCE COMMITTEE REPORT
Proposed Revisions to the *ECU Faculty Manual*, Appendix Y.

Revise Appendix Y. Section III.E.1. to read as follows:

(additions are noted in **bold** print.)

*"The Grievance Committee shall limit its investigations to the written complaints and statement of relief sought provided by the grievant. The committee's responsibility is limited to making recommendations based on the information presented at the hearing. The power of the committee shall be solely to hear representations by the persons directly involved in a grievance and to advise adjustment by the administration when appropriate. In addition to testimony by the grievant, the respondent, and witnesses, presentations may include written materials, sound recordings, video recordings, photographs and other forms of evidence. Each evidentiary item shall be numbered and shall be a part of the formal record of the hearing. **For any hearing from which an appeal may be taken, a court reporter must be used to record and transcribe the hearing.**"*

Revise Appendix Y. Section III.F. to read as follows:

(additions are noted in **bold** print.)

"F. Step Six

*The Faculty Grievance Committee shall submit a written report of its findings and recommendations, **along with a copy of the court reporter's transcript of the hearing** to the administrator most directly empowered to provide the relief sought or otherwise to adjust the grievance, with a copy of **the materials** to the grievant, the respondent and the chair of the faculty. If the committee's report is not acted upon to the committee's satisfaction within twenty working days, the committee shall submit its report to the next higher administrator empowered to provide the relief sought, and shall continue in this way until the report either is acted upon or is submitted to the Chancellor. "*

FACULTY INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY REVIEW COMMITTEE REPORT
Resolution Requesting an Alternative Identification System

WHEREAS, individuals are put at risk of identity theft when their social security numbers are not kept confidential; and

WHEREAS, East Carolina University currently uses social security numbers as identifiers; and

WHEREAS, the University is currently planning to implement a new system that will eliminate the use of social security numbers for identification purposes; and

WHEREAS, it likely will take considerable time to implement this system.

THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the Faculty of East Carolina University support the implementation of a system that will eliminate the use of social security numbers as identifiers; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the faculty urge the university administration to use its best efforts to prevent unauthorized disclosure of social security numbers, even prior to the implementation of a new system, by avoiding the use of social security numbers whenever possible and by educating students, faculty, and staff regarding the security risks associated with social security numbers and the best practices for their safe use.

COMMISSION ON SCHOLARSHIP REPORT

"At doctorate-granting universities, a different approach to scholarship is needed. These institutions typically see themselves as being 'in transition,' embracing to a very large degree the research model. As an administrator at one such campus expressed it, 'Our goal is to be in the top twenty or certainly in the top fifty.' Surely, research is central for some professors, and doctorate-granting institutions can take legitimate pride in the national and international reputations of such scholars. However, doctorate-granting institutions need also to recognize professors who make exceptional contributions to other scholarly areas: integration, application, and teaching. At these institutions, perhaps more than any others, the mosaic of talent should be carefully considered."

Boyer, E. (1990). *Scholarship reconsidered: Priorities of the Professoriate*. Princeton, NJ: The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, p. 58.

REPORT of the COMMISSION on SCHOLARSHIP

Much national attention has been focused on defining scholarship at the national level, followed by local efforts on many campuses to translate those definitions into their unique and mission-driven campus practices of defining faculty roles and rewards. According to the American Association on Higher Education's 2002 National Survey on Encouraging Multiple Forms of Scholarship, 68 percent of the respondents from 1,452 non-profit four-year colleges and universities surveyed indicated that "within the last 10 years, my institution has made formal changes to mission, planning documents, and/or faculty evaluation policy to encourage multiple forms of scholarship." East Carolina University has begun to examine these concepts as possible points of discussion, but defining scholarship (or redefining scholarship) and methods for assessing scholarship has not yet occurred in a formal manner.

Prior ECU taskforces put forward the following suggestions with respect to roles and rewards of the "mosaic of talent" represented in the faculty of East Carolina University:

- revisit university faculty roles and rewards policies to facilitate ECU's goal of becoming a doctoral research-extensive university, and to support the differential scholarly work of faculty;
- use the Unit Codes as vehicles for clarifying how units contribute differentially to the mission of the University;
- use faculty workplans as vehicles for clarifying how faculty contribute differentially to the work of the unit; and
- pursue the Community of Scholars concept for as a way to maintain academic community in a decentralized academic structure.

In Fall 2002 Provost Bill Swart and Chair of the Faculty Bob Morrison formed the *Commission on Scholarship* to examine the definitions of scholarship at East Carolina University. The charge of the committee was to discuss new ways to understand, assess, and recognize faculty scholarship. The need for this effort on the ECU campus was noted by the Education and Research Enhancement Committee in their report to SACS (2002), "The university's transition to a research-intensive doctoral institution presents a rare opportunity for a new definition and vision of the academic community. Once defined, the university will be able to design and refine structures and processes necessary to support growth and quality."

Informed by scholars such as Ernest Boyer and Charles Glassick, and by colleagues at comparable universities across the United States who are examining faculty scholarship, the Commission on Scholarship submits this report and recommendations to the campus community. It proposes a more-inclusive definition of scholarship that we believe fits ECU's culture and strategic plan and that

encompasses the scholarships of discovery, teaching, engagement, and integration. It encourages the university community to incorporate the concept of a "community of scholars" into its actions and activities. And, finally, it offers recommendations that will help ECU faculty achieve appropriate scholarship goals.

History

The report of this Commission builds on suggestions made by two previous groups. In 2000 Vice Chancellor Richard Ringeisen and Chair of the Faculty Brenda Killingsworth convened a faculty task force that produced a "Report of the Academic Affairs Division Task Force on Faculty Roles and Rewards" (2000). One year later a consulting team met to help prepare ECU for the SACS visitation, and the comments of that team that dealt with scholarship were summarized in two sections titled "Education and Research" and "Research Management" (Growth and Quality, 2002).

The SACS Education and Research Committee developed four strategies for enhancing quality undergraduate education given the expected growth in enrollment and in research and doctoral programs. *Strategy #2* stated: "The faculty, administration, and students will engage in a continuing dialogue that defines East Carolina University's vision of itself as a *Community of Scholars*." The purpose of *Strategy #2* is to support changing faculty workloads and to develop reward structures that recognize the value of various roles and contributions.

The Education and Research Committee reviewed current practices at the university and discussed the potential challenges that will exist in the future. Subcommittee members reviewed and reported on external activities in higher education relevant to faculty workloads, roles, and rewards. This review included activities reported in "Focus on Faculty" (2001), Ernest Boyer's *Scholarship Reconsidered: Priorities of the Professoriate* (1990), and Charles Glassick *et al.*'s *Scholarship Assessed: Evaluation of the Professoriate* (1998). Committee members and university constituents gained additional insights from a visit to the ECU campus by Dr. Glassick in November 2001. The subcommittee consulted the work of other ECU committees and task forces and reported its findings to the full committee soon thereafter.

Process

The Commission met twice monthly to discuss scholarship with respect to faculty roles and rewards. Initial discussions identified faculty and administrator concerns with the current system. These concerns included differences between disciplines and professions at the national level; differences peculiar to ECU between academic units; administrative and faculty perspectives on review, tenure, and promotion; and other concerns. Members discussed the role of scholarship in the ECU Strategic Plan and the Chancellor's vision of ECU's academic mission in the four areas of teacher education, human health, the arts, and economic development. The nature of the university as it changes from a comprehensive to what is hoped to be a doctoral extensive institution was the central focus of discussion. We agreed that the processes for defining faculty roles and rewards that were appropriate for a comprehensive university will not serve a doctoral extensive institution.

The Commission reviewed extensive literature in its study of extended definitions of scholarship. Ernest Boyer proposed an expanded definition of scholarship, including the scholarship of teaching, integration, and application in addition to the traditional scholarship of discovery in *Scholarship Reconsidered: Priorities of the Professoriate*. Since its publication in 1990, much has been written to interpret and refine his ideas; in particular, the scholarship of application has become widely known as the scholarship of engagement. Charles Glassick *et al.* (1998) in *Scholarship Assessed: Evaluation of the Professoriate* describe methods for documenting and evaluating the newer forms of scholarship. These topics have been widely discussed, and a clearinghouse has been established to facilitate the evaluation of the scholarship of engagement.

The Commission discovered that a wide variety of universities have been influenced in some way by broader definitions of scholarship. Many institutions are encouraging their faculty to participate in the newer forms of scholarship, revisiting their current definitions of scholarship, adopting broadened definitions, and implementing those definitions to some degree for tenure and promotion. The Commission decided to investigate developments at some of these schools, both by reading relevant documents and contacting professors and administrators to discern what, if any, new policies were being employed and how these policies were actually working.

The Commission reviewed institutions that were peers of ECU as well as those that were already doctoral extensive. Peer institutions included Indiana University Purdue University Indianapolis (IUPUI) and Oregon State University. At IUPUI, tenure and promotion can be obtained by excellence in either teaching, research, or service combined with satisfactory performance in the other two. Publication is required to demonstrate satisfactory or excellent performance in any of these areas. Faculty members are strongly encouraged to participate in the scholarship of engagement. The promotion and tenure policies at Oregon State were revised thoroughly in 1996 to allow scholarship to be demonstrated by research, teaching, and community outreach. The guidelines permit varied emphasis among the three areas for professional advancement. Faculty contacts at both schools believe that the faculty are, in general, happy with their systems.

Commission members also contacted doctoral extensive institutions, including the University of Illinois at Champaign-Urbana, the University of California at Davis, the University of Wisconsin-Madison, and the University of Georgia. While these universities generally support community engagement, they have not made sweeping changes in policy to put the newer forms of scholarship on par with traditional scholarship. The University of Illinois encourages its faculty to be involved in public service, even publishing a faculty guide on the relationship of service to promotion and tenure. At UC-Davis, four areas are recognized for promotional advancement: teaching, research and creative work, professional competence and activity, and university and public service. However, a significant publication record in the scholarship of discovery is still required for promotion and tenure. This is also true for the University of Wisconsin-Madison, although the university does support several outreach projects that could lead to the scholarship of engagement. The University of Georgia has two tracks for faculty: a traditional track and a career track that is based on service. Some faculty at Georgia report that this system is problematic because the career track does not offer the same benefits as the traditional track.

Starting Points

The commission offers the following findings as starting points for the discussion of the nature of scholarship at ECU:

- The work of the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, particularly Ernest Boyer's *Scholarship Reconsidered* (1990) and Charles Glassick *et al.*'s *Scholarship Assessed* (1997), guides discussions on scholarship and faculty roles and rewards nationally, and similarly informs discussion of scholarship here at ECU. Future discussions on scholarship, roles and rewards will benefit from beginning with the Carnegie Foundation's work in mind.
- Good scholarship in any discipline utilizes the standards articulated in Boyer's *Scholarship Reconsidered*: clear goals, adequate preparation, appropriate methods, significant results, effective presentation, and reflective technique.
- There is widespread agreement on the types of scholarship that Boyer first defined: discovery, teaching, engagement (what Boyer first called "application"), and integration.
- There is a difference between faculty scholarship and other professional duties of faculty members. Specifically, the scholarship of teaching is *not* the same as teaching; the scholarship of engagement is *not* the same as performing service; the scholarship of integration is *not* the same as summarizing information. This distinction should be made clear in all discussions of scholarship in

teaching, engagement, and integration as these areas of scholarship do not have the recognizable traditions of the scholarship of discovery.

- Scholarship of all types will become increasingly important at ECU as it changes from a comprehensive institution to one that is doctoral intensive, and that strives to be doctoral extensive.
- Broadening the definition of scholarship explicitly recognizes different areas of faculty scholarly endeavor, but it should not diminish the standards by which scholarship is assessed.
- A broader definition of what constitutes scholarship requires all involved to acknowledge the difficulties of creating new criteria for excellence, designing new evidential records as the basis for judging performance, and implementing new procedures for institutional peer review.

Definition of Scholarship

Scholarship can be defined as those activities that systematically advance teaching, research, and practice through rigorous inquiry that 1) is significant to the profession, 2) is creative, 3) can be documented, 4) can be replicated, extended, or elaborated, and 5) can be peer-reviewed through various methods. This definition is applied in the following standards that describe the various types of scholarship.

Each of the four scholarship activities described by Boyer takes place in varying degrees in various disciplines. The balance among these activities in various disciplines should relate directly to its role and mission. Using Boyer's categories of scholarship as a model, the following elements of scholarship should be considered in carrying out the role and mission assigned to each unit.

Scholarship of Discovery

The scholarship of discovery is inquiry that *produces the disciplinary and professional knowledge* that is at the very heart of academic pursuits (Boyer, 1990). The scholarship of discovery takes the form of primary research and creative activity that advances the knowledge of the discipline. It increasingly is interdisciplinary and collaborative in nature, across professional groups and within professional disciplines.

Examples of Documentation of the Quality of the Scholarship of Discovery

- peer-reviewed publications of research, theory, or philosophical essays;
- presentations of research, theory, or philosophical essays;
- performances;
- exhibitions;
- grant awards in support of research;
- mentorship of junior colleagues in research or scholarship;
- state, regional, national, or international recognition as a scholar within a specific discipline; and
- positive peer evaluations of the body of work.

Scholarship of Teaching

The scholarship of teaching is inquiry that *produces knowledge to support the transfer of disciplinary skills and information from the expert to the novice*, building bridges between the teacher's understanding and the student's learning (Boyer, 1990). This scholarly activity supports the development of educational environments that embrace diverse learning styles, and increasingly, places the focus of education on the learner (Edgerton, 1997). The scholarship of teaching increases the effectiveness of the transfer of discipline-specific knowledge, and adds to deeper understanding of both the discipline and pedagogy. The scholarship of teaching is conducted through application of knowledge of the discipline or specialty area in the teaching-learning process, the development of innovative teaching and evaluation methods, program development, learning outcome evaluation, and professional role modeling.

Knowledge of the discipline or specialty applied in teaching-learning includes innovations that demonstrate the knowledge of the faculty member in relation to teaching (such as authorship of textbooks or other learning aids), technology application, and theory building in the teaching-learning assessment context.

Development of innovative teaching and evaluation methods includes research in teaching strategies, course development and outcome evaluation, curricular and faculty evaluation innovations, research related to the knowledge and pedagogy of the discipline, and creation of innovative learning environments that support diverse groups of students. Program development and learning outcome evaluation include the development of outcomes assessment programs, accreditation reports, grant proposals for educational programs, disciplinary and interdisciplinary programs, and educational evaluation models. Professional role modeling includes the mentoring of students and novice faculty, leadership roles in curriculum and instruction, development of programs for lifelong learning, and leadership in shaping educational policy.

Examples of Documentation of the Quality of Scholarship of Teaching

- peer-reviewed publications of research related to teaching methodology or learning outcomes, case studies related to teaching-learning, learning theory development, and development or testing of educational models or theories;
- accreditation or other comprehensive program reports;
- successful, peer-reviewed, applications of technology to teaching and learning;
- positive peer assessments of innovations in teaching;
- state, regional, national, or international recognition as a master teacher;
- published textbooks or other learning aids;
- grant awards in support of teaching and learning;
- design of outcome studies or evaluation/assessment programs;
- presentations related to teaching and learning; and
- positive peer evaluations of the body of work.

Scholarship of Engagement

Scholarship of engagement is the *interaction of theory and practice that results in the creation of new knowledge and/or the innovative application of disciplinary knowledge to specific problems*. It engages faculty in academically relevant work (including applied research and outreach to businesses, communities, and individuals) that simultaneously meets the mission of the campus and the needs of the community. In essence, it is a scholarly agenda that integrates community issues. In this definition, community is broadly defined to include audiences external to the campus that are part of a collaborative process to contribute to the public good.

Examples of Documentation of the Quality of Scholarship of Engagement

- peer-reviewed publications of research, policy analysis, case studies, and others;
- copyrights, licenses, patents, or products for sale;
- published books;
- positive peer evaluations of contributions to the scholarship of engagement, including review by the National Review Board for the Scholarship of Engagement;
- grant awards for outreach and community engagement;
- presentations and policy papers designed to influence organizations or governments; and
- positive peer evaluations of the body of work.

Scholarship of Integration

The scholarship of integration refers to writings and other products that use concepts and original works from other disciplines in *creating new patterns, placing knowledge in a larger context, or illuminating data in a more meaningful way*. The scholarship of integration emphasizes the

interconnection of ideas and brings new insight to bear on original concepts and research. Critical analysis and interpretation are two common methodologies, but interdisciplinary work may take place through any medium for scholarship such as those described as discovery, teaching, or practice (Boyer, 1990). Original work in the scholarship of integration takes place at the margins, or interface, between two or more disciplines. It serves to respond to both intellectual questions and pressing human problems by creating knowledge or combining knowledge in applications that offer new paradigms and insights.

Integrative scholarship requires participation from two or more disciplines in inquiry that advances knowledge across a wide range of techniques and methodologies. Works that would be recognized in the scholarship of integration include interfaces between a variety of disciplines. Integrative reviews of the literature, analysis of policy, development of interdisciplinary educational programs and service projects, studies of systems, original interdisciplinary research, and integrative models or paradigms across disciplines are examples of the scholarship of integration.

Examples of Documentation of the Quality of Integrative Scholarship

- peer-reviewed publications of research, policy analysis, case studies, integrative reviews of the literature, and others;
- copyrights, licenses, patents, or products for sale;
- published books;
- positive peer evaluations of contributions to integrative scholarship;
- reports of interdisciplinary programs or service projects;
- interdisciplinary grant awards;
- presentations and policy papers designed to influence organizations or governments; and
- positive peer evaluations of the body of work.

Summary of the Definition of Scholarship

While the mission of institutions of higher learning is unique in each setting, the commitment to scholarly approaches to education, research, integration, and engagement creates common bonds across the academic community. *There are two common elements in all types of scholarship in institutions of higher learning: the creation of new knowledge* (fundamental disciplinary knowledge; knowledge to support the teaching process; knowledge created by the innovative application of disciplinary knowledge to specific problems; or new patterns of knowledge, placed in a larger context or illuminated in a more meaningful way) and *the dissemination of that knowledge in peer-reviewed forums.*

Community of Scholars

With this expanded definition of scholarship, the University community can begin to incorporate the concept of a *Community of Scholars* into its actions and activities. Scholarship, particularly the scholarship of discovery, is often thought of as a solitary pursuit: a scientist working in a lab, a history professor writing a book in his or her office, a teacher trying a new idea in a classroom, or a musician sitting at the keyboard working to get the score just right. These images illuminate only fragments of scholarship.

Scholarship is really a collective activity. It is sharing ideas between like-minded researchers, participation in conference activities, public musical performances and gallery shows, peer review of papers, and similar activities. Although the creation of all scholarship encompasses periods of solitary reflection and individual work, real scholarship is only fully formed and disseminated through interaction with others.

It is often thought that the interaction – the collective, community activity – occurs between scholars in the same discipline, often at different institutions. While a significant component of the scholarship of

discovery is discipline-specific, components of the scholarships of teaching, engagement, and integration are discipline neutral. We suggest that all scholarship, particularly in teaching, engagement, and integration, only reaches high quality when it is shared, critiqued, and molded by input from those across a wide range of disciplines. Fundamentally, as scholars, we exist collectively, not in isolation.

While all members of the University have a responsibility to participate in its intellectual life, the faculty and administration have a central responsibility to foster the intellectual collaboration essential for a vital and vibrant *Community of Scholars*. Central to this responsibility are core issues including: respect for the scholarship of others, active engagement in the Community, and appreciation for the efforts and results of others.

Recommendations

One of the Commission's most important findings is that there is little agreement about the standards for evaluation of faculty scholarship at ECU. The following recommendations represent an effort to articulate these standards. We view this effort as essential to the fundamental redefinition of scholarship at ECU.

In implementing these recommendations, the commission urges the university community to avoid two problems identified in the most recent national survey:

1. "The problem of the overload plate" – that is, interpreting the broader definition of scholarship to mean that the faculty must contribute and exhibit strength in all four areas at one time. The purpose of redefining scholarship is not to add additional responsibilities, but to value all forms of scholarly activity.
2. "The tension between the complete scholar and differentiated staffing" – that is, staffing practices that isolate scholars in any one sphere of activity. During a professional career, scholars move through the different ways of knowing. In the words of Dr. Eugene Rice, "universities need faculty who are developing different parts of their scholarly selves, not those permanently fixed in any one sphere."

Recommendation 1: Recognizing Various Types of Scholarship at ECU

Language should be placed in the *Faculty Manual* that acknowledges that there are multiple types of scholarship in which faculty can engage, and that the types of scholarship begin with, but are not limited to, those developed by Boyer in *Scholarship Reconsidered* (1990). The changes to the Faculty Manual should spell out the definitions of types of scholarship recognized by ECU and the standards of excellence used to evaluate the scholarship.

Implementation:

To implement this recommendation, the Commission proposes revisions to Appendix C of the *Faculty Manual*. The proposed revisions are included in this document as Appendix A. The committee requests that the appropriate faculty committees review the suggested changes and present them to the Faculty Senate for approval.

Recommendation 2: Clarification of Standards

Each unit should include within its Code a statement of the nature of scholarship within its academic discipline and its own criteria and standards for evaluation of faculty scholarship. The goal of this exercise is to articulate unit standards so that both candidates and persons evaluating the candidates will have a clear understanding of performance expectations in the area of scholarship.

This recommendation is a response to faculty concerns that standards for advancement are unclear and that expectations have changed quickly and with little notice as a result of ECU's recent change to a research institution. To address these concerns, it is essential that clarification begin at the unit

level, that it receive appropriate higher-level review, and that the resulting expectations be published and readily available to all faculty and administrative officers.

Implementation:

We propose that each unit re-examine its evaluation criteria and provide a brief written summary of its standards for evaluation of faculty scholarship. This re-examination should take the following form:

- Each unit should write a statement that clearly identifies the types of faculty scholarship (the scholarship of discovery, the scholarship of teaching, the scholarship of engagement, and/or the scholarship of integration) it recognizes and the criteria it uses to evaluate that scholarship.
- The statement should reflect the highest standards of the academic discipline, as well as the types of scholarship, standards of excellence, and flexibility mandated by the *Faculty Manual*.
- The revised unit criteria for the evaluation of faculty scholarship should be included in unit codes. Review and approval of revisions to unit codes should follow the established university process and the recognized principles of academic freedom.

Recommendation 3: Workshops on the Academic Personnel Review Process

The Office of the Provost, in cooperation with the Faculty Senate and the Office of the Vice Chancellor for Health Sciences, should organize an annual workshop on the academic personnel review process for chairs, deans, and members of unit personnel committees so that those who participate in the decision-making process have consistent information.

The goals of this recommendation are to educate the principals who participate in the review process, to discuss problems that have arisen, to enhance mutual understanding of the different perspectives that arise at each level of review, and to work toward common solutions. Such communication between the Faculty Senate and the administration is essential to maintaining and improving faculty confidence in the personnel process.

Recommendation 4: Dissemination of Information

Sources of information regarding alternative means of assessing scholarship should be made available, and maintained, in a central location such as the Faculty Senate office, library, and on the Faculty Senate web page. This information should include a copy of this report and any subsequent related reports, as well as reference materials and notable examples of the various types of scholarship.

Implementation:

The Faculty Senate Office should take the lead in this important step of making educational materials on the new definitions of scholarship and various means of evaluating that scholarship available to the faculty.

Recommendation 5: Enhancement of the ECU Community of Scholars

The *ECU Community of Scholars* should work to foster a greater understanding of university scholarship among faculty of disparate disciplines by encouraging collective scholarly activity within the institution.

This task will require the work of many and will be accomplished only by diligent effort over time. It will require the continued commitment of the institution and its component members to support scholarship of high quality and to promote a dynamic relationship between and among the four forms of scholarship and among the faculty, students, staff, alumni, parents, friends, and supporters of the University

Implementation:

Several concrete steps can be taken to strengthen our collective scholarship and highlight the value of a strong Community of Scholars:

- the university should stimulate and support cross-disciplinary collaboration within and among the four forms of scholarship,
- the Chancellor should appoint a group to promote, in formal and informal ways, the strength of our collective scholarship, and
- *Edge Magazine* should regularly include articles that highlight multidisciplinary efforts by campus faculty.

References Cited

(2000). Report of the Academic Affairs Division Task Force on Faculty Roles and Rewards.

(2001). Focus on faculty. *Change: the Magazine of Higher Learning* (July/August). Get pp.

(2002). Growth and quality: Excelling as an emerging doctoral university. Report of the Consulting Team Prepared for East Carolina University's Southern Association of Colleges and Schools Alternative Self-Study.

Boyer, E. (1990). *Scholarship reconsidered: Priorities of the professoriate*. Princeton, NJ: The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching.

Edgerton, R. (1997). *Higher education white paper*. Washington, DC: Pew Charitable Trusts.

Glassick, C., et al. (1998). *Scholarship assessed. Evaluation of the professoriate. Special Report of the Carnegie Foundatin for the Advancement of Teaching*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

Wright, B. The Syracuse transformation on becoming a student-centered research university. *Change*, Vol. 33, p. 38.

Other Relevant Readings

Bellah, N., Madsen, R., Sullivan, W., & Tipton, S. (1996). *Habits of the heart: Individualism and commitment in American life*. New York: Harper & Row.

Boyer, Ernest. (1996). The scholarship of engagement. *Journal of Public Outreach* 1,1,11-20.

Bingle, R. G., Games, R., & Malloy, E.A. (Eds.). (1990). *Colleges and universities as citizens*. Needham Heights, MA: Allyn & Bacon.

Chibucos, T. R. & Lerner, R. M. (Eds.). (1999). *Serving children and families through community-university partnerships: Success stories*. Norwell, MA: Kluwer Academic Publishers.

Driscoll, A. & Lynton, E. A. (1999). *Making outreach visible: A guide to documenting professional service and outreach*. Washington, DC: American Association for Higher Education.

Edgerton, R. (1997). *Higher education white paper*. Washington, DC: Pew Charitable Trusts.

Ehrlich, T. (1995). *The Courage to inquire: Ideals and realities in higher education*. Bloomington, Indiana: Indiana University Press.

Fairweather, S. (1996). *Faculty work and public trust*. Boston: Allyn and Bacon.

Harkavy, I & Benson, L. (1998). De-Platonizing and democratizing education as the bases of service learning. In R.A. Rhoads & J. Howard (Eds.), *Service learning: Pedagogy and research* (pp. 11-19). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Kellogg Commission on the Future of State and Land Grant Universities. (1999). *Returning to our roots: The engaged institution*. Washington, DC: National Association of State Universities and Land-Grant Colleges.

Lazerson, M, Wagener, U., & Shumanis, N. What makes a revolution? *Change*, May/June (2000) p. 12.

Lynton, E. (1995). *Making the case for professional service*. Washington, DC: American Association for Higher Education.

Michigan State University. (1996). *Points of distinction: A guidebook for planning & evaluating quality outreach* (Revised). East Lansing, MI: Michigan State University Board of Trustees.

Palmer, J. (1998). *The courage to teach*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Sandmann, L. R., Foster-Fishman, P.G., Lloyd, J., Rauhe, W., and Rosaen, C. (2000). Managing critical tensions: How to strengthen the scholarship component of outreach. *Change* 32,1, 44-52.

Schon, D.A. (1995). The new scholarship requires a new epistemology. *Change*, November/December, 27-34.

Websites Related to Scholarship

<http://www.aacn.nche.edu/Publications/positions/scholar.htm> (American Association of Colleges of Nursing)

<http://www.scholarshipofengagement.org/>

<http://www.outreach.psu.edu/News/Pubs/Monograph/eval.html>

<http://www.outreach.psu.edu/News/Pubs/Monograph/science.html>

<http://www.nasulgc.org/publications/Kellogg/execsum.pdf>

<http://www.aahe.org/FFRR/preview/emphasis2.htm>

[http://www1.uwex.edu/secretary/\\$WPM79FB/](http://www1.uwex.edu/secretary/$WPM79FB/)

<http://www.cidd.gwu.edu/research/teach.html>

<http://php.indiana.edu/%7Enelson1/SOTLGenres.html>

http://www.upenn.edu/ccp/Bibliography/Service_Learning.html

<http://www.gsu.edu/~wwwctl/programs/scholarship.htm>

http://www.tltgroup.org/resources/Flashlight/Scholarship_What.html

<http://www.personal.psu.edu/faculty/t/r/tra2/EngagedUniversity.htm>

<http://www.uic.edu/depts/oaa/TFSEreport.pdf>

<http://www.nasulgc.org/publications/Kellogg/execsum.pdf>

<http://www.lincoln.ac.nz/tis/talc>

Commission Members

Anderson, Patricia J.	Elementary Education
Dorsey, Michael A.	Art
Estes, Steven G.	Exercise and Sports Science
Horns, Phyllis N. (co-chair)	Nursing
Morrison, Robert C. (co-chair)	Chemistry
Moskop, John C.	Medical Humanities
Niswander, Fredrick	Business
Reaves, Rita R.	Academic Affairs
Ries, Heather L.	Mathematics
Rigsby, Catherine A.	Geology
Sheerer, Marilyn	Education
Swart, William W.	Provost
Taggart, Mark A.	Music

Appendix A – Recommended revisions to Appendix C of the ECU Faculty Manual
(noted in **bold** print)

East Carolina University Faculty Manual

APPENDIX C. PERSONNEL POLICIES AND PROCEDURES FOR THE FACULTY OF EAST CAROLINA UNIVERSITY [1]

Section III. Evaluation

Each faculty member with a probationary term appointment and each permanently tenured faculty member shall receive annually an evaluation of his/her performance from the unit administrator which shall be based upon current academic year data, except that data from the previous year's spring semester survey of student opinion of teaching may be utilized when current spring semester survey data are unavailable [2]. This annual evaluation shall:

- be in writing;
- state the percentage of salary increment available to the unit to be recommended by the unit administrator for the faculty being evaluated;
- be discussed with the faculty member prior to being sent to any other administrator or placed in the faculty member's personnel file; in the case of faculty members with probationary period appointments, a record of this discussion shall be placed in the faculty member's personnel file; and
- shall be signed and dated by the unit administrator and the faculty member, who may attach to the evaluation a concise comment regarding the evaluation. The signature of the faculty member signifies that the faculty member has read, but does not necessarily concur in, the evaluation.

The unit administrator shall forward to each faculty member a copy of that member's annual evaluation within ten days after completing the evaluations of unit members.

The unit administrator's annual performance evaluation of faculty members shall employ the criteria contained in the unit code approved by the chancellor (ECU Faculty Manual, Appendix L). The evaluation shall be based upon that year's assigned duties and responsibilities (except, as earlier noted, for the previous year's Spring semester survey of student opinion) and shall consider:

1. teaching

The quality of teaching must be evaluated by means of

a. data from surveys of student opinion, when such data have been gathered in accordance with established procedures of the department or the university which guarantee the integrity and completeness of said data. As part of the effort to evaluate the teaching of faculty members, each unit shall either: develop and use its own instrument(s) as approved by the chancellor to determine student opinion of teaching or utilize the instrument developed by the Academic Standards Committee to determine student opinion of teaching.

b. formal methods of peer review, including direct observation of the classroom teaching of new and tenure-track faculty.

c. procedures provided for in unit codes;

2. scholarship and creative activities;

Faculty scholarship may include the following categories:

a. **scholarship of discovery—research or creative activity that advances the knowledge of an academic discipline;**

b. **scholarship of teaching—research or creative activity that improves the quality of instruction in an academic discipline;**

c. **scholarship of engagement—research or creative activity that uses the knowledge of an academic discipline to solve social or community problems or to achieve social or community goals.**

d. **scholarship of integration—research or creative activity that links knowledge from two or more academic disciplines to address intellectual or social questions.**

3. patient care;

4. services rendered on department, school, college, and university committees, councils, and senates; service to professional organizations; service local, state and national governments; contributions to the development of public forums, institutes, continuing education projects, patients services and consulting in the private and public sectors; and

5. other responsibilities as may be appropriate to the assignment.

The relative weight given to teaching, scholarship/creative activity, and service in personnel decisions shall be determined by each unit code. In no case, however, shall service be weighed more heavily than either teaching or scholarship/creative activity. (Faculty Senate Resolution #97-43, December 1997)

[1] For policies and procedures dealing with persons on fixed term appointment, ECU Faculty Manual, Appendix D.

[2] With respect to Appendix C, Section III. Evaluation, "academic units" are defined as: departments described in the codes of operation of professional schools, the departments in the College of Arts and Sciences, professional schools without departments, Academic Library Services, Health Sciences Library, and any other units in which faculty evaluations are made. In the College of Arts and Sciences and in professional schools whose unit codes describe departmental structures, departmental chairs are the unit administrators. In schools that do not have departments described in their unit codes, the dean of the school is the unit administrator.

Section IV. Professional Advancement

Promotion is a means through which professional achievement is encouraged, recognized, and rewarded by the university. Evaluation of faculty for purposes of promotion shall accord with the regulations established in accordance with the unit code and shall employ the criteria contained in the unit code approved by the chancellor (ECU Faculty Manual, Appendix L).

Departments in professional schools may also establish guidelines for evaluation of faculty for promotion consistent with the criteria in their school's unit code. Specific regulations and criteria governing evaluation of faculty for purposes of promotion may vary from unit to unit. As a minimum each unit shall:

- apply published criteria in the teaching, **the various forms of scholarship**, and service for evaluating faculty for promotion;
- make available procedures which will permit each faculty member to report achievements annually or on a more frequent basis;
- assure each faculty member the right to discuss one's candidacy with the unit administrator and/or the personnel committee at any time; and
- notify each faculty member within four days of receipt of the administration's call for promotion recommendations.

Upon request by the faculty member, the unit administrator and the unit personnel committee shall evaluate the faculty member for promotion. Following such evaluation, the unit administrator and the personnel committee shall inform the faculty member of their respective recommendations. Promotion shall be based primarily upon the faculty member's total demonstrated professional competence and achievement. Procedures to be followed for promotion are found in *ECU Faculty Manual*, Appendix D. Among the many qualifications which may be considered when making recommendations for promotion, the following are essential:

Assistant Professor - Qualifications necessary to be appointed to the rank of instructor, an appropriate terminal degree, as evaluated by the academic unit and affirmed by the appropriate administrative officer and the profession concerned; a record of progress toward teaching effectiveness; and evidence of a potential for continued professional growth which shall, in part, be measured by **scholarship**/creative activity and membership in professional organizations.

Associate Professor - Qualifications of the previous rank; evidence of teaching effectiveness; a record of **scholarship** or creative activity resulting in publication or comparable productivity; a record of

participation in professional organizations; effective service on academic and/or administrative committees, and a record of effective service to the profession.

Professor - Qualifications of the previous ranks; an established record of excellence in teaching; a record of significant **scholarship or** creative activity; a record of significant service to the profession, such as contributions to the development of public forums, institutes, continuing education projects, and patients services; consulting in the private and public sectors; and a record of significant contribution as a member of academic and/or administrative committees. (Faculty Senate Resolution #99-7, March 1999)

Promotion usually should be accompanied by a salary increment which shall be separate from any and all other increments to which the individual may be entitled. Notwithstanding any previous statement that has appeared herein, competence for promotion to a specific rank may be attested to by advanced study, culminating in appropriate graduate degrees, or by extensive work experience in the teaching fields or in a professional practice which is demonstrably of highest quality.

Section V. Salary

A. Initial Salary

Initial salary shall be based on degree attainment, pertinent experience, professional activity, scholarly publication or its equivalent, and level of responsibility, consideration being given to the salaries of personnel presently in the unit and salaries within the discipline in comparable institutions.

B. Determination of Annual Salary Increments

The unit administrator shall recommend annual salary increments to appropriate administrative officials in accordance with requirements imposed by the North Carolina General Assembly, The University of North Carolina Board of Governors, and the university administration, and shall employ any additional criteria that have been established in this appendix, in units codes, or in policies required by unit codes. Basic criteria for assessing merit shall include the degree of teaching excellence; **scholarship/creative activity**; service to local, state, and national governments; as well as contributions to the development of public forums, institutes, continuing education projects, and patients' services. The unit administrator shall report annually to the unit, in dollar amounts and percentages, the total increment allotted, mean salary increment, and range in salary increments for the unit. Each faculty member shall be informed by the unit administrator of any salary increment recommendations made on behalf of the faculty member by the unit administrator.