

Motion 1: The faculty approve the reassignment of evaluation of endowed chairs for reappointment from the Promotion and Tenure Committee to the Committee for Endowed Professorships and Chairs (CEPC) and the following Handbook revision reflecting that change:

A review and recommendation concerning the reappointment of the incumbent will take place during the last remaining year of the appointment. It will be brought to the ~~Promotion and Tenure Committee~~ [Committee for Endowed Professorships and Chairs](#) by the Provost, and will consist of a brief review of the incumbent's activities in teaching, scholarly/artistic activity, and service during the time since the last review. (Chapter IV.6, p. 54)

Furthermore, the Faculty charge the CEPC with 1) revising the list of submitted materials for initial appointment in order to align these with the selection criteria (see below), 2) providing more specific and criteria-driven guidance for submitted materials for reappointment evaluation, and 3) making the evaluation calendar for appointment and reappointment clearer in the Handbook.

Rationale: As noted in Provost Brodl's October 21 report to the Faculty, both PAT and the CEPC found it frustrating to use the submitted materials to determine whether and to what extent candidates for endowed chairs and for reappointment meet/continue to meet the selection criteria for the award. The criteria are as follows:

- Mastery of teaching at all levels, from introductory to advanced-level courses, and a sustained record of active engagement of students in the cutting-edge issues of the discipline by involving students in scholarship and/or artistic activity. The successful candidate should be widely recognized as a role model for teaching on this campus.
- A record of outstanding scholarship and/or artistic achievement throughout his/her career. In the case for scholarship, evidence for this shall consist of publication in the foremost journals, grants received, peer-reviewed presentations at meetings, editorial service for journals or books, leadership positions held in national or international organizations of the professor's discipline, and prizes and awards received in recognition of scholarship. In the case for artistic achievement, evidence for this shall consist of performance or exhibition in national or international venues, critical acclaim by external reviewers of artistic performance or exhibition, leadership positions held in national or international organizations of the professor's discipline, and prizes or other honors received in recognition of artistic achievement.
- Service at the very highest levels of the university, as exemplified by election to major faculty committees and to leadership positions on those committees; appointment by the President and Provost to major appointive committees and significant meritorious service on those committees; service as chair/director of academic units; or other meritorious service to the university. (Chapter IV.D.2, pp. 51-52)

Yet, submitted materials are limited to a CV, a 1500 word letter of nomination, and up to three external letters in the case of initial appointment. In the case of reappointment evaluation materials are scant (a yearly summary of how the funds were spent and a report on accomplishments). PAT also found the language for nominations to be ambiguous, given that a candidate could submit his or her own case (with a 1500 word letter), at the same time as other faculty members also nominate him or her, each also afforded another 1500 word letter: this has led to cases where candidates had four nominating letters (totaling up to 6000 words), while others had only one. Currently, the Faculty Handbook states that "Members of the faculty—especially Department Heads and School Directors—are encouraged

to forward names of colleagues who they wish to have considered for this recognition.” But it is not clear how “forwarding names” becomes an official nomination for a colleague. CEPC would like to clarify this language and will be bringing proposed changes to the faculty soon.

It is very difficult for candidates to speak to the criteria with such limited and ambiguous guidelines , and, thus, it is difficult for PAT and CEPC to deliberate with confidence. Additionally, the work of the CEPC would be improved by a more obvious schedule (e.g., reappoint in Fall, appoint in Spring).

Finally, though this is not a part of the motion, we would like to note that the provost’s role in reappointment deliberations is unclear, and we urge CEPC to consider what it ought to be as they revise Chapter IV, Part D.