

## **Promotion and Tenure Manual**

*School of Dentistry*

*University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill*

**DRAFT**

Key to interpretation of changes to document:

- Sections in red type are sections where changes were made
  - Items underlined are the specific changes made.
- Items that were deleted from the document are lined-out, e.g. ~~deleted item~~
- Sections highlighted in yellow are sections of the UNC-CH Faculty Code that have been modified recently and now are mandatory for all promotion and tenure decisions taking place in the University.

May, 1991

Revised: July, 1995

Revised: June 2004

## Introduction

Promotion and Tenure is at the heart of the academic reward process for university faculty. The School of Dentistry is committed to having its faculty well-informed about the expectations for promotion and tenure and the process used to evaluate faculty. Hence, the School makes this manual available to all current and new faculty members.

It should be noted that Section I of this document is the promotion and tenure policy statement, while Sections II-IV contain supporting information.

Formatted: Line spacing: 1.5 lines

**TABLE OF CONTENTS**

1. Promotion and Tenure Guidelines..... 4

1.1 UNC Promotion and Tenure Guidelines ..... 4

**1.2 School of Dentistry Promotion and Tenure Guidelines ..... 6**

1.2.1 Introduction ..... 6

1.2.2 Tenured and Tenure-Track Faculty ..... 7

1.2.3 Fixed Term Faculty..... 8

1.2.3.1 Clinical Instructor, Assistant, Associate, and Full Professor ..... 8

1.2.3.2 Research Instructor, Assistant, Associate, and Full Professor ..... 9

1.2.3.3 Administration ..... 9

1.2.4 Adjunct Faculty ..... 10

1.2.5 Areas to Be Evaluated ..... 10

1.2.5.1 Teaching ..... 11

1.2.5.1.1 Scope of Teaching Activities ..... 13

1.2.5.1.2 Criteria Pertinent to All Promotion Decisions ..... 14

1.2.5.1.3 Criteria Pertinent to All Full Professor Decisions ..... 14

1.2.5.1.4 Methods of Evaluation..... 15

1.2.5.2 Scholarly Activity ..... 17

1.2.5.3 Professional and Community or Public Service and Engagement..... 17

1.2.6 Responsibility of the Candidate for Preparation of Documentation ..... 21

1.2.7 Faculty with Secondary Appointments in the School of Dentistry ..... 21

**SUPPORTING INFORMATION**

2. Types of Faculty Reviewed by the School of Dentistry Promotion and Tenure  
Advisory Committee ..... 23

2.1 Full-time Tenure Track Faculty ..... 23

2.2 Fixed-Term Faculty..... 23

2.3 Adjunct Faculty ..... 23

## SEQUENCE OF ACTIONS FOR PROMOTION AND TENURE REVIEW

2.3.1	Mandatory Review .....	24
2.3.2	Non-mandatory Review.....	25
2.4	Departmental Professors Committee .....	25
2.4.1	Intradepartmental Review .....	26
2.5	PTAC Review .....	27
2.5.1	Committee Charge .....	27
2.5.2	Committee Meetings and <i>Management of Conflict of Interest</i> .....	27
2.5.3	Committee Evaluation Procedures .....	28
2.5.3.1	Teaching .....	28
2.5.3.1.a	Teaching Portfolio Definition.....	29
2.5.3.1.b	Teaching Portfolio Table of Contents .....	30
2.5.3.2	Scholarship .....	31
2.5.3.3	Service <u>and Engagement</u> .....	32
2.5.3.4	Previous Experience at Another University .....	32
2.6	School of Dentistry Full Professors.....	32
2.6.1	Committee Charge .....	32
2.6.2	Committee Meetings.....	33
2.7	Dean's Review .....	33
2.8	University Review .....	33
2.8.1	Health Sciences Advisory Committee (HSAC) .....	33
2.8.2	Chancellor's Advisory Committee (CAC).....	33
2.8.3	Board of Trustees (BOT).....	34
2.8.4	Board of Governors (BOG) .....	34
2.8.5	Chart of Review Levels.....	35
2.8.6	Committee Schedules and Deadlines .....	36
2.9	Notification of Faculty Member .....	36
3.	Procedural Information.....	37
3.1	Format for CV.....	37
3.2	Departmental Actions.....	37

3.3	Evaluation Letters .....	37
3.4	Candidate's Statement .....	39
3.5	Chair's Letter .....	39
4.1	Review of Department Chairs .....	40
4.2	<u>Review Process</u> .....	40
4.3	Updating Procedures .....	41
	Exhibit 1 Trustee Policies and Regulations Document.....	42
	Exhibit 2 School of Dentistry's and Provost's Schedules and Deadlines.....	42
	Exhibit 3 UNC Curriculum Vitae (CV) Format.....	43
	Exhibit 4 The New England Journal of Medicine Special Report .....	48
	Exhibit 5 Promotion/Tenure Request Information .....	49
	Exhibit 6 Appointment, Reappointment & Promotion Transmittal Letter .....	52
	Exhibit 7 <u>How to Present an Effective Promotion/Tenure Dossier</u> .....	54
4.4	<u>References</u> .....	58

## **1. PROMOTION AND TENURE GUIDELINES**

The guidelines set forth by the Board of Trustees of the University and the School of Dentistry Guidelines are the basis for all promotion and tenure decisions in the School of Dentistry. The Promotion and Tenure Advisory Committee (PTAC) uses these guidelines as the basis for their evaluation of candidates. School Guidelines were developed to conform to University Guidelines. If inconsistencies occur between the two documents, the University Guidelines take precedence.

### ***1.1 UNC PROMOTION AND TENURE GUIDELINES***

The University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill promotion and tenure guidelines are specified in the Trustee Policies and Regulations Governing Academic Tenure in the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, July 1, 1994, which is included with the School of Dentistry Promotion and Tenure Manual as a separate document. In addition, the University asks that the following statement be a part of the School of Dentistry promotion and tenure information:

#### **University Criteria for Evaluation of Candidates for Reappointment and Tenure**

*The Trustee Policies Governing Academic Tenure* in The University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill indicate that tenure is held with reference to the institution and with reference to institution-wide standards. Section 2.a. of the Trustee Policies, for example, provides as follows:

"While academic tenure may be withheld on any grounds other than those specifically stated to be impermissible under Section 4 hereof, its conferral requires an assessment of institutional needs and resources and evidence of service to the academic community, potential for future contribution, commitment to the welfare of the University, and

demonstrated professional competence, including consideration of commitment to effective teaching, research, or public service." Section 4 of the Trustee Policies provides that the decision regarding tenure "is committed, without further recourse, to the judgment of the officers of administration authorized to make it, acting in accordance with prescribed procedures. In exercise of their judgment, whether in the first instance or in review of a recommendation to reappoint, such officers may take into account and use as a basis of decision, in whole or in part, any factors deemed relevant to total institutional interests..."

The tenure system is based upon the understanding that tenure is a privilege bestowed by the institution in keeping with its needs for outstanding achievement. It represents a fundamental institutional judgment of an individual's actual and potential contributions to the professional life of teaching, scholarship, engagement and service. Thus not everyone will obtain tenure; no set of detailed criteria can exist, the mere fulfillment of which will ensure tenure; and there will occasionally be differences of opinion about evaluations of an individual's contributions. Also relevant in the tenure decision are institutional interests that necessarily extend beyond the domain of any individual department or school. To insure that its intellectual quality is maintained and enhanced, the University insists on a standard of overall excellence.

As a reflection of the relevance of institutional interests, candidates for reappointment and tenure are evaluated independently according to the criteria referenced above at several levels of university administration, including the level of the Department Chair, Dean, Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs or Health Affairs as appropriate, Chancellor, Board of Trustees, and Board of Governors. Each level of administration may apply different or even higher standards of excellence from those applied at previous levels of review, consistent with school, division, and University-wide interests that are represented by these different levels.

## **1.2 SCHOOL OF DENTISTRY PROMOTION AND TENURE GUIDELINES.**

### **1.2.1 INTRODUCTION**

The purpose of this document is to facilitate the evaluation of faculty in the promotion process by describing criteria to be applied in making promotion and tenure decisions. An additional purpose is to provide a set of guidelines that may be useful in guiding individual professional development. These criteria allow consideration of a wide range of the activities of all faculty members. For example, an emerging area of scholarship involves community engagement or service. Community entails a group of people who share a common location, interests, values, work or identity, and who have an association due to common traditions, or political, civic, social, cultural or economic interactions. "Community engagement is the application of institutional resources to address and solve challenges facing communities, through collaboration with these communities (CCPH, 2005)." "Community-engaged scholarship involves the faculty member in a mutually beneficial partnership with the community." It can be interdisciplinary or draw on the principles of community-based participatory research. According to the 2005 Report of the Commission on Community-Engaged Scholarship in the Health Professions, "it is important to point out that not all community-engaged activities undertaken by faculty are scholarship. For example, if a faculty member devotes time to developing a community-based health program, it may be important work and it may advance the service mission of the institution, but unless it includes the other components that define or represent standards for scholarship (e.g., clear goals, adequate preparation, appropriate methods, reflective critique, rigor and/or peer review) it would not be considered scholarship (Glassick et al, 1997).

Because of the diversity of faculty interests and responsibilities, it is not possible to establish a precise series of steps that, when taken, will automatically lead to favorable decisions concerning promotion and tenure. Moreover, since a decision to promote includes a judgment of superior quality of performance, an organized set of illustrations carries with it the risk of being misleading. Nonetheless, the examples of activities cited herein, though not all inclusive, are typical of those considered in the promotion decision.

Faculty may be evaluated in terms of their teaching, scholarship, professional and community engagement/service. For the period being evaluated by the current promotion, the weights

applied to these three areas in reaching a promotion and tenure decision generally will reflect the proportion of time allocated to each area in the candidate's Terms and Conditions of Appointment Statement as may be modified by the Chair during their employment. Service implies a donor-recipient relationship in which one party, generally the community, receives benefit from interaction with the faculty member. "Community engagement is the application of institutional resources to address and solve challenges facing communities through collaboration with these communities (CCPH, 2005)." The defining aspect of engagement is the collaboration and mutuality of benefits.

All decisions on promotion and the awarding of academic tenure shall be based upon considerations of the demonstrated professional competence, the potential for future contribution of the faculty member, and of the needs and resources of the institution.

Sections I.2.2 through I.2.4 specify criteria for different types of faculty. The School of Dentistry defines those faculty members as follows:

**Tenured and Tenure-track** – those faculty members who have earned permanent tenure or who are appointed to probationary positions with eligibility for tenure.

**Fixed-term** -- those full-time faculty members who are appointed for a specified period of time for a specific purpose, such as teaching, research, academic administration, or public service from an academic base. The academic rank will have a prefix-qualifier, such as Clinical or Research, depending on the nature of the appointment.

**Adjunct** -- those faculty members who are part-time and appointed for a specified period of time for a specific purpose.

### **1.2.2 TENURED AND TENURE-TRACK FACULTY**

It is the duty of faculty in the tenure track to contribute in each of the three areas teaching, scholarship and community-engagement/service. Such a spectrum of contribution is essential to the vitality and excellence of the institution, as well as to the professional growth of the individual faculty member.

As an integral part of each promotion evaluation, the primary commitments of the faculty member are considered and an assessment made of their opportunity to contribute to each area of activity. Contributions in the areas where the greatest responsibilities and opportunities lie are weighed more heavily in the evaluation.

The School of Dentistry follows the regulations set forth in Section 2 of the Trustee Policies and Regulations Governing Academic Tenure as to the timing of reviews for re-appointments and promotion. The School also is in accord with the Chancellor's March, 1992 Memorandum detailing a Faculty Major Disability and Maternity Leave Policy. The current policy allows for temporary relief from employment obligations or less than full-time employment, each with commensurate compensation reductions, with appropriate administrative approvals. This temporary relief can be provided for compassionate reasons of health, requirements of childbirth or child care, or similar compelling reasons. Such relief may include extensions of the period of probationary appointment to coincide with the extent and duration of the relief from full-time employment.

### **1.2.3 FIXED TERM FACULTY**

Faculty appointed for a fixed *term make* important and continuing contributions to the vitality and excellence of the University. There are two distinct types of fixed-term faculty, clinical and research. These faculty members may enjoy satisfying academic experiences and professional growth through the pursuit of activities primarily in two of the three areas. Although the criteria for evaluation of faculty in the tenure track and faculty being considered for fixed-term appointment at a higher rank are the same for each area, the different concentrations of activities between fixed-term and tenure-track faculty result in circumstances that merit additional specification.

#### ***1.2.3.1 Clinical Instructor, Assistant, Associate, and Full Professor.***

It is expected that faculty in the clinical track will be evaluated primarily on the effectiveness of their teaching, supplemented by consideration of their [community-engagement/service](#) or research activities. Even though the expectations for the amount of teaching are greater for faculty in this track, the criteria for evaluation of effectiveness are the same as for faculty in the other tracks. In addition, if a clinical faculty member is evaluated for teaching and [community-engagement/service](#), there is still the expectation that they will participate in scholarly activity defined in its broadest sense (see section on

research). This requirement is imposed in the spirit of maintaining the academic viability of the teacher rather than requiring data-based research activity from all faculty members.

### **1.2.3.2 Research Instructor, Assistant, Associate, and Full Professor**

It is expected that faculty in the research track will be evaluated primarily on the quality of their research, supplemented by consideration of their teaching or community-service/engagement activities. It is recognized that research track faculty operate under particular restrictions imposed by the need for their salaries to be funded primarily from research activities. Research productivity should be commensurate with the time devoted to research and achieving the status of an independent investigator is expected to occur sooner than in other tracks. It also is recognized that for research track faculty, teaching roles involving activities as a research mentor, thesis advisor and committee work, and graduate level teaching may be more compatible with their prime source of salary support than clinical, preclinical and didactic teaching of pre-doctoral students.

### **1.2.3.3 Administration:**

It is recognized that there are a few faculty whose appointments are based on a need for administrative leadership. These faculty members are heavily committed to administrative roles that are both essential to and valued by the School. Fixed-term faculty members in these roles are eligible for consideration for promotion based on either evaluation of teaching or research and community-service/engagement. ~~In these instances, service can be the primary area of evaluation for promotion with teaching or research.~~ *However*, an evaluation of the functioning of the unit that they supervise must be a major component of the evaluation. This can be by a process similar to that used in the evaluation of a program director or chair prior to re-appointment.

In instances where Department Chairs and Unit Directors are being reviewed, it is generally considered that they spend 30% of their time in Departmental Administration. This time can be considered as service to the School and University.

### **1.2.4 ADJUNCT FACULTY**

**Adjunct faculty members are part-time faculty members that serve in a variety of very valuable roles in the School of Dentistry. The adjunct faculty group includes individuals who provide teaching,**

research, or community-engagement/service with time commitments that range from one or two days per semester to one to three days per week. Dental personnel who provide supervision to students on extramural rotations also have adjunct faculty appointments. Some adjunct faculty members are paid and others receive no remuneration. All such faculty members have demonstrated their commitment to promote the academic and professional interests of the School of Dentistry. Their contributions to these efforts are recognized through appointment at higher rank when appropriate.

Due to their part-time work schedule, appointment at higher rank for adjunct faculty ordinarily will be at longer intervals than full-time faculty. Initial review of part-time faculty with a commitment of one-half day a week or more will occur at seven years, with subsequent reviews occurring at five year intervals, thereafter. The department professors committee and the Department Chair may conclude that more or less time is needed for consideration for appointment at higher rank based on the scope, value, and quality of the part-time participation of the individual. Such consideration is highly relevant for individuals who have less than weekly commitments to the School of Dentistry. Adjunct faculty who do not have a continuing relationship with the School of Dentistry will not be considered for higher ranks.

Adjunct faculty will be reviewed only in those areas designated for their specific responsibilities. Thus the review may be limited to a single area. Criteria for evaluation can include but will not be limited to teaching evaluations, chair's evaluations, CV, supporting letters, and any available faculty evaluations. Documentation for adjunct faculty who supervise students at extramural sites would rely primarily on student reports and evaluation by the director of the extramural rotation program.

#### **1.2.5 AREAS TO BE EVALUATED**

The areas of activity evaluated in these decisions are: (1) teaching; (2) scholarly activity, the essential component being research; and (3) community-engagement and professional or public service. These areas are interrelated and mutually supportive; participation in one enhances performance in the others.

### **1.2.5.1 TEACHING**

Teaching is a primary function of the University. It is related to and supported by research and other scholarly activities. It extends beyond the institutional setting and serves the profession and the community at large. All faculty in the tenure track and appropriate fixed term faculty must make a significant time commitment to teaching.

Faculty members are expected to be knowledgeable of the literature and other information in their field of expertise. The complete faculty member should demonstrate the ability to assimilate and integrate this knowledge and the ability to effectively teach such knowledge.

Evaluation of teaching effectiveness does not lend itself solely to quantitative measurement and, in the final analysis, may be largely subjective. However, input into the evaluation from peers, department chair, students and other sources can help maximize the validity of the value judgments that must be made. *For full-time faculty, a teaching portfolio is the accepted method to document teaching ability and effectiveness. Suggested contents for such a portfolio are described in section 3.3.3.1.a & b.*

The criteria for teaching effectiveness that shall be considered in evaluation are quality, innovation, impact upon students, and degree of responsibilities. Evaluation will be made in all areas of the faculty member's assignments including: classroom teaching, laboratory and clinical teaching, course coordination, seminar leadership, supervision of individual student projects, and development of instructional materials.

#### Quality

The foundation of quality teaching is mastery of the subject, including the spectrum of the current literature in one's discipline. Essential components of the teaching effort are appropriate methods of instruction, effective planning and organization, appropriate methods of evaluation, and adequate feedback to students.

Teaching of superior quality may be characterized by:

- Utilization of highly effective oral, visual, and written communication techniques
- Stimulation of critical thinking and problem solving
- Encouragement of conceptual comprehension as well as factual recall
- Encouragement of students to raise questions and express ideas
- Performance of duties with enthusiasm and energy

- Continually up-dates teaching based on current knowledge, techniques, and concepts

### Innovation

Teaching excellence includes some degree of innovative effort on the part of a faculty member. Innovations in teaching must accomplish more than mere change. Rather, new methods should show measurable advantages over those previously used. Some examples of innovations in teaching are:

- taking advantage of new technology to improve teaching effectiveness
- development of new courses and programs or unique learning experiences
- use of educational research - development of methods to evaluate individual teaching, courses, or curriculum

### Impact upon students

A positive impact of teaching on the student should be the goal of each faculty member. The qualities of teaching that have positive influences on the student are numerous and may be difficult to measure. *A complete appraisal regarding the quality of teaching may be obtained through formal evaluation of teaching; however, informal evaluations may be used to supplement the formal teaching evaluation. Some examples of informal evaluation are:*

- *students pursue independent study as a result of interaction with the faculty member*
- *students provide unsolicited evaluation of faculty*
- *awards earned by students under faculty mentorship*

Desirable qualities of teachers may include but are not limited to those described by the following:

- presents a balanced point of view
- treats students with respect
- provides constructive criticism without belittling
- is reasonably available for consultation
- is fair and reasonable in evaluation of students

- compliments students for appropriate contributions or performance
- continually evaluates his/her own teaching
- meets teaching obligations by being prompt and available throughout the teaching/clinic session
- presents material at the appropriate level for the type of students being taught
- takes opportunities presented to teach individual students in the clinical setting
- follows course guidelines as to appropriate laboratory objectives and methods
- is effective in small groups or seminars in leading discussions
- devotes appropriate time in mentoring students and displays organizational skills that result in student achievement

Student input in faculty evaluation is essential, but is only a portion of the information considered. . Such input must be used in conjunction with the other factors that affect the quality of teaching *as shown in section 3.3.3.1.b that describes the contents of the teaching portfolio.*

#### Degree of responsibility

The degree of responsibility assigned to the faculty member is a consideration. The extent to which the faculty member's responsibilities contribute to the teaching programs of the school is of importance (e.g. directing a course or having primary responsibilities for a teaching program).

#### 1.2.5.1.1 SCOPE OF TEACHING ACTIVITIES

Teaching is defined in the broadest possible context and may encompass lecture, small group, seminar, clinical and laboratory instruction, *and one-on-one instruction.* Recipients may be undergraduate students, allied dental education students, predoctoral dental students, advanced education students, residents, graduate students, and postdoctoral fellows. Dissertation and thesis supervision and mentoring of students and fellows also are included under this definition of teaching.

#### 1.2.5.1.2 CRITERIA PERTINENT TO ALL PROMOTION DECISIONS

The criteria for teaching effectiveness that shall be considered in promotion decisions to assistant, associate, and full professor include quality of teaching, innovation in teaching, innovation in methods for evaluating students, impact upon students, and nature and extent *of responsibilities*. It is recognized that authoring a textbook is scholarly activity and that the book itself can be viewed as evidence of teaching. The School of Dentistry may consider authorship of textbooks either as teaching or a scholarly activity usually at the discretion of the candidate (See Section 1.2.6.)

#### 1.2.5.1.3 CRITERIA PERTINENT TO FULL PROFESSOR DECISIONS

Promotion based on excellence in teaching is viewed similarly to promotion based on research and service accomplishments. Promotion is not based on time-in-rank. The expectations for promotion to full Professor in the area of teaching involve wider recognition of the individual as a teacher and evidence of a more scholarly approach to teaching. Examples of these characteristics may include but are not limited to the following:

- Service as a course director, graduate program director, or residency director provides an opportunity to demonstrate organizational, testing, feedback, mentoring, and student remediation skills beyond those demonstrated by simply participating as a course member. Being a successful course director is an indication of the teaching maturity expected of a full Professor.
- Broader contributions to the teaching profession, such as authorship of textbooks, curriculum offerings or teaching materials adopted by other institutions, publication of reports involving innovative new educational or evaluation techniques, development of new programs, and/or publication of conceptual articles regarding dental education
- Contributions to the teaching mission outside the University such as participation in regional, national, and international educational activities, participation as a visiting professor or outside speaker (non-research), and activity in national organizations devoted to teaching

- Publication of peer-reviewed articles on new educational methodologies, clinical techniques, or clinical case studies appropriate to the teaching mission.

#### 1.2.5.1.4. METHODS OF EVALUATION

Evaluation of teaching effectiveness cannot be solely a quantitative measurement and, in the final analysis, has a subjective element. However, input into the evaluation from peers, department chairs, students and other sources can help maximize the validity of the value judgments that must be made.

Assessment of all the faculty members teaching assignments will be part of the evaluation including classroom teaching, laboratory and clinical teaching, course coordination, seminar leadership, supervision of individual student projects, and mentoring.

The methods currently used to evaluate teaching by the School of Dentistry are detailed in Section 3.3.3.1.

#### **1.2.5.2 SCHOLARLY ACTIVITY**

Scholarly activity is a central mission of a research university. Its components are: the compilation, synthesis, and transmission of current knowledge; and the generation of new knowledge through original research and publication of the findings. All faculty in the tenure track and appropriate fixed term faculty must engage in scholarly activity, a major portion of which must be original research.

In the evaluation of this aspect of promotion, attention shall be directed to the time a person has had for scholarly activity, the guidance and support provided to expand that time, and the resources available to enhance productivity. In all instances, the quality of the scholarly activity, as judged by authorities in the field, will be the critical measure.

##### Compilation, synthesis, and transmission of current knowledge

All scholarly activity supports teaching and [community-engagement](#)/professional service. The compilation, synthesis, and transmission of current knowledge is one aspect of this activity that contributes to and advances scholarship. Such scholarly work may take many forms.

Boyer's five dimensions of scholarship are: teaching, discovery, integration and application and engagement (Boyer, 1990). "The scholarship of teaching includes transmitting, transforming and extending knowledge. The scholarship of discovery refers to the pursuit of inquiry and investigation in search of new knowledge. The scholarship of integration consists of making connections across disciplines

and, through this synthesis, advancing what we know. The scholarship of application asks how knowledge can be practically applied in a dynamic process whereby new understandings emerge from the act of applying knowledge through an ongoing cycle of theory to practice to theory. The scholarship of engagement connects any of the above dimensions of scholarship to the understanding and solving of pressing social, civic and ethical problems.”

Activities that support teaching and/or [community-engagement/service](#) may include: the publication of textbooks, book chapters, review articles, case reports, technical and clinical procedures, and instructional materials; the development of new continuing education courses; and the editorship of professional journals.

#### Research, [scholarship](#) and publication

Research is the generation of new knowledge through use of the scientific method. Such research may be basic, behavioral, clinical or in health services. It is most frequently expressed as manuscript publication in refereed scientific journals.

A reasonable level of research productivity is required; however, it is the quality of the investigative activity that is of primary importance in evaluation. The quality of research can be most readily measured through two peer review mechanisms: publication in refereed journals and the acquisition of grant funds from sources that evaluate proposals using a quality peer review system. It is recognized that quality research can be conducted without the support of peer reviewed grant awards.

Additional demonstrations of the research record may include: invitations to present one's research at other universities or major scientific meetings, appointment as a section or symposium chair, receipt of awards or other special recognition for outstanding research, appointment to NIH study sections, supervision of thesis or dissertation research, service on thesis or dissertation committees, and publication of research abstracts.

To be considered for promotion to Assistant Professor, the Instructor must be regarded by the department chair and peers as one who has or can develop the background, talent and commitment to do good research even though a tangible measure of research productivity may not yet be evident. To be considered for promotion to Associate Professor, the candidate should have worked as a productive independent investigator or collaborator, achieved first author status on publications, and participated as a

co-author on others. Specific numbers of publications in each case are not as important as the quality and significance of the work.

The Associate Professor who expects to be promoted to Professor must show continuing research development. Sustained activity as an independent investigator or collaborator and reasonable first author activity should be evident. The faculty member should be a recognized authority in his/her discipline and as such, should be committed to guiding the development of young faculty in their scientific endeavors.

### **1.2.5.3 PROFESSIONAL AND COMMUNITY OR PUBLIC SERVICE AND ENGAGEMENT**

Professional and community or public service and engagement are related to those activities that pertain to one's role as a professional and as a University faculty member. Faculty effort in this area of evaluation may include administrative activities, patient care, continuing education, and other types of professional service to the profession, community, state, University, national and international level

Service and engagement activities are important ways in which a faculty member connects the resources of the University to social and health issues faced in society. However, service and engagement activities will not be considered as the scholarship or service unless they are formal and meet the criteria identified in the previous section on "Scholarly Activity."

It is expected that the level of professional service will be commensurate with the proposed rank. Faculty at associate and full professor ranks are expected to perform service activities that reflect their more senior status, such as chairing important school committees, and service at the professional, community, state, University, national, and international level.

### **Administrative Responsibilities**

A variety of administrative activities may exist that serve the School of Dentistry, the University or Profession that should be considered when evaluating contributions to professional service.

It is recognized that there are a few faculty whose appointments are based on a need by the School for administrative leadership. These faculty are heavily committed to administrative roles that are

both essential to and valued by the School. Fixed-term faculty in these roles are eligible for consideration for promotion based on either evaluation of teaching or research and community-service/engagement, while tenure track faculty will still be evaluated in all three areas. In instances where department chairs and unit directors are being reviewed, School of Dentistry guidelines provide that 30% of their time is spent in departmental/unit administration. This time can be considered as service to the School or University.

Examples of administrative responsibilities may include:

- Assistant or Associate Dean
- Department Chair or Program Director, including Graduate Program Directors, Center Directors.
- Special activity director or coordinator
- Leadership role in faculty governance or professional organizations
- Serving in the capacity of a journal editor
- Serving as a Chair of a Committee for the School or University

### Patient Care

Patient care will be evaluated only when it is an assigned responsibility of the faculty member. Faculty members are expected to provide exemplary patient care, using current methods that are respected by patients and peers both within the University and in the professional community. Examples of additional activities relating to patient care are:

- certification by specialty board
- fellowship status in national clinical dental organization
- membership on a specialty examining board
- service as a consultant on patient care (e.g. third-party payment groups, courts, health organizations, dental healthcare companies)
- development of new clinical programs
- development of new clinical techniques
- acquisition of patents on clinical materials or instruments

### Continuing Education

Continuing Education is a special responsibility of the School of Dentistry and its faculty members. The State, the profession, and the general public depend on the School for help in maintaining state-of-the-art practice in this area of health care delivery. Continuing education is both an instructional and public service activity that the School of Dentistry is uniquely qualified to provide. Only a faculty whose collective responsibilities include research and other scholarly activities can provide these important services from an informed base of current and developing new knowledge in the field.

Continuing education, as a special responsibility, is not applicable to all faculty members. For those faculty members who participate in continuing education, their effort will be evaluated as part of their service commitment to the School of Dentistry. Because continuing education also is an instructional activity, the learner (attendee) evaluations from this activity can be used as documentation of general excellence in teaching.

Examples of CE activities to be considered for promotion include:

- Presentation of continuing educational lectures
- Development and/or presentation of a new CE course
- Major revision of existing CE courses
- Table clinic
- Development of interactive or web-based CE offerings

### Other Service to the University, the Profession or the Community

All faculty members must share in the work necessary to maintain the operation of the institution. Furthermore, faculty members are expected to contribute to the growth of the institution through efforts that are aimed at improving programs and facilities. Especially, the faculty should contribute to the maintenance and growth of their profession. Finally, faculty members are encouraged to serve the community at large in a professional or leadership capacity that enhances the stature of the University or the health of the public.

Examples of other service/engagement activities related to the University, the profession or the community are:

- service on boards and committees or other assignments within the School of Dentistry, University, or profession
- leadership in curriculum development and implementation of clinical activity, curricular research programs, etc.
- contribution to faculty government
- contribution to professional organizations
- service to professional journals as a manuscript referee, reviewer, etc.
- service as a consultant to accrediting and other educational review boards
- service on boards and committees in the community-at-large in a professional capacity
- building partnerships with communitiites to develop and diversify the health workforce.
- delivering community-based quality health care
- translating research into practice and policy and disseminating research findings to communities
- *inservice training activities within the School or University, e.g. infection control and emergency updates.*

#### **1.2.6 RESPONSIBILITY OF THE CANDIDATE FOR PREPARATION OF DOCUMENTATION**

To assist in the evaluation process, candidates are required to prepare appropriate supporting documentation. At minimum, this will include a curriculum vita (CV), for which the School of Dentistry has a prescribed format (see Section IV).

Candidates who are full-time faculty are also required to identify persons who can provide meaningful letters of evaluation (see Section IV). All letters received will be used in the evaluation process, and will be forwarded to the Health Sciences Advisory Committee if the process reaches that level of review (see Section III for procedures). Full-time candidates must also prepare a portfolio appropriately documenting their teaching contributions as detailed in Sections 2and IV, and a brief (1 to 3 pages),

reflective statement summarizing the main contributions - including potential future contributions- which the candidate believes should be considered in the review. For candidates who have written a textbook, the candidate should include in their reflective statement a sentence on whether they wish their textbook to be counted as part of their Teaching or Scholarly Activity evidence. The candidate's statement should strive to be factual and objective, rather than purely self-promotional.

It is imperative that all supporting documentation be prepared to the highest possible standard, with principal emphasis on the content of the documentation rather than its style.

### **1.2.7 FACULTY WITH SECONDARY APPOINTMENTS IN THE SCHOOL OF DENTISTRY**

*(As an introduction to this section, the following paragraph regarding joint appointments is taken from Section 2.7 of the 1994 edition of the Trustee Policies and Regulations Governing Academic Tenure)*

A faculty member may at one time hold but one faculty appointment at the rank of professor, associate professor, or assistant professor. This appointment may be held in a single department or by joint appointment in more than one department. When an initial joint appointment is to be made, the regular procedures prescribed for initial appointment to the rank proposed shall be followed simultaneously by the departments involved. The joint recommendation shall designate one of the departments as the unit of the base appointment and shall set forth special terms and conditions for inclusion in the appointing document including the basis for initial funding, the procedures agreed to be followed by the departments in making joint decisions respecting promotion, reappointment, and tenure of the joint appointee, and the procedures to be followed by the chair in respect to salary adjustments for the joint appointee. If the joint appointment is approved thereafter, the base department is responsible for processing personnel actions affecting the joint appointee, but in respect to each such action, the recommendation put forward shall be one jointly concurred in by the departments concerned.

In joint appointments where the School of Dentistry is the secondary school, the faculty member shall be reviewed for promotion and tenure only for those aspects defined as responsibilities and duties to the School of Dentistry. These duties shall be specified in the initial appointing document.

Faculty members with a primary appointment in another unit of the University who have an adjunct appointment in the School of Dentistry, where no funding is provided by the School of Dentistry,

are to be reviewed for promotion and tenure by the base school of appointment. Promotion and tenure decisions shall be made by the base department with the School of Dentistry respecting the decision made by the base school.

## SUPPORTING INFORMATION

### 2. TYPES OF FACULTY REVIEWED BY THE SCHOOL OF DENTISTRY PROMOTION AND TENURE ADVISORY COMMITTEE.

#### 2.1 *Full-time Tenure Track Faculty*

These faculty actions are subject to the full procedures outlined in Sections 3. and 4. The general criteria applied by the PTAC come from the School's guidelines for full-time tenure track faculty that require appreciable contributions in the areas of teaching, scholarly activity (the essential component being research), and professional or community-service/engagement. (Details of needed documentation appear in Exhibit 6)

#### 2.2 *Fixed-term Faculty*

These faculty actions are subject to the full procedures outlined in Sections 3. and 4., but do not go to the Board of Trustees since tenure is not involved. The general criteria applied by the PTAC come from the School's guidelines for fixed term faculty that specify the same criteria as used for tenure track faculty applied to one or two of the three areas.

#### 2.3 *Adjunct Faculty*

Appointments of adjunct faculty at a higher rank, whether salaried or non-salaried are handled within the School of Dentistry. PTAC bases its recommendations for adjunct faculty on the Chair's letter a CV, and two supporting letters of recommendation. External or internal letters are acceptable.

## SEQUENCE OF ACTIONS FOR PROMOTION AND TENURE REVIEW

### Initiation of Action

#### 2.3.1 Mandatory Review

~~*Faculty appointed into the Clinical and Research tracks are reviewed for promotion on the same time schedules.* Assistant Professors usually are appointed for an initial 4-year term and can be re-appointed for one additional 3-year term. Assistant Professors are reviewed approximately 18-months prior to the end of their initial appointment and at approximately 18-months prior to the end of their re-appointment. Non-tenured Associate Professors are reviewed after three and one-half years for tenure at five years. Tenured Associate Professors initially are reviewed after five years and then every three years. Mandatory reviews are initiated at the Department level upon receipt of a reminder from the Dean's office that a review is due. The review must at least consist of the Chair meeting with the faculty member to inform them of a negative decision on the part of the Chair in consultation with the Full Professor of the Department if appropriate. Faculty appointed into the Clinical and Research tracks are reviewed for promotion on the same time schedules.~~

*Tenured Associate Professors have an initial mandatory review after five years and then every three years thereafter. The five-year post-tenure review, will include a discussion between the department chair and the faculty member concerning promotion. This decision must be made in consultation with the departmental full professors. Subsequent three year reviews or interim reviews (less than three years), if applicable, may, but need not include such consultation. Any decision made not to request outside letters at a required interval must be fully explained in the letter of the chair reporting his or her decision not to recommend promotion. For a particular candidate, however, after one combined five year and three year cycle and at the request of the candidate, the next review must include outside letters as part of the departmental evaluation of promotion to full professor.*

### **2.3.2 Non-mandatory Review**

The Department may elect to initiate a promotion or tenure action off cycle. The decision to recommend a faculty member for "early" promotion demands documentation of outstanding qualifications. Tenure may not be granted to a faculty member with an initial appointment at the Associate Professor level until the faculty member has been with the University for 18 months.

#### **2.4 Departmental Professors Committee (Yellow highlighted text in Section 2.4.1, 2.6.1, and 2.8.5 has been modified to conform to this section).**

**Faculty review of recommendations for conferral of permanent tenure or for promotion to a higher rank of persons holding permanent tenure.**

**(a) A recommendation for the conferral of permanent tenure or for promotion to a higher rank is initiated by the chair of the candidate's department, if the candidate's school or college is organized into departments. The chair is advised by the entire assembled faculty who are qualified to consult on the action. The department chair's recommendation is then communicated to the dean of the school or college, who seeks the advice of an elected committee of the school or college faculty before acting on the department chair's recommendation.**

**A dean's recommendation for the conferral of permanent tenure and/or promotion to a higher rank is reviewed by the elected faculty Committee on Appointments, Promotions, and Tenure, which advises the provost on the recommendation.**

**(b) Consultation with respect to tenured appointments and promotions.\* Tenured faculty members of all ranks in an appointing unit are qualified to consult on the appointment or promotion of a candidate to a rank conferring permanent tenure, except in the case of initial appointment or promotion to the rank of professor, in which case consultation may be limited to professors in the appointing unit.**

(c) Consultation with respect to full-time fixed-term faculty appointments.\* Chairs or deans making appointments or reappointments of persons to full-time fixed-term faculty positions consult with an appropriate faculty committee in the appointing unit."

#### **2.4.1 Intradepartmental Review**

At the individual department level, a departmental full professors committee, normally consisting of at least three tenured professors and if appropriate, associate professors, is the first level of review. The departmental committee reviews the CV of the candidate (and other appropriate documents) and makes a recommendation to the department chair. Both positive and negative decisions regarding promotion and tenure will be forwarded by the Department to the School of Dentistry Human Resources Office for further review by the PTAC and School of Dentistry Full Professor's Committee. Necessary documentation is described in Section 4.

In departments with fewer than three full professors, the following arrangements will be made:

- 1) For promotion to the associate professor. There must be at least three full professors and/or associate professors with tenure on the departmental review committee.
  - a) If a department has fewer than three full professors, the tenured associate professors in the department will meet with the existing full professors to review the candidate's CV and supporting documentation.
  - b) In the case where there are fewer than three full and associate professors with tenure, the department chair shall consult with the full professor(s) and designate one or more full professors from outside the department, who along with the existing full and/or tenured associate professors, will comprise the departmental review committee.
  - c) In the case where there are no full professors, the department chair, in consultation with the Dean, shall appoint one or more full professors to sit on the departmental review committee in conjunction with existing tenured associate professors. There must always be at least one full professor on the departmental review committee.

- 2) For promotion to full professor. The committee must consist of at least three full professors
  - a) If there are fewer than three full professors, the department chair shall meet with the existing full professors of the department and designate one or more full professors from outside the department to sit on the departmental review committee.
  - b) If there are no full professors in the department, the department chair will designate, in consultation with the Dean, full professors from outside the department to serve on the review committee.

## **2.5 PTAC Review**

### **2.5.1 Committee Charge**

The authority for the PTAC committee is in the Constitution and Bylaws of the School of Dentistry. The function of the PTAC is to advise and recommend to the Dean in all matters relating to faculty promotion and tenure. In addition, the committee will give a verbal report to the assembled Full Professors. The composition, terms of office, methods of appointment and election to the committee are detailed in the Constitution and Bylaws.

### **2.5.2 Committee Meetings and Management of Conflict of Interest:**

The PTAC normally meets two times per year, usually in January and July, for as long or often as necessary to thoroughly review each candidate. An official vote of the PTAC committee requires a quorum of two-thirds of the committee. The committee also meets to review the procedures in **Section 4** and update them if necessary. Documents used in the review of candidates consist of the curriculum vitae, the Chair's letter, letters evaluating the candidate, articles submitted to outside reviewers, the candidate's statement, and data from the teaching portfolio. The PTAC review has two components. The first is to make sure the information documenting the action conforms to the recommended form and style. The second component pertains to the qualifications of the candidate and primarily is based on the School of Dentistry Promotion and Tenure Guidelines. The committee discusses each candidate and the committee

chair prepares a report on the strengths and weaknesses found, along with a recommendation and a tally of the secret ballot to the Dean. The PTAC report minus the ballot results accompanies action for further University reviews.

The Chair of the PTAC Committee shall excuse individual PTAC members when a candidate from their home department is being evaluated. Removing department members from the deliberations is required in order to reduce the appearance of conflict of interest. Other circumstances also could lead to the choice to withdraw when a particular faculty member is being considered by PTAC. Every instance of an excused absence must be noted in meeting minutes. *When a member of the home department of the Committee Chair is being evaluated, the Committee Chair will be excused and a replacement Committee Chair will be appointed by the Dean from the PTAC membership to Chair the deliberation process regarding that individual candidate. Should recusal of multiple PTAC members be required such that a quorum is not met, the Dean will appoint additional PTAC members from among the faculty to reach the minimum required number of participants, on an ad hoc basis. The membership of the convened committee will be included in the meeting minutes.*

### **2.5.3 Committee Evaluation Procedures**

For those faculty members who do not have current Terms and Conditions, the Dean will supply same through the Personnel Office. For those faculty members who have Terms and Conditions of Appointment or whose Terms and Conditions of Appointment have been modified, the Personnel Office will see that the relevant material is included in the material for PTAC review.

#### ***2.5.3.1 Teaching***

The *data* used to evaluate teaching by the School of Dentistry include but are not limited to the following:

1. learner evaluation of teaching (includes CE presentations)
2. peer evaluation of teaching
3. student and peer evaluation of courses
4. review of teaching innovations
5. review of scholarship involving teaching

6. evaluation of outcomes, such as success of students mentored, number of schools adopting textbooks, outside invitations to present continuing education from other institutions, or teaching awards.

Learner evaluation of teaching, peer evaluation of teaching, student and peer evaluation of courses, and review of teaching innovations, will be evaluated using the Teaching Portfolios and the Chair's letter. (NOTE: Learner and peer evaluation currently is not fully implemented in the School of Dentistry). Documentation from the Teaching Portfolio required by the PTAC includes the candidate's reflective statement about teaching and summaries and details of the student assessment of teaching, the peer evaluation of teaching, and any pertinent teaching *innovations*.

Review of scholarship involving teaching (appropriate at any rank, but required for promotion to full professor), will be taken from the candidate's CV, the outside letters, and the chair's letter.

Evaluation of outcomes, such as success of students mentored, number of schools adopting textbooks, outside invitations to present continuing education from other institutions, students providing unsolicited favorable evaluations of faculty, or teaching awards will be done from the candidate's CV, outside letters, and the chair's letter. In cases where quality of mentoring is being evaluated, sections from the Teaching Portfolio, detailing student work and publications should be submitted and mentioned in the chair's letter. The information detailed in sections 3.3.3.1.a and 3.3.3.1.b provides the definition of a teaching portfolio and a suggested list of contents.

#### 2.5.3.1.a Teaching Portfolio Definition

Definition: A selective summary of an individual's teaching effectiveness. It contains documents suggesting scope, individuality, innovation and accomplishment in teaching

The portfolio should be reflective of the candidate's own unique teaching experience. It is not expected that teaching portfolios from different candidates will be exactly the same. In section

3.3.3.1b are a list of suggested items that could be used to develop a teaching portfolio. These items are not all inclusive and candidates may include other relevant teaching activities as deemed appropriate. Please note that although the items are suggested, candidates are strongly advised to include information in items A, B, E, and I. Candidates also may consider obtaining advice in the composition and presentation style of the portfolio from CEDI (Center for Educational Development and Informatics) here at the UNC School of Dentistry..

2.5.3.1.b Teaching Portfolio Table of Contents

A. Statement of Teaching Responsibilities

1. Summary of courses taught and directed
2. Student mentorship
3. Student research committees

B. Statement of Teaching Philosophy and Goals (one page or less)

C. Efforts to Improve Teaching

1. Formal courses in education
2. Conferences and workshops attended

D. Enhancement of Existing Courses

1. Addition of tutorials, role playing, case studies, etc.
2. Incorporation of writing skills, oral presentation skills in course

E. Information from Students

1. Summary of student ratings of teaching effectiveness
2. Statements from former students
3. Listing of papers published by students
4. Honors earned by students

*F. Service to Teaching*

- 1. Membership on teaching related committees*
- 2. Membership on student examining committees*

*G. Information from Colleagues*

- 1. Summary of peer evaluations of course materials*
- 2. Summary of peer reviews of teaching related research*
- 3. Comments from colleagues*

*H. Information from Other Sources*

- 1. Guest lectures to other faculties*
- 2. Continuing education lectures*
- 3. Honors and awards*

*I. Future Teaching Goals*

**2.5.3.2 *Scholarship***

This area primarily is evaluated through the candidate's CV and outside letters. PTAC considers the candidate's productivity in research as measured by peer-reviewed articles (with attention to authorship); non-teaching books or book chapters; and published abstracts from scientific meetings. Quality and impact of research in the scientific community is evaluated through outside letters, citation statistics from the chair's letters, invited presentations, and success at peer-reviewed funding. In the evaluation of the scholarship of community-service/engagement, input and letters from community partners and agencies will provide additional evidence of accomplishment.

**2.5.3.3 *Service and Engagement***

This area is evaluated by means of the candidate's CV, the chair's letter, and letters from agencies or community-based organizations which have benefited from the service of the candidate. Service implies a donor-recipient relationship in which one party, generally the community, receives

benefit from interaction with the faculty member. "Community engagement is the application of institutional resources to address and solve challenges facing communities through collaboration with these communities(CCPH, 2005)." The defining aspect of engagement is the collaboration and mutuality of benefits.

#### **2.5.3.4 Previous Experience at another University**

When faculty members at another university are hired, an implicit decision is made as to how much of their previous experience is counted as time toward promotion and tenure at UNC. That decision indicates that activities at that university are counted toward promotion. However, review committees may look more closely at activities since coming to UNC as indicators of future productivity at this institution, especially when tenure is being evaluated.

### **2.6 School of Dentistry Full Professors**

#### **2.6.1 Committee Charge**

The authority for the School of Dentistry Full Professors Committee is contained in the 1994 citation of the Trustee Policies and Regulations Governing Academic Tenure in the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill. The Trustee Policies note that, "Each initial appointment with permanent tenure or for a fixed or probationary term longer than one year, each promotion in rank, and each reappointment of an instructor, assistant professor or associate professor shall be initiated by recommendation of the chair of the department concerned after consultation **by the entire assembled faculty who are qualified to consult on the action.** In the School of Dentistry, the Full Professors Committee reviews all faculty recommendations regardless of type of appointment and term.

#### **2.6.2 Committee Meetings**

The School of Dentistry Full Professors Committee, chaired by the Dean, meets monthly on a schedule established each semester by the Dean's Office. The professors receive a list of candidates and proposed actions along with the CV, the chair's letter, and appropriate letters evaluating the candidate in advance of the meeting. The assembled full professors are then read the PTAC report on each candidate

with the recommendation, but without the actual PTAC vote. The professors then offer comments and discuss the candidates.

### **2.7 Dean's Review**

For purposes of Promotion and Tenure, the University looks upon the Dental School as a department with the Dean being the equivalent of a Department Chair.

The Dean reviews the candidate's documentation, the PTAC report, and comments from the Full Professors Committee in order to come to a decision regarding the proposed action. This decision is then forwarded with appropriate documentation for University review.

### **2.8 University Review.**

#### **2.8.1 Health Sciences Advisory Committee (HSAC)**

This committee is comprised of faculty members from each of the Health Affairs Schools and is advisory to the Executive Vice Chancellor and Provost for EPA tenure and tenure-track appointments, reappointments and promotions. Please consult School website at [????](#) for current HSAC Tenure Track Schedule.

#### **2.8.2 Chancellor's Advisory Committee (CAC):**

The CAC reviews actions that must be forwarded to the Board of Trustees and the Board of Governors after approval by the Chancellor and, as such, serve in an advisory capacity to the Chancellor. All tenure and tenure track actions are sent on for review by the CAC.

#### **2.8.3 Board of Trustees (BOT)**

All tenure and tenure track faculty actions favorably reviewed by the Chancellor are sent forward to the Board of Trustees (BOT). Appointments or promotions of tenure track faculty that do not involve conferral of tenure receive final approval at this level. Actions that require approval by the Board of Governors are reviewed by the BOT for consultation purposes. New appointments and reappointments of Department Chairs and Directors (not equivalent to Deans) are approved at the Chancellor's level, and are forwarded to the BOT for information.

#### **2.8.4 Board of Governors (BOG)**

Any action that confers tenure must be approved by the Board of Governors.

### 2.8.5 Chart of Review Levels

All possible steps	Tenure Track				Non Tenure Track
	Instructor	Assistant Professor	Associate Professor	Professor	
1. Consultation by chair with all faculty members qualified to consult on action	X	X	X	X	X <sup>3</sup>
2. Recommendation by dept. chair	X	X	X	X	X
3. Preliminary review and approval by Dean	X	X	X	X	X
4. Review and recommendation by School's committee on appointments, promotion and tenure		X <sup>2</sup>	X	X	X <sup>4</sup>
5. Final Review and approval by the Dean		X	X	X	X
6. Review and recommendation by the Health Sciences Advisory Committee	X	X	X	X	X
7. Review and approval by Vice Chancellor for Health Affairs	X	X	X	X	X
8. Review and approval by Chancellor's Advisory Committee	X <sup>1</sup>	X	X	X	
9. Review and approval by UNC-CH Board of Trustees	X <sup>1</sup>	X	X	X	X <sup>5</sup>
10. Review and approval by UNC Board of Governors (for conferring permanent tenure)			X <sup>2</sup>	X	

Notes:

1. Review and approval by Board of Trustees is necessary only if the salary level is over the amount specified for Board of Trustee approval; or if the person is to be automatically promoted to assistant professor on conferral of degree.
2. Only if reappointment with tenure.
3. Only if appointment is to be longer than one year.
4. Only if it is a promotion from assistant to associate professor, or from associate to full professor; or if it is an initial appointment at associate or professor rank.
5. Only if the salary level is over the amount specified for Board of Trustee approval.

### **2.8.6 Committee Schedules and Deadlines**

A sample schedule appears as Exhibit 2. These schedules vary slightly each month and by year. The Dental School Personnel Office keeps current schedules on hand. Departments should request new schedules each year.

### **2.9 Notification of Faculty Member**

Candidates for promotion and or tenure are notified in writing either by the Vice Chancellor or the Chancellor according to the proposed action as indicated in the chart above.

### **3. PROCEDURAL INFORMATION**

#### ***3.1 Format for CV***

The CV is the basis for review of accomplishments in teaching, research, professional service and community-service/engagement. The University has requirements for the type of information contained in the CV. In addition, the School of Dentistry has added sections that are relevant to a professional school and has designated a format for listing publications. Please follow the suggested format (as applicable) as the PTAC does review the CV for compliance with the recommended format.

The format for the CV is shown in Exhibit 3, which contains a summary of the reference style. A more detailed description of the reference style is contained in Exhibit 4.

#### ***3.2 Departmental Actions***

Twice each year, Department Chairs receive a memorandum from the Dean's Office (Exhibit 5) notifying them of mandatory reviews for faculty. For both mandatory and optional reviews, Department Chairs consult with the Dean early in the review cycle and before bringing the actions to the Departmental Full Professors Committee. The required information for various types of appointments appears in Exhibit 6. This information must accompany positive recommendations that leave the department.

If the decision at the Department level is negative, the Dean's office and the faculty member must be informed and the letter to the Dean must state how the faculty member was informed. Negative decisions for promotion and/or tenure at the Department level for tenure-track and fixed-term faculty also will be reviewed by PTAC and the School's Full Professors Committee.

#### ***3.3 Evaluation Letters***

At least four outside letters of recommendation are required for all decisions conferring tenure, promotions to Full Professor, and initial appointments in the tenure track. If obtaining four outside letters is not feasible for initial appointments not conferring tenure, a combination of outside

and internal letters of recommendation is acceptable. For example, for individuals who may have only been at one institution prior to their initial appointment, or are initially appointed from UNC, "inside" letters are acceptable. Letters are not required for reappointments of Assistant Professors to a second probationary term. The cover letter from the dean and/or department chair is sufficient. However, any letters of recommendation that have been received will be forwarded.

For fixed-term appointments, two letters of recommendation are required regardless of the appointment duration. Outside or internal letters of recommendation are acceptable. In the School of Dentistry, inside letters usually are sufficient for fixed-term "clinical" appointments. However, PTAC finds that outside letters, if available, can strengthen the presentation. Actions involving fixed-term faculty with "research" appointments need outside letters to help in the evaluation of the quality of a candidate's research. PTAC reviews all letters of support in terms of how well they address accomplishments in teaching, research, professional service, and community-service/engagement. Letters with general statements indicating that the candidate is an outstanding person and should be promoted are not as useful as letters from respected and impartial outside faculty (normally at the Associate Professor level or higher, or of equivalent status) that provide independent corroboration of excellence in one or more of the areas. Former classmates, former colleagues, or other outside faculty with whom strong personal relationships have developed should not be candidates as outside referees.

For tenure track faculty who must have four outside letters, additional outside letters are appropriate, if they provide expanded documentation of outside recognition of the candidate. Letters from former UNC Dental School faculty who have been gone less than three years are considered to be inside letters. Inside letters will be used in the review, but are generally viewed as less valuable than outside letters. The PTAC feels that important information from faculty within the School that is not contained in outside letters is most effective when it is included in the Chair's letter.

Requests for letters of evaluation are initiated by the Department Chair. Letters are required for the PTAC review, but optional for the Departmental review unless the candidate specifically requests that they be considered. The candidate should identify a minimum of three potential reviewers in writing to the Chair, and suggest for each why that individual is appropriate and what parts of the available documentation would provide an adequate basis for the review. Three

additional reviewers will be identified by the Chair in consultation with appropriate faculty. Working with six names makes it more likely that four letters will arrive on time, enabling the review to proceed. All letters of support will be used in the evaluation process, and all will be forwarded to the Health Sciences Advisory Committee as part of the documentation accompanying the Dean's decision regarding the proposed action.

The standard request package sent to each reviewer will include a cover letter prepared by the Chair that identifies the specific area(s) to be evaluated, together with supporting documentation consisting at minimum of the candidate's CV, supplemented by any additional material from the candidate's teaching portfolio, reprints of journal articles, etc, that the Chair judges to be necessary or useful for the review. The cover letter should make clear that what is requested is a thoughtful evaluation of specific aspects of the candidate's performance, and that the reviewer's opinion regarding the suitability of promotion is neither requested nor useful (See Exhibit 5 for sample letters).

### **3.4 Candidate's Statement**

Each full-time candidate is required to prepare a brief (1 to 3 pages), reflective statement summarizing the main factors the candidate believes should be considered in the review. Possible topics include, in addition to bare descriptions of previous activities in the pertinent areas, thoughtful analyses of what the candidate regards as most exciting, important, and/or limiting in his/her work to date, statements regarding overall "philosophy" and/or specific plans for further professional development, and a summary of current and potential future contributions to the School. These are meant only as examples, however, and the intent is to encourage flexibility and creativity appropriate to the specific circumstances of each candidate.

### **3.5 Chair's Letter**

The PTAC review places great importance on the Chair's letter. Exhibit 7 details the type of information that should be included. *In addition, Exhibit 9, a memorandum from the Provost's Office should be reviewed before the Chairperson writes the letter of recommendation. The Chair's letter should not simply summarize the candidate's CV, rather it is* the opportunity for information not easily gleaned from the CV to be presented, including the candidate's contributions to the

department's teaching, research, and service missions. One section of the Chair's letter should address the outside letters, specifically, the people from who letters were requested, their qualifications, and the disposition of each letter. The PTAC also finds that balanced chair's letters are more effective than letters that only praise the candidate. Almost all faculty members have things they do better than others and some do have weaknesses. It is better to address these aspects directly and, when explanations are useful, to include those explanations. The Chair's letter should include a general overview of how the candidate's time at the school was distributed among the areas to be evaluated (percent time effort) during the period covered by this promotion. Since certain issues in the Chair's letter and /or the CV can require clarification by the PTAC, it is important that the Chair of the Department understand that they may be asked to attend the PTAC meeting if the Chair of PTAC determines that needed information is not available in the letter. Following the meeting with the PTAC, the Chair of the Department may be asked to address certain issues by revising the letter of recommendation.

#### **4.1 Review of Department Chairs**

The Dean or the Dean's designated representative will assume the Department Chair's role in instances where the Department Chair is reviewed for Promotion and Tenure.

#### **4.2. Review Process:**

The Chairman of the PTAC will call for the meeting at the dates agreed upon by the Committee. Copies of all written documents will be provided to members in advance for review. At the meeting, a preliminary discussion of the candidate's performance will be followed by the Chair of the Department meeting with the PTAC for clarification of specific issues or additional information that may be needed. As applicable, the Chair may be asked to revise the letter of recommendation before the PTAC vote. In this case, the PTAC may need a follow up meeting two weeks later to make a decision and recommendations.

### TIME TABLE FOR PROMOTIONS AND TENURE ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETINGS

<u><i>If Applicant dossier is submitted to personnel office by</i></u>	<u><i>PTAC will review the dossier in</i></u>	<u><i>The School of Dentistry Full Professors will discuss the PTAC report in</i></u>
<u><i>November 15<sup>th</sup></i></u>	<u><i>The second full week of January</i></u>	<u><i>The last week of February</i></u>
<u><i>April 15<sup>th</sup></i></u>	<u><i>The second full week of June</i></u>	<u><i>The last week of July</i></u>

### ***4.3 Updating Procedures***

The procedures contained in Section IV may need to be revised more frequently than other sections of this document. Directives from the University, such as new requirements regarding the number and types of letters needed, mandate a change in School procedures. The Dean or PTAC also may find that some procedures do not work well and may wish to make changes. Thus, the PTAC is charged with conducting an annual review of Section IV to determine if any changes are needed. Any changes should be sent to all faculty as an Addendum to this manual and appear in the PTA Committee's Annual Report. When manuals are reprinted, the current procedures should be included.

**Exhibit 1**

**Trustee Policies and Regulations Governing Academic Tenure  
in the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill**

(Please see: <http://www.unc.edu/provost/policies/tenure-regs.pdf> to access this document).

**Exhibit 2**

**School of Dentistry and Provost's Schedules and Deadlines:**

**Please consult School website at ???? for current calendars**

**(Please see document attached to faculty PTAC distribution email.**

**Web link will be active soon.)**

Exhibit 3

UNC CURRICULUM VITAE FORMAT

CURRENT DATE

FULL NAME

PERSONAL HISTORY

Born:                      Date:  
                                    Place:  
                                    Citizenship:

Office Address:      Address  
                                    Phone number

Home Address:      Address  
                                    Phone number

EDUCATION (list highest earned degree first)

<u>Institution and Location</u>	<u>Degree</u>	<u>Date Conferred</u>	<u>Degree Major</u>
Postdoctoral Training (Residency/Fellowship)			
Graduate School			
Dental School			
College			

MILITARY SERVICE

Dates

STATE(s) LICENSED

Date      State

SPECIALTY BOARDS

ACADEMIC OR PROFESSIONAL APPOINTMENTS (list most recent position first)

Date Appointment  
Date Appointment

HOSPITAL APPOINTMENTS (Most recent first)

Date Appointments

PRIVATE DENTAL PRACTICE (Most recent first)

Dates Type of Practice and Location

SOCIETY MEMBERSHIPS (Most recent first)

Dates Society  
Dates Offices  
Dates Society  
Dates Offices

HONORS AND AWARDS (Most recent first)

Dates Honor or Award

[Do not include items such as "Outstanding young ... in Midwest, etc."]

MAJOR TEACHING AND ADMINISTRATIVE RESPONSIBILITIES (Most recent first)

Courses directed (brief summary of major responsibilities, include number of hours actually taught).

Course participation (include number of hours the individual actually taught)

COMMITTEE APPOINTMENTS & CONSULTANT POSITIONS (Most recent first)

Dental School

Date Committee name  
Date Offices held

University

Date Committee name  
Date Offices held

State

Date Committee name  
Date Offices held

National/International

Date      Committee name

Date      Offices held

SERVICE AND ENGAGEMENT ACTIVITIES (Most recent first)

Partner agency or community

Dates      Nature of the relationship and activities

SERVICE ON EDITORIAL BOARDS OF JOURNALS (Most recent first, include position)

PRESENTATIONS (Most recent first. Include papers and table clinics. Do not include presentations that also appear as published abstracts)

Local (Most recent first)

Date      Title or presentation, group presented to, location

State

Date      Title or presentation, group presented to, location

National or International

Date      Title or presentation, group presented to, location

INVITED PRESENTATIONS. Most recent first, include school, institution, or organization and location)

A. Teaching Related

B. Research Related

CONTINUING EDUCATION COURSES PRESENTED (Most recent first except when same course is given multiple times. Then list under first time taught and include other dates given)

Date      Course title

THESES

DIRECTED

Date      Title, type, and student's name

## COMMITTEE MEMBER

Only list the number of thesis committees on which you served as a member. It is not necessary to provide the date, title, and student's name.

## MAJOR RESEARCH INTERESTS

## PUBLICATIONS

(List most recent first. On all items show author order. For articles that have been accepted for publication, please include the name of the journal and the amount of typescript pages in the submitted manuscript. Do not include articles that have been submitted for which you do not have an acceptance letter. Refereed publications should be marked with an asterisk. Use the following subheadings and reference format when applicable. More specific examples are given in Exhibit 4.)

### Books and Chapters in Books

### Journal Articles

- A. Clinical Case Reports and Clinical Technique Articles
- B. Research Reports and Literature Reviews

### Abstracts & Book Reviews

### Monographs

### Self-Instructional Units and Course Syllabi

#### Reference Format

Most journals have adopted some form of the Vancouver System for references, which features greatly simplified punctuation. These journals tend to differ on where the date is placed, capitalization of author's entire name versus first letter and initials, more extensive use of "colons" versus "periods", and how the page numbers are displayed. The following style recommendation appears to be the most common in the Journals we reviewed.

### I. Journals (list all authors if six or less, otherwise list only first three and add et al.)

- \* 1. Standard Reference

Gibson GB, Richardson AS, Patton RE, Waldman R. A clinical evaluation of occlusal composite and amalgam restorations: one- and two-year results. *J Am Dent Assoc* 1982;104:335-37.

## 2. Corporate Author

Federation Dentaire Internationale. Technical Report No. 28. Guidelines for antibiotic prophylaxis of infective endocarditis for dental patients with cardiovascular disease. *Int Dent J* 1987;37:235.

## II. Books and Monographs

### 1. Personal Author(s)

Tullman JJ, Redding SW. Systemic disease in dental treatment. St. Louis: The CV Mosby Co; 1983:1-5.

### 2. Chapter in a book

Johns R. Restorative needs and methods. In: Cohen B, Thomson H, eds. Dental care for the elderly. London: William Heinemann Medical Books; 1986:142-77.

### 3. Agency Publication

Miller AJ, Brunelle JA, Carlos JP, Brown LJ, Loe H. Oral health of United States adults. Bethesda, Maryland: National Institute of Dental Research, 1987; NIH publication no. 87-2868.

### 4. Dissertation or Thesis

Author. Title. [Thesis]. City, State: Institution, date. # p.

GRANTS, CONTRACTS, AND PATENTS (List most recent first. Include type of grant, role on project, starting and ending dates)

You may include grant applications that were approved, but not funded, but you must include the score and percentile)

Date Agency & Amount, Title

Exhibit 4

(New England Journal of Medicine Special Report to be added by the Dean's Office.)

## Exhibit 5

### PROMOTION/TENURE REQUESTS FOR TENURE TRACK ASSISTANT OR ASSOCIATE PROFESSORS WITHOUT TENURE DOCUMENTATION REQUIRED

- \*1. Updated CURRICULUM Vitae
  - a. UNC School of Dentistry CV format is attached.
  - b. Publications should be cited in the format provided.
2. Updated AP-2 (RECOMMENDATION FOR EPA PERSONNEL ACTION)
  - a. Except for items 9-15 (to be completed after School reviews), the AP-2 should be completed in the department and signed by the individual and chair.
  - b. Attachments can be sections of the CV, cross-referenced to AP-2 item.
- \*3. LETTER OF RECOMMENDATION from department chair
  - a. See attached outline of information to be included in Exhibits 7 & 8. Note in particular the need for detailed reasons for the recommendation, indicating contributions made by individual toward the education, research, and service programs of the School of Dentistry and University.
  - b. Please mention review by department full professors.
  - c. Early recommendations (to be effective before end of initial appointment of Associate Professor or end of second term of Assistant Professor) should note timing and provide reasons for being early.
- \*4. SUPPORTING LETTERS of recommendation
  - a. Please see sample letter of request for evaluation in Exhibit 5.
  - b. At least 4 letters from outside the university are required.
  - c. Faculty member should be given opportunity to suggest sources.
  - d. Consideration should be given to rank, prominence, and institutional affiliation of individuals supporting recommendation, as well as ability to provide a thorough and thoughtful opinion.
5. Teaching Portfolio
6. AFFIRMATIVE ACTION statement
7. 1-9 (EMPLOYMENT VERIFICATION form), sample attached, with copies of verification documents.

\*Submitted to Promotion and Tenure Advisory Committee and assembled  
Full Professors of the School of Dentistry

MANDATORY REVIEW OF TENURE-TRACK  
ASSISTANT OR ASSOCIATE PROFESSORS

Assistant Professors with tenure and Associate Professors after five years who acquire or continue to hold tenure must be reviewed not less frequently than every three years.

**DOCUMENTATION REQUIRED**

Recommendations for promotion require the same documents as promotion requests for non-tenured Assistant or Associate Professors.

Faculty review that does not result in a recommendation for promotion requires a **LETTER OF NEGATIVE DECISION**, with supporting reasons from the Department Chair that will be reviewed by PTAC, the Full Professors Committee, and the Dean. If the Dean upholds the Department's negative decision, the faculty member must be notified by the Department Chair and a letter describing how that faculty member was notified of the decision: "Chair discussed personally with faculty member and provided a copy of the letter of recommendation" or "Faculty member was notified in writing with supporting reasons," etc must be forwarded to the Dean.

## PROMOTION OR REAPPOINTMENT REQUESTS FOR FIXED-TERM FACULTY

### DOCUMENTATION REQUIRED

- \*1. Updated CURRICULUM Vitae
  - a. UNC School of Dentistry CV format is attached.
  - b. Publications should be cited in the format provided.
  
2. FOR PROMOTION ONLY  
Updated AP-2 (RECOMMENDATION FOR EPA PERSONNEL ACTION)
  - a. Except for items 9-15 (to be completed after School reviews), the AP-2 should be completed in the department and signed by the individual and chair.
  - b. Attachments can be sections of the CV, cross-referenced to AP-2 item.
  
- \*3. LETTER OF RECOMMENDATION from department chair
  - a. See outline of information to be included (Exhibit 7). Note in particular the need for detailed reasons for the recommendation, indicating contributions made by individual toward the education, scholarship, and service programs of the School of Dentistry and University.
  
- \*4. FOR PROMOTION ONLY  
SUPPORTING LETTERS of recommendation
  - a. At least 2 letters are required.
  - b. Letters may be requested of faculty within the School of Dentistry or the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill or outside the university.
  
5. Teaching Portfolio
  
6. AFFIRMATIVE ACTION statement
  
7. 1-9 (EMPLOYMENT VERIFICATION form), sample attached, with copies of verification documents.

\*Submitted to the Promotion and Tenure Advisory Committee and/or assembled Full Professors of the School of Dentistry

## Exhibit 6

### APPOINTMENT, REAPPOINTMENT AND PROMOTION TRANSMITTAL LETTER

#### OUTLINE

##### A. Factual Information

1. Name of person being recommended.
2. Identification of the action being recommended, including tenure recommendation.
3. Effective date. NOTE: If the promotion or reappointment confers tenure, the letter should identify if the action is early or on time. (The Chancellor's Advisory Committee defines "early" as anything less than seven years as Assistant Professor or less than five years as Associate Professor at UNC-CH.)
4. Notice of contingency on the availability of funds (if applicable) or other contingency (such as attainment of terminal degree).
5. Report of the opinion of the assembled full professors, preferably including whether or not the opinion is unanimous.
6. Description of current or expected duties (*including the percent time effort for each area*)
7. For joint appointments, the percentage of contribution in each department and the rank in each department.

##### B. Explanation of the Recommendation

1. Identification of the areas (teaching, research, and/or service) on which the recommendation is being based.
2. Teaching
  - a. Overview of what *is taught and to whom*.
  - b. Assessment of quality of teaching and basis for judgment including summary of evaluative methods used.
  - c. Reference to significant comments, pro and con, in letters of recommendation.
  - d. Mention of any particularly impressive aspects of the candidate's background in preparation for teaching.
  - e. Identification of teaching honors or awards.
  - f. Scholarly aspects of teaching?
3. Research
  - a. Identification of substantive or methodological areas of research interest, including any special information about the interest area ("highly competitive", "new", "not yet well defined", etc.). The

- research/scholarship career thrust, strategy and emphasis of the candidate should be discussed.
- b. Discuss the letters. You are required, by rules and ethics, to include all the letters you have received, not just a select subset. You must explain which references were solicited from the candidate's list and which were solicited by you without any suggestion from the candidate. Explain why each referee was selected and the standing of each referee in the field, especially those of rank other than professor or from institutions that might be considered lower than Carolina.
  - c. Departmental standards and expectations for research productivity should be included.
  - d. Summary of refereed and other publications. Also include comments on other peer-reviewed research endeavors such as grantsmanship. Explain relative roles in multi-author works, indicate the significance of author order and the relative standing of journals in which the candidate has published.
  - e. Critical assessment of the special significance, if any, of contributions to the literature. If applicable, includes critical assessment of any scholarship of service/ engagement with reference to non-traditional products of scholarship and research, including policy reports, websites, videos, and other peer-reviewed publications.
  - f. Identification and explanation of possible weaknesses in the research record, including weaknesses in the discipline itself.
  - g. Reference to significant comments, pro and con, in letters of recommendation.
  - h. Mention of any particularly impressive aspects of the candidate's research training.
  - i. Identification of honors or recognition received for research.
4. **Service and Engagement Activities**
    - a. Identification of notable service **and engagement** activities.
    - b. Reference to significant comments, pro and con, in letters of recommendation.
    - c. Honors or awards for service performed.
  5. **Other:** Comments on interpersonal skills, organizational citizenship, etc.

## **EXHIBIT 7**

NOTE: The PTAC Document Revision Committee had previously written this Exhibit based on an earlier document from the University's Appointment, Promotion and Tenure Committee, which reviews all recommendations for appointment, promotion, and tenure at UNC-Chapel Hill. We received this updated document dated August 1, 2005 and it has been substituted here without committee review. It is likely that edits related to scholarship service/engagement will be added to this Exhibit in the manner indicated by the track changes below.

### **How to Present an Effective Dossier to the Appointment, Promotion and Tenure Committee**

The Appointment, Promotion and Tenure Committee ("APT Committee") is the third level of faculty review of promotion and tenure decisions. The APT Committee, composed of 12 faculty members, makes recommendations to the Executive Vice Chancellor and Provost, who makes the final decision, subject to confirmation by the Board of Trustees.

The APT Committee has now had two years of experience, and has reviewed over 200 dossiers from across the Chapel Hill campus. These guidelines are provided to Department Chairs and Deans in an effort to ensure that dossiers are presented in as effective a manner as possible.

#### ***Recommended order of documents***

Form Ap-2

CV

Dean's letter – demarked with a tab

Chair's letter

Internal committee report, if submitted

Sample solicitation letter for outside letters of reference

Outside letters of reference – demarked with a tab

Any other necessary material, including teaching evaluations if appropriate

#### ***Ap-2***

Make sure the dates of all prior appointments are correct.

#### ***CV***

**Preferred order – in every subhead, reverse chronological, most recent first**

Personal

Education

Professional Experience

Honors

Bibliography – on all items, show author order

Books and Chapters, including pages

Refereed papers/articles, including pages

Refereed unpublished oral presentations and/or abstracts

Other refereed works, including book reviews  
Teaching record  
Grants (source, type of grant, role on project, starting and ending dates)  
Professional Service  
    To discipline  
    Within UNC-Chapel Hill

**Additional Information**

Research Statement  
Teaching Statement

Focus and brevity are appreciated in both research and teaching statement; these should generally not exceed five pages. Both should include a short statement of future plans.

**Dean's Letter**

Or signed endorsement on Chair's letter  
Must show the vote of School's Tenure and Promotion Committee.  
Attach any document produced by School's Tenure and Promotion Committee.  
Should address any articulated concerns reflected in negative votes by School's committee or full professors.  
Need not, and should not, reiterate the Chair's letter.  
From Schools without departmental structure, the Dean's letter should incorporate the Chair's letter information specified below.

**Chair's Letter – The Most Important Recommendation**

The Chair's letter should clearly show the considerations influencing the Chair's decision to recommend or not recommend the candidate for tenure and/or promotion. The Chair should frankly discuss any of his or her misgivings, reflected in negative votes by any member of the department, or noted in any of the letters of reference. Open discussion of misgivings gives the Chair's ultimate decision much more credibility than an unalloyed letter or praise when the dossier indicates that some people have misgivings. If the Chair quotes from a departmental committee report, it should be attached.

**The letter must show the vote of the full professors: yes, no, abstain.** If departmental policy calls for taking votes of other ranks, they should be reported also. Discuss any known or suspected reasons for negative votes or abstentions. (Abstentions are perceived as mildly negative votes.) State whether voting is closed (secret ballot) or open.

**Discuss the research/scholarship career thrust, strategy and emphases of the candidate.**

- Is there a clear path?
- How has it changed over time?
- What is the most promising outcome you can foresee for the scholarly trajectory?

- How does that trajectory mesh with department strategy and needs?
- What is the current national and international visibility and standing of the candidate?

#### **Set the entries in context.**

- Explain the departmental standards and expectations for scholarship, teaching and service.
- Explain the importance, percentage of articles accepted, and relative standing of the journals in which the candidate has published.
- If the discipline is one of the rare ones in which certain conferences outrank the journals, explain that.

#### **Discuss the research record in some detail.**

- Explain the relative roles in multi-author works, especially when multiple works have the same co-authors.
  - Indicate the significance of author order, since disciplines differ radically in their customs in this matter.
  - Indicate which items report work done as part of the candidate's dissertation, and which work has been done since joining the UNC Chapel Hill faculty.
  - Indicate the relative weight of any publications completed by the candidate before joining the UNC Chapel Hill faculty.
  - Note any external evidences of excellence of particular works: best paper awards, favorable reviews, high citation counts, etc.
  - Insist that the status of unpublished works be precisely stated. *In press* means the work has been accepted without further revision and has left the author's hands; give the anticipated date of publication. *Accepted and under revision*, *submitted*, and *in preparation* all have precise meanings. *Under contract* does not; it must be supplemented with a clear indication of the state of completion.
  - For books, indicate the standing of the press. Explain the relative importance of books versus articles in your discipline. Discuss the importance of textbooks and edited volumes in your discipline.
- For scholarship of service or engagement, indicate the impacts of the scholarship on the communities involved and explain the import to the field of service or inquiry.
- If your field is one in which grant success is a common external measure of research quality, discuss the candidate's success in obtaining extramural funding (other than UNC Chapel Hill grant awards).

#### **Letters of Evaluation**

- A minimum of four letters of evaluation are required: all four from outside the institution, all from individuals independent of the candidate, two from a list of names provided by the candidate and two from individuals selected by the Department Chair or Dean, as appropriate. Ideally, all of the letters should come from Research I institutions.

- The purpose of these letters is to provide an independent and unbiased assessment of the individual's national and international reputation. Therefore, the request from the Department Chair or Dean to prospective writers of outside letters of evaluation should be phrased neutrally and should not solicit an affirmative response or recommendation. A copy of the letter requesting an evaluation of the candidate should be included in the dossier. The letters may not be from individuals who have been directly involved with a candidate, e.g., a collaborator, mentor, previous co-worker, former dissertation chair, etc., but may be from individuals who know the candidate through professional interactions, e.g., reviewed the candidate's publications or served on review committees together.
- These requirements for independent outside letters of evaluation apply to all appointment, promotion, and tenure decisions except those at the initial assistant professor level and at the re-appointment as assistant professor without tenure level. For the latter, it is appropriate, indeed essential, for mentors or other individuals more closely connected to the candidate to provide letters of evaluation.
- In addition to the minimum four required independent letters, any number of additional letters from any source may also be submitted. These may be from individuals within the institution with whom the candidate has collaborated or from former colleagues, collaborators, mentors or other individuals connected to the candidate.
- All letters of evaluation that are received must be made an official part of any appointment, promotion and tenure package and must be part of the evaluation process of the candidate under consideration.
- In the appointment/promotion packet, each outside letter should have a designation in its upper right hand corner indicating whether the writer of the letter was suggested by the candidate or was chosen by the Department Chair or Dean.

**Discuss the letters.**

**You are required, by rule and ethics, to include all the letters you received, not a selected subset.**

- Explain which referees were solicited from the candidate's list and which were selected by you without any suggestion from the candidate.
- Tell any personal connection between candidate and referee, e.g., dissertation advisor, post-doc mentor.
- Explain why each referee was selected and the standing of each referee in the field, especially those of rank other than professor or from institutions that might be considered as lower rank than Carolina.
- Please don't quote extensively from the several letters, but a few-sentence summary of each is in order.
- Quoting just favorable sentences out of context hurts your credibility – review committees read the letters as well as your summaries of them.

**Discuss the teaching record, especially all assessments of teaching effectiveness.**

- Include any quantitative data from student evaluations, and discuss trends over time.
- If you have a procedure for gathering non-quantitative student comment, report the results of that process.
- Do not, however, provide input from selected individuals, as opposed to broad categories of students.

**Discuss the service record.**

The importance of service varies from unit to unit. Explain its role within your school or department, and discuss the candidate's service record.

For Dentistry, discuss the service and engagement record aside from the scholarship of service.

Review in brief form the service and engagement activities undertaken by the candidate. Include assessments of the value of this service if apparent from letters submitted from community partners or other agencies. While quality of service does not compensate for limitations in scholarship or teaching, a refusal to carry one's share of an institutional service load is a severe demerit

***A final word of advice for chairs to give to candidates.***

The dossier will be read by many people; tell them what you would want to know if you were reviewing it. Be straightforward in your recitation of achievements, but omit puffery, such as talks at your department's colloquium. Openness breeds respects; any perceived attempt to manipulate excites challenges.

4.4 REFERENCES:

*Scholarship Reconsidered: Priorities of the Professoriate*, by Ernest L. **Boyer** (The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching,). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, Inc., 1990.

CCPH (Community-Campus Partnerships for Health) Linking Scholarship and Communities: Report of the Commission on Community-Engaged Scholarship in the Health Professions. Seattle: 2005.

*Scholarship Assessed: Evaluation of the Professoriate: A Special Report*, by Charles **Glassick**, Mary Taylor Huber and Gene I. Maeroff (The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching,). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1997.