

# Hussman School of Journalism and Media

## Revised Promotion and Tenure Guidelines

### For Tenure-Track Positions

16 Feb 2022

## Table of Contents

<b>Overview of Processes for Evaluating Tenure-Track Performance .....</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>Timing of tenure-track reviews .....</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>Evaluation Procedures for Tenure-Track Reappointment (Third-year Review) .....</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>Appointment as “instructor (with special provision)” for eventual tenure track .....</b>	<b>6</b>
<b>Evaluation Procedures for Tenure and Promotion to Associate Professor .....</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>Initial appointment of faculty with previous tenure-track positions .....</b>	<b>9</b>
<b>Evaluation Procedures for Post-tenure Review .....</b>	<b>11</b>
<b>Evaluation Procedures for Promotion to Full Professor .....</b>	<b>13</b>
<b>Initial appointment as full professor .....</b>	<b>14</b>
<b>Expectations for Evaluating Areas of Effort .....</b>	<b>15</b>
<b>Overview of Tenure Tracks .....</b>	<b>17</b>
<b>Scholarly Activity (Research Tenure Track) .....</b>	<b>18</b>
<b>Scholarship expectations for pre-tenure and post-tenure stages .....</b>	<b>21</b>
<b>Creative/Professional Activity (Professional Tenure Track) .....</b>	<b>22</b>
<b>Creative/professional expectations for pre-tenure and post-tenure stages .....</b>	<b>26</b>
<b>Teaching (Both Tenure Tracks) .....</b>	<b>27</b>
<b>Teaching expectations for pre-tenure and post-tenure stages .....</b>	<b>29</b>
<b>Procedures for peer teaching observations .....</b>	<b>30</b>
<b>Service (Both Tenure Tracks) .....</b>	<b>31</b>
<b>Service expectations for pre-tenure and post-tenure stages .....</b>	<b>32</b>
<b>Recognizing Engaged Scholarship / Engaged Activity .....</b>	<b>33</b>
<b>Recognizing New Forms of Scholarship and Professional Work .....</b>	<b>34</b>
<b>Regarding Interdisciplinary Work .....</b>	<b>34</b>
<b>How to Prepare Dossiers for Reappointment, Tenure, Post-tenure, and Promotion .....</b>	<b>35</b>
<b>A Note on External Reviewers and Letters of Evaluation .....</b>	<b>40</b>

## Overview of Processes for Evaluating Tenure-Track Performance

Each faculty member is expected to demonstrate sustained accomplishment appropriate to their rank in the areas of scholarship or creative/professional work, teaching and service as explained in the sections below describing [Expectations for Evaluating Areas of Effort](#).

Procedures for reappointment, tenure and promotion to associate professor, post-tenure review, and promotion to full professor are described after the description of school- and university-level review processes below.

**School Promotion and Tenure Committee review.** Each year, the School's human resources officer informs the School's Promotion and Tenure Committee which faculty members must be reviewed that year in accordance with the rules and procedures described below. Five full professors and four associate professors, appointed by the dean and representing both tenure tracks and different academic areas, serve as the School's Promotion and Tenure committee (hereafter referred to as "the committee"). They serve three-year staggered terms. The dean names one of the full professors to chair the committee.

- Faculty members under review must give the committee a current CV and other materials listed in the section on [How to Prepare Dossiers for Reappointment, Tenure, Post-tenure, and Promotion](#). The chair of the committee will contact each faculty member to be reviewed at least three months prior to the end of that faculty member's review period and provide dates that materials must be submitted. The calendar for the committee's review process, which is driven by key deadlines on the University's Academic Personnel Office calendar, will be coordinated with the School's dean and the School's head of human resources.
- The committee chair appoints committee members to conduct thorough reviews of the CVs, publications or creative/professional work, other relevant materials and reflective/explanatory statements. In their statements, faculty members under review should be sure to include their self-assessment and critical evaluation of their work, along with quantification or verification of the impact of their teaching, scholarship or creative/professional work, and service. In all cases, the internal and external reviews of a faculty member's work should focus primarily on work done at UNC since the initial hire or since the previous review. However, the faculty member's entire record, including work done at other institutions, should be considered.
- For tenure and promotion reviews, discussed in greater detail in the section on [How to Prepare Dossiers for Reappointment, Tenure, Post-tenure, and Promotion](#), the dean's office arranges to have external reviewers read the materials in the tenure or promotion package and write letters of evaluation. The committee does not vote until it has received external letters and discussed those letters as part of the candidate's full dossier.
- The committee examines the records of faculty members being considered for reappointment, promotion and tenure and makes recommendations for the appropriate action to the tenured associate professors and/or professors in the School and to the dean.
- Only the full professor members of the committee participate in the evaluation of individuals being considered for initial appointment as full professors, associate

professors being considered for promotion to full, or full professors undergoing post-tenure review.

- Six members of the committee constitute a quorum, and actions are voted on by those present. The recommendation of the committee is captured in a report by the committee explaining their findings of how well the faculty member's performance in all three areas of effort (scholarship or creative/professional work, teaching, service) met the criteria and qualifications for the review, as described in the section below on [Expectations for Evaluating Areas of Effort](#).
- Once the committee has reviewed and approved the report, the report is then forwarded to the dean and faculty for discussion and vote if appropriate (see **School faculty vote** paragraphs below) and ultimately to the University's Academic Personnel Office. When appropriate (see **University-level review** paragraphs below), the report will also be forwarded as part of the candidate's dossier to the University's faculty-elected committee on Appointments, Promotion and Tenure and to the Board of Trustees.
- The candidate will receive the report after the School's faculty vote (or after the committee finalizes the report in cases of post-tenure review).
- Both the dean and the chair of the School's Promotion and Tenure committee will meet with individual faculty who have had any academic review, such as a third-year (reappointment) for assistant professors, a post-tenure review for associate or full professors, or promotion in the case of newly promoted associate or full professors, to discuss the report.

**School faculty vote.** For reappointment, tenure, and promotion cases, the committee forwards its recommendation and vote to the dean and to tenured associate professors and/or professors for their own recommendation via vote by secret ballot. There is no faculty vote for post-tenure reviews.

- Tenured associate and full professors can vote on appointment or promotion of a candidate to the rank of associate professor with tenure, but only full professors can vote on decisions about full professors. Assistant professors vote only on initial appointments to the rank of assistant professor.
- In accordance with University policy, faculty members who are in phased retirement retain their professorial rank and may continue to vote on tenure and promotion decisions accordingly.
- Votes are to be counted by rank. All votes, but especially any "no" votes or abstentions, should include a justification for that vote to assist the dean in documenting and explaining the vote to the provost and the University's faculty-elected committee on Appointments, Promotions and Tenure.
- Aggregate vote tallies of the committee and the tenured associate professors and/or professors become part of the record and recommendation. Actions by the faculty are advisory to the dean. The dean makes the final recommendation.

**University-level review.** Reappointment, tenure, and promotion evaluations require university-level approval (post-tenure review does not require this approval). The dean's recommendation to promote to a higher rank or grant tenure to a faculty member is made to the University's faculty-elected committee on Appointments, Promotions and Tenure, which

advises the executive vice chancellor and provost on the recommendation. Affirmative decisions by the provost are forwarded to the UNC-Chapel Hill's Board of Trustees for final approval. The UNC System's Board of Governors and president has delegated decisions conferring permanent tenure to UNC-Chapel Hill's Board of Trustees.

From beginning to end, the process of review and decision can take from a minimum of six months to a year. The dean keeps the candidate apprised of decisions at the various levels as they learn of them.

The University's Academic Personnel Office ([linked here](#)) has information about Faculty Appointments, Promotion, and Tenure (APT) that includes Tenure/Tenure Track Appointments. Guidelines for these appointments include the university-level APT Dossier Schedule for the given year, which shows dates for university committee meetings and subsequent Board of Trustee meetings. Additional steps, including background checks completed at appointment and at promotion with tenure, can be found through the Academic Personnel Office or through the School's human resources office.

### ***Timing of tenure-track reviews***

The sections that follow provide a general timeline for reviews for reappointment, tenure and promotion to associate professor, post-tenure, and promotion to full professor. Untenured faculty members who wish to be reviewed for tenure earlier than their scheduled date (e.g., 12 months before the end of their reappointment period, see procedures for ***Evaluation Procedures for Tenure and Promotion to Associate Professor*** below) or tenured faculty who wish to be reviewed for promotion (see procedures for ***Evaluation Procedures for Promotion to Full Professor*** below) must convey that request to the dean to be forwarded to the chair of the School's Promotion and Tenure committee following the guidelines outlined in the appropriate above-mentioned procedure.

Faculty in the tenure track can request to have the tenure process lengthened in cases such as medical leave, parental leave, or for other reasons that fall within the University's policies for extending the period of probationary appointment (see Section 2.c.6.iii in [Trustee Policies and Regulations Governing Academic Tenure in the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill](#)).

## Evaluation Procedures for Tenure-Track Reappointment (Third-year Review)

The first formal tenure-track review is called the third-year review, in which untenured assistant professors who joined the faculty two years prior are formally reviewed in their third year for reappointment based on their progress toward tenure. Faculty members hired at the rank of associate professor without tenure do not undergo this third-year review.

Initial appointment to the rank of assistant professor is for a probationary period of four years. At the end of two years of service—the beginning of the faculty member’s third year, the faculty member is reviewed for reappointment to a second three-year probationary term that will culminate with a review for tenure and promotion to associate professor. No later than 12 months before the end of this first probationary term (end of the faculty member’s third year), the School will communicate in writing to the assistant professor whether they will be reappointed upon expiration of the current term. Assistant professors must be reviewed in their third year of their initial four-year contract to be reappointed.

In contrast, initial appointment to the rank of *associate* professor is for one five-year probationary term, and the review for tenure must occur in that faculty member’s fourth year, if not sooner (see [Evaluation Procedures for Tenure and Promotion to Associate Professor](#) below for more).

During each academic year, the dean meets individually with non-tenured faculty members and their mentors to review progress and expectations for the coming year. They review the materials needed for the specific review and answer questions. The dean then provides a one-page review of the conversation and expectations of the faculty member and mentor(s). This review document is included in the faculty member’s personnel file.

Prior to the beginning of the third year, untenured assistant professors should consult with their faculty mentor(s) and the dean and/or chair of the School’s Promotion and Tenure committee to discuss preparation of dossier materials, as further described under the [How to Prepare Dossiers for Reappointment, Tenure, Post-tenure, and Promotion](#) section. The typical timeline is as follows:

- In May prior to the third academic year, begin working with faculty mentor(s) to prepare dossier materials. If any materials are missing (e.g., peer teaching observation reports, see the “How to” section for details), these missing materials will need to be remedied as soon as possible and before the School’s Promotion and Tenure committee reviews the dossier.
- In August of the third academic year, submit all dossier material as listed in the “How to” section to dean’s office for internal review. These materials will be distributed to the School’s Promotion and Tenure committee for review and recommendation to the faculty.
- The faculty vote and internal decision is delivered to the candidate in November or December of the third academic year.
- The dean writes a letter of recommendation to accompany the dossier, which will be submitted to the University’s Academic Personnel Office in January or February of the third academic year.

- Final university-level approval is expected by the end of June of the third academic year.

The dean and the chair of the School's Promotion and Tenure committee will then meet with the assistant professor and faculty mentor(s) to discuss the report of the Promotion and Tenure committee. The review should serve as a guide to the nontenured faculty member as to his or her strengths and weaknesses, but a positive report is not to be construed as an indication that tenure eventually will be granted.

Noted above, the reappointment is at the rank of assistant professor (without tenure) for a second probationary period of three years—commencing at the end of the initial, four-year term. In the event that the third-year review is negative and the dean decides to not reappoint the faculty member or transition the faculty member to a fixed-term appointment, the faculty member's employment with the University terminates at the end of the initial four-year appointment. The faculty member has recourse to question the non-reappointment according to Section 4 of the [Trustee Policies and Regulations Governing Academic Tenure in the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill](#).

#### ***Appointment as “instructor (with special provision)” for eventual tenure track***

While this designation is usually applied to someone hired to teach one course, this rank is also appropriate for someone appointed to the faculty with the expectation that they will progress to the rank of assistant professor. That is the case with a person appointed to the research tenure track before completing the Ph.D. or to the professional track before completing a master's degree. The initial appointment is for a probationary one-year term, and the dean may reappoint the faculty member for three additional successive one-year terms, for a total of four terms. No reappointment to the rank of instructor may be made after four years' employment at that rank. The dean may deny reappointment to an instructor who does not meet the deadline for completion of the master's degree or Ph.D. Notice of reappointment, promotion, or non-promotion will be made in accordance with Section 2 of the [Trustee Policies and Regulations Governing Academic Tenure in the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill](#).

## Evaluation Procedures for Tenure and Promotion to Associate Professor

Unless otherwise approved, untenured assistant professors are formally reviewed at the end of five years of service—the beginning of their sixth year—for tenure and promotion to associate professor. In most circumstances (excluding cases where there is an exception made to the usual time in rank, see below), this review occurs within the faculty member's second probationary period. If the School recommends tenure and promotion to associate professor (recommendation is only for tenure for those hired as associate professors without tenure), and if tenure is approved at the university level (including Board of Trustees), tenure and promotion from assistant to associate professor will be conferred simultaneously at the end of the sixth year. No later than 12 months before the end of the second probationary term, the School will communicate in writing to the assistant professor if they will be reappointed or if their tenure-track appointment will end upon expiration of the current term.

To be reappointed, assistant professors hired without tenure must be reviewed in their sixth year, if not before, unless they have received an extension of their probationary appointments as provided in the [Trustee Policies and Regulations Governing Academic Tenure in the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill](#). More information on timing is provided in the paragraphs that follow.

**Time in rank (all tenure tracks).** It is customary for assistant professors to be in rank for six years before tenure and promotion. A review usually is conducted during the faculty member's sixth year, after having completed five years in rank at the School. An earlier review is possible in exceptional cases. Consideration for promotion and/or tenure should not generally occur in less than four years.

Exceptions to the customary six-year timing, encompassing five years of effort, include instances when a candidate has been hired from another institution with time already in rank. In these cases, some or all of the candidate's prior experience may be counted as time in rank, as detailed in the candidate's departmental offer letter or by recommendation by the dean in consultation with the Promotion and Tenure Committee chair and faculty mentor(s).

The other exception to the customary six-year timing (five years of effort) is if the candidate, whether hired with or without prior time in rank at other institutions, has demonstrated unusually high and sustained accomplishment in the three areas of scholarship (research track) or creative/professional work (professional track), teaching, and service, such that their record meets or exceeds expectations of a typical tenure candidate's six-year record. Assistant professors with this unusual record may request to be reviewed for tenure as early as, but no earlier than their fourth year in rank at the School, encompassing three years of effort.

Faculty members who wish to be considered for tenure or promotion earlier than general practice or as indicated by the terms of their contract must notify the dean in writing by August 25, at the latest. If the dean – in consultation with the Promotion and Tenure Committee chair and faculty mentor(s) – endorses an early review, that is conveyed to the School's Promotion and Tenure committee. The committee then decides whether it will conduct an early tenure review based on an initial review of the candidate's current CV.

In all cases, the committee, tenured full and associate professors, and external

reviewers will consider the candidate's total record, with greater emphasis placed on years of service at the School.

Prior to the beginning of the tenure review year, candidates should consult with their faculty mentor(s), the dean, and the chair of the School's Promotion and Tenure committee to discuss preparation of dossier materials, as further described under the [How to Prepare Dossiers for Reappointment, Tenure, Post-tenure, and Promotion](#) section. The typical timeline is as follows:

- In May, begin working with the faculty mentor(s) to prepare dossier materials. If any materials are missing (e.g., peer teaching observation reports, see the "How to" section for details), these missing materials will need to be remedied as soon as possible and before the School's Promotion and Tenure committee reviews the dossier.
- In June, submit to the dean's office six names and contact information of people who meet the qualifications for being suitable external reviewers of the dossier. An explanation of the role and qualifications of external reviewers is below. Names should be discussed in consultation with the dean and faculty mentor(s). For professional track faculty, suitable names may be leaders in the profession as explained below.
- In August, submit all dossier material as listed in the "How to" section to dean's office for internal and external review. These materials will be distributed to the School's Promotion and Tenure committee for review and recommendation to the faculty. External reviewers will receive materials as outlined in the "How to" section, which provides guidance for preparing specific materials for external review.
- External reviewers are asked to complete their review within six weeks once the dossier is received.
- The School's Promotion and Tenure committee reviews the dossier and external review letters and submits a written recommendation to the dean and faculty for a vote.
- The result of the faculty vote is delivered to the candidate in November of the tenure review year at the earliest. The dean then writes a letter of recommendation to accompany the dossier.
- In January-February, the School's human resources consultant reviews all materials for consistency and begins finalizing the dossier in consultation with the faculty member to ensure that the dossier meets the requirements of the University's Academic Personnel Office, Committee on Appointments, Promotion and Tenure, and the Board of Trustees. All dossiers must be finalized and ready to submit to the Academic Personnel Office for university-level review no later than mid-March.
- When ready, the finalized dossier, including external reviewers' letters and the dean's recommendation letter, is forwarded for university-level review.
- Final university-level approval is expected by the end of June.

The committee will conduct a thorough review of the assistant professor in the manner described above. If the faculty member is not promoted, notice of the non-reappointment will be provided no less than 12 months before the end of the second probationary term, and



their employment with the University will end at the end of the second probationary term. When a faculty member is promoted to the rank of associate professor, they are granted permanent tenure from the effective date of the promotion. The faculty member has recourse to question the non-reappointment according to Section 4 of the [Trustee Policies and Regulations Governing Academic Tenure in the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill](#).

### ***Initial appointment of faculty with previous tenure-track positions***

**Assistant professors with ‘time served.’** In most cases, newly recruited assistant professors who have been assistant or associate professors at a previous university will not be extended the offer of tenure consideration at UNC-Chapel Hill at the time of the offer unless they clearly and compellingly demonstrate that they have already met the promotion and tenure standards of the School. Rather, the initial appointment as assistant or associate professor is without tenure and for the typical probationary terms (tenure review in the sixth year) unless otherwise specified in the departmental offer letter or, by recommendation of the dean in consultation with the chair of the Promotion and Tenure committee and faculty member’s mentor(s).

For tenure-track assistant professors hired without tenure but with time served at a prior institution, time from the prior institution may count as time towards tenure at UNC, as described in the candidate’s departmental offer letter or by recommendation by the dean in consultation with the chair of the Promotion and Tenure committee and the faculty member’s mentor(s). Ideally, timing and criteria for indicating tenure readiness would be indicated in the departmental offer letter, making it clear how much of the candidate’s prior record will be counted as time in rank at the School. If explicit use of previous university teaching, research and service experience as time in rank for tenure or promotion decisions at UNC-Chapel Hill is not established in the departmental offer letter, or by recommended by the dean in consultation with the chair of the Promotion and Tenure committee and the faculty member’s mentor(s), then the Committee will assume that no such expectation exists.

**Associate professors with ‘time served.’** It is possible — although unusual — for a new faculty member in a prior tenure-track position to be given an initial appointment at the rank of associate professor. An initial appointment as associate professor rarely confers tenure at the time of appointment, but the dean — after consultation with the tenured full and associate professors — may petition the executive vice chancellor or provost for permission to recommend tenure with the initial appointment. That decision will be on the basis of a thorough review conducted in the manner described above, including external letters of evaluation and a vote by the tenured associate and full professors. The use of previous university teaching, scholarly/creative/professional, and service records will need to be conveyed to all external letter writers and to the School’s Promotion and Tenure committee. Evidence of teaching effectiveness at the previous university (peer or student teaching evaluations) will in these cases be examined for promotion and tenure decisions here. The recommendation to grant tenure will be reviewed by the University’s Appointment, Promotion and Tenure Committee, the provost, and the board of trustees. Newly recruited associate professors coming without tenure from another university will not be extended an offer of tenure consideration at the University at the time of the offer unless they clearly and compellingly demonstrate that they have already met the promotion and tenure standards at UNC-Chapel Hill.

Initial appointment as an associate professor without tenure is for a five-year probationary term, in which the tenure review must occur no later than the fourth year of service and notice of the non-reappointment will be provided no less than 12 months before the end of the five-year probationary term. In cases of initial appointment as an associate professor without tenure, there is no minimum amount of time for an untenured associate professor (with time served at a prior institution) to undergo tenure review before this customary fourth year. However, it is typical for reviews to occur at least one year after the initial appointment to establish a record at the School in all three areas of effort. Tenure review for faculty with initial appointments as associate professors must occur by the beginning of the fourth year at the School. By the end of the fourth year, the School must decide and communicate in writing to the associate professor whether they will be reappointed based on this tenure review. A decision to reappoint at the rank of associate professor confers tenure.

	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Year 5	Year 6	Year 7
Initial appointment as <b>assistant</b> professor	First 4-yr probationary period						
		Prepare review	3 <sup>rd</sup> -yr review	Reappointed to second probationary term (or Yr 4 is last year of service)			
				Yr 4 earliest, generally, for tenure review		Prepare review	Tenure review
							Promoted (or last year of service)
Initial appointment as <b>associate</b> professor	5-yr probationary period						
		Yr 2 earliest, generally, for tenure review					
			Prepare review	Tenure review	Promoted (or last year of service)		

## Evaluation Procedures for Post-tenure Review

Every five years after being awarded tenure, each faculty member must undergo post-tenure review to examine all aspects of a faculty member's academic performance. The goal of the review is to promote faculty development, ensure faculty productivity and provide accountability, as indicated in the UNC-Chapel Hill policies on academic personnel.

Tenured associate professors are expected to continue to make significant contributions to their fields, to maintain an excellent teaching record and to grow their service activities in anticipation of being promoted to full professor. Evaluation of an associate professor's or full professor's dossier for post-tenure review should take into consideration the work that the faculty member has done in significant administrative roles for the School. This is in line with the provost's [document](#) on post-tenure review which states on page 3: "The post-tenure review process should be flexible enough to acknowledge different expectations in different disciplines and changing expectations at different stages of faculty careers. If a faculty member's responsibilities do not include teaching, research and public service, but instead focus primarily on one or two of these areas, the review shall take this allocation of responsibilities into account."

If the faculty member is being considered for promotion to the next rank in the same year of his or her mandated post-tenure review, then the review for promotion constitutes the post-tenure review. In other words, the promotion review can take the place of the post-tenure review if the promotion review occurs before the fifth year after tenure. Individuals may ask to be considered for promotion rather than complete the post-tenure review and should make the request before the beginning of the academic year involving the post-tenure review, if not sooner, to allow for an initial internal review of readiness, followed by the solicitation of external reviewers if ready. See **Promotion to Full Professor** section below for details on how to request a promotion review.

A one-year delay of the post-tenure review is allowed at the faculty member's request and with permission of the dean and approval from the executive vice chancellor and provost. Faculty requests must be in writing to the dean at least 6 months prior to the end of the academic year involving the post-tenure review (corresponding with 6 months prior to the due date for review completion) and specify the compelling reason for the delay.

A faculty member's entire academic, scholarly or professional career may be considered, but the emphasis of this review is on the accomplishments over the last five years of effort. The overall record is evaluated as exceeding, meeting, or not meeting expectations based on performance in each of the three areas of effort (scholarship or creative/professional work, teaching, service).

Dossier materials are further described under the [How to Prepare Dossiers for Reappointment, Tenure, Post-tenure, and Promotion](#) section. The typical timeline is as follows:

- In June-July, begin preparing dossier materials. If any materials are missing (e.g., peer teaching observation reports, see the "How to" section for details), these missing materials will need to be remedied as soon as possible and before the School's Promotion and Tenure committee reviews the dossier.
- In the fall semester or early spring (likely no later than January), submit all dossier

material as listed in the “How to” section to dean’s office. These materials will be distributed to the School’s Promotion and Tenure committee for review and recommendation to the faculty.

- The internal decision is delivered to the candidate by June, if not earlier.

The Promotion and Tenure committee members will review the post-tenure materials and produce a written report to the dean on the faculty member’s accomplishments and plans. The dean and the committee chair review the report with the faculty member and make the report part of the permanent employee record. The faculty member is given the opportunity to provide a written response, if so desired, and that response becomes part of the employee record.

The post-tenure review process should identify and recognize outstanding performance.

- If the committee and dean find that the faculty member’s progress meets or exceeds expectations (a successful post-tenure review), the faculty member must submit to the dean a short document outlining their goals for the next five years.
- If the committee and dean find that the faculty member’s progress is not adequate, however, the dean should propose a development plan for improvement. A development plan should be created jointly by the faculty member being reviewed and the dean on the basis of the committee’s evaluation and recommendations. Specific actions and timeline should be included to define measures of progress. Potential consequences for not meeting measures of progress should be discussed by the faculty member and dean to agree upon those consequences and indicate those consequences in the development plan. More information on producing and monitoring such plans can be found in the [provost’s website on post-tenure review](#). Failure to complete a plan of action successfully and continued deficiencies could result in disciplinary action or dismissal per University policy.

## Evaluation Procedures for Promotion to Full Professor

Promotion to full professor is not guaranteed, and some associate professors may remain in that rank until retirement. As noted above, a promotion review can take the place of a post-tenure review if the promotion review occurs before the fifth year after tenure.

**Time in rank (all tracks).** There is no fixed length of time an associate professor must be in rank before they can be considered for promotion to full professor. However, most do not go up for review before the first post-tenure review after promotion and tenure as an associate professor.

With little exception, tenured associate professors are expected to be in rank for a minimum of four years before demonstrating readiness for full professor. The exception to this four-year minimum is if the candidate has demonstrated unusually high and sustained accomplishment in the three areas of scholarship (research track) or creative/professional work (professional track), teaching, and service, such that their record meets or exceeds expectations of a typical full professor candidate's record.

To be reviewed for promotion to full professor, the faculty member must submit his or her current CV to the dean along with a written self-evaluation statement establishing readiness to be promoted. This evaluation of readiness should include a discussion of sustained accomplishment, in addition to future plans in the areas of scholarship or creative/professional work, teaching, and service and leadership. The statement and CV will be forwarded to the chair of the School's Promotion and Tenure committee, who will convene the full professors on the committee—the subcommittee able to review requests for promotion to full professor. This subcommittee, along with the chair, will review the CV and the statement to determine whether the faculty member is ready to be reviewed for promotion.

If the subcommittee, in consultation with the dean, decides that the faculty member's record merits consideration for promotion to full professor, that decision does not signify that the subcommittee has decided to recommend the faculty member for promotion but simply that a full review is warranted. The chair of the committee will give the candidate a deadline to produce a full package for review and conduct a full review in the manner described in the section on the review process.

A faculty member's entire academic, scholarly or professional career is considered, with more emphasis being given to accomplishments since promotion to associate professor.

Dossier materials are further described under the [How to Prepare Dossiers for Reappointment, Tenure, Post-tenure, and Promotion](#) section. The typical timeline is as follows:

- In April or May, the faculty member must submit CV and self-evaluation of readiness to the dean's office for review by the dean in consultation with the subcommittee of full professors on the School's Promotion and Tenure committee.
- If recommended for full review, submit immediately to the dean's office six names and contact information of people who meet the qualifications for being suitable external reviewers of the dossier. An explanation of the role and qualifications of external reviewers is below. Names should be discussed in consultation with the

dean and faculty mentor(s). For professional track faculty, suitable names may be leaders in the profession as explained below.

- In June-July, begin preparing dossier materials. If any materials are missing (e.g., peer teaching observation reports, see the “How to” section for details), these missing materials will need to be remedied as soon as possible and before the School’s Promotion and Tenure committee reviews the dossier.
- In October if not sooner, the faculty member should submit all dossier materials as listed in the “How to” section to dean’s office for internal and external review. These materials will be distributed to the School’s Promotion and Tenure committee for review and recommendation to the faculty. External reviewers will receive materials as outlined in the “How to” section, which provides guidance for preparing specific materials for external review.
- External reviewers are asked to complete their review within six weeks once the dossier is received.
- If, as a result of the full review, the committee of full professors does recommend the faculty member move forward, the recommendation will go to a vote of all full professors in the School.
- The result of the faculty vote is delivered to the candidate in the spring semester of the promotion review year. The dean then writes a letter of recommendation to accompany the dossier.
- Following the faculty vote, the School’s human resources consultant reviews all materials for consistency and begins finalizing the dossier in consultation with the faculty member to ensure that the dossier meets the requirements of the University’s Academic Personnel Office, Committee on Appointments, Promotion and Tenure, and the Board of Trustees. All dossiers must be finalized and ready to submit to the Academic Personnel Office for university-level review as soon as possible.
- When ready, the finalized dossier, including external reviewers’ letters and the dean’s recommendation letter, is forwarded for university-level review.
- Final university-level approval and promotion conferral is expected by the end of June.

If, as a result of the full review, it is not recommended that the faculty member move forward toward promotion to full professor, the subcommittee of full professors will provide guidance to the faculty member on how to redirect effort to meet qualifications. A faculty member can submit a new review request at any time, following the procedures outlined above, once the faculty member believes their record has met the qualifications for promotion.

### ***Initial appointment as full professor***

Occasionally a distinguished professional career may justify initial appointment as a full professor with tenure. On these occasions, usually in the case of persons hired and appointed to chaired professorships, the initial appointment is to the rank of professor, which confers permanent tenure from the effective date of the appointment. That decision will be on the basis of a thorough review conducted in the manner described above, including external letters of evaluation and a vote by the full professors.

## Expectations for Evaluating Areas of Effort

Each faculty member is expected to contribute to the School and to the discipline in significant and appropriate ways throughout their career. **Sustained accomplishment** is the principle guiding criteria used to evaluate readiness for reappointment, tenure, and promotion and contributions in post-tenure reviews. The following sections define “sustained accomplishment” review criteria and examples of evidence used to demonstrate sustained accomplishment in the areas of scholarship (for research track faculty), creative/professional work (for professional track faculty), teaching (all tracks), and service (all tracks).

In all cases, faculty members under review will need to provide a scholarly or creative/professional statement, a teaching statement, and service statement as part of their review packet (dossier) to explain how they meet criteria in each area of effort.

**Effort distribution.** Faculty tenure tracks are defined, in part, by the type of work they are expected to produce and, in part, by how they distribute their time and effort. A faculty member’s distribution of effort across the year, the semester, or the week can vary widely depending on the faculty member’s work obligations and requirements for managing their time.

The following distributions are provided to offer guidance for how a faculty member should allocate their academic year distribution of effort based on the number of courses the faculty member is assigned to teach across the year:

2:2 Teaching Load – When assigned to teach two courses per semester, a typical effort distribution might resemble –

40%-55% on scholarship or creative/professional work (those working toward tenure are encouraged to devote more than 40% to this area)

40%-50% on teaching

5%-20% on service (those working toward tenure are encouraged to devote less than 20% to this area if possible, but see **Invisible Labor** section below)

3:2 Teaching Load - When assigned to teach three courses in one semester and two courses in the other semester, a typical effort distribution might resemble –

50%-70% on teaching

20%-40% on creative/professional work or scholarship (those working toward tenure are encouraged to devote more than 25% to this area)

5%-20% on service (those working toward tenure are encouraged to devote less than 20% to this area if possible, but see **Invisible Labor** section below)

When a faculty member has a reduced course load due to an administrative position or grant-funded project, modifications in workload are expected, such that each reduced course load (about 10% of workload allocation) is expected to be devoted to the respective administrative position or grant-funded research or professional/creative activity.

The above effort distribution percentages are intended to serve as guides for individual planning purposes, as well as a common set of expectations for individuals to follow or modify. Noted above, effort distributions will vary by faculty member and based on the demands of a given

semester.

Flexibility in applying these expectations to each faculty member is therefore needed, and faculty members are expected to provide an accurate description of their efforts in scholarly or creative/professional activity, teaching, and service in light of these 'typical' percentages. The sections that follow provide descriptions of the criteria and expectations for performance in the areas of scholarly or creative/professional activity, teaching, and service to inform faculty members as they develop and manage their individual goals and effort distribution.

**Invisible labor.** We also recognize that some faculty, particularly women and those from underrepresented or historically minoritized or marginalized groups, are called on by administrators, students, and others to engage in important and necessary service, some of which is able to be documented (e.g., committee service) and some of which is not (e.g., a disproportionate amount of time advising and supporting students). This invisible labor tends to not be compensated nor recognized as a part of the faculty member's teaching, research/creative activity, or service load.

We are committed to recognizing this uncompensated and often unrecognized labor in faculty evaluations by adjusting the expected effort distributions to note that the time and effort put into teaching, service, and especially scholarly/creative/professional work will be impacted by this important labor. Although we realize that documenting this work may place an additional burden on those already engaged in this labor, faculty who have been impacted by this labor will need to clearly indicate this labor and its impact in their scholarly or creative/professional, teaching, and/or service statements.



## Overview of Tenure Tracks

**Research track.** The research tenure track is the traditional academic track, in which a faculty member usually teaches four classes each academic year and is expected to be engaged in scholarly activity, teaching, and service to earn tenure. Faculty members with a Ph.D. are in this track by definition unless they have been hired specifically to be in the professional track.

Faculty in this track are expected to maintain strong records in scholarship, teaching, and service to successfully pass all pre-tenure and post-tenure reviews. However, typically, in reappointment, tenure, and promotion decisions, the greatest emphasis is placed on scholarship, with less emphasis on teaching and the least emphasis on service based on the expected effort distribution for a 2:2 teaching load defined above.

Faculty appointed to the research tenure track may not move to the professional tenure track after the initial appointment.

**Professional track.** The professional tenure track, sometimes called the practice tenure track, is the track in which a faculty member usually teaches five classes each academic year and is expected to be engaged in teaching, creative/professional activity, and service to earn tenure. Faculty members in this track must have significant professional experience and significant teaching experience or the promise of excellence in teaching when appointed. Occasionally a faculty member holding a Ph.D. may have had primarily a professional rather than an academic career and may be hired into the professional track.

Faculty in this track are expected to maintain strong records in teaching, creative/professional work, and service to successfully pass all pre-tenure and post-tenure reviews. However, the heavier teaching load of professional track faculty compared to research track faculty is recognized by the School's Promotion and Tenure committee when it makes decisions about promotion and tenure. Thus, in reappointment, tenure, and promotion decisions, slightly greater emphasis is typically placed on teaching than on the amount of creative/professional work, with the least emphasis placed on service based on the expected effort distribution for a 3:2 teaching load defined above. That is, the amount of creative/professional work is considered in light of the teaching hours, but the quality and significance (defined below) of work is expected to be high.

Faculty appointed to the professional tenure track may not move to the research tenure track after the initial appointment.

## Scholarly Activity (Research Tenure Track)

The criteria for demonstrating sustained accomplishment in scholarship are (1) productivity, (2) quality, and (3) significance. Productivity relates to the frequency and quantity of scholarly output. Quality relates to the focus and rigor of the output. Significance refers to the impact of the work and/or recognition earned because of the work. These criteria are all important. The order in which they are presented here is **not** intended to suggest a rank order of importance.

### Productivity

- Scholarly work is expected to be regular rather than sporadic, with expected variability in frequency of annual output, given the scope of projects, time taken for review and publication processes, etc. Frequency and quantity of scholarly output, including new work appearing in publications and presentations, are used as evidence of this regularity.
  - A gap of a year or more during which little or no work is published or presented at academic conferences requires explanation (e.g., the faculty member was working on a book or had undertaken a major administrative or service responsibility). Any such explanation or should appear in the faculty member's scholarly statement.
  - Any faculty member who has reduced frequency and/or regularity of scholarly work due to invisible labor should explain the nature and impact of this labor on their productivity in their scholarly statement.
- Scholarly work is expected to be focused thematically, such that the body of work does not appear to be diffuse. Although faculty may engage in occasional work that is outside their established or developing research stream(s) and their types of output might vary, the majority of work should be able to be described as fitting into an overarching theme that defines the faculty member's contribution to scholarship. The faculty member should make it clear in their scholarly statement how their body of work demonstrates overall focus.
- Types of products considered to be traditional scholarly output include the following: scholarly books, textbooks, edited books, book chapters, monographs, articles in refereed journals, refereed conference papers, invited academic papers, and encyclopedia entries. Publications in law reviews are considered to be the equivalent of publications in peer-reviewed journals.
- Refereed published works and law reviews are given greater emphasis than non-refereed works, encyclopedia entries, or papers presented at scholarly meetings. While conference presentations are valuable and serve to enhance a faculty member's national and international visibility, faculty members should plan to convert their conference papers into publications as soon as possible after presentation.
- No specific number of publications is required, and no specific number of solo- or first-authored output is expected or required. Rather, the scholarly statement should make it clear as to how the overall body of work demonstrates sustained productivity, quality, and significance regarding the faculty member's contributions to scholarship.

- If a work is proprietary and cannot be reviewed, then it cannot be evaluated and listed as scholarly output. It could instead be considered a service activity.

### ***On collaborative work***

- Collaborative work is valued, as is the contribution of methodologists to collaborative teams. However, in the case of co-authored work, evaluators may have trouble understanding the individual's contribution. For co-authored works, the faculty member should explain their role and indicate the significance of author order.
- Faculty members who supervise or coordinate student research, whether part of course requirements or a special project, must clearly explain their role in the final product if they want to list this work as the faculty member's research. If the work is created solely as part of a class project or paper and was done by students for course credit, then the work should not be listed under the faculty member's research. Rather, this work would be listed under teaching or service. If there is additional work done by the faculty member following the course with students, then the work could be listed under research, but the faculty member should clarify the additional role they played in the creation of the new project. It is important for the faculty member to discuss the context in which the work was done and to explain and clearly define the various roles that they played in producing collaborative research involving groups of students or other faculty members.

### ***On other forms of scholarly achievement***

- Grant seeking is encouraged but not required by the School. However, external and internal grants that are received demonstrate quality and significance of a faculty member's work. Therefore, grants sought and obtained should be noted on the faculty member's CV and scholarly statement in order to be recognized in promotion and re-appointment decisions.
- Technological advancements that enable scholarly work, such as algorithms, software, databases, or digital tools should be noted on the faculty member's CV and scholarly statement in order to be recognized in promotion and re-appointment decisions.
- Engaged scholarship and new forms of scholarship are described in the sections below. These types of work should be described in the scholarly activity statement to clarify how the work meets the definition of engagement or new forms of scholarship, and evidence will be needed to indicate the quality, significance, and outcomes of the work as noted in those sections below.

### **Quality**

- The scholarly work, as a whole, should be theoretically based and appropriately grounded in existing literature.

- The work should be rigorous, methodologically sound, studies well executed, and with appropriate conclusions.
- The writing should be appropriate for the intended audiences.
- Quality of work can, in part, be demonstrated through the evaluation of external reviewers in cases of tenure and promotion. Quality can also, in part, be demonstrated through other means, for example awards and honors recognizing the quality of a given work or securing funding to support a given project.
- Quality of work can, in part, also be demonstrated by the exclusivity, reputation, impact, and relevance of the venues of publication, such as the journals in which articles are published, the publishers and/or editors of books, book chapters, and encyclopedia entries, and conference associations. For example, faculty members can report impact factors and measures of the journal's reputation or provide other evidence of the importance of a journal to the field or community. If a journal or book publisher is not included in traditional ranking systems, then faculty members must present information about the quality of the journal or book publisher, including but not limited to the types of scholars who publish in the journal or with that publisher, the audience likely to read the journal or books from the publisher, as well as other factors that help demonstrate the caliber of the journal or book publisher and the value of having work published in that venue.

### **Significance**

- Scholarly work should be perceived as significant in the field and/or a community, in that the work is having or will have an impact or influence in the field and/or community.
- The work should be innovative, with the potential to move the field or community in new directions or break new ground and advance concepts, ideas or approaches that transcend the ordinary. Faculty statements (and external reviews in tenure and promotion cases) should assist in evaluating this criterion.
- Faculty members should be developing (for those not tenured) or have developed (for tenured faculty) national or international recognition of their scholarly work.
- Evidence of impact and/or recognition might consist of, among other things, citations by others, readership, awards and honors recognizing impact or potential impact, invitations to publish in anthologies, invitations to publish in collections and/or books, use by others in classes, influence of work in the profession, incorporation of work by organizations, impact of work to inform regulatory bodies or community action, or appointments to editorial boards or editor positions, community or industry boards, or other leadership bodies.
- The School specifically recognizes and places additional value on scholarship related to diversity, equity, and inclusion issues and invites faculty members to note their work in this area in their scholarly statement. If applicable, faculty members may also note how this work has had impact in the area of diversity, equity, and inclusion.

### **Scholarship expectations for pre-tenure and post-tenure stages**

**Reappointment.** Evidence of sustained scholarly activity is expected with the promise of continued consistency and quality of output. It is understood that the CV might be dominated at this time by conference papers and manuscripts in progress, in review, and/or accepted but not yet published.

**Tenure and promotion to associate professor.** Research tenure-track faculty members are expected to demonstrate an impact in their field or community due to their scholarship, including signs of having established national and in some cases international reputation as scholars in their field. Sustained accomplishment in the overall body of scholarship should be clearly demonstrated in terms of productivity\*, quality, and significance. An individual's unique and significant contributions across their record should be apparent and demonstrate their independence as a scholar, whether through solo or collaborative work.

\*Scholarly productivity of faculty members who have engaged in important and necessary invisible labor will be evaluated based on the faculty member's explanation of time required for this labor and its impact on their scholarly activity.

**Post-tenure review.** Research track faculty members are expected to have continued their record of sustained accomplishment in scholarly activity and are encouraged to use their expertise to mentor and support others' scholarly efforts. For those who engage in these valuable roles, it is expected that their scholarly record will reflect this engagement, for example, including more publications led by graduate students and/or untenured faculty, or including more co-authored works reflecting increased collaborative activity.

**Promotion to full professor.** Promotion to full professor requires evidence that the individual has established a major scholarly record and demonstrated impact in their area of expertise at the national even international level. The dossier of a candidate being promoted to full professor should show significant additional sustained accomplishment in their scholarship beyond the dossier of candidates being promoted to associate professor. There must be strong evidence that the individual has achieved and sustained excellence in scholarship and that the work can be evaluated in measurable ways appropriate to the discipline. While quality is more important than quantity, quantity should show sufficient and continuous productivity and impact in each of these areas. For example, the individual could provide evidence that the body of work has attracted the attention or stimulated the work of other scholars; has received awards; shows audience or public influence, or adoption; or has generated grant support. Some forms of activity might not be peer-reviewed, and as the media landscape changes, faculty might be engaged in new forms of scholarly work. If that work is included, individuals must explain the significance of the work and how that work impacts audiences.

## Creative/Professional Activity (Professional Tenure Track)

The criteria for demonstrating sustained accomplishment in creative/professional work are (1) productivity, (2) quality, and (3) significance. Productivity relates to the frequency and quantity of creative/professional output. Quality relates to the focus and caliber of the output. Significance refers to the impact of the work, for example the size of audience attracted or industry recognition of faculty member's contributions. These criteria are all important. The order in which they are presented here is **not** intended to suggest a rank order of importance.

### Productivity

- Faculty members in this track are expected to regularly engage in professional work appropriate to their areas of professional expertise and interests. Frequency and quantity of output are used as evidence that the creative/professional record is regular rather than sporadic, with expected variability in frequency of annual output, given the scope of projects, time taken for production or publication, etc.
  - A gap of a year or more during which little or no creative/professional work is evident requires explanation (e.g., the faculty member was working on a major project or had undertaken a major administrative or service responsibility). Any such explanation should appear in the faculty member's creative/professional statement.
  - Any faculty member who has reduced frequency and/or regularity of creative/professional work due to invisible labor should explain the nature and impact of this labor on their productivity in their scholarly statement.
- Creative/professional work is expected to be focused thematically, such that the body of work does not appear to be diffuse. Although faculty may engage in occasional work that is outside their established or developing area(s) and their types of output might vary, the majority of work should be able to be described as fitting into an overarching theme that defines the faculty member's contribution to the field. The faculty member should make it clear in their creative/professional statement how their body of work demonstrates overall focus, for example noting whether the focus is defined by the specific subject matter, topic, or field, or whether the focus is defined by a particular methodological approach.
- Types of projects and products considered to be creative/professional scholarship output include the following: short or full-length documentary films, feature films, television programming, multi-media projects, podcasts, information graphics, data visualizations, apps and websites, emerging technologies such as virtual and augmented reality, and processes including social impact design and innovation to address social issues. They may also include news articles (print or online), books, white papers, research and campaign reports, print or online publications such as magazines and blogs, books or textbooks, edited books, book chapters, articles in refereed publications, articles in non-refereed publications, refereed and invited conference papers and presentations, invited book reviews in reputable professional venues, and other juried and non-juried creative works. Professional track faculty members might publish their work in print or online, including educational publications, trade publications, news and other general circulation publications, and/or traditional scholarly journals. They might write textbooks or books targeting particular professional audiences or the general public. They might conduct research that is presented to industry groups.

They might write government or corporate policy documents. Or they might create projects or products with media organizations that help to advance the industry/academic dialogue. Likewise, audio, visual and multimedia works might be publicly presented and disseminated in the manner and to the audience that is most appropriate for the work. Finally, productivity can be demonstrated through the specific entries in incremental works, such as individual podcasts that comprise a podcast series or individual articles that comprise an ongoing investigative project.

- Pre-planning and pre-production efforts, the production of the creative/professional project itself, and post-production promotion of creative/professional projects and products are all considered productivity given that they are all necessary parts of the creative/professional process.
- No specific number of professional projects or products is required, and no specific number of solo- or first-authored output is required. Rather, the creative/professional statement should make it clear as to how the overall body of work demonstrates sustained productivity, quality, and significance regarding the faculty member's contributions in creative/professional work.
- If a work is proprietary and cannot be reviewed, then it cannot be evaluated and listed as creative/professional output. It could instead be considered a service activity. Consulting work must result in a product – a website, video or print publication, for example – to be considered professional work; otherwise it is considered a service activity.
- Traditional scholarly research related to the individual's expertise and interests can also count as creative/professional activity as described in the scholarship productivity section above.

### ***On collaborative work***

- Collaborative and interdisciplinary work are valued. However, in the case of collaborative projects, evaluators may have trouble understanding the individual's contribution. For collaborative and group projects, the faculty member should clearly explain their role.
- Faculty members who supervise or coordinate student projects, whether part of course requirements, student group advising or a special program, must clearly explain their role in the final product if they want to list this work under professional work. If the work is created solely as part of a class project or paper and was done by students for course credit, then the work should not be listed under as the faculty member's professional work. Rather, this work would be listed under teaching or service. If there is additional work done by the faculty member, including during production and/or pre- and post-production for the successful creation, publication, promotion, public launch, and/or ongoing work in re-publication of the project, then the work could be listed under professional work, and the faculty member should clarify the additional role(s) played in the creation of the new project. It is important for the faculty member to discuss the context in which the work was done. Faculty members should clearly explain and define the various roles that they played in producing collaborative professional work involving students.

### ***On other forms of creative/professional achievement***

- Grant seeking is encouraged but not required by the School. However, external and internal grants that are received demonstrate quality and significance of a faculty member's work. Therefore, grants sought and obtained should be noted on the faculty member's CV and creative/professional statement in order to be recognized in promotion and re-appointment decisions.
- Technological advancements that enable creative/professional work, such as algorithms, software, databases, or digital tools should be noted on the faculty member's CV and creative/professional statement in order to be recognized in promotion and re-appointment decisions.
- Engaged activity and new forms of creative/professional work are described in the sections below. These types of work should be described in the creative/professional statement to clarify how the work meets the definition of engagement or new forms of work, and evidence will be needed to indicate the quality, significance, and outcomes of the work as noted in those sections below.

### **Quality**

- The creative/professional work, as a whole, should demonstrate high standards of professional excellence.
- The writing or other mode of expression should be appropriate for the intended audiences.
- The work should be creative and/or innovative, in that the work has potential to significantly move the field in new directions or break new ground and advance concepts, ideas or approaches that transcend the ordinary. Faculty statements (and external reviews in tenure and promotion cases) should assist in evaluating this criterion.
- Quality of work can also, in part, be demonstrated through the evaluation of external reviewers in cases of tenure and promotion or through the securing of competitive funding to support the given project.
- Quality can, in part, be demonstrated through awards or honors recognizing the quality of a given work. For example, quality of published materials may be demonstrated by their ability to win regional, national, or international awards or be accepted by juries for major exhibits. In the case of new or emerging forms of publication or presentation, faculty should provide the metrics by which the work can be evaluated.
- Quality of work can further, in part, be demonstrated by the exclusivity, reputation, and/or quality of the venues in which the faculty member's work appears. Markers of quality of venue may include, among other things, circulation of the publication venue, visits or subscriptions to the publication venue, awards won by the publication venue or by other contributions to the publication venue, or importance of the venue to a target audience or issue.



## Significance

- Creative/professional work should be perceived as significant in the industry and/or a community, in that the work is having or will have an impact or influence in the field and/or community. Faculty members on the professional track should clearly explain in their creative/professional statement the impact of their professional work as it applies to specific issues or problems, such as those within the media or communications industry or media- or communication-related issues within an organization in the public or private sector. Such impact could be quantified, such as numbers of people affected or policies implemented and resulting effects. Evidence of impact may also include citations by others, readership and use of books or material, awards and honors recognizing impact in the profession or community, invitations to feature the faculty member's work, use by others in classes, influence of work in the profession, incorporation of work by organizations, impact of work to inform regulatory bodies or community action, or appointments to community or industry boards, editorial boards, or other leadership bodies.
- Faculty members should be developing (for those not tenured) or have developed (for tenured faculty) national or international recognition due to their creative/professional work. Faculty members whose major impact is within a community may also demonstrate an established reputation in that community for their creative/professional work.
- Generally, works reaching a national or international audience carry more weight than those for regional, state or local audiences. Local or regional material may, however, be upgraded to national stature by the winning of national awards or recognition. The magnitude of the significance and impact of a work at a community level will also determine the weight of local or regional material.
- The School specifically recognizes and places additional value on professional/creative work related to diversity, equity, and inclusion issues and invites faculty members to note work in this area in their creative/professional statement. If applicable, faculty members may also note how this work has had impact in the area of diversity, equity, and inclusion.

### ***Creative/professional expectations for pre-tenure and post-tenure stages***

**Reappointment.** Evidence of sustained creative/professional activity is expected with the promise of continued consistency and quality of output. It is understood that the CV might be dominated at this time by works in progress, in review, and/or presented but not yet published.

**Tenure and promotion to associate professor.** Professional tenure-track faculty members are expected to demonstrate signs of having established a national reputation in their field. Sustained accomplishment in the overall body of creative/professional work should be clearly demonstrated in terms of productivity\*, quality, and significance, with the overall record being evaluated in light of the heavier teaching load of this track. An individual's unique and significant contributions across their record should be apparent and demonstrate their independence as a professional, whether through solo or collaborative work.

\*Scholarly productivity of faculty members who have engaged in important and necessary invisible labor will be evaluated based on the faculty member's explanation of time required for this labor and its impact on their scholarly activity.

**Post-tenure review.** Professional track faculty members are expected to have continued their record of sustained accomplishment in creative/professional work and are encouraged to use their expertise to mentor and support others' creative/professional efforts. For those who engage in these valuable roles, it is expected that their record will reflect this engagement, for example adopting more executive roles on projects involving graduate students and/or untenured faculty, or including more co-authored works reflecting increased collaborative or mentoring activity.

**Promotion to full professor.** Promotion to full professor requires evidence that the individual has established a major creative record and demonstrated impact in his or her area of expertise at the national or even international level. The dossier of a candidate being promoted to full professor should show significant additional sustained accomplishment in their creative/professional work beyond the dossier of candidates being promoted to associate professor. There must be strong evidence that the individual has achieved and sustained excellence in creative/professional work and that the work can be evaluated in measurable ways appropriate to the discipline. While quality is more important than quantity, quantity should show sufficient and continuous productivity and impact in each of these areas. For example, the individual could provide evidence that the body of work has attracted the attention or stimulated the work of other practitioners; has been positively reviewed or juried or has received awards; shows audience or public influence, reaction or adoption; or has generated grant support. Some forms of activity might not be peer-reviewed, and as the media landscape changes, faculty might be engaged in new forms of creative activity. If that work is included, individuals must explain the significance of the work and corresponding effort and how that work impacts audiences.

## Teaching (Both Tenure Tracks)

The School prides itself on excellent teaching. The criteria for demonstrating sustained accomplishment in teaching are (1) effectiveness, (2) advancement, and (3) inclusion. Effectiveness relates to the quality of course content and delivery. Advancement relates to continued development and innovation in course development. Inclusion refers to the attention given to the diversity of the student body and intentional inclusion of diverse or underrepresented perspectives in course content. These criteria are all important. The order in which they are presented here is **not** intended to suggest a rank order of importance.

### Effectiveness

- Course material, including syllabi, should be clear and well-organized. Course syllabi are included among the materials in a dossier and are used, in part, to evaluate effectiveness.
- Course content should correspond with course objectives and link to broader concepts (or encourage critical thinking). Faculty members may use the teaching statement and/or course syllabi to demonstrate this correspondence.
- Faculty members should be able to demonstrate mastery of course content appropriate for the level of course being taught. The teaching statement can be used to provide an explanation of mastery. Peer teaching observations and student course evaluations may also be used to provide this evidence.
- Peer teaching observation reports (explained in greater detail below) are a part of the process of evaluating teaching and helping instructors improve their teaching skills. During the semester in which an observation is assigned, one faculty member selects the class and class period in which another faculty member visits and quietly observes the class period. A written report of that observation is generated from that observation, which is then included in the faculty member's dossier and used to provide evidence of effectiveness, advancement, and/or inclusion efforts.
- Student perceptions from the School's required course evaluation (by students each semester) are also included among the evidence used to demonstrate effectiveness, but are not the primary evidence for evaluating teaching. The results of these evaluations are quantifiable and are reported to the dean. Generally, for a given course, the average student rating on a particular item is considered adequate if the average is above the natural midpoint of the scale (e.g., above a 3.0 on a 1-to-5 rating, with 5 being the most favorable rating). Of the various ratings, overall course and overall instructor ratings are used as the measures of student perceptions of effectiveness. Students also provide comments, which are also considered part of the evidence of effectiveness.
- For any review (e.g., reappointment, tenure, post-tenure review), within the given review period, the total number of students taught, the number of distinct courses and unique sections taught, and the number of undergraduate and/or graduate theses or dissertations advised are all considered when evaluating dossiers for performance across the three areas of effort.

- The number and exclusivity of awards won by the faculty member for teaching, as well as won by students for work produced directly and exclusively in the faculty member's class are considered as measures of teaching effectiveness.
- In some instances, a faculty member might take on a course overload in times of high course demand. This additional load should be recognized in the faculty member's teaching statement.

### **Advancement**

- Faculty members should be able to demonstrate, through their statements and/or student course evaluations, a trajectory of growth in their teaching. Evidence may include refinement or adaptation of course material or innovation in content or delivery. Faculty members who have engaged in professional development, including attendance at workshops or teaching panels, enrollment in self-paced education, or other forms of professional development efforts to improve course development or teaching skills, are invited to list these efforts in their teaching statement and CV as evidence of advancement.
- Although not required, participation and innovation in curricular development and new course development is valued. Any such activity should be noted on the CV and/or in the faculty member's statement.

### **Inclusion**

- The School values the incorporation of diverse and underrepresented perspectives in course materials and teaching approaches. Evidence of this inclusion should be provided in the faculty member's teaching statement and should also be evident in course syllabi.
- Efforts to be inclusive and value diversity among students in the classroom are expected and should be noted in the faculty member's teaching statement. Evidence of these efforts may also be evident in student course evaluations and peer teaching observations.
- The School also wishes to acknowledge invisible labor, as described above. Faculty members who engage in teaching-related invisible labor are invited to include this work in their teaching statement. Or, if they prefer, faculty members may wish to include an optional section in their CV and/or an optional diversity & inclusion statement as part of their dossier to describe these activities with respect to teaching.

### ***Teaching expectations for pre-tenure and post-tenure stages***

**Reappointment.** Evidence should indicate a promising trajectory, demonstrating signs of teaching advancement and effectiveness.

**Tenure.** Evidence should demonstrate sustained accomplishment in teaching. Tenure candidates should also have begun serving regularly as members, and possibly chairs, of undergraduate honors, master's student, and/or doctoral student committees (only faculty holding Ph.D. degrees may chair doctoral student committees).

**Post-tenure review.** Evidence should indicate a continuation of sustained accomplishment in teaching. Post-tenure faculty should also serve regularly as members, and possibly chairs, of undergraduate honors and/or graduate student committees (master's for research or professional track, doctoral for research track). Additional teaching-related responsibilities are expected to be assumed post-tenure.

**Promotion to full professor.** Promotion to full professor requires evidence that the individual has demonstrated a record of high-quality teaching supported by valid metrics or indicators. The candidate must demonstrate sustained, high-quality teaching as indicated in evaluations, observations, teaching statements, awards or other relevant criteria. The candidate should show ability to mentor and advise students, particularly graduate students. Teaching load should be recognized, particularly in the dean's letter to outside reviewers, in that professional tenure track faculty teach five courses in an academic year compared to the four-course load for those faculty in the research track. Efforts related to diversity, equity, and inclusion should also be demonstrated.

## ***Procedures for peer teaching observations***

Peer teaching observations are a part of the process of evaluating teaching and helping instructors improve their teaching skills. A written report of that observation is given to the dean's office and to the instructor for their records. These reports are reviewed as part of the multi-faceted evaluation process for reappointment, tenure and/or promotion, and post-tenure review.

Although the following reflects the schedule and minimum number of peer observations that will be done for Hussman School instructors, there may be occasions when a peer observation of teaching is requested by senior leadership to be done sooner than the next review.

- At minimum, tenure-track assistant professors should be observed once in their first year and once in their second year (within 12 months prior to submitting their materials for their third-year review), and once more within 12 months prior to submitting their materials for review for tenure and promotion to associate professor.
- At minimum, tenured faculty should be observed within 12 months prior to submitting their materials for post-tenure review and/or review for promotion to full professor.
- Faculty members may also request a peer observation of their teaching outside of the schedule detailed above.
- Fixed-term faculty members with a contract term of longer than one year are observed initially during their first year of employment and thereafter in the year before their contract end date.
- Adjunct faculty members with a contract term of one year or less are observed initially during the first class they teach and, depending on the needs of the School and adjunct, thereafter (at a minimum) every other year that they teach.
- Graduate students are observed during their first time teaching a course as the instructor of record and thereafter in consultation with the senior associate deans. Graduate students may request a peer observation to provide material for their teaching portfolios.

All faculty are eligible and expected to do teaching observations. The School typically asks a professor of an equal or higher rank or position to observe other faculty members. Therefore, full professors may be asked to observe all faculty (tenure track and fixed term), adjuncts or graduate students; associate professors may be asked to observe assistant and associate professors, fixed-term faculty, or graduate students; assistant professors may be asked to observe assistant professors, fixed-term faculty, or graduate students; fixed-term faculty may be asked to observe other fixed-term faculty and in some cases, graduate students teaching in classes taught by those fixed-term faculty (skills classes, for example).

## Service (Both Tenure Tracks)

Service is an important part of the School's core mission, with increased service responsibilities expected for faculty after tenure. The criteria for demonstrating sustained accomplishment in service are (1) effort and (2) impact. Effort relates to the magnitude and consistency of service. Impact relates to the meaning and influence of the work. These criteria are both important. The order in which they are presented here is **not** intended to suggest a rank order of importance.

### Effort

- Service includes performance in areas such as international and national offices, work in appropriate scholarly, professional and academic organizations including but not limited to manuscript reviewing, editorial board memberships, or editorships; University and School positions and committee work; workshops, speeches, etc.
- Service is expected to be regular and continuous. Frequency and quantity of service is used as evidence of consistency. A gap of a year or more during which little or no service was conducted for the School, University, or field requires explanation. Any such explanation should appear in the faculty member's service statement.

### Impact

- In the service statement, faculty members should explain how their service efforts for the School, University, and/or field have had an impact on students, peers, and/or the academic or greater community.
- Positions of leadership are valued for their impact, given these leadership positions can lead to national or international recognition for the individual and the School. The impact or outcomes of such positions, such as chairs or membership of committees in academic or professional organizations, or holding leadership positions within the School or University, should be noted in the service statement.
- Service focused on improving diversity, equity, and inclusion are valued and should be noted in the faculty member's service statement.
- As with teaching, the School wishes to acknowledge invisible labor. Faculty members who engage in service-related invisible labor are invited to include this work in their service statement. Or, if they prefer, faculty members may wish to include an optional section in their CV and/or an optional diversity & inclusion statement as part of their dossier to describe these activities with respect to service.

### ***Service expectations for pre-tenure and post-tenure stages***

**Reappointment.** The expectation for this stage is service within the School and an emerging service record within the University and/or appropriate statewide and national organizations prior to promotion and tenure.

**Tenure.** Tenure candidates should have begun establishing a significant service record. Service records are expected to increase in magnitude and impact following reappointment and preceding tenure review.

**Post-tenure review.** Evidence should indicate a consistent, if not increased level of service since tenure. Additional service and administrative responsibilities are expected to be assumed post-tenure.

**Promotion to full professor.** Promotion to full professor requires evidence that the individual has embodied unwavering commitment to service as documented by activities within the School, University, and/or appropriate academic or professional organizations. The candidate should have a record of impactful and continuing contributions in professional service and engaged activities within the School, University, academic and professional organizations, and/or community. In addition, those requesting promotion to full professor must provide evidence of service and/or leadership roles that have or do contribute to the life of the School. Examples could be mentoring junior faculty members, chairing search committees, or managing specific programs. An exceptional administrative role or leadership position can compensate for a more limited scholarly or creative/professional record during the review period, but cannot substitute for an unacceptable scholarly or creative/professional record.



## Recognizing Engaged Scholarship / Engaged Activity

The School has a long history of engagement with media professions and other external communities. Public engagement refers to scholarly, professional, pedagogical or service activities for the public good, directed toward persons and groups outside the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill. Although the University is clear that engaged work is not a prerequisite for promotion and tenure, the University has declared its commitment to encouraging, recognizing and rewarding engaged scholarship, professional work, teaching and service. As reflected in the Final Report of the Provost's Task Force on Engaged Scholarship in Promotion and Tenure, engaged scholarship refers to scholarly efforts to expand multifaceted intellectual endeavors with a commitment to public practices and public consequences, and engaged activities are defined by the University as artistic, critical, scientific, and humanistic work that influences, enriches and improves the lives of people in the community. Faculty engagement (in the form of scholarly or creative/professional work, teaching, and/or service) may develop as collaborative interactions that respond to short and long-term professional or societal needs and should be reciprocal and inclusive of communities involved.

Engagement can serve the media professions, as well as people in our state, nation or the world through a continuum of academically informed activities. Products of such activities should have a high-quality, high-value impact in the community—be it industry, profession, government or other venue—not only in the academy. To satisfy the criterion for scholarly research, “engaged scholarship” must meet a rigorous standard such as external funding, peer-reviewed publications and evaluations. Beyond that the University looks to individual units to decide what kinds of scholarship are excellent engaged scholarship.

Help is found through the [Final Report of the Provost's Task Force on Engaged Scholarship](#) as to what qualifies as engaged work and how to report this work in a dossier. The [Carolina Center for Public Service](#) also [provides a toolkit](#) for defining engaged work and reporting this work in tenure and promotion dossiers, including what indicators of quality and impact might be gathered to explain and support this work in the appropriate statement (scholarly or creative/professional, teaching, service).

In the School, engaged scholarship and activities will be recognized for tenure and promotion. Faculty who want recognition for engaged scholarship and/or activities will need to describe in their scholarly or creative/professional statement how the work meets the definition of engagement. Faculty who present engaged scholarship and/or activities as part of their record must also present metrics by which the work can be evaluated for significance and impact.

Evidence of quality and significance of the engaged work may include testimonials, external evaluations, use of work in decisions of public importance, and other demonstrations of impact in the communities or organizations involved in the work. Supplemental letters from nonacademic sources attesting to the quality, significance, and/or implemented outcomes of the faculty member's engaged work may be solicited by the faculty member under review. These letters will not replace the traditional letters from academic reviewers, which are focused on the overall body of work. Instead, these supplemental letters would be used as evidence of the quality and impact of the specific engaged work.

## **Recognizing New Forms of Scholarship and Professional Work**

Faculty may have new forms of scholarship and professional work. That work can come in a variety of forms that do not resemble traditional journal articles or monographs. The School recognizes that digitally published work is not always peer-reviewed prior to publication. Also, faculty often must devote considerable amounts of time to mastering new technologies and methods, which constitutes professional development and may, itself, be an avenue for teaching and impact. Such issues should be explained in the materials submitted by the faculty member under review, along with an explanation for how this activity qualifies as scholarship or creative/professional work. Evidence of output, quality and significance of this new work must be provided by the faculty member to support the inclusion of this work as a new form of scholarship or creative/professional work. This evidence may consist of testimonials, external evaluations, use of work by others, influence of work in decisions of public importance, and other demonstrations of impact in the communities or organizations involved in the work.

## **Regarding Interdisciplinary Work**

The field of media and journalism has a long tradition of encouraging and valuing interdisciplinary scholarship, professional work, teaching and service. The University likewise has a tradition of placing interdisciplinarity as one of its key priorities. Interdisciplinary work allows both faculty and students to cross traditional departmental boundaries to bring together multiple perspectives and a variety of expertise to address issues and solve problems, often leading to cutting-edge scholarship and teaching.

While participating in interdisciplinary collaborations is not a requirement for promotion and tenure, such activity will be recognized in the School's promotion, tenure and post-tenure review processes. Faculty members are invited to identify interdisciplinary activities listed on his or her CV and discuss such activities in the appropriate statement (scholarly or creative/professional, teaching, service). Faculty members will also need to provide sufficient information and explanation of their individual roles in the work to enable both internal and external reviewers to evaluate the faculty member's contribution to the interdisciplinary activities and the products that may result.

## How to Prepare Dossiers for Reappointment, Tenure, Post-tenure, and Promotion

This section lists materials that must be submitted to the School's promotion and tenure committee and to the dean by the tenure-track or tenured faculty member seeking a reappointment, tenure, promotion or post-tenure review decision. It is the responsibility of the candidate to collect and submit the materials needed for the dossier.

*A Note on External Reviewers and Letters of Evaluation* is provided at the end of this section to provide additional information about the role of these reviewers and qualifications for viable external reviewers.

The University's Academic Personnel office ([linked here](#)) has information about Faculty Appointments, Promotion, and Tenure that includes Standard Order Tables. Standard Order Tables for Tenure Track include the requirements for contents necessary for university-level review. The Appointment Guidelines for Tenure/Tenure Track Appointments also include a guide for the required Dossier Format for Tenure Track or Tenured Faculty Review.

The School's committee requires the following materials to be submitted to the chair of the committee in electronic pdf form.

- Curriculum vitae (CV)
  - These are the University's guidelines on how to prepare a CV:  
<https://academicpersonnel.unc.edu/policies-and-procedures/faculty-appointments/dossier-format-for-tenure-track-or-tenured-faculty-review/>
  - It is important to have the categories in the correct order, but it is recognized that the CV bibliography categories listed on the provost's website may require some modification for professional-track faculty members, especially those whose work is not print-based. Within each category, items should be listed in reverse chronological order.
  - CVs should **not** include age, date of birth, marital status or Social Security number.
  - The first page of the CV should include the date (month, year) when it was last updated.
  - Follow the guidelines for listing engaged work and include this work under its own section called "Products of Engaged Scholarship" or "Products of Engaged Activity."
  - Academic positions should be separate from professional positions.
  - When listing research or professional work, be sure to show author order and include page numbers. Follow the guidelines linked above for categories of work.
  - Under teaching activities, list courses taught since initial appointment or since the last review. Include the number of students enrolled in each course. List courses in reverse chronological order, with the semester/year each course was taught.
  - Also, list names and project titles of graduate students supervised and their completion dates. List undergraduate honors projects, as well.

- If grants are reported, faculty members should list the principal investigator, as well as their own role on the grant, in addition to the granting agency and the duration (months/years) of the grant. Faculty must also indicate the percentage of effort allotted to each grant. Percentage of effort, in this case, relates to the amount of salary paid by the grant as an indication of the proportion of work hours given to the grant project as opposed to hours given to the School. For example, a grant that is used to “buy out” two courses may be recognized by the University Office of Sponsored Research’s (OSR’s) Effort Certification and Reporting Technology (eCRT) system as 30% paid by sponsored dollars and 70% paid by the School. For grants outside the eCRT system (grants that do not pay for a portion of salary through the OSR), it is advised to either indicate “0% effort (no salary paid)” or “100% effort (no salary paid)” to indicate the effort percentage reporting requirement is not applicable to that particular grant.
  - Put page numbers on each page of the CV.
  - Edit the CV carefully.
- Teaching statement
  - Scholarly or creative/professional activity statement
  - Service statement
- Each statement should be no more than three single-spaced pages and should include a paragraph or two about plans for future work.
  - For post-tenure review, these statements should indicate how the faculty member has distributed their effort if different than the models provided under [Expectations for Evaluating Areas of Effort](#) section above, as well as how the faculty member has met their goals over the last five years, in order to guide the expectations of the committee reviewing the post-tenure dossier.
  - Statements should document how the faculty member has met the expectations for sustained accomplishment in their areas of work, following the criteria for reappointment, tenure, promotion, and post-tenure review outlined above. Statements should also explain and put into context any challenges, gaps, “invisible” labor, or other issues that might be apparent from supporting material, for example student course evaluations or amounts of scholarly or creative productivity.
  - These statements are a faculty member’s opportunity to speak to the School’s promotion and tenure committee, the dean, the outsider reviewers and University officials about why they deserve a positive review.
  - The faculty member should use the statements to explain his or her work, its purpose and its value. There is no prescribed format or list of topics that must be addressed.
  - Faculty members may choose to either include diversity and inclusion efforts in their statements or to create a separate statement on diversity and inclusion that is no more than three single-spaced pages in length.

- Scholarly or creative/professional work portfolio consisting of five (electronic if possible) representative publications or other work. The candidate should submit five physical copies of any works that cannot be submitted electronically.
  - For reappointment and tenure cases, the candidate should select, most likely in consultation with mentors, five works that the candidate thinks are his or her best representative work.
  - For post-tenure review and promotion cases, the candidate is expected to select five of their best representative works from the last five years (representing the time since the last tenure or post-tenure review).
  
- Most recent syllabus for each course taught
  
- Student course evaluation summaries or a separate faculty-created summary course evaluation chart for each course taught since the initial appointment if the faculty member is untenured or since the last review in other cases.
  - Course evaluations are given to faculty members after each semester and are available electronically through Connect Carolina’s Blue Course Evaluation System link under the Faculty Portal’s Student Administration menu. These course evaluations are required to be submitted for university-level review and will need to eventually be included with dossiers for reappointment, tenure, and promotion cases.
  - However, for dossier review by the internal School committee and by external reviewers, faculty members may wish instead to submit their own summary of these evaluations. Faculty-created summary reports will consist of quantitative scores and student comments as follows:
    - For each section of each course taught during the period being reviewed, provide the average score for the overall evaluations of both the instructor and the course. For each section of each course, list how many students were enrolled in that course and how many completed the evaluation. Also, please note the range of possible scores – for example, the scores can be from 0 to 4 with 4 being the highest. Or 5 might be the highest. This has changed periodically. An example is provided here:

Semester	Course	Students Responding	Students Enrolled	Average Course (out of 5)	Average Instructor (out of 5)
Fall 2018	MEJO 867.002	15	18	3.21	4.23
Fall 2018	MEJO 530.001	45	50	4.32	4.00
Spring 2019	MEJO 999.003	5	6	2.34	3.50

*Note. Average ratings are on a 1-to-5 scale, with 5 being the most favorable.*

- Paste all the student comments into an attached Word document.
- Submit either the individual course evaluations or the faculty-created summary table and pasted comments as part of the dossier given to the dean’s office for review. In any case, do not submit any student evaluations that are individualized. Rather, any submission of student evaluations should

be reported in the aggregate (as is provided through the Blue Evaluation System), with comments disconnected from any information that could identify the student.

- Evaluation information for all courses taught at UNC are needed for reappointment reviews, as well as for reviews for tenure and promotion to associate professor.
  - Evaluation information is only needed for courses taught since tenure for promotion reviews for full professor, or since last review for post-tenure reviews.
  - For tenure and promotion reviews, which require university-level review and approval, the University will require the individual course evaluations from the Blue Evaluation System to be submitted with the final dossier, merged into one single pdf file with course evaluations in reverse chronological order.
- Peer teaching observation reports
    - For reappointment cases, all peer teaching observation reports since the initial appointment must be included. At least 2 peer teaching observation reports are required, including one completed within 12 months of the review.
    - For tenure and promotion to associate professor, all peer teaching observation reports since the initial appointment must be included. There should be two observations from before the reappointment review and a third observation within 12 months of the tenure review.
    - For post-tenure review, all peer teaching observation reports since the last review must be included. At minimum, there should be one observation completed, which has been completed within 12 months of the post-tenure review.
    - For promotion to full professor, the two most recent peer teaching observation reports must be included, at minimum. One of the included observations must have been completed within 12 months of the promotion review.

Candidates may include anything else they think is relevant – for example, list of awards students have won for work done for class or number of student papers accepted at conferences.

All of the above evidence will be reviewed by the School's Promotion and Tenure committee. However, it is customary to provide only the CV, statements, and samples of work to external reviewers so as not to overburden them with detail (e.g., peer teaching observations, student course evaluations) for which they likely cannot adequately evaluate due to lack of knowledge of School context, culture, or curriculum.

The candidate is encouraged to consider creating one or more brief addenda to supplement their teaching and/or service statements to assist external reviewers in commenting on teaching and/or service contributions. These addenda should be few in number and one page in length per addendum to convey details of the candidate's strengths in teaching and/or service while respecting the external reviewer's time and effort. For example, a one-page list of awards won by students via the candidate's class, a one-page summary of

student course evaluation ratings and select comments, and a one-page list of recent job placements of student advisees may comprise the addenda given to external reviewers in addition to the CV, statements, and samples of work.

The dean requires electronic pdfs of the following to send to the external reviewers:

- A CV that complies with University requirements
- Scholarly or creative/professional activity, teaching and service statements
- Portfolio of five representative publications or other work (five physical copies of any works that cannot be submitted electronically)
- If provided by the candidate, a small number of select supporting addenda (see the paragraph above) to supplement the teaching and/or service statement

The dean will arrange with writers of external letters to provide letters in electronic pdf form if possible.

## A Note on External Reviewers and Letters of Evaluation

Letters of evaluation from evaluators outside the University are an important part of the review process and are required for all promotion and tenure decisions. The purpose of these letters is to provide an independent and unbiased assessment of the individual's work. No recommendations will be made until after the external review letters have been received and considered by the committee.

Unless otherwise directed, external reviewers will focus their evaluation on scholarly activity for research-track faculty and will be asked to focus on both teaching and creative/professional work for professional-track faculty.

A minimum of four letters is required, and all must be from outside UNC-Chapel Hill and from individuals independent of the candidate. They must not be from individuals who have been directly involved with the candidate, including, but not limited to, collaborator or co-author, mentor, previous co-worker or dissertation chair. Letters may be from individuals who know the candidate through coincidental national interactions. Two must come from a list of names provided by the candidate and two from individuals selected by the dean, in consultation with the faculty member's mentor(s). Ideally, all of the letters should come from UNC-Chapel Hill peer institutions. There are several lists of UNC peer institutions, and they are located [here](#). In addition, the University recognizes that a specific school or program might have peer schools or programs that are not on any of the University lists. If an external reviewer is selected from such an institution, the dean's letter to the University must explain why the reviewer's school or program is a UNC-Chapel Hill peer school or program.

Relevant to professional track faculty, external reviewers may also be leaders in the profession who can comment on the faculty member's impact on the practice or community. Such reviewers may be governmental leaders, community leaders, non-governmental organization leaders, high-ranking officers in industry, or recognized owners or innovators in industry. The faculty member should assist in providing information for the dean's and committee's reports on why these atypical reviewers provide unique evidence to support the dossier.

In addition to the minimum of four, any number of additional letters from any source may be submitted. These may be from individuals within UNC-CH or from former colleagues, collaborators or mentors, both inside and outside of the academy.

All letters that are received—not a subset—must be made part of any appointment, promotion or tenure package and must be part of the evaluation process. External evaluation letters should be identified in the upper-right-hand corner as to their source (selected by dean or from the list provided by the candidate).