

College of Arts and Sciences
Department of Philosophy
Policies on Faculty Personnel Actions

Approved by Department, Spring 2013
Approved by the College of Arts and Sciences, August 2013
Effective July 1, 2013
Revised March 2021 – to remove 18-month rule

PART I. Policies for tenure-track and tenured faculty

I. Introduction

The principal aims of the Department of Philosophy are to preserve, increase, and transmit knowledge and understanding of philosophy. These aims are furthered by the scholarly activity of the faculty and by their teaching and training of undergraduate and graduate students. In hiring and promoting faculty, the Department seeks to maintain its high standards of scholarship and teaching. It also encourages service to the Department, the University, the professional community, the state, the nation and the world; as appropriate, it also encourages engagement with groups outside academia. The Department of Philosophy seeks to be objective, fair, and honest in matters of hiring and promotion. It reaffirms at this time its goal of quality combined with diversity. All hiring and promotion take place within the context of departmental needs and resources. The Department subscribes wholeheartedly to the guidelines of Affirmative Action and commits itself to make personnel decisions with all possible justice to both the University and the individuals concerned.

The Department's policies are subject to those set forth in the following University publications. The most recent edition of each document takes precedence.

- A. The Code, Board of Governors, UNC (October 9, 2009 edition <http://www.northcarolina.edu/policy/index.php>).
- B. Trustee Policies and Regulations Governing Academic Tenure in the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill (October 20, 2009 edition <http://policy.sites.unc.edu/files/2013/04/tenure.pdf>).
- C. The Faculty Code of University Government, the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill (July 1, 2010 edition <http://www.unc.edu/faculty/faccoun/code/code2010.shtml>).
- D. Affirmative Action Plan, University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill (October 1, 2011 – September 30, 2012 <http://equalopportunity-ada.unc.edu/files/2013/03/2012-Final-Plan-Web-Version.pdf>).
- E. Personnel Policies for Academic Personnel, Office of the Executive Vice Chancellor & Provost (<http://academicpersonnel.unc.edu/index.htm>)

F. College of Arts & Sciences Chair's Manual (<http://college.unc.edu/>)

G. Memorandum from the Dean on Peer Faculty Teaching Observations for Tenure, Promotion and Post-Tenure Review, August 21, 2012.

(<http://collegeintranet.web.unc.edu/files/2012/02/Peer-Teaching-Memo-2012-08-21.pdf>)

This departmental document is supplemental to, and subject to, the policies found in the above publications. Each faculty member has the responsibility to become familiar with their provisions.

II. Standards

The Department, College and University continually aspire to enhance their academic stature. Such stature is achieved primarily through the continual recruitment, development, and retention of outstanding faculty.

The standards that this Department applies to the evaluation of candidates are qualitative and cannot be expressed quantitatively. Therefore, they inescapably entail subjective judgment. As a result, it is not possible to reduce the evaluation of academic personnel to a purely objective enumeration of expected accomplishments within a specific period of time.

The Department may recommend a candidate for promotion and/or permanent tenure before the expiration of his or her probationary term if the quality of the candidate's record meets the standards and makes a compelling case for an early recommendation. A candidate's prior record in a tenure track or equivalent position at another institution of higher education may form part of a compelling case for an early recommendation.

Prerequisite to the appointment or reappointment of any candidate is the continuing need by the Department, College and University for the services that he or she, as a scholar-teacher in a particular field, is qualified to carry out. An appointment of an individual to a tenure-track position is based on the belief that the appointment meets a continuing need of the Department. However, where this need is found not to exist, or has disappeared or may disappear, or where program change or curtailment of funding obliges the University to discontinue support, appointment or reappointment is precluded.

Quality research, teaching excellence and a commitment to service are important areas of evaluation of faculty by the Department of Philosophy. In addition to long-standing criteria for such evaluation, innovative faculty work in these areas should also be considered when germane. Thus, tenure and promotion guidelines must balance the need for precedent and consistency with openness to new approaches and ideas for which establishing criteria for evaluation may be difficult, at least at first. Candidates for promotion and their departments share the responsibility for effectively evaluating innovative contributions. Candidates should help articulate the nature and value of their new work. Departments should continually educate themselves on the changing landscape of the profession, and they should consider when to seek evaluations of the candidate's work that inform and can help explain

particular innovations. Some of the prominent areas in which innovation occurs include engagement, digital technologies, and interdisciplinarity.

As a public university, we recognize the importance of faculty engagement. Engagement may be embedded in one or more aspects of a faculty member's research, teaching, and service activities. Faculty engagement refers to scholarly, creative, pedagogical, and service activities directed toward persons and groups outside UNC Chapel Hill and outside the usual spheres of professional academic work. Such activities typically take the form of collaborative interactions, include partners outside the University, and seek to enhance the "public good" or "public life" of the state, nation, or wider world.

When present, engagement should be recognized as a significant component of a faculty member's professional achievements. Engagement may play a more prominent role at different phases of a faculty member's career, and it should be supported at any phase if it is consistent with our Department's practices and priorities. However, faculty whose work does not include engaged activities should not be penalized or denied tenure or promotion on those grounds.

Digital technologies are reshaping every profession. Digital technologies shape not only how we communicate new knowledge, but also how we perceive and develop knowledge in the first place. Since digital technologies influence every aspect of professional life, including research, teaching, and service, the Department of Philosophy should, therefore, regularly evaluate this changing landscape. Candidates for promotion or tenure should help articulate the nature and reception of their digital work.

Interdisciplinary work provides opportunities for creating knowledge in new and unanticipated ways, often representing cutting-edge scholarship and teaching. Since many challenges and problems require skills and perspectives from multiple academic and professional disciplines, evidence of innovative inter- and cross-disciplinary research, teaching, and service should therefore be valued in a candidate's promotion and tenure dossier.

General Standards. The following standards will be employed in evaluations for reappointment, promotion, and tenure:

- a) A demonstrated commitment to, and achievement of, research excellence is required for consideration for tenure and/or promotions in rank.
- b) A demonstrated commitment to, and achievement of, teaching excellence is required for consideration of tenure decisions and/or promotions in rank, and while its presence without the other two general standards also being met will not bring tenure or promotion, its absence is sufficient to deny tenure or promotion.
- c) Service to the Department, University, community, state, nation and world, and to one's

academic profession is a further, additional consideration in the overall assessment of a faculty colleague. Service is not a substitute for excellence in research and excellence in teaching.

A. Standards of Research

The Department of Philosophy expects its faculty to be actively involved throughout their careers in achieving scholarly research excellence. Scholarship is understood as the advancement of knowledge and understanding and consists substantially of original research or interpretation that is part of a coherent project. The central result of scholarship is publication. The Department of Philosophy requires such publication as an obvious way of extending knowledge and of sharing the fruits of scholarly thought and investigation with a wider audience that can be both critical and appreciative. The Department of Philosophy insists on regarding quality of publication as more important than quantity.

Engaged scholarship refers to research on projects that include collaborative interactions with partners outside the University and outside the usual spheres of professional academic work. In order to satisfy the criterion for engaged scholarship, the faculty member's work must meet rigorous standards. In our Department, the criteria for evaluating the quality of engaged scholarship include external competitive funding, publication of findings in peer-reviewed journals or books, and evaluations by experts in the field.

The Department of Philosophy recognizes faculty who conduct or publish their research digitally for their innovation and for moving beyond traditional formats. The standard for excellence is the same for digital and non-digital work and may include influence on a scholarly field, rigorous peer reviews or other evaluation by experts in the area. The overall quality and contribution of the work must be measured against the University's long-standing high standards, which should be independent of the mode or medium of publication.

The research of faculty engaged in innovative interdisciplinary research shall be given formal consideration and due credit, although the overall quality and contribution of the interdisciplinary work should be measured through appropriate means against the University's well-established high standards. For faculty with interdisciplinary interests hired within the Department of Philosophy, the main criteria for review and judgment lie within, rather than outside, our discipline broadly defined. In the case of joint appointments, reviews must include multi-departmental evaluations. For faculty hired as joint appointees, the main criteria for review and judgment of a faculty member's scholarly work shall encompass work across the units of appointment and related interdisciplinary work, assessed by appropriate high standards.

B. Standards of Teaching

The Department of Philosophy expects and encourages teaching of the highest quality. Although it is not possible to enumerate here all criteria of highly effective teaching, such teachers prepare their courses with discrimination and skill. They responsibly formulate the objectives of the courses and use imaginative pedagogical methods to achieve their goals. Effective teachers

engage their students, stimulate their interests, broaden their perspectives and improve their thinking. To the extent that it is possible, they also make their students active rather than passive participants in the learning process. Excellent teachers demand substantial accomplishment and high standards of work, grade all work fairly, and base what they teach on evidence and sound method. They are articulate, resourceful, and reflective. In addition, where appropriate, such teachers conscientiously provide advice and guidance to both graduate and undergraduate students on an individual basis, direct theses and dissertations, and serve on committees that critically examine and evaluate such research projects. In short, the Department expects colleagues to be generously involved in teaching and training.

Engaged teaching refers to pedagogical practices that typically take students outside the traditional classroom. Such teaching may include courses that help students engage with non-academic communities, participate in service learning programs, or interact with public schools and government policymakers. To satisfy the criterion for “engaged teaching” and for engaged teaching to be considered in evaluations for reappointment, promotion and tenure, the faculty member’s courses should include analytical and reflective components and carry academic credit. Such teaching should be evaluated by students, by academic peers, and also by individuals who participate in these courses from a position outside the University.

One of the most prominent areas of recent pedagogical innovation is the integration of digital technologies within the traditional classroom as well as online. When faculty members employ new technologies to enhance teaching and learning, evaluation of teaching excellence should include assessments of this use.

Evaluation of teaching excellence should also consider faculty contributions to different forms of interdisciplinary teaching. Such endeavors greatly enhance the intellectual life of the University and provide a sense of common purpose and community among students and faculty. All levels and forms of interdisciplinary teaching should therefore be considered, including: interdisciplinary teaching within one’s home unit; participation in team-taught, multidisciplinary courses that transcend the Department and unit boundaries; undergraduate, graduate and post-doctoral mentoring; and involvement in cross-disciplinary learning experiences outside the University. As with all forms of teaching, rigorous standards of evaluation should be applied.

C. Standards of Service

A service assignment should be pursued diligently, imaginatively, and responsibly, with concern for deadlines and appropriate results. Conscientious and efficient performance combined with collegiality, tact, and resourcefulness bring credit to the individual and the Department and will be recognized.

Assistant and associate professors without permanent tenure are expected to undertake those service functions the Department Chair may assign. Although they should focus primarily on teaching and research, untenured members of the Department will be called upon to perform a number of service activities such as work on departmental or appropriate University committees. Associate professors with tenure and professors may be expected to undertake a wider range of service functions.

Engaged service refers to activities that are informed by the faculty member's scholarly expertise and include interactions with groups and projects outside the professional and scholarly organizations of academia. In the Department of Philosophy, we value engaged service related to the faculty member's professional expertise, such as participation in outreach activities.

Groups and communities increasingly connect and identify themselves through online resources, electronic networks, virtual spaces and social media. Therefore, in the Department of Philosophy, faculty service involving digital technologies may be recognized as an important contribution to academic life and to communities outside the University. Candidates for promotion or tenure should help articulate the nature of their contribution in this area.

Faculty may be involved in interdisciplinary service in one, two or more units, depending on the nature of their appointment(s) or interdisciplinary approach. In cases of interdisciplinary service, the Department of Philosophy, the other units involved and the faculty member will establish standards and expectations clarifying the extent of service expected from the faculty member for the Department and the other unit(s). These standards and expectations shall be reviewed, evaluated and, if necessary, modified on a regular basis. The same general standards of evaluation shall be employed for interdisciplinary service as for service within a single unit.

III. Criteria for Specific Personnel Actions

The projected needs and resources of the Department, the College and the University shall be considered in recommending initial appointments, reappointments, promotions to associate professor with tenure, and promotion to full professor.

A. Instructor with Special Provision

The candidate approved by the Department to be recommended for an appointment as an assistant professor but who, when approved, is still completing a doctoral dissertation, will be recommended for an appointment as instructor for one year with the special provision that upon conferral of the doctorate he or she will be reappointed at the rank of assistant professor, and with the further provision that the effective date of his or her appointment at the rank of assistant professor will be retroactive to the effective date of his or her current appointment as instructor, or to the July 1 or January 1 immediately preceding the date of conferral. Such an appointment will carry the title "instructor with special provision."

B. Assistant Professor

The rank of assistant professor denotes a tenure-track position, with an initial appointment for four years, the possibility of reappointment for three additional years, and a review for the conferral of tenure and promotion to the rank of associate professor.

1. Standards for initial appointment

Clear promise of excellence in teaching and scholarship, and completion of all requirements for the doctorate or other terminal degree and the degree's conferral are required.

2. Reappointment for a second probationary term

The initial review and recommendation for reappointment occur by the end of the third year of the initial probationary appointment. For an assistant professor already serving in the Department, reappointment is based on evidence of (a) a demonstrated commitment to, and promise of or achievement of, research excellence, (b) a demonstrated commitment to, and promise of or achievement of, teaching excellence, and (c) appropriate service to the Department.

C. Associate Professor

Initial appointment to a rank of associate professor may be with or without tenure. Promotion to associate professor always confers tenure. Except as otherwise provided under University policy, tenure is a permanent commitment by the Department, the College and the University. Recommendation for tenure requires a judgment not only about the past and present achievements of the candidate but also about his or her potential for future achievements. While emphasizing proven excellence in research and teaching, the Department remains very much concerned, in questions of tenure, that a person show promise of continuing achievement in all three areas: research, teaching, and service. A recommendation for promotion and/or tenure by the Department Chair requires a careful assessment informed by outside references about the qualifications of the candidate and the professional judgment of the assembled full professors; the professional judgment of the tenured associate professors is also considered.

In evaluating past performance, present achievements, and promise for the future, the following factors will be considered:

- a) The candidate must have made scholarly contribution(s) of demonstrable value to the field of inquiry and to have demonstrated commitment to continued research excellence.
- b) The candidate's teaching should be excellent in several courses and clearly distinguished in at least one area.
- c) The candidate must be recognized as a helpful and valued colleague, one who has willingly and conscientiously performed needed services within the academic community.

The Department will decide whether to recommend tenure following an initial appointment as an associate professor on the basis of the criteria outlined above for promotion to associate professor. With written advance approval of the Dean, an associate professor appointed from outside the Department may be recommended for an initial appointment with tenure if the quality of the candidate's record meets the standards.

D. Full Professor

Appointment to the rank of full professor confers tenure. A candidate for full professor should have made significant contributions in the field beyond those expected of an associate professor with tenure.

Recommendation for promotion to the rank of full professor requires a judgment not only about the past and present achievements of the candidate but about his or her potential for future achievements. A recommendation for promotion to full professor by the Department Chair requires a careful assessment informed by outside references about the qualifications of the candidate and the professional judgment of the full professors.

In evaluating past performance, present achievements, and promise for the future, the following factors will be considered:

- a) As a scholar, the candidate should have a record of sustained research and high quality publication, and distinctive achievements sufficient to have gained significant recognition in the field.
- b) The candidate should have a demonstrated commitment to and achievement of continued excellence in teaching.
- c) The candidate should have a record of service that demonstrates the capacity for constructive contributions to the Department and the University.

E. Full Joint Tenure-Track and Tenured Appointments

In order to be recommended for a joint tenure-track or tenured appointment in the Department of Philosophy, a faculty member must meet the standards for the rank for which he or she is being considered and must simultaneously meet the standards for the same rank in another department, so that he or she may hold the same rank in both departments. A joint tenure-track or tenured appointment in the Department of Philosophy is an honor and not a right or extended as a courtesy. The projected needs and resources of the departments and the University shall be considered in initiating or approving joint tenure-track or tenured appointments. Policies pertaining to these appointments differ from those for appointments across departments or units in which the faculty member holds a tenure-track or tenured appointment in one of the departments or units and holds a fixed term (i.e., adjunct) appointment in another.

F. General Recruiting Procedures

The Department of Philosophy follows University and College recruiting policies and procedures. For further details, see the Provost's website and the College of Arts & Sciences Chair's Manual.

IV. Summary of Procedural Steps in Appointments, Reappointments and Promotion (not applicable for fixed-term appointments)

Policies identified here are supplemental to, and subject to, the policies found in the most recent versions of the publications listed in the Introduction.

Letters of recommendation. Outside letters of evaluation constitute an important part of the appointment, promotion and tenure packet. A minimum of four letters of evaluation is required.

For appointments of assistant professors and instructors with special provision, these letters should be preferably from outside the institution, and also preferably from research universities with very high research activity (RU/VH institutions). They may include letters from mentors and other individuals more closely connected to the candidate.

In the case of promotion and tenure packets, it is required that all four of the outside letters of evaluation be from outside the institution, and that all be from individuals independent of the candidate. Two of the four letters must be from a list of names provided by the candidate and two of the four from individuals selected by the Department Chair. Ideally, all of the letters should come from individuals at research universities with very high research activity (RU/VH institutions). If, in the Chair's view, the most appropriate reviewer is from a university or other institution that is not a research university with very high research activity (RU/VH institutions), the Chair's letter should provide an explanation for the choice of reviewer. The goal is to obtain a letter from the person who will give the most discriminating review and unbiased assessment of the individual's national and international reputation. Therefore, the request from the Department Chair to prospective writers of outside letters of evaluation should be phrased neutrally and should not solicit an affirmative response or recommendation.

The letters may not be from individuals who have worked directly with the candidate, e.g., as a collaborator, mentor, previous coworker, or former dissertation chair, but may be from individuals who know the candidate through professional interactions, e.g., having reviewed the candidate's publications or served on review committees together.

In addition to the minimum four required independent letters, any number of additional letters from any responsible source may also be submitted. These may be from individuals within the institution with whom the candidate has collaborated or from former colleagues, collaborators, mentors, or other individuals connected with the candidate.

All letters of evaluation that are received must be made an official part of any appointment, promotion, and tenure package and must be part of the evaluation process of the candidate under consideration. In the appointment/promotion packet, each outside letter should have a designation in its upper right hand corner indicating whether the writer of the letter was suggested by the candidate or was chosen by the Department Chair.

The dossier. The Department of Philosophy will employ the guide provided by the Appointments, Promotion and Tenure Committee of the University in completing the candidate's dossier for review for faculty reappointments, promotions and tenure.

Notification. Untenured assistant and associate professors should be notified in writing at least three months prior to the start of the scheduled review. Tenured associate professors should be notified in writing at least six months prior to the start of the scheduled review because that scheduled review also constitutes the University's post tenure review which requires six months' notice. The notification should include the requirements for the dossier the faculty member must submit for evaluation.

Timing of review. Except as expressly limited, promotions in rank may be made at any time during a faculty member's employment. [9/24/20 Amended Trustees Policies]

Review and consultation. Proceedings for promotion to associate professor with tenure or to full professor are initiated by recommendation of the Department Chair "after consultation with the assembled full professors of that department" (Trustees' Policies and Regulations Governing Academic Tenure, May, 2004, p. 5). Any department charged with evaluating a candidate and making a recommendation regarding reappointment of an assistant professor, conferral of tenure and promotion to associate professor or promotion to full professor may utilize an *ad hoc* or special committee to review the candidate and present a report to the assembled voting faculty. If this committee prepares a written evaluation of the candidate, that report must be included in the candidate's dossier.

The Department's assembled voting faculty for purposes of reappointment, promotion and tenure are known as the Evaluating Committee, as explained further below. The assembled voting faculty must include at least four full professors. If a department has fewer than four full professors, a standing advisory committee including additional full professors shall be named by the Dean of the College in consultation with the Chair to advise the Chair in personnel matters.

The departmental vote must be recorded and reported by rank, and must list the number of votes in support and opposition, as well as any abstentions. No faculty member may vote on the question of reappointment, tenure and/or promotion for another faculty member of the same or higher rank. Tenured associate professors, therefore, may not vote for conferral of tenure or promotion for another associate professor.

A. Assistant Professor

Tenure Track Assistant Professors (Third-Year Reviews). Initial appointment to the rank of assistant professor is for a probationary term of four years. No less than 12 months before the end of this term, the assistant professor must be notified in writing whether he or she will be recommended for a second probationary term of three years or not reappointed.

The Department's assembled voting faculty shall review the assistant professor's scholarship, teaching, and service. Outside letters of evaluation are not required for reappointment. It is a University requirement that the Chair consult the "assembled full professors" of the unit before acting upon a recommendation. In the Department of Philosophy, that discussion is followed by a vote of the assembled full professors and tenured associate professors regarding the proposed

reappointment. The faculty's vote is advisory to the Chair, who either recommends reappointment or decides against reappointment.

The procedures set out in α - ζ below for reviews for promotion to associate professor with tenure also govern reappointment decisions concerning tenure-track assistant professors, with appropriate modifications as specified by University and College policies.

If the Chair decides against reappointment at the end of the initial probationary term, the assistant professor shall be notified in writing of the Chair's decision no less than 12 months before his or her current term ends. A faculty member has the right to an administrative conference with the Chair and, if necessary, with the Dean of the College, along with such other appeal rights as are afforded under the "Trustee Policies and Regulations Governing Academic Tenure in the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill."

Review for Promotion to Associate Professor with Tenure

Assistant professors are reviewed during their sixth year for promotion to associate professor with tenure, non-reappointment, or (under exceptional circumstances) reappointment at the rank of assistant professor with permanent tenure.

If the assistant professor receives permanent tenure at that same rank, he or she must be reviewed every five years to meet the post-tenure review requirement of the University, and is eligible to be reviewed for promotion on the same schedule.

The Department's assembled voting faculty shall review the assistant professor's scholarship teaching, and service in accordance with the following procedure.

α . The Chair will indicate what materials the candidate must submit for this purpose. These include:

1. Up-to-date curriculum vitae.
2. Publications and professional and scholarly activities.
 - a) Copies of relevant writings, published or unpublished.
 - b) Reviews of the candidate's writings, such as book reviews or manuscript reviews that the candidate wishes to submit, including referee reports or publishers' reviews.
 - c) A list of public lectures, papers read, or symposia organized with places and dates.
 - d) A description of any grants or fellowships received, together with copies of the proposals, as well as any grant requests pending.
 - e) A brief outline of plans for future research.

3. Materials relevant to the evaluation of the candidate's teaching.
 - a) Statement detailing teaching experience, courses taught, and courses planned for the future.
 - b) Examples of teaching materials, such as course descriptions, outlines, reading lists, and examinations.
 - c) A list of B.A., M.A., and Ph.D. theses directed and graduate committee memberships, both inside and outside the Department.
 - d) A brief statement by the candidate describing his or her teaching goals and strategies, with regard to both undergraduate and graduate instruction.
4. Summary of service activities for the Department, the University, the profession of philosophy, the academic community, and the public at large.
5. The candidate may submit any other materials which he or she thinks relevant, including letters of support (for example, from the candidate's dissertation director).

β. Evaluation of the candidate's research and contributions to the Department and the field of philosophy:

1. In any case involving a decision to recommend for tenure, the Chair will assemble the candidate's curriculum vitae, publications and other scholarly writings, together with any other material the candidate wishes to submit to the outside referees.
2. Outside letters of evaluation are required for promotion to associate professor with tenure. The outside referees will be chosen as follows:
 - a) A minimum of four outside letters must be obtained. Two of these will be solicited from persons named by the candidate and two from persons named by the Chair in consultation with colleagues who are expert in the field. The candidate will be asked to submit the names of at least three persons of recognized standing outside the University who are qualified to evaluate his or her scholarly abilities and contributions. These must not include the candidate's own dissertation director. The dissertation director, former students, post-doctoral mentors, or co-authors may submit letters in behalf of the candidate, as long as they are not included in the required minimum of four letters.
 - b) In the event that an insufficient number of people on the list are willing to write letters, the Chair will consult again with the candidate for further suggestions.
 - c) The selection of colleagues from whom letters are to be solicited should be made judiciously and with due concern given to requirements of objectivity and fairness in the evaluation of the candidate. The Chair will share the combined list of potential external referees with the candidate and solicit comments concerning the suitability of persons

represented on the list. Appropriate consideration should be given to the candidate's comments and reservations regarding people on the combined list, but the candidate cannot veto the Chair's selection of any outside evaluator.

- d) All letters become part of the candidate's file when received and may not be removed. Current state law allows the candidate access to his or her personnel file including these evaluations. All letters of evaluation shall be made available to the Evaluating Committee for review as part of the candidate's dossier.
3. The Chair will send a letter to each member of the faculty of the candidate's rank or lower inviting him or her to convey to the Chair whatever perceptions of the candidate's contributions to the Department and the field of philosophy they have which are thought to be relevant to the decision.

γ. Evaluation of the candidate's teaching:

1. As teaching is a fundamentally important activity of the University, it is essential that this aspect of a colleague's abilities be evaluated before reappointment or promotion and tenure. Classroom effectiveness as well as sensitivity and responsiveness to student educational needs should be assessed. This includes such factors as competence, selection of course materials, organization and clarity of presentation, and fairness in dealing with students, setting examinations, and in grading. The Chair will work to ensure that the Evaluating Committee is apprised of any of the candidate's teaching activities that are not evidenced in the record.
2. Evaluations shall be solicited from graduate students in residence and from a representative selection of undergraduate students. The letters will be placed in the candidate's dossier to be distributed to the Evaluating Committee. Students will be informed of state law allowing the candidate the right to access to his or her personnel file.
3. Within the year prior to the candidate's review, at least two tenured faculty colleagues must directly observe the candidate's teaching through classroom visitation. Each colleague-observer must make at least two classroom visits to a representative sample of undergraduate and graduate classes. Observers must prepare a written evaluation of the teaching as observed. Copies of that written evaluation must be given to the candidate and put in the candidate's file for consideration by the Evaluating Committee.
4. Results of student evaluations of a candidate's teaching from (graduate and undergraduate) courses over at least three recent semesters prior to review must be submitted to the Evaluating Committee. The candidate should use a departmentally approved evaluation questionnaire. While student evaluations of teaching are an important basis for evaluation of teaching quality or effectiveness, they are not the sole or most important such basis. Student evaluations supplement and enrich peer evaluations.

δ. Chair's statements on service:

The Chair will prepare a written report summarizing the nature and quality of the candidate's service on departmental and University committees and provide this to the Evaluating Committee.

ε. Composition and Charge of the Evaluating Committee:

1. Where the recommendation in question concerns the reappointment, tenure, and/or promotion of a candidate holding assistant professor rank, the Evaluating Committee for purposes of review shall consist of those permanently-tenured full-time departmental faculty holding the rank of associate professor or full professor.
2. In all remaining questions of reappointment, promotion, and tenure, the Evaluating Committee shall consist solely of the full professors of the Department.
3. The role of the Evaluating Committee is that of advising the Chair, with whom the final decision to recommend for reappointment, tenure and/or promotion or to decide against it remains.

ζ. Decision Procedure:

1. Sufficient time shall be allowed for careful, judicious, and conscientious evaluation of the materials in the candidate's dossier. The completed file of collected materials shall be given to the members of the Evaluating Committee involved in the review process at least two weeks before the first meeting at which the candidate's case is discussed.
2. All materials handled by the Evaluating Committee must be kept confidential and returned to the Chair after the final decision has been made.
3. At least one meeting of the assembled Evaluating Committee should be devoted to a thorough discussion of the candidate in question. At either this or at a later meeting, a final recommendation of the Evaluating Committee to the Chair should be developed. Again, the Chair should caution the members that all such discussions are confidential, and the Chair should review University, College and Department criteria for tenure and/or promotion. The Chair ought also to remind his or her colleagues that their advice is, in the final analysis, advice; the final decision remains the Chair's. When the candidate's dossier has been discussed sufficiently for an evaluation to be made, the Chair will request the members of the Evaluating Committee to vote by secret ballot on an appropriate action. In the case of an assistant professor, the options will be promotion to associate professor with tenure, non-reappointment, or in exceptional circumstances reappointment as an assistant professor with tenure. It is a University requirement that the "assembled full professors" of the unit meet to discuss and vote upon the committee's recommendations. In the Department of Philosophy, that discussion is followed by a vote of the assembled full professors and tenured associate professors regarding the proposed promotion to associate professor with tenure. The faculty's vote is advisory to the Chair, who either recommends promotion to associate professor with

tenure or decides against reappointment. The Chair will record the vote. The votes of full professors and tenured associate professors (if any) will be reported separately.

4. Before informing the faculty of his or her decision, the Chair will notify the candidate. However, that notification will not be given for twenty four hours after the final meeting in order to give the Chair ample time to think it through. The Chair's recommendation to confer tenure and promotion or decision not to do so will then be forwarded to the Dean accompanied with the recorded concurrence and dissent of the Evaluating Committee.
5. When the Chair's decision is final the colleague under review must be informed. If the Chair decides against reappointment at the end of the second probationary term, the assistant professor shall be notified in writing of the Chair's decision no less than 12 months before his or her current term ends. A faculty member has the right to an administrative conference with the Chair and, if necessary, with the Dean of the College, along with such other appeal rights as are afforded under the "Trustee Policies and Regulations Governing Academic Tenure in the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill."
6. The Chair shall forward the candidate's completed dossier together with the final recommendation or decision, as well as the results of the poll of the Evaluating Committee, recorded as described above, to the Dean of the College of Arts & Sciences.

B. Associate Professor, Full Professor, and Post-Tenure Review

The procedures set out in α - ζ above for reappointment, promotion and/or tenure decisions concerning untenured assistant professors also govern decisions to confer tenure (and possibly promotion) on untenured associate professors and promotion decisions concerning tenured assistant and associate professors, with appropriate modification as specified by university and college policies.

Untenured Associate Professor. Initial appointment to the rank of untenured associate professor is for the probationary term of five years. An untenured associate professor is reviewed no later than the fourth year of this probationary term since no less than 12 months before the end of this term, the associate professor must be notified in writing whether he or she will be reappointed with tenure, promoted to professor, or recommended for non-reappointment.

The Department's assembled voting faculty shall review the untenured associate professor's scholarship, teaching, and service. Outside letters of evaluation are required for appointment as an associate professor with tenure, or for an appointment as full professor, which confers tenure. It is a University requirement that the Chair consult with the "assembled full professors" of the unit before acting upon a recommendation. The faculty's vote is advisory to the Chair, who either recommends tenure (and, if also being considered, promotion to full professor) or decides against tenure (and, if also being considered, promotion to full professor).

Full Professor. An associate professor who has completed five years and has been reappointed at the same rank with tenure must be reviewed every five years to meet the post-tenure review requirement of the University, and is eligible to be reviewed for possible promotion to full

professor on the same schedule. Since the University's Tenure Regulations were revised, effective July 1, 2004, it has been possible for reviews for promotion to full professor and post-tenure reviews for tenured associate professors to take place simultaneously.

Every five years, associate professors with tenure must have an internal review that constitutes their required post-tenure review. If the faculty member wishes to be considered for promotion to full professor at that time, then recommendation letters from outside the institution are solicited as part of that review. If the faculty member does not wish to be reviewed for possible promotion at that time, only the internal review is carried out.

The Department's assembled voting faculty shall review the tenured associate professor's scholarship, teaching, and service. Outside letters of evaluation are required for promotion to full professor. It is a University requirement that the Chair consult with the "assembled full professors" of the unit before acting upon a recommendation. The faculty's vote is advisory to the Chair, who either recommends promotion to full professor or decides against promotion.

Out of cycle reviews. If a tenured associate professor, with the concurrence of the Department, wishes to be considered for review for early promotion before his/her scheduled five-year review, an out-of-cycle review may take place. If the faculty member requests a full out-of-cycle review and the Department full professors believe that not enough has been done to warrant consideration for promotion, the Chair has the right to recommend denying the request on the advice of the full professors. The Chair must give the reasons for recommending denial and communicate these reasons to the faculty member in writing.

Post-Tenure Review. Since 1997, post-tenure review has been mandated by UNC General Administration on orders from the Board of Governors in response to a directive of the NC General Assembly that a system of periodic review of the performance of tenured faculty be implemented. Our Department has a separate set of post-tenure review policies. Post-tenure review applies to all tenured faculty, except as otherwise specified by University or College policy with regard to its timing for faculty who are department chairs, senior associate deans, and deans.

C. Untenured Faculty Annual Review

The Department Chair must perform evaluations of untenured assistant and associate professors every year. These evaluations are especially important for setting goals, clarifying expectations, and providing mentoring. After meeting with the untenured faculty member, the Chair must write a report of the evaluation, provide a copy to the faculty member in question, and place one in his or her personnel file.

The evaluation should provide a clear assessment of the faculty member's work that year in research, teaching and service. It should be clear about goals on which the untenured professor and the Chair agree. It should not explicitly comment on or venture a prediction regarding any later decision to grant tenure to the faculty member. On the contrary, the evaluation should include a disclaimer: "This evaluation is not an indication of the likelihood of a positive or negative recommendation regarding tenure but rather summarizes and assesses the activities in

which you have been engaged for the past year.” The Dean’s Office should be notified when these reviews are completed.

Part II. Policies on Fixed-Term Faculty

Instructions regarding completion of this Part II will be provided at a later date.