School of Education (SoE)

University of North Carolina-Chapel Hill

Policy Manual for Faculty Appointments, Promotions, and Tenure (APT)

**Approved by School of Education Faculty December 1, 2021
September 1, 2022 (Part VI)**

**Reviewed and approved by Legal Counsel March 14, 2022
(Parts I, II, III, V, VII) September 30, 2022 (Part VI)**

**Post-Tenure Review Policy approved by School of Education
Faculty in May 2023; policy pending University review.**

Table of Contents

Part I: Introduction

This Policy Manual contains the School of Education policies and procedures on appointment, reappointment, promotion, and tenure. Its purpose is to provide clear and detailed guidance to both tenure track and fixed-term faculty regarding expectations for appointment and advancement within the School of Education. As such, it will guide evaluation decisions and can facilitate career planning by faculty. Recommendations made by the Dean and faculty based on these policies and procedures are subject to review at higher levels within the University. The University-wide review procedures may apply standards that are modifications or differences in emphases with regard to teaching, research, and service expectations for members of the faculty of The University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill. When University policies are provided in this Manual, they are presented in italics. The University policies are specified in the following documents:

(1)   *The Code of the Board of Governors of The University of North Carolina (*https://www.northcarolina.edu/apps/policy/index.php#policy-tab).

(2)   *Trustee Policies and Regulations Governing Academic Tenure in The University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill* (https://www.northcarolina.edu/apps/policy/index.php#policy-tab).

(3)   The *Faculty Code of University Government* (https://www.northcarolina.edu/apps/policy/index.php#policy-tab).

(4)   The *Equal Employment Opportunity Plan and Report of The University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill*. (https://eoc.unc.edu/wp-content/uploads/sites/201/2021/04/2021-Federal-Narrative-Final.pdf).

Trustee Policies and Regulations Governing Academic Tenure in the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill contains the following regarding academic tenure:

Academic tenure refers to the conditions and guarantees that apply to a faculty member's employment. More specifically, it refers to the protection of a faculty member against involuntary suspension, demotion, discharge, or termination from employment by the University except upon specified grounds and in accordance with specified procedures. Those grounds and procedures are exclusively as provided in Section 3 (suspension, demotion, and discharge) and Section 6 (termination for financial exigency or elimination or major curtailment of a program) hereof. The purposes intended to be served by the protections of academic tenure to faculty members are to secure their freedom and to aid this University in attracting and retaining faculty members of the high quality it seeks. While academic tenure may be withheld on any grounds other than those specifically stated to be impermissible under Section 4 hereof, its conferral requires an assessment of institutional needs and resources and evidence of service to the academic community, potential for future contribution, commitment to the welfare of the University, and demonstrated professional competence, including consideration of commitment to effective teaching, research, and public service. (https://academicpersonnel.unc.edu/wp-content/uploads/sites/1069/2020/02/UNC-Chapel-Hill-Tenure-Policies-and-Procedures.pdf)

The Report of the UNC Task Force on Future Promotion and Tenure Policies and Practices (10/5/09) provides the following description of tenure:

The conferral of tenure at the University of North Carolina carries significant privileges as well

as responsibilities on the part of both the university and the faculty member. For the faculty member, tenure grants the right to engage in free inquiry in both teaching and research without fear of reprisal. Tenure also provides job security. Tenured faculty provide the university a vigorous exchange of ideas in both scholarship and the class, and a stable, high quality professional staff loyal to the institution.

The Report of the UNC-Chapel Hill Task Force on Promotion and Tenure Policies and Practices (2020) included recommendations related to tenure and promotion policies and practices that all units on campus are to address. This 2022 School of Education Appointment, Promotion, and Tenure Manual addresses the following recommendations from that report:

1. Early Promotion and Tenure Decisions
2. Management of External Offers and Promotion Review
3. Recognizing Research Methodologist and Varied Funding Sources in the Tenure/Promotion Process
4. Timing of Permanent Tenure Actions
5. Reporting of School-Level Tenure Denials to the University
6. Search Waivers and Recruitment
7 Fixed-Term Faculty
9. Orienting Administrators and Faculty Members
10. Under-Represented Minority Faculty Experiences
11. Mentoring

Given the occasion to engage in significant revision to this manual, the faculty of the School of Education also endeavored to revise text across all sections to improve clarity and transparency in the tenure and promotion process. Following recommendations from the 2009 UNC Task Force Report on Future Promotion and Tenure Policies and Practices, the tenure and promotion policies and procedures outlined in this manual should be revised at least every 10 years.

Part II: Tenure Track Positions Appointment, Promotion and Tenure

General

Tenure-track faculty members are essential to the overall mission of the School of Education, including teaching, research/scholarship, and service. Tenure-track faculty may hold joint appointments with other schools or departments, or they may be appointed to fixed-term appointments in other schools, departments, centers, or institutes.

Recruitment and Selection: The recruitment and selection process will comply with all federal and state laws, regulations, and policies and will give equal employment opportunity to all applicants, without regard to race, religion, color, creed, national origin, sex, age, disability, sexual orientation or veteran statues. The final selection decision will be made from among the most qualified applicants.

The School of Education may use a search waiver under special circumstances to hire outside of the formal recruitment process, following UNC Equal Opportunity and Compliance Office (EOC) guidelines.

Waivers for searches should be carefully considered and utilized cautiously to ensure confidence in the open search process and to ensure equal opportunity at UNC-Chapel Hill.

Searches with five or fewer applicants need approval by the Provost Office before interviews can begin. The department must submit the position description, recruitment plan, and an explanation for why the number of applicants is five or fewer. The Provost Office should provide a response within three business days to avoid delays in the application and interview processes.

Consideration of Prior Career Experience in Recruitment and Appointment: The offer letter to a prospective candidate should explain how previous career experiences as a faculty member would relate to the timing and criteria of a possible promotion and/or tenure review at UNC-Chapel Hill. Explicit use of previous university teaching, research, and service experience for tenure or promotion decisions at UNC-Chapel Hill should be clearly established in the offer letter. The use of previous university teaching, research, and service will need to be conveyed to all external letter writers and to the various Promotion and Tenure committees that review the dossier, including the relevant Senior Faculty in the School of Education. Evidence of teaching effectiveness at the immediate previous university (peer or student teaching evaluations) will in these cases be examined for promotion and tenure decisions at UNC-Chapel Hill.

Sustained faculty accomplishment should be the hallmark of readiness for promotion and tenure at UNC-Chapel Hill. Training, service, or previous employment at an elite/peer institution should not replace actual faculty accomplishment as a criterion in UNC-Chapel Hill's hiring, promotion, and tenure processes.

In lieu of a decision to accept experience from previous university service, it is assumed the accomplishments evaluated for promotion or tenure will be based upon the time at UNC-Chapel Hill. If evidence of previous teaching effectiveness is not available or is not compelling, time at UNC-Chapel Hill will be used to collect sufficient evidence.

Initial Appointment to Tenure Track Faculty Positions

Instructor. This position is a tenure-track position used for an initial appointment where the individual meets the standards for the position of assistant professor, with the exception of the completion of the doctoral dissertation. It is expected that the person will fulfill all qualifications for the doctorate during the first year with the School of Education, and at such time the individual may be promoted under the specific provisions as stated under University Trustee Policies and Regulations and by School standards. However, this promotion is not guaranteed per Section 2.b.4 of the University Trustee Policies and Regulations.

Assistant Professor. This position is a tenure-track position with an initial probationary term of four years and the possibility of reappointment for three more years. Persons appointed to this position should have demonstrated potential to contribute through teaching, research, and service as evidenced by completion of a dissertation, publications, establishment of a research focus, and prior teaching experience or evidence of teaching potential; the candidate should show promise of progression in rank.

Associate Professor. Newly recruited associate professors coming with tenure from another university will be assessed by the dean for whether or not to recommend tenure at the time of offer to UNC-Chapel Hill. Based upon this recommendation, the vote of the senior faculty is required to extend the offer of tenure at UNC-Chapel Hill at the time of the offer. In these cases, UNC-Chapel Hill will generally award tenure with the new appointment or as soon as possible thereafter if there is compelling evidence the individual meets UNC-Chapel Hill's expectations in terms of scholarship and creative endeavor, teaching, and service. The recommendation to award tenure will be reviewed by the campus APT Committee, the Provost, and the Board of Trustees. This assessment will consider:

(a)　The entire body of scholarly, creative, service, and educational accomplishment prior to coming to UNC-Chapel Hill.
(b)　Evidence that the new faculty member will contribute to the multiple missions of the School of Education.
(c)　External letters from reviewers who may be familiar with the body of work at the previous university.
(d)　In the unusual case of the associate professor arriving with that rank from another university which does not grant tenure at the associate professor level, the faculty member will be considered for tenure at UNC-Chapel Hill based upon UNC- Chapel Hill's criteria.
(e)　In cases where a faculty member has been approved for tenure at another university but is waiting for tenure there to become final and official, the faculty member will similarly be considered for tenure at UNC-Chapel Hill at the time of offer, as described above.
(f)　For a faculty member who was tenured at a previous university with clearly less-demanding criteria than at UNC-Chapel Hill and/or was in a position that did not provide the necessary experiences to establish a record in a critical area (e.g., teaching), but who still wishes to move to UNC-Chapel Hill, they may be offered a position at a lower rank or a position at rank without tenure.

Newly recruited associate professors **coming without tenure** from another university or having been assistant professors at the 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 UNC-Chapel Hill school.

If it is the judgment of the dean that the untenured associate professor has demonstrated compelling evidence of meeting UNC-Chapel Hill's criteria for tenure in terms of scholarly and creative activity, teaching and service, they may initiate formal consideration for tenure during the initial probationary appointment.

Professor. The position of professor is a tenure-track position. Promotion or appointment to the rank of professor confers permanent tenure on persons who do not already have tenure. Persons appointed or promoted to this position should have documented evidence of a substantial level of attainment in teaching, research, and service as evidenced by a sustained publication record of sufficient quality and quantity, national recognition for their work, and indications of effective teaching and service.

During the first semester of hire, the Dean or Dean's designee will share documents about and an orientation to the promotion and/or tenure process with assistant and associate professors.

Tenure And/Or Promotion

Decisions on faculty appointments are based in part upon qualitative criteria that cannot be reduced to quantitative specifications. It is possible, however, to identify major areas of consideration for faculty

decisions, and to provide examples of the types of information that are considered in making decisions.

Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion (DEI) Work
The School of Education values research, teaching, and service activities with under-represented populations. All faculty under review for promotion and/or tenure may include a section on Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion on their vita and in their professional statement, which will contain a narrative or bullets about how the work of the faculty member has affected issues of inclusion. This would be similar to the existing narrative sections on research, teaching and service. In the DEI section, faculty members could review their scholarship, creative endeavors, teaching, mentorship, and service that relates to inclusion and diversity.

No faculty member should experience pressure to move away from a research focus on underrepresented groups, nor should faculty be pressured to engage in research, teaching, or service specifically focused on URM issues.

Meet the Mark Criteria for Promotion and/or Tenure

The promotion of tenure-track faculty members requires demonstrated and sustained evidence of both excellence and productivity in research and scholarship. For promotion to associate professor with tenure, assistant professors are expected to demonstrate promise and potential to develop into leaders in their field, as evidenced by progression and excellence in their scholarship each year; strong teaching and a clear commitment to improving their teaching capacities; and recognition as helpful and valued colleagues, who have conscientiously performed needed service within the academic and professional community. For promotion to full professor, associate professors are expected to demonstrate their potential fulfilled as scholar leaders in their field, as evidenced by sustained, positive contributions to scholarship; established peer recognition within their subspecialty at the national and/or international level; established effectiveness as an instructor and advisor to students; and must have provided substantial service the School of Education, the profession, and the University.

Specific Meet-the-Mark criteria for the areas of research, teaching, and service are outlined in Tables 1, 2, and 3, respectively. Promotion and tenure decisions require a holistic assessment across all of the criteria outlined in these tables. The candidate must develop a portfolio that demonstrates the Meet-the-Mark criteria, which includes a 6–8-page professional statement that summarizes and provides an overview of the candidate's research and scholarship, teaching, and service activities and contributions; a C.V., copies of their publications, and the products listed in Appendix A.

Research and Scholarship

Research and scholarship include the systematic collection and analysis of data and information for the generation of new knowledge, verification of knowledge, and/or revision of existing knowledge regarding, broadly, the education and development of children, youth, and adults. Included are individual, collaborative, and interdisciplinary activities, and work focused on significant educational issues that address individual, school, family, community, or other systems level problems and concerns to enhance the education, development, and well-being of children, youth, and adults. Research and scholarship may be undertaken in a wide range of settings, including schools, communities, homes, clinics, laboratories, field settings, and libraries, as well as derived from secondary and other available data sets. Activities may be in collaboration with other faculty, individuals from other disciplines, public or private organizations, or agencies. Research and scholarship include empirical work (e.g., qualitative, quantitative, mixed, and other accepted methods), philosophical investigations, theoretical conceptualizations, and methodological contributions that influence the research and practice of others.

Competence, accomplishment, and reputation in research and scholarship are documented through evidence such as the kinds listed below. An overall assessment of a program of research involves a synthesis of evidence regarding the quantity of research products, their quality, and markers of their impact.

Table 1: Criteria for Promotion to Associate or Full Professor - Research

Criteria for Promotion to Associate Professor	Criteria for Promotion to Full Professor
An identifiable, coherent, and promising program of research with evidence of impact on their field commensurate with peers.	An identifiable, coherent, and influential program of research with evidence of impact on their field commensurate with established experts in the field.
A strong record of original, peer-reviewed scholarly products published in respected venues. The candidate should drive the intellectual leadership on a substantial number of the scholarly products.	A consistent and exemplary record of original, peer-reviewed scholarly products published in respected venues. The candidate should drive the intellectual leadership on a substantial number of the scholarly products.
Testimony from external letters of review that the candidate has produced high-quality, substantive scholarship that has contributed to the field with emerging promise to be recognized as a leading scholar in their area of scholarship.	Testimony from external letters of review that the candidate has produced exemplary, substantive scholarship that has made a significant impact upon the field and that the candidate is recognized as a leading scholar in their area of scholarship.
Evidence of competitive attempts to secure funding as principal investigator or co-principal investigator for scholarship from sources external to the School of Education as is appropriate for the candidate's subdiscipline.	Successful earning of funding for scholarship from sources external to the School of Education, as principal or co-principal investigator as is appropriate for the candidate's subdiscipline.
Evidence of a positive scholarly trajectory	Evidence of a continued positive scholarly trajectory commensurate with established experts in the field.

Definition of Research and Scholarly Products

The following are demonstrations of evidence in both quantity and quality of research and scholarship. Evidence may be published or in press.

- Peer-reviewed publications that make a significant contribution to a particular line of inquiry, as evidenced by markers of impact including but not limited to citation indices or evident journal prestige (e.g., journal of a national organization). Peer-reviewed publications that address diversity, equity, and inclusion can be recognized as significant contributions even in cases in which traditional measures of impact (e.g., impact factors, inclusion in established indices) do not adequately capture the significance of the work.
- Books from well-regarded publishers that make a significant contribution to a particular line of inquiry. Markers of impact can include but are not limited to citation indices or published positive evaluations of the scholarship (e.g., book reviews).
- PI or co-PI on funding external to the School of Education, including awards from the university, state, federal government, and private sponsors.
- Handbook or book chapters that make a significant contribution to a particular line of inquiry
- Participation in collaborative/team science where the candidate has made substantial contribution to the design, implementation, and/or dissemination of the research, including non-lead authored publication as research methodologist on funded research awards.
- Peer-reviewed, published conference proceedings or research reports that make a significant contribution to a particular area of inquiry, and that are accepted by the specific research community to be rigorous outlets for research
- New methods or instrumentation for conducting research
- Awards and fellowships for completed and proposed research
- Evidence that research has stimulated the work of other researchers or provided new breakthroughs in the field. Impact of research may influence education practice, theory, or policy.

The following may be considered as evidence but carry less weight than the products listed above:

- Conference papers
- Submitted but unfunded grant proposals
- Reports or white papers resulting from collaborations with external partners to address educationally significant issues
- Reviews of books or articles
- Published curriculum

Teaching

Teaching is a fundamental mission of the university and is an important aspect of all tenure-track and tenured faculty promotion decisions. Teaching is delivered in a variety of modes (i.e.,in-person, virtual/online, or hybrid formats) and takes place in a variety of settings (e.g., formal university classroom or research setting, informal learning settings, school settings, and other settings appropriate for the supervision of students in professional preparation programs who engaged in practica, internships, or other clinical/field-based activities). Teaching includes the supervision of undergraduate and master's theses and projects, doctoral dissertations and capstones, and other forms of student research. Teaching may also include collaborating with and providing related training to field-based supervisors (i.e., practicing professionals).

Course-based teaching should be evaluated through multiple methods. Peer teaching observations should address the content, process, and outcomes of teaching. Content includes the course goals, course syllabi, course texts and readings, audio/visual materials, class assignments, and laboratory or field- based assignments. Process includes the delivery of content and the ability to effectively engage students in the teaching/learning process. Outcome is most often determined through student course evaluations, but may also include other forms of outcome evaluation such as indications of student mastery of content, the evaluation of other impacts of one's teaching (e.g., widely adopted published curricula and other learning modules), and teaching honors.

Faculty course-based teaching performance shall be evaluated based only on the courses taught. The presence, absence, or number of course buyouts and releases should not reflect either positively or negatively upon the evaluation of a faculty member's teaching and should not influence the evaluation of the faculty member's teaching in any way.

Table 2: Criteria for Promotion to Associate or Full Professor – Teaching

Criteria for Promotion to Associate Professor	Criteria for Promotion to Full Professor
Course evaluation scores on items required by SoE policy that demonstrate teaching competence and/or evidence of positive growth on those items	Course evaluation scores on items required by SoE policy that demonstrate consistent competence and/or evidence of growth of course evaluations
Testimony from peer observation that candidate is a promising instructor	Testimony from peer observation that candidate is a competent instructor
Evidence of impact on student learning	Evidence of impact on student learning
Evidence of activities to evaluate and improve one's teaching	Evidence of activities to evaluate and improve one's teaching
Contributions to student success outside of formal instruction, such as serving on committees for undergraduate and master's theses and projects, doctoral dissertations and capstones, and other forms of student research as well as student advisement and serving on student program committees	Contributions to student success outside of formal instruction, such as serving and leading on committees for undergraduate and master's theses and projects, doctoral dissertations and capstones, and other forms of student research as well as student advisement and serving and leading on student program committees

Definition of Teaching Products

All candidates under review for promotion and/or tenure must provide the following evidence:

- A 3–5-page statement of philosophy of teaching that includes a statement of guiding values, theories, and/or perspectives on effective teaching, how these views/theories/perspectives influence one's practice, an evidence-based self-evaluation of one's strengths and limitations.
- A table that lists all courses taught since the last appointment, reappointment, promotion, and/or tenure, with a designation of new course development where applicable.
    - Table should be ordered by semester, with most recent semester first.
    - Course and instructor evaluation items, as specified by SoE policy, should be included for each course.
    - Course releases and buyouts should be indicated in the semester they occurred.
    - Electronic links to all syllabi with text, readings, and assignments identified should be included, or copies of the syllabi provided.
- Copies of student course evaluations of all listed courses.
- Peer teaching observation report, which should be completed as described under Section VI "Peer Teaching Evaluations of Teaching".
- A list of four students, of whom two will be contacted by the APT review subcommittee to write a letter regarding the candidate's instruction.
- List of undergraduate honors, and master's and doctoral committee advisement, including student name and role on the committee.
- Samples of student work supervised by the candidate.
- Evidence of activities to evaluate and improve one's teaching. Specific efforts to improve one's teaching, such as attendance at seminars or workshops or participation in peer mentoring, should be noted. Goals and plans for future teaching enhancement should be included.

Candidates under review for promotion and/or tenure may include the following:

- Honors and awards received for teaching or mentoring.
- Information on teaching methods, course content, other learning experiences, curriculum development or revision, contributions to educational theory, or empirical studies on teaching.
- Grants to support and enhance instructional activities.
- Invitations to serve as a consultant in educational programs and methods.

Service

Service can encompass both professional and service to the public. Professional service is service to the academy and scholarly community and may occur in various arenas: the School of Education, the University, and professional communities. This service is undertaken at the local, state, and/or national levels. All faculty members in the School of Education are expected to share in service work necessary to maintain operations of the School and University and contribute to the maintenance and growth of their profession.

Faculty members are also encouraged to serve communities and the public at large in a professional capacity that provides benefits to broader society and enhances the stature of the University.

Service contributions must be evaluated holistically, including consideration of the quantity of service activities, the nature of those activities, the impact of the service, and the overall amount of effort.

Table 3: Criteria for Promotion to Associate or Full Professor - Service

Criteria for Promotion to Associate Professor	Criteria for Promotion to Full Professor
Engagement with prominent professional organizations within or related to the candidate's field	Leadership and engagement with prominent professional organizations within or related to the candidate's field
Participating in peer-review processes	Leadership in peer-review processes (e.g., editorial board membership, editorial

	positions)
Contributing to SoE activities important to SoE functioning (e.g., committee work) and/or new initiatives (e.g., special projects)	Developing and/or leading SoE activities important to SoE functioning (e.g., committee work) and/or new initiatives (e.g., special projects)
	Contributing to and/or leading activities and/or initiatives important to the operation of the University (e.g. UNC Faculty Council)

Definition of Professional Service Activities

The following are demonstrations of professional service contributions.

- Mentoring assistant and/or associate professors
- Membership on standing and/or ad hoc committees of the Program, School, University, State, Federal Government, or within the profession
- Leadership of standing and/or ad hoc committees of the Program, School, University, or within the profession
- Other contributions to faculty governance (e.g., conducting special studies for the Program, School, or University)
- Serving in an administrative capacity for the School or University
- Membership on, or leadership of, panel or ad-hoc reviewing for external funding agencies
- Leadership in professional organizations
- Reviewing proposals for professional organization meetings
- Serving as an editor, associate editor, or on the editorial board of a professional journal
- Reviewing manuscripts for professional journals
- Serving as external reviewer for faculty promotion and/or tenure cases
- Participation or consultation to an accreditation or other educational review board (e.g., NCATE, APA, NCDPI)
- Providing professional development for non-university individuals in the field
- Program evaluations at local, state, and national levels that is not compensated as consultation or funded through grant work
- Professional service to local communities and/or external constituencies that is not compensated as consultation or funded through grant work

Recognition and Value of "Invisible Labor" in Service Activities

"Invisible labor" for faculty members must be made evident and should be accounted for on the vita used in appointments, promotions and tenure actions. "Invisible Labor" refers to roles undertaken by faculty from underrepresented groups, that enable an institution to have diverse representation and participation on search and administrative committees or projects; it is labelled "invisible" because it is often unseen, undocumented and not valued in advancement, promotion, tenure, and compensation decisions. Such service may include contributions nationally, internationally and on campus.

Administration

Definition

Administration is defined as those activities that are contractually obligated, which are associated with leadership, management, and/or financial direction of an academic or other organizational unit of the School. These units are typically identified in an administrative organizational chart. These leaders hold such titles as chair, coordinator, director, assistant or associate dean, and are officially designated by the Dean. Faculty whose contracts do not include formal assignment of administration responsibilities will record administrative activities as service.

Examples of Administrative Service

Administrative activities may include: determination and/or facilitation of policy or other decisions affecting the unit; leadership; management and evaluation of unit faculty and staff; responsibility for program development, management, and operations for the unit; responding to the needs and concerns of students or other constituents of the unit; and financial responsibility for the unit's activities or for securing funding for the unit.

Evidence

Sources of information should be provided which can enable reviewers to make an informed judgment about quality of performance with respect to the major administrative responsibilities of the position. In this regard, a clear description of those responsibilities as provided by the administrator, or the Dean (as appropriate) is a necessary prerequisite for evaluation. Evidence may be obtained from multiple sources including the administrator, fellow or senior administrators, faculty, students, and staff of the administrator's unit, and publics served by the unit. In all instances, the focus of the evidence should be on the quality of administrative performance. The following list is not exhaustive but includes the types of evidence that might be submitted.

- Administrator's summary of major administrative activities and accomplishments and their importance/relevance to the unit, School, University, or other constituents served by the unit
- Evidence of strong leadership and vision
- Awards or other recognition for administrative accomplishments
- Evidence of facilitating program coordination/development activities
- Evidence of financial or other support generated for the unit
- Evidence of fiscal accountability of the unit
- Reports submitted to supervisors and/or external agencies
- Surveys or other systematically collected data from faculty, students, and/or staff about perceived performance level with respect to the major administrative responsibilities of the position.

Timing of Promotion and/or Tenure Review

It should be considered a rare event for an assistant professor to be considered for promotion at the time of first reappointment as a probationary assistant professor. Consideration for promotion and/or tenure with a submitted dossier should not generally occur in less than four years at UNC-Chapel Hill (except for those with years of previous experience that is recognized in the letter of offer). It should be considered a rare event for an associate professor with tenure to be considered for promotion to full professor with a submitted dossier in less than four years in rank. However, unusually high levels of accomplishment may be considered in the timing of an earlier promotion or tenure review. Additionally, competitive external offers that convey higher rank or tenure may be a rationale for an earlier promotion or tenure review.

Management of External Offers

The School of Education aspires to retain accomplished faculty members when possible.
Faculty who are recruited from another university or employer are encouraged to share written recruitment visit invitations or other written evidence of candidacy (e.g., job talk, being on a short list of candidates), rather than delay discussion of a counteroffer until a formal offer from another institution or employer is in hand.
Counteroffers for faculty will not typically be extended more than once every five years. Exceptions to this policy will require explicit approval from the Provost in advance of a counter offer.

Part III: Fixed-term Faculty Appointment, Reappointment, and Promotion

General

Fixed-term faculty members, like tenure-track faculty members, are an important part of the overall instructional, research, and service efforts in the School of Education (SoE). Fixed-term faculty members are appointed for a period of one to five years depending on the availability of resources and needs and may be either part-time or fulltime. They may have principal or joint appointments in other units of the University.

Approval to Conduct Search: Searches for new fixed-term faculty are approved in writing at the level of the Dean. New appointments to the fixed-term ranks should be proposed only when necessary and appropriate for the School. Fixed-term appointments can be made to satisfy instructional, research, and/or administrative needs. Initial appointments greater than 3 years and more than $100,000 in salary require Provost approval.

Recruitment and Selection: The recruitment and selection process will comply with all federal and state laws, regulations and policies, and will give equal employment opportunity to all applicants, without regard to race, religion, color, creed, national origin, sex, age, disability, sexual orientation or veteran status. The final selection decision will be made from among the most qualified applicants.

Faculty review: All fixed-term faculty appointments that exceed one year must be recommended by the senior faculty of the SoE. All fixed-term reappointments and promotions must also be recommended by the senior faculty of the School.

Decisions: Decisions on faculty appointments are based in part upon qualitative criteria that cannot be reduced to quantitative specifications. It is possible, however, to identify major areas of consideration for faculty decisions, and to provide examples of the types of information that are considered in making decisions.

Appointment to Fixed-term Faculty Positions

Fixed-term faculty members are expected to hold a doctorate degree in education or closely related fields. An exception can be made by the Dean in the case of Professors of the Practice if they bring special expertise to their appointment.

Instructors

A lecturer refers to a person whose primary responsibility is teaching and might include some service at the SoE level. Appointment to this position is usually governed by the availability and source of funding, and the special nature of the work that will be performed

Professors of the Practice

Appointment as a Professor of the Practice is reserved for senior level professionals who have obtained a high level of recognition for their performance in settings outside the University, such as in school administration or public service. It is expected, but not required, that these individuals hold the doctorate in their field of expertise. Such individuals may be appointed to part time or full-time positions for a period of one to five years, with the possibility of reappointment for consecutive appointments or at intervals.

Clinical/Research Professorships: Assistant Professor, Associate Professor, or Professor

Persons appointed to one of these positions should be working closely with the SoE. Appointment to such a position is usually governed by the availability and source of funding, and by the special nature of the

work that will be performed. In the SoE, "Clinical Faculty" include fixed-term faculty members whose primary responsibility is teaching and/or administration. "Research Faculty" include fixed-term faculty members whose primary responsibility is research and whose positions are mostly funded on grants and/or contracts. It is expected that, at least, 75% of a research faculty member's salary is covered on grants and contracts, with high preference for research faculty to fully fund their salaries. Exceptions to the 75% threshold could granted by the Dean in specific cases.

Persons appointed to any professorial rank in a clinical or research capacity are expected to meet the general professional standards at the rank to which they are appointed. A person may be appointed in a clinical or research position if they excel in one or more areas (research, teaching, service, administration) without necessarily making contributions in all areas. A clinical or research appointment is not extended simply as a courtesy, but rather is initiated or approved when it serves to fulfill a well-defined need of the School.

General Responsibilities within the School

Service includes professional and public activities within and outside the University. All faculty members in the SoE, including fulltime fixed-term faculty, are expected to provide service to the School and to participate fully in faculty responsibilities, including attendance and participation in faculty meetings, serving on and chairing committees, sharing in the work necessary to maintain the operations of the School, and contributing to the growth of the School through efforts aimed at improving programs and facilities. Examples include program coordination activities, participation in recruitment and admission of students, development of field placements, serving on committees (e.g., curriculum committees, search committees, planning committees, governance committees), serving on and chairing committees for master's students, and serving on committees for doctoral students. In specific cases, exceptions can be asked and granted for fixed-term faculty members to chair committees for doctoral students.

Service contributions can be evaluated through the quality and quantity of the service and through documentation of the influence and quality of the person's work. Fixed-term faculty members (with the exception of lecturers) are also expected to contribute to the maintenance and growth of their profession. A fulltime fixed-term faculty member is held to a higher standard for service than their part time fixed-term counterpart. Full time fixed-term faculty will be held to the same criteria as tenure track faculty in their assigned area of responsibility.

Review of Fixed-Term Appointments

Appointment, Reappointment, or Promotion
Initial appointments are related to specific needs within the School. For individuals in fixed-term positions initially appointed to fulfill a specific need of the School, decisions to pursue reappointment or promotion should relate directly to the performance of the individual in relation to the specific reasons for initial appointment, and to the continuing needs and resources of the School.

Lecturers. Initial appointments for lecturers with 50% or higher appointments are triggered by requests from program coordinators to help address short-term instructional needs (e.g., resulting from faculty leaves, and/or course buyouts or releases; unanticipated enrollment growth of a certain program, and/or other emergencies). Initial appointments are made for a fixed-term of one year, and could be renewed in one-year intervals. Subsequent appointments may be either in direct succession or at intervals. Reappointment of lecturers for an additional one-year term is determined by availability of funding, continuing instructional needs, and teaching performance. These requests are communicated to the Dean's office and eventually approved by the senior faculty.

Professors of the Practice. Initial appointments for Professor of the Practice may arise through special opportunities presented to the Dean or to individual faculty or programs. Requests to consider a Professor of the Practice appointment will be reviewed initially by the Dean, for alignment with School of Education priorities. Appointment, and subsequent reappointment of professors of practice for an additional one-year term is determined by availability of funding, continuing alignment with programmatic needs, and performance. Requests for appointment and reappointment to Professor of the Practice are approved initially by the Dean and subsequently reviewed and voted on by the senior faculty.

Clinical Faculty. Initial appointments for clinical faculty members (i.e., faculty whose primary responsibilities are teaching and/or administration) with 50% or higher appointment follow the same process and timeline of the tenure-line faculty members as articulated in the "call for new faculty positions" process. Appointments are to a rank consistent with experiences but must adhere to the terms of the position for which a person is being recruited. An initial appointment may be for a fixed term of one to five years, as determined by the Dean, based on SoE resources available to support the position and the financial circumstances of the University and the School. Initial appointments that are greater than 3 years and more than $100,000 in salary require Provost approval. The appointment may be for part time or full-time work.

Considerations for reappointment of clinical faculty members are triggered by contract expiration dates, with identification of expiring contracts at the beginning of two semesters prior to the expiration. The Dean's office will review the availability of resources to support reappointment. Pending the availability of resources, the Dean will ask the HR director to initiate the reappointment process. First, the HR director will ask the Program Coordinator to complete a Fixed-term Appointment-Reappointment Form that includes a statement of the program need, the fit of the candidate for this need, and what the candidate will provide during the reappointment period; a table of courses taught with the overall instructor and student course ratings; additional student evaluations; the candidate's curriculum vita. The Program Coordinator (or Area Chair if the candidate is also the Program Coordinator) hosts a discussion of the reappointment among program faculty. The faculty in the program may agree to support or not support the recommendation. In some cases, area faculty members might examine the request for reappointment as appropriate for the program in question. The Program Coordinator or Area Chair communicates the program faculty's recommendation to the HR director who summarizes information on all fixed-term appointments/reappointments for review by the senior faculty and Dean. When possible, review for reappointment, including the senior faculty vote, will occur during the semester prior to the final semester of the current appointment. Following a review and recommendation in the senior faculty meeting, each fulltime, fixed-term candidate up for reappointment will be notified by the Dean or the Dean's designee within 5 business days either in-person or by email about the results of the senior faculty's reappointment decision. Following University policy, contract term lengths for clinical faculty appointments are determined by the Dean for a term of one to five years. The Dean will strive to issue a minimum of a three-year contract for faculty who have served three years or longer, if SoE resources are available and financial circumstances for the University and/or School allow for a multi-year contract. A fixed-term faculty who will not be reappointed will be notified by letter from the Dean, at least, three months prior to the end date of their fixed-term appointment, with a preference to provide six months lead time when possible. However, under section 2.b.5 of the University Trustee Policies and Regulations, such notice of intent to reappoint is not required.

Research Faculty. Initial appointments for fixed-term research faculty members entail more flexibility given that these positions are primarily funded on grants and/or contracts and, thus, are more sensitive to the timeframe of receiving such funding. The timeline and nature of the search and/or hiring process for fixed-term research faculty members will depend, to a large extent, on the nature of funding (e.g., positions generated from a SoE faculty member receiving funding, versus the fixed-term faculty member in question bringing their own funding). Appointments for fixed-term research faculty members are for a term of one to five years as allowed and aligned with the duration of the associated grants and/or contracts. Reappointments for terms of one to five years could happen in succession or at intervals and are closely tied with performance and the continuity of funding. All reappointments of fixed-term research faculty members are eventually approved by the senior faculty.

Promotion Procedures

Clinical and Research faculty may be considered for promotion, through a process designed to recognize faculty growth, merit, and contributions to the field. There is no requirement or expectation that a Clinical or Research faculty member seek promotion; faculty members with these appointments will not receive notices or reminders of the promotion process. The promotion process occurs independently from the reappointment process.

During the first semester of hire, the Dean or Dean's designee will share documents about the promotion process with Clinical and Research faculty and encourage faculty to be proactive about initiating their promotion process, by contacting the Dean or Dean's designee, as they approach the minimum number of years in rank required for consideration for promotion (see requirements below). The Dean or Dean's designee will explain the requirements for promotion at all fixed-term faculty levels and within each of the four domains of professional activity: Teaching; research and scholarship; service; and administration. These conversations should include the School's expectations associated with promotion to each rank, for the domains of focus for the faculty member.

Any promotions within the fixed-term ranks will be given careful attention and consideration. Each recommendation for promotion shall be based upon considerations of the candidate's demonstrated professional performance and of the needs and resources of the School. Three major elements are at the core of the School's mission, and therefore determine the major criteria by which promotions are judged:

1. Teaching, or the dissemination of knowledge to students, educators, and the public;
2. Research, or the creation of new knowledge pertinent to the field of education; and
3. Service within the SoE, the University, the community, the state, the nation, and internationally, including the advancement of the innovative application of knowledge to enhance the education across the P-20 continuum.

Faculty with a Clinical appointment may also engage in significant administrative activities for the School and may be evaluated for their contributions in this domain.

Procedures for the promotion of Clinical and Research faculty will follow the procedures outlined for tenure track appointments, except for the number and nature of external review letters involved in the review process (explained below).

Criteria for appointment, reappointment, and promotion within each domain are specified in Section II (Standards and Criteria, pp. 4-14) of this document. Clinical and Research faculty should refer to the information specific to research, teaching, service, and administration. The same criteria used for tenure-track faculty apply to part time or fulltime Clinical and Research faculty in their area(s) of responsibility.

Clinical faculty members whose primary responsibility is teaching should refer to the Teaching section in Part II of this manual. Clinical faculty members may also conduct research and administrative activities; such activities may be offered additionally with respect to their application for promotion.

Clinical faculty whose primary responsibility is administration should refer to the administrative section in Part II of this manual. Clinical faculty whose primary responsibility is administration may teach and/or conduct research in the SoE. If

Clinical faculty whose primary responsibility is administration teach four or more courses during the period since initial appointment or previous promotion review, information on teaching consistent with procedures under Section II will be submitted for evaluation. If these individuals conduct research, these activities may become part of their application for promotion.

Fixed-term faculty whose primary responsibility is research should refer to the research section of this manual. Research faculty members may also teach periodically. If these faculty teach four or more courses during the period since initial appointment or previous promotion review, information on teaching consistent with procedures under Section II will be submitted for evaluation. For research faculty who also engage in administrative roles for the School, these activities may become part of their application for promotion.

All fulltime Clinical and Research faculty are expected to engage in service to their fields. Clinical faculty, including faculty whose primary responsibilities are teaching and/or administration, are expected to contribute service to the university and School of Education communities. The extent and nature of

Research faculty members' engagement in service activities to the SoE and University will depend on the sources of their funding and will be explained by the Dean to the faculty member under review. The same criteria for service identified for tenure-track faculty related to the SoE are to be used for evaluating service for Clinical and Research faculty. Fulltime clinical and research faculty members are held to a higher standard for service in the SoE than their part time fixed-term counterparts.

Promotion to Fixed-term Clinical or Research Associate Professor: Appointment to this rank requires a doctoral degree in education or in a related field and 6 years of relevant experience (5 years must be post doctorate). Appointees should evidence excellence in the primary domain of responsibility (i.e., teaching, research and scholarship, administration). The Clinical Teaching or Research Assistant Professor already employed in the SoE will complete a minimum of 6 years of employment in the School at this rank to be eligible for promotion to the rank of Clinical Teaching or Research Associate Professor. At the discretion of the Dean, a candidate with fewer years of experience may be eligible for promotion if the candidate's reputation and expertise warrant such an exception.

Faculty who seek promotion to Clinical or Research Associate Professor will demonstrate an impact upon one area of primary responsibility (teaching, research, or administration). Faculty seeking promotion to Clinical or Research Associate Professor may also make important contributions in other areas (including service), but doing so is not a requirement for promotion. The successful candidate for promotion will demonstrate progressively greater amounts of leadership, initiative, responsibility, creativity, and independence (in conjunction with program coordinators or School administrators for teaching faculty, and in conjunction with the principal investigator, if applicable, or other supervisor, for research faculty).

To demonstrate an impact in teaching sufficient to achieve the rank of Clinical Associate Professor, faculty members will demonstrate understanding and proficiency in instruction through excellence in teaching, and/or development of curriculum that is well-received or evaluated by their professional community or consumers, and/or the use of research findings in the development of professional trainings or other scholarly activities (e.g., co-author or co-presenter).

To demonstrate an impact in administration sufficient to achieve the rank of Clinical Associate Professor, faculty members will demonstrate excellence in carrying the administrative responsibilities of their position, as well as leadership and innovation through the application of, or contribution to, evidence-based administrative practices and continuous improvement, and/or further refinement/improvement of administrative operations, efficiency and/or effectiveness.

To demonstrate an impact in teaching sufficient to achieve the rank of Research Associate Professor, faculty members will demonstrate understanding and proficiency in research through publication of scholarly work, presentations at conferences or workshops, securing external funding, and/or the use of research findings in the development of professional trainings or other scholarly activities. Collaborative publications and presentations are encouraged and count toward a candidate's promotion to Research Associate Professor. Additionally, candidates are expected to serve as lead authors and presenters on outputs of their scholarly activities that reflect their primary area(s) of research focus.

Promotion to Fixed-Term Clinical or Research Full Professor: Appointment to the rank of Clinical or Research Full Professor requires a doctoral degree in education or in a related field, 12 years of relevant experience (11 years must be post doctorate), and demonstrated expertise and consistent functioning in at least two work domains: the primary work domain (teaching, administration, or research) and a secondary work domain (teaching, administration, research, or service external to the SoE). Criteria and evidentiary indicants used for appointment to this rank are described in Section II. At the discretion of the Dean, a candidate with fewer years of experience may be appointed to the rank of Clinical or Research Full Professor if the candidate's reputation, expertise, and record warrant such an exception and appointment. Clinical or Research Associate Professors already employed in the SoE and who have a doctoral degree in education or in a related field are eligible for promotion to Clinical or Research Full Professor after a minimum of 6 years in their current position. At the discretion of the Dean, a candidate with fewer years of experience may be eligible for promotion if the candidate's reputation, expertise, and record warrant such an exception.

Faculty who seek promotion from Clinical or Research Associate Professor to Clinical or Research Full Professor will demonstrate excellence, leadership and impact in two of the following areas: Teaching, research, and/or administration. Service external to the SoE may be a secondary but not primary area. The successful candidate for promotion will demonstrate significant contributions to and impact on each area (teaching, research, or administration, and service as a secondary area), reflected in leadership, initiative, responsibility, creativity, and independence.

To demonstrate an impact in teaching sufficient to achieve the rank of Clinical Full Professor (i.e., primary focus is teaching, with a secondary area of research, administration, or service external to the SoE), faculty members will evidence excellence in teaching and contributions to pedagogy in their respective teaching area. Excellence in teaching will be demonstrated both by the evidentiary standards detailed in Part II for teaching in this manual, and also, where possible, through the external review process established by the Center for Faculty Excellence at UNC-Chapel Hill. In addition to demonstrating excellence in teaching and contributions to pedagogy, candidates are expected to mentor other colleagues and to have substantial leadership in their area of expertise within the state of North Carolina and possibly regionally or nationally. Candidates may also demonstrate success in bringing external funding into the school.

To demonstrate an impact in administration sufficient to achieve the rank of Clinical Full Professor (i.e., primary focus is administration, with a secondary area of research, teaching, or service external to the SoE), faculty members will demonstrate excellence in carrying the administrative responsibilities of their position, as well as state, regional and/or national leadership and innovation through the application of, or contribution to, evidence-based administrative practices and continuous improvement; transformative improvement of administrative operations, efficiency and/or effectiveness; and/or leadership in scholarship in areas related to their primary responsibilities.

To demonstrate an impact in research sufficient to achieve the rank of Research Full Professor (i.e., primary focus is research, with a secondary area of teaching, administration, or service external to the SoE), faculty members will evidence a sustained publication record of sufficient quality and quantity; external funding to support their research activities; and national and/or international recognition for their work.

External Review. If a candidate wishes to be considered for promotion in the fixed-term rank, all procedures pertaining to tenure track appointments should be followed, with the exception of the number and nature of external review letters involved in the review process.

For promotion to rank of Clinical Associate Professor, two external review letters are required. The candidate will provide a list of, at least, two potential external reviewers and the sub-committee will provide at least two potential external reviewers. The Dean will prioritize and finalize the selection of external reviewers from among these recommended reviewers. Letters must be solicited from individuals external to the University and may be from individuals who are familiar with the candidate's work related to their School of Education assignment. Letters must be selected from professionals with expertise in the domain of primary review (i.e., teaching or administration), but do not need to be from faculty at other universities.

For promotion to the rank of Clinical Full Professor, three external review letters are required. The candidate will provide a list of, at least, four potential external reviewers and the sub-committee will provide, at least, four potential external reviewers. The Dean will prioritize and finalize the selection of external reviewers from among these recommended reviewers. Letters may be from individuals who are familiar with the candidate's work related to their School of Education assignment. Letters must be selected from professionals with expertise in the domain of primary review (i.e., teaching or administration), but do not need to be from faculty at other universities. For Clinical faculty whose primary area is teaching, when possible, one of the external letters obtained will be from the external review of teaching process conducted by the Center for Faculty Excellence, rather than from a reviewer external to UNC-Chapel Hill. This external teaching review will replace one of the letters identified by

the sub-committee. With the exception of the external review of teaching conducted by the Center for Faculty Excellence for Clinical faculty whose primary area is teaching, all letters must be solicited from individuals external to the University.

External letters for promotion to Research Associate Professor or Research Professor will follow all guidelines that are applicable to the promotion of tenure-line faculty members.

Part IV: Post-Tenure Review

Post-tenure review is a systematic process for the periodic, comprehensive review of the performance of all faculty members having permanent tenure and whose primary duties are teaching, research and service. The goals of post-tenure review are to promote faculty development, ensure faculty productivity and provide accountability. The post-tenure review process should respect the basic principles of academic freedom. Post-tenure review does not abrogate, in any way, the due process criteria or procedures for dismissal or other disciplinary action established under the Trustee Policies and Regulations Governing Academic Tenure.

The current UNC-Chapel Hill policy for Review of Tenured Faculty is found at the following link:
https://academicpersonnel.unc.edu/policies-and-procedures/faculty-reviews/post-tenure-review-policy/

School of Education General Policies

All matters relating to post-tenure review are confidential. All those who participate as members of the Post-Tenure Review Committee or who otherwise advise on individual cases should be advised of their obligation to abide by this requirement.

Comprehensive evaluations conducted for other purposes, such as promotion, may be substituted for post-tenure review. Annual reports may inform but not substitute for the post-tenure review.

The faculty believes that the post-tenure process should be as efficient, straightforward, fair, functional, constructive, and flexible as possible.

Responsibilities of the Dean

The Dean is to ensure that each tenured faculty member is reviewed at least once every five years following conferral of permanent tenure. More frequent review may be made at the discretion of the Dean. The review must examine all aspects of faculty activities and performance. Each faculty member who is to undergo review will be advised by the Dean of the upcoming review at least six months before the start of the review. The Dean will ensure that faculty members are advised of the members of their review committee during the year of their review.

The Dean will review the Post-Tenure Review Committee's work and determine if additional consultation/review is needed. The Dean will maintain the Post-Tenure Review Committee's final report and the faculty member's response, if applicable, in the faculty member's confidential personnel file. If the Post-Tenure Review Committee determines that the faculty member under review does not meet expectation, the Dean will meet with the faculty member and establish a development plan designed to assist the faculty member in addressing identified deficiencies. The plan should include clear goals, specific steps designed to achieve those goals, definite indicators of goal attainment, a clear and reasonable time frame for implementation of the plan, and identification of the consequences of failure to attain the goals. Faculty development plans should be individualized and flexible, taking into account the faculty member's intellectual interests, abilities, and career stage, as well as the needs of the School. The plan will be filed in the faculty member's personnel file. If a development plan is established, the faculty member in question is reviewed on an annual basis by the Dean until such time as the faculty member being reviewed demonstrates successful completion of the development plan. The Dean should acknowledge in writing the faculty member's successful completion of a

development plan. In the event substantial deficiencies in performance continue to exist at the end of the remediation plan period, the Dean will notify in writing the faculty member and make a recommendation regarding any remedial action, consistent with Trustee Policies and Regulations Governing Academic Tenure. If a development plan is required, then all background information and other materials used in the review are kept for a period of five years in the faculty member's personnel file.

When faculty members being reviewed are found to have exceeded expectation in performance, the Dean may initiate other forms of positive recognition (i.e., recommendation for awards).

At the request of the Provost's Office, the Dean's office prepares and submits an annual report specifying the number of faculty members reviewed during the previous year and the number of evaluations that are given using the UNC-CH category system (does not meet expectations, meets expectations, exceeds expectations). In addition, information is presented on whether and how many development plans were recommended.

Expectations of Faculty Members

All members of the faculty are expected throughout their careers to maintain the standards of excellence in scholarship, teaching, and service as described in the School's APT Policy Manual. Faculty will be evaluated based on the expectations at their current rank, as indicated in the School's APT Policy Manual. Each faculty member who is to undergo review in a given year will take an active role in the post-tenure review process by assisting with preparing relevant information, and participating in the creation of a development plan, if needed, to address deficiencies in performance.

Each tenured associate and full professor being reviewed should provide the following:

- A concise summary of accomplishments for the preceding five years and plans for the next five years (not to exceed 750 -1000 words).
- An updated CV.
- Copies of the last five years of annual reports

The Dean may also provide the Post-Tenure Review Committee with additional pertinent information developed during periodic merit reviews and information relating to the faculty member's ongoing work within the School.

Post-Tenure Review Committee Composition and Responsibilities

The School of Education Post-Tenure Review Committee consists of four tenured full professors elected by the tenured faculty. Members' two-year terms are staggered to ensure continuity on the committee. A subcommittee of three members, with one serving as chair, conduct individual faculty member reviews.

The Post-Tenure Review Committee will use all the evidence provided by the faculty member being reviewed and the School in evaluating performance. The committee will evaluate faculty performance using the standards articulated in the SoE Appointment, Promotion, and Tenure manual. The review process will be conducted in a way that provides the faculty member being reviewed, the Dean, and the members of the Post-Tenure Review Committee with relevant information concerning the faculty member's accomplishments and plans in the areas of teaching, scholarship and service in relation to the mission of the School and University over the

course of at least the previous five years. Clarification regarding the faculty member's record of scholarship, teaching, or service may be sought from the Associate Dean for Research and Faculty Development.

The Post-Tenure Review Committee prepares a written report, not to exceed 2 pages, summarizing its findings regarding the faculty member's research, teaching, and service. In the report, the committee should recognize significant accomplishments, and make recommendations for ways to strengthen the record in research, teaching or service, when appropriate. Within its report, the Post-Tenure Review Committee will advise the faculty member being reviewed and the Dean on its conclusions regarding the faculty member's performance, using the UNC-CH category system (does not meet expectations, meeting expectations, exceeding expectations).

The faculty member being reviewed is afforded an opportunity to review the report and provide a written response to the Post-Tenure Review Committee within two weeks of the report being sent to the faculty member. Based on this response, the Dean may ask the Committee to re-visit its recommendations. The final Post-Tenure Review and faculty member's response (if applicable) are kept in the faculty member's confidential personnel file.

PART V: Faculty Mentoring

Mentoring is central to both individual and institutional success and as such should be thoughtfully planned and implemented. The purpose of mentoring is to meet the goals of the mentee related to their faculty role at UNC-CH. In general, these goals will include supporting the mentee's development as a researcher/scholar, a teacher, and a contributor of professional and public service, as well as helping the mentee balance these activities.

Mentoring requires trusting, confidential relationships built on mutual respect. The best mentoring relationships create a safe space in which the faculty member can openly and honestly discuss challenges, problems and concerns, and be assured of confidentiality as well as advice and support.

Faculty at all ranks can benefit from mentorship. All faculty should proactively cultivate mentoring relationships. This policy primarily enumerates mentorship opportunities for tenure-track and fixed term faculty at the assistant professor rank.

Mentorship Roles

The Dean is responsible for ensuring that the mentorship processes described here are implemented in way that optimally support faculty member professional development.

The Associate Dean for Research & Faculty Development is responsible for ensuring that each assistant professor has at least one mentor. The assistant professor, with the assistance of the Associate Dean for Research & Faculty Development, identifies appropriate faculty to serve as mentor. This mentorship relationship is formalized by a written signed agreement between the dean, the mentor(s), and assistant professor. The Associate Dean for Research & Faculty Development should provide mentors and mentees with access to resources related to effective mentorship.

Upon faculty request, the Associate Dean for Research & Faculty Development will work with faculty members at the Associate Rank to facilitate mentorship opportunities for promotion and professional development.

Mentors should seek out opportunities and resources to develop their competencies as mentors.

Mentoring Relationship Guidelines

Ultimately the success of a mentoring relationship depends on the commitment of the individuals involved and for this reason mentees are the best persons to select their mentors.

A mentor should meet at least once a semester to review the mentee's professional portfolio and to advise the mentee regarding the best next steps or overall direction. It is important for mentors to initiate meetings and activities with their mentee because assistant professors can be, at times, hesitant to ask for time and uncertain about the kinds of help that might be available.

Mentors should assist the Associate Dean for Research & Faculty Development in clarifying expectations for the mentee. They should assist the mentee in developing a professional plan of action and provide ongoing feedback to ensure faculty members know how they are progressing in relation to expectations and timelines. The Mentor should encourage the mentee to conduct a self-evaluation of professional knowledge and skills, identifying their own strengths and areas for improvement, as well as areas where the mentor can be of assistance.

Mentors for tenure-track faculty members should provide guidance on research, teaching, and service, as well as guidance on balancing these responsibilities. Since research plays such an important role in promotion decisions for tenure-line faculty members, tenure-track mentors will likely focus much of their mentorship on research.

Since fixed-term faculty contracts typically emphasize teaching, research and/or administration, mentors for fixed-term faculty members will focus their mentorship on the areas that are most relevant to the faculty member's position. Mentorship for fixed-term faculty members on the research track will often emphasize research. Mentorship for fixed-term faculty members on the clinical track will often emphasize teaching and/or program coordination.

See Appendix Q for a list of possible mentorship activities relevant to research, teaching, and service.

Mentorship Review and Evaluation Process

In the spring of each year, the Associate Dean for Research & Faculty Development should survey mentors and mentees in order to catalogue mentorship experiences and assess the sufficiency of the mentorship opportunities available to each assistant professor.

The survey for mentees will provide opportunities to document the mentorship activities they have participated in over the course of the year. In addition, this survey will ask mentees to reflect on their satisfaction with the mentorship they have received from their School of Education mentor(s). Finally, this survey will provide a forum for assistant professors to request additional mentorship and/or reflect on mentorship resources and models that may more fully meet their needs. Since the mentee surveys is designed to help the Associate Dean for Research & Faculty Development and the mentee to adapt mentorship plans, the information disclosed on the mentee survey should be confidential to the Dean, Associate Dean for Research & Faculty Development and the mentee.

The survey for mentors will ask mentors to document the mentorship opportunities that they provided to their mentees. In addition, this survey will provide mentors with a chance to document concerns about their mentees' progress toward tenure and/or promotion as well as other concerns about the mentorship available to their mentee.

Based on the results of this annual survey, the Associate Dean for Research & Faculty Development may work with assistant professors to revise mentorship plans and rethink mentorship matches, as needed.

Mentors for tenure-track assistant professors will provide two additional reports, in the form of a letter to the Dean, on their mentor's progress, The first of these reports will be submitted the semester before notification of review for first reappointment. The second will be submitted the semester before the tenure-track assistant professor receives notification of review for promotion and tenure.

Mentors for fixed-term assistant professors will provide reports in the form of a letter to the Dean, on their mentor's progress, at the end of the mentee's 2nd year in the position, the end of the mentee's 5th year in the position, and every subsequent 3rd year (as applicable).

Each of these letters will provide feedback from the mentor to the assistant professor, Dean, and Associate Dean for Research & Faculty Development on the mentee's progress in relation to expectations, timeline for tenure and/or promotion, and any concerns the mentor may have about the mentee's likelihood of successful tenure and/or promotion. The mentor letter is not intended to be evaluative and should not be included in the mentee's promotion and materials or other personnel records.

Part VI: Peer Evaluations of Teaching

Faculty Who are Required to Have a Peer Evaluation of Teaching

- Tenure-track assistant professors who are under review for reappointment, promotion, or tenure.
- Tenure-track, untenured associate professors who are under review for tenure.
- Tenured associate professors who are under review for promotion to full professor, or for post-tenure review.
- Full-time fixed-term faculty whose primary responsibility is teaching (i.e., clinical faculty) who are under review for promotion.
- Full-time fixed-term faculty whose primary responsibility is research or administration who are under review for promotion if they have taught four or more courses since the time of last review.

Timelines
- **Pre-tenure reappointment**
  Tenure-track faculty to be considered for reappointment will be notified by the Dean or the Dean's designee the semester they need to be observed prior to coming up for reappointment. The faculty member will be observed either one or two semesters before the semester in which their case will be reviewed.

- **Tenure appointment**
  Tenure-track faculty to be considered for tenure will be notified by the Dean or the Dean's designee about their teaching observation at least one year prior to the decision point. The observation can occur either one or two semesters before the semester in which faculty members submit their documents for tenure review.

- **Appointment to higher rank (Promotion)**
  Tenured associate professors seeking promotion, and fixed-term faculty seeking promotion are responsible for scheduling and completing a peer evaluation of teaching either one or two semesters before the semester in which they submit their documents for promotion review.

- **Post-tenure review**
  Tenured associate professors undergoing mandatory post-tenure review will be notified about their teaching observation at least 6 months prior to the date their materials are due. This notification will be included in the notification of post-tenure review issued by the HR Director.

Peer Evaluation of Teaching Procedures

Selection of Observers and Classes for Peer Evaluation of Teaching

The faculty member under review, in consultation with the Associate Dean for Research and Faculty Development, will identify two members of the faculty to review their teaching and to make in classroom observations. Both observers must be at the rank of associate or higher. At least one observer must be in the same faculty track as the faculty member to be observed.

The faculty member will choose the course(s) and negotiate the observation schedule. Observers and the faculty member will meet for one pre-observation conference to discuss the goals, objectives, and methods for the course. The faculty member should provide relevant written materials, such as course syllabi, before or during the conference.

Two class sessions will be observed by prior arrangement with the faculty member. Both observers must attend the same two class sessions. Students should be fully informed in advance of the observation. One class session is defined as the entire class period for classes that meet multiple times per week or at least fifty minutes for seminar classes that meet once a week.

Following the observation of both class sessions, the observers and faculty member will meet for a post-observation conference, to discuss the specific goals, objectives, and methods set by the faculty member.

Remote Synchronous & Asynchronous Instruction

Synchronous and asynchronous classes pose a different challenge for peer observations. For remote synchronous classes, the reviewers should request to join the virtual class meeting at the specified time and assess the interactions in a manner similar to face-to-face classes, with the understanding that virtual dynamics are different from in person dynamics.   Instructors should not record class periods and share recordings with reviewers. For remote asynchronous classes, reviewers must rely on the syllabus, schedule, and asynchronous lessons and activities provided to students via the course learning management system (LMS) site. Reviewers may have time-limited access to the course LMS in the student or auditor role.

The topics listed below should be considered for remote courses that are asynchronous.

- The instructor's design rationale for the course structure and content
- Strategies to motivate students to engage with asynchronous content
- Goals and measures for asynchronous engagement

Pre-Observation Conference

Observers and the faculty member will meet for one pre-observation conference. The faculty member should provide relevant written materials such as course syllabus, powerpoint presentations, and lesson/ class outlines before or during the conference. The conference should provide an opportunity for the faculty member to describe the course, classes to be observed, and any aspects of teaching that the faculty member would like the observers to focus on.

Pre-observation conferences should cover the following elements:

- Materials used to help structure and guide the specific class being observed (lesson plans, rubric, syllabus, etc.)
- Objectives of the class being observed and a discussion of how the class fits into larger course objectives
- Instructor's subjective view of their strengths and areas of growth/opportunities for improvement
- Specific areas of teaching or student learning the instructor would like feedback on
- How instructor communicates with students and conducts office hours
- Frequent questions instructor tends to get from students
- A discussion of the type of preparation that has gone into the course and the specific class being observed
- A discussion of Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion (DEI) incorporation into course content and class activities

Course Material Review

Review of the course materials includes the following categories. The faculty member and observers will collaborate on
which areas to prioritize:

Categories	Observational Elements of Course Materials
Organization	- Course objectives are clearly articulated - Materials and activities are well-aligned with course content and objectives

Course Assessments	▪ Relevant assessments are aligned with course objectives and appear to be scaffolded ▪ Assessments are aimed at deepening and broadening student understanding
Diversity, Equity & Inclusion	▪ Course readings and materials are reflective of diverse perspectives and diverse scholars ▪ Learning activities are diversified, attending to the varied ways that students process information, participate, and receive feedback

Observation Guidelines

These multidimensional guidelines identify categories to attend to and review. Observers are encouraged to adapt the guidelines to fit disciplinary expectations and course context.

Categories	Observational Course Elements
Class Organization	▪ Class objectives are clearly articulated ▪ An overview/agenda of class contents and a closing/summative activity/discussion are provided to students ▪ Materials and activities are well-aligned with content and class objectives
Teaching Practices	▪ Instructors facilitate engaging and relevant learning activities aligned with class objectives ▪ Instructors utilize strategies aimed at deepening and broadening student understanding ▪ Instructors provide responsive and constructive feedback during class activities (e.g., critical questioning, student reflection) ▪ Instructor invites student participation ▪ Instructor is aware of/attends to student disengagement (confusion/boredom) ▪ Instructor utilizes relevant learning tools (e.g., technologies) to scaffold learning as appropriate ▪ Instructor creates expectations that challenge students and required them to be prepared for class activities
Diversity, Equity & Inclusion	▪ Course materials and learning tools are reflective of diverse perspectives and scholars ▪ Instructors utilize practices to promote diversity, equity, and inclusion, and support learning by all students ▪ Instructor has rapport with students and cultivates a learning community inviting to students of all backgrounds and identities** ▪ Instructor actively encourages divergent or diverse perspectives from students ▪ Learning activities are diversified, attending to the varied ways that students process information, participate, and receive feedback

Classroom Culture	▪ Classroom is democratic and divergent viewpoints are welcomed ▪ Classroom is cooperative and conducive to active listening ▪ Atmosphere reflects a sense of focus and purpose
Student Engagement	▪ Students are generally prepared and demonstrate they have read/viewed materials ▪ Students are attentive and actively follow the instructor and class flow ▪ A wide range of students actively participate by asking questions and contributing to discussions/activities ▪ Instructor provides formative feedback to deepen student engagement ▪ Students demonstrate higher-order thinking, critically engage with material ▪ Students collaborate with peers or respond directly to peers

*Adapted from UNC's CAS and the Bay View Alliance and University of Kansas Rubric for Faculty Teaching Effectiveness. Follmer Greenhoot, A.,
Ward, D., & Bernstein, D. (2017), Benchmarks for Teaching Effectiveness, designed to build consensus on effective teaching in a research university.
**Race, ethnicity, gender, class, religion, language, geographic region, sexual orientation, ability/disability, and first-generation college.

Recommendations for Observers

Select seats in a position minimally distracting to students and the instructor.

Note the physical arrangement of the room, student interactions with instructor and students, and if possible, listen to students before class to document any expectations or attitudes expressed.

Record both verbal and non-verbal behaviors to document what happened (not your interpretation). Note pedagogy styles such as problem-based teaching or lecture or student led sessions and the use of time by students and the instructor.

Monitor time when observing a class. Note the time in the margin when taking notes to put class structure in context.

Many SOE instructors have begun to incorporate educational technology into their courses. In some cases, these technologies have replaced pedagogical activities that used to happen exclusively in classrooms. In other cases, the technologies have enabled new classroom activities that support student active participation. Because these technology-enabled activities are directly analogous to traditional, in-person classroom activities, the peer teaching observation may include evaluations of the use of technology as appropriate.

Peer Teaching Evaluation Report

Observers will collaboratively write a report based on the class materials and sessions observed. Feedback should be descriptive and specific, and focused on behaviors that can be changed, acknowledging the instructor's strengths. The use of constructive feedback characterized by concrete language and positive phrasing is encouraged.

A draft of the report, co-written by the observers, should be given to the faculty member before the post-observation conference. Following the conference, the report will be finalized. This report will be signed by both observers and by the faculty member observed. The faculty member may submit their own analysis as well in the case of further explanation needed regarding the report.

The report and additional analysis from the faculty member (if applicable) will be addressed to the Dean and submitted to the HR Director. Observers should reference notes taken on observational elements to construct a narrative report or a report structured in the format below.

Peer Teaching Evaluation Reports will contain the following elements:

- **Introduction:** This section should include general information about the observed class including peer observers' names and ranks, the observed course number/title/format, class enrollment number, class observation dates, and a brief overview of the pre-observation conference.
- **Overview of Class #1:** This section should include a synthesis of both peer observers' notes from their observation of the first class, including identification and discussion of strengths, with examples as evidence from the observational elements in the course materials and observed class. As well, this section should include an identification and discussion of areas for improvement and/or growth, with examples as evidence as from the observational elements.
- **Overview of Class #2:** This section should include a synthesis of both peer observers' notes from their observation of the second class, including identification and discussion of strengths, with examples as evidence from the observational elements in the course materials and observed class. As well, this section should include an identification and discussion of areas for improvement and/or growth, with examples as evidence as from the observational elements.
- **Conclusion:** This section should include a brief overview of the pre- and post-observation conferences and any other general comments and conclusions the peer observers would like to offer.

Post-Observation Conference

A post-observation conference including the observers and the faculty member should occur within two weeks of the last observation to discuss the specific goals, objectives, and methods set by the faculty member. Observers should use the following checklist to guide post-observation conferences:

- Observers' and instructor's reflection of pre-observation conference
- Instructor reflections on the class observed
- Review and discussion of observations on teaching and student engagement
- Instructor's reflections on their methods and practices
- Observer summary of observations and insights
- Observer summary of overall observation

Faculty Professional Development for Teaching

Faculty members are encouraged to engage in professional development related to their teaching, beginning in their first semester of employment. Faculty members who have not previously taught, or who have had limited supervision and advice on their teaching, are encouraged to work with the Mentoring Coordinator to set up specific activities that can provide them with feedback and suggestions on their teaching within their first semester of employment. Several resources are available on the UNC-CH campus for this purpose. Faculty members in the School of Education who have established reputations as strong teachers can serve as teaching mentors.

Faculty can also work in pairs, observing one another during classes, and providing each other with feedback and suggestions. Faculty may also consider video recording their teaching for self- evaluation and/or evaluation by others. Finally, faculty may take advantage of resources provided through the Center for Faculty Excellence.

Part VII: Procedures for Decisions on Appointment, Reappointment, Promotion, and Tenure of Tenure-line Faculty, and Promotion of Fixed-term Faculty

The procedures described in this part of the manual apply to appointment, reappointment, promotion and tenure of tenure-line faculty; and to promotion of fixed-term faculty. Procedures for the appointment and reappointment of fixed-term faculty are described in Part III of this manual.

Faculty responsibility

Each faculty member has the responsibility to assemble and send forward to the SoE all material necessary for an appointment, reappointment, promotion, and/or tenure. The faculty member considered for review should become familiar with the timelines (Appendix I for tenure-track reappointments, promotions and tenure reviews and J for fixed-term promotional reviews). Tenure-track and tenured faculty under consideration for reappointment, promotion, and/or tenure; and fixed-term faculty under consideration for promotion will submit all required dossier materials electronically to the designated platform. Materials required for initial appointment for either rank will be submitted to the Director of Human Resources by the candidate and/or the search committee chair.

APT Committee, Subcommittee and Dean's Responsibilities

Each tenure-line or tenured faculty candidate for reappointment, promotion, and/or tenure, and each fixed-term faculty candidate for promotion will be reviewed by a 3-person review subcommittee identified primarily from the School of Education APT Committee. The APT Committee is an elected committee of three tenured Full Professors and three tenured Associate Professors. The committee election will occur annually via a secret tiered ballot. The ballot will include a reminder to faculty that the School's aim is to elect a committee that is inclusive and diverse. The elected APT Committee members will serve a three-year term starting in July of their election year, with a rolling schedule so that three members leave the committee each year in a manner that retains the equal representation of ranks. Faculty are limited to no more than two terms, full or partial, during a ten-year period. The chair of the APT Committee is elected by the APT committee and serves a 1-year term.
An alternate for each rank, the candidate receiving the next highest number of votes, is also elected. Because the APT includes equal representation for associate and full professor ranks, if an associate professor is promoted to full professor during his/her term then the alternate for the associate professor representative replaces the promoted faculty member and assumes the responsibilities for the remainder of the term. The associate professor promoted to full professor no longer serves on the APT committee but can be re-elected at a later date if within the service terms described on page 33. The alternate at the appropriate rank also serves for the remainder of a term if a vacancy occurs.

The elected APT Committee will form a 3-person review subcommittee for each candidate from the elected APT Committee, and will identify one review subcommittee member as chair. In the event that the APT Committee determines that additional representation is needed to provide an equitable review experience for individual faculty candidates the APT Committee may ask the Dean to appoint an appropriate person to join the committee for duration for the candidate's review. In the case of fixed-term faculty candidates, the APT Committee will ask the Dean to appoint a representative from among the fixed-term faculty at the rank to which the person is seeking a promotion, to serve on the 3-person subcommittee for the duration of the candidate's review.

Three-person review subcommittees assigned to each faculty candidate have the following responsibilities:

- Assemble to identify a list of five potential external reviewers to submit to the Dean. External reviewers must meet university criteria for external review and may not have a conflict of interest with the candidate, as defined by the university.

- Request and secure two letters from students identified by the candidate. Student letters will address the candidate's teaching, including advising and mentoring. Student letters will become part of the

candidate's teaching portfolio.

- Assemble to discuss the candidate's credentials, including evidence submitted by faculty independent of the candidate and the candidate's written response, if any, to this evidence as well as letters from external reviewers that are filed in the candidate's materials by the HR Director.

- Determine if clarification about any required documents is necessary. If clarification is needed, the subcommittee chair may notify the SoE HR Director or Associate Dean for Research and Faculty Development, who will then send a request to the candidate. Once the candidate provides the requested information, the HR Director or Associate Dean will alert the subcommittee chair that the clarification has been added to the candidate's materials on Sakai.

- Collectively write the subcommittee report that includes their evaluation of the candidate's materials. For promotion reviews, the report should provide explicit and detailed comments from named external reviewers. The subcommittee's evaluation should include their assessment of the quality, rigor, and impact of the candidate's research, teaching, service (and administration, if applicable). The subcommittee report must conclude with a recommendation about the candidate's appointment and must note the nature of subcommittee consensus.

- Follow current SoE policy for using course teaching evaluations [text here will include the link to the policy adopted for use of numerical course evaluations when this is passed by the faculty]

- Apply an equity lens to the review process and final report.

- Review subcommittees should identify and determine how to address the specific equity issues that are relevant for the faculty candidate; continuously monitor their evaluation for implicit and other biases; and pursue additional resources and guidance as needed, to conduct an equitable review. Subcommittees should value work (research, creative, teaching, service, etc.) with under-represented and/or under-served populations. Publications in smaller or niche journals that deal with diversity matters should be given serious consideration in faculty promotion and/or tenure reviews and documented appropriately. If applicable, review subcommittees may include a section in the report that addresses the faculty candidate's attention to equity, inclusion, and diversity.

- Share a draft of its report with the Dean and the Associate Dean for Research and Faculty Development for review and feedback. After the subcommittee completes the final report, all members of the subcommittee must sign the report. The subcommittee chair will submit the final, signed report to the HR Director and Associate Dean for Research, for electronic posting with the candidate's materials.

- Present highlights of the subcommittee's review and report, and answer questions about the candidate's record, at the Senior Faculty meeting.

In the interest of conducting equitable reviews of all faculty candidates, faculty engaged in the review of their colleagues are strongly encouraged to complete anti-bias training and/or to read relevant articles on the presence, and strategies to address the presence, of bias in the faculty evaluation process. Recommended articles are available in faculty resource portals.

Completion of the Review Process within the School of Education

Three months prior to Senior Faculty Meetings all senior faculty are notified by the Dean or the Dean's designee: (1) who is to be reviewed and (2) the location of all documents. The Dean or the Dean's designee will also track and upload all external review letters, notify SOE faculty when written input is due, notify senior faculty when dossier questions for the sub-committee members are due, and indicate when the 'final' electronic dossier is ready. The review of the candidate's materials by senior faculty will be tracked. It is the responsibility of all senior faculty members to review the materials in advance of the meeting, to be eligible to vote on the candidate.

Senior Faculty Meeting Procedures on Appointment, Promotion, and Tenure

All senior faculty members, including full and associate tenured professors, and full-time fixed-term faculty members in the clinical and research tracks at the associate and full professor ranks are expected to attend senior faculty meetings related to appointment, promotion, and tenure. Participation in APT decisions, nonetheless, varies with faculty rank and track. Participation in this context is defined as reviewing candidate materials, being present for the review committee presentation of the candidate's materials, engaging in deliberation on the candidate's record, and voting on the question of appointment, promotion, and/or tenure.

- **Tenured full professors vote on all APT cases across all ranks and tracks.**
- **Fixed-term full professors vote on APT cases for fixed-term assistant, associate, and full professors in their track (i.e., clinical, research).**
- **Tenured Associate professors vote on APT cases for assistant professors across all tracks.**
- **Fixed-term associate professors vote on APT cases for fixed-term assistant professors in their track (i.e., clinical, research).**

For all promotion and tenure decisions, a quorum shall consist of the majority plus one of the members eligible to vote on any given candidate. When necessary for University review/approval deadline purposes, at the request of the Dean, an expedited Appointments, Promotions and Tenure Committee review, and then an out-of-cycle meeting of the senior faculty members to decide on the cases, can take place.

Order of Review: The order of review in the senior faculty meeting shall be as follows:
- adjunct and part-time appointments
- appointments at the rank of clinical assistant professor
- promotion from clinical assistant to clinical associate
- promotion from clinical associate to clinical full
- appointments at the rank of research assistant professor
- promotion from research assistant to research associate
- promotion from research associate to research full
- appointments at the rank of tenure-line assistant professor
- promotion and/or tenure from assistant to associate
- promotion from associate to full for tenured appointments

Deliberation: The assembled senior faculty will assume the responsibility of advising the Dean after having heard the presentation of the APT subcommittee's evaluation of the candidate's credentials. The advice to the Dean will be both oral discussion and by written confidential vote of the assembled senior faculty eligible to vote. Great care should be taken during the senior faculty meeting to prevent the presentation of new, adverse information to which the candidate has not had a prior opportunity to respond. Faculty are expected to self-monitor and address the presence of their own implicit biases as they discuss candidates' portfolios. The deliberations of the senior faculty are strictly confidential. Participating faculty members must not disclose any of the senior faculty meeting deliberations to anyone outside the meeting, partially or in whole, as well as verbally or in any other communication medium. Minutes of this meeting, including results of votes taken, should provide a summary of the discussion to provide an accurate record of the proceedings. Meeting minutes should be brief and not make attributions to specific participant faculty in terms of meeting discussions. ("Responsibilities of the Dean", p 36(f) provide more detail on voting procedures).

Responsibilities of the Dean

The Dean ensures that all promotion materials are readily available in the room of the convened faculty or through secure online access, for reference if needed.

The Dean ensures the following topics are reviewed in the designated appropriate order: research, teaching, and service and, when appropriate, engaged scholarship and administration. This format should include the following:

(a) Senior faculty meetings will occur in a synchronous, face-to-face format. Faculty unable to attend in person may attend the meeting virtually, but virtual attendance should be an exception rather than the rule for participation by senior faculty.

(b) Virtual attendance is intended to approximate, to the extent possible, the form and intent of the face-to-face meeting. Specifically, faculty are expected to actively engage in careful deliberations of the appointment, reappointment, promotion, and/or tenure cases at hand. Thus, faculty joining the meeting virtually should:

- Join the meeting only if they are able to be in a secure, private, and quiet location. This will ensure that meeting deliberations are kept confidential, and distractions are kept to a minimum.
- Log on to the meeting 10 minutes in advance to avoid the interruptions often associated with establishing a link to a virtual meeting.
- Allow enough time by early log on for the Dean or Dean's designee to verify the faculty member's eligibility to join and vote in the meeting. Ensure they are continuously present and engaged by keeping their camera on throughout the meeting.
- Refrain from making any recording of any type or any or all parts of the meeting.
- The SoE will ensure the platform used to host virtual participation is secure and allows for audio and video presence of participants. All concurrent communication channels (chat, text, etc.) will be disabled, such that all meeting attendees will engage in the same manner, that is, verbally, in all deliberations. All meeting participants agree to limit their communications to verbal comments.

(c) The Dean or Dean's designee will take attendance at the meeting. Faculty are expected to maintain a continuous and engaged presence throughout the meeting, whether attending in person or virtually.

(d) The Dean begins the discussion by making any pertinent comments related to appointment, tenure, and/or promotion of the individual faculty member. Introductory statements by the Dean must remind the faculty of the intent to conduct a confidential, thorough, and equitable review of each candidate.

(e) The APT review subcommittee chair and the members present their report, addressing the designated topics above in the designated order, and concluding with a recommendation. The report will be summarized, not read. Salient features of each area should be reported.

(f) Following the subcommittee report, the Dean calls for discussion on each topic in order (research, teaching, service, engaged scholarship, and/or administrative work as pertinent to the specific cases), ensuring that each topic is brought to the floor for discussion. The Dean will ask all faculty members in attendance to consider equity issues relevant for each candidate; and to monitor and address the presence of their own implicit biases as they discuss candidates' portfolios. Committee members may be asked to elaborate on points.

(g) The Dean ensures parliamentary procedures are adhered to during discussions. The Dean or Dean's designee will mediate the faculty discussion, ensuring that faculty members attending in person and virtually have an opportunity to contribute to the discussion. Only verbal comments are allowed in the discussion, from in-person and virtual attendees. No comments will be accepted into the discussion via email, text message, chat or other electronic means.

(h) The Dean ensures that all voting procedures called for by the University and the SOE are adhered to. Voting will occur only after the discussion has been completed and the call for the vote has occurred, following parliamentary procedures. Faculty must be present (in person or virtually) for the full discussion of a candidate and must be present at the time of voting for any faculty candidate.

Voting for adjunct faculty appointments and reappointments will occur by verbal assent or dissent for categories of appointment. Reappointment of clinical faculty holding appointments greater than .50 FTE will occur by verbal assent or dissent for each individual reappointment.

Voting on new tenure track and clinical faculty appointments, and tenure and promotion decisions will occur by anonymous electronic ballot. Virtual ballots will be prepared, distributed, and received so that faculty in attendance in the meeting may submit their votes anonymously and through secure means. Faculty must respond to mandatory questions, or the ballot will not be accepted electronically. Faculty are required to specify their own rank (i.e., associate or full professors) on the ballot so that an accurate recording of votes by rank can be obtained. Votes are recorded as yes, no, or abstention. Faculty must provide a reason on the ballot for any "no" vote or abstention, or the ballot will not be accepted electronically. Faculty members who have a significant conflict of interest are excused from voting on a candidate for promotion and tenure; this does not become reported as an abstention. All voting must be completed prior to discussion of subsequent candidates, other faculty business, or the termination of the meeting. The APT faculty votes are recorded in the minutes by rank and the secret ballots with notes are also kept with the minutes for the use by the Dean in writing up their report.

Materials for University Review

Written materials must include a letter from the Dean that clearly indicates: the criteria upon which the faculty member is being recommended for appointment or promotion; how the faculty member meets the criteria specified in this manual; and the vote of the assembled senior faculty of the School (as designated above).

The Dean's letter must also indicate what impact the faculty member's work has had, or is likely to have, in the field of education. If applicable, the faculty candidate's attention to diversity, equity, and inclusion should be addressed, including work with under-represented and/or underserved populations. Publication in smaller or niche journals that deal with diversity matters should be documented appropriately. If a promotion is early for time in rank at UNC-CH, the letter must include a strong justification in relation to the "meet the mark" criteria established within the School for an early decision, and the materials must clearly document and attest to the earliness.

The Dean will forward the materials to the Provost's Office by the specified date. The University Subcommittee will advise the Provost whether or not to accept a positive recommendation. The Subcommittee or the Provost must also receive all negative decisions and may, apart from any request for a formal reconsideration by a faculty member, seek more information from the Dean on the reasons for any negative decision.

If the Dean makes a negative decision, a meeting with the faculty member should be held, if requested, as outlined in the *Trustee Policies.* At that time the candidate should be informed of the nature and structure of the appeal process should the individual choose to appeal the decision of the Dean.

Outside Letters of Recommendation

Four outside letters of recommendation are required for tenure track appointments and promotions. The following UNC policy describing letters of recommendation is adhered to by the School of Education: A minimum of four (4) letters of evaluation are required: all four (4) from outside the institution, all from individuals independent of the candidate, two from a list provided by the candidate and two from individuals selected by the Dean, as appropriate. Ideally, all of the letters should come from research universities (RU/VH) with very high research activity.

The purpose of these letters is to provide an independent and unbiased assessment of the individual's national and international reputation. Therefore, the request from the Dean 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 been directly involved with a candidate, e.g., a collaborator, mentor, previous co-worker, former dissertation chair, etc., but may be

from individuals who know the candidate through professional interactions, e.g., reviewed the candidate's publications or served on review committees together. External reviewers should not hold a conflict of interest with the candidate, as defined by the university at the time of review.

For fixed-term faculty, for promotion to rank of Clinical Associate Professor, two external review letters are required. The candidate will provide a list of, at least, two potential external reviewers and the sub-committee will provide at least two potential external reviewers. The Dean will prioritize and finalize the selection of external reviewers from among these recommended reviewers. Letters must be solicited from individuals external to the University and may be from individuals who are familiar with the candidate's work related to their School of Education assignment. Letters must be selected from professionals with expertise in the domain of primary review (i.e., teaching or administration), but do not need to be from faculty at other universities.

For promotion to the rank of Clinical Full Professor, three external review letters are required. The candidate will provide a list of, at least, four potential external reviewers and the sub-committee will provide, at least, four potential external reviewers. The Dean will prioritize and finalize the selection of external reviewers from among these recommended reviewers. Letters may be from individuals who are familiar with the candidate's work related to their School of Education assignment. Letters must be selected from professionals with expertise in the domain of primary review (i.e., teaching or administration), but do not need to be from faculty at other universities. For Clinical faculty whose primary area is teaching, one of the external letters obtained must be from the external review of teaching process conducted by the Center for Faculty Excellence, rather than from a reviewer external to UNC-Chapel Hill. This external teaching review will replace one of the letters identified by the sub-committee. With the exception of the external review of teaching conducted by the Center for Faculty Excellence for Clinical faculty whose primary area is teaching, all letters must be solicited from individuals external to the University.
External letters for promotion to Research Associate Professor or Research Professor will follow all guidelines that are applicable to the promotion of tenure-line faculty members.
All letters of recommendation are made available to the APT subcommittee and voting members of the senior faculty prior to the senior faculty meetings.

Appeals

The procedure whereby a faculty member may appeal a non-reappointment decision is specified in the Trustee Policies and Regulations Governing Academic Tenure in UNC-CH, (2009) (see Section 4, "Non reappointment of faculty members on a probationary term appointments").