



Reappointment, Promotion and Tenure Handbook

College of Health and Human Services

Updated April 2024

CONTENTS

CONTENTS	2
SECTION 1. OVERVIEW OF THE CANDIDATE REVIEW PROCESS	4
STANDARDS FOR REVIEW	4
LEVELS OF REVIEW	4
SECTION 2. TIMETABLES FOR FACULTY REVIEWS	5
MANDATORY TENURE TRACK FACULTY REAPPOINTMENT OF ASSISTANT PROFESSORS	6
MANDATORY TENURE TRACK FACULTY PROMOTION TO ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR	7
AND/OR CONFERRAL OF PERMANENT TENURE	7
NON-MANDATORY TENURE TRACK FACULTY PROMOTION TO PROFESSOR	9
NON-MANDATORY NON-TENURE TRACK FACULTY PROMOTION OF LECTURERS AND CLINICAL FACULTY	11
MANDATORY NON-TENURE TRACK FACULTY REAPPOINTMENT OF LECTURERS AND CLINICAL FACULTY	12
MANDATORY TENURED FACULTY PERFORMANCE REVIEW	13
SECTION 3. LECTURER AND SENIOR LECTURER PERFORMANCE REVIEW	14
PROCESS OVERVIEW	14
LECTURER AND SENIOR LECTURER ASSIGNMENTS	14
AREAS OF PERFORMANCE	14
SECTION 4. CHHS CONSIDERATIONS AND CRITERIA FOR THE REAPPOINTMENT AND PROMOTION FOR CLINICAL FACULTY	19
REAPPOINTMENT OF A CLINICAL ASSISTANT PROFESSOR	19
PROMOTION OF A CLINICAL ASSISTANT PROFESSOR TO CLINICAL ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR	21
PROMOTION OF A CLINICAL ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR TO CLINICAL PROFESSOR	23
SECTION 5. CHHS CONSIDERATIONS AND CRITERIA FOR THE REAPPOINTMENT, PROMOTION AND CONFERRAL OF TENURE FOR TENURE TRACK FACULTY	25
REAPPOINTMENT OF AN ASSISTANT PROFESSOR	25
PROMOTION OF AN ASSISTANT PROFESSOR TO ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR	27
PROMOTION OF AN ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR TO PROFESSOR	29
SECTION 6. THE DOSSIER	32

PROCESS _____	32
FORMAT _____	32
PAGE LIMITS _____	ERROR! BOOKMARK NOT DEFINED.
DOSSIER COMPONENTS _____	33
SECTION 7. CHHS GUIDELINES FOR EXTERNAL REVIEW _____	61
FORMAT _____	61
PAGE LIMITS _____	61
EXTERNAL REVIEW MATERIALS _____	61
THE PROCESS _____	62
SECTION 8. CHHS GUIDELINES FOR TENURED FACULTY PERFORMANCE REVIEW _____	64
OVERVIEW _____	64
APPLICABILITY OF REVIEW PROCESS _____	64
RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN TENURED FACULTY PERFORMANCE REVIEW AND REVIEW FOR PROMOTION _____	65
REVIEW OF PROCEDURE _____	65
PROCEDURES _____	65

SECTION 1. OVERVIEW OF THE CANDIDATE REVIEW PROCESS

In this Reappointment, Promotion and Tenure (RPT) Handbook, you will find the timeline, standards and dossier guidelines for each faculty category and rank, as well as guidelines for external review processes (for promotion to Associate and Full Professors). In addition, the Tenured Faculty Performance Review (TFPR) guidelines and process are included at the end of this handbook. The College and its academic units adhere to the University policies and procedures for faculty review (see University and College Faculty Handbooks).

Standards for Review

The College of Health and Human Services' faculty review processes conform with those of the University. Standards for review and other related information are found within the Academic Personnel Procedures Handbook (Section VI) at the [Office of the Provost website](#).

The University policies (102.13), regulations and procedures (including the characteristics of the ranks), procedures for review and procedures for unfavorable RPT decisions can be found at the [Office of Legal Affairs website](#).

Levels of Review

Faculty should refer to the CHHS RPT Timetables (SECTION 2 of the CHHS RPT Handbook) and the Dossier (SECTION 6 of the CHHS RPT Handbook) for a detailed description of the levels of review that are required for various types of faculty review and the deadlines associated with each review (Mandated Tenure Track Review, Mandated Tenured Faculty Review, Mandated Non-Tenure Track Faculty Reappointment Review, Promotion to Senior Lecturer and Promotions Associated with Clinical Professor [all levels]).

According to their job descriptions, faculty are evaluated in some or all of these areas: teaching, mentoring, curriculum development, research and scholarly activity, and service/leadership within UNC Charlotte, the community, and their profession. Each area is considered as part of a holistic review.

The College Review Committee (CRC) and Unit Review Committees (URC) are elected according to CHHS Faculty Organization bylaws before the end of each academic year.

The Dean's Office schedules and hosts an information forum for any interested faculty to discuss review procedures, preparation of review materials, and academic career development before the end of each academic year.

If a candidate receives an unfavorable decision from the Chair/School Director or the Dean, the candidate has a right to submit rebuttal within fourteen days after receiving a copy of the Dean's determination (see <https://legal.uncc.edu/policies/up-102.13> for more information).

SECTION 2. TIMETABLES FOR FACULTY REVIEWS

These are approximate dates. Exact timelines are released annually.

Mandatory Tenure Track Faculty Reappointment of Assistant Professors

{This Process involves the URC, unit head, CRC and Dean}

Early March	Dean confirms candidates for mandated review with Unit Head.
Mid-March	Unit head notifies candidates of upcoming review, offers guidance in preparation of review materials and provides an opportunity for discussion of the review process and procedures with candidates. Electronic folders will be provided for candidate uploads.
August 15 (or first day of the academic year)	Deadline for candidates to complete dossiers. Candidates have the option of posting their dossier components in advance of this date but must submit all dossier information in the prescribed electronic format by this date. Each URC may begin the internal review process as soon as the dossier is available.
August 16 (or 2 nd day of the academic year)	Permanently tenured faculty members in the candidate's department, other than those who will participate in the review process at another level, who are at or above the rank for which a candidate is under consideration, shall receive a one-week opportunity to review the candidate's review file and provide advice to the URC.
Mid-September	Each URC sends its report to unit head and meets with unit head for discussion. For candidates with joint appointments, the URC's review shall include a letter from the candidate's secondary unit to be provided to the unit head for upload by the end of August.
Mid-October	The unit head shall, after consulting with the assembled URC, provide the candidate with a copy of their determination and rationale and invite the candidate to meet to discuss the determination. If the unit head's determination is negative, the unit head shall meet with the candidate to explain the candidate's right to submit a rebuttal. Candidates will have 14 days to submit a written rebuttal if they choose to do so. After this 14-day window is exhausted, the unit head submits their recommendation, the URC recommendation, and any rebuttal to the Dean. The CRC may begin the College-level review process as soon as the dossier is advanced to the Dean's Office.
Mid-November	The CRC Chair submits the report of the CRC to the Dean. The Dean may elect to meet with the College Review Committee to discuss the report.
Mid-December	Dean completes the review and provides the candidate with a copy of their determination and rationale and invites the candidate to meet to discuss the determination. If the Dean's determination is negative, the Dean shall meet with the candidate to explain the candidate's right to submit a rebuttal.
Early January	Dean notifies Provost of decision and provides copies of their determination and rationale, the URC and CRC recommendations, the determinations and rationales of the unit head, and any rebuttal(s) to the Provost.

**Mandatory Tenure Track Faculty Promotion to Associate Professor
and/or conferral of permanent tenure**

{This Process involves the URC, unit head, CRC and Dean}

Early March	Dean confirms candidates for mandated review with unit head.
Mid-March	Unit head notifies candidates of upcoming review, offers guidance in preparation of review materials and provides an opportunity for discussion of the review process and procedures with candidates. Electronic folders will be provided for candidate uploads.
Early April	Candidates provide the unit head with a list of six potential external reviewers.
Mid-April	Unit head shares complete list of twelve or more potential external reviewers with candidate and confirms conflicts of interest (removes and replaces names of external reviewers should there be a conflict). Unit head preliminarily contacts and confirms reviewers (preferably a mix from each list). At least 3 external reviews must be received. If additional external reviews are received, all reviews will be given full consideration.
Mid-May	Deadline for candidates to upload external review materials to electronic folder provided.
Mid-May	Unit head sends letter with instructions, College criteria for the relevant rank, and a link to candidate materials to external reviewers.
August 15 (or first day of the academic year)	Deadline for candidates to complete dossiers. Candidates have the option of posting their dossier components in advance of this date but must submit all dossier information in the prescribed electronic format by this date. The unit head is responsible for uploading external review letters and the External Reviewers Letters: Record & Procedures grid from Academic Affairs into the electronic folder by this date. Each URC may begin the internal review process as soon as the dossier is available.
August 16 (or 2 nd day of the academic year)	Permanently tenured faculty members in the candidate's department, other than those who will participate in the review process at another level, who are at or above the rank for which a candidate is under consideration, shall receive a one-week opportunity to review the candidate's review file and provide advice to the URC.
Mid-September	Each URC sends its report to the Unit head and meets with Unit head for discussion. For candidates with joint appointments, the URC's review shall include a letter from the candidate's secondary unit to be provided to the unit head for upload by the end of August.
Mid-October	If the Unit head's determination is positive, the Unit head shall, after consulting with the assembled URC, submit the determination and rationale, together with the recommendation and rationale of the URC, to the Dean. If the Unit head's determination is negative,

	the Unit head shall meet with the Faculty Member to provide the Faculty Member with a copy of that determination and its rationale and to explain the Faculty Member’s right of rebuttal. Candidates will have 14 days to submit a written rebuttal if they choose to do so. After this 14-day window is exhausted, the Unit head submits their determination and rationale and the URC recommendation to the Dean. The CRC may begin the College-level review process as soon as the dossier is advanced to the Dean’s Office.
Mid-November	The CRC Chair submits the report of the CRC to the Dean. The Dean may elect to meet with the College Review Committee to discuss the report should there be questions.
Mid-December	Dean completes the review and provides the candidate with a copy of their determination and rationale and invites the candidate to meet to discuss the determination. If the Dean’s determination is negative, the Dean shall meet with the candidate to explain the candidate’s right to submit a rebuttal.
Early January	Dean notifies Provost of decision and provides copies of their determination and rationale, the URC and CRC recommendations, the determinations and rationales of the unit head, and any rebuttal(s) to the Provost.
April	Provost shares her determination with candidates (actual date varies).

Non-Mandatory Tenure Track Faculty Promotion to Professor

{This Process involves the URC, unit head, CRC and Dean}

Early March	Unit head confirms candidates seeking non-mandatory review for promotion.
Mid-March	Unit head notifies candidates of upcoming review, offers guidance in preparation of review materials and provides an opportunity for discussion of the review process and procedures with candidates. Electronic folders will be provided for candidate uploads.
Early April	Candidates provide the unit head with a list of six potential external reviewers.
Mid-April	Unit head shares complete list of twelve or more potential external reviewers with candidate and confirms conflicts of interest (removes and replaces names of external reviewers should there be a conflict). Unit head preliminarily contacts and confirms reviewers (preferably a mix from each list). At least 3 external reviews must be received. If additional external reviews are received, all reviews will be given full consideration.
Mid-May	Deadline for candidates to upload external review materials to electronic folder provided.
Mid-May	Unit head sends letter with instructions, College criteria for the relevant rank, and a link to candidate materials to external reviewers.
August 15 (or first day of the academic year)	Deadline for candidates to complete dossiers. Candidates have the option of posting their dossier components in advance of this date but must submit all dossier information in the prescribed electronic format by this date. The unit head is responsible for uploading external review letters and the External Reviewers Letters: Record & Procedures grid from Academic Affairs into the electronic folder by this date. Each URC may begin the internal review process as soon as the dossier is available.
August 16 (or 2 nd day of the academic year)	Permanently tenured faculty members in the candidate's department, other than those who will participate in the review process at another level, who are at or above the rank for which a candidate is under consideration, shall receive a one-week opportunity to review the candidate's review file and provide advice to the URC.
Mid-September	Each URC sends its report to the unit head and meets with unit head for discussion. For candidates with joint appointments, the URC's review shall include a letter from the candidate's secondary unit to be provided to the unit head for upload by the end of August.
Mid-October	If the unit head's determination is positive, the unit head shall, after consulting with the assembled URC, submit the determination and rationale, together with the recommendation and rationale of the URC, to the Dean. If the unit head's determination is negative, the

	unit head shall meet with the Faculty Member to provide the Faculty Member with a copy of that determination and its rationale and to explain the Faculty Member's right of rebuttal. Candidates will have 14 days to submit a written rebuttal if they choose to do so. After this 14-day window is exhausted, the unit head submits their determination and rationale and the URC recommendation to the Dean. The CRC may begin the College-level review process as soon as the dossier is advanced to the Dean's Office.
Mid-November	The CRC Chair submits the report of the CRC to the Dean. The Dean may elect to meet with the College Review Committee to discuss the report should there be questions.
Mid-December	Dean completes the review and provides the candidate with a copy of their determination and rationale and invites the candidate to meet to discuss the determination. If the Dean's determination is negative, the Dean shall meet with the candidate to explain the candidate's right to submit a rebuttal.
Early January	Dean notifies Provost of decision and provides copies of their determination and rationale, the URC and CRC recommendations, the determinations and rationales of the unit head, and any rebuttal(s) to the Provost.
April	Provost shares their determination with candidates (actual date varies).

Non-Mandatory Non-Tenure Track Faculty Promotion of Lecturers and Clinical Faculty
 {This process involves the URC, Unit Chair/School Director, CRC and the Dean}

Mid-March	Candidate notifies unit head of intention to be considered for promotion. Unit head offers guidance in preparation of review materials and provides an opportunity for discussion of the review process and procedures with candidates. Electronic folders will be provided for candidate uploads.
August 15 (or first day of the academic year)	Deadline for candidates to complete dossiers. Candidates have the option of posting their dossier components in advance of this date but must submit all dossier information in the prescribed electronic format by this date (first day of 9-month faculty contract). Each URC may begin the internal review process as soon as the dossier is available.
Mid-September	Each URC sends its report to the unit head and meets with the unit head for discussion.
Mid-October	If the Unit head's determination is positive, the unit head shall, after consulting with the assembled URC, submit the determination and rationale, together with the recommendation and rationale of the URC, to the Dean. If the unit head's determination is negative, the Unit head shall meet with the Faculty Member to provide the Faculty Member with a copy of that determination and its rationale and to explain the Faculty Member's right of rebuttal. Candidates will have 14 days to submit a written rebuttal if they choose to do so. After this 14-day window is exhausted, the unit head submits their determination and rationale and the URC recommendation to the Dean. The CRC may begin the College-level review process as soon as the dossier is advanced to the Dean's Office.
Mid-November	The CRC Chair submits the report of the CRC to the Dean. The Dean may elect to meet with the College Review Committee to discuss the report should there be questions.
Early January	Dean completes the review and provides the candidate with a copy of their determination and rationale and invites the candidate to meet to discuss the determination. If the Dean's determination is negative, the unit head shall meet with the candidate to explain the candidate's right to submit a rebuttal.

Mandatory Non-Tenure Track Faculty Reappointment of Lecturers and Clinical Faculty
 {This process involves the URC, Unit Chair/School Director and the Dean}

Early March	Dean confirms mandated review to Chair/Director
Mid-March	Unit Chair/School Director notifies candidates of upcoming review, offers guidance in preparation of review materials and provides an opportunity for discussion of the review process and procedures with candidates. Electronic folders will be provided for candidate uploads.
Mid-October	Deadline for candidates to complete dossiers. Candidates have the option of posting their dossier components in advance of this date but must submit all dossier information in the prescribed electronic format by this date. Each URC may begin the internal review process as soon as the dossier is available.
Mid-November	Each URC sends its report to the unit head and meets with the unit head for discussion.
Mid-December	If the Unit head's determination is positive, the unit head shall, after consulting with the assembled URC, submit the determination and rationale, together with the recommendation and rationale of the URC, to the Dean. If the unit head's determination is negative, the Unit head shall meet with the Faculty Member to provide the Faculty Member with a copy of that determination and its rationale and to explain the Faculty Member's right of rebuttal. Candidates will have 14 days to submit a written rebuttal if they choose to do so. After this 14-day window is exhausted, the unit head submits their determination and rationale and the URC recommendation to the Dean.
End of January	Dean notifies candidate and Provost of decision.

Mandatory Tenured Faculty Performance Review

{This process involves the URC, Unit Chair/School Director and the Dean}

Early March	Dean confirms candidates mandated for Tenured Faculty Performance Review in the coming academic year with Unit Chairs/School Director.
Mid-March	Unit Chair/School Director notifies candidates of upcoming review and offers guidance in preparation of review materials and discussion of procedures for review. Electronic folders will be provided for candidate uploads.
Mid-October	Candidates have the option of posting their dossier components far in advance of this date but must submit all dossier information into the prescribed electronic format by this date. Each URC may begin the internal review process as soon as the dossier is available. For candidates with joint appointments, the URC's review shall include a letter from the candidate's secondary unit to be provided to the unit head for upload by the end of October.
Mid-January	Each URC sends its report to the Unit Chair/School Director and meets with Unit Chair/School Director for discussion.
Mid-February	Unit Chair/School Director completes his/her/their review and any proposed development plans and submits recommendation to Dean.
Mid-April	Dean notifies candidate and Associate Vice Chancellor of decision.

SECTION 3. LECTURER AND SENIOR LECTURER PERFORMANCE REVIEW

Process Overview

The Review for Renewal of Special Faculty Appointments process is outlined in detail in the UNC Charlotte Tenure Policies, Regulations, and Procedures <https://legal.uncc.edu/policies/up-102.13#s34>

The Special Faculty term of employment is specified at the time of appointment, and that specification is deemed to constitute full and timely notice of non-reappointment when the specified term expires. The University has no obligation to consider future appointments and no obligation to provide further notice of the expiration of the appointment.

The review processes in the College of Health and Human Services conform to these documents and if any part of the stated guidelines is found to be in conflict, the UNC Charlotte documents shall prevail.

Lecturer and Senior Lecturer Assignments

The areas of performance in which a candidate is reviewed for renewal and/or promotion in a special faculty appointment (Lecturer or Senior Lecturer) will depend upon the **responsibilities assigned** to them which may include the following: 1) teaching, advising, curriculum and instructional development; and 2) service to the University, the public and the profession, including any administrative duties.

As required by [Section 3.4](#) of the University's TENURE POLICIES, REGULATIONS AND PROCEDURES OF THE UNIVERSITY OF NORTH CAROLINA AT CHARLOTTE, the assessment of the candidate's performance in any of these areas must address at least the following: (a) the faculty member's demonstrated professional competence; (b) potential for future contribution to UNC Charlotte; and (c) institutional needs and resources.

Areas of Performance

Teaching, Advising, Curriculum and Instructional Development

Effective teaching is the primary mission of the College and University and, therefore, is an essential criterion for appointment or advancement. Clear documentation of effectiveness in this area is required for approval of any recommendation for reappointment, and/or promotion to Senior Lecturer.

Effective teaching encompasses a broad range of activities in addition to performance in the classroom, and the weighting of each may differ from case to case. The total performance of the candidate in this area must be evaluated according to established unit and College criteria and standards, taking into consideration the types and levels of instructional activities assigned to and expected of the candidate.

Evaluation of the candidate's teaching should consider any of the following that is assigned. All review documents will be posted by the candidate in the appropriately corresponding folders in the College's dossier posting system.

1. Articulates a teaching philosophy that demonstrates development for continued contributions to the classroom.
2. Demonstrated responsiveness to peer reviews of teaching.
3. Meets CHHS expectations for student evaluations on the four core items (see below); it is expected that average student ratings are aligned with the teaching means of the Unit and are ≥ 3.0 since initial appointment:
 - (a) "Overall, I learned a lot in this course"
 - (b) "Overall, this instructor was effective"
 - (c) "I am free to express and explain my own views in class" and
 - (d) "The course increased my knowledge of the subject matter."
4. Course syllabi demonstrate evidence of: (1) Cultural awareness/diversity; (2) Current content; (3) Evaluation and grading of student performance; and (4) Appropriate instructional technology in classroom teaching.
5. Subject Competence
 - (a) Subject areas and level of courses normally taught and their relevance to the unit's curriculum.
 - (b) Candidate's full command of the subject and an understanding of its relationship to other areas of knowledge.
 - (c) Course content is current and appropriate for the level of the course and curriculum.
6. Course Design
 - (a) Courses taught are organized appropriately for their subject matter
 - (b) Course formats are appropriate to support for learning goals (face to face, hybrid, on-line, other)
 - (c) Instructional strategies and course materials are appropriate for the level of the course, size of the class, nature and preparation of the students, contact hours, and schedule of class meetings.
7. Course Presentation
 - (a) Course materials are presented clearly and coherently.
 - (b) Course presented with enthusiasm that supports the learning process.
 - (c) Course presented in a manner that stimulates the interest and involvement of students and challenges their abilities.
 - (d) Candidate's impact on the quality of student performance.
8. Advising
 - (a) Type and the extent of advising responsibilities of the candidate.
 - (b) Measures used by the unit to evaluate effectiveness in advising; results of these evaluations.
 - (c) Extent to which the candidate attempted to improve the effectiveness of advising; success of these efforts.
9. Directing Student Research/Scholarship (if applicable)
 - (a) Types and levels of student research directed by the candidate.
 - (b) Dissertation/thesis/project chairing and membership. Indicate titles and any

- outcomes from dissertations/theses/projects.
- (c) Measures used by the unit to evaluate effectiveness in guiding student research; results of these evaluations for the candidate.
- 10. Supervision of Graduate Teaching Assistants (if applicable)
 - (a) Responsibilities the candidate has had for training, supervising, and evaluating graduate teaching assistants.
 - (b) Measures used by the unit to evaluate effectiveness in fulfilling such responsibilities; results of these evaluations for the candidate.
- 11. Curriculum and Instructional Development
 - (a) Contribution to development of the curriculum; how this contribution has been evaluated.
 - (b) Effectiveness, innovation, and significance of the instructional strategies and materials developed and disseminated by the candidate.
 - (c) Contribution to development of the curriculum; how this contribution has been evaluated.
 - (d) Significance and results of curriculum and instructional development projects for which the candidate has been awarded internal or external funding.
 - (e) Participation in the program accreditation process (e.g., developing self-study, organizing on-site visit, etc.), if applicable.
 - (f) Quality and significance of other pedagogical contributions to the unit's program(s).

Service

As a public university, the mission of UNC Charlotte and thus the College of Health and Human Services and its units, is to provide for the educational, economic, social, and cultural advancement of the people of North Carolina. To fulfill this mission requires participation of members of the faculty in service activities that are distinct from but related to their roles at the University. Contributions in these areas should be carefully documented, evaluated, and considered as positive factors in the reappointment as Lecturer, and/or promotion to Senior Lecturer.

Such service includes participation in the administration and governance of the University (which includes the unit and the College) and activities that involve the professional expertise of members of the faculty in the community or region outside the University. It also may include contributions of faculty members to their discipline or profession through service to professional societies and associations, as well as Executive Board leadership roles. Faculty members are expected to contribute to the advancement of the University, public, and/or profession in a manner that is consistent with their professional expertise.

For Reappointment:

1. Articulates a service agenda to the University, public, and/or profession that builds on

- one's professional expertise.
2. Statement of service activities and how one chooses which activities to engage in may be reflected in one or more of the areas listed below.
 - (a) If the individual participates as a member in the governance of the University, information provided should include: description of the purpose and function of the committee; role; elected or appointed; significance and effectiveness of contributions.
 - (b) If the individual serves in an administrative role that supports the governance and deliverance of service to the university, information provided should include: description of the purpose and function of the administrative role; elected or appointed; significance and effectiveness of contributions
 - (c) If the individual serves as a member in relevant professional organizations and advocates for one's profession, information provided should include: list professional organizations with membership, description of the purpose and function of the committee; role; elected or appointed; significance and quality of contributions; types and effects of advocacy.
 - (d) If the individual has relevant professional licenses and certifications, information provided should include: list of licenses/ certifications, source, and dates they are valid
 - (e) If the individual participates as a member in relevant community organizations, information provided should include: description of the purpose and function of the organizations. Include any committee; role; elected or appointed; significance and effectiveness of contributions.

For Promotion to Senior Lecturer:

(Eligibility and consideration for promotion following 5 years in a Lecturer role)

1. Articulates a service agenda to the University, public, and/or profession that demonstrates increasingly well-developed professional expertise that enhances and complements teaching excellence and curriculum development.
2. Statement of service activities and how one chooses which activities to engage in.
3. Assumption of significant leadership roles is strongly recommended and highly encouraged.
 - (a) In the governance of the unit, College or University, candidates should exceed minimum unit expectations for committee work; describe the purpose and function of the committee; role; elected or appointed; significance and effectiveness of contributions.
 - (b) In relevant professional organizations; advocates for one's profession: list professional organizations and the nature of role played with membership, describe the purpose and function of the committee and role, indicate whether elected or appointed, describe significance and quality of contributions, describe types and effects of advocacy.
 - (c) In engagement with relevant community organizations: describe the purpose and function of the organization and role, indicate whether elected or appointed,

describe significance and quality of contributions, describe relevance of the work to their area of expertise.

4. List relevant professional licenses or certifications (if applicable), source, and dates they are valid

For Senior Lecturer Performance Review:

Demonstrates sustained contributions in teaching and service at the levels described (above).

Note about Research Activities

Although explicit assignments related to conducting or being involved in research is not typical in Lecturer or Senior Lecturer contracts/appointments, many Special Faculty possess, or are interested in developing, research-related skills that are of great value to the CHHS research enterprise. Given the teaching focused mission of these appointments, Special Faculty who are interested in engaging in research should **discuss opportunities with their unit leadership before doing so**. If appropriate or practical (as deemed by unit leadership), these opportunities may then become part of assignments and will be presented in dossier evaluation for consideration as a contribution to the unit and the College.

SECTION 4. CHHS CONSIDERATIONS AND CRITERIA FOR THE REAPPOINTMENT AND PROMOTION FOR CLINICAL FACULTY

Reappointment of a Clinical Assistant Professor

The rank of Clinical Assistant Professor requires a terminal degree recognized by each CHHS discipline (e.g., MSW, PhD, EdD, DNP – the definition of terminal is defined by each Unit in this case).

The initial appointment for a Clinical Assistant Professor is for a term of two years. All faculty participate in the Annual Faculty Review process and this is also true for newly appointed faculty in their first year. During the second year as Clinical Assistant Professor, the faculty member shall begin to assemble the dossier to be reviewed for reappointment. This reappointment review is mandatory. A Clinical Assistant Professor who is reappointed at the same rank shall receive an additional appointment of up to three years. During and before the end of the third year of this additional appointment, the Clinical Assistant Professor will have a mandatory review for reappointment, with the option of review for promotion to Clinical Associate Professor.

For the reappointment of a Clinical Assistant Professor, the College of Health and Human Services considers the following:

- Effective teaching
- Professional practice development/expertise
- Scholarship or dissemination of work (as defined by the discipline/Academic Unit)
- Appropriate service contributions at the unit level

Teaching, Advising, Curriculum and Instructional Development

1. Articulates a teaching philosophy that demonstrates development for continued contributions to the classroom.
2. Demonstrated responsiveness to peer reviews of teaching.
3. Meets CHHS expectations for student evaluations on the four core items (see below); it is expected that average student ratings are aligned with the teaching means of the Unit and are ≥ 3.0 since initial appointment:
 - (a) “Overall, I learned a lot in this course”
 - (b) “Overall, this instructor was effective”
 - (c) “I am free to express and explain my own views in class” and
 - (d) “The course increased my knowledge of the subject matter.”
4. Course syllabi demonstrate evidence of: (1) Cultural awareness/diversity; (2) Current content; (3) Evaluation and grading of student performance; and (4) Appropriate instructional technology in classroom teaching.
5. If applicable, demonstrates availability and accuracy in advisement.
6. Demonstrates developing expertise in content and technical skills required to support. Undergraduate and graduate student-directed scholarship (e.g., capstone projects, scholarly projects, theses, dissertations)

7. If applicable, demonstrates satisfactory training and supervision of graduate teaching assistants.
8. Demonstrates initial activities to enhance teaching effectiveness and curriculum.

Scholarly Work and Other Professional Activities

1. Articulates a developing practice agenda that shows capacity for scholarly practice contributions to the field.
2. Meets College requirement of an average of 1 piece of scholarly work per year. Scholarly work includes peer reviewed publications, technical reports, practice briefs, case reports, textbook chapters, and is ultimately defined by each unit. Candidates should check with their Unit for more specific expectations for scholarly work based on Unit workload expectations as their scholarly work will be evaluated in the URC review.

Service to the University, the Public and the Profession

1. Articulates a service agenda to the University, public, and/or profession that builds on the faculty member's professional expertise
2. Serves as a member and developing leader in the governance of the Unit, the College or the University; meets the Unit expectations for committee and other service assignments
3. Serves as a member and developing leader in relevant professional organizations; advocate for one's profession
4. Relevant professional licenses or certifications are in good standing

Promotion of a Clinical Assistant Professor to Clinical Associate Professor

Promotion within the clinical ranks (Clinical Assistant to Clinical Associate and Clinical Associate to Clinical Professor) in the College of Health and Human Services is elective (not mandatory) and must be preceded by a successful initial contract reappointment.

The College recommends that review for promotion occur simultaneously with the review that occurs within the year prior to the end of the reappointment period (reappointment periods vary from 1-5 years). Five years at rank is typical before applying for promotion but early promotion may be considered if the candidate has the support of both the Unit Head and Dean.

For the promotion of a Clinical Assistant Professor to Clinical Associate Professor, the College of Health and Human Services considers the following:

- Demonstrated record of increasing effectiveness as a teacher
- Continuous and distinctive record of scholarship or dissemination of work
- Demonstrated an increasing record of outreach, partnership involvement and/or community engagement appropriate to the discipline
- Demonstrated an increasing commitment to service, with a level of engagement appropriate to the discipline, the academic Unit and, where possible, the College, and/or University.

In addition to these broad guidelines, individual Academic Units within the College of Health and Human Services may highlight additional expectations of their Clinical Faculty.

Teaching, Advising, Curriculum and Instructional Development

1. Articulates an evolving and well-developed teaching philosophy that demonstrates significant development for continued contributions to the classroom.
2. Demonstrated responsiveness to peer reviews of teaching.
3. Meets the CHHS expectations for student evaluations on the four core items (see below); it is expected that average student ratings are aligned with the teaching means of the Unit and are ≥ 3.0 during the period since last review period.
 - (a) "Overall, I learned a lot in this course"
 - (b) "Overall, this instructor was effective"
 - (c) "I am free to express and explain my own views in class" and
 - (d) "The course increased my knowledge of the subject matter."
4. Course syllabi demonstrate evidence of: (1) Cultural awareness/diversity; (2) Current content; (3) Evaluation and grading of student performance; and (4) Appropriate instructional technology in classroom teaching.
5. Demonstrates availability and accuracy in advisement.
6. Demonstrates strengthened and well-developed expertise in content and technical skills required to support undergraduate and graduate student-directed scholarship (e.g., capstone projects, scholarly projects, theses, dissertations).
7. If applicable, demonstrates satisfactory training and supervision of graduate teaching assistants.

8. Demonstrates increasing commitment to further development of teaching effectiveness and increasingly involved and responsible for improvements in curriculum.

Scholarly Work and Other Professional Activities

1. Articulates a well-developed practice agenda that demonstrates a trajectory for continued scholarly practice contributions to the field.
2. Meets College requirement of an average of 1 piece of scholarly work per year. Scholarly work includes peer reviewed publications, technical reports, practice briefs, case reports, textbook chapters, and is ultimately defined by each unit. Candidates should check with their Unit for more specific expectations for scholarly work based on Unit workload expectations as their scholarly work will be evaluated in the URC review.

Service to the University, the Public and the Profession

1. Articulates a service agenda to support the unit, College, and University; public and professional service to build professional expertise.
2. Serves as a member and demonstrates leadership in the governance of the Unit, the College or the University; meets the Unit expectations for committee and other service assignments.
3. Serves as a member and demonstrates leadership in relevant professional organizations; advocate for one's profession.
4. Relevant professional licenses or certifications are in good standing.
5. Serves as a member and demonstrates leadership in relevant community organizations.
6. Clinical Associate Professors may make contributions to administration in their academic Units as assigned. These activities should be considered when assessing accomplishments related to both annual review and reappointment.

Promotion of a Clinical Associate Professor to Clinical Professor

Promotion to Clinical Professor in the College of Health and Human Services is elective (not mandatory) and must be preceded by a successful contract reappointment.

While colleges and academic units determine progression requirements through the ranks, five years' experience at the previous level is recommended. Thus, a Clinical Associate Professor would typically seek promotion to Clinical Professor after a minimum of five years at the Clinical Associate Professor level. However, a Clinical Associate Professor need not wait for a 5-year period in order to be reviewed for promotion to Professor. Individuals seeking to "go up early" for promotion to Clinical Professor are encouraged to discuss policies, procedures, and promotion expectations with their Unit head prior to submitting materials. Both the Unit Head and the Dean must also agree that an early review is appropriate prior to submitting materials.

Note that advancement through the Clinical Professor ranks is optional and not a criterion for retention.

The College recommends that review for promotion occur simultaneously with the review that occurs within the year prior to the end of the contract period (contract periods vary); individual Academic Units may determine other schedules for elective consideration for promotion in the clinical ranks.

A successful review for promotion must reflect an accomplishment trajectory within the faculty member's scope of responsibilities that clearly demonstrates increasing:

- Leadership
- Quality teaching
- Professional practice development/expertise
- Scholarship or dissemination of work (as defined by the discipline/Academic Unit)
- Appropriate service contributions at the unit level

In addition to these broad guidelines, individual Academic Units within the College of Health and Human Services may highlight additional expectations of their Clinical Faculty.

Teaching, Advising, Curriculum and Instructional Development

1. Articulates a highly developed statement of teaching philosophy that demonstrates the highest level of standards for continued contributions to the classroom.
2. Demonstrated responsiveness to peer reviews of teaching.
3. Regularly exceeds CHHS expectations for student evaluations on the four core items (see below); it is expected that average student ratings are aligned with the mean of the Unit and are ≥ 3.0 during the period since last review.
 - (a) "Overall, I learned a lot in this course"
 - (b) "Overall, this instructor was effective"
 - (c) "I am free to express and explain my own views in class" and
 - (d) "The course increased my knowledge of the subject matter."

4. Course syllabi demonstrate evidence of highly evolved: (1) Cultural awareness/diversity; (2) Current content; (3) Evaluation and grading of student performance; and (4) Appropriate instructional technology in classroom teaching.
5. Demonstrates leadership in availability and accuracy in student advisement.
6. Demonstrates leadership in mentoring colleagues, particularly junior faculty, in their own teaching.
7. Demonstrates leadership in course and program development and an exemplary commitment to career-long improvements in teaching effectiveness.
8. Demonstrates leadership in accreditation and program approval efforts and activities.
9. Demonstrates leadership level and highly developed and sought-after expertise in content and technical skills required to support undergraduate or graduate student-directed scholarship (capstone projects, scholarly projects, theses, dissertations).
10. If applicable, demonstrates exemplary training and supervision of graduate assistants

Scholarly Work and Other Professional Activities

1. Articulates a well-developed practice agenda that demonstrates leadership and an uninterrupted trajectory for continued scholarly practice contributions to the field.
2. Meets College requirement of an average of 1 piece of scholarly work per year. Scholarly work includes peer reviewed publications, technical reports, practice briefs, case reports, textbook chapters, and is ultimately defined by each unit. Candidates should check with their Unit for more specific expectations for scholarly work based on Unit workload expectations as their scholarly work will be evaluated in the URC review.

Service to the University, the Public and the Profession

1. Articulates an expansive service agenda to the Unit, College and University, and/or and professional organization enhancement that builds on one's professional expertise
2. Assumes significant leadership roles in the governance of the Academic Unit, College and University
3. Assumes significant leadership roles in relevant professional organizations; advocates for one's profession
4. Relevant professional licenses or certifications are in good standing, if applicable
5. Assumes significant leadership roles in relevant community organizations and provides evidence of impact and significance of leadership contributions (changing policies, systems, etc.)

SECTION 5. CHHS CONSIDERATIONS AND CRITERIA FOR THE REAPPOINTMENT, PROMOTION AND CONFERRAL OF TENURE FOR TENURE TRACK FACULTY

Reappointment of an Assistant Professor

The initial appointment for an Assistant Professor is for a term of four years. At the end of the second year of the initial appointment as Assistant Professor, the faculty shall begin to assemble the dossier to be reviewed for reappointment during their third year. This reappointment review is mandatory. An Assistant Professor who is reappointed at the same rank shall receive an additional appointment of three years. During and before the end of the second year of this additional appointment, the Assistant Professor will have a mandatory review for promotion to Associate Professor with permanent tenure.

For the reappointment of an Assistant Professor, the College of Health and Human Services considers the following for this standard of rank:

- Effective teaching
- High quality research; dissemination of published work
- Appropriate service contributions at the unit level
- Projected growth as a teacher, scholar, and university citizen that shows promise of satisfying criteria for promotion to Associate Professor with conferral of permanent tenure

Teaching, Mentoring and Curriculum Development

1. Articulates a teaching philosophy that demonstrates development for continued contributions to the classroom
2. Demonstrated responsiveness to peer reviews of teaching.
3. Meets CHHS expectations for student evaluations on the four core items (see below); it is expected that average student ratings are aligned with the teaching means of the Unit and are ≥ 3.0 since initial appointment:
 - (a) “Overall, I learned a lot in this course”
 - (b) “Overall, this instructor was effective”
 - (c) “I am free to express and explain my own views in class” and
 - (d) “The course increased my knowledge of the subject matter.”
4. Course syllabi demonstrate evidence of: (1) Cultural awareness/diversity; (2) Current content; (3) Evaluation and grading of student performance; and (4) Appropriate instructional technology in classroom teaching
5. If applicable, demonstrates availability and accuracy in advisement
6. Demonstrates developing expertise in content and technical skills required to mentor undergraduate and graduate student-directed scholarship (e.g., capstone projects, scholarly projects, theses, dissertations)
7. If applicable, demonstrates satisfactory training and supervision of graduate teaching assistants

8. Demonstrates initial activities to enhance teaching effectiveness and curriculum

Scholarly Research and Other Professional Activities

1. Articulates a developing research agenda that describes the importance of the work, and shows capacity for continued contributions to the field
2. Meets the CHHS expectations for pre-tenure reappointment publication productivity (although standards may vary from unit to unit, an average of 2 publications in quality peer reviewed journals/books a year during the review period is considered meeting expectations at the College level; see unit guidelines and standards)
3. Has pursued internal funding and shows promise of progression to external funding to support the program of research prior to tenure.
4. Disseminates scholarly work at conferences via peer-reviewed poster and/or oral presentations

Service to the University, the Public and the Profession

1. Articulates a service agenda to the University, public, and/or profession that builds on the faculty member's professional expertise
2. Serves as a member and developing leader in the governance of the Unit, the College or the University; meets the Unit expectations for committee and other service assignments
3. Serves as a member and developing leader in relevant professional organizations; advocate for one's profession
4. If applicable, relevant professional licenses or certifications are in good standing

Promotion of an Assistant Professor to Associate Professor

An Assistant Professor who is reappointed at the same rank shall receive an appointment of three years. She/he shall be reviewed for promotion to Associate Professor with conferral of Permanent Tenure no later than the end of the second year of the second appointment as Assistant Professor. Note that the tenure and promotion review is mandatory. Individuals seeking to “go up early” for tenure and promotion (i.e., before the end of the second year of the second appointment) represent an extraordinary case and are encouraged to discuss policies, procedures, and promotion expectations with their Unit head prior to submitting materials. Both the Unit Head and the Dean must also agree that an early review is appropriate prior to submitting materials.

For the promotion of an Assistant Professor to Associate Professor (which automatically includes conferral of permanent tenure or, in the rare occurrence of the need to confer permanent tenure on an Associate Professor not hired with tenure), the College of Health and Human Services considers the following:

- A demonstrated record of increasing effectiveness as a teacher
- A continuous and distinctive record of peer reviewed publication and/or peer-reviewed scholarly activity, and appropriate external funding, as determined by Unit guidelines
- Demonstrated and increasing record of outreach, partnership involvement and/or community engagement appropriate to the discipline
- Demonstrated and increasing commitment to service, with a level of engagement appropriate to the discipline, the academic Unit and, where possible, the College, and/or University.

Teaching, Advising, Curriculum and Instructional Development

1. Articulates a well-developed statement of teaching philosophy that demonstrates progressive development as a teacher
2. Demonstrated responsiveness to peer reviews of teaching.
3. Meets the CHHS expectations for student evaluations on the four core items (see below); it is expected that average student ratings are aligned with the teaching means of the Unit and are ≥ 3.0 during the period since last review (i.e., years 3 – 5)
 - (a) “Overall, I learned a lot in this course”
 - (b) “Overall, this instructor was effective”
 - (c) “I am free to express and explain my own views in class” and
 - (d) “The course increased my knowledge of the subject matter.”
4. Course syllabi demonstrate evidence of: (1) Cultural awareness/diversity; (2) Current content; (3) Evaluation and grading of student performance; and (4) Appropriate instructional technology in classroom teaching
5. Demonstrates availability and accuracy in advisement
6. Demonstrates increasingly progressive development in expertise in content and technical skills required to support student-directed scholarship (e.g., capstone projects, scholarly projects, theses, dissertations).

7. If applicable, demonstrates satisfactory training and supervision of graduate teaching assistants
8. Demonstrates progressive and sustained growth to improve teaching effectiveness and expertise and plays an increased and more significant role in curriculum development and revision

Scholarly Research and Other Professional Activities

1. Articulates a research agenda that is significant and sustained, and shows capacity for continued contributions to the field
2. Demonstrated participation in team and/or interdisciplinary science
3. Meets the CHHS expectations for pre-tenure publication productivity (although standards may vary from unit to unit, an average of 2 publications in quality peer reviewed journals/books a year during the review period is considered meeting expectations at the College level; see unit guidelines and standards)
4. Has sought internal and/or external funding at a level consistent with expectations in the field or unit.
5. Disseminates scholarly work at conferences via peer-reviewed poster and/or oral presentations

Service to the University, the Public and the Profession

1. Articulates a service agenda to the University, public, and/or profession that builds on one's professional expertise
2. Serves as an engaged member and leader in the governance of the Unit, College and University with significant and effective results; meets Unit expectations for committee and other service assignments
3. Demonstrates sustained and focused involvement in and leadership of relevant professional organizations, and advocates for one's profession, with significant results of high quality
4. Relevant professional licenses or certifications are in good standing, if applicable
5. Serves as an involved member and developing leader in relevant community organizations and initiatives, making increasingly significant and effective contributions

Promotion of an Associate Professor to Professor

An Associate Professor with Permanent Tenure may be reviewed for promotion at least once every five years. The individual may waive the review for promotion since there is no requirement to go up for Professor. Note that waiving the promotion review does not waive the Tenured Faculty Performance Review requirement. If a review of a tenured faculty member for promotion to Professor is conducted at the time at which a Tenured Faculty Performance Review is mandated, review for promotion fulfills the Tenured Faculty Performance Review requirement.

An Associate Professor with Permanent Tenure need not wait for a 5-year period in order to be reviewed for promotion to Professor. For example, it is possible to be reviewed on the regular Tenured Faculty Performance Review cycle and then based on feedback, be reviewed for promotion to Professor the following year. It is also possible to be reviewed for promotion to Professor prior to the conclusion of the initial 5-year period following promotion to Associate Professor with Permanent Tenure. Individuals seeking to “go up early” for promotion to Professor are encouraged to discuss policies, procedures, and promotion expectations with their Unit head prior to submitting materials. Both the Unit Head and the Dean must also agree that an early review is appropriate prior to submitting materials.

Note that the initial appointment of a faculty member at the rank of Associate Professor without Permanent Tenure shall be for a term of three to five years. The faculty member shall be reviewed for Permanent Tenure no later than the end of the penultimate year of the appointment as Associate Professor. This tenure review is mandatory. Individuals may not be considered for promotion to Professor until they have received Permanent Tenure.

All individuals seeking promotion to Professor are encouraged to discuss policies procedures, and promotion expectations annually with their Unit head and especially prior to submitting materials.

For the promotion of an Associate Professor to Professor, the College of Health and Human Services considers the following:

- A sustained, and distinctive record of academic contribution and achievement that has led to national or international recognition as a scholar, teacher or community engaged leader within the discipline (national and/or international distinction in at least one area is required)
- A cumulative record of sustained teaching effectiveness since promotion to Associate Professor.
- Sustained peer-reviewed publications or other scholarly peer review (although standards may vary from unit to unit, an average of 2 publications in quality peer reviewed journals/books a year during the review period is considered meeting expectations at the College level; see unit guidelines and standards)
- Has sought internal and/or external funding at a level consistent with expectations in the field or unit.
- A demonstrated growth in scholarship and maturity as an independent (but not solo) researcher since promotion to Associate Professor

- A significant, leadership level service record within the individual's academic profession and also within the University community at large

Teaching, Advising, Curriculum and Instructional Development

1. Articulates a highly developed statement of teaching philosophy that demonstrates progressive growth as a teacher.
2. Demonstrated responsiveness to peer reviews of teaching.
3. Meets the CHHS expectations for student evaluations on the four core items (see below); it is expected that average student ratings are aligned with the mean of the Unit and are ≥ 3.0 during the period since last review.
 - (a) "Overall, I learned a lot in this course"
 - (b) "Overall, this instructor was effective"
 - (c) "I am free to express and explain my own views in class" and
 - (d) "The course increased my knowledge of the subject matter."
4. Course syllabi demonstrate evidence of: (1) Cultural awareness/diversity; (2) Current content; (3) Evaluation and grading of student performance; and (4) Appropriate instructional technology in classroom teaching
5. Demonstrates excellence, availability and accuracy in advisement
6. Demonstrates significant positive impact on students' professional development for student-directed scholarship
7. Demonstrates progressive and sustained growth to improve teaching effectiveness and expertise and plays an increased and more significant role in in curriculum development and revision.
8. Demonstrated and strong evidence of sustained mentoring of junior faculty or post-doctoral, doctoral and master's students (if applicable) in teaching and instruction.

Scholarly Research and Other Related Activities

1. Articulates a leadership level research agenda that is highly significant and sustained, and shows capacity for high-level, continued contributions to the field
2. Has an established national or international reputation related to research in their field as is evidenced by national or international presentations, refereed publications, sustained receipt of external funds, or similar evidence to support the candidate's program of research.
3. Meets CHHS expectations for research leadership and productivity appropriate to the rank of full professor and associated with overall instructional and service workload.
4. Disseminates scholarly work at conferences via peer-reviewed poster and/or oral presentations

Service to the University, the Public and the Profession

1. Articulates an expansive service agenda to the Unit, College and University, and/or professional organization enhancement that builds on one's professional expertise
2. Assumes significant leadership roles in the governance of the Academic Unit, College and University
3. Assumes significant leadership roles in relevant professional organizations; advocates for one's profession
4. Relevant professional licenses or certifications are in good standing, if applicable
5. Assumes significant leadership roles in relevant community organizations and provides evidence of impact and significance of leadership contributions (changing policies, systems, etc.).

SECTION 6. THE DOSSIER

Process

All faculty will submit an electronic Dossier (using current A Tech format) of his/her/their accomplishments for review. At this time, CHHS uses DropBox to organize components of the Dossier. Electronic folders will be provided for candidate uploads with required fillable Adobe forms for candidate narratives. Subfolders are intended to assist the candidate with organizing and presenting their dossier. However, it is the faculty member's responsibility to adhere to the required expectations below.

Format

Narratives must use 12-point font, pagination, single space with 1-inch margins, and include the name of the candidate on each page right aligned in a footer or header. Narratives should be uploaded as a pdf document only.

Page limits

Please adhere to the page limits outlined in the table below. following page limits. Narrative text exceeding the page limits below will not be included as part of in the review process.

Sections	Page limits
Narrative: Personal statement (everyone)	3
Narrative: Teaching statement (everyone)	2
Narrative: Research statement (tenure track) OR Scholarship statement (applicable special faculty) OR Practice statement (applicable special faculty practice statement)	2
Narrative: Service statement (everyone)	2
Five-year plan and set of goals with related milestones (tenure-track candidates for promotion)	3

Tables	No page limits
Appendices	No page limits

Dossier Components

Components of the Dossier will vary with type of appointment, but candidates should convey any activity within Teaching, Research/Scholarship/Practice and Service that is relevant. It is essential that candidates confer with their Unit Chair/Director on the scope of information that should be posted.

For helpful resources in writing your portfolio, please consult ADVANCE FADO resources: <https://advance.uncc.edu/programming/programs/resources-all-faculty/faculty-procedures-policies-and-regulations-including-rpt>.

1. Candidate Narratives
 - (a) The candidate narratives represent the candidate’s opportunity to provide an overview of their overall impact (personal statement) and summaries of impacts in the areas of teaching, research/scholarship/practice, and service. Narratives should be organized, cohesive documents with appropriate subheadings.
 - (b) Declaration of FMLA/COVID year extension – a simple statement that alerts internal reviewers to take into consideration any duly granted extension when considering productivity over time.
 - (c) A current five-year plan and set of goals with related milestones (for candidates for promotion to professor only)
2. CV
3. Copies of results of Annual Reviews (i.e., signed letters from supervisor)
4. Teaching Statement
5. Course Evaluations (all electronic data including all student comments)
6. Copies of all Peer Evaluations of Teaching
7. Syllabi. Attach in chronological order the most recent course syllabus for each course taught. For tenure track reappointment and/or promotion, attach most current syllabi for each course taught since appointment to UNC Charlotte. For lecturer reappointment and/or promotion, attach most current syllabi for each course taught since last review period.
8. Research Scholarship/Practice Statement
9. Copies of Published Work
10. Service Statement
11. Completed Tables (detailing teaching, research/scholarship/practice, service)
12. Appendices (copies of supporting materials referenced in any of the Statements)

Narrative Component: Personal Statement

Candidates will craft a Personal Statement of their accomplishments that both narrates and integrates all aspects of their accomplishments within the evaluation timeframe related to their assignment. This is an opportunity for tenure-track faculty, lecturers and clinical faculty to tell the story of their work, discussing the significance, challenges, and professional growth associated with those accomplishments.

Narrative Component: Teaching, Mentoring, and Curriculum Development Contributions

Effective teaching is the primary mission of the University and, therefore, is an essential criterion for appointment or advancement. Clear documentation of effectiveness in this area is required for approval of any recommendation for reappointment, promotion, or conferral of permanent tenure. The narrative should be holistic and reflective in nature and highlight the candidate's contributions in the area of teaching, mentoring and curriculum development. Specific examples of the candidate's teaching effectiveness should be identified and referred to in the narrative, with corresponding tables and documents. All relevant documentation should be clearly labeled.

The teaching narrative should consider at least the following to demonstrate the candidate's abilities to perform at the rank he/she/they are seeking:

Philosophy of Teaching:

Describe your core beliefs, life experiences, or teaching philosophy and how they influence how you teach. Individuals' teaching styles may be influenced by pedagogical theory or training, their experiences as a student, observations of specific mentors or role models, and so forth. The following are questions that you may find helpful in guiding your reflections on how to describe your teaching philosophy (do not respond to these items individually, they are only ideas to help you craft your narrative):

- Is your teaching philosophy based on pedagogical theory and research? If so, what pedagogical literature do you apply when choosing teaching methodologies, and how do you apply this to help students achieve learning outcomes?
- What are and how do your teaching beliefs relate to the mission of the university and college?
- What core beliefs about teaching and learning guide you and what life experiences have shaped your core beliefs?
- What outcomes do you set for student learning?
- Have others influenced the way you teach and your thoughts about teaching? How and in what way/s?
- Is there a metaphor that best describes your approach to teaching? How/why does this metaphor apply?

Instructional Strategies:

Provide 1 or 2 concrete examples of instructional strategies that you employ which demonstrate your teaching philosophy. Indicate how you have applied this philosophy with specific examples that highlight your beliefs, desired student outcomes and methodologies chosen.

Subject Competence:

What subject areas and level of courses do you normally teach and what are their relevance to the Unit's curriculum? Do you have full command of the subject matter and an understanding of its relationship to other areas of knowledge? Is course content current and appropriate for the level of the course and curriculum?

Course Design:

Are the courses that you teach organized appropriately for the subject matter and placed within the curriculum? Are instructional strategies and course materials appropriate for the level of the course, size of the class, nature and preparation of the students, contact hours, and schedule of class meetings?

Course Presentation:

Are course materials presented clearly and coherently? Do you present the course with enthusiasm that supports the learning process? Is the course presented in a manner that stimulates the interest and involvement of students and challenges their abilities? What is your impact on the quality of student performance?

Assessment of Teaching Effectiveness:

Summarize and present an analysis of your teaching effectiveness data, addressing any scores that are below the College standard. The College standard is that average student ratings are aligned with the teaching means of the Unit and are ≥ 3.0 since initial appointment for the questions of: "Overall, I learned a lot in this course", "Overall, this instructor was effective", "I am free to express and explain my own views in class" and "The course increased my knowledge of the subject matter.". If you are below these means, state how you will improve those scores.

You may also address any peer evaluations of teaching here.

Summarize the data listed in the teaching appendix (Tables T.1-5) to provide context for your teaching contributions.

Mentoring, Advising, and Supervision:

Highlight your contributions to mentoring, advising, and supervision of students (and junior faculty if appropriate).

Summarize the data presented in Tables T.2 through T.4. Some candidates may not have

engaged in all of these activities – just indicate “not applicable” after the table title and delete the actual table.

Advising (Table T.2) relates to formally assigned, academic advising. Use the narrative to highlight and reflect on advising. What is the type and the extent of advising responsibilities of the candidate? What measures does the department use to evaluate advising effectiveness, and what are the results of these evaluations? To what extent have you attempted to improve the effectiveness of advising? Have these efforts been successful?

Mentoring (Table T.3) refers to chairing or being a committee member of a student’s project, capstone, thesis, or dissertation. Table T.3 has separate sections for students who have graduated versus those students with whom you are currently working. In the narrative, what types and levels of student research have been directed by the candidate? How does the department evaluate effectiveness in guiding student research, and what are the results of these evaluations for the candidate?

Directed Independent Study (DIS) or Field/Clinical Supervision (Table T.4) addresses other types of advising or supervisory activities that may not be formally recognized within the document or our formal electronic systems. These should be activities such as: DIS, and/or clinical or field supervision of students (if this is not normally a part of your job and/or you do not appear as the instructor of record). Summarize these activities in the text.

Student Supervision (Table T.4) relates to students who work for you as graduate assistants, research assistants, or teaching assistants (regardless of where the funding originates). Summarize the students’ responsibilities, any training that occurred, and any deliverables that were produced. In the narrative describe what responsibilities you have had, if any, for training, supervising, and evaluating graduate assistants? How does the department evaluate effectiveness in fulfilling such responsibilities, and what are the results of these evaluations for the candidate?

Curricular Development:

Provide any examples of your curriculum development activities. These should be activities related to an overall curriculum or degree program, generally not changes made to an individual course where you are the sole instructor. How have you contributed to development of the curriculum, and how has this contribution been evaluated? How effective, innovative, and significant have the instructional strategies and materials that you have developed been? What are the significance and results of curriculum and instructional development projects for which you have been awarded grant funding? Describe the quality and significance of other contributions by you to pedagogy. Attach relevant curriculum development contributions (If applicable).

Any Specific Strategies/Goals and Future Directions:

Note any specific strategies or goals for your teaching or curricular contributions and your future directions in this area. Note any specific strategies or goals for your teaching or curricular contributions and your future directions in this area. Refer to Table T.5.

Other possible narrative topics:

If applicable, you could also include narrative demonstrating collegiality and interest in interdisciplinarity and/or interprofessional activities as well as any demonstrated interest in team/interdisciplinary instruction and mentoring.

Teaching Tables:

A. Complete Tables T.1 – T.5

1. Teaching Experience. Complete Table T.1 (Semester, Course name, Level, Enrollment, Student evaluation mean score, Date of peer evaluation, Peer evaluator, [Grade distributions – optional], Also include any additional teaching/guest lectures – if applicable)
2. Formal Student Advising (if applicable). Complete Table T.2 (Semester/Year, Number of advisees and level, Type and frequency of contacts, advising evaluation results, Efforts to improve advising process)
3. Thesis and Dissertation Committees. Complete Table T.3 (Graduate, Degree Awarded, Product, Title/Topic, Role, Graduation; Current Student, Degree Sought, Product, Title/Topic, Role, Status/Graduation)
4. Directed/Independent Study (if applicable), Field/Clinical Supervision (if applicable), Student Supervision (if applicable). Complete Table T.4 (Semester/Year, Student name or number of students, Product/Activities (which may include description of students' responsibilities) or Results from the work accomplished.)
5. Efforts to Improve Instruction (if applicable) and Future Directions in Teaching. Complete Table T.5 (Semester/Year (if goal state which sem/yr will occur), Goal, Action Plan or Activity that will be performed. State Sponsor when relevant.

If applicable, you could also include the following tables:

6. Teaching Awards or Nominations (If applicable)
7. Grants Awarded for Curricular or Instructional benefits (If applicable)

Please note that Peer Evaluation of Teaching and Student Evaluation of Teaching (Course Evaluations) each have their own location in the Dossier files.

Sample Teaching Tables to be included in the Dossier

Table T.1 Teaching Experience

Semester	Course Name	Level*	Enrollment	Student evaluation**	Peer evaluator
Fall 2005	LBST 2214 Health and Quality of Life	U	32	4.35	
	NURS 6400 Nursing the Elderly	G	9	3.89	
Spring 2006	HSRD 8101 Design of Health Services Research	D	3	3.67	Dr. Tonya Martin
	SOWK 6222 Research Methods in Social Work Practice	G	3	2.67	Dr. Patty Springsteen
Insert or delete rows as needed					

U=undergraduate; G=graduate/Master's; D=doctoral

** Mean response for the statement "Overall, this instructor was effective."

Table T.2 Formal Student Advising (if applicable)

Semester/Year or Academic Year	Number of Advisees and Level	Type and Frequency of Contacts	Advising Evaluation Results	Efforts to Improve Advising Process
2006-2007	10 UG	Held individual meetings with each student once per semester	Overall score 3.4/5.0 (n=7)	Developed a BSPH curriculum checklist for students
2009-2010	20 MSPH	Held 2 group advising sessions each semester; also met with students during graduate orientation	NA	Created a brief document to aid students in selecting a project/thesis Chair
Insert or delete rows as needed				

Table T.3 Thesis and Dissertation Committees (alphabetical order within status) (N=xx)

Status: Graduate	Degree Awarded	Product	Title/Topic	Role	Status/Graduation
Suzie Baker	MSW	Thesis	Examining Domestic Violence and Future Pregnancy Readiness and Intention	Member	May 2010
Linda James	MSN	Thesis	A Cross-Sectional Study Examining the Relationship between Social Support and Myocardial Infarction Outcomes	Chair	August 2010
Martin Jones	PhD Health Psychology	Dissertation	Exercise Based Cognitive Therapy as a Novel Treatment for Co-morbid Insomnia and Obesity	Member	December 2010
Katherine Sutton	PhD Health Services Research	Dissertation	The Association between Physician Training and Clinical Outcomes for Hip Replacement Surgery	Graduate School Representative	August 2011
James Whyte	MSPH	Project	An Evaluation of a Faith-based Diabetes Awareness Program	Chair	August 2009
Insert or delete rows as needed					

Table T.3 Thesis and Dissertation Committees, continued (alphabetical order within status) (N=xx)

Status: Current Student	Degree Sought	Product	Title/Topic	Role	Status
Karen Batson	PhD Health Services Research	Dissertation	The Effectiveness of a Collaborative Care Model in Improving Symptoms of Anxiety in Patients with Congestive Heart Failure	Co-chair	Expected May 2013
Rhonda Miller	MSPH	Thesis	Tentative: Diabetes Management	Member	Expected December 2011
Insert or delete rows as needed					

Table T.4 Directed Independent Study or Field/Clinical Supervision* or Student Supervision (if applicable)

Type of Supervision	Semester/Year or Academic Year	Student Name or Number of Students/Level	Product/Activities
Directed Independent Study	2008-2010	Rosemary Morehead/ UG	2 students submitted conference abstracts and both were accepted
Student Supervision	2008-2010	2 UG & 1 MSN	I supervised 3 students working on a grant for me. Undergraduate students collected survey data and the master's student was responsible for data entry and analysis; I provided training for the students and held weekly status meetings.
	Insert or delete rows as needed		

*These entries are only for supervision of students who do not have a field instructor (such as sometimes occurs in Social Work). If you are the Instructor of Record for a Clinical, Internship or Field course, the information should be listed in Table T.1.

Table T.5 Efforts to Improve Instruction (if applicable) and Future Directions in Teaching

Semester & Year effort was (or will be) performed	Goal	Action Plan or Activity (list Sponsor if applicable)
Fall 2008	Increase undergraduate student participation	Attended workshop Canvas Open Swim/Offered by CTL
Spring 2014	Develop and teach an elective on primary data collection for HSR students	Work in Fall 2013 to develop syllabus, course objectives and course content.
Insert or delete rows as needed		

Narrative Component: Research and Scholarship

The University's mission in the discovery, dissemination, synthesis, integration, and application of knowledge requires that all members of the faculty are productively engaged in research, scholarship, creative, and other professional activities appropriate to their discipline or profession. Clear documentation of appropriate productivity in this area is required for any recommendation for reappointment, promotion, or conferral of permanent tenure.

Engagement in these activities takes many different forms depending upon the disciplinary or professional affiliation of the faculty member. Likewise, evidence of the productivity of this engagement varies widely from refereed publications to artistic productions to original designs to unique applications of existing knowledge to solve a problem. It is the responsibility of the Unit to ensure that the candidate and reviewers at all levels understand what constitutes appropriate evidence and documentation of productive engagement within the discipline or profession, and the quality and significance of the work.

Candidates should frame their individual research program activities in relation to a larger body of research and describe how their work has contributed to the advancement of their area of expertise. Discussion of where the candidate has been, is now, and where he/she/they are going, should also be provided.

With increasing interdisciplinary research and scholarship being done in teams, the candidate must explicitly describe their role in joint efforts of research and scholarship such as studies or disseminated work (e.g., your role in the conception, planning, and performance of the research work; in the synthesis of the research results and in writing manuscripts; assessment of the importance of the your contributions relative to those of the other authors, and, when feasible, percentage of total effort on the work attributable to you).

The research section **should consider at least the** following to demonstrate the candidates' abilities to perform at the rank they are seeking:

Area of Research and its Significance for the Discipline/Profession.

Define your area of research and highlight your contribution to the field. Faculty members usually have 2-3 thematic areas in which they work. These areas should encompass your publications, presentations, and grants since beginning at UNC Charlotte or since gaining tenure. The use of work completed prior to these time periods is acceptable but narrative must primarily focus on time since beginning at UNC Charlotte or since gaining tenure.

Questions to guide your narrative: Why is this area important to your field? Is it a very prevalent issue or a rapidly growing problem? Is it rare but serious? Provide sufficient context to understand the importance of the area. Highlight the contributions that your research has made to the field in your stated areas. Contributions can be in the form of theoretical contributions, psychometrics, applying new technology or methods, program/service implementation or evaluation, advancing clinical practice or pedagogy, etc. When appropriate, cite your relevant

publications or grants that are evidence of your contribution.

Research Accomplishments to Date:

Summarize the data listed in the research appendix to provide context for how your scholarly work fits into your research agenda – noting the quality and importance of your work. Describe your level of accomplishment within this stated research agenda as evidenced by your publications, presentations, and grants. The goal is to summarize the data in the tables and provide context for reviewers to understand the importance and contribution of the body of your work. Specifically, Publications, Presentations, Grants/Contracts and Other scholarly work (if applicable).

Publications:

- Summarize the data presented in Tables R.1-R.3.
- Publications, and the work they represent, must be evaluated and not merely enumerated. The department should assist reviewers to understand the status within the discipline or profession of the journal or type of publication, the rigor of the review process for acceptance, and any other special distinctions that should be considered. Include accepted and in-press manuscripts, and designate them as such.
- Discuss the level of contribution that you made as a co-author on each publication where you were not the lead author or senior/mentor author (e.g., your role in the conception, planning and performance of the research work; your role in the synthesis of the research results and in writing the manuscript; assessment of the importance of your contributions relative to those of the other authors, and, when feasible, percentage of total effort on the project attributable to you.)
- Describe the quality of your publication outlets within the context of your Unit's journal quality criteria. Appraisals of publications or other works in scholarly and critical literature would be useful in this process. A piece of work that has been disseminated through multiple outlets should be identified as such (e.g., it should be clear to the reviewers when a book chapter presents a piece of work previously published in a journal and/or a conference proceeding after originally being presented as a paper at a professional meeting.) If available, discuss the number of citations for your publications, referring to Table R.1
- Work in progress should be assessed and its status clearly identified (e.g., in press, accepted for publication, submitted for publication, or manuscript in preparation.), referring to Table R.2

Presentations:

- Unless documentation to the contrary is provided, a paper or presentation at a

professional meeting is not considered to have been critically refereed. If the contribution was peer reviewed or if it was specially invited, it is the candidate's responsibility to provide appropriate documentation.

- It is the responsibility of the Unit to assist reviewers at all levels to understand the distinction of presenting at the meeting in question, the rigor of the review process for acceptance, and the significance to be attributed to an invitation to make a presentation.
- Summarize the data presented in Table R.3. Describe the importance of your dissemination outlets to your field or Unit (local, regional, national, international), the audience (clinicians, researchers, practice personnel), and level of rigor/quality of the venue.

Grants and Contracts:

- Identify work supported by grants or contracts and indicate the funding agency and the amount and duration of funding.
- Summarize the data presented in Table R.4 related to funding proposals and awards. Describe how proposals build upon one another. From awarded monies, indicate the research products that were generated (e.g., number of presentations, publications, additional grant proposals, student theses or dissertations). For large awards where you are a subcontractor or co-investigator, list both the total award and the portion awarded to you. For external proposals, provide reviewers with context for understanding the scoring of proposals. In some instances, the candidate may need to discuss the economic climate if a well-scored proposal was not funded.

Other Recognition of Research and Scholarship:

- Exhibitions, and other creative works must be evaluated and not merely enumerated. It is the responsibility of the candidate to provide any published reviews of the creative work by outside critics and appropriate documentation that a performance or exhibition has been juried. It is the responsibility of the Unit to assist reviewers at all levels to understand the significance the discipline attributes to the type of performance or exhibition and the credibility of the reviewers. Each collaborator in a collaborative production must be identified and the department must establish as clearly as possible the role of the candidate in the joint effort and provide an assessment of the importance of the contribution relative to the contributions of the other collaborators.
- Complete Table R.5. Provide any other narrative relating to research accomplishments such as awards, keynote speaking engagements, and so forth to demonstrate acknowledged or potential for expertise in the field.

On-going Agenda for Research, Scholarly and Creative Activities:

Consideration should be given to other work in progress in terms of its place in the candidate's on-going agenda for research, scholarly and creative activities. How does this work relate to that reported above; e.g., does it replicate or extend that work, or does it represent a new line of investigation? Describe how your research is evolving in terms of direction, content, and/or

methodology.

For future grant/contract submissions, be sure to use concrete language that directly notes grants/contracts, funding organizations, specific collaborators, and/or new research methodologies that build upon your past work.

You may also note manuscripts in preparation and include a brief description of the journals for submission as well as a timeline for the manuscript to be submitted and the expected editorial response period. For example, “*What publications are you working on? What data are you collecting or analyzing? What is the next grant you will write?*” Describe how you are effectively building a foundation to continue your research and to expand it. Complete and discuss Table R.6.

Other possible narrative topics:

If applicable, the candidate could discuss demonstrated interest and participation in team and/or interdisciplinary science. In addition, the candidate could discuss acquired foundational knowledge of research grants management, policies, procedures and compliance; pursuit of research grants acumen improvement as well as any success in maintaining financial support for students.

Research Appendix:

1. Complete Tables R.1-R.6, as applicable.
 - (a) Publications. Complete Table R.1 (Publication (including accepted and in-press manuscripts) in citation format – in chronological order, Journal Quality, – Peer-reviewed material then Non-Peer-reviewed material, Citation Analysis of Published Work including Source Information)
 - (b) Manuscripts in Preparation. Complete Table R.2 (Number, Tentative Title, Status, Target Journal)
 - (c) Presentations. Complete Table R.4 (Presentations in citation format – chronological order, Peer-reviewed material then Non peer-reviewed material)
 - (d) Funded and Unfunded Grant Proposals. Complete Table R.5 (Title, Role, Explanation of Resource Management, Date Submitted, Name of Funder & Internal/External, Requested Amount, Duration, Status.) [For large awards where you are a subcontractor or co-investigator, list both the total award and the portion awarded to you.]
 - (e) Additional Recognition of Research and Scholarship (If applicable). Complete Table R.6 (Year; Title of post-graduate award, fellowship, lectureship; Sponsor)
 - (f) Future Directions in Research and Scholarship. Complete Table R.7 (Research/Scholarship Goals, Rationale and Action Plan).
2. Post the following in the Appendix
 - (a) All published, in press, or accepted manuscripts in chronological order since

appointment at UNC Charlotte. For promotion to Full Professor, include only manuscripts published since the review for tenure and promotion.

- (b) A maximum of 3 oral or poster presentations that are representative of work disseminated at professional conferences.
- (c) Copies of submitted grant proposal abstracts, award letters, reviewer comments, documentation of grants and contracts (such as letters of acceptance, etc.)
- (d) Copies of any awards or scholarships received for research.

Sample Research Tables to be included in the Dossier

Table R.1 Publications and Citation Analysis

			Citation Source Info	
Number/ Type of Publication	Article Publication, Book Chapter, or Non-peer Reviewed Publication in Citation Format	Journal Quality	ISI Web of Knowledge	Google Scholar
1/Article	Edwards, M., Korczynski, R. D., & Randel, D. (2010). Talking about chronic illness self-care: Findings from the Caring for Arthritis in Mexican American Families study. <i>The Gerontologist</i> , 51(1): 64-75. doi:10.1093/geront/gnq077	IF=2.315; ranks 6 out of 28 gerontology journals; 15% acceptance rate	8	20
2/Book	Edwards, M., Hiller, L. C., <u>Farley, N. J.</u> , & Smith, B. Z. (2007). Women and Arthritis. In Smith, A. & Jones, H. (Eds.), <i>Arthritis, Health, and CommUnity: A Public Health Perspective</i> (pp. 245-262). New York: Macmillan.			

Table R.2. Manuscripts in Preparation

Number	Tentative Title	Status	Target Journal
1	Arthur, C. & Edwards, M. Exploring cancer support group communication among Latinos.	Revise for submission elsewhere	Qualitative Communication Research
2	Sanders, M. L., Edwards, M. , Evans, M. E., Redfinger, M. The cumulative effect of sporadic homelessness among Mexican American adolescents.	Draft	Journal of Homelessness
	Insert or delete rows as needed		

Table R.3. Presentations Since Initial Appointment at UNC Charlotte in Chronological Order (Peer reviewed unless noted as ‘Invited’)

Number	Citation	Type
1	Edwards, M. “Stress and Depression in Older Hispanic Women with Chronic Illness.” 58 th Annual Scientific Meeting of the Gerontological Society of America, Orlando, FL, November 2005.	Poster
2	Spiller, T.R. (chair) & Edwards, M. (co-chair). “Nutrition Counseling with Older Latinos: OpportUnities and Challenges for Diverse Health Care Providers.” 58 th Annual Scientific Meeting of the Gerontological Society of America, Orlando, FL, November 2005.	Oral
3	Edwards, M. “Older Latinos and Chronic Illness.” North Carolina Society of Nurse Practitioners, Charlotte, NC, October, 2006.	Invited/Oral
	Insert or delete rows as needed	

Table R.4. Funded and Unfunded Grant Proposals since Initial Appointment at UNC Charlotte

Title	Role	Submitted	Funding Agency	Requested Amount	Duration	Status
Acculturation and health behaviors of Latinos in Charlotte	PI	Sept 2006	Junior Faculty Grant, UNC Charlotte	\$6,000	2006-2007	Funded
Self-care practices among Mexican American families with diabetes	PI	Oct 2006	NIH/NIA 1R03AG030523-01	\$175,000	2007-2008	Score 230
Development and validation of Latino Health Beliefs Scale	Co-I	Feb 2007	Robert Wood Johnson Foundation	\$381,171	2007-09	Unscored
Self-care practices among Mexican American families with diabetes	PI	Oct 2007	NIH/NIA 5R03AG030417-01	\$175,000 (awarded \$153,704)	2008-10	Score 124; Funded
Health communication among Latinos with diabetes	Co-PI	Sept 2010	NIH/NINR 1 DP2 OD008491-01	\$1,500,000 (\$450,000 as co-PI)	2011-2016	Score 136; Funded
Insert or delete rows as needed						

Table R.5. Additional Recognition of Research and Scholarship (If applicable)

Year	Title	Sponsor
2010-2011	Royster Society of Fellows Award	Royster Society of Fellows
Insert or delete rows as needed		

Table R.6. Future Directions in Research and Scholarship

Research/Scholarship Goals	Rationale and Action Plan
Social support	<p>Submit RO1 on social support among Hispanic families with diabetes. Revise previous grant proposal to use R01 format (Fall 2011).</p> <p>Submit an R01 intervention study to improve diabetes self-care among intergenerational families with diabetes (2014).</p>
Women’s health/health disparities	Develop a larger proposal with the VA to examine homeless female veterans and their chronic illness health status.
Insert or delete rows as needed	

Narrative Component: Service to the University, the Public and the Profession

As a public university, the mission of UNC Charlotte, and thus the College of Health and Human Services and its Units, is to provide for the educational, economic, social, and cultural advancement of the people of North Carolina. To fulfill this mission requires participation of members of the faculty in service activities that are distinct from but related to their roles as teachers and scholars. Contributions in these areas should be carefully documented, evaluated, and considered as positive factors in the reappointment, promotion, and tenure review process. Such service includes participation in the administration and governance of the Unit, College and University and activities that involve the professional expertise of members of the faculty in the community or region outside the University. It also may include contributions of faculty members to their discipline or profession through service to professional societies and associations.

Each candidate should provide a description of his/her/their service agenda and how service reflects the candidate's area of expertise. It is understood that a certain proportion of activities are unrelated to the candidate's research and expertise but needed for department and program functioning. Include any personal criteria for seeking/accepting service opportunities. Describe the overall contribution to internal administration and governance and external public and professional service as outlined below. Discuss your contributions at the various levels within the context of where you are in your career trajectory.

Candidates should provide information on personally attributable activities to help reviewers evaluate the quality, effectiveness, and significance of their service to the University, public, and profession. This information should be objective when possible (e.g., cite the number of candidates you recruited while serving on a search committee).

The service narrative **should consider at least** the following to demonstrate the candidates' abilities to perform at the ranks they are seeking:

Service Agenda:

Highlight those significant service and public engagement activities and contributions that provide evidence of your commitment to the University, Discipline/Profession, and Community. Discuss how your service enhances your work as a faculty member, or improves understanding of the Unit, the College or the University. Importantly, discuss how bringing your professional expertise to a community organization or initiative will have a positive impact on the community or targeted community members.

Contributions to the Administration and Governance of the University:

Consideration should be given to administrative responsibilities and terms of service and their effectiveness. Recognition should be given to special contributions to the governance of the institution through service on committees at department, college, and University levels. It is important that the candidate details their direct contribution on the committees served at the level

of the Unit, College and University. In addition, if there are cross-cutting contributions within UNC Charlotte – if you are involved in other degree programs, academies or institutes that cross Units and Colleges, describe these activities. Service to the academy may include mentoring of junior faculty; conducting peer teaching evaluations; peer review of colleagues' manuscripts, grants, Dossiers, etc. For example, “*I served as research team leader for the Academy of Community Health from 2010 to 2011, led community advisory meetings, and successfully solicited funds from various Deans on campus to provide award monies for faculty and student research prizes.*”

Public Service.

Consideration should be given to activities external to the University that are based on the professional expertise of the candidate and related to the public service objectives of the institution. Such activities might include service on boards, committees, task forces and through consulting arrangements. For example, it may be participating in a health fair with a target population by a community-based researcher or serving as a volunteer with United Way in an area that reflects your expertise. For bench scientists, this may include judging a high school student science fair or clinicians giving a talk at a facility celebrating Nurses’ Week or participating in Leadership Charlotte. For clinicians involved in licensure and certification training, describe any activities conducted with the community (e.g., Basic Life Support (BLS) for community organizations.) Delivery of continuing education workshops and non-credit courses might be included here or in the teaching area depending upon guidelines established by the candidate’s unit and college. It is the responsibility of the candidate to provide accurate information about the nature and extent of these services. The capacity of the service should be described, including if the candidate held leadership roles.

DO NOT include any consulting or other paid work, even if approved by the Unit and College

Service to the Profession:

Faculty members often provide service to their profession through involvement in professional associations appropriate to their specialization. Contributions might take the form of editorial work or service as a referee for a professional journal; membership on committees; or holding an elective or appointed office. It is the responsibility of the candidate to identify these activities and provide appropriate documentation. Service to your profession may include provision of continuing professional education, for example. For clinical faculty involved in licensure and certification training.

Future Directions:

Discuss plans for future service activities and contributions. Highlight your future plans to move into leadership roles within your chosen areas of service.

Service Tables:

- A. Complete Tables S.1-S.2, as applicable.
 - 1. Unit/College/University Service, Discipline/Profession Service, and Community/Public Contributions. Complete Table S.1 (Level, Description of the organization/committee; Purpose & function of the committee/position; Your role/position; Elected/appointed, etc.; Dates, Significance and effectiveness of contributions)
 - 2. Relevant Professional Licenses/Certifications. Complete Table S.2 (If applicable) (Licenses/certifications, Good standing Y/N, Dates, State(s) valid)
- B. Put any of the following in the Appendix
 - 1. Any letters or commendations from professional or community service organizations related to your service
 - 2. Copies of relevant licenses or certifications as applicable.

Sample Service Tables to be included in the Dossier

Table S.1 Service Contributions

¹ Level for Unit/College/University, identify if Unit, College, University or other cross-cutting themes

² Level for Discipline or Professional, identify if State, Regional, National, International

³ Level for Community, identify community locale (local, regional, state, national, international)

Level ^{1,2,3}	Organization/ Committee	Purpose & Function of Committee/Position	Your Role/ Position	Elected, Appointed, Invited, or Volunteered	Dates	Significance & Effectiveness of Contributions
Unit	MSW Admissions Committee	Review applications and make recommendations	Member	Appointed	2005- present	Review approximately 25-70 applicants annually for graduate admissions
Other Cross- Cutting Themes	Gerontology Program	Interdisciplinary Baccalaureate and Master's Certificate	Faculty Affiliate	Volunteer, appointment	2005- present	Attended new student orientation; guest lecture in GRNT classes once/year; reviewed affiliate faculty member applications; participated in the evaluation of the Gerontology Program; taught a cross-listed GRNT course

National	National Institutes of Health (NIH)	Reviews proposals quarterly	Grant Reviewer	Appointed	2007 & 2009	Ad hoc study section member/reviewer for NINR grants on health disparities
Regional	Rowan-Salisbury Schools	Faculty continuing education	Represented SOWK	Volunteered	September 2011-current	Assisted with poverty simulation event for faculty and staff of the school system

Table S.2. Relevant Professional Licenses/Certifications (If applicable)

License/Certification	Good Standing (Y or N)	Dates	State(s) Valid
Licensed Clinical Social Worker (LCSW)	Y	1995-present	North Carolina
Licensed Clinical Addiction Specialist	Y	2009-present	North Carolina
Insert or delete rows as needed			

Narrative Component: Five-Year Plan (applicable only for candidates for promotion to professor)

Candidates for promotion to professor should include a five-year plan with goals and related milestones, comparable to the narrative required in the [tenured faculty performance review \(TFPR\) process](#).

SECTION 7. CHHS GUIDELINES FOR EXTERNAL REVIEW

CHHS' guidelines for the External Review process follow the University policies under the [Academic Personal Procedure Handbook Appendix L](#).

Candidates being considered for promotion or for conferral of permanent tenure, external evaluations will be requested from a sufficient number of faculty (typically six or more) outside the University of North Carolina at Charlotte in order to receive at least three reviews (required).

Candidates will develop materials to be shared with external reviewers. At this time, CHHS uses DropBox to organize materials for external review. A file folder separate from the Dossier folder will be assigned to individual candidates. It is the faculty member's responsibility to adhere to the required expectations below.

Format

Please use 12-point font, pagination, single space with 1-inch margins, and include the name of the candidate on each page in a footer or header.

Page limits

Please adhere to the following page limits. Reviewers have the right to stop reading anything that goes over these page limits.

External Review Materials

Materials	Page limits
External Review Narrative	3
Candidate CV	No page limits
Representative samples of the candidate's publications and other relevant scholarly works.	No page limits

The Process

Reviewers must be external to UNC Charlotte and must have a sufficient record of accomplishment and expertise in the candidate's field of scholarship to make a sound professional judgment. The College of Health and Human Services generally applies NIH conflict of interest standards to this process – close colleagues including those served with at a previous university position, current or former mentor or advisor, research or publication collaborator, friend, family member, etc.). These external reviewers should be recognized scholars in the candidate's field and should be whenever possible, located at Carnegie classified doctoral/research-intensive or research-extensive universities (there are cases where a nationally or internationally known expert in a faculty member's area of scholarship is employed at other types of institutions; a rationale can be presented for their selection). Conference interactions with colleagues are acceptable external reviewers.

By the specified deadline, candidates for promotion to Associate or Full Professor and/or tenure provide the unit head with a list of six potential external reviewers. Each unit head will also identify 6 and will share the complete list of 12 or more potential external reviewers with candidates to identify any conflicts of interest (removes and replaces names of external reviewers should there be a COI). The unit head preliminarily contacts and confirms reviewers (preferably a mix from each list). The dossier must include the [External Reviewers Letters: Record & Procedures grid](#) from Academic Affairs.).

Candidates submit their packets of materials (3-page external review narrative, current vitae, samples of scholarly work) to be sent to external reviewers to the unit head by the College deadline. The unit head confirms the submitted materials comply with page limits and then sends instructions and all relevant materials to reviewers.

By the specified deadline, the unit head will send to the external reviewers:

1. A description of the process for selecting the external reviewers and brief explanation of why they were selected including the nature and extent of any prior personal or professional relationship between the candidate and the reviewer
2. CHHS RPT criteria for scholarship
3. A brief description of the Unit and the candidate's roles/ responsibilities,
4. A statement indicating that the external reviewer is not to make a determination about whether the candidate should be promoted
5. Notification that, per North Carolina law, the review process is an open one and their review will be open to the candidate
6. Candidate's materials: external review narrative (describing and contextualizing their research/scholarship), candidate's CV, and copies of or links to representative samples of the candidate's publications and other relevant scholarly works.
7. Unit/Departmental journal ranking and other criteria (if relevant).

The external reviewers will be asked to focus their evaluation of the candidate on *the quality and significance of the candidate's scholarly work* (research), not teaching or service unless the

external reviewer can make direct and meaningful observations of this teaching or service. The external reviewer is not to make a determination about whether the candidate should be promoted or tenure conferred, but instead should focus on the quality of the scholarship and its impact.

External reviews are asked to be returned to the Chair/Director by mid-August (the beginning of the fall semester) when URC committee work begins (Review letters are posted in the CHHS electronic format).

Upon request, these external review letters should be made available to the candidate and permanently tenured faculty members in the department who are at or above the rank for which a candidate is under consideration in accordance with Section 6.3.2 of the Tenure Document.

SECTION 8. CHHS GUIDELINES FOR TENURED FACULTY PERFORMANCE REVIEW

The Tenured Faculty Performance Review process is applicable to all tenured members of the faculty (Associate and Full Professors) who have been on a continuous contract for a period of five years or more since their last cumulative review. A faculty member shall undergo a cumulative review no less frequently than once every five years. A faculty member may request postponement of a scheduled Tenured Faculty Performance Review for extenuating personal circumstances, such as health problems. The request for a postponement must be in writing and submitted for approval by the faculty member's Chair and Dean.

Department Chairs, Deans, and Associate Deans are exempt from a Tenured Faculty Performance Review while they are serving in these specific administrative posts. After returning to full-time faculty duties, they too will be subject to Tenured Faculty Performance Reviews. Faculty returning from full-time administrative positions will create a five-year plan in consultation with the Unit Chair/Director at the time they return to full-time, non-administrative faculty status.

University Policy and Procedures for Tenured Faculty Performance Review (approved by the UNC Charlotte Board of Trustees on May 29, 1998, and approved by the Board of Governors of the University of North Carolina System on September 11, 1998; and revised March 26, 2015) are published in the [UNC Charlotte Academic Procedure: Tenured Faculty Performance Review](#).

The College of Health and Human Services adheres to University published procedures related to the review of tenured faculty performance (excerpts follow):

Overview

The CHHS Tenured Faculty Performance Review provides for the periodic and comprehensive review of all aspects of the performance of faculty members who have tenure and whose primary duties are teaching, research, and/or service. The purpose of such a review is to promote faculty development, productivity, and excellence by:

1. Recognizing and rewarding faculty performance that exceeds expectations;
2. Providing for a clear plan and timetable for improvement of faculty performance for those faculty who do not meet expectations; and
3. Providing the imposition of appropriate sanctions for faculty who continue to not meet expectations.

Applicability of Review Process

The Tenured Faculty Performance Review process is applicable to all tenured members of the faculty who have been on a continuous contract for a period of five years or more since their last

cumulative review. A faculty member shall undergo a cumulative review no less frequently than once every five years. A faculty member may request postponement of a scheduled Tenured Faculty Performance Review for extenuating personal circumstances, such as health problems. The request for a postponement must be in writing and submitted for approval by the faculty member's Chair/Director and Dean.

Department Chair/Directors, Deans, and other administrators whose primary responsibilities are not teaching and research, are exempt from a Tenured Faculty Performance Review while they are serving in their administrative posts. Upon returning to full-time faculty duties, they are subject to a Tenured Faculty Performance Review.

Relationship between Tenured Faculty Performance Review and Review for Promotion
Tenured Faculty Performance Review will be coordinated with the review of a faculty member for promotion in the following ways:

Unit consideration for promotion five years after a faculty member receives tenure satisfies the requirements for the faculty member's Tenured Faculty Performance Review. One outcome of the promotion review could be a requirement that the faculty member prepare a development plan as described below.

If a faculty member postpones the application for promotion five years after receiving tenure, he/she/they will undergo a Tenured Faculty Performance Review. The Tenured Faculty Performance Review, in this case, would satisfy the requirement of a promotion review five years after the award of tenure.

Review of Procedure

This procedure will be certified annually by the Provost to ensure all aspects of the post-tenure review process are in compliance with this procedure and any associated guidelines adopted by the President of the University of North Carolina. In addition, UNC General Administration will conduct a review of the post-tenure review process every three years in compliance with UNC Policy Manual 400.3.3.1.

Procedures

Training and Support of Institutional Decision Makers

All post-tenure review evaluators, including Unit Review Committee, Academic Unit Chair/Directors/Directors, and Deans, are required to complete the UNC training module prior to review of a Tenured Faculty Performance Review file. The training link is a login. The login

can be found under VI. Related Policies, Procedures, and Resources within the Tenured Faculty Performance Review page <https://provost.uncc.edu/policies-procedures/academic-policies-and-procedures/tenured-faculty-performance-review>.

Initiating the Review Process

Whenever a Tenured Faculty Performance Review is initiated, the supervisor/Chair/Director shall first consult with the faculty member and then shall establish a schedule for the conduct of the review by the Review Committee (see definition below). Ordinarily, a faculty member should be given at least four months' notice that one is to be reviewed. The faculty member should discuss with his/her supervisor/Chair/Director a five-year plan consistent with the expectations of post-tenure review. This plan can be modified annually by the faculty member, in consultation with the direct supervisor, as deemed appropriate by changes in institutional, departmental, or personal circumstances. This plan should indicate milestones aligned with annual performance evaluations.

Review File

To initiate the review process, the faculty member's supervisor/academic Chair/Director, in cooperation with the faculty member, shall construct a Tenured Faculty Performance Review file containing only: (a) copies of the faculty member's last five annual review letters; (b) a current curriculum vitae; (c) a current five-year plan and set of goals with related milestones; and (d) a statement describing his or her professional accomplishments in teaching, research and service. The statement should be no more than three pages. If necessary for clarification, the Chair/Director or Review Committee may request further information. All aspects of faculty performance associated with their position will be evaluated.

The Review Committee

The Unit Review Committee or a special committee elected by the tenured members of the faculty member's academic unit shall conduct the review of the faculty member's performance. The Committee shall be elected according to Unit, College and University procedures. The faculty member being reviewed will not have the option of selecting members of the Review Committee. The Review Committee shall review the file and may meet with the Supervisor/Chair/Director and the faculty member, either together or separately. The Committee may consult other sources of information not included in the file, if deemed appropriate, with the approval of the Chair/Director. In accordance with the schedule for the review established by the Chair/Director, the Review Committee shall make a written assessment of the faculty member's performance, including, where appropriate, recommendations to the Chair/Director intended to

enhance the faculty member's contributions to the unit and the University. The Review Committee Report is advisory to the Supervisor/Chair/Director. The Report shall include an assessment of the strengths and weaknesses of the faculty member's performance. This written assessment shall conclude with one of the following findings:

- “Exceeds Expectations” : The faculty member exceeds expectations.
- “Meets Expectations” : The faculty member has no substantial and chronic performance deficiencies.
- “Does Not Meet Expectations”

The faculty member has substantial and chronic performance deficiencies. The Review Committee shall state the faculty member’s primary responsibilities and describe the performance deficiencies in its Report as they relate to the faculty member’s assigned duties and the goals established.

The standards for determining "Does Not Meet Expectations" shall be determined by the faculty in each unit, and, when approved by the appropriate Supervisor/Chair/Director and Dean, and by the Provost, shall become part of the Unit's Tenured Faculty Performance Review procedures.

The Chair/Director shall provide the faculty member being reviewed a copy of both the Review Committee report and the Chair/Director's recommendation. The report and any response from the faculty member shall be made a part of the faculty member's permanent personnel record.

Review by the Chair/Director

The Review Committee submits its written evaluation to the Chair/Director and the Chair/Director conducts an evaluative review. In the event that the Chair/Director’s evaluation differs from that of the Review Committee, the Chair/Director will communicate in writing to the faculty member, the Dean and the department Review Committee. A recommendation for sanctions to be imposed on the faculty related to their lack of performance under the terms and expectations of a previously agreed upon performance improvement plan will be described in the Chair/Director’s written statement.

Review by the Dean

The Chair/Director submits a written appraisal to the Dean. The Dean conducts an evaluative review in addition to the review conducted by the committee and the Chair/Director. The Dean's response and written evaluation shall be provided to the faculty member, the Chair/Director, and the Provost, and shall include the plan for improvement or sanction imposed, if applicable.

Faculty Grievance or Hearing

Following the final review and determination of the Provost, a faculty member dissatisfied with the results of the Tenured Faculty Performance Review may pursue any option otherwise available to faculty members relating to matters that affect their employment status. If discharge or other serious sanctions are imposed as a result of a seriously deficient post-tenure performance review, University regulations for hearing procedures outlined in Section 8 of the Tenure Policies, Regulations and Procedures of The University of North Carolina at Charlotte will apply. For lesser actions, a faculty member may pursue a grievance through the UNC Charlotte ["Procedures for Resolving Faculty Grievances Arising from Section 607\(3\) of The Code of The University of North Carolina."](#)

Development Plan

When the Chair/Director and the Dean agree that the faculty member's performance does not meet expectations, the Chair/Director will require that the faculty member have a written development plan designed to improve the faculty member's performance in clearly identified areas over a specified time period. The development plan will be prepared jointly by the Chair/Director and faculty member and will include at a minimum: (a) the expectations of the Chair/Director as to how the faculty member can remedy the deficiency or deficiencies in performance or enhance the faculty member's professional accomplishments and contributions to the unit; (b) specific performance goals and objectives, timetables for achieving such goals over a two-to-three year period, and the criteria to be used in measuring progress toward the performance goals; (c) the resources or developmental support, if any, the Chair/Director is willing and able to provide the faculty member to assist in implementing the plan; (d) any adjustment in workload, assignments or responsibilities of the faculty member in order to enhance his or her performance and contribution to the mission of the unit; and (e) clear statement of consequences should deficiencies not be corrected within the designated timeline. Progress meetings with the department Chair/Director or direct supervisor must occur on at least a semi-annual basis during the specified timeframe.

The development plan will be reviewed by the Dean, who may make suggestions for improving the plan. When the plan has received the final approval of the faculty member, the Chair/Director, and the Dean, it will be implemented by the faculty member.

Monitoring and Re-evaluation of Performance

Progress towards achieving the goals and timetables set out in the development plan will be reviewed in subsequent annual reviews by the Chair/Director, who will provide detailed feedback to the faculty member and a copy to the Dean. At the end of the time period specified in the development plan, the Chair/Director, in consultation with the Unit Review Committee,

will review the faculty member's performance and make one of the following recommendations:

1. The faculty member has improved his/her/their performance, and no further action is necessary pending the next regularly scheduled Tenured Faculty Performance Review;
2. The faculty member's performance has improved but not at the expected level. The Chair/Director may require an adjustment in the development plan or in the faculty member's workload in order to improve further the faculty member's performance; or
3. The faculty member's performance continues to not meet expectations. The Chair/Director/direct supervisor may recommend the imposition of appropriate sanctions. Any decision to recommend imposition of serious sanctions should occur only after the widest consultation with the tenured faculty in the Unit; whether this involves a poll or other mechanism is left up to the Unit. However, the Unit is expected to transmit the outcome of such consultation with the tenured faculty to the Dean. The Chair/Director's recommendation is forwarded to the faculty member and the Dean.

Dean's Review and the Possible Imposition of Sanctions

If the Dean agrees with a Unit recommendation that no further action is necessary, the review process stops pending the next regularly scheduled Tenured Faculty Performance Review.

If the Dean agrees with a recommendation for a workload adjustment, the adjustment is implemented and the review stops pending the next regularly scheduled Tenured Faculty Performance Review.

If the Dean agrees with a Unit recommendation for the imposition of serious sanctions, the Dean forwards this recommendation to the Provost. Serious sanctions may be imposed only in accord with Section VI, of the Tenure Policies, Regulations and Procedures of The University of North Carolina at Charlotte and Chapter VI of The Code of the Board of Governors of the University of North Carolina. Serious sanctions that may be imposed include demotion, salary reduction and, in the most serious cases, may include a recommendation for discharge. A faculty member retains full rights to seek a hearing if the decision is made to impose serious sanctions. Neither a negative review nor an insufficient improvement from a development plan will necessarily result in the imposition of sanctions; such sanctions may be imposed only upon grounds specified in Section VI of the Tenure Policies and Chapter VI of The Code of the Board of Governors of the University of North Carolina. In the imposition of serious sanctions, the burden of proof is on the University to prove that the serious deficiencies on the development plan constitute incompetence or neglect of duty.

If the Dean disagrees with the Unit decision, the Unit and Dean's recommendation are forwarded to the Provost for review.