



Reappointment, Promotion and Tenure Handbook

College of Health and Human Services

Updated May 2025 for 2025-2026 Cycle

TABLE OF CONTENTS

| | |
|--|-----------|
| SECTION 1. OVERVIEW OF THE CANDIDATE REVIEW PROCESS | 3 |
| STANDARDS FOR REVIEW | 3 |
| LEVELS OF REVIEW | 3 |
| SECTION 2. TIMETABLES FOR FACULTY REVIEWS..... | 4 |
| MANDATORY TENURE TRACK FACULTY REVIEW FOR REAPPOINTMENT OF ASSISTANT PROFESSORS..... | 5 |
| NON-MANDATORY TENURE TRACK FACULTY REVIEW FOR PROMOTION TO PROFESSOR | 8 |
| NON-MANDATORY NON-TENURE TRACK FACULTY REVIEW FOR PROMOTION OF LECTURERS AND CLINICAL FACULTY | 10 |
| MANDATORY NON-TENURE TRACK FACULTY REVIEW FOR REAPPOINTMENT OF LECTURERS AND CLINICAL FACULTY | 11 |
| MANDATORY POST TENURE REVIEW | 12 |
| SECTION 3. LECTURER AND SENIOR LECTURER PERFORMANCE REVIEW | 13 |
| PROCESS OVERVIEW..... | 13 |
| LECTURER AND SENIOR LECTURER ASSIGNMENTS | 13 |
| AREAS OF PERFORMANCE..... | 13 |
| WHAT UNIQUELY DEFINES THE CLINICAL TRACK IN CHHS? | 18 |
| WHAT IS EXPECTED OF A CLINICAL ASSISTANT PROFESSOR FOR REAPPOINTMENT?..... | 18 |
| WHAT IS EXPECTED FOR THE PROMOTION OF A CLINICAL ASSISTANT PROFESSOR..... | 20 |
| TO A CLINICAL ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR? | 20 |
| WHAT IS EXPECTED FOR THE PROMOTION OF A CLINICAL ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR TO CLINICAL PROFESSOR?..... | 22 |
| BOYER’S MODEL OF SCHOLARSHIP (BOYER, 1990)..... | 24 |
| SECTION 5. CHHS CONSIDERATIONS AND CRITERIA FOR THE REAPPOINTMENT, PROMOTION AND CONFERRAL OF TENURE FOR TENURE TRACK FACULTY | 26 |
| REAPPOINTMENT OF AN ASSISTANT PROFESSOR | 26 |
| PROMOTION OF AN ASSISTANT PROFESSOR TO ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR..... | 28 |
| PROMOTION OF AN ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR TO PROFESSOR..... | 29 |
| SECTION 6. THE DOSSIER..... | 33 |
| PROCESS | 33 |
| FORMAT | 33 |
| PAGE LIMITS..... | 33 |
| DOSSIER COMPONENTS | 34 |
| SECTION 7. CHHS GUIDELINES FOR EXTERNAL REVIEW..... | 62 |
| FORMAT | 62 |
| PAGE LIMITS..... | 62 |
| EXTERNAL REVIEW MATERIALS..... | 62 |
| THE PROCESS..... | 62 |
| SECTION 8. CHHS GUIDELINES FOR POST-TENURE REVIEW | 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 Professor ranks). In addition, a link to the University's Post-Tenure Review (PTR) policy and guidelines 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).

All faculty are encouraged to discuss policies, procedures, and promotion expectations annually with their Unit Head. These discussions should include any unit-specific guidelines or processes that may be applicable, in addition to the College and University policies and procedures.

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 sample CHHS RPT Timetables (SECTION 2 of the CHHS RPT Handbook) and the Dossier (SECTION 6 of the CHHS RPT Handbook) for a description of the levels of review that are required for various types of faculty review and the approximate 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.

Each spring, the Dean's Office hosts information forums for faculty scheduled for reviews in the upcoming cycle to discuss review procedures, preparation of review materials, and academic career development.

If a candidate receives an unfavorable decision from the Unit Head 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 based on that year's academic calendar.

Mandatory Tenure Track Faculty Review for 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 1st weekday of the 9-month 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 weekday of the 9-month 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 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 meets with the College Review Committee to discuss their determination. |
| Mid-December | Dean completes their independent review. The Dean provides the candidate with a copy of the CRC report in addition to their own determination and rationale and invites the candidate to meet to discuss the determination. If the Dean's determination is negative, the Dean will 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 Review for 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 1st weekday of the 9-month academic year) | Deadline for candidates to complete uploads of all dossier materials to electronic folders. Candidates have the option of uploading 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 weekday of the 9-month 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 | The Unit Head shall provide the Faculty Member with copies of their determination and rationale, the recommendation and rationale of the URC, and external reviewer letters. If the Unit Head's determination is positive, the Unit Head shall 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 discuss 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 meets with the College Review Committee to discuss their determination. |
| Mid-December | The Dean completes their independent review. The Dean provides the candidate with a copy of the CRC report in addition to their own determination and rationale and invites the candidate to meet to discuss the determination. If the Dean's determination is negative, the Dean will 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 Review for 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 1st weekday of the 9-month academic year) | Deadline for candidates to complete uploads of all dossier materials to electronic folders. Candidates have the option of uploading 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 weekday of the 9-month 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 | The Unit Head shall provide the Faculty Member with copies of their determination and rationale, the recommendation and rationale of the URC, and external reviewer letters. If the Unit Head's determination is positive, the Unit Head shall submit their 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 discuss 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 meets with the College Review Committee to discuss their determination. |
| Mid-December | The Dean completes their independent review. The Dean provides the candidate with a copy of the CRC report in addition to their own determination and rationale and invites the candidate to meet to discuss the determination. If the Dean's determination is negative, the Dean will 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 Review for Promotion of Lecturers and Clinical Faculty

{This process involves the URC, Unit Head, 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 1st weekday of the 9-month academic year) | Deadline for candidates to complete dossiers. Candidates have the option of uploading their dossier components in advance of this date but must upload 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-September | Each URC sends its report to the Unit Head and meets with the unit head for discussion. |
| Mid-October | The Unit Head shall provide the Faculty Member with copies of their determination and rationale, and the recommendation and rationale of the URC. If the Unit Head's determination is positive, the unit head shall submit their 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 discuss 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 meets with the College Review Committee to discuss their determination. |
| Early January | The Dean completes their independent review. The Dean provides the candidate with a copy of the CRC report in addition to their own determination and rationale and invites the candidate to meet to discuss the determination. If the Dean's determination is negative, the unit head will meet with the candidate to explain the candidate's right to submit a rebuttal. |

Mandatory Non-Tenure Track Faculty Review for Reappointment of Lecturers and Clinical Faculty

{This process involves the URC, Unit Head and the Dean}

| | |
|----------------|---|
| Early March | Dean confirms mandated review to 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. |
| Mid-October | Deadline for candidates to complete dossiers. Candidates have the option of uploading their dossier components to electronic folders 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 | The Unit Head shall provide the Faculty Member with copies of their determination and rationale, and the recommendation and rationale of the URC. If the Unit Head's determination is positive, the Unit Head shall 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 discuss 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 Post Tenure Review

{This process involves the PTR Committee, Unit Head and the Dean}

| | |
|--------------|--|
| Early March | Dean confirms candidates mandated for Post-Tenure Review in the coming academic year with Unit Heads. |
| Mid-March | Unit Head 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 uploading their dossier components to electronic folders in advance of this date but must submit all dossier information into the prescribed electronic format by this date. Each PTR Committee may begin the internal review process as soon as the dossier is available. For candidates with joint appointments, the PTR Committee'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 PTR Committee sends its report to the Unit Head and meets with Unit Head for discussion. |
| Mid-February | The Unit Head shall provide the Faculty Member with copies of their determination and rationale, and the recommendation and rationale of the PTR Committee. Unit Head completes his/her/their review and any proposed success 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 reappointment 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 observations of teaching.
3. Meets CHHS expectations for student evaluations on the 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) Core Items (course sections taught prior to Spring 2025)
 - i. Overall, I learned a lot in this course.
 - ii. Overall, this instructor was effective.
 - iii. I am free to express and explain my own views in class.
 - iv. The course increased my knowledge of the subject matter.
 - (b) Core Items (course sections taught in Spring 2025 or later)
 - i. Overall, I learned a lot in this course.
 - ii. Overall, this instructor was effective.
 - iii. The course used evaluation methods that were clearly defined and consistently applied.
 - iv. The teaching strategies (e.g., lectures, activities, texts) helped me learn the course content.
 - v. The instructor created a positive learning environment.
 - vi. I have a better understanding of the concepts because of this course.
4. Course syllabi demonstrate evidence of: (1) strategies for student success; (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

What uniquely defines the Clinical Track in CHHS?

1. Clinical track faculty contribute to the teaching and service mission of the College, but also uniquely contribute clinical expertise and scholarship to their respective field of study.
2. Evaluate Clinical Track faculty's contribution to scholarship using [Boyer's Model of Scholarship](#). Please note that faculty may focus on one or more aspects of the Boyer's Model. Clinical Faculty have the option to focus on one area of scholarship or an integration of all three areas of scholarship:
 - a. Scholarship of Practice, e.g., Nursing has additional expectations regarding maintaining active practice. APRN faculty are required to work approximately 8 hours per week to maintain licensure. Social Workers may have their own therapy practice. Evidence of scholarship related to this practice requirement is acceptable.
 - b. Scholarship of Teaching, e.g., Clinical Track Teaching workload is 3:3. Evidence of pedagogy-related scholarship is acceptable.
 - c. Scholarship of Discovery

What is expected of a Clinical Assistant Professor for reappointment?

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 degree 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:

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 observations of teaching.

3. Meets CHHS expectations for student evaluations on the 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. Core Items (course sections taught prior to Spring 2025)
 - i. Overall, I learned a lot in this course.
 - ii. Overall, this instructor was effective.
 - iii. I am free to express and explain my own views in class.
 - iv. The course increased my knowledge of the subject matter.
 - b. Core Items (course sections taught in Spring 2025 or later)
 - i. Overall, I learned a lot in this course.
 - ii. Overall, this instructor was effective.
 - iii. The course used evaluation methods that were clearly defined and consistently applied.
 - iv. The teaching strategies (e.g., lectures, activities, texts) helped me learn the course content.
 - v. The instructor created a positive learning environment.
 - vi. I have a better understanding of the concepts because of this course.
4. Course syllabi demonstrate evidence of: (1) strategies for student success; (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)

Scholarly Work and Other Professional Activities

1. Articulates a developing practice, teaching, and/or discovery scholarship agenda that shows the capacity for contributions to the field.
2. Meets College requirement for evidence of some scholarly work each year. Please refer to [Boyer's Model of Scholarship](#) for examples of scholarly work.

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. Examples may include:
 - a. Serves as a member and developing leader in the governance of the Unit, the College or the University.

- b. Serves as a member and developing leader in relevant professional organizations; advocate for one's profession.
2. Relevant professional licenses or certifications are in good standing

**What is expected for the promotion of a Clinical Assistant Professor
to a 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. While colleges and academic units determine progression requirements through the ranks, five years' experience at the previous level is recommended. 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:

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 observations of teaching.
3. Meets the CHHS expectations for student evaluations on the 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. Core Items (course sections taught prior to Spring 2025)
 - i. Overall, I learned a lot in this course.
 - ii. Overall, this instructor was effective.
 - iii. I am free to express and explain my own views in class.
 - iv. The course increased my knowledge of the subject matter.
 - b. Core Items (course sections taught in Spring 2025 or later)
 - i. Overall, I learned a lot in this course.
 - ii. Overall, this instructor was effective.
 - iii. The course used evaluation methods that were clearly defined and consistently applied.
 - iv. The teaching strategies (e.g., lectures, activities, texts) helped me learn the course content.
 - v. The instructor created a positive learning environment.
 - vi. I have a better understanding of the concepts because of this course.

4. Course syllabi demonstrate evidence of: (1) strategies for student success; (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 maturing practice, teaching, and/or discovery scholarship agenda that demonstrates contributions to the field.
2. Meets College requirement for evidence of some scholarly work each year. Please refer to [Boyer's Model of Scholarship](#) for examples of scholarly work.

Service to the University, the Public and the Profession

1. Articulates a service agenda to support the unit, College, University, public, and/or professional service to build professional expertise. Examples may include:
 - a. 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.
 - b. Serves as a member and demonstrates leadership in relevant professional organizations; advocate for one's profession.
 - c. Serves as a member and demonstrates leadership in relevant community organizations.
2. Relevant professional licenses or certifications are in good standing.
3. 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.

What is expected for the 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. 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:

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 observations of teaching.
3. Regularly exceeds CHHS expectations for student evaluations on the 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. Core Items (course sections taught prior to Spring 2025)
 - i. Overall, I learned a lot in this course.
 - ii. Overall, this instructor was effective.
 - iii. I am free to express and explain my own views in class.
 - iv. The course increased my knowledge of the subject matter.
 - b. Core Items (course sections taught in Spring 2025 or later)
 - i. Overall, I learned a lot in this course.
 - ii. Overall, this instructor was effective.
 - iii. The course used evaluation methods that were clearly defined and consistently applied.
 - iv. The teaching strategies (e.g., lectures, activities, texts) helped me learn the course content.
 - v. The instructor created a positive learning environment.
 - vi. I have a better understanding of the concepts because of this course.
4. Course syllabi demonstrate evidence of highly evolved: (1) strategies for student success; (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, teaching, and/or discovery scholarship agenda that demonstrates continued contributions to the field.
2. Meets College requirement for evidence of some scholarly work each year. Please refer to [Boyer's Model of Scholarship](#) for examples of scholarly work.

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. Examples may include:
 - a. Assumes leadership roles in the governance of the Academic Unit, College and University.
 - b. Assumes leadership roles in relevant professional organizations; advocates for one's profession.
 - c. Assumes leadership roles in relevant community organizations and provides evidence of impact and significance of leadership contributions (changing policies, systems, etc.)
2. Relevant professional licenses or certifications are in good standing, if applicable.

Boyer's Model of Scholarship (Boyer, 1990)

*Synopsis Prepared by CHHS Dean's Taskforce on
RPT Guidelines for Clinical Faculty (Spring 2025)*

The Scholarship of Practice

- Develops best practices for translating evidence to practice based on results of translational and implementation science.
- Secures competitive funding to support innovations in practice.
- Publishes to influence practice via peer-reviewed venues.
- Disseminates policy papers through peer-reviewed media.
- Provides expert review for quality improvement projects, journals, periodicals, or textbooks.
- Disseminates practice-based findings at regional, national, or international meetings.
- Analyzes system-wide data to evaluate practice patterns and/or uncover new issues related to practice from such data.
- Serves as a clinical practice specialist in partnerships that advance research, clinical improvements, policy development and/or implementation.
- Influences policy through leadership activities at the local, national, and international levels and participates in policy think tanks.
- Translates research and utilizes evidence to improve health and generate practice-based knowledge.
- Develops unique clinical nursing programs or interventions with documented effectiveness.
- Disseminates clinical programs or quality improvement initiatives in regional, national, or international arenas.
- Leads in the development, review, and evaluation of clinical practice models to transform healthcare delivery.
- Translates research and utilizes evidence to improve health, impact practice, and effect change in health systems.
- Develops clinical guidelines, innovations, and new program initiatives.
- Assists with or conducts systematic reviews that synthesize and summarize research findings to recommend solutions to current clinical problems.

The Scholarship of Teaching

- Redesigns or develops educational systems to effectively prepare students as practitioners, researchers, and educators of the future.
- Develops and implements evidence-based educational strategies that promote critical thinking and clinical decision-making.
- Evaluates impact, cost effectiveness, and efficiency of teaching strategies in attainment of student learning outcomes.
- Disseminates research findings from programmatic and systematic evaluations to foster curricular changes in all levels of nursing education.
- Develops new teaching methods and strategies to prepare graduates for a transformed healthcare system.
- Incorporates and evaluates the use of instructional technology in nursing education.
- Leads the design of interprofessional education that enhances collaborative practice and/or policy development to improve health outcomes.

Boyer's Model of Scholarship, continued

The Scholarship of Discovery

- Generates new knowledge based on systematic evaluation using all methods of scientific inquiry to inform nursing practice, education, and/or policy through translation of research findings.
- Secures competitive extramural funding to investigate phenomena that expand the core of nursing knowledge.
- Leads successful research initiatives to include research teams or centers at the local, regional, national, or international arenas that focus on scientific inquiry to augment nursing knowledge related to health promotion and/or testing of interventions to improve health and disease outcomes.
- Develops innovative scientific approaches that inform practice and advance healthcare delivery methods.
- Disseminates in peer-reviewed journals with published impact factors or through media outlets.
- Presents research findings at regional, national, and international conferences and healthcare meetings.
- Communicates to lay groups to promote translation and implementation of research findings.
- Develops and investigates unique programs of scientific inquiry at the basic, clinical, or population level to include testing interventions for efficacy, effectiveness, or implementation processes. Generates new knowledge based on systematic evaluation using all methods of scientific inquiry to inform nursing practice, education, and/or policy through translation of research findings.
- Secures competitive extramural funding to investigate phenomena that expand the core of nursing knowledge.
- Develops innovative scientific approaches that inform practice and advance healthcare delivery methods.
- Disseminates in peer-reviewed journals with published impact factors or through media outlets.

[Boyer, E. L. \(1990\), *Scholarship reconsidered: Priorities of the professoriate*. \(PDF\)](#), Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching.

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 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) Core Items (course sections taught prior to Spring 2025)
 - i. Overall, I learned a lot in this course.
 - ii. Overall, this instructor was effective.
 - iii. I am free to express and explain my own views in class.
 - iv. The course increased my knowledge of the subject matter.
 - (b) Core Items (course sections taught in Spring 2025 or later)
 - i. Overall, I learned a lot in this course.
 - ii. Overall, this instructor was effective.
 - iii. The course used evaluation methods that were clearly defined and consistently applied.
 - iv. The teaching strategies (e.g., lectures, activities, texts) helped me learn the course content.
 - v. The instructor created a positive learning environment.
 - vi. I have a better understanding of the concepts because of this course.
4. Course syllabi demonstrate evidence of: (1) strategies for student success; (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 minimum 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 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) Core Items (course sections taught prior to Spring 2025)
 - i. Overall, I learned a lot in this course.
 - ii. Overall, this instructor was effective.
 - iii. I am free to express and explain my own views in class.
 - iv. The course increased my knowledge of the subject matter.
 - (b) Core Items (course sections taught in Spring 2025 or later)
 - i. Overall, I learned a lot in this course.
 - ii. Overall, this instructor was effective.
 - iii. The course used evaluation methods that were clearly defined and consistently applied.
 - iv. The teaching strategies (e.g., lectures, activities, texts) helped me learn the course content.
 - v. The instructor created a positive learning environment.
 - vi. I have a better understanding of the concepts because of this course.

4. Course syllabi demonstrate evidence of: (1) strategies for student success; (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 minimum expectations at the College level)
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 must be reviewed for Post-Tenure Review every five years. If a review of a tenured faculty member for promotion to Professor is conducted at the time at which a Post-Tenure Review is mandated, review for promotion fulfills the Post-Tenure 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 Post-Tenure 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 “early” review for promotion to Professor are encouraged to discuss policies, procedures, and promotion expectations with their Unit Head.. 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.

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 minimum expectations at the College level)
- 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 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) Core Items (course sections taught prior to Spring 2025)
 - i. Overall, I learned a lot in this course.
 - ii. Overall, this instructor was effective.

- iii. I am free to express and explain my own views in class.
- iv. The course increased my knowledge of the subject matter.
- (b) Core Items (course sections taught in Spring 2025 or later)
 - i. Overall, I learned a lot in this course.
 - ii. Overall, this instructor was effective.
 - iii. The course used evaluation methods that were clearly defined and consistently applied.
 - iv. The teaching strategies (e.g., lectures, activities, texts) helped me learn the course content.
 - v. The instructor created a positive learning environment.
 - vi. I have a better understanding of the concepts because of this course.
- 4. Course syllabi demonstrate evidence of: (1) strategies for student success; (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 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 develop a dossier that represents 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. 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 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) | 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.

Review materials should be provided for the time from the date of the candidate's last reappointment or promotion, or if this is the first review, from the date of the candidate's initial appointment.

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 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 tenure-track candidates 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. Upload the most recent course syllabus for each course taught.
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 for the core student course evaluation items:

1. Core Items (course sections taught prior to Spring 2025)
 - (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.
 - (d) The course increased my knowledge of the subject matter.
2. Core Items (course sections taught in Spring 2025 or later)
 - (a) Overall, I learned a lot in this course.
 - (b) Overall, this instructor was effective.
 - (c) The course used evaluation methods that were clearly defined and consistently applied.
 - (d) The teaching strategies (e.g., lectures, activities, texts) helped me learn the course content.
 - (e) The instructor created a positive learning environment.
 - (f) I have a better understanding of the concepts because of this course.

You may also address any peer observations 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; in these situations, candidates can 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 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 related to 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

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 discipline and, if applicable, 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

³Level 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 |

| | | | | | | |
|--------------|----------------------------|---------------------------------|-------------------------|-------------|-----------------------------------|---|
| Regiona 1 | Rowan-Salisbury Schools | Faculty continuing education | Represe nted SOWK | Volunteered | Septem ber 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 tenure track candidates for promotion only)

Candidates for promotion to professor should include a five-year plan with goals and related milestones. See sample plan provided on the following page.

The following is a simple one-page example of a five-year plan that is expected of all tenure-track faculty when they go up for promotion or for Post Tenure Review. Individual five-year plans will vary and what follows is only a suggestion. Progress on the five-year plan is reviewed annually during the FAR process. Five-year plans may be edited at these annual reviews and changes will be acknowledged and signed off by Unit Head and Dean.

DATE

NAME

RANK

UNIT

College of Health and Human Services

CHHS Five Year Plan

Research, Years 1-5

- Submit 2 articles per year for peer review - LIST POTENTIAL TITLES, DATA SOURCES, JOURNALS
- ALTERNATIVE OPTION: Contribute invited chapter to TOPIC book based on EXPERTISE.
- Unless actively engaged in a funded internal/external project, annually submit INTERNAL GRANT AWARD to generate pilot data on TOPIC.
- Unless actively engaged in an externally funded project, annually apply/re-apply for at least one EXTERNAL GRANT AWARD based on DATA SOURCE and EXPERTISE to support research enterprise including funding a graduate assistant.
- Achieve DESIGNATION in my disciplinary society.

Teaching, Years 1-5

- Aspirational goals:
- Student evaluation scores > 4 in all courses.
- Receive at least two nominations for College teaching awards.
- Tactics to achieve these goals:
- Host one Peer Teaching Observation annually. Conduct one Peer Teaching Observation.
- Annually seek out at least one professional development opportunity to advance pedagogy.
- LIST POTENTIAL OPPORTUNITIES OF INTEREST.

Service, Years 1-5

- Conduct at least 2 *ad hoc* article reviews each year
- LIST POTENTIAL JOURNALS
- Rotate as a member of at least one new unit/college committee each year.
- LIST POTENTIAL COMMITTEES AND YEARS.
- Volunteer to serve on at least one university level committee by the third year of plan.
- LIST POTENTIAL COMMITTEES AND YEARS.
- Seek a service leadership role on at least one committee in at least 2 years (e.g., year 4 and 5).
- Volunteer to take on an administrative service role (e.g., program coordinator/director) at some point in the five-year period.
- Apply for Dean's Faculty Fellow position when eligible.

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. | 3-6 scholarly works |

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-intensive (R1) 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 do not constitute grounds for a conflict of interest.

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 potential reviewers 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 conflict of interest). 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, 3-6 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 review of external letters will be open to the candidate and other permanently tenured faculty upon request
6. Candidate's materials: external review narrative (describing and contextualizing their research/scholarship), candidate's CV, and copies of or links to 3-6 representative samples of the candidate's publications and other relevant scholarly works.
7. Unit/Departmental journal ranking and other criteria (if applicable).

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 required to be returned to the Unit Head 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, external review letters should be made available to permanently tenured faculty members in the department who are at or above the rank for which a candidate is under consideration during the review window for such faculty members to provide input to the URC. . External review letters will be made available to the candidate after the Unit Head has completed their determination and rationale.

SECTION 8. CHHS GUIDELINES FOR POST-TENURE REVIEW

The post-tenure review process follows [UNC Charlotte's Academic Procedure for Post-Tenure Review](#). At both unit and College levels, tenured Associate Professors will be reviewed according to Associate Professor expectations, and tenured Full Professors will be reviewed relative to Full Professor expectations.

Note: In 2022, the University began requiring 5-year work plans with goals and related milestones as part of promotion dossiers. Beginning in 2024, the University's post-tenure review procedures require that all Faculty Members who are post-tenure develop a 5-year plan in consultation with their Unit Head.

As we make the transition to implementation of these updated procedures, faculty who earned promotion to their current rank prior to 2022 may not yet have formalized a 5-year plan. Faculty Members undergoing Post-Tenure Review should construct a summary of their workplan with goals and related milestones representing the 5 years preceding the post-tenure review.