**Criteria and Procedures Used at Department and College Levels
to Conduct Reappointment, Promotion, and Tenure Reviews
in the Cato College of Education**

at

The University of North Carolina at Charlotte

Seventh Edition: Adopted January 16, 2017 (Minor Update April, 2018)
Sixth Edition: 2013
Sixth Edition: 2012
Fifth Edition: 2004
Fourth Edition: 2000
Third Edition: 1996
Second Edition: 1995
First Edition: 1994

Table of Contents

Introduction to the Seventh Edition

This document, Criteria and Procedures Used at Department and College Levels to Conduct Reappointment, Promotion, and Tenure Reviews in the College of Education at the University of North Carolina at Charlotte, is designed to help faculty fulfill the College's mission and to guide administrative and peer reviews in making fair and appropriate recommendations for reappointment, promotion, and/or tenure. The document, originally developed in 1994, is a living document that has been modified in 1995, 1996, 2000, 2004, 2013, and 2017.

This current version arose from requests made by several faculty members at the Dean's Listening Meetings that a more equitable process be developed through a revision of the RPT process and criteria. Specifically, requests were made to examine equity related to the composition of Departmental Review Committees and the inclusion of a check on possible implicit bias of all those who review dossiers.

The leadership team asked for volunteers to work on the revision. The deans of the College selected from among the ten people who volunteered. They included every faculty member of color, given the reasons for the revision, and then selected representations from every department and professorial level. Two volunteers (full professors) who were not selected, were thanked for volunteering. The following members comprised the committee:

- Lyndon Abrams - Counseling
- Valerie Balog - Counseling
- Erik Byker - REEL
- Mark D'Amico - EDLD
- Paul Fitchett - MDSK
- Charles Hutchison - MDSK
- Florence Martin - EDLD
- Erin Miller - REEL
- Shawnee Wakeman - SPCD
- Charlie Wood - SPCD

Revision Process:

Spring 2016:
The committee created an RPT Revision Moodle site. On this page, they provided resources used by the Task Force as they work on the RPT revision. The information contained on this site was open to the entire College of Education. The provided narrative updates on the site each month.

The committee created a survey to solicit recommendations from faculty on ways to revise the RPT guidelines. Then, on May 23 and 24, the committee held two open forums to (1) discuss survey feedback and other relevant information and (2) engage in dialog on each section of the RPT document. Data from the survey and open forums were used to shape the first revised draft.

Summer 2016:
The RPT Task Force met to review and discuss draft revisions of the RPT document. The RPT Task Force members independently reviewed drafts and assembled its recommended changes to be made available at the beginning of the academic year. They posted the recommended changes in both "Clean" and "Track Changes" versions to the Moodle site by August 15 for all to review. The committee chair gave a brief update at the August 19th College meeting and encouraged attendance at two open forums to provide feedback on the draft.

Fall 2016:
Two open forums were held Monday, August 29 at 10:00 and Tuesday, August 30 at 2:00. In addition to the forums, the Task Force took feedback on the recommendations through the discussion board on the Moodle site, through email, in person. 23 individuals from the College participated in one or both of the open forums on the draft revision.

The Task Force discussed the feedback at its mid-September meeting. Additionally, the Task Force chair had a discussion with the Faculty Council on August 31 for additional feedback. They created a second version of the revision. This version was discussed at the September 23 COED meeting.

An online faculty vote distributed by email was completed by October 15, which allowed three weeks for faculty to review the current document prior to final votes being cast. A total of 80 responses to the online ballot provided this result:

Yes-70, No-8, Abstain-2.

In April of 2018, the RPT task force was asked by the dean to tweak language for clarity. These changes were recommended, voted on, and made to this document.
Vote:

Yes—50
No-12
Abstain-2

Section One
Undergirding Principles

1. Faculty personnel decisions at UNC Charlotte are governed by University Policy 102.13, Tenure Policies, Regulations and Procedures of the University of North Carolina at Charlotte and UNC Charlotte Academic Personnel Procedures Handbook-Section C, Review for Reappointment, Promotion, and Conferral of Permanent Tenure.

2. The procedures for personnel reviews that are described in this document are intended to be consistent with those described in the University documents named above. In the event of a conflict between this document and the University policies and procedures in #1, the terms of the University documents shall have precedence.

3. In the Cato College of Education, the criteria and procedures used at department levels are consistent with the criteria and procedures used at the college level.

4. Responsibility for presenting the case for personnel reviews rests with the faculty candidate, who, through narrative statements and supporting documentation collected in an electronic dossier, addresses how the standards are met and how the candidate is contributing and will contribute to the mission of the College.

5. Standards are presented in two categories: the broad expectations of all faculty in the Cato College of Education and specific standards relevant to teaching, research, and service/outreach/engagement. Standards are differentiated at the various levels of review.

6. It is expected that different profiles of faculty achievement will be demonstrated through the review process. This document offers a strengths-based model for building a faculty record of achievement.

7. Based on their assessment of the evidence presented and available to them, the review committees, chairs, and dean are expected to independently consider the total profile presented by each candidate, including both broad expectations and specific standards, and to make independent holistic judgments about the candidate's performance and potential as a faculty member in the College.

8. All reviews of unfavorable RPT decisions will follow University Policy 102.13, Tenure Policies, Regulations and Procedures of the University of North Carolina at Charlotte.

Section Two
Broad Expectations of All Faculty in the College of Education

All faculty members in the Cato College of Education are expected to do the following:

1. Support the mission and programs of the College and University appropriate to one's role;

2. Demonstrate integrity and high standards of ethical and professional behavior;

3. Be collaborative and respectful of diversity (as defined by the College of Education Diversity Commitment) through interactions with students, staff, other faculty, and professional colleagues in the field;

4. Continue to grow as a professional through reflective practice, active learning, and engagement in relevant contexts;

5. Maintain continuing appointment to the Graduate Faculty of the University (unless one's program responsibilities are exclusively at the undergraduate level); and

6. Recognize the interconnectedness of the professional domains of teaching, research, and service/outreach/engagement by demonstrating a thematically integrated professional focus across these domains as appropriate to the faculty member's job description.

Specific standards relevant to teaching, research, and service/outreach/engagement are presented in the following pages by level of review:

    Reappointment as Assistant Professor (Section Three)
    Promotion to Associate Professor and Conferral of Permanent Tenure (Section Four)
    Promotion to Full Professor (Section Five)

Section Three
The Specific Standards for Reappointment as Assistant Professor (Tenure-Track)

An Assistant Professor at the time of reappointment is expected to satisfy the broad expectations of a faculty member in the Cato College of Education (Section Two).

In addition, an Assistant Professor at the time of reappointment is expected to demonstrate satisfactory achievement in the three domains of professorial activity (teaching, research, and service/outreach/engagement) and to demonstrate the potential to be successful at the subsequent tenure/promotion review. Review for reappointment as Assistant Professor is mandatory at the time specified in University Policy 102.13, Tenure Policies, Regulations and Procedures of the University of North Carolina at Charlotte, UNC Charlotte Academic Personnel Procedures Handbook-Section C. Review for Reappointment, Promotion, and Conferral of Permanent Tenure, and as delineated in the candidate's letter of offer. Any variations in the time for the reappointment review must be approved according to appropriate University policies (e.g., Family Medical Leave Act).

Specific Standards Relevant to Three Domains of Scholarship: Teaching, Research, and Service/ Outreach/Engagement

TEACHING: Representing knowledge in one's field by:

Standards to be addressed by everyone:

1. Teaching
   a) Articulates a statement of one's teaching philosophy and teaching responsibilities
   b) Has in-depth understanding about content field and pedagogy
   c) Reflects the UNC Charlotte conceptual framework, incorporates appropriate assessments, and integrates diversity throughout the coursework (for additional information see the College of Education Diversity Commitment)
   d) Clearly aligns teaching to programmatic objectives and accreditation standards
   e) Assesses and values student learning and adjusts instruction appropriately using multiple sources of data (course evaluations, peer evaluation, etc.) to improve practice
   f) Demonstrates growth in teaching expertise and effectiveness
   g) Appropriately incorporate instructional technology in teaching
   h) Participates in and reflects upon the Peer Observation of Teaching process
   i) Presents a statement of teaching goals that demonstrates reflective practice and the promise of a teaching record recognized for its quality and its contribution to the teaching mission of the College

2. Developing course and program curriculum which can be demonstrated through any of the following activities:
   a) Participates in course and program development and/or revision that is based on emerging research, best practices, and/or sustained experience with stakeholders in one's field and in response to programmatic need
   b) Is knowledgeable of emerging needs in one's field and community
   c) Is knowledgeable of changes in licensure, certification, and accreditation standards in one's field
   d) Refines, updates, and improves courses

In addition to the standards addressed above, faculty members at the time of reappointment can address any of the following for further consideration of their ability to demonstrate expectations appropriate for reappointment:

3. Advising/mentoring students appropriate to role and program assignment
    a) Contributes to student learning and professional development through an active role in advising
    b) Participates in supervising student-directed scholarship (e.g., research, comprehensive examinations, required evidences, independent study projects, theses, Master's degree projects, dissertations, honors requirements)
    c) Is consistently accessible to students when appropriate
    d) Provides consistent and accurate advice to students and is knowledgeable about programs, policies, and procedures
    e) Is considered by students and colleagues to be a helpful and conscientious advisor

4. Clinical supervision appropriate to role and program assignment
    a) Presents a record of positive impact on University students' clinical growth
    b) Presents a record of development of new or revised resources for students, agencies and/or schools; for example, handbooks and/or evaluation instruments related to supervision
    c) Provides productive mentoring experiences for new clinical supervisors
    d) Participates in department/college events related to clinical supervision
    e) Demonstrates ongoing professional development and reflective practice
    f) Disseminates best practices in clinical supervision, based on research/evaluation data

RESEARCH: Expanding the knowledge base in one's discipline through generating, synthesizing, and/or integrating new knowledge:

Standards to be addressed by everyone:

1. Articulates a clearly defined research agenda and focus which is related to the professional themes that define the candidate's work. The work should demonstrate the promise of quality and impact over time. Measures of quality and impact could include the following: journal acceptance rates, number of citations, circulation, publication notes (e.g., special mention, best paper award), journal impact factor, recognition at the national and/or international level, and quality of book publisher. It is incumbent upon the candidate to provide a strong and clear rationale for how the research described is situated in relation to a larger body and how the work has contributed to the advancement of their area of expertise.

2. Possesses a record of peer-reviewed publications that include systematic methods of inquiry

3. Presents a statement of research goals and record of works-in-progress that demonstrate the promise of continued contributions and productivity

In addition to the standards addressed above, Assistant Professors at the time of reappointment can address additional criteria for further consideration of their ability to demonstrate expectations appropriate for reappointment, such as:

4. A record of published work that translates research into practice to improve professional practices and outcomes and/or synthesizes knowledge through literature reviews which identify critical themes and needs

5. A record of community engaged scholarship (e.g., technical or program evaluation reports)

6. Efforts to obtain funding to support one's research agenda

7. Research contributions that reflect both collaboration and leadership

8. A record of disseminating research and knowledge at multiple levels (e.g., state, national, and international conferences)

SERVICE/OUTREACH/ENGAGEMENT: Applying knowledge in one's field through engaged scholarship and outreach to communities and practitioners, engagement with the profession, and service to the institution:

Standards to be addressed by everyone:

1. Has a record of involvement within the community of practitioners/professionals in one's field

2. Is involved in professional organizations and associations in one's field (e.g., some combination of state, regional, nation/international levels)

3. Contributes to the mission of the program, department, college, and/or university through active engagement in committees or task forces that are addressing issues of importance

4. Presents a statement of service goals that demonstrates the promise of increased contributions in service/outreach/engagement recognized for their quality and impact

Section Four
The Specific Standards for Promotion to Associate Professor with the Conferral of Permanent Tenure
(Also applicable to faculty who hold the rank of Associate Professor who are seeking tenure)
(Tenure Track)

The conferral of permanent tenure, usually accompanied by promotion to Associate Professor, signifies the end of a probationary period of service and the beginning of a new phase of the academic career, with increased opportunities and responsibilities to work for the common good. (See *1940 Statement of Principles on Academic Freedom and Tenure,* American Association of University Professors.)

At the time of review for promotion to Associate Professor with conferral of permanent tenure, the faculty member is expected to satisfy the broad expectations of a faculty member in the Cato College of Education (Section Two).

In addition to satisfying the broad expectations of a faculty member in the College, the faculty member at the time of this review is expected to present a strong record of accomplishment with promise of continued contribution and productivity in all three domains of professorial activity: teaching, research, and service/outreach/engagement. While individual faculty profiles are expected to vary, a record of at least satisfactory achievement in each of the three domains is required for a successful promotion/tenure review.

Review for promotion to Associate Professor with conferral of permanent tenure is mandatory at the time specified in University Policy 102.13, Tenure Policies, Regulations and Procedures of the University of North Carolina at Charlotte, UNC Charlotte Academic Personnel Procedures Handbook-Section C. Review for Reappointment, Promotion, and Conferral of Permanent Tenure, and as delineated in the candidate's letter of offer. Similarly, tenure reviews for Associate Professors are also mandatory at the time specified in the letter of offer. Any variations in the time for promotion/tenure review must be approved according to appropriate University policies (e.g., Family Medical Leave Act).

Specific Standards Relevant to Three Domains of Scholarship: Teaching, Research, and Service/Outreach/Engagement

TEACHING: Representing knowledge in one's field by:

Standards to be addressed by everyone.

1. Teaching
   a) Articulates a statement of one's teaching philosophy and teaching responsibilities
   b) Has in-depth understanding about content field and pedagogy
   c) Reflects the UNC Charlotte conceptual framework, incorporates appropriate assessments, and integrates diversity throughout coursework
   d) Clearly aligns teaching to programmatic objectives and accreditation standards
   e) Appropriately incorporates instructional technology in teaching
   f) Assesses and values student learning and adjusts instruction appropriately to enhance that learning, using multiple sources of data (e.g., course evaluations, peer evaluation) to improve practice
   g) Demonstrates growth in teaching expertise and effectiveness
   h) Participates in and reflects upon the Peer Observation of Teaching process
   i) Presents a statement of teaching goals that demonstrates reflective practice and a record of achievement in teaching recognized for its quality and its contributions to the mission of the College.

2. Developing course and program curriculum which can be demonstrated through any of the following activities.
   a) Participates effectively and successfully in course and program development and/or revision that is based on established research, best practices, and/or sustained experience with practitioners in one's field
   b) Is knowledgeable of emerging needs in one's field and community
   c) Is knowledgeable of changes in licensure, certification, and accreditation standards in one's field
   d) Refines, updates, and improves courses
   e) Engages in efforts to obtain funding to support course and program development

In addition to the standards addressed above, faculty members at the time of promotion and tenure can address any of the following for further consideration of their ability to demonstrate expectations appropriate for tenure and promotion:

3. Advising/Mentoring students appropriate to role and program assignment
   a) Contributes to student learning and professional development through an active role in advising
   b) Is consistently accessible to students when appropriate and possible
   c) Provides consistent and accurate advice to students and is knowledgeable about programs, policies, and procedures
   d) Is considered by students and colleagues to be a helpful and conscientious advisor
   e) Supervises student-directed scholarship (e.g., research, comprehensive examinations, required evidences, independent study projects, theses, Master's degree projects, dissertations, honors requirements)

4. Clinical Supervision appropriate to role and program assignment
   a) Presents a record of positive impact on University students' clinical growth
   b) Presents a record of development of new or revised resources for students, agencies and/or schools; for example, handbooks and/or evaluation instruments related to supervision
   c) Provides productive mentoring experiences for new clinical supervisors
   d) Participates in department/college events related to clinical supervision
   e) Demonstrates ongoing professional development and reflective practice
   f) Disseminates best practices in clinical supervision, based on research/evaluation data

RESEARCH: Expanding the knowledge base in one's discipline through generating new knowledge and synthesizing and integrating knowledge:

Standards to be addressed by everyone:

1. Articulates a clearly defined research agenda and focus that has grown in its quality and impact over time. Measures of quality and impact could include the following: journal acceptance rates, number of citations, circulation, publication notes (e.g., special mention, best paper award), journal impact factor, recognition at the national and/or international level, and quality of book publisher. It is incumbent upon the candidate to provide a strong and clear rationale for how the research described is situated in relation to a larger body and how the work has contributed to the advancement of their area of expertise.

2. Possesses a record of peer-reviewed publications that include systematic methods of inquiry

3. Presents a statement of research goals and record of works-in-progress that demonstrates continued contributions and productivity

4. Makes research contributions that reflect collaboration and leadership over time

In addition to the standards addressed above, faculty members at the time of promotion and tenure can address any of the following for further consideration of their ability to demonstrate expectations appropriate for tenure:

5. Presents a record of published work that translates research into practice to improve professional practices and outcomes and/or synthesizes knowledge through literature reviews which identify critical themes and needs

6. Demonstrates a record of community engaged scholarship (e.g., technical or program evaluation reports)

7. Engages in efforts to obtain funding to support one's research agenda

8. Demonstrates recognition of the quality of one's research

9. Presents a sustained record of disseminating research and knowledge at multiple levels (e.g., state, regional, national, and international conferences)

10. Engages in research that can be used to mentor and create opportunities for students and provides an emerging record of research collaborations with students

SERVICE/OUTREACH/ ENGAGEMENT: Applying knowledge in one's field through engaged scholarship and outreach to communities and practitioners, engagement with the profession, and service to the institution:

At the time of review for promotion to Associate Professor with conferral of permanent tenure, the faculty member is expected to demonstrate sustained and impactful service in each of the three areas for service/outreach/engagement.

Standards to be addressed by everyone:

1. Has a record of sustained involvement within the community of practitioners/professionals in one's field

2. Is actively involved in professional organizations and associations in one's field (e.g., some combination of state, regional, national/international levels including elected or appointed roles which may include editorial service)

3. Contributes to the mission of the program, department, college, and/or university through active engagement in committees or task forces that are addressing issues of importance

4. Presents a statement of service/outreach/engagement goals that shows continuing contributions and a record of service/outreach/engagement that is recognized for its quality and impact

Section Five
The Specific Standards for Promotion to Full Professor (Tenure Track)

A Full Professor in the Cato College of Education is expected to be a leader in the University and in the profession, contributing in a major way to the mission of the College and to the advancement of knowledge and practice in the professional field.

Review for promotion to Full Professor is not mandatory but tenured faculty in the Cato College of Education are encouraged to build a record of distinguished professional accomplishments and service that leads to this recognition. Reviews for promotion to Full Professor are encouraged and invited five years after promotion to Associate Professor and each five-year anniversary thereafter. Faculty members who decline review for promotion to Full Professor participate in the (Tenured Faculty Performance Review). Faculty members may request a review for promotion to Full Professor at times other than the five-year anniversaries of the promotion to Associate Professor/tenure decision. All reviews will be consistent with University Policy 102.13, Tenure Policies, Regulations and Procedures of the University of North Carolina at Charlotte and UNC Charlotte Academic Personnel Procedures Handbook-Section C. Review for Reappointment, Promotion, and Conferral of Permanent Tenure.

To achieve the rank of Full Professor, candidates in the Cato College of Education are expected to function successfully as tenured faculty members, meeting expected standards and making continuing contributions across the three professorial domains of teaching, research, and service/outreach/ engagement. They are expected to act as good citizens of the professional learning community in the College and function as contributing colleagues to their peers, meeting the broad expectations of all faculty members (Section Two). Finally, they must demonstrate a record of distinction through leadership and impact in at least one of the three professorial domains of teaching, research, or service/outreach/engagement.

At the time of review of promotion to Full Professor, faculty members are expected to present a record that not only continues the record of achievement at the time of the last review but is qualitatively different in scope, level of contribution, leadership, and evidence of impact.

Candidates are required at the time of review to identify the professorial domain(s) to be reviewed as the area(s) of distinction.

Specific Standards Relevant to Three Domains of Scholarship: Teaching, Research, and Service/ Outreach/Engagement

TEACHING: Representing knowledge in one's field by:

Standards to be addressed by everyone.

1. Teaching
   a) Articulates a statement of teaching that shows exemplary instruction informed by ongoing analysis of instructional practice and student learning outcomes
   b) Exhibits an in-depth understanding of the field and is a teacher-scholar who integrates current and relevant knowledge about content fields, teaching, learning, and assessment into instructional practice
   c) Demonstrates leadership in mentoring colleagues, particularly junior faculty, in their teaching
   d) Makes substantive contributions in teaching and the professional development of education professionals by conducting professional development seminars and/or developing curriculum materials at the local, state, national, and/or international levels

    2. Advising/Mentoring students
       a) Provides excellent advising and/or mentoring for students
       b) Mentors colleagues in advising students
       c) Creates opportunities and involves students in professional activities beyond the classroom
       d) Supervises student-directed scholarship (e.g., research, comprehensive examinations, required evidences, independent study projects, theses, Master's degree projects, dissertations, honors requirements)
       e) Fosters publication and presentation opportunities for students

    3. Developing course and program curriculum
       a) Participates effectively and successfully in course and program development that is based on established research, professional standards, best practices, and/or sustained experience with practitioners in one's field
       b) Engages in efforts to obtain funding to support course and/or program development
       c) Demonstrates leadership in course and program development
       d) Demonstrates leadership in accreditation and program approval efforts and activities
       e) Contributes to regional, state, national, and/or international curriculum development in one's field

In addition to the standards addressed above, faculty members at the time of promotion can address any of the following for further consideration of their ability to demonstrate expectations appropriate for full professor:

    4. Clinical supervision appropriate to role and program assignment
       a) Demonstrates a continuous record of positive impact on University students' professional growth
       b) Demonstrates a continuous record of involvement in development of materials and resources related to clinical supervision
       c) Provides evidence of frequent and sustained mentoring of new clinical supervisors
       d) Provides evidence of sustained leadership positions in department and/or college events related to clinical supervision
       e) Provides strategic leadership in designing and implementing clinical education at UNC Charlotte
       f) Presents a sustained record of dissemination of best practices in clinical supervision, based on research/evaluation data and evidence of impact and importance of this work

In addition to the above standards, faculty candidates will demonstrate **distinction in teaching** through a history of leadership and impact in most of the following ways:

- Engage in the scholarship of teaching, including investigating and implementing innovations in course and curriculum design and assessing impact on student learning and the success of graduates in the field; this work should lead to peer-reviewed publications and presentations
- Attain recognition in the College and University for the quality of one's teaching
- Provide leadership in improving the educational experience of students and their learning at UNC Charlotte and/or through state, national, and/or international initiatives in the candidate's discipline
- Generate funding to support teaching and learning
- Participate in junior faculty mentorship
- Contribute to the improvement of the quality of teaching within the department, college and university

RESEARCH: Expanding the knowledge base in one's discipline through generating new knowledge and synthesizing and integrating knowledge by:

Standards to be addressed by everyone:

1. Articulates a clearly defined research agenda and focus that has grown in its quality and impact over time. Measures of quality and impact could include the following: journal acceptance rates, number of citations, circulation, publication notes (e.g., special mention, best paper award), journal impact factor, recognition at the national and/or international level, and quality of book publisher. It is incumbent upon the candidate to provide a strong and clear rationale for how the research described is situated in relation to a larger body and how the work has contributed to the advancement of their area of expertise.

2. Possesses a record of peer-reviewed publications that include systematic methods of inquiry

3. Providing leadership in research which can be demonstrated by any of the following:
   a) Demonstrates leadership in mentoring colleagues, particularly junior faculty, in their efforts to generate new knowledge in their field and in synthesizing and integrating knowledge
   b) Demonstrates leadership in mentoring students in their efforts to generate new knowledge in their field and in synthesizing and integrating knowledge
   c) Demonstrates leadership in building successful collaborative teams locally and/or nationally/internationally

In addition to the standards addressed above, faculty members at the time of promotion can address any of the following for further consideration of their ability to demonstrate expectations appropriate for full professor:

4. Presents a record of published work that translates research into practice to improve professional practice and outcomes and/or synthesizes knowledge through literature reviews which identify critical themes and needs

5. Presents a record of community engaged scholarship (e.g., technical or program evaluation reports)

6. Engages in efforts to obtain funding to support one's research agenda

7. Receives recognition by others of the quality of one's research

8. Presents a sustained record of disseminating research and knowledge at multiple levels (e.g., state, regional, national, and international conferences)

9. Engages in research that can be used to mentor and create opportunities for students and provides an emerging record of research collaborations with students

In addition to the above standards, faculty candidates who seek **distinction in research** will present evidence of how their research demonstrates leadership and impact in most of the following ways:

- Presents a record of single- or lead-author research
- Reviews or referees research
- Serves on research panels
- Gives invited or keynote presentations on candidate's research

- Presents a record of securing funding through internal and external grants, contracts, and/or direct awards to support candidate's research agenda

SERVICE/OUTREACH/ENGAGEMENT: Applying knowledge in one's field through engaged scholarship and outreach to communities and practitioners, engagement with the profession, and service to the institution.

Standards to be addressed by everyone, including evidence of leadership in any of the following:

1. Presents a record of sustained involvement within the community of practitioners/professionals in one's field

2. Is actively involved in professional organizations and associations in one's field (e.g., some combination of state, regional, national/international levels), including elected or appointed roles which may include editorial service

3. Contributes to the mission of the program, department, college, and/or university through active engagement in committees or task forces that are addressing issues of importance

4. Presents a statement of service/outreach/engagement goals that shows sustained contributions and a record of service/outreach/engagement that is recognized for its quality and impact

Faculty candidates who seek **distinction in service/outreach/engagement** will document the quality and impact of service/outreach/engagement leadership in most of the following ways:

- Provides evidence of quality and impact of sustained and focused leadership in service to communities and practitioners
- Presents a record of substantial leadership in professional service and engagement through documentation of the quality and impact of professional service
- Documents the impact of leadership in service to the institution through evidence such as external accreditation reviews, curriculum approvals, strategic plans, program creation/revision, and descriptions of changes/improvement in the professional learning community as a result of the candidate's leadership

Section Six
The Candidate's Dossier for Reappointment, Promotion, and Tenure Review

The candidate's dossier for reappointment, promotion, and tenure decisions is prepared by the candidate, with some elements added by the department chair and later by the dean. The annual reports provide a foundation for the preparation of the dossier. Chairs' feedback letters to faculty members' annual reports should clearly address the extent to which the faculty member is progressing toward success at the next phase of the RPT process.

Materials included in the dossier are designed to provide evidence about the faculty member's achievements in teaching, research, and service/outreach/engagement, the promise of future contributions, and through the candidate's narrative statement, the contexts for understanding the nature and purpose of the work. The narrative statement provides the candidate with an opportunity to present an overview of how the faculty member is meeting the professorial role expectations for a faculty member in the Cato College of Education, including both the broad expectations and the specific standards for teaching, research, and service/outreach/engagement. The candidate and the reviewers should be guided in the preparation and the review of the dossier by the broad standards that are listed in Section Two and by the specific standards, appropriate to the level of review, listed in Sections Three, Four, or Five.

All documents posted in the candidate's dossier must be in PDF format. When going up for Reappointment, Promotion, and Tenure Review the dossier needs to be submitted by or before 11:55pm, on September 1.

Required Sections of the Candidate's Dossier

1. The candidate's current vita (See *Dossier Preparation Handbook* for recommended outline)

    The vita should document all of the candidate's professional activities, including those prior to joining the UNC Charlotte faculty. It should include information about the candidate's educational background (baccalaureate through doctoral degrees, dates, institutions, majors and minors); professional experience in education or related fields (dates, employers, job responsibilities, etc.); professional licenses or certifications, publications and presentations (complete citations in APA-style); and service to the institution, engagement with the profession, and outreach to communities and practitioners. Please refer to the *Dossier Preparation Handbook* for guidance in the classification and ordering of professional activities.

    Throughout the vita, specific entries should be ordered consistently from most recent to least recent, and the most current APA style should be used to list publication, presentations, research projects, etc. Related entries should be cross-referenced or presented together (e.g., reprints of articles in other journals, presentations subsequently published in conference proceedings or in refereed journals, or closely related articles or research reports based on the same data source).

    The vita should include an asterisk (*) at the end of the citation of the publications and presentations that use systematic methods of inquiry appropriate to the research goals and a pound sign (#) for those that are peer-reviewed.

2. The candidate's narrative statement/self-assessment

    The narrative statement should be written in the first person.

    The candidate's narrative statement/self-assessment is presented in four parts, each of which will be described below:

- Narrative statement overview
- Teaching narrative
- Research narrative
- Service/outreach/engagement narrative

The four elements of the narrative statement should be posted as separate documents so that reviewers may consider the appropriate element in conjunction with the supportive evidence provided later in the dossier.

Narrative statement overview (limited to 4 single-spaced pages)
The narrative overview should include the following information:
- The candidate's roles, responsibilities, and commitments in the department and college, including a description of the candidate's workload
- The evolution of the candidate's professional interests and priorities in teaching, research, and service/outreach/engagement, including relevant background information that relates to the candidate's current roles, responsibilities, and professional commitments such as the commitment to diversity
- The unifying themes (areas of focus) in the candidate's teaching, research, and service/outreach/engagement (typically 2-4 themes are delineated)
- Self-reflection on personal accomplishments to date, including strengths, challenges, areas for growth
- Major professional goals in research, teaching, and service for the next 3-5 years

Teaching narrative (limited to 3 single-spaced pages plus charts)
The teaching narrative should include the following information:
- A statement of the candidate's teaching philosophy or belief system about teaching and learning
- The nature/role of the courses taught by the candidate in the academic program and how they connect to the *Conceptual Framework*
- Brief contextual statement to introduce course syllabi, including information about how courses have been revised and improved
- An analysis of how the candidate has interpreted and used student and peer evaluations to improve instruction, including trend analysis and how instruction has been revised and improved, based on feedback
- A description of how the candidate assesses and values student learning and has adjusted instruction to enhance learning based on measures of student learning outcomes
- Description of advising responsibilities, including the supervision of student scholarship (e.g., number/type of advisees and/or roles and responsibilities in directing student scholarship)
- Description of contributions to curriculum development including how the candidate aligns the curriculum to accreditation standards
- Description of efforts related to diversity in the professional domain of teaching
- Description of efforts related to inclusion of instructional technology in the professional domain of teaching
- (For Promotion to Full) Description of leadership contributions in teaching (e.g., mentoring, peer observation, curriculum leadership) and the impact of that work

Research narrative (limited to 3 single-spaced pages plus charts)
The research narrative should include the following information:

- A description of the candidate's research agenda, including major areas of focus and the relevance/importance of the research questions to the field
- A rationale for the selection of the five exemplar publications in the dossier (e.g., why these articles are good representations of the candidate's achievements in research)
- A description of the research methodologies employed by the candidate
- The evolution of the candidate's research and scholarship in terms of focus, audience, quality of publication outlet, etc.
- A chart of in-progress work to show continued contributions and productivity.
- The nature of the candidate's contributions to the work of research teams, engaged scholarship with communities, and/or work with students
- Future directions
- (For promotion to Associate and promotion to Full) Evidence of quality and impact of scholarship
- (For promotion to Full) Description of leadership in research (e.g., mentoring, editorial leadership, leadership of research teams) and the impact of that work

Service/outreach/engagement narrative (limited to 3 single-spaced pages)
The service narrative should include the following information:
- A description of the candidate's agenda for service to the institution, engagement with the profession, and outreach to practitioners and communities and how this agenda links to the candidate's areas of professional focus
- Provide examples of the impact of one's service
- (For promotion to Full) Description of leadership in service, outreach, and community engagement and the impact of that work

3. Copies of all prior annual evaluation letters to the candidate since the last review (or the most recent 3 years, whichever is shorter) and copies of the dean's recommendations for all prior reappointment, promotion, and tenure recommendations (posted by chair)

4. Materials relevant to teaching
- Copies of one course syllabus for each of the different courses (a maximum of five) taught by the candidate during the prior three years
- All student evaluations collected since the candidate's last review for reappointment, promotion, or tenure, including both quantitative and qualitative information (or the last three years, whichever is shorter) (posted by chair)
- Peer observation reports and observation signature form (posted by chair)
- When appropriate: Student comments on the effectiveness of advisement (including the supervision of student scholarship), (e.g., accessibility, responsiveness, knowledge and effectiveness of guidance). Such comments will be solicited by the chair, in consultation with the faculty candidate, and will reflect the specific advising roles and responsibilities of the faculty candidate. (posted by chair)
- Teaching charts (see *Dossier Preparation Handbook*)

5. Materials relevant to research
- Copies of five research publications, selected by the candidate, to provide reviewers with an understanding of the candidate's research areas of focus, quality of research, and impact. The research examples may be journal articles, book chapters, or books (not the entire book but representative chapters plus table of contents.) Specific guidance about the selection of the research examples is provided below:
  ➤ While most selected materials should be in print, items *in press* or under review may be included if in the candidate's view, the manuscripts contribute important

information about the research record. In these cases, any correspondence with journals about the publication status of the manuscripts should be included with the manuscript.
  - ➢ While most selected materials should be published since the last review, if one or two earlier articles (or books or book chapters) provide important information about the research record, such earlier work may be included.
  - ➢ At least two of the submissions should be research that reflects use of systematic methods of inquiry and peer-reviewed appropriate to one's research goals.

- For tenure and promotion reviews (but not reappointment reviews), three to five letters from external reviewers who have been asked to review the selected publications or products of the candidate's research and then, based on that review, assess both the quality of the research and its contributions to the candidate's field of specialization (placed in dossier folder by chair).
  - ➢ All of the reviewers must be outside UNC Charlotte, none should be a close colleague or collaborator with the candidate, and the majority should be selected independently by the department chair in consultation with the dean. When the chair solicits the external reviews, he or she will inform the candidate regarding the names of the reviewers, the materials sent to each, and the questions(s) they have been asked to address.
  - ➢ Chart listing external reviewers, their expertise, and who recommended them will be added to the dossier by the chair (Template provided, *Dossier Preparation Handbook).*
- Research charts (Template provided, *Dossier Preparation Handbook*)

6. Materials relevant to service/outreach/engagement
  - Descriptions or products of the candidate's most significant service activities (a maximum of five items), along with evaluation of the quality of that work and its impact (if available)
  - For tenure and promotion reviews (but not reappointment reviews), three to five letters from appropriate individuals who have in-depth knowledge of one or more of the candidate's service activities and who have been asked to assess the quality and impact of that service. It is the responsibility of the candidate's department chair to obtain these assessments of the candidate's service to the profession and to practitioners in his or her field. Working with the candidate, the chair will identify and select three to five appropriate individuals who have in-depth knowledge of one or more of the candidate's service/outreach/engagement activities and who are in a position to assess objectively the quality of service and contribution made by the candidate to his or her profession or to a specific group of practitioners in the field. Ideally, these reviewers should be knowledgeable of the candidate's work, but not collaborators or close colleagues. When the chair solicits the external reviews, he or she will inform the candidate regarding the names of the reviewers, any materials sent to them, and the questions(s) they have been asked to address.
  - The chart listing external reviewers of service and their expertise will be added to the dossier by the chair (Template provided, *Dossier Preparation Handbook*)

Timeline and Checklist for Tenure/Tenure-Track Dossier Preparation

In the Cato College of Education, the candidate's dossier is submitted electronically for review by the Departmental Review Committee, the department chair, the College Review Committee, and the dean. Additionally, an abbreviated paper version of the dossier that includes the required elements from Academic Affairs is prepared for review by the provost. The department chair is responsible for preparing the paper version of the materials to be sent to the provost and will forward the paper file to the dean's Office when departmental-level reviews are completed. In the chart below, the elements of the dossier, the person responsible for completing and including those elements, deadlines for submission, and whether the elements are included only in the electronic submission or in both the electronic and paper submissions are noted. Each of the required elements has been described in the previous pages.

If significant new information is received by the candidate after the 11:55pm, September 1 submission date, the candidate may request that the chair add the new material to the dossier. The chair will notify the appropriate committee if new material is added. No additional material may be added after the close of the Fall semester.

During the last week of September, faculty who hold the same rank or higher of the rank being sought by the candidate may view the candidate's dossier (limited to materials submitted by the candidate) and provide typed feedback to the DRC Chair. Materials submitted by the Department Chair (e.g., annual reviews, previous promotion reviews) are part of the full review file and are only accessed by the review committees. Feedback should pertain to documentation provided in the candidate's dossier and must be provided by October 1.

Elements	Person Responsible	Deadline	Electronic Submission	Paper Submission
AA-20 Cover Form with signatures and votes recorded	Chair	Oct. 15		X
AA-27 Affirmative Action Form	Chair	Oct. 15		X
Vita*	Candidate	Sept. 1*	X	X
Candidate's narrative statement/self-assessment*	Candidate	Sept. 1*	X	X
Copies of prior annual evaluations (3 years)	Chair	Sept. 1	X	X
Copies of prior reappointment, promotion and tenure recommendations of dean (if applicable)	Chair	Sept. 1	X	X
Course syllabi	Candidate	Sept. 1	X	
Student evaluations of instruction	Chair	Sept. 1	X	
Peer observation reports	Chair	Sept. 1	X	
Survey of students for whom candidate has provided Guidance	Chair	Sept. 1	X	
Chart of master's and doctoral committee service	Candidate	Sept. 1	X	X
Chart- course & curriculum contributions	Candidate	Sept. 1	X	X
Chart – teaching assignments	Candidate	Sept. 1	X	X
5 research publications	Candidate	Sept. 1*	X	
External reviews of research*	Chair	Sept. 1*	X	X
Chart of external reviewers of research*	Chair	Sept. 1*	X	X
Chart- published and *in press* work, including evidence of quality and impact	Candidate	Sept. 1	X	X
Chart – works in progress	Candidate	Sept. 1	X	X
Chart – external funding	Candidate	Sept. 1	X	X
Description of 5 most significant service contributions, with evaluation of quality and impact	Candidate	Sept. 1	X	
External reviews of quality and impact of service*	Chair	Sept. 1*	X	X
Chart of external reviews of service/outreach/engagement	Chair	Sept. 1	X	X
DRC recommendation letter to Department Chair	DRC Chair	Oct. 15	X	X
Department Chair's recommendation letter to dean	Chair	Nov. 1	X	X
CRC recommendation letter to Dean	CRC Chair	Dec. 1	X	X

Dean's recommendation letter to Provost	Dean	Jan. 2	X	X

*Candidates for promotion/tenure must work with their chair to develop a list of external reviewers to be solicited by the chair for external reviews. By **June 1**, candidates must provide advance copies of the following materials to their chair so that the chair can send these materials to external reviewers who have agreed to conduct reviews: Vita; research narrative; service narrative. These elements may be revised/updated for the September 1 dossier submission. Candidates are encouraged to schedule a meeting with their chair on or around August 15 to review this checklist and ensure that all documents are in the dossier or will be added before the due dates (above).

Section Seven

**Faculty Review Committees for Reappointment/Promotion/Tenure Reviews
for Tenure-Track Faculty**

Reviews for reappointment, promotion, and conferral of permanent tenure are guided by University Policy 102.13, Tenure Policies, Regulations and Procedures of the University of North Carolina at Charlotte, UNC Charlotte Academic Personnel Procedures Handbook-Section C. Review for Reappointment, Promotion, and Conferral of Permanent Tenure. All committee members and administrators with responsibility for these reviews should review the policies, regulations, and procedures as delineated in the relevant policies and procedures. This material provides essential guidance on the areas of performance to be reviewed and the responsibilities of the Department Review Committee, the department chair, the College Review Committee, and the dean in analyzing the strengths and weakness of the candidate's record and in presenting the resultant recommendation.

The tenure document describes the responsibilities of the reviewers in conducting the review sessions, permissible and impermissible grounds for decisions, the channels of review, and notifications.

<u>Review Committees</u>

1. <u>Department Review Committee (DRC)</u>

    Each academic department in the Cato College of Education has a Department Review Committee (DRC) consisting of three members. The assembled DRC provides recommendations to the department chair on reappointment, promotion, and tenure.

    The committee is elected from the permanently tenured faculty of the department who hold full-time appointments. Members are elected for staggered terms of two years each. At least one member of the committee must hold the academic rank of Professor. Permanently tenured faculty members from other departments within the Cato College of Education may be selected as voting members if necessary to constitute the DRC. The committee elects its chair from its membership.

    DRC members will receive yearly training/updates on the RPT policies and procedures, standards, and ethical guidelines.

    A faculty member may not serve consecutive terms and must sit off the DRC for a period of at least one year before being eligible to again serve on the DRC.

    One member of the elected committee will be appointed by the department chair to serve as the DRC Diversity Representative. This individual will receive additional training on inclusion and fairness and be invested with the responsibility of monitoring the processes of the committee for fairness and equity.

    During years when a Clinical Faculty Member will be reviewed for promotion, the department will elect one clinical faculty member to serve as a voting member of the DRC during the clinical review. This member will serve in addition to the members identified above. In the event that a department has no clinical member eligible to serve, a member of another department may be selected to serve.

2. College Review Committee (CRC)

The College Review Committee provides the dean with recommendations on reappointment, promotion, and the conferral of permanent tenure.

The College Review Committee is elected from the permanently tenured faculty of the College who hold full-time appointments and has a history of service as a Departmental Review Committee member. Each academic department elects one member for service on the CRC for two-year staggered terms and two additional members are elected at-large by the College for one-year terms. A faculty member may not serve consecutive terms and must sit off the CRC for a period of at least one year before being eligible to again serve on the CRC.

CRC members will receive yearly training/updates on the RPT policies, standards, and ethical guidelines.

When necessary for clinical faculty reviews, the CRC will be expanded to include two senior level Clinical Faculty Members. These committee members are elected at the time of the yearly college election and serve two year staggered terms. (Note: Senior Level clinical faculty is defined as a member who has successfully been appointed as a Clinical Associate Professor, Clinical Professor, or Senior Research Associate.)

One member of the elected committee will be appointed by the dean to serve as the CRC Diversity Representative. This individual will receive additional training on inclusion and fairness and be invested with the responsibility of monitoring the processes of the committee for fairness and equity.

For election of the at-large members of the CRC, a ballot of eligible faculty will be prepared by the dean. Excluded from eligibility are faculty who are undergoing a review in the coming year and their immediate family members, department chairs and deans, and faculty who have been elected to serve on a Department Review Committee. The list of eligible faculty will be distributed to eligible voters by an electronic ballot. Faculty may vote for two CRC members. The two CRC nominees with the highest number of votes are elected to the committee.

The committee elects a chair from its membership.