

The University of North Carolina at Greensboro
College of Arts and Sciences

Regulations on Reappointment, Tenure, & Promotion

Table of Contents

I.	The Purpose of this Document.....	3
I.A.	Fundamental purpose	3
I.B.	Additional Purpose.....	3
I.C.	Programs and Program Directors/Heads	3
I.D.	Official UNC and UNCG Documents	3
I.E.	Faculty with Joint Appointments	4
II.	Departmental Promotion and Tenure Guidelines Document.....	4
II.A.	Requirement and Compliance	4
II.B.	Expectations for Judging Quality and Quantity	4
II.C.	Availability of Department Promotion and Tenure Guidelines Documents	5
II.D.	Clear and Specific Expectations	5
II.E.	Judgments of Quality and Quantity.....	5
III.	Promotion and Tenure Form and P&T Portfolios/Dossiers.....	6
IV.	Materials for Late Inclusion in a Portfolio/Dossier	6
V.	Timing and Circumstances of Reviews for Reappointment, Promotion, and Tenure	6
V.A.	Reappointment	7
V.B.	Tenure and Promotion from Assistant to Associate Professor....	7
V.C.	Tenure at the Rank of Associate Professor for Faculty Hired at that Rank without Tenure.....	7
V.D.	Tenure at the Rank of Professor for Faculty Hired at that Rank without Tenure.....	7
V.E.	Promotion from Associate Professor to Professor	8
V.F.	Appointment of Special Review Committees	8
V.G.	Extensions of the Probationary Period (“Stopping the tenure clock”).....	9
V.H.	Early decisions on Tenure and Promotion	9
V.I.	Withdrawing an Application for Promotion and Tenure	10
VI.	External Review Letters.....	10
VI.A.	Content of Review Letters	10
VI.B.	Candidate’s List of External Evaluators	10
VI.C.	The Department’s Letter that Accompanies the Portfolio/Dossier to the External Reviewers	11

VI.D.	Qualifications of the Reviewers	11
VI.E.	External Review Letters Cannot be Confidential.....	12
VI.F.	Non-Evaluative Letters	12
VII.	Summary of Work.....	12
VIII.	Meeting of the Faculty to Deliberate and Vote on the Candidate.....	12
VIII.A.	Voting Eligibility	13
VIII.B.	Faculty who Cannot Vote.....	13
VIII.C.	Faculty with Joint Appointments	14
VIII.D.	Selection of a Chair.....	14
VIII.E.	Chair’s Duties and Responsibilities	14
IX.	Dissenting Opinions.....	15
IX. A.	Procedures and Contents of Dissenting Opinions	15
IX. B.	Due date for Dissenting Opinions	16
X.	Department Head’s Review.....	16
XI.	Comments by the Candidate	16
XII.	Assembly of the Portfolio/Dossier for Review	16
Appendix A:	Form of letter sent to external reviewers.....	17

I. The Purpose of this Document

I.A. Fundamental Purpose

The purpose of this document is to provide regulations and procedures that must be followed when considering candidates for the following:

- Reappointment
- Tenure and promotion from Assistant to Associate Professor
- Tenure at the rank of Associate Professor or Professor for faculty hired at either of those ranks without tenure
- Promotion from Associate Professor to Professor

I.B. Additional Purpose

Additionally, this document informs candidates about the procedures that must be used in preparing and reviewing their portfolios/dossiers by the College's departments and by the College itself. The departments' and the College's regulations and procedures must conform to the University's official documents on reappointment, promotion, and tenure.

I.C. Programs and Program Directors/Heads

Both departments and programs exist within the College. Departments are headed by a department head. Programs are headed by a program director. For the purposes of reappointment, promotion and tenure, all regulations that apply to departments also apply to programs, and all regulations and responsibilities that apply to department heads apply to program directors. Programs must have a set of *Program Promotion and Tenure Guidelines* similar to the *Department Promotion and Tenure Guidelines* and must follow the procedures and protocols explicated in the *College of Arts & Sciences Regulations for Reappointment, Promotion, & Tenure* (this document) and in the *College of Arts & Sciences Guidelines for Reappointment, Promotion, & Tenure*.

I.D. Official UNC and UNCG Documents

The following are the major documents that regulate appointment, promotion, tenure, and due process in the University of North Carolina system and at UNCG. A list of all relevant documents can be found in the Appendix of the *Promotion, Tenure, Academic Freedom, and Due Process Regulations: The University of North Carolina at Greensboro*. In the case of any conflict, these documents take precedence over provisions in College or department documents.:

“The Code of the Board of Governors of the University of North Carolina, Chapter 6: Academic Freedom and Tenure” (henceforth, *The Code*)

“Promotion, Tenure, Academic Freedom, and Due Process Regulations: The University of North Carolina at Greensboro” (henceforth, *UNCG Regulations*)

“University-Wide Evaluation Guidelines for Promotions and Tenure” (henceforth, *UNCG Guidelines*)

Current versions of all these documents may be accessed through links on the Provost’s web site at: <http://provost.uncg.edu/publications/personnel/pt.html>.

I. E. Faculty with Joint Appointments

Review of faculty with joint appointments is governed by the *Guidelines on Joint Faculty Appointments of the University of North Carolina at Greensboro*. The Memorandum of Agreement (MOA) that creates the joint appointment must include a description of the process that will be followed in reviews for reappointment, tenure, and promotion. The review takes place in the candidate’s primary department and the MOA specifies how input will be provided by the secondary department and how disagreement between the primary and secondary departments will be resolved.

II. Departmental Promotion and Tenure Guidelines Document

II. A. Requirement and Compliance

Each department must have a *Department Promotion and Tenure Guidelines* document (henceforth, *Department Guidelines*). This document must be consistent with the College Promotion and Tenure Guidelines and Regulations documents and with the University documents referenced in Section I, above. Each *Department Guidelines* must include a description of the department’s standards and expectations and procedures regarding reappointment, promotion, and tenure. Any changes to Department Guidelines must be approved by the Dean, who will consult with the College P&T Committee in the case of major revisions.

Each *Department Guidelines* must include timelines for reappointment, tenure, and promotion reviews that will ensure that all review processes are complete in time for all relevant materials to be forwarded to the College prior to College deadlines.

II. B. Expectations for Judging Quality and Quantity

Department heads must provide every candidate for promotion and/or tenure with the *Department Guidelines* and periodically discuss the contents and criteria with him or her. Minimally, these discussions must occur when the offer of employment is made, in the year of their reappointment review, and in the year prior to consideration for tenure.

II. C. Availability of Department Promotion and Tenure Guidelines Documents

The Department shall make its *Department Guidelines* available to all faculty and must keep an online, downloadable, updated version on its website. Links will be maintained from the *College's Promotion, Tenure, and Reappointment Documents* webpage: <http://www.uncg.edu/aas/about/promotion.htm>). Each department must include its *Department Guidelines* in each candidate's promotion and tenure portfolio/dossier.

II. D. Clear and Specific Expectations

As required by the UNC system (see *UNCG Regulations*, Section 2.D.i), each department's *Guidelines* must be specific and clear regarding expectations in the three areas of teaching, research, and service, and in the optional area of directed professional activity if the department intends to support candidates in that area. Department *Guidelines* must be more than a mere reiteration of the College's *Guidelines*; they must expand upon the College's more general criteria and apply them to the department's field/fields of study and research. It is acknowledged that some degree of flexibility is necessary to assure that candidates with various and differing records and patterns of achievement are fairly considered. However, because clarity and precision in departments' *Guidelines* are fairer to the candidate and make it easier for subsequent reviewers to understand the significance of a candidate's work, it is important for departments to strive for the greatest specificity possible.

II. E. Judgments of Quality and Quantity

Judgments of quality of the candidate's achievements in each area (teaching, research, service) should focus on the originality, significance, and impact of the work. The criteria and forms of evidence that will be referenced to assess quality must be described in the *Department Guidelines* (e.g., for judgments about research, departments might indicate that their judgments of quality will be based upon factors such as citation rates, quality of the journals in which articles have been published, awards and honors received, comments of external reviewers, etc.).

To the extent that departments have quantitative expectations in any area of evaluation, they should be described in the *Department Guidelines* in order to avoid the phenomenon of "unstated but generally understood" standards being applied. Reference to quantity, however, is best stated in terms of general expectations because the quantitative analysis of each candidate's achievement must be measured in conjunction with assessments of the quality of those achievements. Too much and too specific quantification is not desirable because it is very difficult to anticipate all the possible combinations of quantity and quality of accomplishments that might be acceptable for reappointment, tenure, or

promotion.

III. Promotion and Tenure Form and P & T Portfolios/Dossiers

All promotion and tenure dossiers are assembled online in Blackboard; each candidate is assigned a Blackboard Organization to which access is granted at the department, College, and University levels as the review proceeds. The University's *Promotion and Tenure Form* lists materials that must be included in the dossier and gives explicit directions for assembling it. (To access the University's *Promotion and Tenure Form*, go to: <http://provost.uncg.edu/publications/personnel/PT.asp>). The College of Arts and Sciences provides instructions to aid departments and candidates in assembling complete portfolios/dossiers for review by the College and University committees.

IV. Materials for Late Inclusion in a Portfolio/Dossier

Each year, a promotion and tenure schedule is provided by the Provost's Office and a deadline is set by which departments must complete the assembly of dossiers (generally around October 1st). It is expected that the portfolio/dossier will be complete by the deadline, but occasionally it is necessary to add materials after the deadline has passed. In order to ensure that candidates are treated equally, and that all levels of review (Department, College, University) have access to the same materials, the University places strict limitations on materials that may be included after the submission deadline (See *UNCG Regulations* Section 4.B.i.g. (2) and 4.B.i.g. (3)).

V. Timing and Circumstances of Reviews for Reappointment, Promotion, and Tenure

Each *Department Guidelines* must include timelines for the reviews described below that will ensure that all relevant materials can be uploaded to the online dossier by the College's deadline. Because the dossiers of candidates for tenure and/or promotion to Associate Professor or Full Professor must include letters of evaluation from external reviewers, the departmental tenure and/or promotion process must begin during the spring prior to the academic year when the College and University will consider the candidate's application.

During the spring semester preceding the academic year in which a review for reappointment, tenure, or promotion is scheduled, the department head shall establish a timetable for the departmental review process which ensures that all phases will be completed prior to the date when all materials must be sent to the Dean. The department head will also provide the candidate, in writing, with this timetable along with a clear statement of what information the candidate must provide and the dates when each item is due.

V. A. Reappointment

The 3rd-year reappointment review provides a valuable opportunity for feedback on progress made thus far towards tenure and promotion. A separate document, *Reappointment Review Guidelines and Reappointment Review Form*: (<http://www.uncg.edu/aas/about/promotion.htm>), describes the procedures to be followed for reappointment reviews.

V. B. Tenure and Promotion from Assistant to Associate Professor

Faculty hired at the rank of Assistant Professor are normally reviewed at the College level for tenure and promotion early in the sixth year of their appointment. Accordingly, the promotion and tenure review process in departments will normally begin toward the end of the candidate's fifth year of his or her appointment.

V. C. Tenure at the Rank of Associate Professor for Faculty Hired at that Rank without Tenure

Associate Professors hired without tenure shall be reviewed for tenure or for promotion and tenure at the College level early in the penultimate year of the probationary term. (See *UNCG Regulations*, 3.E.ii.b). Accordingly, the review process in departments will normally begin in the spring of the antepenultimate year of the initial appointment.

When a candidate is hired as an Associate Professor without tenure, the department may, following its formal review, recommend either tenure at that rank, or tenure with promotion to Professor. If the latter is recommended, it will be necessary for two votes to be taken in the department by the tenured Professors: one vote on the question of tenure, and another vote on the question of promotion. These votes should be reported separately in the portfolio/dossier. In such cases it is possible for reviewers at the College or University level to endorse the recommendation for tenure but not that for promotion.

V. D. Tenure at the Rank of Professor for Faculty Hired at that Rank without Tenure

Professors hired without tenure shall be reviewed for tenure at the College level early in the penultimate year of the probationary term. (See *UNCG Regulations*, 3.F.ii.b). Accordingly, the review process in departments will normally begin in the spring of the antepenultimate year of the initial appointment. Only tenured Professors may vote on the conferral of tenure on an untenured Professor.

V. E. Promotion from Associate Professor to Professor

Formal review for promotion to Professor may be initiated at any time by the department head or by the Professors in the department. If requested by the candidate, the department may not delay the beginning of formal review beyond August 1 of the seventh year following conferral of tenure. Each Associate Professor must receive feedback on progress towards promotion at the time of annual review (*UNCG Policy on Annual and Post-Tenure Review*, Sect. III.C). The following describe the circumstances related to a decision to begin the formal process of reviewing an Associate Professor for promotion to Professor:

V. E. i. By Recommendation from the Department Head and/or the Department's Professors

The department head and/or a majority of the department's Professors may begin the formal process of reviewing a tenured Associate Professor for promotion to Professor at any time. (See *UNCG Regulations*, Section 3.E.iii.a.)

V. E. ii. By the Candidate's Right to a Formal Review

A candidate who has not been formally reviewed for promotion to Professor has the right to a formal review after his or her 6th year in rank as a tenured Associate Professor at UNCG, if requested by the candidate. To exercise this right, the candidate shall write to the department head by March 1st of that year requesting review. The formal review must begin by the following August 1. (See *UNCG Regulations*, Section 3.E.iii.b.)

V. E. iii. Subsequent Attempts

If a formal review of an Associate Professor for promotion does not culminate in promotion of the candidate to Professor, whether by a negative decision of the Chancellor or by the candidate's decision to withdraw the dossier, the candidate may next request a review during the third year following his or her unsuccessful previous attempt by writing to his or her department head as described above. (See *UNCG Regulations*, Section 3.E.iii.c.)

V. F. Appointment of special review committees

Sometimes there are too few faculty of the appropriate rank in a department to conduct a review for tenure or promotion. In that case, the department head should discuss the situation with the dean well in advance. The dean and the department head will agree on, and the dean will appoint an *ad hoc* committee of 3-5 faculty of the appropriate rank, including faculty from other departments, to conduct the review and prepare the dossier. If the candidate being considered for

promotion is the department head, then the dean will consult with the department faculty senior in rank to the head regarding the appointment of a review committee. The dean and the senior faculty will agree on the composition of this committee and the dean will appoint its members.

V. G. Extensions of the probationary period (“Stopping the tenure clock”)

Faculty members are entitled to take leave for medical or personal reasons and in such cases, the probationary period before mandatory tenure review may be extended. Faculty may also request extensions to the probationary period on grounds of personal exigency without taking a leave. Department heads should be familiar with these University and College policies and explain the consequences of taking a leave to any untenured faculty who requests one. All agreements regarding changes to the probationary period must be documented in writing and have the approval of the Dean and the Provost. (See *UNCG Regulations*, Sections: 3.C., 3.C.i, 3.C.ii., and 3.C.iii.)

V. H. Early decisions on Tenure and Promotion

Faculty appointed at the rank of Assistant Professor are normally reviewed at the College level for tenure and promotion during the sixth year of their appointment. Faculty appointed at the rank of Associate Professor or Professor without tenure are normally reviewed during the penultimate year of their term. Exceptional accomplishments may provide grounds for an early recommendation and such early decisions are permitted when they are clearly appropriate. The department head must consult with the Dean before sending forward an early recommendation. If, after review of the portfolio/dossier at the College level, the Dean believes that the case does not support a positive recommendation for early tenure, the candidate will be advised to withdraw the dossier before it is submitted for review at the University level. Resubmission of a dossier following a negative tenure decision by the Chancellor is not permitted. Withdrawal of a portfolio/dossier for early tenure prior to its being submitted to the Chancellor will not prejudice a subsequent review that takes place at the normal time.

In some cases, faculty may be hired with a specific written agreement to be considered for tenure at a specified time (normally no more than three years) before the end of the maximum probationary period, with work done at another institution included in the dossier for consideration. On the recommendation of the department head, and with the approval of the Dean and the Provost, a separate agreement with the candidate will be prepared specifying the date of review for tenure and the previous work that will be considered in the review.

Any subsequent request to extend the modified probationary period for reasons of personal exigency must be made in writing by the candidate to the department head before the end of the academic year preceding the year in which the review is expected (see <http://provost.uncg.edu/documents/personnel/exigency.pdf>). The

extension requires the approval of the Dean and Provost and will not be granted solely on the grounds that the candidate's progress has been less rapid than expected. (Note: Faculty hired before 2009 with an agreement for early tenure were given the option of delaying their tenure review without any special justification and this was recorded in a letter from the Dean. Those agreements still stand, but if the review is to be delayed, the head must inform the Dean in writing so that accurate records can be maintained.)

V. I. Withdrawing a Candidate's Application for Promotion and Tenure

The candidate may, at his or her discretion, withdraw his or her portfolio/dossier from consideration at any stage of review before it is submitted to the chancellor for a final decision. (See *UNCG Regulations*, Section 4.A.iii. and Footnote).

VI. External Review Letters

External review letters are required of all candidates for tenure or promotion and should be requested early in the summer preceding the review year. At least three external letters must be included in the dossier, although it may be advisable to get more in particular cases (for example, where a candidate's work spans more than one specialty, or where assessment of the impact of a candidate's scholarly work requires appraisal by evaluators with a variety of areas of professional expertise). It is a good idea to request letters from at least one more person than the number of letters needed, since reviewers do sometimes fail to respond by the deadline. However many letters are requested, *all* of those received must be included in the dossier.

VI.A Content of Review Letters

Review letters are normally solicited for the candidate's research, scholarship, or creative activity only, but it is permissible to solicit external letters for other portions of the record if appropriate. This will usually be the case, for example, if the candidate's record includes Directed Professional Activity, and it may also occur if the teaching record includes significant work beyond the campus. However, the point of any external letter is to assist us in evaluating the candidate's work, and this should be the guiding principle when determining whether a letter is appropriate.

VI.B. Selection of External Reviewers

The candidate should provide a list of up to 4 names of suggested reviewers and may also request that certain individuals not be asked to provide a review because of personal animosities or other matters unrelated to professional expertise. The department head should seek other names from senior department faculty and professional contacts. Journal editors, department heads at other institutions, and program directors at funding agencies are often good sources of advice. The aggregate list must contain at least eight potential reviewers, from which no fewer

than three are selected; at least one of the three must be someone suggested by the candidate. (See *UNCG Regulations*, Sections 4.B.i.c.)

VI.C. The Department's Letter that Accompanies the Portfolio/Dossier to the External Reviewer

After confirming the reviewers' availability, the department head, or the chair of the review committee, will send a letter to each external reviewer using the wording provided in Appendix A. The candidate will provide the materials to be sent to the reviewers; these normally consist of a vita, the narrative describing the candidate's research, and copies of selected works, but may include other materials if necessary to permit a proper review. The department head shall not unreasonably refuse to include material provided by the candidate.

VI.D. Qualifications of the Reviewers

VI. D. i. Those Not Qualified

The reviewers who are finally selected must exclude anyone whom readers might consider unable to provide an objective review, such as previous mentors or formal advisors (undergraduate, graduate, or postdoctoral) of the candidate, close personal friends, or frequent collaborators. It may sometimes be difficult to find reviewers who are completely unacquainted with the candidate, particularly in cases of promotion to Professor, but it is not necessary for the candidate and the reviewers to be completely unknown to one another. It is most important to ensure that the reviewers are objective and have the professional credentials to provide an authoritative assessment of the candidate's work.

VI. D. ii. Acquaintance of the Reviewer with the Candidate

Each reviewer should be asked to describe his or her acquaintance with the candidate (if any) in the letter so that readers of the dossier can make their own evaluation of the reviewers' objectivity. If any reviewer has had significant prior contacts with the candidate, the dossier should explain carefully why that person was nonetheless chosen to write a letter.

VI. D. iii. External Reviewers to be Senior in Rank to the Candidate

Most, if not all, of the external reviewers should be at or above the rank to which the candidate is seeking promotion. Also, most of the reviewers should hold academic positions at respected institutions – such people are generally familiar with the expectations of tenure and promotion and can speak most authoritatively to the review committees who will read the candidate's file. In some cases, reviewers in non-academic positions may

be better suited to evaluate a candidate's work, in which case it is particularly important to establish their credentials in the dossier. It is important to remember that letters from reviewers who appear unqualified will tend to weaken a candidate's case.

VI. D. iv. Biographical Sketches of the External Evaluators

The portfolio/dossier must include a brief biographical sketch of each reviewer, explaining to those unfamiliar with the field why the reviewer's opinion is considered to be authoritative. It is not necessary to include a full vita for each reviewer, although these may be included if desired. The biographical sketch should include the reviewer's present position, significant previous positions, contributions to the field, honors and awards, and any other information that demonstrates their professional accomplishments.

VI.E. External Review Letters cannot be confidential

The letter to potential reviewers must state that the candidate will have the opportunity to read the entire dossier, including the unredacted external letters with signatures. North Carolina law specifically forbids redacting the signatures. Candidates may not be prevented or discouraged from reading the external letters.

VI.F. Non-Evaluative Letters

In some cases, it may be appropriate to request additional letters to explain aspects of a candidate's work rather than to evaluate it. For example, if a significant number of publications derive from a long-term collaboration with another researcher, it would be useful to include a letter from the collaborator describing the candidate's role in that research program. When requesting letters of this type, it is important to emphasize that the writer is being asked for a description or explanation, not an evaluation (which would be inappropriate in the example just given, where the writer is a close collaborator). Such letters should be placed separately from letters of evaluation and their role in the dossier clearly explained. Do not simply include them without explanation.

VII. Summary of Work

Candidates for promotion and/or tenure must write a Summary of Work Accomplished that describes their accomplishments in the areas of teaching, research, service, and (if applicable) Directed Professional Activity. In some cases, the candidate's record may include a significant and substantial community-engaged or applied research/scholarship component; if so, the candidate should explicate this in the Summary of Work.

VIII. Meeting of the Faculty to Deliberate and Vote on the Candidate (Henceforth referred to as the Deliberation/Vote Meeting)

VIII. A. Voting Eligibility

VIII. A. i. Tenured Faculty

Only tenured faculty may participate in decisions involving reappointment, tenure and promotion. (See *UNCG Regulations*, Sections 4.B.i.a. and Footnotes #4 and #8).

Faculty must be present in order to vote. If necessary, the Dean may be asked to give permission for faculty who cannot be physically present to participate in the meeting remotely. Proxy or absentee voting is not permitted. (See *UNCG Regulations*, Section 4.B.i.a. and Footnote #7).

VIII. A. ii. Faculty Rank

At the department level, only tenured faculty senior in rank to a candidate are eligible to participate in discussions and decisions involving reappointment, tenure and promotion. Professors and Associate Professors are senior in rank to Assistant Professors; Professors are senior in rank to Associate Professors. (Tenured Associate Professors are eligible to serve on the College Promotion and Tenure Committee and can deliberate and vote on candidates for promotion to Professor.)

VIII. B. Faculty who cannot Vote

VIII. B. i. Adjunct Faculty

Adjunct faculty are not eligible to vote on reappointment, tenure or promotion cases.

VIII. B. ii. Faculty on Phased Retirement

Faculty on phased retirement relinquish tenure and so are not eligible to vote on any reappointment, tenure or promotion cases.

VIII. B. iii. Domestic Partners or Spouses in the Same Department

In cases where two spouses or domestic partners hold positions in the same department, they may not participate at any stage in discussions or decisions about each other's reappointment, tenure, promotion, or other personnel matters.

VIII. C. Faculty with Joint Appointments

If any member of the tenured faculty holds a *joint* (not adjunct) appointment, the Memorandum of Understanding that established the appointment should be consulted to determine that individual's voting rights.

VIII. D. Selection of a Chair

The deliberations/vote meeting must be held no later than one week prior to the date when the report of the faculty deliberations must be delivered to the head. Selection of the chair may be decided by a vote of the faculty at the deliberation meeting or by a separate process prior to that meeting, following a procedure established by the department and described in its *Guidelines* document.

Although the chair will normally be a member of the voting faculty, it may sometimes be desirable to appoint a non-voting chair senior in rank to the candidate from outside the department. In such cases, the chair will serve only to moderate the meeting, record the vote, and prepare the summary (see below). At the request of the department head, the Dean will prepare a memo appointing a non-voting chair for inclusion in the tenure/promotion dossier.

VIII. E. Chair's Duties and Responsibilities

The chair of the department's deliberations/vote meeting has the following responsibilities:

The chair presides over the meeting(s) of the faculty at which the candidate's application for promotion and/or tenure is reviewed, discussed and voted upon. This meeting must be divided into evidence-gathering and deliberative phases, followed by a secret ballot vote. The head may not be present beyond the evidence-gathering phase.

The vote must be by secret ballot and must be administered and counted by the chair of the deliberations/vote meeting. Another member of the voting faculty shall double-check the vote count for accuracy.

VIII.E. i. Preparation of the written summary

The chair is responsible for preparing a written summary of the faculty meeting(s). The summary must fairly reflect both majority and minority views on the candidate's suitability for tenure and/or promotion.

The written summary should include sections devoted to evaluations of the candidate's teaching, research, and service (and directed professional activity where appropriate). The Head, in consultation with the chair of the deliberation/vote, may assign specific voting-eligible faculty members

to assist the meeting chair with the preparation of specific subsections of the written summary.

A draft of the summary must be made available to all voting faculty for feedback prior to submission of the final written summary.

VIII. E. ii. Recording the Vote and Signature Sheet

At the conclusion of the deliberations/vote meeting, the chair will record the vote and have the faculty sign the *Signature Sheet* included in the *University Promotion and Tenure Form*. The chair shall immediately inform the department head of the vote and the *Signature Sheet* shall be inserted immediately into the candidate's portfolio/dossier.

VIII. E. iii. Timetable

The meeting(s) of the faculty must be completed in time for the chair of the meeting to deliver the written summary and the results of the vote to the department head at least ten days prior to the date when all materials are due to be forwarded to the Dean of the College.

IX. Dissenting Opinion

If the vote of the faculty is not unanimous then a dissenting opinion may, but need not, be written and included in the dossier. The dissenting opinion takes the form of a single statement signed by any or all those members of the assembled faculty who did not vote in accordance with the majority, explaining the reasons for their vote (UNCG Regulations, Section 4.B.i.h). If the faculty vote is a tie, then those individuals voting for the action under consideration are defined to constitute the majority, and those voting against may elect to write a dissenting opinion.

Nothing in this provision relieves the chair of the faculty deliberation and vote meeting of the responsibility for including both positive and negative views in the written summary of the meeting.

IX. A. Procedures and Contents of a Dissenting Opinion

Any dissenting opinion must be signed and must be limited to objective evaluations of the candidate's professional work. It may not include hearsay, statements about the candidate's age, gender, ethnicity, political or religious beliefs, or anything that might be construed as personal malice, as defined by the Regulations on Academic Freedom. If necessary, a *limited* amount of documentary evidence supporting a dissenting opinion may be included.

IX. B. Due date for the Dissenting Opinion

Any written dissenting opinion must be given to the head in its final form at least five business days prior to the date when all materials are due in the College office.

X. Department Head's Review

The department head reviews the entire portfolio/dossier and writes his/her own independent evaluation of the candidate. This evaluation must be added to the dossier and made available to the voting faculty and to the candidate no later than three full business days prior to the date specified by the College for completion of the dossier.

The department head is also responsible for ensuring that the completed portfolio/dossier is organized in accordance with the *University Promotion and Tenure Form*.

XI. Comments by the Candidate

After the portfolio/dossier has been completed but before it is submitted to the College office, the candidate must be allowed to review it and sign the statement to this effect following his/her review. The candidate may, but is not obliged to, write a response to the portfolio/dossier or to opinions expressed in it. This response is not the place to include new evidence or information, which the candidate should have included in the appropriate narrative section. It provides an opportunity to draw attention to points that the candidate believes have been overlooked or given inappropriate emphasis, to rebut dissenting opinion, or to correct errors of fact. (See *Promotion, Tenure, Academic Freedom, and Due Process Regulations, The University of North Carolina at Greensboro*, section 4.B.i.g. (2) (c)). The candidate must be allowed at least three full business days to complete and forward his/her written comments to the head.

XII. Assembly of the Portfolio/Dossier for Review

For details about assembling the portfolio/dossier, please refer to the University Promotion and Tenure Form and the College document "Best Practices in Tenure and Promotion."

Appendix A: Form of letter sent to external reviewers.

Dear [Name]:

Thank you for agreeing to provide an evaluation to assist in our review of [*candidate's name*] for [*tenure and promotion to Associate Professor, or other action being contemplated*]. University regulations require that every candidate for tenure or promotion be externally reviewed regardless of the Department's assessment of the merits of the case and that all cases, whether or not supported at the department level, be sent forward for review by the College and University. I have enclosed a copy of the Department of XXX's Tenure and Promotion Guidelines and ask that you provide your evaluation in relation to the expectations described in that document. You may also consult the College and University promotion and tenure documents at the following locations:

College Regulations: [link]

University Regulations: [link]

We would appreciate your candid assessment of the candidate's qualifications and any other information you can provide that will help us in making a wise decision. We are especially interested in your assessment of the quality and significance of the candidate's professional publications [*and/or creative work*] and his/her national reputation and relative standing in the field. I enclose a copy of [*candidate's*] vita, a description of his/her program of research/creative activity, and a representative sample of his/her work. I will be glad to provide you with additional material on request.

Please include in your letter a description of any prior contacts or association you have had with the candidate. University regulations do not permit anyone with a close personal or professional relationship to serve as an external review for tenure or promotion.

State law and University regulations require that candidates be given the opportunity to review all the materials in their dossier, including unredacted outside letters of evaluation, before it is sent forward from the department. I need to receive your review no later than [date]. If you anticipate any problems in meeting this deadline, please let me know as soon as possible.

Thank you again for your assistance with this important task.

Sincerely,