

Promotion and Tenure Manual

School of Dentistry

University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill

April 2006

Introduction

Promotion and Tenure lie at the heart of the academic reward process for university faculty. The School of Dentistry is committed to having its faculty well-informed about the expectations for promotion and tenure and the process used to evaluate faculty. Hence, the School makes this manual available to all current and new faculty members.

It should be noted that Section I of this document is the promotion and tenure policy statement, while Sections II-IV contain supporting information.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1.	Promotion and Tenure Guidelines	4
1.1	UNC Promotion and Tenure Guidelines.....	4
1.2	School of Dentistry Promotion and Tenure Guidelines	6
1.2.1	Introduction.....	6
1.2.2	Tenured and Tenure-Track Faculty	7
1.2.3	Fixed Term Faculty.....	8
1.2.3.1	Clinical Instructor, Assistant, Associate, and Full Professor	8
1.2.3.2	Research Instructor, Assistant, Associate, and Full Professor.....	8
1.2.3.3	Administration	9
1.2.4	Adjunct Faculty.....	9
1.2.5	Areas to Be Evaluated	10
1.2.5.1	Teaching.....	10
1.2.5.1.1	Scope of Teaching Activities	13
1.2.5.1.2	Criteria Pertinent to All Promotion Decisions.....	13
1.2.5.1.3	Criteria Pertinent to All Full Professor Decisions.....	13
1.2.5.1.4	Methods of Evaluation	14
1.2.5.2	Scholarly Activity.....	14
1.2.5.3	Professional and Community or Public Service and Engagement	16
1.2.6	Responsibility of the Candidate for Preparation of Documentation.....	19
1.2.7	Faculty with Secondary Appointments in the School of Dentistry.....	20

SUPPORTING INFORMATION

2.	Types of Faculty Reviewed by the School of Dentistry Promotion and Tenure Advisory Committee.....	22
2.1	Full-time Tenure Track Faculty.....	22
2.2	Fixed-term Faculty	22
2.3	Adjunct Faculty.....	22

SEQUENCE OF ACTIONS FOR PROMOTION AND TENURE REVIEW

2.3.1	Mandatory Review	23
2.3.2	Non-mandatory Review	23
2.4	Departmental Professors Committee	23
2.4.1	Intradepartmental Review	24
2.5	PTAC Review	25
2.5.1	Committee Charge.....	25
2.5.2	Committee Meetings and Management of Conflict of Interest	26
2.5.3	Committee Evaluation Procedures.....	27
2.5.3.1	Teaching.....	27
2.5.3.1.a	Teaching Portfolio Definition	28
2.5.3.1.b	Teaching Portfolio Table of Contents.....	28
2.5.3.2	Scholarship	29
2.5.3.3	Service and Engagement.....	30
2.5.3.4	Previous Experience at Another University.....	30
2.6	School of Dentistry Full Professors	30
2.6.1	Committee Charge.....	30
2.6.2	Committee Meetings	31
2.7	Dean's Review.....	31
2.8	University Review.....	31
2.8.1	Health Sciences Advisory Committee (HSAC)	31
2.8.2	Chancellor's Advisory Committee (CAC)	31
2.8.3	Board of Trustees (BOT)	31
2.8.4	Board of Governors (BOG)	32
2.8.5	Chart of Review Levels	33
2.8.6	Committee Schedules and Deadlines.....	34
2.9	Notification of Faculty Member	34
3.	Procedural Information	37
3.1	Format for CV.....	35

3.2	Departmental Actions	35
3.3	Evaluation Letters	35
3.4	Candidate’s Statement	37
3.5	Chair's Letter	37
4.1	Review of Department Chairs.....	38
4.2	Review Process	38
4.3	Updating Procedures.....	39
	Exhibit 1 Trustee Policies and Regulations Document.....	40
	Exhibit 2 School of Dentistry’s and Provost’s Schedules and Deadlines	40
	Exhibit 3 UNC Curriculum Vitae (CV) Format	41
	Exhibit 4 The New England Journal of Medicine Special Report.....	46
	Exhibit 5 Promotion/Tenure Request Information.....	56
	Exhibit 6 Appointment, Reappointment & Promotion Transmittal Letter.....	59
	Exhibit 7 <i>How to Present an Effective Promotion/Tenure Dossier</i>	61
	Exhibit 8 Administrative Memorandum.....	66
	Exhibit 9 Sample Solicitation for an External Letter of Recommendation	75
4.4	References	76

1. PROMOTION AND TENURE GUIDELINES

The guidelines set forth by the Board of Trustees of the University and the School of Dentistry Guidelines are the foundation for all promotion and tenure decisions in the School of Dentistry. The Promotion and Tenure Advisory Committee (PTAC) uses these guidelines as the basis for their evaluation of candidates. School Guidelines were developed to conform to University Guidelines. If inconsistencies occur between the two documents, the University Guidelines take precedence.

1.1 UNC Promotion and Tenure Guidelines

The University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill promotion and tenure guidelines are specified in the Trustee Policies and Regulations Governing Academic Tenure in the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, July 1, 1994. This information is included with the School of Dentistry Promotion and Tenure Manual as a separate document. In addition, the University asks that the following statement be a part of the School of Dentistry promotion and tenure information:

University Criteria for Evaluation of Candidates for Reappointment and Tenure

The Trustee Policies Governing Academic Tenure in The University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill indicate that tenure is held with reference to the institution and with reference to institution-wide standards. Section 2.a. of the Trustee Policies, for example, provides as follows:

"While academic tenure may be withheld on any grounds other than those specifically stated to be impermissible under Section 4 hereof, its conferral requires an assessment of institutional needs and resources and evidence of service to the academic community, potential for future contribution, commitment to the welfare of the University, and demonstrated professional competence, including consideration of commitment to effective teaching, research, or public service." Section 4 of the Trustee

Policies provides that the decision regarding tenure "is committed, without further recourse, to the judgment of the officers of administration authorized to make it, acting in accordance with prescribed procedures. In exercise of their judgment, whether in the first instance or in review of a recommendation to reappoint, such officers may take into account and use as a basis of decision, in whole or in part, any factors deemed relevant to total institutional interests..."

The tenure system is based upon the understanding that tenure is a privilege bestowed by the institution in keeping with its needs for outstanding achievement. It represents a fundamental institutional judgment of an individual's actual and potential contributions to the professional life of teaching, scholarship, engagement and service. Thus not everyone will obtain tenure; no set of detailed criteria can exist, the mere fulfillment of which would ensure tenure; and there will occasionally be differences of opinion about evaluations of an individual's contributions. Also relevant in the tenure decision are institutional interests that necessarily extend beyond the domain of any individual department or school. To insure that its intellectual quality is maintained and enhanced, the University insists on a standard of overall excellence.

As a reflection of the relevance of institutional interests, candidates for reappointment and tenure are evaluated independently according to the criteria referenced above at several levels of university administration, including the level of the department chair, dean, Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs or Health Affairs as appropriate, Chancellor, Board of Trustees, and Board of Governors. Each level of administration may apply different or even higher standards of excellence from those applied at previous levels of review, consistent with school, division, and University-wide interests that are represented by these different levels.

1.2 School of Dentistry Promotion and Tenure Guidelines

1.2.1 Introduction

The purpose of this document is to facilitate the evaluation of faculty in the promotion process by describing criteria to be applied in making promotion and tenure decisions. An additional purpose is to provide a set of guidelines that may be useful in guiding individual professional development. These criteria allow consideration of a wide range of the activities of all faculty members. For example, an emerging area of scholarship involves community engagement or service. Community entails a group of people who share a common location, interests, values, work or identity, and who have an association due to common traditions, or political, civic, social, cultural or economic interactions. "Community engagement is the application of institutional resources to address and solve challenges facing communities, through collaboration with these communities. Community-engaged scholarship involves the faculty member in a mutually beneficial partnership with the community (CCPH 2005)." It can be interdisciplinary or draw on the principles of community-based participatory research. According to the 2005 Report of the Commission on Community-Engaged Scholarship in the Health Professions, "it is important to point out that not all community-engaged activities undertaken by faculty are scholarship. For example, if a faculty member devotes time to developing a community-based health program, it may be important work and it may advance the service mission of the institution, but unless it includes the other components that define or represent standards for scholarship (e.g., clear goals, adequate preparation, appropriate methods, reflective critique, rigor and/or peer review) it would not be considered scholarship (Glassick et al, 1997)."

Because of the diversity of faculty interests and responsibilities, it is not possible to establish a precise series of steps that, when taken, will automatically lead to favorable decisions concerning promotion and tenure. Moreover, since a decision to promote includes a judgment of superior quality of performance, an organized set of illustrations carries with it the risk of being misleading. Nonetheless, the examples of activities cited herein, though not all-inclusive, are typical of those considered in the promotion decision.

Faculty may be evaluated in terms of their teaching, scholarship, and professional and community engagement/service. For the period being evaluated by the current promotion, the weights applied to these three areas in reaching a promotion and tenure decision generally will reflect the proportion of time allocated to each area in the candidate's Terms and Conditions of Appointment Statement as may be

modified by the Chair during their employment. Service implies a donor-recipient relationship in which one party, generally the community, receives benefit from interaction with the faculty member. “Community engagement is the application of institutional resources to address and solve challenges facing communities through collaboration with these communities (CCPH, 2005).” The defining aspect of engagement is the collaboration and mutuality of benefits.

All decisions on promotion and the awarding of academic tenure shall be based upon considerations of the demonstrated professional competence, the potential for future contribution of the faculty member, and of the needs and resources of the institution.

Sections I.2.2 through I.2.4 specify criteria for different types of faculty. The School of Dentistry defines those faculty members as follows:

Tenured and Tenure-track – those faculty members who have earned permanent tenure or who are appointed to probationary positions with eligibility for tenure.

Fixed-term – those full-time faculty members who are appointed for a specified period of time for a specific purpose, such as teaching, research, academic administration, or public service from an academic base. The academic rank will have a prefix-qualifier, such as Clinical or Research, depending on the nature of the appointment.

Adjunct – those faculty members who are part-time and appointed for a specified period of time for a specific purpose.

1.2.2 Tenured and Tenure-track Faculty

It is the duty of faculty in the tenure track to contribute in each of the three areas – *teaching, scholarship and community-engagement/service*. Such a spectrum of contribution is essential to the vitality and excellence of the institution as well as to the professional growth of the individual faculty member.

As an integral part of each promotion evaluation, the primary commitments of the faculty member are considered and an assessment made of their opportunity to contribute to each area of activity. Contributions in the areas where the greatest responsibilities and opportunities lie are weighed more heavily in the evaluation.

The School of Dentistry follows the regulations set forth in Section 2 of the Trustee Policies and Regulations Governing Academic Tenure as to the timing of reviews for re-appointments and promotion.

The School also is in accord with the Chancellor's March 1992 Memorandum detailing a Faculty Major Disability and Maternity Leave Policy. The current policy allows for temporary relief from employment obligations or less than full-time employment, each with commensurate compensation reductions, with appropriate administrative approvals. This temporary relief can be provided for compassionate reasons of health, requirements of childbirth or child care, or similar compelling reasons. Such relief may include extensions of the period of probationary appointment to coincide with the extent and duration of the relief from full-time employment.

1.2.3 Fixed-term Faculty

Faculty appointed for a fixed term make important and continuing contributions to the vitality and excellence of the University. There are two distinct types of fixed-term faculty – Clinical and Research. These faculty members may enjoy satisfying academic experiences and professional growth through the pursuit of activities primarily in two of the three areas. Although the criteria for evaluation of faculty in the tenure track and faculty being considered for fixed-term appointment at a higher rank are the same for each area, the different concentrations of activities between fixed-term and tenure-track faculty result in circumstances that merit additional specification.

1.2.3.1 Clinical Instructor, Assistant, Associate, and Full Professor

It is expected that faculty in the clinical track will be evaluated primarily on the effectiveness of their teaching, supplemented by consideration of their community-engagement/service or research activities. Even though the expectations for the amount of teaching are greater for faculty in this track, the criteria for evaluation of effectiveness are the same as for faculty in the other tracks. In addition, if a clinical faculty member is evaluated for teaching and community-engagement/service, there is still the expectation that they will participate in scholarly activity defined in its broadest sense (see section on research). This requirement is imposed in the spirit of maintaining the academic viability of the teacher rather than requiring data-based research activity from all faculty members.

1.2.3.2 Research Instructor, Assistant, Associate, and Full Professor

It is expected that faculty in the research track will be evaluated primarily on the quality of their research, supplemented by consideration of their teaching or community-service/engagement activities. It is recognized that research track faculty operate under particular restrictions imposed by

the need for their salaries to be funded primarily from research activities. Research productivity should be commensurate with the time devoted to research, and achieving the status of an independent investigator is expected to occur sooner than in other tracks. It also is recognized that for research track faculty, teaching roles involving activities as a research mentor, thesis advisor and committee work, and graduate level teaching may be more compatible with their prime source of salary support than clinical, preclinical and didactic teaching of pre-doctoral students.

1.2.3.3 Administration

It is recognized that there are a few faculty members whose appointments are based on a need for administrative leadership. These faculty members are heavily committed to administrative roles that are both essential to and valued by the School. Fixed-term faculty members in these roles are eligible for consideration for promotion based on either evaluation of teaching or research and community-service/engagement. However, an evaluation of the functioning of the unit that they supervise must be a major component of the evaluation. This can be by a process similar to that used in the evaluation of a program director or chair prior to re-appointment.

In instances where department chairs and unit directors are being reviewed, it is generally considered that they spend 30% of their time in departmental administration. This time can be considered as service to the School and to the University.

1.2.4 Adjunct Faculty

Adjunct faculty members are part-time faculty members who serve in a variety of very valuable roles in the School of Dentistry. The adjunct faculty group includes individuals who provide teaching, research, or community-engagement/service with time commitments that range from one or two days per semester to one to three days per week. Dental personnel who provide supervision to students on extramural rotations also have adjunct faculty appointments. Some adjunct faculty members are paid and others receive no remuneration. All such faculty members have demonstrated their commitment to promote the academic and professional interests of the School of Dentistry. Their contributions to these efforts are recognized through appointment at higher rank when appropriate.

Due to their part-time work schedule, appointment at higher rank for adjunct faculty ordinarily will be at longer intervals than full-time faculty. Initial review of part-time faculty with a commitment of one-half day a week or more will occur at seven years, with subsequent reviews occurring at five-

year intervals thereafter. The department professors committee and the department chair may conclude that more or less time is needed for consideration for appointment at higher rank based on the scope, value, and quality of the part-time participation of the individual. Such consideration is highly relevant for individuals who have less than weekly commitments to the School of Dentistry. Adjunct faculty who do not have a continuing relationship with the School of Dentistry will not be considered for higher ranks.

Adjunct faculty will be reviewed only in those areas designated for their specific responsibilities. Therefore, the review may be limited to a single area. Criteria for evaluation can include but will not be limited to teaching evaluations, chair's evaluations, CV, supporting letters, and any available faculty evaluations. Documentation for adjunct faculty who supervise students at extramural sites would rely primarily on student reports and evaluation by the director of the extramural rotation program.

1.2.5 Areas to Be Evaluated

The areas of activity evaluated in these decisions are: (1) teaching; (2) scholarly activity, the essential component being research; and (3) community-engagement and professional or public service. These areas are interrelated and mutually supportive; participation in one enhances performance in the others.

1.2.5.1 Teaching

Teaching is a primary function of the University. It is related to and supported by research and other scholarly activities. It extends beyond the institutional setting and serves the profession and the community at large. All faculty in the tenure track and appropriate fixed term faculty must make a significant time commitment to teaching.

Faculty members are expected to be knowledgeable of the literature and other information in their field of expertise. The complete faculty member should demonstrate the ability to assimilate and integrate this knowledge and the ability to effectively teach such knowledge.

Evaluation of teaching effectiveness does not lend itself solely to quantitative measurement and, in the final analysis, may be largely subjective. However, input into the evaluation from peers, department chair, students and other sources can help maximize the validity of the value judgments that must be

made. For full-time faculty, a teaching portfolio is the accepted method to document teaching ability and effectiveness. Suggested contents for such a portfolio are described in section 2.5.3.1.a & b.

The criteria for teaching effectiveness that shall be considered in evaluation are quality, innovation, impact upon students, and degree of responsibilities. Evaluation will be made in all areas of the faculty member's assignments including classroom teaching, laboratory and clinical teaching, course coordination, seminar leadership, supervision of individual student projects, and development of instructional materials.

Quality

The foundation of quality teaching is mastery of the subject, including the spectrum of the current literature in one's discipline. Essential components of the teaching effort are appropriate methods of instruction, effective planning and organization, appropriate methods of evaluation, and adequate feedback to students.

Teaching of superior quality may be characterized by:

- Utilization of highly effective oral, visual, and written communication techniques
- Stimulation of critical thinking and problem solving
- Encouragement of conceptual comprehension as well as factual recall
- Encouragement of students to raise questions and express ideas
- Performance of duties with enthusiasm and energy
- Continually up-dating of teaching based on current knowledge, techniques, and concepts

Innovation

Teaching excellence includes some degree of innovative effort on the part of a faculty member. Innovations in teaching must accomplish more than mere change. Rather, new methods should show measurable advantages over those previously used.

Some examples of innovations in teaching are:

- Taking advantage of new technology to improve teaching effectiveness
- Developing new courses and programs or unique learning experiences
- Using educational research – developing methods to evaluate individual teaching, courses, or curriculum

Impact upon students

A positive impact of teaching on the student should be the goal of each faculty member. The qualities of teaching that have positive influences on the student are numerous and may be difficult to measure. A complete appraisal regarding the quality of teaching may be obtained through formal evaluation of teaching; however, informal evaluations may be used to supplement the formal teaching evaluation.

Some examples of informal evaluation are:

- Students pursue independent study as a result of interaction with the faculty member
- Students provide unsolicited evaluation of faculty
- Awards earned by students under faculty mentorship

Desirable qualities of teachers may include but are not limited to the following:

- Presents a balanced point of view
- Treats students with respect
- Provides constructive criticism without belittling
- Is reasonably available for consultation
- Is fair and reasonable in evaluation of students
- Compliments students for appropriate contributions or performance
- Continually evaluates his/her own teaching
- Meets teaching obligations by being prompt and available throughout the teaching/clinic session
- Presents material at the appropriate level for the type of students being taught
- Takes opportunities presented to teach individual students in the clinical setting
- Follows course guidelines as to appropriate laboratory objectives and methods
- Is effective in leading discussions in small groups or seminars
- Devotes appropriate time in mentoring students and displays organizational skills that result in student achievement

Student input in faculty evaluation is essential, but is only a portion of the information considered. Such input must be used in conjunction with the other factors that affect the quality of teaching as shown in section 2.5.3.1.b that describes the contents of the teaching portfolio.

Degree of Responsibility

The degree of responsibility assigned to the faculty member is a consideration. The extent to which the faculty member's responsibilities contribute to the teaching programs of the School is of importance (e.g. directing a course or having primary responsibilities for a teaching program).

1.2.5.1.1 SCOPE OF TEACHING ACTIVITIES

Teaching is defined in the broadest possible context and may encompass lecture, small group, seminar, clinical and laboratory instruction, and one-on-one instruction. Recipients may be undergraduate students, allied dental education students, predoctoral dental students, advanced education students, residents, graduate students, and postdoctoral fellows. Dissertation and thesis supervision and mentoring of students and fellows also are included under this definition of teaching.

1.2.5.1.2 CRITERIA PERTINENT TO ALL PROMOTION DECISIONS

The criteria for teaching effectiveness that shall be considered in promotion decisions to assistant, associate, and full professor include quality of teaching, innovation in teaching, innovation in methods for evaluating students, impact upon students, and nature and extent of responsibilities. It is recognized that authoring a textbook is scholarly activity and that the book itself can be viewed as evidence of teaching. The School of Dentistry may consider authorship of textbooks either as teaching or a scholarly activity usually at the discretion of the candidate (See Section 1.2.6.).

1.2.5.1.3 CRITERIA PERTINENT TO FULL PROFESSOR DECISIONS

Promotion based on excellence in teaching is viewed similarly to promotion based on research and service accomplishments. Promotion is not based on time-in-rank. The expectations for promotion to full professor in the area of teaching involve wider recognition of the individual as a teacher and evidence of a more scholarly approach to teaching. Examples of these characteristics may include but are not limited to the following:

- Service as a course director, graduate program director, or residency director provides an opportunity to demonstrate organizational, testing, feedback, mentoring, and student remediation skills beyond those demonstrated by simply participating as a course member. Being a successful course director is an indication of the teaching maturity expected of a full
- .
- Broader contributions to the teaching profession, such as authorship of textbooks, curriculum offerings or teaching materials adopted by other institutions, publication of reports involving innovative new educational or evaluation techniques, development of new programs, and/or publication of conceptual articles regarding dental education.
- Contributions to the teaching mission outside the University such as participation in regional, national, and international educational activities, participation as a visiting professor or outside speaker (non-research), and activity in national organizations devoted to teaching.
- Publication of peer-reviewed articles on new educational methodologies, clinical techniques, or clinical case studies appropriate to the teaching mission.

1.2.5.1.4. METHODS OF EVALUATION

Evaluation of teaching effectiveness cannot be solely a quantitative measurement and, in the final analysis, has a subjective element. However, input into the evaluation from peers, department chairs, students and other sources can help maximize the validity of the value judgments that must be made.

Assessment of the entire faculty member's teaching assignments will be part of the evaluation including classroom teaching, laboratory and clinical teaching, course coordination, seminar leadership, supervision of individual student projects, and mentoring.

The methods currently used to evaluate teaching by the School of Dentistry are detailed in Section 2.5.3.1.

1.2.5.2 Scholarly Activity

Scholarly activity is a central mission of a research university. The components of scholarly activity are: the compilation, synthesis, and transmission of current knowledge; and the generation of new knowledge through original research and publication of the findings. All faculty in the tenure track and

appropriate fixed-term faculty must engage in scholarly activity, a major portion of which must be original research.

In the evaluation of this aspect of promotion, attention shall be directed to the time a person has had for scholarly activity, the guidance and support provided to expand that time, and the resources available to enhance productivity. In all instances, the quality of the scholarly activity, as judged by authorities in the field, will be the critical measure.

Compilation, Synthesis, and Transmission of Current Knowledge

All scholarly activity supports teaching and community engagement/professional service. The compilation, synthesis, and transmission of current knowledge is one aspect of this activity that contributes to and advances scholarship. Such scholarly work may take many forms.

Boyer's five dimensions of scholarship are: teaching, discovery, integration and application and engagement (Boyer, 1990). "The scholarship of teaching includes transmitting, transforming and extending knowledge. The scholarship of discovery refers to the pursuit of inquiry and investigation in search of new knowledge. The scholarship of integration consists of making connections across disciplines and, through this synthesis, advancing what we know. The scholarship of application asks how knowledge can be practically applied in a dynamic process whereby new understandings emerge from the act of applying knowledge through an ongoing cycle of theory to practice to theory. The scholarship of engagement connects any of the above dimensions of scholarship to the understanding and solving of pressing social, civic and ethical problems."

Activities that support teaching and/or community-engagement/service may include: the publication of textbooks, book chapters, review articles, case reports, technical and clinical procedures, and instructional materials; the development of new continuing education courses; and the editorship of professional journals.

Research, Scholarship and Publication

Research is the generation of new knowledge through use of the scientific method. Such research may be basic, behavioral, clinical or in health services. It is most frequently expressed as manuscript publication in refereed scientific journals.

A reasonable level of research productivity is required; however, it is the quality of the investigative activity that is of primary importance in evaluation. The quality of research can be most readily measured through two peer review mechanisms: publication in refereed journals and the acquisition of grant funds from sources that evaluate proposals using a quality peer review system. It is recognized that quality research can be conducted without the support of peer reviewed grant awards.

Additional demonstrations of the research record may include: invitations to present one's research at other universities or major scientific meetings, appointment as a section or symposium chair, receipt of awards or other special recognition for outstanding research, appointment to NIH study sections, supervision of thesis or dissertation research, service on thesis or dissertation committees, and publication of research abstracts.

To be considered for promotion to assistant professor, the instructor must be regarded by the department chair and peers as one who has or can develop the background, talent and commitment to do good research even though a tangible measure of research productivity may not yet be evident. To be considered for promotion to associate professor, the candidate should have worked as a productive independent investigator or collaborator, achieved first author status on publications, and participated as a co-author on others. Specific numbers of publications in each case are not as important as the quality and significance of the work.

The associate professor who expects to be promoted to professor must show continuing research development. Sustained activity as an independent investigator or collaborator and reasonable first author activity should be evident. The faculty member should be a recognized authority in his/her discipline and as such, should be committed to guiding the development of young faculty in their scientific endeavors.

1.2.5.3 Professional and Community or Public Service and Engagement

Professional and community or public service and engagement are related to those activities that pertain to one's role as a professional and as a University faculty member. Faculty effort in this area of evaluation may include administrative activities, patient care, continuing education, and other types of professional service to the profession, community, state, University, nation and international community.

Service and engagement activities are important ways in which a faculty member connects the resources of the University to social and health issues faced in society. However, service and

engagement activities will not be considered as the scholarship of service unless they are formal and meet the criteria identified in the previous section on “Scholarly Activity.”

It is expected that the level of professional service will be commensurate with the proposed rank. Faculty at associate and full professor ranks are expected to perform service activities that reflect their more senior status, such as chairing important school committees, and service at the professional, community, state, University, national and international level.

Administrative Responsibilities

A variety of administrative activities may exist that serve the School of Dentistry, the University or the profession that should be considered when evaluating contributions to professional service. It is recognized that there are a few faculty whose appointments are based on a need by the School for administrative leadership. These faculty members are heavily committed to administrative roles that are both essential to and valued by the School. Fixed-term faculty in these roles are eligible for consideration for promotion based on either evaluation of teaching or research and community-service/engagement, while tenure track faculty will still be evaluated in all three areas. In instances where department chairs and unit directors are being reviewed, School of Dentistry guidelines provide that 30% of their time is spent in departmental/unit administration. This time can be considered as service to the School or University.

Examples of administrative roles may include:

- Assistant or associate dean
- Department chair or program director, including graduate program directors, center directors
- Special activity director or coordinator
- Leadership role in faculty governance or professional organizations
- Serving in the capacity of a journal editor
- Serving as a chair of a committee for the School or University

Patient Care

Patient care will be evaluated only when it is an assigned responsibility of the faculty member. Faculty members are expected to provide exemplary patient care, using current methods that are respected

by patients and peers both within the University and in the professional community. Examples of additional activities relating to patient care are:

- Certification by specialty board
- Fellowship status in national clinical dental organization
- Membership on a specialty examining board
- Service as a consultant on patient care (e.g. third-party payment groups, courts, health organizations, dental healthcare companies)
- Development of new clinical programs
- Development of new clinical techniques
- Acquisition of patents on clinical materials or instruments

Continuing Education

Continuing Education (CE) is a special responsibility of the School of Dentistry and its faculty members. The State, the profession, and the general public depend on the School for help in maintaining state-of-the-art practice in this area of health care delivery. Continuing education is both an instructional and public service activity that the School of Dentistry is uniquely qualified to provide. Only a faculty member whose collective responsibilities include research and other scholarly activities can provide these important services from an informed base of current and developing new knowledge in the field.

Continuing education, as a special responsibility, is not applicable to all faculty members. For those faculty members who participate in continuing education, their effort will be evaluated as part of their service commitment to the School of Dentistry. Because continuing education also is an instructional activity, the learner (attendee) evaluations from this activity can be used as documentation of general excellence in teaching.

Examples of CE activities to be considered for promotion include:

- Presentation of continuing educational lectures
- Development and/or presentation of a new CE course
- Major revision of existing CE courses
- Table clinic
- Development of interactive or web-based CE offerings

Other Service to the University, the Profession or the Community

All faculty members must share in the work necessary to maintain the operation of the institution. Furthermore, faculty members are expected to contribute to the growth of the institution through efforts that are aimed at improving programs and facilities. Especially, the faculty should contribute to the maintenance and growth of their profession. Finally, faculty members are encouraged to serve the community at large in a professional or leadership capacity that enhances the stature of the University or the health of the public.

Examples of other service/engagement activities related to the University, the profession or the community are:

- Service on boards and committees or other assignments within the School of Dentistry, University, or profession
- Leadership in curriculum development and implementation of clinical activity, curricular research programs, etc.
- Contribution to faculty government
- Contribution to professional organizations
- Service to professional journals as a manuscript referee, reviewer, etc.
- Service as a consultant to accrediting and other educational review boards
- Service on boards and committees in the community-at-large in a professional capacity
- Building partnerships with communities to develop and diversify the health workforce.
- Delivering community-based quality health care
- Translating research into practice and policy and disseminating research findings to communities
- In-service training activities within the School or University, e.g. infection control and emergency updates

1.2.6 Responsibility of the Candidate for Preparation of Documentation

To assist in the evaluation process, candidates are required to prepare appropriate supporting documentation. At minimum, this will include a curriculum vita (CV), for which the School of Dentistry has a prescribed format (see Section 3).

Candidates who are full-time faculty are also required to identify persons who can provide meaningful letters of evaluation (see Section 3.3). All letters received will be used in the evaluation process, and will be forwarded to the Health Sciences Advisory Committee if the process reaches that level of review (see Section III for procedures). Full-time candidates must also prepare a portfolio appropriately documenting their teaching contributions as detailed in Sections 2.5.3.1, and a brief (1 to 3 pages), reflective statement summarizing the main contributions – including potential future contributions- which the candidate believes should be considered in the review. For candidates who have written a textbook, the candidate should include in their reflective statement a sentence on whether they wish their textbook to be counted as part of their Teaching or Scholarly Activity evidence. The candidate's statement should strive to be factual and objective, rather than purely self-promotional.

It is imperative that all supporting documentation be prepared to the highest possible standard, with principal emphasis on the content of the documentation rather than its style.

1.2.7 Faculty with Secondary Appointments to the School of Dentistry

(As an introduction to this section, the following paragraph regarding joint appointments is taken from Section 2.7 of the 1994 edition of the Trustee Policies and Regulations Governing Academic Tenure)

A faculty member may at one time hold but one faculty appointment at the rank of professor, associate professor, or assistant professor. This appointment may be held in a single department or by joint appointment in more than one department. When an initial joint appointment is to be made, the regular procedures prescribed for initial appointment to the rank proposed shall be followed simultaneously by the departments involved. The joint recommendation shall designate one of the departments as the unit of the base appointment and shall set forth special terms and conditions for inclusion in the appointing document including the basis for initial funding, the procedures agreed to be followed by the departments in making joint decisions respecting promotion, reappointment, and tenure of the joint appointee, and the procedures to be followed by the chair in respect to salary adjustments for the joint appointee. If the joint appointment is approved thereafter, the base department is responsible for processing personnel actions affecting the joint appointee, but in respect to each such action, the recommendation put forward shall be one jointly concurred in by the departments concerned.

In joint appointments where the School of Dentistry is the secondary school, the faculty member shall be reviewed for promotion and tenure only for those aspects defined as responsibilities and duties to the School of Dentistry. These duties shall be specified in the initial appointing document.

Faculty members with a primary appointment in another unit of the University who have an adjunct appointment in the School of Dentistry, where no funding is provided by the School of Dentistry, are to be reviewed for promotion and tenure by the base school of appointment. Promotion and tenure decisions shall be made by the base department with the School of Dentistry respecting the decision made by the base school.

SUPPORTING INFORMATION

2. *Types of Faculty Reviewed by the School of Dentistry Promotion and Tenure Advisory Committee*

2.1 Full-time Tenure Track Faculty

These faculty actions are subject to the full procedures outlined in Sections 3 and 4. The general criteria applied by the PTAC come from the School's guidelines for full-time tenure track faculty that require appreciable contributions in the areas of teaching, scholarly activity (the essential component being research), and professional or community-service/engagement. (Details of needed documentation appear in Exhibit 5).

2.2 Fixed-term Faculty

These faculty actions are subject to the full procedures outlined in Sections 3 and 4, but do not go to the Board of Trustees since tenure is not involved. The general criteria applied by the PTAC come from the School's guidelines for fixed term faculty that specify the same criteria as used for tenure track faculty applied to one or two of the three areas.

2.3 Adjunct Faculty

Appointments of adjunct faculty at a higher rank, whether salaried or non-salaried, are handled within the School of Dentistry. PTAC bases its recommendations for adjunct faculty on the chair's letter, a CV, and two supporting letters of recommendation. External or internal letters are acceptable.

SEQUENCE OF ACTIONS FOR PROMOTION AND TENURE REVIEW

Initiation of Action

2.3.1 Mandatory Review

Faculty appointed into the clinical and research tracks are reviewed for promotion on the same time schedules. Assistant professors usually are appointed for an initial 4-year term and can be re-appointed for one additional three-year term. Assistant professors are reviewed approximately 18-months prior to the end of their initial appointment and at approximately 18 months prior to the end of their re-appointment. Non-tenured associate professors are reviewed after three and one-half years for tenure at five years.

Tenured associate professors have an initial mandatory review after five years and then every three years thereafter. The five-year post-tenure review will include a discussion between the department chair and the faculty member concerning promotion. This decision must be made in consultation with the departmental full professors. Subsequent three-year reviews or interim reviews (less than three years), if applicable, may but need not include such consultation. Any decision made not to request outside letters at a required interval must be fully explained in the letter of the chair reporting his or her decision not to recommend promotion. For a particular candidate, however, after one combined five-year and three-year cycle and at the request of the candidate, the next review must include outside letters as part of the departmental evaluation of promotion to full professor.

2.3.2 Non-mandatory Review

The department may elect to initiate a promotion or tenure action off-cycle. The decision to recommend a faculty member for "early" promotion demands documentation of outstanding qualifications. Tenure may not be granted to a faculty member with an initial appointment at the associate professor level until the faculty member has been with the University for 18 months.

2.4 Departmental Professors Committee

Faculty review of recommendations for conferral of permanent tenure or for promotion to a higher rank of persons holding permanent tenure.

- (a) A recommendation for the conferral of permanent tenure or for promotion to a higher rank is initiated by the chair of the candidate's department if the candidate's school or college is organized into departments. The chair is advised by the entire assembled faculty who are qualified to consult on the action. The department chair's recommendation is then communicated to the dean of the school or college, who seeks the advice of an elected committee of the school or college faculty before acting on the department chair's recommendation.
A dean's recommendation for the conferral of permanent tenure and/or promotion to a higher rank is reviewed by the elected faculty Committee on Appointments, Promotions, and Tenure, which advises the provost on the recommendation.
- (b) Consultation with respect to tenured appointments and promotions.* Tenured faculty members of all ranks in an appointing unit are qualified to consult on the appointment or promotion of a candidate to a rank conferring permanent tenure, except in the case of initial appointment or promotion to the rank of professor, in which case consultation may be limited to professors in the appointing unit.
- (c) Consultation with respect to full-time fixed-term faculty appointments.* Chairs or deans making appointments or reappointments of persons to full-time fixed-term faculty positions consult with an appropriate faculty committee in the appointing unit.

2.4.1 Intradepartmental Review

At the individual department level, a departmental full professors committee, normally consisting of at least three tenured professors and, if appropriate, associate professors, is the first level of review. The departmental committee reviews the CV of the candidate (and other appropriate documents) and makes a recommendation to the department chair. Both positive and negative decisions regarding promotion and tenure will be forwarded by the department to the School of Dentistry Human Resources Office for further review by the PTAC and School of Dentistry Full Professor's Committee. Necessary documentation is described in Section 4.

In departments with fewer than three full professors, the following arrangements will be made:

- 1) For promotion to associate professor: There must be at least three full professors and/or associate professors with tenure on the departmental review committee.

- a) If a department has fewer than three full professors, the tenured associate professors in the department will meet with the existing full professors to review the candidate's CV and supporting documentation.
 - b) In the case where there are fewer than three full and associate professors with tenure, the department chair shall consult with the full professor(s) and designate one or more full professors from outside the department, who along with the existing full and/or tenured associate professors, will comprise the departmental review committee.
 - c) In the case where there are no full professors, the department chair, in consultation with the dean, shall appoint one or more full professors to sit on the departmental review committee in conjunction with existing tenured associate professors. There must always be at least one full professor on the departmental review committee.
- 2) For promotion to full professor: The committee must consist of at least three full professors.
- a) If there are fewer than three full professors, the department chair shall meet with the existing full professors of the department and designate one or more full professors from outside the department to sit on the departmental review committee.
 - b) If there are no full professors in the department, the department chair will designate, in consultation with the dean, full professors from outside the department to serve on the review committee.

2.5 PTAC Review

2.5.1 Committee Charge

The authority for the PTAC committee is in the Constitution and Bylaws of the School of Dentistry. The function of the PTAC is to advise and recommend to the dean in all matters relating to faculty promotion and tenure. In addition, the committee will give a verbal report to the assembled Full Professors. The composition, terms of office, methods of appointment and election to the committee are detailed in the Constitution and Bylaws.

2.5.2 Committee Meetings and Management of Conflict of Interest

The PTAC normally meets two times per year, usually in January and July, for as long or often as necessary to thoroughly review each candidate. An official vote of the PTAC requires a quorum of two-thirds of the committee. The committee also meets to review the procedures in Section 4 and update them, if necessary. Documents used in the review of candidates consist of the curriculum vitae, the chair's letter, letters evaluating the candidate, articles submitted to outside reviewers, the candidate's statement, and the teaching portfolio. The PTAC review has two components. The first is to make sure the information documenting the action conforms to the recommended form and style. The second component pertains to the qualifications of the candidate and primarily is based on the School of Dentistry Promotion and Tenure Guidelines. The committee discusses each candidate and the committee chair prepares a report on the strengths and weaknesses found, along with a recommendation and a tally of the secret ballot to the dean. The PTAC report minus the ballot results accompanies action for further University reviews.

The chair of the PTAC shall excuse individual PTAC members when a candidate from their home department is being evaluated. Removing department members from the deliberations is required in order to reduce the appearance of conflict of interest. Other circumstances also could lead to the choice to withdraw when a particular faculty member is being considered by PTAC. Every instance of an excused absence must be noted in meeting minutes. When a member of the home department of the committee chair is being evaluated, the committee chair will be excused and a replacement committee chair will be appointed by the dean from the PTAC membership to chair the deliberation process regarding that individual candidate. Should refusal of multiple PTAC members be required such that a quorum is not met, the dean will appoint additional PTAC members from among the faculty to reach the minimum required number of participants, on an ad hoc basis. The membership of the convened committee will be included in the meeting minutes.

2.5.3 Committee Evaluation Procedures

For those faculty members who do not have current Terms and Conditions, the dean will supply same through the School of Dentistry Office of Human Resources. For those faculty members who have Terms and Conditions of Appointment or whose Terms and Conditions of Appointment have been modified, the Office of Human Resources will see that the relevant material is included in the material for PTAC review.

2.5.3.1 Teaching

The data used to evaluate teaching by the School of Dentistry include but are not limited to the following:

- Learner evaluation of teaching (includes CE presentations)
- Peer evaluation of teaching
- Student and peer evaluation of courses
- Review of teaching innovations
- Review of scholarship involving teaching
- Evaluation of outcomes, such as success of students mentored, number of schools adopting textbooks, outside invitations to present continuing education from other institutions, or teaching awards.

Learner evaluation of teaching, peer evaluation of teaching, student and peer evaluation of courses, and review of teaching innovations, will be evaluated using the teaching portfolios and the chair's letter. (NOTE: Learner and peer evaluation currently is not fully implemented in the School of Dentistry). Documentation from the teaching portfolio required by the PTAC includes the candidate's reflective statement about teaching and summaries and details of the student assessment of teaching, the peer evaluation of teaching, and any pertinent teaching innovations.

Review of scholarship involving teaching (appropriate at any rank, but required for promotion to full professor), will be taken from the candidate's CV, the outside letters, and the chair's letter.

Evaluation of outcomes – such as success of students mentored, number of schools adopting textbooks, invitations from other institutions to present continuing education, students providing unsolicited favorable evaluations of faculty, or teaching awards – will be done from the candidate's CV, outside letters, and the chair's letter. In cases where quality of mentoring is being evaluated, sections from the teaching portfolio detailing student work and publications should be submitted and mentioned in the chair's letter. The information detailed in sections 2.5.3.1.a and 2.5.3.1.b provides the definition of a teaching portfolio and a suggested list of contents.

2.5.3.1.a Teaching Portfolio Definition

Definition: A selective summary of an individual's teaching effectiveness. It contains documents suggesting scope, individuality, innovation and accomplishment in teaching.

The portfolio should be reflective of the candidate's own unique teaching experience. It is not expected that teaching portfolios from different candidates will be exactly the same. In section 2.5.3.1b is a list of suggested items that could be used to develop a teaching portfolio. These items are not all-inclusive and candidates may include other relevant teaching activities as deemed appropriate. Please note that although the items are suggested, candidates are strongly advised to include information in items A, B, E, and I. Candidates are encouraged to obtain advice in the composition and presentation style of the portfolio from CEDI (Center for Educational Development and Informatics) at the UNC School of Dentistry.

2.5.3.1.b Teaching Portfolio Table of Contents

- A. Statement of Teaching Responsibilities
 - 1. Summary of courses taught and directed
 - 2. Student mentorship
 - 3. Student research committees
- B. Statement of Teaching Philosophy and Goals (one page or less)
- C. Efforts to Improve Teaching
 - 1. Formal courses in education
 - 2. Conferences and workshops attended
- D. Enhancement of Existing Courses
 - 1. Addition of tutorials, role playing, case studies, etc.
 - 2. Incorporation of writing skills, oral presentation skills in course
- E. Information from Students
 - 1. Summary of student ratings of teaching effectiveness
 - 2. Statements from former students
 - 3. Listing of papers published by students
 - 4. Honors earned by students
- F. Service to Teaching
 - 1. Membership on teaching related committees
 - 2. Membership on student examining committees

G. Information from Colleagues

1. Summary of peer evaluations of course materials
2. Summary of peer reviews of teaching related research
3. Comments from colleagues

H. Information from Other Sources

1. Guest lectures to other faculties
2. Continuing education lectures
3. Honors and awards

I. Future Teaching Goals

2.5.3.2 Scholarship

This area primarily is evaluated through the candidate's CV and outside letters. PTAC considers the candidate's productivity in research as measured by peer-reviewed articles (with attention to authorship); non-teaching books or book chapters; and published abstracts from scientific meetings. Quality and impact of research in the scientific community is evaluated through outside letters, citation statistics from the chair's letters, invited presentations, and success at obtaining peer-reviewed funding. In the evaluation of the scholarship of community service/engagement, input and letters from community partners and agencies will provide additional evidence of accomplishment.

2.5.3.3 Service and Engagement

This area is evaluated by means of the candidate's CV, the chair's letter, and letters from agencies or community-based organizations which have benefited from the service of the candidate. Service implies a donor-recipient relationship in which one party, generally the community, receives benefit from interaction with the faculty member. "Community engagement is the application of institutional resources to address and solve challenges facing communities through collaboration with these communities(CCPH, 2005)." The defining aspect of engagement is the collaboration and mutuality of benefits.

2.5.3.4 Previous Experience at another University

When faculty members at another university are hired, an implicit decision is made as to how much of their previous experience is counted as time toward promotion and tenure at UNC. That decision

indicates that activities at that university are counted toward promotion. However, review committees may look more closely at activities since coming to UNC as indicators of future productivity at this institution, especially when tenure is being evaluated.

2.6 School of Dentistry Full Professors

2.6.1 Committee Charge

The authority for the School of Dentistry Full Professors Committee is contained in the 1994 citation of the Trustee Policies and Regulations Governing Academic Tenure in the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill. The Trustee Policies note that, "Each initial appointment with permanent tenure or for a fixed or probationary term longer than one year, each promotion in rank, and each reappointment of an instructor, assistant professor or associate professor shall be initiated by recommendation of the chair of the department concerned after consultation by the entire assembled faculty who are qualified to consult on the action. In the School of Dentistry, the Full Professors Committee reviews all faculty recommendations regardless of type of appointment and term.

2.6.2 Committee Meetings

The School of Dentistry Full Professors Committee, chaired by the dean, meets monthly on a schedule established each semester by the Dean's Office. The professors receive a list of candidates and proposed actions along with the CV, the chair's letter, and appropriate letters evaluating the candidate in advance of the meeting. The assembled full professors are then read the PTAC report on each candidate with the recommendation, but without the actual PTAC vote. The professors then offer comments and discuss the candidates.

2.7 Dean's Review

For purposes of Promotion and Tenure, the University looks upon the Dental School as a department with the dean being the equivalent of a department chair.

The dean reviews the candidate's documentation, the PTAC report, and comments from the Full Professors Committee in order to come to a decision regarding the proposed action. This decision is then forwarded with appropriate documentation for University review.

2.8 University Review

2.8.1 Health Sciences Advisory Committee (HSAC)

This committee is comprised of faculty members from each of the Health Affairs Schools and is advisory to the Executive Vice Chancellor and Provost for EPA tenure and tenure-track appointments, reappointments and promotions. For current HSAC Tenure Track Schedule, please consult School website at <http://www.dent.unc.edu/depts/admin/hr/APTSchedule.pdf>.

2.8.2 Chancellor's Advisory Committee (CAC):

The CAC reviews actions that must be forwarded to the Board of Trustees and the Board of Governors after approval by the Chancellor and, as such, serve in an advisory capacity to the Chancellor. All tenure and tenure track actions are sent on for review by the CAC.

2.8.3 Board of Trustees (BOT)

All tenure and tenure track faculty actions favorably reviewed by the Chancellor are sent forward to the Board of Trustees (BOT). Appointments or promotions of tenure track faculty that do not involve conferral of tenure receive final approval at this level. Actions that require approval by the Board of Governors are reviewed by the BOT for consultation purposes. New appointments and reappointments of department chairs and directors (not equivalent to deans) are approved at the Chancellor's level, and are forwarded to the BOT for information.

2.8.4 Board of Governors (BOG)

Any action that confers tenure must be approved by the Board of Governors.

2.8.5 Chart of Review Levels

All possible steps	Tenure Track				Non Tenure Track
	Instructor	Assistant Professor	Associate Professor	Professor	
1. Consultation by chair with all faculty members qualified to consult on action	X	X	X	X	X ³
2. Recommendation by department chair	X	X	X	X	X
3. Preliminary review and approval by dean	X	X	X	X	X
4. Review and recommendation by School's committee on appointments, promotion and tenure		X ²	X	X	X ⁴
5. Final review and approval by the dean		X	X	X	X
6. Review and recommendation by the Health Sciences Advisory Committee	X	X	X	X	X
7. Review and approval by Vice Chancellor for Health Affairs	X	X	X	X	X
8. Review and approval by Chancellor's Advisory Committee	X ¹	X	X	X	
9. Review and approval by UNC-CH Board of Trustees	X ¹	X	X	X	X ⁵
10. Review and approval by UNC Board of Governors (for conferring permanent tenure)			X ²	X	

Notes:

1. Review and approval by Board of Trustees is necessary only if the salary level is over the amount specified for Board of Trustee approval; or if the person is to be automatically promoted to assistant professor on conferral of degree.
2. Only if reappointment with tenure.
3. Only if appointment is to be longer than one year.
4. Only if it is a promotion from assistant to associate professor, or from associate to full professor; or if it is an initial appointment at associate or professor rank.
5. Only if the salary level is over the amount specified for Board of Trustee approval.

2.8.6 Committee Schedules and Deadlines

Current School of Dentistry and Office of the Provost's schedules and deadlines can be found by visiting the website listed in Exhibit 2.

2.9 Notification of Faculty Member

Candidates for promotion and or tenure are notified in writing either by the Vice Chancellor or the Chancellor according to the proposed action as indicated in the chart above.

3. PROCEDURAL INFORMATION

3.1 Format for CV

The CV is the basis for review of accomplishments in teaching, research, professional service and community-service/engagement. The University has requirements for the type of information contained in the CV. In addition, the School of Dentistry has added sections that are relevant to a professional school and has designated a format for listing publications. Please follow the suggested format (as applicable) as the PTAC does review the CV for compliance with the recommended format.

The format for the CV is shown in Exhibit 3, which contains a summary of the reference style. A more detailed description of the reference style is contained in Exhibit 4.

3.2 Departmental Actions

Twice each year, department chairs receive a memorandum from the Dean's Office (Exhibit 5) notifying them of mandatory reviews for faculty. For both mandatory and optional reviews, department chairs consult with the dean early in the review cycle and before bringing the actions to the departmental Full Professors Committee. The required information for various types of appointments appears in Exhibit 5. This information must accompany positive recommendations that leave the department.

If the decision at the department level is negative, the Dean's office and the faculty member must be informed and the letter to the dean must state how the faculty member was informed. Negative decisions for promotion and/or tenure at the department level for tenure-track and fixed-term faculty also will be reviewed by PTAC and the School's Full Professors Committee.

3.3 Evaluation Letters

At least four outside letters of recommendation are required for all decisions conferring tenure, promotions to full professor, and initial appointments in the tenure track. If obtaining four outside letters is not feasible for initial appointments not conferring tenure, a combination of outside and internal letters of recommendation is acceptable. For example, for individuals who may have only been at one institution prior to their initial appointment, or are initially appointed from UNC, "inside"

letters are acceptable. Letters are not required for reappointments of assistant professors to a second probationary term. The cover letter from the dean and/or department chair is sufficient. However, any letters of recommendation that have been received will be forwarded.

For fixed-term appointments, two letters of recommendation are required regardless of the appointment duration. Outside or internal letters of recommendation are acceptable. In the School of Dentistry, inside letters usually are sufficient for fixed-term "clinical" appointments. However, PTAC finds that outside letters, if available, can strengthen the presentation. Actions involving fixed-term faculty with "research" appointments need outside letters to help in the evaluation of the quality of a candidate's research. PTAC reviews all letters of support in terms of how well they address accomplishments in teaching, research, professional service, and community-service/engagement. Letters with general statements indicating that the candidate is an outstanding person and should be promoted are not as useful as letters from respected and impartial outside faculty (normally at the associate professor level or higher, or of equivalent status) that provide independent corroboration of excellence in one or more of the areas. Former classmates, former colleagues, or other outside faculty with whom strong personal relationships have developed should not be candidates as outside referees.

For tenure track faculty who must have four outside letters, additional outside letters are appropriate, if they provide expanded documentation of outside recognition of the candidate. Letters from former UNC Dental School faculty who have been gone less than three years are considered to be inside letters. Inside letters will be used in the review, but are generally viewed as less valuable than outside letters. The PTAC feels that important information from faculty within the School that is not contained in outside letters is most effective when it is included in the chair's letter.

Requests for letters of evaluation are initiated by the department chair. Letters are required for the PTAC review, but optional for the departmental review unless the candidate specifically requests that they be considered. The candidate should identify a minimum of three potential reviewers in writing to the chair, and suggest for each why that individual is appropriate and what parts of the available documentation would provide an adequate basis for the review. Three additional reviewers will be identified by the chair in consultation with appropriate faculty. Working with six names makes it more likely that four letters will arrive on time, enabling the review to proceed. All letters of support will be used in the evaluation process, and all will be forwarded to the

Health Sciences Advisory Committee as part of the documentation accompanying the dean's decision regarding the proposed action.

The standard request package sent to each reviewer will include a cover letter prepared by the chair that identifies the specific area(s) to be evaluated, together with supporting documentation consisting at minimum of the candidate's CV, supplemented by any additional material from the candidate's teaching portfolio, reprints of journal articles, etc, that the chair judges to be necessary or useful for the review. The cover letter should make clear that what is requested is a thoughtful evaluation of specific aspects of the candidate's performance, and that the reviewer's opinion regarding the suitability of promotion is neither requested nor useful (See Exhibit 9 for a sample solicitation for an external letter of recommendation).

3.4 Candidate's Statement

Each full-time candidate is required to prepare a brief (1 to 3 pages), reflective statement summarizing the main factors the candidate believes should be considered in the review. Possible topics include, in addition to bare descriptions of previous activities in the pertinent areas, thoughtful analyses of what the candidate regards as most exciting, important, and/or limiting in his/her work to date, statements regarding overall "philosophy" and/or specific plans for further professional development, and a summary of current and potential future contributions to the School. These are meant only as examples, however, and the intent is to encourage flexibility and creativity appropriate to the specific circumstances of each candidate.

3.5 Chair's Letter

The PTAC review places great importance on the chair's letter. Exhibit 9 details the type of information that should be included. In addition, Exhibit 8 – a memorandum from the Provost's Office – should be reviewed before the chairperson writes the letter of recommendation. The chair's letter should not simply summarize the candidate's CV – the letter is an opportunity for information not easily gleaned from the CV to be presented, including the candidate's contributions to the department's teaching, research, and service missions. One section of the chair's letter should address the outside letters, specifically, the people from who letters were requested, their qualifications, and the disposition of each letter. The PTAC also finds that balanced chair's letters are more effective than letters that only praise the candidate. Almost all faculty members have things

they do better than others and some do have weaknesses. It is better to address these aspects directly and, when explanations are useful, to include those explanations. The chair's letter should include a general overview of how the candidate's time at the school was distributed among the areas to be evaluated (percent time effort) during the period covered by this promotion. Since certain issues in the chair's letter and /or the CV may require clarification by the PTAC, it is important that the chair of the department understand that they may be asked to attend the PTAC meeting if the chair of PTAC determines that needed information is not available in the letter. Following the meeting with the PTAC, the chair of the department may be asked to address certain issues by revising the letter of recommendation.

4.1 Review of Department Chairs

The dean or the dean's designated representative will assume the department chair's role in instances where the department chair is reviewed for Promotion and Tenure.

4.2 Review Process

The chairman of the PTAC will call for the meeting at the dates agreed upon by the Committee. Copies of all written documents will be provided to members in advance for review. At the meeting, a preliminary discussion of the candidate's performance will be followed by the chair of the department meeting with the PTAC for clarification of specific issues or additional information that may be needed. As applicable, the chair may be asked to revise the letter of recommendation before the PTAC vote. In this case, the PTAC may need a follow-up meeting two weeks later to make a decision and recommendations.

TIME TABLE FOR PROMOTIONS AND TENURE ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETINGS

<u>If Applicant dossier is submitted to personnel office by</u>	<u>PTAC will review the dossier in</u>	<u>The School of Dentistry Full Professors will discuss the PTAC report in</u>
<u>November 15th</u>	<u>The second full week of January</u>	<u>The last week of February</u>
<u>April 15th</u>	<u>The second full week of June</u>	<u>The last week of July</u>

4.3 Updating Procedures

The procedures contained in Section 4 may need to be revised more frequently than other sections of this document. Directives from the University, such as new requirements regarding the number and types of letters needed, mandate a change in School procedures. The dean or PTAC also may find that some procedures do not work well and may wish to make changes. Thus, the PTAC is charged with conducting an annual review of Section 4 to determine if any changes are needed. Any changes should be sent to all faculty as an Addendum to this manual and appear in the PTAC Committee's Annual Report. When manuals are revised, the current procedures should be included.

Exhibit 1

**Trustee Policies and Regulations Governing Academic Tenure
in the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill**

Please see
<http://www.unc.edu/provost/policies/tenure-regs.pdf>
to access this document.

Exhibit 2

School of Dentistry and Provost's Schedules and Deadlines:

Please consult School website at
<http://www.dent.unc.edu/depts/admin/hr/APTschedule.pdf>
for current calendars.

Exhibit 3

UNC CURRICULUM VITAE FORMAT

CURRENT DATE

FULL NAME

PERSONAL HISTORY

Born: Date:
 Place:
 Citizenship:

Office Address: Address
 Phone number
 Email address

Home Address: Address
 Phone number
 (do not include personal information)

EDUCATION (list highest earned degree first)

<u>Institution and Location</u>	<u>Degree</u>	<u>Date Conferred</u>	<u>Degree Major</u>
Postdoctoral Training (Residency/Fellowship)			
Graduate School			
Dental School			
College			

MILITARY SERVICE

Dates

STATE(S) LICENSED

Date State

SPECIALTY BOARDS

ACADEMIC OR PROFESSIONAL APPOINTMENTS (list most recent position first)

Date Appointment
Date Appointment

HOSPITAL APPOINTMENTS (Most recent first)

Date Appointments

PRIVATE DENTAL PRACTICE (Most recent first)

Dates Type of Practice and Location

SOCIETY MEMBERSHIPS (Most recent first)

Dates Society
Dates Offices
Dates Society
Dates Offices

HONORS AND AWARDS (Most recent first)

Dates Honor or Award

[Do not include items such as "Outstanding Young ... in Midwest, etc."]

MAJOR TEACHING AND ADMINISTRATIVE RESPONSIBILITIES (Most recent first)

Courses directed (brief summary of major responsibilities, include number of hours actually taught)

Course participation (include number of hours the individual actually taught)

COMMITTEE APPOINTMENTS & CONSULTANT POSITIONS (Most recent first)

Dental School

Date Committee name
Date Offices held

University

Date Committee name
Date Offices held

State

Date Committee name
Date Offices held

National/International

Date Committee name
Date Offices held

SERVICE AND ENGAGEMENT ACTIVITIES (Most recent first)

Partner agency or community

Dates Nature of the relationship and activities

SERVICE ON EDITORIAL BOARDS OF JOURNALS (Most recent first, include position)

PRESENTATIONS (Most recent first. Include papers and table clinics. Do not include presentations that also appear as published abstracts.)

Local (Most recent first)

Date Title or presentation, group presented to, location

State

Date Title or presentation, group presented to, location

National or International

Date Title or presentation, group presented to, location

INVITED PRESENTATIONS Most recent first, include school, institution, or organization and location)

A. Teaching Related

B. Research Related

CONTINUING EDUCATION COURSES PRESENTED (Most recent first except when same course is given multiple times--then list under first time taught and include other dates given. Do not include CE courses that you have taken.)

Date Course title

THESES DIRECTED

Date Title, type, and student's name

COMMITTEE MEMBERSHIPS

Only list the number of thesis committees on which you served as a member. It is not necessary to provide the date, title, and student's name.

MAJOR RESEARCH INTERESTS

PUBLICATIONS

(List most recent first. On all items show author order. For articles that have been accepted for publication, please include the name of the journal and the amount of typescript pages in the submitted manuscript. Do not include articles that have been submitted for which you do not have an acceptance letter. Refereed publications should be marked with an asterisk. Use the following subheadings and reference format when applicable. More specific examples are given in Exhibit 4.)

Books and Chapters in Books

Journal Articles

- A. Clinical Case Reports and Clinical Technique Articles
- B. Research Reports and Literature Reviews

Abstracts & Book Reviews

Monographs

Self-Instructional Units and Course Syllabi

Reference Format

Most journals have adopted some form of the Vancouver System for references, which features greatly simplified punctuation. These journals tend to differ on where the date is placed, capitalization of author's entire name versus first letter and initials, more extensive use of "colons" versus "periods", and how the page numbers are displayed. The following style recommendation appears to be the most common in the journals we reviewed.

I. Journals (list all authors if six or less, otherwise list only first three and add et al.)

- * 1. Standard Reference

Gibson GB, Richardson AS, Patton RE, Waldman R. A clinical evaluation of occlusal composite and amalgam restorations: one- and two-year results. *J Am Dent Assoc* 1982;104:335-37.

2. Corporate Author

Federation Dentaire Internationale. Technical Report No. 28. Guidelines for antibiotic prophylaxis of infective endocarditis for dental patients with cardiovascular disease. *Int Dent J* 1987;37:235.

II. Books and Monographs

1. Personal Author(s)

Tullman JJ, Redding SW. Systemic disease in dental treatment. St. Louis: The CV Mosby Co; 1983:1-5.

2. Chapter in a book

Johns R. Restorative needs and methods. In: Cohen B, Thomson H, eds. Dental care for the elderly. London: William Heinemann Medical Books; 1986:142-77.

3. Agency Publication

Miller AJ, Brunelle JA, Carlos JP, Brown LJ, Loe H. Oral health of United States adults. Bethesda, Maryland: National Institute of Dental Research, 1987; NIH publication no. 87-2868.

4. Dissertation or Thesis

Author. Title. [Thesis]. City, State: Institution, date. # p.

GRANTS, CONTRACTS, AND PATENTS (List most recent first. Include type of grant, role on project, starting and ending dates)

You may include grant applications that were approved, but not funded, but you must include the score and percentile)

Date Agency & Amount, Title

Exhibit 4

The New England Journal of Medicine

SPECIAL REPORT UNIFORM REQUIREMENTS FOR MANUSCRIPTS SUBMITTED TO BIOMEDICAL JOURNALS

International Committee of Medical Journal Editors*

In the 12 years since it was first published, the “Uniform Requirements for Manuscripts Submitted to Biomedical Journal” (the Vancouver style), developed by the International Committee of Medical Journal Editors, has been widely accepted by both authors and editors; over 400 journals have stated that they will consider manuscripts that conform to its requirements. This is the fourth edition of the Uniform Requirements, the first to be published in the Journal, which now serves as coordinator of the ICMJE in North America.

In January 1978 a group of editors from some major biomedical journals published in English met in Vancouver, British Columbia, and decided on uniform technical requirements for manuscripts to be submitted to their journals. These requirements, including formats for bibliographic references developed for the Vancouver group by the National Library of Medicine, were published in three of the journals early in 1979. The Vancouver group evolved into the International Committee of Medical Journal Editors. Over the years, the group has revised the requirements slightly; this is the fourth edition.

Over 400 journals have agreed to receive manuscripts prepared in accordance with the requirements. It is important to emphasize what these requirements imply and what they do not.

First, the requirements are instructions to authors on how to prepare manuscripts, not to editors on publication style. (But many journals have drawn on these requirements for elements of their publication styles.)

Second, if authors prepare their manuscripts in the style specified in these requirements, editors of the participating journals will not return manuscripts for change in these details of style. Even so, manuscripts may be altered by journals to conform with details of their own publication styles.

Third, authors sending manuscripts to a participating journal should not try to prepare them in accordance with the publication style of that journal but should follow the “Uniform Requirements for Manuscripts Submitted to Biomedical Journals.”

Nevertheless, authors must also follow the instructions to authors in the journal as to what topics are suitable for that journal and the types of papers that may be submitted – for example, original articles, reviews, or case reports. In addition, the journal’s instructions are likely to contain other requirements unique to that journal, such as number of copies of manuscripts, acceptable languages, length of articles, and approved abbreviations.

Participating journals are expected to state in their instructions to authors that their requirements are in accordance with the “Uniform Requirements for Manuscripts Submitted to Biomedical Journals” and to cite a published version.

This document will be revised at intervals. Inquiries and comments from Central and North America about these requirements should be sent to Editor, the *New England Journal of Medicine*, 10 Shattuck St., Boston, MA 02115; those from other regions should be sent to Editor, *British Medical Journal*, British Medical Association, Tavistock Sq., London WC1H 9JR, United Kingdom. Note that these two journals provide secretariat services for the International Committee of Medical Journal Editors; they do not handle manuscripts intended for other journals. Papers intended for other journals should be sent directly to the offices of these journals.

SUMMARY OF REQUIREMENTS

Type the manuscript double-spaced, including title page, abstract, text, acknowledgements, references, tables, and legends.

Each manuscript component should begin on a new page, in the following sequence: title page; abstract and key words; text; acknowledgements; references; tables (each table complete with title and footnotes on a separate page); and legends for illustrations.

Illustrations must be good-quality, unmounted glossy prints, usually 127 x 173 mm (5 x 7 in.), but no larger than 203 x 254 mm (8 x 10 in.).

Submit the required number of copies of manuscript and figures (see journal's instructions) in a heavy paper envelope. The submitted manuscript should be accompanied by a covering letter, as described under Submission of Manuscripts, and permissions to reproduce previously published material or to use illustrations that may identify human subjects.

Follow the journal's instructions for transfer of copyright. Authors should keep copies of everything submitted.

PRIOR AND DUPLICATE PUBLICATION

Most journals do not wish to consider for publication a paper on work that has already been submitted in a published paper or is described in a paper submitted or accepted for publication elsewhere. This policy does not usually preclude consideration of a paper that has been rejected by another journal or of a complete report that follows publication of a preliminary report, usually in the form of an abstract. Nor does it prevent consideration of a paper that has been presented at a scientific meeting if not published in full in a proceedings or similar publication. Press reports of the meeting will not usually be considered as breaches of this rule, but such reports should not be amplified by additional data or copies of tables and illustrations. When submitting a paper an author should always make a full statement to the editor about all submissions and previous reports that might be regarded as prior or

duplicate publication of the same or very similar work. Copies of such material should be included with the submitted paper to help the editor decide how to deal with the matter.

Multiple publication – that is, the publication more than once of the same study, irrespective of whether the wording is the same – is rarely justified. Secondary publication in another language is one possible justification, provided the following conditions are met.

(1) The editors of both journals concerned are fully informed; the editor concerned with secondary publication should have a photocopy, reprint, or manuscript of the primary version.

(2) The priority of the primary publication is respected by a publication interval of at least two weeks.

(3) The paper for secondary publication is written for a different group of readers and is not simply a translated version of the primary paper; an abbreviated version will often be sufficient.

(4) A footnote on the title page of the secondary version informs readers, peers, and documenting agencies that the paper was edited, and is being published, for a national audience in parallel with a primary version based on the same date and interpretations. A suitable footnote might read as follows: "This article is based on a study first reported in the [title of journal, with full reference]."

Multiple publication other than as defined above is not acceptable to editors. If authors violate this rule they may expect appropriate editorial action to be taken.

Preliminary release, usually to public media, of scientific information described in a paper that has been accepted but not yet published is a violation of the policies of many journals. In a few cases, and only by arrangement with the editor, preliminary release of data may be acceptable – for example, to warn the public of health hazards.

PREPARATION OF MANUSCRIPT

Type the manuscript on white bond paper, 216 x 279 mm (8 ½ x 11 in.) or ISO A4 (212 x 297 mm), with margins of at least 25 mm (1 in.). Type only on one side of the paper. Use double-spacing throughout, including title page, abstract, text, acknowledgements, references, tables, and legends for illustrations. Begin each of the following sections on separate pages: title page, abstract and key words, text, acknowledgements, references, individual tables, and legends. Number pages consecutively, beginning with the title page. Type the page number in the upper or lower right-hand corner of each page.

Title Page

The title page should carry (a) the title of the article, which should be concise but informative; (b) first name, middle initial, and last name of each author, with highest academic degree(s) and institutional affiliation; (c) name of department(s) and institution(s) to which the work should be attributed; (d) disclaimers, if any; (e) name and address of author responsible for correspondence about the manuscript; (f) name and address of author to whom requests for reprints should be addressed or statement that reprints will not be available from the author; (g) source(s) of support in the form of grants, equipment, drugs, or all of these; and (h) a short running head or foot line of no more than 40 characters (count letters and spaces) placed at the foot of the title page and identified.

Authorship

All persons designated as authors should qualify for authorship. The order of authorship should be a joint decision of the coauthors. Each author should have participated sufficiently in the work to take public responsibility for content.

Authorship credit should be based only on substantial contributions to (a) conception and design, or analysis and interpretation of data; and to (b) drafting the article or revising it critically for important intellectual content; and on (c) final

approval of the version to be published. Conditions (a), (b), and (c) must all be met. Participation solely in the acquisition of funding or the collection of data does not justify authorship. General supervision of the research group is also not sufficient for authorship. Any part of an article critical to its main conclusions must be the responsibility of at least one author.

A paper with corporate (collective) authorship must specify the key persons responsible for the article; others contributing to the work should be recognized separately (see Acknowledgements).

Editors may require authors to justify the assignment of authorship.

Abstract and Key Words

The second page should carry an abstract (of no more than 150 words for unstructured abstracts or 250 words for structured abstracts). The abstract should state the purposes of the study or investigation, basic procedures (selection of study subjects or laboratory animals; observational and analytical methods); main findings (give specific data and their statistical significance, if possible), and the principal conclusions. Emphasize new and important aspects of the study or observations.

Below the abstract provide, and identify as such, 3 to 10 key words or short phrases that will assist indexers in cross-indexing the article and may be published with the abstract. Use terms from the medical subject headings (MeSH) list of *Index Medicus*; if suitable. If MeSH terms are not yet available for recently introduced terms, present terms may be used.

Text

The text of observational and experimental articles is usually – but not necessarily – divided into sections with the headings Introduction, Methods, Results, and Discussion. Long articles may need subheadings within some sections to clarify their content, especially the Results and Discussion sections. Other types of articles such as case reports, reviews, and

editorials are likely to need other formats. Authors should consult individual journals for further guidance.

Introduction

State the purpose of the article. Summarize the rationale for the study or observation. Give only strictly pertinent references, and do not review the subject extensively. Do not include data or conclusions from the work being reported.

Methods

Describe your selection of observational or experimental subjects (patients or laboratory animals, including controls) clearly. Identify the methods, apparatus (manufacturer's name and address in parentheses), and procedures in sufficient detail to allow other workers to reproduce the results. Give references to established methods, including statistical methods (see below); provide references and brief descriptions for methods that have been published but are not well known; describe new or substantially modified methods, give reasons for using them, and evaluate their limitations. Identify precisely all drugs and chemicals used, including generic name(s), dose(s), and route(s) of administration.

Ethics

When reporting experiments on human subjects indicate whether the procedures followed were in accordance with the ethical standards of the responsible committee on human experimentation (institutional or regional) or with the Helsinki Declaration of 1975, as revised in 1983. Do not use patients' names, initials, or hospital numbers, especially in any illustrative material. When reporting experiments on animals indicate whether the institution's or the National Research Council's guide for, or any national law on, the care and use of laboratory animals was followed.

Statistics

Describe statistical methods with enough detail to enable a knowledgeable reader with access to the original data to verify the reported results. When possible, quantify findings and present them with appropriate indicators of measurement error or uncertainty (such as confidence intervals). Avoid sole reliance on statistical hypothesis testing, such as the use of P values, which fails to convey important quantitative information. Discuss eligibility of experimental subjects. Give details about randomization. Describe the methods for and success of any blinding of observations. Report treatment complications. Give numbers of observations. Report losses to observation (such as dropouts from a clinical trial). References for study design and statistical methods should be to standard works (with pages stated) when possible rather than to papers in which the designs or methods were originally reported. Specify any general-use computer programs used.

Put general descriptions of methods in the Methods section. When data are summarized in the Results section specify the statistical methods used to analyze them. Restrict tables and figures to those needed to explain the argument of the paper and to assess its support. Use graphs as an alternative to tables with many entries; do not duplicate data in graphs and tables. Avoid nontechnical uses of technical terms in statistics, such as "random" (which implies a randomizing device), "normal," "significant," "correlations," and "sample." Define statistical terms, abbreviations, and most symbols.

Results

Present your results in a logical sequence in the text, tables, and illustrations. Do not repeat in the text all the data in the tables or illustrations; emphasize or summarize only important observations.

Discussion

Emphasize the new and important aspects of the study and the conclusions that follow from them. Do not repeat in detail data or other material given in the Introduction or the Results section. Include in the Discussion section the implications of the findings and their limitations, including implications for future research. Relate the observations to other relevant studies. Link the conclusions with the goals of the study but avoid unqualified statements and conclusions not completely supported by your data. Avoid claiming priority and alluding to work that has not been completed. State new hypotheses when warranted, but clearly label them as such. Recommendations, when appropriate, may be included.

Acknowledgements

At an appropriate place in the article (title-page footnote or appendix to the text; see the journal's requirement) one or more statements should specify (a) contributions that need acknowledging but do not justify authorship, such as general support by a departmental chairman; (b) acknowledgements of technical help; (c) acknowledgements of financial and material support, specifying the nature of the support; (d) financial relationships that may pose a conflict of interest.

Persons who have contributed intellectually to the paper but whose contributions do not justify authorship may be named and their function or contribution described – for example, “scientific advisor,” “critical review of study proposal,” “data collection,” or “participation in clinical trial.” Such persons must have given their permission to be named. Authors are responsible for obtaining written permission from persons acknowledged by name, because readers may infer their endorsement of the data and conclusions.

References

Number references consecutively in the order in which they are first mentioned in the text. Identify

references in the text, tables, and legends by Arabic numerals in parentheses. References cited only in tables or in legends to figures should be numbered in accordance with a sequence established by the first identification in the text of the particular table or illustration.

Use the style of the examples below, which are based with slight modifications on the formats used by the U.S. National Library of Medicine in *Index Medicus*. The titles of journals should be abbreviated according to the style used in *Index Medicus*. Consult *List of Journals Indexed in Index Medicus*, published annually as a separate publication by the library and as a list in the January issue of *Index Medicus*.

Try to avoid using abstracts as references; “unpublished observations” and “personal communication” may not be used as references, although references to written, not oral communications may be inserted (in parentheses) in the text. Include among the reference papers accepted but not yet published; designate the journal and add “In press.” Information from manuscripts submitted but not yet accepted should be cited in text as “unpublished observations” (in parentheses).

The references must be verified by the author(s) against the original documents.

Examples of correct forms of references are given below.

Articles in Journals

(1) *Standard journal article* (List all authors, but if the number exceeds six give six followed by et al.)

You CH, Lee RY, Menguy R. Electrogastrographic study of patients with unexplained nausea, bloating and vomiting. *Gastroenterology* 1980; 79:311-4.

Goate Am, Haynes AR, Owen MJ, Farrall M, James LA, Lai LY, et al. Predisposing locus for Alzheimer's disease on chromosome 21. *Lancet* 1989; I:352-5.

(2) *Organization as author*

The Royal Marsden Hospital Bone-Marrow Transplantation Team. Failure of syngeneic bone-marrow graft without preconditioning in post-hepatitis marrow aplasia.. Lancet 1977;2:742-4.

(3) *No author given*

Coffee drinking and cancer of the pancreas [editorial]. BMJ 1981;283:628.

(4) *Article in a foreign language*

Massone L, Borghi S, Pestarino A, Piccini R, Gambini C. Localisations palmaires purpuriques de la dermatite herpétiforme. Ann Dermatol Venereol 1987;114:1545-7.

(5) *Volume with supplement*

Magni F, Rossoni G, Berti F. BN-52021 protects guinea-pig from heart anaphylaxis. Pharmacol Res Commun 1988;20 Suppl 5:75-8.

(6) *Issue with supplement*

Gardos G, Cole JO, Haskell D, Marby D, Paine SS, Moore P. The natural history of tardive dyskinesia. J. Clin Psychopharmacol 1988;8(4 Suppl):31S-37S.

(7) *Volume with part*

Hanly C. Metaphysics and innateness: a psychoanalytic perspective. Int J Psychoanal 1988;69(Pt 3):389-99.

(8) *Issue with part*

Edwards L, Meyskens F, Levine N. Effect of oral isotretinoin on dysplastic nevi. J Am Acad Dermatol 1989;20(2 Pt 1):257-60.

(9) *Issue with no volume*

Baumeister AA. Origins and control of stereotyped movements. Monogr Am Assoc Ment Defic 1978;(3):353-4.

(10) *No issue or volume*

Danock K. Skiing in and through the history of medicine. Nord Medicinhist Arsb 1982:S6-100.

(11) *Pagination in Roman numerals*

Ronne Y. Ansvarsfall. Blodtransfusion till fel patient. Vardfacket 1989;13:XXVI-XXVII.

(12) *Type of article indicated as needed*

Spargo PM, Manners JM. DDA VP and open heart surgery [letter]. Anaesthesia 1989;44:363-4.

Fuhrman SA, Joiner KA. Binding of the third component of complement C3 by Toxoplasma gondii [abstract]. Clin Res 1987;35:475A.

(13) *Article containing retraction*

Shishido A. Retraction notice: Effect of platinum compounds on murine lymphocyte mitogenesis (Retraction of Alsabti EA, Ghalib ON, Salem MH. In: Jpn J Med Sci Biol 1979;32:53-65). Jpn J Med Sci Biol 1980;33:235-7.

(14) *Article retracted*

Alsabti EA, Ghalib ON, Salem MH. Effect of platinum compounds on murine lymphocyte mitogenesis [Retracted by Shisido A. In: Jpn J Med Sci Biol 1980;33:235-7]. Jpn N Med Sci Biol 1979;32:53-65.

(15) *Article containing comment*

Piccoli A, Bossati A. Early steroid therapy in IgA neuropathy: still an open question [comment].

Nephron 1989;51:289-91. Comment on: Nephron 1988;48:12-7.

(16) *Article commented on*

Kobayashi H, Fujii K, Hiki Y, Tateno S, Kurosawa A, Kamiyama M. Steroid therapy in IgA nephropathy: a retrospective study in heavy proteinuric cases [see comments]. Nephron 1988;48:12-7. Comment in: Nephron 1989;51:289-91.

(17) *Article with published erratum*

Schofield A. The CAGE questionnaire and psychological health [published erratum appears in Br J Addict 1988;83:761-4.

Books and Other Monographs

(18) *Personal author(s)*

Colson JH, Armour WJ. Sports injuries and their treatment. 2nd rev. ed. London: S. Paul, 1986.

(19) *Editor(s), compiler as author*

Diener HC, Wilkinson M, editors. Drug-induced headache. New York: Springer-Verlag, 1988.

(20) *Organizational as author and publisher*

Virginia Law Foundation. The medical and legal implications of AIDS. Charlottesville: The Foundation, 1987.

(21) *Chapters in a book*

Weinstein L, Swartz MN. Pathologic properties of invading microorganisms. In: Sodeman WA Jr, Sodeman WA, editors. Pathologic physiology: mechanisms of disease.

(22) *Conference proceedings*

Vivian VL, editor. Child abuse and neglect: a medical community response. Proceedings of the First AMA National Conference on Child Abuse and Neglect; 1984 Mar 30-31; Chicago. Chicago: American Medical Association. 1985.

(23) *Conference paper*

Harley NH. Comparing radon daughter dosimetric and risk models. In: Gammage RB, Kaye SV, editors. Indoor air and human health. Proceedings of the Seventh Life Sciences Symposium; 1984 Oct 29-31 ; Knoxville (TN). Chelsea (MI): Lewis. 1985: 69-78.

(24) *Scientific and technical report*

Akutsu T. Total heart replacement device. Bethesda (MD); National Institutes of Health, National Heart and Lung Institute; 1974 Apr. Report No.: NIH-NHLI-69-2185-4.

(25) *Dissertation*

Youssef NM. School adjustment of children with congenital heart disease [dissertation]. Pittsburgh (PA); Univ. of Pittsburgh, 1988.

(26) *Patent*

Harred JF, Kngith AR, McIntyre JS, inventors. Dow Chemical Company, assignee. Epoxidation process. US patent 2,654,317. 1972 Apr 4.

Other Published Material

(27) *Newspaper article*

Rensberger B, Spector B. CFCs may be destroyed by natural process. The Washington Post 1989 Aug 7;Sect A:2 (col. 5).

(28) *Audiovisual*

AIDS epidemic: the physician's role [videorecording]. Cleveland (OH): Academy of Medicine of Cleveland, 1987.

(29) *Computer file*

Renal system [computer program]. MS-DOS version. Edwardsville (KS): Medi-Sim, 1988.

(30) *Legal material*

Toxic Substances Control Act: Hearing on S. 776 Before the Subcomm. on the Environment of the Senate Comm. on Commerce, 94th Cong., 1st Sess. 343 (1975).

(31) *Map*

Scotland [topographic map]. Washington: National Geographic Society (US);1981.

(32) *Book of the Bible*

Ruth 3:1-18. The Holy Bible. Authorized King James version. New York: Oxford Univ. Press, 1972.

(33) *Dictionary and similar references*

Ectasia. Dorland's illustrated medical dictionary. 27th ed. Philadelphia: Saunders, 1988: 527.

(34) *Classical material*

The Winter's Tale: act 5, scene 1, lines 13-16. The complete works of William Shakespeare. London: Rex, 1973.

Unpublished Material

(35) *In press*

Lillywhite HB, Donald JA. Pulmonary blood flow regulation in an aquatic snake. Science. In press.

Tables

Type each table double-spaced on a separate sheet. Do not submit tables as photographs. Number tables consecutively in the order of their first citation in the text and supply a brief title for each. Give each column a short or abbreviated heading. Place explanatory matter in footnotes, not in the heading. Explain in footnotes all nonstandard abbreviations that are used in each table. For footnotes use the following symbols, in this sequence: *, †, ‡, §, ||, ¶, **, ††,

Identify statistical measures of variations such as standard deviation and standard error of the mean.

Do not use internal horizontal and vertical rules.

Be sure that each table is cited in the text.

If you use data from another published or unpublished source obtain permission and acknowledge fully.

The use of too many tables in relation to the length of the text may produce difficulties in the layout of pages. Examine issues of the journal to which you plan to submit your paper to estimate how many tables can be used per 1000 words of text.

The editor, on accepting a paper, may recommend that additional tables containing important backup data too extensive to published be deposited with an archival service, such as the National Auxiliary Publication Service in the United States, or made available by the authors. In that event an appropriate statement will be added to the text. Submit such tables for consideration with the paper.

Illustrations

Submit the required number of complete sets of figures. Figures should be professionally drawn and photographed; freehand or typewritten lettering is unacceptable. Instead of original drawings, roentgenograms, and other material send sharp, glossy black-and-white photographic prints, usually 127 x 173 mm (5 x 7 in.), but no larger than 203 x 254 mm (8 x 10 in.). Letters, numbers, and symbols should be clear and even throughout and of sufficient size that

when reduced for publication each item will still be legible. Titles and detailed explanations belong in the legends for illustrations, not on the illustrations themselves.

Each figure should have a label pasted on its back indicating the number of the figure, author's name, and top of the figure. Do not write on the back of figures or scratch or mar them by using paper clips. Do not bend figures or mount them on cardboard.

Photomicrographs must have internal scale markers. Symbols, arrows, or letters used in the photomicrographs should contrast with the background.

If photographs of persons are used, either the subjects must not be identifiable or their pictures must be accompanied by written permission to use the photograph.

Figures should be numbered consecutively according to the order in which they have been first cited in the text. If a figure has been published acknowledge the original source and submit written permission from the copyright holder to reproduce the material. Permission is required irrespective of authorship or publisher, except for documents in the public domain.

For illustrations in color, ascertain whether the journal requires color negatives, positive transparencies, or color prints. Accompanying drawings marked to indicate the region to be reproduced may be useful to the editor. Some journals publish illustrations in color only if the author pays for the extra cost.

Legends for Illustrations

Type legends for illustrations double-spaced, starting on a separate page, with Arabic numerals corresponding to the illustrations. When symbols, arrows, numbers, or letters are used to identify parts of the illustrations, identify and explain each one clearly in the legend. Explain the internal scale and identify method of staining in the photomicrographs.

UNITS OF MEASUREMENT

Measurements of length, height, weight, and volume should be reported in metric units (meter, kilogram, or liter) or their decimal multiples.

Temperatures should be given in degrees Celsius. Blood pressures should be given in millimeters of mercury.

All hematologic and clinical-chemistry measurements should be reported in the metric system in terms of the International System of Units (SI). Editors may request that alternative or non-SI units be added by authors before publication.

ABBREVIATIONS AND SYMBOLS

Use only standard abbreviations. Avoid abbreviations in the title and abstract. The full term for which an abbreviation stands should precede its first use in the text unless it is a standard unit of measurement.

SUBMISSION OF MANUSCRIPTS

Mail the required number of manuscript copies in a heavy paper envelope, enclosing the manuscript copies and figures in cardboard, if necessary, to prevent bending of photographs during mail handling. Place photographs and transparencies in a separate heavy paper envelope.

Manuscripts must be accompanied by a covering letter signed by all coauthors. This must include (a) information on prior or duplicated publication or submission elsewhere of any part of the work as defined earlier in this document; (b) a statement of financial or other relationships that might lead to a conflict of interest; (c) a statement that the manuscript has been read and approved by all authors, that the requirements for authorship as previously stated in this document have been met, and furthermore, that each coauthor believes that the manuscript represents honest work; and (d) the name, address, and telephone number of the corresponding author, who is responsible for communicating with the other authors about revisions and final approval of the proofs. The

letter should give any additional information that may be helpful to the editor, such as the type of article in the particular journal the manuscript represents and whether the author(s) will be willing to meet the cost of reproducing color illustrations.

The manuscript must be accompanied by copies of any permissions to reproduce published material, to use illustrations or report sensitive personal information of identifiable persons, or to name persons for their contributions.

PARTICIPATING JOURNALS

Journals that have notified the International Committee of Medical Journal Editors of their willingness to consider for publication manuscripts prepared in accordance with earlier versions of the committee's uniform requirements identify themselves as such in their information for authors. A full list is available on request from the *New England Journal of Medicine* or the *British Medical Journal*. Citations of this document should be to one of the sources listed below.

International Committee of Medical Journal Editors. Uniform requirements for manuscripts submitted to biomedical journals. *N Engl J Med* 1991; 324:424-8.

International Committee of Medical Journal Editors. Uniform requirements for manuscripts submitted to biomedical journals. *BMJ* 1991 Feb 9;302(6772).

This document is not covered by copyright: it may be copied or reprinted without permission.

Exhibit 5

PROMOTION/TENURE REQUESTS FOR TENURE TRACK ASSISTANT OR ASSOCIATE PROFESSORS WITHOUT TENURE: REQUIRED DOCUMENTATION

- *1. Updated CURRICULUM VITAE
 - a. UNC School of Dentistry CV format is attached.
 - b. Publications should be cited in the format provided.

2. Updated AP-2 (RECOMMENDATION FOR EPA PERSONNEL ACTION)
 - a. Except for items 9-15 (to be completed after School reviews), the AP-2 should be completed in the department and signed by the individual and chair.
 - b. Attachments can be sections of the CV, cross-referenced to AP-2 item.

- *3. LETTER OF RECOMMENDATION from department chair
 - a. See attached outline of information to be included in Exhibits 6 & 7. Note in particular the need for detailed reasons for the recommendation, indicating contributions made by individual toward the education, research, and service programs of the School of Dentistry and University.
 - b. Please mention review by department full professors.
 - c. Early recommendations (to be effective before end of initial appointment of associate professor or end of second term of assistant professor) should note timing and provide reasons for being early.

- *4. SUPPORTING LETTERS of recommendation
 - a. Please see sample letter of request for evaluation in Exhibit 6.
 - b. At least 4 letters from outside the University are required.
 - c. Faculty member should be given opportunity to suggest sources.
 - d. Consideration should be given to rank, prominence, and institutional affiliation of individuals supporting recommendation, as well as ability to provide a thorough and thoughtful opinion.

5. Teaching Portfolio (see section 2.5.3.1.b)

6. AFFIRMATIVE ACTION statement

7. 1-9 (EMPLOYMENT VERIFICATION form), sample attached, with copies of verification documents.

*Submitted to Promotion and Tenure Advisory Committee and assembled
Full Professors of the School of Dentistry

**MANDATORY REVIEW OF TENURE-TRACK
ASSISTANT OR ASSOCIATE PROFESSORS**

Assistant professors with tenure and associate professors after five years who acquire or continue to hold tenure must be reviewed no less frequently than every three years.

DOCUMENTATION REQUIRED

Recommendations for promotion require the same documents as promotion requests for non-tenured assistant or associate professors.

Faculty review that does not result in a recommendation for promotion requires a LETTER OF NEGATIVE DECISION, with supporting reasons from the department chair that will be reviewed by PTAC, the Full Professors Committee, and the dean. If the dean upholds the department's negative decision, the faculty member must be notified by the department chair and a letter describing how that faculty member was notified of the decision: "Chair discussed personally with faculty member and provided a copy of the letter of recommendation" or "Faculty member was notified in writing with supporting reasons," etc. must be forwarded to the dean.

PROMOTION OR REAPPOINTMENT REQUESTS FOR FIXED-TERM FACULTY

DOCUMENTATION REQUIRED

- *1. Updated CURRICULUM Vitae
 - a. UNC School of Dentistry CV format is attached.
 - b. Publications should be cited in the format provided.

2. FOR PROMOTION ONLY
Updated AP-2 (RECOMMENDATION FOR EPA PERSONNEL ACTION)
 - a. Except for items 9-15 (to be completed after School reviews), the AP-2 should be completed in the department and signed by the individual and chair.
 - b. Attachments can be sections of the CV, cross-referenced to AP-2 item.

- *3. LETTER OF RECOMMENDATION from department chair
 - a. See outline of information to be included (Exhibit 7). Note in particular the need for detailed reasons for the recommendation, indicating contributions made by individual toward the education, scholarship, and service programs of the School of Dentistry and University.

- *4. FOR PROMOTION ONLY
SUPPORTING LETTERS of recommendation
 - a. At least 2 letters are required.
 - b. Letters may be requested of faculty within the School of Dentistry or the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill or outside the university.

5. Teaching Portfolio (see section 2.5.3.1.b)

6. AFFIRMATIVE ACTION statement

7. 1-9 (EMPLOYMENT VERIFICATION form), sample attached, with copies of verification documents.

*Submitted to the Promotion and Tenure Advisory Committee and/or assembled Full Professors of the School of Dentistry

Exhibit 6

APPOINTMENT, REAPPOINTMENT AND PROMOTION TRANSMITTAL LETTER OUTLINE

A. Factual Information

1. Name of person being recommended.
2. Identification of the action being recommended, including tenure recommendation.
3. Effective date. NOTE: If the promotion or reappointment confers tenure, the letter should identify if the action is early or on time. (The Chancellor's Advisory Committee defines "early" as anything less than seven years as assistant professor or less than five years as associate professor at UNC-CH.)
4. Notice of contingency on the availability of funds (if applicable) or other contingency (such as attainment of terminal degree).
5. Report of the opinion of the assembled full professors, preferably including whether or not the opinion is unanimous.
6. Description of current or expected duties (*including the percent time effort for each area*).
7. For joint appointments, the percentage of contribution in each department and the rank in each department.

B. Explanation of the Recommendation

1. Identification of the areas (teaching, research, and/or service) on which the recommendation is being based.
2. Teaching
 - a. Overview of what is taught and to whom.
 - b. Assessment of quality of teaching and basis for judgment including summary of evaluative methods used.
 - c. Reference to significant comments, pro and con, in letters of recommendation.
 - d. Mention of any particularly impressive aspects of the candidate's background in preparation for teaching.
 - e. Identification of teaching honors or awards.
 - f. Scholarly aspects of teaching.
3. Research
 - a. Identification of substantive or methodological areas of research interest, including any special information about the interest area ("highly competitive", "new", "not yet well defined", etc.). The research/scholarship career thrust, strategy and emphasis of the candidate should be discussed.
 - b. Discuss the letters. You are required, by rules and ethics, to include all the letters you have received, not just a select subset. You must explain which references were

solicited from the candidate's list and which were solicited by you without any suggestion from the candidate. Explain why each referee was selected and the standing of each referee in the field, especially those of rank other than professor or from institutions that might be considered lower than Carolina.

- c. Departmental standards and expectations for research productivity should be included.
 - d. Summary of refereed and other publications. Also include comments on other peer-reviewed research endeavors, such as grantsmanship. Explain relative roles in multi-author works, indicate the significance of author order and the relative standing of journals in which the candidate has published.
 - e. Critical assessment of the special significance, if any, of contributions to the literature. If applicable, includes critical assessment of any scholarship of service/engagement with reference to non-traditional products of scholarship and research, including policy reports, websites, videos, and other peer-reviewed outcomes.
 - f. Identification and explanation of possible weaknesses in the research record, including weaknesses in the discipline itself.
 - g. Reference to significant comments, pro and con, in letters of recommendation.
 - h. Mention of any particularly impressive aspects of the candidate's research training.
 - i. Identification of honors or recognition received for research.
4. Service and Engagement Activities
 - a. Identification of notable service and engagement activities.
 - b. Reference to significant comments, pro and con, in letters of recommendation.
 - c. Honors or awards for service performed.
 5. Other: Comments on interpersonal skills, organizational citizenship, etc.

Exhibit 7

How to Present an Effective Dossier to the Appointment, Promotion and Tenure Committee

The Appointment, Promotion and Tenure Committee (“APT Committee”) is the third level of faculty review of promotion and tenure decisions. The APT Committee, composed of 12 faculty members, makes recommendations to the Executive Vice Chancellor and Provost, who makes the final decision, subject to confirmation by the Board of Trustees.

The APT Committee has now had two years of experience, and has reviewed over 200 dossiers from across the Chapel Hill campus. These guidelines are provided to department chairs and deans in an effort to ensure that dossiers are presented in as effective a manner as possible.

Recommended order of documents

Form Ap-2

CV

Dean’s letter – demarked with a tab

Chair’s letter

Internal committee report, if submitted

Sample solicitation letter for outside letters of reference

Outside letters of reference – demarked with a tab

Any other necessary material, including teaching evaluations if appropriate

Ap-2

Make sure the dates of all prior appointments are correct.

CV

Preferred order – in every subhead, reverse chronological, most recent first

Personal

Education

Professional experience

Honors

Bibliography – on all items, show author order

Books and chapters, including pages

Refereed papers/articles, including pages

Refereed unpublished oral presentations and/or abstracts

Other refereed works, including book reviews

Teaching record

Grants (source, type of grant, role on project, starting and ending dates)

Professional service

To discipline

Within UNC-Chapel Hill

Additional Information

Research statement

Teaching statement

Focus and brevity are appreciated in both research and teaching statement; these should generally not exceed five pages. Both should include a short statement of future plans.

Dean's Letter

Or signed endorsement on chair's letter

Must show the vote of School's Tenure and Promotion Committee

Attach any document produced by School's Tenure and Promotion Committee

Should address any articulated concerns reflected in negative votes by School's committee or full professors

Need not, and should not, reiterate the chair's letter

From schools without departmental structure, the dean's letter should incorporate the chair's letter information specified below

Chair's Letter – The Most Important Recommendation

The chair's letter should clearly show the considerations influencing the chair's decision to recommend or not recommend the candidate for tenure and/or promotion. The chair should frankly discuss any of his or her misgivings, reflected in negative votes by any member of the department, or noted in any of the letters of reference. Open discussion of misgivings gives the chair's ultimate decision much more credibility than an unalloyed letter of praise when the dossier indicates that some people have misgivings. If the chair quotes from a departmental committee report, it should be attached.

The letter must show the vote of the full professors: yes, no, abstain. If departmental policy calls for taking votes of other ranks, they should be reported also. Discuss any known or suspected reasons for negative votes or abstentions (abstentions are perceived as mildly negative votes). State whether voting is closed (secret ballot) or open.

Discuss the research/scholarship career thrust, strategy and emphases of the candidate.

- Is there a clear path?
- How has it changed over time?
- What is the most promising outcome you can foresee for the scholarly trajectory?
- How does that trajectory mesh with department strategy and needs?
- What is the current national and international visibility and standing of the candidate?

Set the entries in context.

- Explain the departmental standards and expectations for scholarship, teaching and service.
- Explain the importance, percentage of articles accepted, and relative standing of the journals in which the candidate has published.

- If the discipline is one of the rare ones in which certain conferences outrank the journals, explain that.

Discuss the research record in some detail.

- Explain the relative roles in multi-author works, especially when multiple works have the same co-authors.
- Indicate the significance of author order, since disciplines differ radically in their customs in this matter.
- Indicate which items report work done as part of the candidate's dissertation, and which work has been done since joining the UNC Chapel Hill faculty.
- Indicate the relative weight of any publications completed by the candidate before joining the UNC Chapel Hill faculty.
- Note any external evidences of excellence of particular works: best paper awards, favorable reviews, high citation counts, etc.
- Insist that the status of unpublished works be precisely stated. *In press* means the work has been accepted without further revision and has left the author's hands; give the anticipated date of publication. *Accepted and under revision*, *submitted*, and *in preparation* all have precise meanings. *Under contract* does not; it must be supplemented with a clear indication of the state of completion.
- For books, indicate the standing of the press. Explain the relative importance of books versus articles in your discipline. Discuss the importance of textbooks and edited volumes in your discipline.
- For scholarship of service or engagement, indicate the impacts of the scholarship on the communities involved and explain the import to the field of service or inquiry.
- If your field is one in which grant success is a common external measure of research quality, discuss the candidate's success in obtaining extramural funding (other than UNC Chapel Hill grant awards).

Letters of Evaluation

- A minimum of four letters of evaluation are required: all four from outside the institution, all from individuals independent of the candidate, two from a list of names provided by the candidate and two from individuals selected by the department chair or dean, as appropriate. Ideally, all of the letters should come from Research I institutions.
- The purpose of these letters is to provide an independent and unbiased assessment of the individual's national and international reputation. Therefore, the request from the department chair or dean to prospective writers of outside letters of evaluation should be phrased neutrally and should not solicit an affirmative response or recommendation. A copy of the letter requesting an evaluation of the candidate should be included in the dossier. The letters may not be from individuals who have been directly involved with a candidate, e.g., a collaborator, mentor, previous co-worker, former dissertation chair, etc., but may be from individuals who know the candidate through professional interactions, e.g., reviewed the candidate's publications or served on review committees together.

- These requirements for independent outside letters of evaluation apply to all appointment, promotion, and tenure decisions except those at the initial assistant professor level and at the re-appointment as assistant professor without tenure level. For the latter, it is appropriate, indeed essential, for mentors or other individuals more closely connected to the candidate to provide letters of evaluation.
- In addition to the minimum four required independent letters, any number of additional letters from any source may also be submitted. These may be from individuals within the institution with whom the candidate has collaborated or from former colleagues, collaborators, mentors or other individuals connected to the candidate.
- All letters of evaluation that are received must be made an official part of any appointment, promotion and tenure package and must be part of the evaluation process of the candidate under consideration.
- In the appointment/promotion packet, each outside letter should have a designation in its upper right hand corner indicating whether the writer of the letter was suggested by the candidate or was chosen by the department chair or dean.

Discuss the letters. You are required, by rule and ethics, to include all the letters you received, not a selected subset.

- Explain which referees were solicited from the candidate's list and which were selected by you without any suggestion from the candidate.
- Tell any personal connection between candidate and referee, e.g., dissertation advisor, post-doc mentor.
- Explain why each referee was selected and the standing of each referee in the field, especially those of rank other than professor or from institutions that might be considered as lower rank than Carolina.
- Please don't quote extensively from the several letters, but a few-sentence summary of each is in order.
- Quoting just favorable sentences out of context hurts your credibility – review committees read the letters as well as your summaries of them.

Discuss the teaching record, especially all assessments of teaching effectiveness.

- Include any quantitative data from student evaluations, and discuss trends over time.
- If you have a procedure for gathering non-quantitative student comment, report the results of that process.
- Do not, however, provide input from selected individuals, as opposed to broad categories of students.

Discuss the service record.

The importance of service varies from unit to unit. Explain its role within your school or department, and discuss the candidate's service record.

For Dentistry, discuss the service and engagement record aside from the scholarship of service.

Review in brief form the service and engagement activities undertaken by the candidate. Include assessments of the value of this service if apparent from letters submitted from community partners

or other agencies. While quality of service does not compensate for limitations in scholarship or teaching, a refusal to carry one's share of an institutional service load is a severe demerit.

A final word of advice for chairs to give to candidates.

The dossier will be read by many people; tell them what you would want to know if you were reviewing it. Be straightforward in your recitation of achievements, but omit puffery, such as talks at your department's colloquium. Openness breeds respects; any perceived attempt to manipulate excites challenges.

Exhibit 8

The University of North Carolina
Office of the President

ADMINISTRATIVE MEMORANDUM

SUBJECT Tenure and Teaching in the
University of North Carolina

NUMBER 338

DATE September 28, 1993

I. Introduction

At the November 1992 meeting of the Board of Governors, questions were raised about the procedures and criteria for the awarding of tenure and about the evaluation, recognition, and reward of teaching, particularly in tenure decisions. The Chairman of the Board referred the questions and concerns to two standing committees, the Committee on Personnel and Tenure and the Committee on Educational Planning, Policies, and Programs. The report entitled *Tenure and Teaching in the University of North Carolina*, adopted by the board on September 10, 1993, distilled what was learned by the committees and recommended additional steps to encourage good teaching within the University and to see that the quality of teaching continues to be a prime consideration in tenure decisions.

In its report, the board reaffirmed the concept of tenure. The central question that led to the review was whether sufficient consideration is given to the quality of teaching when tenure decisions are made. The board recognized that the relative importance given to the three major functions of teaching, research, and public service varies at specific institutions depending upon their relative missions. Nevertheless, the report confirms that, regardless of classification, each institution should view teaching as a core requirement. The board states in its long-range plan that teaching or instruction is the primary responsibility of each of the UNC institutions. Thus while neither teaching nor service nor research is the sole measure of a faculty member's competence and contribution at any UNC institution, teaching should be the first consideration at all of the UNC institutions.

II. Recommendations

This memorandum lists the recommendations adopted by the Board of Governors and provides instructions to be followed by the constituent institutions in complying with them.

1. *That the Board of Governors, through the President of the University, instruct the Chancellors of each constituent institution to do the following:*
 - a. *Review institutional mission statements, tenure policies, and the criteria for making faculty personnel decision and, where necessary, to revise them so as to give explicit recognition to the primary importance of teaching in the University;*
 - b. *Revise institutional policies and procedures, as necessary, to require (1) that clear and specific statements of criteria for evaluation of faculty performance at every level (institution, college/school, department) are provided in writing and discussed with each probationary faculty member before initial employment and at the beginning of the first term of employment and with each candidate being reviewed for reappointment or tenure at the beginning of the year in which the review is scheduled to be made, and (2) that a record of these discussions be kept in the individual's personnel file;*
 - c. *Review procedures for the evaluation of faculty performance to ensure (1) that student evaluations and formal methods of peer review are included in teaching evaluation procedures, (2) that student evaluations are conducted at regular intervals (at least one semester each year) and on an ongoing basis, (3) that peer review of faculty includes direct observation of the classroom teaching of new and non-tenured faculty and of graduate teaching assistants, and (4) that appropriate and timely feedback from evaluations of performance is provided to those persons being reviewed.*

Any proposed revisions to institutional mission statements necessitated by the review referenced in Recommendation 1.a. should be submitted to the President by January 21, 1994 so that they can be acted upon prior to adoption of the revised long-range plan. A full report on actions taken in response to Recommendation 1 with respect to criteria for faculty personnel decisions and policies and procedures for evaluation of faculty teaching performance at both the undergraduate and graduate levels should be sent to this office by April 4, 1994. Proposed changes to tenure policies and regulations, which require the approval of the President and the board, should be separately identified in the report.

2. *That the President of the University be asked to report on these reviews to the Board of Governors by July 1, 1994.*
3. *That the Board of Governors, through the President of the University, call upon the chancellors of institutions which do not now have awards for outstanding teaching to establish such awards either campus-wide or at the school/college level.*

Institutions that do not now have awards for outstanding teaching should submit a report on those actions taken in response to Recommendation 3 by April 4, 1994.

4. *That the Board of Governors create annual system-wide teaching awards with monetary stipends which are designated "Board of Governors' Awards for Excellence in Teaching." (The Chairman of the Board of Governors should name an ad hoc committee to work out the details and present recommendations concerning implementation of this proposal.)*

Chairman Poole has appointed an ad hoc committee to work out the details to implement the awards. Institutions are invited to submit recommendations or suggestions by December 1, 1993 for the consideration of this committee.

5. *That the Board of Governors seek appropriations for each campus in biennial budget requests to establish or to strengthen centers and activities designed to encourage and support teaching excellence and to improve teaching effectiveness throughout the University.*

The report recognized the special efforts of many institutions to emphasize professional development activities intended to have a direct and positive impact on teaching. But it also acknowledged that great efforts need to be made in this regard at a number of campuses, especially those with limited resources available for such initiatives. Despite financial strains, it declared that "each institution should allocate a portion of its budget for faculty development and target a specific part of that for the development of teachers and teaching." It is the board's clear expectation that an institution which does not have a special center for teaching and learning should plan to create such a center as soon as possible. The report also urged institutions to provide tangible incentives and encouragement for tenured and non-tenured faculty and graduate teaching assistants to take advantage of these professional development opportunities. In addition, Recommendation 5 commits the board to seek appropriations in biennial budget requests to give greater support to centers and activities designed to encourage and support teaching excellence.

6. *That greater efforts be made to develop and strengthen the teaching skills of graduate students, and that the Board of Governors ask the President to prepare, in consultation with the University-wide Graduate Council, a report with specific guidelines and recommendations for the training, monitoring, and evaluation of graduate students who teach courses in UNC institutions.*

A committee from the University-wide Graduate Council is addressing this recommendation and should report to General Administration by February 1, 1994. Thereafter, the Council's proposals will be shared with constituent institutions for their reactions and comments.

Copies of the report on *Tenure and Teaching in the University of North Carolina* are being printed and will be provided to constituent institutions. Chancellors should ensure that the report is disseminated as widely as possible among the faculty, and especially among department chairs and members of department personnel committees.

C.D. Spangler, Jr.

cc: Chief Academic Officer

Summary of deadlines (please submit three copies of each response):

December 1, 1993 Recommendations or suggestions to Board of Governors ad hoc committee on Awards for Excellence in Teaching (Recommendation 4).

January 21, 1994 Proposed revisions to institutional mission statements (Recommendation 1.a.).

April 4, 1994 Report on actions taken (or proposed, where the President's and the board's approval is required) in response to Recommendation 1 and 3.

Recommendations from Tenure and Teaching Report

1. *That the Board of Governors, through the President of the University, instruct the Chancellors of each constituent institution to do the following:*
 - a. *Review institutional mission statements, tenure policies, and the criteria for making faculty personnel decisions and, where*

necessary, to revise them so as to give explicit recognition to the primary importance of teaching in the University;

- b. Revise institutional policies and procedures, as necessary, to require (1) that clear and specific statements of criteria for evaluation of faculty performance at every level (institution, college/school, department) are provided in writing and discussed with each probationary faculty member before initial employment and at the beginning of the first term of employment and with each candidate being reviewed for reappointment or tenure at the beginning of the year in which the review is scheduled to be made, and (2) that a record of these discussions be kept in the individual's personnel file;
 - c. Review procedures for the evaluation of faculty performance to ensure (1) that student evaluations and formal methods of peer review are included in teaching evaluation procedures, (2) that student evaluations are conducted at regular intervals (at least one semester each year) and on an ongoing basis, (3) that peer review of faculty includes direct observation of the classroom teaching of new and non-tenured faculty and of graduate teaching assistants, and (4) that appropriate and timely feedback from evaluations of performance is provided to those persons being reviewed.
2. That the President of the University be asked to report on these reviews to the Board of Governors by July 1, 1994.
 3. That the Board of Governors, through the President of the University, call upon the chancellors of institutions which do not now have awards for outstanding teaching to establish such awards either campus-wide or at the school/college level.
 4. That the Board of Governors create annual system-wide teaching awards with monetary stipends which are designated "Board of Governors' Awards for Excellence in Teaching." (The Chairman of the Board of Governors should name an ad hoc committee to work out the details and present recommendations concerning implementation of this proposal.)
 5. That the Board of Governors seek appropriations for each campus in biennial budget requests to establish or to strengthen centers and activities designed to encourage and support teaching excellence and to improve teaching effectiveness throughout the University.
 6. That greater efforts be made to develop and strengthen the teaching skills of graduate students, and that the Board of Governors ask the President to prepare, in consultation with the University-wide

Graduate Council, a report with specific guidelines and recommendations for the training, monitoring, and evaluation of graduate students who teach courses in UNC institutions.

Institutional reports on actions taken in response to Recommendation 3 with respect to criteria for faculty personnel decisions and policies and procedures for evaluation of faculty teaching performance at both the undergraduate and graduate levels were to be submitted to the President by April 4, 1994. Any proposed changes to tenure policies and regulations which would require the approval of the President and the Board were to be separately identified.

Institutions that did not have awards for outstanding teaching were to submit a report on actions taken in response to Recommendations 3 by April 4, 1994.

Institutional responses to that memorandum were submitted in April and included copies of policy statements, revised faculty manuals and handbooks, faculty evaluation policies, and other materials. The responses provide clear evidence of substantial progress, especially in the evaluation of teaching. Those institutional responses are summarized in this report.

Institutional Responses to Recommendation #1

1a. Review of Mission Statements

Institutional mission statements were reviewed by all of the constituent institutions. The mission statements, whether unchanged or revised, were presented to the Board of Governors' Committee on Educational Planning, Policies, and Programs at its meeting on June 9, 1994. As a result of their reviews, 11 institutions revised their statements with respect to teaching, while the remaining five institutions saw no need for changes in that regard. The committee suggested some minor revisions in a few of the statements. The statements will be presented to the full board to be acted upon when the board adopts a revised long-range plan this fall.

1a. Review of Tenure Policies and Criteria for Making Faculty Personnel Decisions

Institutions reviewed their overall tenure regulations and criteria for making faculty personnel decisions. Based upon their reviews, seven institutions (Appalachian State University, Pembroke State University, UNC-Asheville, UNC-Charlotte, UNC-Wilmington, Western Carolina University, and Winston-Salem University) reported that their current university policies and criteria were in compliance

with the recommendations of the report on tenure and teaching in the University. Eight institutions (Each Carolina University, Fayetteville State University, North Carolina A&T State University, North Carolina Central University, North Carolina School of the Arts, North Carolina State University, UNC-Chapel Hill and UNC-Greensboro) indicated either (1) that reviews had been completed and changes had been approved which would be in effect in the 1994-1995 academic year, or (2) that extensive reviews were underway and that final reports and recommendations had not yet been approved. One institution (Elizabeth City State University) did not report explicitly on "tenure policies and the criteria for faculty personnel decisions" as such, but did indicate that the requirements of the board had been embodied in the criteria for evaluation of faculty performance.

1b. Review of Statements of Criteria for Evaluation of Faculty Performance and Adequate Communication of those Criteria to Faculty Members

These reviews were conducted by chief academic officers, deans, department heads, and, on most campuses, by special committees or task forces. Five institutions (Elizabeth City State University, Pembroke State University, UNC-Asheville, UNC-Wilmington, and Western Carolina University) report that they were either already in full compliance with the specific requirements of the Board of Governors or had completed revisions necessary to be in compliance. Nine other institutions (Appalachian State University, East Carolina University, Fayetteville State University, North Carolina A&T State University, North Carolina Central University, North Carolina School of the Arts, UNC-Chapel Hill, UNC-Greensboro, and Winston-Salem University have completed draft revisions of basic documents which should be approved and in place by the beginning of the Fall Semester, 1994. At the two remaining campuses (North Carolina State University and UNC-Greensboro), departmental reviews and revisions are underway, and full compliance with the requirements of Recommendation 1b. will be effective during the 1994-95 academic year.

1c. Review of Procedures for Evaluation of Faculty Performance

As noted in the report on Tenure and Teaching in the University of North Carolina, there are standing committees at every institution which are responsible for evaluating faculty performance. The committees render their judgments based upon multiple forms of assessment by students and professional colleagues.

At the time of the report, in every institution and in virtually every department within the University students assessment instruction and instructors through formal, regular, and written evaluations. As a result of the report and the subsequent Presidential directive,

student evaluations will now be required in every department on a regular, ongoing basis. All institutions report that this requirement has been included in their faculty evaluation policies.

Beyond the implementation of the new requirement, standing and special committees and task forces are endeavoring to improve approaches to student evaluations, e.g., through better classroom rating forms, more systematic exit interviews of graduating seniors, and more frequent surveys of former students.

Other than student ratings, the most common way of assessing teacher performance is peer review. A 1993 survey and the report on tenure and teaching revealed that there were schools and departments on every campus which included in their peer review process formal arrangements for direct classroom visits for the explicit purpose of evaluation. These visits were made by the department chairperson, one or two faculty colleagues, members of the departmental personnel committee, the dean, or others. Such visits were mandatory in many instances, especially when the individual faculty member was being reviewed for reappointment, tenure, or promotion. Most such visits, however, were voluntary and by invitation.

The report on tenure and teaching noted that faculty members have numerous other opportunities to observe a colleague's performance, for example, when classroom visits are made for purposes of accreditation or reaccreditation, when courses are team-taught by several instructors, when faculty members serve as guest lecturers in colleague's classes, and when individuals make presentations within and beyond their departments in special forums and lecture series.

Nevertheless, the Board of Governors approved a recommendation requiring the direct observation by peers of the classroom teaching of new and nontenured faculty and of graduate teaching assistants.

The constituent institutions are making serious and sustained efforts to translate that directive into effective practice. Chief administrators, faculty senates/councils, standing and special committees have developed, or are still in process of developing, the necessary procedures for use in every department on campus. This involves careful delineation of procedures concerning: (1) when and under what conditions visitations will take place, including the notice to be provided the faculty to be visited; (2) the frequency of such visits; (3) the number and selection of reviewers; (4) the specific process to be used for the visitations, including pre-visit consultation with the candidate; (5) the criteria and forms to be used in evaluations; (6) the form and timing of the feedback to be provided

to the faculty member visited; and (7) the use of the documentation in the formal process for reappointment and tenure.

With one exception, all of the institutions have these formal procedures in place now or expect to have them in place during the Fall Semester, 1994. Appalachian State University indicated that the procedures will be completed and approved during the 1994-95 academic year and will be in practice in the Fall Semester of 1995.

Institutional Responses to Recommendation #3

Establishment of Teaching Awards

At the time of our 1993 survey and the adoption of the report on tenure and teaching, there were institutional or campus-wide awards for outstanding teaching at 11 of the constituent institutions. Appalachian State University, which once had institutional awards, and North Carolina A&T University reported awards only at the college or school level. Three institutions did not currently make awards for outstanding teaching (Elizabeth City State University, North Carolina Central University, and North Carolina School of the Arts).

Since the adoption of the report on tenure and teaching, Elizabeth City State University has developed a structure for teaching awards that will be initiated for the 1994-95 academic year, North Carolina Central University initiated an institutional awards program and made three awards for teaching excellence at the May 1994 commencement exercises, and Appalachian State University has reinstated an institutional level award. The Faculty Council at the North Carolina School of the Arts has established a committee to make recommendations for an awards program, and that committee will make its recommendations consistent with the guidelines adopted by the Board of Governors on April 8, 1994.

In addition, the Board of Governors has allocated \$125,000 from overhead receipts for each year of the current biennium to the 16 constituent institutions to establish additional faculty awards for excellence in teaching. Each institution is to file an annual report to the Board of Governors on the internal distribution and use of these funds.

Conclusion

The reports that we have received from the campuses on steps taken to implement the new requirements are most encouraging. Serious efforts are being made on an unprecedented scale to improve the ways that we identify, recognize, and reward good teaching throughout the University. It is clear that substantial progress is being made to clarify our priorities, our standards, and our procedures for making faculty personnel policies and

decisions. Much is being done, also, to ensure more focused, structured, and extensive evaluation of faculty performance, especially of teaching effectiveness. There is clear evidence that the results of that evaluation will be taken into account whenever decisions are to be made concerning appointment, reappointment, promotion, and the awarding of tenure to faculty members.

We shall continue to monitor these efforts closely, and another progress report will be presented to the Board of Governors in the spring of 1995.

Exhibit 9

Sample Solicitation Letter for an External Letter of Recommendation

Dear _____

The Department/School of _____ is reviewing the qualifications of Dr. J. Smith for promotion from assistant professor to associate professor with tenure to be effective --/--/--. The Department/School will base its recommendation concerning Dr. Smith primarily on the value of his/her contributions in research, teaching, and service. I write to seek your opinion about Dr. Smith's worthiness for this promotion. To aid in your review of his/her qualifications and contributions, his/her curriculum vitae and his/her most recent and, according to him/her, most important publications are enclosed.

With respect to scholarly activity, we are particularly interested in placing Dr. Smith's work in a national context. We would value, therefore, your evaluation of the importance of his/her area of study and of the significance of his/her contributions to it. We are also interested in your opinion of his/her stature relative to peers nationally. Please use whatever criteria you think are appropriate in making these assessments. It would be most helpful, however, if you could provide us a summary of those criteria.

We are also very interested in any assessment you are able to make about the quality of Dr. Smith's teaching and professional service contributions. These areas are understandably more difficult to assess than scholarship, but any evaluative comments you may be able to provide would be appreciated. In addition, we would benefit from having your thoughts concerning Dr. Smith's interpersonal skills, organizational citizenship, and other such intangibles.

Please understand that your assessments will be used to evaluate Dr. Smith in light of our own promotion and tenure criteria. Therefore, recommendations from reviewers as to whether Dr. Smith would be promoted at their own institutions are discouraged.

If you agree to serve as an external peer consultant, we would require your report being in our hands by _____.

Finally, we want to acknowledge our gratitude to you for assisting us in accomplishing one of the most significant responsibilities in the modern research university. We place great importance on detail, quality, and thoroughness of the information we receive from external peer consultants for tenure and promotion recommendations. Thank you for the care you take in preparing the requested evaluations.

Sincerely,

Department Chair

4.4 REFERENCES:

Scholarship Reconsidered: Priorities of the Professoriate, by Ernest L. Boyer (The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching,). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, Inc., 1990.

CCPH (Community-Campus Partnerships for Health) Linking Scholarship and Communities: Report of the Commission on Community-Engaged Scholarship in the Health Professions. Seattle: 2005.

Scholarship Assessed: Evaluation of the Professoriate: A Special Report, by Charles Glassick, Mary Taylor Huber and Gene I. Maeroff (The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching,). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1997.