



UNC
PHARMACY

***POLICIES AND PROCEDURES GOVERNING APPOINTMENTS, REAPPOINTMENTS,
PROMOTION, AND TENURE FOR FACULTY IN THE SCHOOL OF PHARMACY***

I. PREAMBLE

A. STATEMENT OF PURPOSE. This document has been developed to summarize and communicate the philosophy, policies, and procedures underlying considerations of faculty appointment, reappointment, promotion, tenure, and post-tenure review in the School of Pharmacy, the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill. The School of Pharmacy has a broad-ranging mission encompassing teaching at the professional, graduate, and post-graduate levels, including continuing education; developing and maintaining individual, and contributing to collaborative, research programs of distinction; and providing service to a variety of constituencies, including state and local health practitioners and societies that support the various scientific disciplines comprising pharmacy and the pharmaceutical sciences. It is unrealistic to expect that each individual member of the faculty will contribute equally, at the highest level, to all aspects of this mission. For the purposes of faculty personnel actions, it therefore is important to identify and, wherever possible, recognize the specific contributions of faculty to the mission of the School. This document is intended, in part, to provide philosophical and practical guidelines to accomplish this important task.

B. STATEMENT OF VALUES. The School of Pharmacy aspires to lead the state, the nation, and the world in all aspects of its mission, as articulated in the School's Vision and Mission Statement. Consequently, the faculty of the School of Pharmacy must strive to be nationally-recognized leaders in their individual areas of expertise; it is expected that, irrespective of their rank, type of appointment, or area of expertise, all faculty in the School of Pharmacy will pursue scholarly activities in some form. Thus, the degree to which the School values and rewards each member of the faculty is dependent to a large extent on the impact of the individual's scholarship. Although many definitions may be offered, for the purposes of this document *scholarship* is defined as *the creation, dissemination, and application of new knowledge, or the synthesis of existing knowledge in novel ways or in a manner that allows practical application to an identifiable problem*. Areas of scholarship include discovery, education, and application, and are described in Section III below. Academic freedom, as it relates to the scholarly activities of faculty, is a core value of the School of Pharmacy. Indeed, it is the policy of The University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill to maintain and encourage full freedom of its faculty to pursue, within the law, scholarship in all its forms, and to protect its faculty from influence that would restrict the exercise of such freedom. The complete statement of the University's position on academic freedom may be found in the *Trustee Policies and Regulations Governing Academic Tenure in the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill* (<http://www.unc.edu/faculty/faccoun/tenure/>).

C. CONGRUENCY WITH UNIVERSITY POLICY. Faculty appointments, reappointments, and promotions in the School of Pharmacy, together with relevant tenure

considerations, are recommended in accordance with *The Trustee Policies and Regulations Governing Academic Tenure in the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill* (<http://www.unc.edu/faculty/faccoun/tenure/>). This document provides guidelines and serves to clarify additional requirements for faculty appointments in the School of Pharmacy.

II. DEFINITION OF APPOINTMENT SERIES AND FACULTY RANKS

A. APPOINTMENT SERIES

i. **Tenure track.** Tenure-track appointments are intended for those faculty who will contribute full-time effort to all three general mission areas of the School: teaching (in any of the School's curricula), research, and service (which may include patient care). Within these three mission areas it is anticipated that, at the point of hire, one will be identified as the dominant area of concentration. For eventual consideration of promotion or tenure, performance in the dominant area of concentration will be the most important area of assessment.

ii. **Clinical track.** Clinical-track appointments are of fixed term (from one to five years), and are intended for those faculty who focus the majority of their efforts on teaching (predominantly in the professional curriculum) and/or service (including patient care). These faculty generally receive full or partial compensation from the University and/or AHEC. As is the case for all individuals with faculty appointments, clinical-track faculty are expected to be engaged in scholarly pursuits, consistent with their appointment to the faculty.

iii. **Research track.** Research-track appointments also are of fixed term (from one to five years), and are intended for those faculty whose scope of activity is more limited than that expected in the tenure track. Faculty with research-track appointments focus their efforts on research, usually in association with a tenure-track member of the faculty. There is an expectation that, although research-track faculty often work closely with, and are financially dependent on, a member of the tenure-track faculty, these individuals will be in the process of becoming independent scholars (e.g., will submit grant proposals as the PI, will take the lead role on relevant publications, and will assist in the laboratory-based training of more junior colleagues).

iv. **Adjunct.** Adjunct appointments are of fixed term (from one to five years), and are intended for individuals who may contribute to one or more aspects of the School's mission, but are not employed in full or in part by the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill.

v. **Visiting.** Visiting appointments are of brief duration (one year or less, with the option for one successive reappointment for a term not to exceed one year) and are intended for individuals who are not employed by the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill. Visiting faculty may receive full or partial compensation from the University, but do not receive benefits.

vi. **Joint.** Joint appointments may be made in conjunction with one or more other schools, departments, or units, and may be applicable to any of the foregoing appointment series. Although faculty with joint appointments often derive salary from each of the appointing units, the sharing of the salary burden is not a requirement for a joint appointment. However, all

units participating in a particular joint appointment also should participate in appropriate review of faculty appointment, particularly with respect to issues of reappointment, promotion, tenure and post-tenure review.

B. RANKS

i. **Instructor.** The instructor rank is appropriate for one appointed to the faculty with the expectation of eventual progression to the professorial ranks, either at the University of North Carolina or another academic institution. Unlike other faculty ranks, initial appointment to the rank of instructor is for a probationary term of one year. The instructor may be reappointed successively for three additional one-year terms.

ii. **Assistant professor.** The assistant professor rank represents an entry-level appointment, regardless of the specific appointment series. This rank typically applies to the first appointment in a faculty capacity, although individuals with substantial, relevant experience (e.g., in industry, government service, etc.) may receive an initial appointment at a higher rank.

iii. **Associate professor.** The associate professor rank represents the next level in rank after that of assistant professor. Appointment at, or promotion to, the rank of associate professor is reserved for those individuals who have documented significant accomplishments in their areas of scholarship, and have been recognized as experts in that area outside the boundaries of the University (typically at the national level).

iv. **Professor.** The rank of professor is reserved for those individuals who are clearly advanced in their areas of scholarship, with a body of work consistent with sustained excellence that establishes a reputation of leadership that is national or international in scope. Appointment at, or promotion to, the rank of professor, regardless of appointment series, is based on demonstration of significant and sustained impact of the individual's work within her or his defined area(s) of scholarship.

III. CRITERIA FOR APPOINTMENT, REAPPOINTMENT, AND PROMOTION

A. AREAS OF SCHOLARSHIP

i. **Education.** The *scholarship of education* involves both the practice of teaching (i.e., those characteristics that lead to being considered a “good teacher”), and intellectual pursuits that advance the educational process in the pharmacy/pharmaceutical sciences arena. Such scholarship may generate new information, or may utilize existing information in new or novel ways. This information should be shared through appropriate publications and presentations, and thereby have the capacity to influence educators outside the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill.

ii. **Discovery.** The *scholarship of discovery* may be viewed primarily as those activities that lead to the creation and dissemination of new knowledge. As such, this is the area of scholarship that is most readily identifiable with “research universities”, and one that is most amenable to quantification. In the simplest of terms, the scholarship of discovery is most

often viewed as “pure” or “basic” research. As with all forms of scholarship, there is the expectation that the results of these activities will be published and presented, and will influence other investigators working in the individual’s area of expertise outside of the home institution.

iii. **Application.** The *scholarship of application* focuses on bringing contemporary knowledge to bear on problems of consequence to individuals, institutions, or society. An important historical responsibility of professional schools is the connection of theory with practice. This connection is not service *per se*, which is an element of being a broadly contributing member of an organization (an important but separate issue), but rather is a dynamic, iterative relationship between basic research and practical utility. The scholarship of application could generate new knowledge or enhanced understanding of the subject matter under investigation; this information should be amenable to dissemination through appropriate publications and presentations, and influences other investigators or practitioners outside of the home institution. Many components of translational, clinical, health services, and social behavioral research fall within this category of scholarship. In addition, faculty who spend the majority of their time in clinical practice would focus their scholarship efforts in the area of *scholarship of application*.

B. OTHER AREAS OF POTENTIAL FACULTY RESPONSIBILITY

i. **Administration.** Many faculty have significant administrative activities as an element of their individual responsibilities. While such activities fall outside the usual scope of faculty endeavors, the “faculty-administrator” model demands assessment of the quality of one’s administrative efforts and leadership qualities, their impact on the institution, and the degree to which the time commitment to those efforts might detract from the individual’s scholarly work. It is important to note that administrative activities *per se*, even significant activities of the highest quality, cannot serve as the primary basis for promotion and tenure, as those are decisions that are based primarily on the candidate’s scholarly activities. However, documentation of the candidate’s administrative responsibilities and their impact, when the candidate is truly a “faculty-administrator” (i.e., has retained all the traditional elements of faculty responsibility in addition to an administrative assignment), provides an additional point of reference.

ii. **Professional/community service.** Virtually all faculty activities are pursued in a communal environment. The University is a community of scholars; professional associations represent loosely-defined communities of individuals with similar interests and expertise; faculty who pursue their scholarly endeavors in a state-supported institution are, to some extent, responsible to the state-wide community. An important element, therefore, is the degree to which an individual works effectively in this communal environment, and the degree to which one’s efforts benefit the community at large. To a large extent, the ability to work in a communal environment for the benefit of the entire community may be viewed as an essential characteristic of a broadly contributing member to the organization.

C. METRICS FOR DOCUMENTING ACADEMIC PRODUCTIVITY. It is incumbent on the faculty member to document, to the extent possible, her or his contributions to all relevant areas of the School’s mission. In the case of tenure-track faculty, for example, in addition to the expectation of pursuit of scholarship there is an expectation of contribution to the teaching

mission of the School in the professional, graduate, and/or postgraduate/continuing education program(s), and there is an expectation of broad contributions to the organization as reflected by willingness to undertake service commitments to the School, the University, and outside constituencies. For fixed-term faculty, the relevant areas of the School's mission are often more narrowly defined, and the relative emphasis on specific areas is dependent upon the nature of the position and the distribution of effort agreed upon by the faculty member and her or his chair. For example, a faculty member in the clinical track with primary responsibility for teaching in the professional program may have patient care as an important, but secondary, area of responsibility; a faculty member in the research track may have contributions to the School's teaching mission as an important, but secondary, area of responsibility. Regardless of the appointment series, it is important for the candidate to clearly delineate the primary area of responsibility (i.e., the category of activity upon which a case for promotion will be based), to describe all relevant secondary areas of responsibility or activity, and to document performance in each of those areas.

i. **Documenting acceptable performance in scholarship.** Several indicators may be used to communicate performance in this most common area of faculty responsibility. These include, but are not necessarily limited to, the following:

a. **Significance.** Judgment of the impact of an individual's scholarly activities may be based on a number of indicators, including the garnering of competitive, extramural funding; publications in high quality peer-reviewed journals; review articles or chapters in major textbooks; publication of books (as an author or editor); publication of patents; invited and contributed presentations at national/international meetings, at other academic institutions, at corporate entities, or to specific interest groups; service on review panels, editorial boards, scientific advisory boards, and corporate boards; consultation to corporate entities, hospitals, and other healthcare institutions, and assessment of peers external to UNC. It is important to note that these rather traditional metrics generally apply to all areas of scholarship. Invitations to speak, for example, may be based on the development of novel teaching methods or innovative teaching curricula; competitive, extramural funding may be based on activities in the clinic or classroom, as well as the laboratory; leadership roles in patient care-quality improvement, patient guidelines, public health policy, and entrepreneurial activities that translate academic research to application in the society and marketplace are as valid as similar roles in the basic research arena. The guiding principle is that the candidate must take a scholarly approach to her or his activities, must communicate the results of those activities to a relevant audience, and those activities must have demonstrable value to the relevant community or communities of scholars, educators, and/or practitioners.

b. **Innovation.** Innovative scholarship (i.e., work that has the potential to move the discipline forward) may be of significant value to the academic organization and/or the broader community it serves. Many seminal scholarly contributions have developed, over time, from innovative work with limited short-term impact. The degree of innovation in one's scholarship, as well as the potential for longer-term impact, is sometimes difficult to judge but should be thoughtfully considered.

c. **Independence.** The ability of an individual to "stand on one's own" is often used as a hallmark of a mature scholar. However, it must be realized that the

biomedical and foundational sciences for pharmacy have become highly interdisciplinary. In some cases, it is not practical for an individual academician to pursue scholarly work in the absence of collaboration if the work is to be simultaneously significant, innovative, and of sufficient scope to add value to the institution and society. In these cases, the issue is the degree to which an individual contributes important intellectual input to the pursuit of those goals and drives the scholarship forward. It is expected that faculty at the associate and full professor ranks will serve in leadership role(s) for some, but not necessarily all, of their scholarly activities when those activities are pursued on a collaborative basis. In some cases, assessment of the importance of an individual's intellectual contributions to a specified body of work is relatively straightforward, and may be based on such issues as serving as principal investigator on extramural grants or contracts, or being identified as senior/corresponding author on publications. Given the highly collaborative nature of many forms of contemporary scholarship, discretion must be applied to assessing the intellectual contributions of faculty whose scholarly activities have relied significantly upon collaborative relationships and efforts. For these faculty, one important approach is to seek input from key collaborators. However, national/international reputation in the discipline is an indicator of intellectual independence, and it is incumbent upon the candidate to document such a reputation.

The School of Pharmacy values mentoring as an ongoing aspect of career development. It is expected that many junior faculty will enter into mentoring relationships, both formal and informal in nature. The existence of such relationships, and the participation of junior faculty in programs that grant mentored career development awards, is a positive indicator of long-term success, and should not be viewed as a limitation of the individual's independence.

d. *Demonstrable area of focus.* The individual's primary area of focus may be viewed from two perspectives: the general area of scholarship (education, discovery, or application) and the specific discipline or sub-disciplinary area of focus. The faculty member, together with her or his Chair, is expected to articulate clearly the area of scholarship upon which the individual's activities will be judged. The definition of a disciplinary area of focus typically would be determined by the cohesiveness of primary publications and presentations related to a central theme or issue. It is anticipated that a significant portion, but likely not the entirety, of an individual's scholarly work would have such a central focus.

ii. *Documenting acceptable performance in teaching.* Acceptable performance in teaching typically is documented by learner- and peer-review of teaching efficacy. Compilation of student review data, evaluation of changes in student satisfaction over time, comparison of such data with peers in the same disciplinary area, and regular peer review of in-class performance all are important elements in evaluating an educator's contribution to the teaching mission of the School. Other elements include, but are not limited to, such issues as teaching load, service as a coordinator of team-taught courses, activities in the revision of existing courses or the development of new courses or teaching approaches, curricular development on a broad scale, and non-traditional teaching within the professional degree program (e.g., working with honors or independent studies students in a scholarly setting). In addition, the training of graduate students, fellows, and residents outside the classroom setting, as well as participation in other forms of student mentoring relationships such as thesis or dissertation advisory committees, constitute important areas of teaching responsibility.

iii. **Documenting acceptable performance in service.** Acceptable performance in service typically is documented through compilation of service activities; in some cases (typically when service, including administrative or clinical service, is a significant component of the overall expectation of the individual), testimony from key points-of-contact relating to the efficacy and impact of the service commitments may be informative. Such testimony may be obtained in the form of “internal” letters (i.e., written evaluation or assessment from members of the University community). While such letters do not contribute to the requirement for independent evaluation by external experts, they do provide additional context by which certain aspects of performance may be assessed.

iv. **Quantitative versus qualitative performance indicators.** Certain aspects of faculty productivity (e.g., extramural funding; publications and presentations; didactic teaching load; mentoring of students in a research or clinical environment) are amenable to quantitative summary and evaluation. While quantitative aspects are important in a number of ways, many characteristics that are crucial to a comprehensive evaluation of performance (the actual impact of scholarly work; the effectiveness of classroom instruction; the effectiveness and impact of mentoring relationships; the degree to which the individual contributes broadly to the School) defy a truly quantitative approach. The School of Pharmacy does not utilize strict quantitative guidelines for decisions of appointment, reappointment, promotion, or tenure, but rather a balanced approach, utilizing quantitative and qualitative metrics, to formulate recommendations for action.

D. EVALUATING THE METRICS OF ACADEMIC PRODUCTIVITY

i. **General considerations.** The process of evaluating a faculty member for eventual promotion actually begins at the point of hire. As part of the hiring process, the hiring supervisor (in most cases in the School of Pharmacy, this will be the Chair of the Division in which the academic appointment is made) must articulate a clear set of expectations associated with the appointment. These expectations must include statements regarding the dominant area of responsibility for the new faculty member (support of the teaching mission, the provision of service, or the pursuit of scholarship) and the expected distribution of effort among all potential areas of faculty responsibility, and should be developed based on the requirements of the specific position and the career aspirations of the faculty member. Finally, these expectations should be developed and communicated in context of the promotion guidelines for the School of Pharmacy.

When a candidate accepts a faculty appointment, she or he also accepts, in a very formal way, the set of expectations associated with that appointment. While these expectations are assumed to be part of the overall process of negotiating the initial appointment, they are not immutable, and may very well change with time as needs of the Division, the School, and the faculty member change. However, the evolution of such changes in responsibility and expectation must be negotiated and documented (typically at the time of annual reviews). Of course, such changes may impact the individual’s ability to be promoted within the individual’s appointment series. Thus, such changes should only be pursued after due consideration of the School’s promotion guidelines. In the absence of such specificity, the faculty member is afforded little guidance as

she or he progresses through the initial appointment, and success becomes more a matter of chance than something that is planned and managed.

In building the case for promotion, it is incumbent upon both the candidate and the Division Chair to frame that case with respect to the specific expectations of the position. The dominant area of responsibility, i.e., teaching (the discharge of specific responsibilities within one or more of the School's curricula), scholarship (in any of the areas defined above: education, discovery, or application), or service (the discharge of specific responsibilities outside the real of either traditional teaching or scholarship) must be clearly articulated. Performance in that dominant area must be documented in a manner that will allow comprehensive and thoughtful analysis by all individuals involved in the review process. Secondary areas of responsibility must be specified, together with the expectations for contributions in these areas based on the fractional effort that had been negotiated and agreed to by both the faculty member and the Chair.

ii. Tenure-track appointments. The dominant area of responsibility for most, but certainly not all, faculty in the tenure track is scholarship in one or more forms. Consequently, success for a tenure-track faculty member typically would be based on considerations of the quality and impact of that scholarship, and the degree to which that scholarship establishes the candidate as an expert or thought leader within the specific discipline. Typically, the amount (e.g., funding level, duration, and continuity) and type (investigator-initiated, competitive, peer-reviewed) of research support, the number and quality (based on journal reputation) of publications, reviews, book chapters, books, citations of the publications, the degree to which the individual's opinion is sought on review panels, in authoring scholarly texts, or through consultative arrangements, and the general reputation within the field as articulated by external referees are used as indicators of performance as a scholar. It is important to evaluate each of these indicators in context of the individual's area of scholarly focus. For some, investigator-initiated, peer-reviewed funding may be the "gold standard" for research support; for others, those types of funding mechanisms may not be entirely relevant. No *a priori* value can be applied to any of these metrics in the absence of a clear understanding of the individual's area of focus. In addition to scholarship, members of the tenure-track faculty are expected to be involved, at some level, in all traditional areas of faculty responsibility. Thus, it is important to document the quality and impact of the candidate's efforts as an educator and the contributions she or he has made through service commitments.

iii. Clinical-track appointments. The dominant area of responsibility for most, but certainly not all, faculty in the clinical track is teaching, primarily in the professional curriculum. However, some faculty in clinical-track appointments have service (usually the provision of clinical service) as the dominant area of responsibility. It is important to bear in mind that fixed-term appointments, including those in the clinical track, are made to address a targeted area of need. Faculty with fixed-term appointments must always be mindful of their primary obligation to the School (the targeted area of need), and therefore should be evaluated from that perspective.

As the primary area of responsibility addresses a specific and identifiable need, performance in that area is easily communicated. For example, with respect to positions intended to primarily support the School's educational mission, were teaching obligations fulfilled, and did they have a positive impact? Did the candidate evidence innovation in fulfilling these obligations, and apply

her or his unique experiences and intellect to those obligations? Similar questions may be posed for faculty in positions intended primarily to support the School's service mission.

In the fixed-term appointment series, scholarship remains an important element of any faculty appointment, and therefore will be evaluated during promotion. The expectations for scholarship, in terms of quality, impact, and independence, must be viewed in context of the candidate's primary responsibilities and the fractional effort (negotiated with her or his Chair) that can be devoted to scholarly pursuits. Nevertheless, the candidate must be able to document activities in a relevant area of scholarship (through publications, presentations, and/or extramural support) and must demonstrate clear intellectual contributions (through leadership roles in activities related to scholarship; senior authorship of manuscripts, texts, or presentations; testimony of individuals with whom the candidate has collaborated).

iv. Research-track appointments. The dominant area of responsibility for faculty in the research track is, by definition, scholarship. In the context of promotion, the hallmark characteristic for success in this appointment series is an increasing level of independence. Has the candidate experienced success in garnering independent research support? Has the candidate begun to make unique intellectual contributions to projects for which she or he is not the principal investigator? Has the candidate taken a lead role in publications or presentations? Is the candidate sought by others outside the organization (i.e., has the candidate begun to establish a reputation in her or his area of scholarship)?

As with any faculty appointment, the scope of activities must not be so narrow that it focuses on only one of the traditional areas of faculty responsibility. It is expected that faculty in the research track will contribute, perhaps in a modest way, to the educational and service missions of the School. Often, such faculty may contribute to the graduate program by providing material for didactic courses or through interacting with graduate students in the research setting. Service activities may include internal committee assignments or contributions to the relevant community of scholars through such activities as reviewing manuscripts for publication. However, as is the case for clinical-track appointments, the performance of research-track faculty in these secondary areas must be interpreted based on the fractional effort that can be devoted to such activities.

v. Adjunct appointments. Adjunct faculty are appointed to address very specific, narrowly-defined areas of need (e.g., providing a limited number of lectures, serving on graduate student committees). Often, these individuals are not otherwise associated with an academic organization, and therefore have no expectations for the pursuit of scholarship in the context of their primary employment. Appointment at, or promotion to, a specific rank in the adjunct series must be appropriate for the stature of the individual in her or his field of specialization.

vi. Joint appointments. The approach to evaluating faculty with joint appointments in a specific series is not different than that described above. However, all relevant units partnering in the joint appoint must be participants in the evaluation leading to promotion.

E. OTHER FACTORS

i. **Professional collegiality.** Most endeavors undertaken by faculty require interpersonal interactions (with students, colleagues, support staff, and external constituencies). The School of Pharmacy strives to maintain a collegial environment that fosters open discourse, and values the diversity of background and opinion inherent in a major research university. An expectation of all faculty is the ability to operate effectively in this environment.

ii. **Institutional needs and resources.** Decisions regarding appointment, reappointment, and tenure always consider the needs of the School and the resources that are available to address those needs. In some cases, the decision to not reappoint an individual may be related to institutional constraints, rather than the accomplishments or capabilities of the individual faculty member. As described in the University Trustee Policies and Regulations document, the conferral of tenure requires, among other things, an assessment of institutional needs and resources. Should these needs and resources not be forthcoming, the University may withhold tenure, reappointment, or promotion on any grounds other than those specifically stated to be impermissible in the Trustee Policies and Regulations document.

IV. CHARACTERISTICS FOR APPOINTMENT AT, OR PROMOTION TO, ADVANCED FACULTY RANKS

A. Associate Professor. The transition from assistant professor to associate professor in any of the appointment series (tenure-track, clinical-track, research-track, or adjunct), or initial appointment at the rank of associate professor, is based on the following characteristics: evidence of appropriate professional development (as assessed through the metrics of academic productivity described in preceding sections of this document); evidence for the potential for continued professional development; relevance of the candidate's scholarly activities to the mission of the Division and the School; evidence that the candidate has made important intellectual contributions to a defined area of scholarship; evidence that the candidate has developed a reputation, as an expert in her or his field, external to the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill (on the regional, national, or international level); evidence that the candidate contributes appropriately and effectively to the teaching mission(s) of the School; evidence that the candidate provides effective service to the scientific/professional community at a level appropriate for time in rank; evidence that the candidate contributes broadly to the Division, School, and University. An important hallmark of this transition is evidence that the candidate has indeed developed a defined body of scholarly work. In those cases in which the scholarship is truly collaborative, it is incumbent on the candidate to demonstrate that she or he not only made important intellectual contributions, but served as an important intellectual driving force for the work. The degree to which the candidate has met this standard may be ascertained, in part, by invitations to speak at professional meetings or to provide lectures at other academic institutions; senior authorship on manuscripts or scholarly reviews; or service on review panels, editorial boards, scientific advisory boards, and leadership roles in grant applications.

B. Professor. The transition from associate professor to professor in any of the appointment series (tenure-track, clinical-track, research-track, or adjunct), or initial appointment at the rank of professor, builds upon the characteristics established or considered in promotion from assistant professor to associate professor. The candidate must be able to demonstrate the following: evidence of sustained intellectual contributions to scholarly activities in a well-defined area; recognition as a national or, in the usual case, an international authority in the

discipline of specialization; evidence of sustained contributions to the teaching missions of the School at a high level (effectiveness and significance of contributions are equally important elements); evidence of sustained service commitments (to the School, University, scientific discipline, profession) at a high level. As with promotion to the rank of associate professor, an important aspect for consideration is the degree to which the candidate can demonstrate the importance of her or his individual contributions to shaping a defined area of inquiry.

V. OTHER POTENTIAL ACTIONS

A. **SUSPENSION, DIMINISHMENT IN RANK, DISCHARGE.** During any fixed or probationary term appointment and while on permanent tenure, a faculty member may be suspended, diminished in rank or discharged from employment only on the grounds and in accordance with the procedures as outlined in the Trustee Policies and Regulations documentation.

B. **NON-REAPPOINTMENT.** A decision not to reappoint upon expiration of a probationary term at the rank of Instructor, Assistant Professor or Associate Professor in the tenure track may be made in the first instance by the Dean of the School of Pharmacy upon the recommendation of the appropriate Division Chair and after consultation with the assembled Full Professors Committee. A decision not to reappoint is final, except as it may subsequently be reviewed in accordance with the guidelines of the Trustee Policies and Regulations document. Such a decision may take into account, in whole or in part, any factors deemed relevant to total institutional interests, including funding and programmatic need. However, the decision not to reappoint may not be based upon (1) exercise by the faculty member or rights of freedom of speech guaranteed by the First Amendment to the Constitution of the United States or by Article 1 of the Constitution of North Carolina, or (2) discrimination based upon race, sex, religion, sexual orientation, or national origin of the faculty member, or (3) personal malice. A decision not to reappoint shall be communicated in writing to the faculty member by the Dean within the times prescribed by the Trustee Policies and Regulations document. This document details the procedures a faculty member must follow to request an administrative conference and, if necessary, review by a hearings committee, the Chancellor and the Board of Trustees.

VI. TENURE

A. **POLICIES GOVERNING THE GRANTING OF TENURE.** Academic tenure refers to the conditions and guarantees that apply to a faculty member's employment. More specifically, it refers to the protection of a faculty member against involuntary suspension or discharge from, or termination of employment with, the University, except upon specified grounds and in accordance with specified procedures. This information may be found in the Trustees Policies and Regulations Governing Academic Tenure document.

Tenure is not earned, but rather is granted by the University following 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

and public service. Tenure may be withheld on any grounds other than those specifically stated to be impermissible in the Trustee Policies and Regulations.

B. POLICIES GOVERNING POST-TENURE REVIEW. The fundamental purpose of post-tenure review in the School of Pharmacy is to advance the School's mission. In order to achieve this purpose, the review process should assist individual faculty members in their ongoing professional development, in particular in their efforts to enhance their skills as educators, their accomplishments as scholars, and their contributions to the profession and the public. The review process is intended to foster constructive dialogue between colleagues, a dialogue characterized by fairness, mutual respect, a desire to learn, open-mindedness, and appreciation for the importance of academic freedom. The process of review also serves to enhance a sense of accountability within the School of Pharmacy and the University. The process conforms to the Framework for Implementation of Post-Tenure Review adopted by the University's Board of Trustees and the University Board of Governors. The system of post-tenure review supplements, rather than substitutes for, other systems of review, including annual reviews, reviews for promotion, or reviews associated with other personnel actions taken pursuant to University policies on matters relating to faculty conduct and performance.

A post-tenure review is conducted every five years from the effective date of conferred permanent tenure. The fundamental purpose of post-tenure review in the School of Pharmacy is to ensure that all tenured faculty are contributing to achieving the School's mission and maintaining the School's leadership role in scholarship. An important characteristic of many programs in the School of Pharmacy is the emphasis on interdisciplinary (team) approaches to targeted areas of excellence.

All members of the faculty of the School of Pharmacy are expected throughout their careers to maintain the standards of excellence in teaching, scholarship, and service that are set forth in this document. Evaluation of performance will take into account changing expectations at different stages of faculty careers.

VII. PROCEDURES

The procedures outlined below apply to initial appointments conferring permanent tenure; appointments for a fixed or probationary term longer than one year; promotions in rank; and reappointment at the rank of instructor, assistant professor, or associate professor (the latter conferring tenure in the tenure-track appointment series). Initial appointments or reappointments to terms not exceeding one year may be initiated by the Division Chair with concurrence from the Dean.

A. RECRUITMENT (AFFIRMATIVE ACTION PLAN). The Affirmative Action Plan of the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill has been adopted by the Chancellor and represents the official commitment of the University. Fundamental to this Plan is the affirmative commitment of the University to equal employment and to establishing a diverse community of scholars. It is the University's policy to recruit, hire, develop, and promote without regard to race, color, religion, sex (except where sex is a bona fide occupational qualification), national origin, age, disability, sexual orientation, or veteran status; to base decisions on employment so as to further the principle of equal employment opportunity; to ensure that promotion decisions

are in accord with principles of equal employment opportunity by imposing only valid requirements for promotion; and to ensure that all personnel actions (compensation, benefits, transfers, layoffs, terminations, sponsored training, education, tuition assistance, social and recreational programs) are administered in accord with the principles of equal opportunity.

B. APPOINTMENT. In accordance with the University's Affirmative Action Plan, the Division Chair, in consultation with the School's Office of Human Resources, will prepare a suitable advertisement and name an appropriate search committee. Both the advertisement and the composition of the search committee must be approved by the School's Equal Employment Opportunity Officer, the Dean, and the University Equal Opportunity/ADA Officer before a search may commence.

Following receipt of applications and review by the Search Committee, external references will be requested for selected candidates to obtain information on issues relevant to the appointment. Such information will depend on the nature of the appointment (tenure-track, clinical, research, adjunct), rank, and the primary area(s) in which the appointment is being made (to support the teaching, research, and/or service mission of the School).

One or more selected candidates will be interviewed by the members of the recruiting Division, the Division Chair, the Dean, and relevant stakeholders within and outside the School. Each candidate will be required to present a seminar, open to the entire School, as part of the formal interview process, except in the cases of adjunct appointments, joint appointments when the School of Pharmacy is the secondary appointing unit, and for community-based faculty positions when the primary focus of the appointment is to serve as a preceptor in the School's experiential education program. Following the interview, the Search Committee Chair will solicit comments from all participants for consideration by the Search Committee. The Search Committee Chair will convey the Committee's recommendation to the Division Chair.

Full Professors will be invited to meet (for example through a scheduled "open hour") with the faculty candidate who will be proposed by the Division Chair for initial appointment at the Associate Professor or Professor rank. Such a meeting typically occurs during the selected candidate's second interview. Candidates proposed for appointment at the Assistant Professor rank are not required to meet with the Full Professors.

In most cases, a joint letter initiated by the Division Chair, with concurrence from the Dean, will be submitted to the Dean's Office for submission to the Provost Office.

C. REAPPOINTMENT

The Trustee Policies and Regulations document requires that faculty receive periodic formal consideration for reappointment or promotion. The review process leading to reappointment, however, differs by appointment series and rank. In addition to these formal reviews, it is the responsibility of the Division Chair to meet annually with each faculty member and to communicate in writing the goals related to teaching, scholarship/research, service and professional collegiality qualities. This evaluation will become part of the documentation considered by the Division Chair for reappointment/promotion.

Fixed-term appointments. The faculty member must be reviewed by her or his Division Chair no less than 12 months prior to the expiration of the current appointment. The faculty member should provide a current curriculum vitae and, where appropriate (i.e., for faculty with teaching obligations as an expectation of the position), a teaching portfolio for review. It is expected that the Division Chair will consult with the Division faculty of rank equal to or higher than the rank sought by the individual under review as part of the review process. The individual's performance, her or his relevance to the mission of the Division and the School, and the continued availability of funding are factors that must be taken into account when considering the question of reappointment for fixed-term faculty. Upon completion of the review, the Division Chair will make a recommendation regarding reappointment to the Dean.

Tenure-track assistant professors. Initial appointment for assistant professors in the tenure track is for a four-year term. No later than the end of the third year, a recommendation must be made regarding reappointment to a second, three-year term. Therefore, a formal review must be undertaken in the latter half of the assistant professor's third year. The candidate must provide a current curriculum vitae, a teaching portfolio, a reflective self-evaluation, and a plan for the subsequent term as part of the documentation for review. The candidate will be reviewed by the Division Chair. It is expected that the Division Chair will consult with the Division faculty of rank equal to or higher than the rank sought by the individual under review as part of the review process. Upon completion of this phase of the review, the Division Chair will compose a letter to the Full Professors Committee communicating a recommendation regarding reappointment to a second three-year term. The Division Chair will present the case at a regularly scheduled meeting of the Full Professors, who will communicate their recommendation to the Dean. A final recommendation regarding reappointment will be provided by the Dean to the Provost.

Tenured associate professors. Review is required during the fifth year after appointment or promotion to this rank, and every five years thereafter, consistent with the University's post-tenure review process. However, the decision to pursue or forego consideration for promotion to the rank of professor must be made at this time as well. If the faculty member, in conjunction with the Division Chair, decides to pursue review for promotion to full professor, the review process is governed by the procedures specified for promotion. If the faculty member, in conjunction with the Division Chair, decides not to pursue review for promotion to full professor, the review process is governed by the procedures specified for post-tenure review.

Full professors. Full professors are reviewed at five-year intervals, consistent with the University's post-tenure review policy.

D. PROMOTION

Peer review for faculty under consideration for promotion in rank, and/or for the awarding of tenure, is an important element in the promotion and tenure process. For the purposes of review for promotion and/or tenure, "peers" are defined as those faculty at or above the rank under consideration. The candidate's dossier (AP-2 form, curriculum vitae, teaching portfolio, reflective and planning statements) will be made available to peers within the candidate's Division. The Division Chair will convene a meeting of these peers to discuss the candidate's strengths, weaknesses, and to receive a recommendation (by written vote of all those in

*Faculty Appointment, Reappointment, Promotion, and Tenure
School of Pharmacy
The University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill*

attendance) of the Division. The tabulated vote must be reported in the Division Chair's summary statement to the Full Professors Committee. In addition, written commentary will be invited by the Division Chair from the candidate's peers in the other Divisions in the School. Contributing to this evaluation process, while not mandatory, is an expectation of members of a community of scholars.

The candidate and the Division Chair should meet to discuss the outcome of the internal peer review process. If this process suggests a lack of enthusiasm for the requested action, or uncovers potential weaknesses in the candidate's case, the decision may be made at that time, by the candidate, to withdraw the requested action. However, if the decision is made to proceed, the candidate must undergo external peer review. A minimum of four external reviewers, at or above the rank under consideration and independent of a prior relationship with the candidate, will be selected. The candidate should present a list of potential reviewers to her or his Division Chair. The Division Chair selects two reviewers from this list; selection of the remaining reviewers should be made independent of the candidate. A letter communicating the request for review, together with the candidate's material (curriculum vitae, teaching portfolio, reflective and planning statements) and a copy of the School's ***POLICIES AND PROCEDURES GOVERNING APPOINTMENTS, REAPPOINTMENTS, PROMOTION, AND TENURE FOR FACULTY IN THE SCHOOL OF PHARMACY***, will be sent to each external reviewer. A copy of the letter of solicitation for review becomes part of the permanent documentation for the requested promotion/tenure action.

Following completion of internal and external peer review, the Division Chair will present the requested action, including the candidate's materials, the Division Chair's summary letter, and all written internal and external letters of review, to the Full Professors Committee. Upon completion of their deliberation, the Full Professors will communicate their recommendation to the Dean. In addition, the Chair of the Full Professors Committee will notify the candidate of the Committee's decision, along with any relevant recommendations. Upon receiving the advice of the Full Professors, the Dean will forward a recommendation for action to the Provost.

The recommendations of the Chair, the Full Professors Committee, and the Dean may be shared with the candidate as a particular action is in process. It is understood, although should be reinforced to the candidate, that these are merely recommendations for action, and do not guarantee a particular outcome. However, once a requested action has been forwarded by the Dena to the Provost, no further information should be provided to the candidate until a final decision has been rendered and communicated by the Provost or the Chancellor. Any public announcement of a reappointment or promotion, or the granting of tenure, should occur only at the time that the particular action becomes effective and not at the time of final approval.

Consideration of promotion for faculty with fixed-term appointment is pursued in a manner identical to that described above, with the exception that initial appointment and promotion to higher ranks in this series require a minimum of two external letters (for promotion, those letters must be from individuals without a prior relationship with the candidate). Depending upon the individual situation, however, external commentary may be helpful. The decision to include external peer review as part of the documentation provided to the Full Professors Committee is left to the discretion of the candidate and her or his Division Chair.

E. Tenure.

Tenure refers to the conditions and guarantees that apply to a faculty member's employment, particularly with respect to the protection of a faculty member against involuntary suspension or discharge from her or his position by the University except upon specified grounds and in accordance with specified procedures. The protections accorded by tenure to members of the faculty are intended to secure individual academic freedom and to aid the University in recruiting and retaining the highest quality faculty. Conferral of tenure requires an assessment of institutional needs and resources, evidence of service to the academic community, evidence of the potential for future contributions, commitment to the welfare of the University, and demonstrated professional competence, including consideration of commitment to providing effective teaching, advancing scholarship, and contributing to the broader community.

No recommendation for a promotion or reappointment which will confer permanent tenure may be initiated until the candidate has been a member of the University faculty for at least 18 months. Any recommendation for a promotion or reappointment which will confer permanent tenure must have an effective date within 18 months of initiation of the recommendation. With the explicit exception of actions that also confer tenure, promotions in rank may be made at any time during a faculty member's employment with the University.

Actions that result in the conferral of tenure (promotion to the rank of associate professor in the tenure track; reappointment of an untenured associate professor in the tenure track) are pursued in a manner identical to that described for promotion in the preceding section.

F. Post-tenure review.

Once every five years, each tenured member of the faculty (associate and full professors) must undergo formal review. The Full Professors Committee serves as the School's post-tenure review committee, and is responsible for the conduct of the review, for formulating recommended action, and for communicating those recommendations to the faculty member and the Dean.

Prior to the review, the faculty member should meet with the Division Chair to summarize progress made during the time since the last post-tenure review (or since the granting of tenure in the case of the first post-tenure review). In advance of the Full Professors Committee meeting, the faculty member should provide the Division Chair with an updated curriculum vitae, an updated teaching portfolio, a reflective self-evaluation of the preceding five-year period, and a plan of action for the subsequent five years. The Division Chair must provide her or his summary and recommendation to the Full Professors, together with the faculty member's material and copies of annual reviews for the years under consideration.

Peer evaluation of teaching is an especially important component of the post-tenure review process. Peer review of syllabus materials, visitation of classes, and other indicators of teaching will be conducted in order to enhance the insights of the faculty as a whole about teaching and to provide relevant information on the faculty member being reviewed. As a general matter, the

*Faculty Appointment, Reappointment, Promotion, and Tenure
School of Pharmacy
The University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill*

Division Chair will work with the faculty member being reviewed to arrange for visitation in at least two class sessions of at least two courses during the year prior to or the year in which the post-tenure review of an individual faculty member is conducted.

The Full Professors Committee will advise the Dean on the faculty member being reviewed; this advice also will be conveyed to the Division Chair. The Full Professors Committee will consider whether the faculty member being reviewed is performing at a satisfactory level or has substantial deficiencies in performance that need to be addressed through creation of a development plan, which will be communicated to the faculty member by the Dean in writing.

In the event that the Dean and Division Chair conclude that the faculty member being reviewed has a record of overall performance that reflects substantial deficiencies that must be addressed, the Division Chair and the faculty member being reviewed will meet to formulate a development plan designed to assist the faculty member in removing deficiencies in performance. The development plan will include clear goals, indicators of goal attainment, a reasonable time frame for the completion of goals, and a statement of consequences if the goals are not reached. The performance of a faculty member who is found to have substantial deficiencies in overall performance and who is working on completion of a development plan will be reviewed by the Full Professors Committee on an annual basis for a period of up to three years, until such time as substantial deficiencies have been remedied. In the event that substantial deficiencies in performance continue to exist at the end of the three-year period, the Dean will consider whether action should be initiated pursuant to the Trustee Policies and Regulations Governing Academic Tenure or other steps taken to address the substantial deficiencies in performance.

Appeals of Findings of Substantial Deficiencies and Development Plans. Faculty members found by the Division Chair and the Dean to have substantial deficiencies in performance and for whom a development plan is established may appeal the finding of substantial deficiency or the terms of the development plan within 30 days of receiving a final letter from the Dean including such findings and development plan. Appeal rights are as provided for in the University's policy on post-tenure review.

Annual Reports Filed with Provost. As provided in the University policy on post-tenure review the Dean will file annual reports to the Office of the Provost specifying the names of faculty members reviewed during the previous year, the names of faculty members for whom a development plan was recommended and established, and the names of faculty members who were subject to review in that year but for whom a delay was requested (along with the reasons for delay).