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Section 1 Advisory Committee Guidelines

These guidelines apply to the reappointment of assistant professors and lecturers, the promotion of assistant professors to associate professor with tenure, and the reappointment with tenure of probationary term associate professors. Reviews for promotion to full professor and senior lecturer follow the same process, except that they are conducted by ad hoc faculty committees appointed by the Dean.

Faculty Advisory Committees. As stated in the School’s APT policy, faculty advisory committees offer guidance on overall professional development and are a resource for new faculty members as they plan their work and develop their fields of expertise. A recommendation from the advisory committee is also the first step in the reappointment, promotion, and tenure process. One member of each committee serves as a teaching mentor, with responsibilities as outlined by the School’s teaching committee. The Associate Dean for Faculty Development will appoint the committee members and, when appropriate, meet with the committee before a new colleague arrives for work.

Committee Meetings. The chair of each advisory committee will convene at least two regular meetings per year beginning within two weeks after a new faculty member arrives. The chair is responsible for calling and scheduling all meetings. In its first meeting the committee should make clear that the new faculty member is encouraged to consult with them any time he or she has a question about work, procedures, or anything else involving the School. It is not necessary to wait for a meeting. The committee chair or a new faculty member may call a meeting at any other time as needed. Committee members other than the chair may also request that the chair call a meeting. These guidelines are not intended to discourage committees from meeting more regularly than twice per year.

Written Summaries. The committee chair will prepare a written summary of each meeting. It should include a short assessment of a person's work in each of the following areas: (1) teaching (which could be written by a person’s teaching mentor); (2) advising; (3) research and publication; (4) administrative responsibilities and other School service; (5) other important activities (special University or professional service, for example); and (6) overall summary. Committee reports should document completion of teaching observations and other teaching development activities called for in the guidelines for teaching mentors. A draft copy of the summary should be circulated to the other committee members and to the faculty member for approval. A final copy should be provided (preferably by email) to each of them, and to the Dean, Senior Associate Dean, and the Associate Dean for Faculty Development.

Preparing for Reappointment and Tenure. Committee chairs are responsible for scheduling meetings in advance of deadlines for submitting reports and paperwork for reappointment and tenure. The School’s Human Resources Division (HR) maintains a central database and schedule of these dates. The schedule is also available on the School’s intranet.
Section 2 of these guidelines provides additional information about the timeline for preparing material for review. Information and standards for reviewing faculty members are detailed in Section 7 of the School’s APT policy.

**Obtaining Outside Letters in Support of Promotion.** Outside letters are required for initial appointments, promotion to associate professor with tenure, and promotion to full professor. They are *not required* for reappointment of tenure track faculty, or for reappointment of lecturers.

The earliest deadlines on the schedule for the promotions that involve letters are designed to encourage the committee chair and the faculty member to begin working on a list of potential reviewers from whom to request letters. It is helpful for committees and faculty to be thinking about possible external reviewers before the scheduled deadlines. Often, the faculty member will be in the best position to identify experts who can evaluate his or her work. The faculty member should consult with the advisory committee, other colleagues, and professionals with whom they work to identify respected professionals and academics who can provide an objective evaluation of the faculty member’s work – especially their published work. We expect at least one letter from a person who is not a North Carolina public official, which means either an academic or a public official with a national perspective. Where possible, it is good to have at least one academic letter to provide a peer review of research and publication work.

Communication from the chair, including an email from the chair in advance of a conversation with an outside reviewer, is essential to provide the context for the review. We have developed standard emails and letters for this purpose. The emails, the conversations, and the letters help educate reviewers (both public officials and academics) about what our standards for promotion are, and how they differ from more traditional units. This is important because our standards differ from typical research university standards. The letters we send out to public officials ask for very specific information (not just, do you like this person’s work), and it’s important for the chairs to reinforce the need for comparative and specific evaluation. The Associate Dean for Faculty Development provides copies of the letters and emails to chairs as they embark on this process.

At least four letters of review must be submitted for promotion and tenure. It’s a good idea for the committee to identify five or six potential reviewers in case one or more decline the request. It is ok to ask for more than four letters but be aware that all letters received must be forwarded to the campus APT committee. The chair of the faculty advisory committee is responsible for providing to HR a list of outside reviewers with contact information so that they can prepare the letters. This list should be finalized no later than the meeting at which the advisory committee begins its review of the faculty member’s materials. *The chair must list which of the proposed outside reviewers were suggested by the faculty member and which were*
suggested by the chair or the School administration. Although we typically use a collaborative process to select outside reviewers, University procedures require us to identify them this way.

Letters are prepared by HR using standard forms, and are sent out over the Dean’s signature. A selection of faculty publications and a near final version of the CV should also be provided to HR at this time for inclusion with the letters. The CV can be updated prior to the internal decision if necessary. Information about sending publications is set out in Section 3 of these guidelines. Once received, outside letters are filed and maintained in HR.

Preparing the Committee Recommendation. The advisory committee is responsible for preparing the committee’s recommendation regarding reappointment, promotion and tenure. The final committee report should take into consideration the outside letters (for promotion and tenure), teaching evaluations and peer review of teaching, and should be framed in terms of the criteria for set out in the School’s APT policy.

The recommendation should be reviewed and approved by the members of the committee. Unlike the periodic summaries from earlier committee meetings, this report is not shared with the faculty member before being submitted to the Dean. The faculty member may see it after it is submitted to the Dean and before the internal decision at the School level has been made. Each member of the committee must sign the committee recommendation. The signed report must be submitted to HR, with copies to the Dean, Senior Associated Dean, and the Associate Dean for Faculty Development.

Summary of Major Faculty Advisory Committee Chair Responsibilities.

1. Call meetings of the committee; at least two per year.
2. Prepare, circulate, finalize and submit committee reports for each meeting.
3. Prompt faculty member to begin thinking about outside reviewers no less than four months before initial review of materials by the committee and consult with faculty member on possible choices. Contact potential reviewers to determine willingness and suitability
4. Contact potential outside reviewers to explain our mission and the context and parameters of the outside review we’re asking for, and answer any questions reviewers may have about the process.
5. No later than the date listed on the School’s schedule, submit a list of outside reviewers to the HR (designating each as either faculty or committee suggestion), along with a list of faculty publications to be sent to outside reviewers.
6. Call meeting for initial review for reappointment, promotion, or tenure decision no later than the date listed on the School’s schedule.
7. Prepare, circulate, and finalize, the recommendation and report on behalf of the committee, and submit it no later than the date listed on the School’s schedule.
8. Attend professors meeting to present and discuss committee report on reappointment, promotion, or tenure.

**Process for Promotion to Full Professor or Senior Lecturer.** Advisory committees cease to function after a positive tenure decision. Faculty members are encouraged to consult former advisory committee members for guidance as needed, and to discuss possibilities for outside reviewers in advance of the deadline for requesting letters in support of promotion to full professor. For promotion to full professor or senior lecturer, the original committee is reconvened, if possible, or new members are added, for development and review of the promotion package. Responsibility for calling meetings, identifying and making individual contact with outside reviewers, and preparing the committee’s report is the same as for tenure. The committee makes a recommendation to the Dean regarding the faculty member’s suitability for promotion to full professor or senior lecturer.
Section 2  Timelines for Review Process.

Timelines for promotion are set for each individual faculty member to comply with the UNC Chapel Hill Trustee Policies and Regulations Governing Academic Tenure, which are available online at http://www.unc.edu/campus/policies.html.

The Trustee Policies generally require that decisions about reappointment and promotion be made “no less than 12 months before the end” of a term of employment. Consequently, timelines work back from this deadline. The specific term of employment depends on the type of appointment.

Typically, an individual timeline must permit adequate time to collect reference letters when required, to create written recommendations, for discussion by the appropriate body within the School’s faculty, to gather materials for submission to the University process beyond the School, and for a candidate to be considered by the appropriate University bodies. HR maintains a schedule showing individual timelines for review for reappointment or promotion. The document is called “Faculty Promotion and Reappointment Schedule” and it is available on the School’s intranet. The following information supplements the Faculty Promotion and Reappointment Schedule with details about activities that should be undertaken at each stage listed on that schedule.

Six Months Before Committee Begins Review
Faculty member beings work on review materials.
Faculty member should:
1. Begin developing a list of suitable outside reviewers and discuss them with the committee chair;
2. Begin to prepare material to submit for initial committee review;
   o Compile teaching evaluations (see Section 3, Documentation Requirements for Faculty Reappointment, Tenure, and Promotion and Guidelines for Preparing Materials)
   o Draft teaching and research statements (see Section 6, Elements of a Teaching Statement and Teaching Portfolio, and Section 7 Elements of a Research Statement)
   o Update CV in proper order and format (see Section 3, Documentation Requirements for Faculty Reappointment, Tenure and Promotion, and Guidelines for Preparing Materials)
   o Prepare teaching portfolio (see Section 6, Elements of a Teaching Statement and Teaching Portfolio)
   o Assemble publications for committee review
   o Arrange for peer reviews of teaching (see Section 5, Teaching Evaluation)
Committee Begins Review
Committee should:
1. Review preliminary draft of CV and assess whether faculty member is on track for scheduled final review deadline;
2. Review and discuss list of outside reviewers.

No Later Than One Week After Initial Committee Review
List of names for outside reviewers due in HR
Committee chair should:
1. Forward 6 names for outside review to HR with top four choices noted. Typically, four letters are requested and two are in reserve in case of insufficient response or failure to respond.
2. Forward to HR a list of publications to be sent to outside reviewers.

Outside reviews are due six weeks before the committee report is due so that chairs will have time to review them and incorporate pertinent information into the report. HR will provide copies of outside review letters to committee chair.

Four Months After Initial Committee Review
Finalized packet of materials to chair
Faculty member should:
1. Provide the committee chair with the finalized CV in proper form, peer observations of teaching, teaching evaluations, teaching statement and portfolio, and research statement. HR is available to review CV’s in advance of this deadline to assure proper format.
2. Provide portfolio with CV to HR so publications can be displayed in the library prior to internal vote.

No Later Than the Due Date for the Committee Report as Shown on the School’s Schedule
Committee report due
Committee chair should:
1. Draft, circulate to committee members only, finalize and submit committee recommendation and report. The faculty member is entitled to see the report after it is reviewed by the Dean and prior to the faculty meeting at which the recommendation is made.
Reappointment, Tenure, and Promotion Checklist for Materials

- Updated CV
- Teaching Statement
- Research Statement (Not required for lecturers)
- Peer Review of Teaching (at least two, one from a person not on faculty advisory committee)
- Teaching Evaluations (if any, as supplement to those collected by HR)
- Teaching portfolio (see examples in HR)
- Outside letters of review (tenure and full professor actions only)
- Signed Committee Report
Section 3  Documentation Requirements for Faculty Reappointment, Tenure, and Promotion, and Guidelines for Preparing Materials

The Associate Dean for Faculty Development and HR can provide assistance in preparation of materials for promotion and tenure. *Faculty members should start the process of preparing materials at least six months before the scheduled date for the internal committee to begin its review.* (See Section 2, Timelines for Review Process.) Examples of School faculty CV’s, teaching portfolios, and teaching and research statements are available from HR.

Preparing the CV

Guidelines for Curriculum Vitae (CV) presentation are set forth below. These reflect University guidelines as well as approaches the School recommends for documenting the information necessary to address the standards set out in the School’s APT policy.

**Important Note: CVs should not include age, date of birth, marital status, family information, or social security number.** These items are not relevant and should always be omitted from the CV.

The following is the preferred order for presentation of the CV. In every subheading, list items in *reverse chronological order* with most recent items first. Please (1) date the CV so reviewers will know that they have the most recent version, (2) make sure to number pages, and (3) include dates of teaching, advising, and consulting activities.

CV Format and Order

- Personal
- Education (institution and location, degree, date conferred, degree major)
- Professional Experience (with dates)
- Honors (with dates)
- Fields of work at the School of Government
- Bibliography -- for co-authored publications, show author order and indicate percentage of faculty member contribution.
  - Books and chapters, including E-books; list pages
  - Refereed papers/articles; list pages
  - Refereed unpublished oral presentations and/or abstracts
  - Other unrefered works, including book reviews, dissertations, monographs. School of Government Bulletins are usually listed as monographs. This category would also include substantial written work for reports or websites, and other electronic works, including blogs, blog posts, and other electronic content.
- Teaching record (with dates) -- School faculty typically have a longer list of teaching activities than do faculty in other units. Teaching activities are sometimes consolidated
by 1) listing annual courses once, followed by the years they were taught, and 2) listing
typical courses by particular clients groups for whom they are taught, or by particular
topics. School faculty also list regular course planning and development activities for
particular client groups, as well as web-based teaching material they have developed.

- **Advising/Consulting Activities (with dates)** – This is the category under which telephone
  and email consultation should be included. Faculty members sometimes summarize in a
  single sentence or short paragraph the volume and types of daily telephone and email
  inquiries they receive. Other major consulting projects are separately listed and typically
  include projects that extended beyond a single meeting or conversation, and involved
  more effort than a typical telephone or email inquiry. This category could also include
  activities such as maintaining, moderating, and regularly responding to listservs, and
  creating websites, but substantial written work posted to websites should be listed under
  “Bibliography – other unrefereed works.”

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

- **Professional Service (with dates)**—See Section 6 of the School’s APT policy for
  examples of activities considered service to the School, University, and profession.
  - To discipline (Some faculty members list pre-publication review of manuscripts
    for outside journals or other peer reviewed publications here.)
  - Within UNC-Chapel Hill
    - Service to the School (Some faculty members list pre-publication review
      of School manuscripts here.)
    - Service to the University

- **Research statement** -- See Section 7, Elements of a Research Statement

- **Teaching statement** -- See Section 6, Elements of a Teaching Statement and Teaching
  Portfolio

### Teaching Evaluations

The School has a centralized system for collecting teaching evaluations for School-
ponsored programs. This information is provided to HR for use in the promotion and tenure
process. Faculty members may obtain this information from HR, and are responsible for
providing to HR all teaching evaluations from *non-School courses*. These should be provided at
least one month before the materials are due to the faculty advisory committee for review in
order to provide sufficient time for compiling.

Peer observations of teaching (see Section 5, Teaching Evaluation) should be submitted
to the advisory committee for review, and should be included with the committee’s report to the
Dean.

### Sending Publications to Outside Reviewers

We typically send representative selections of faculty members’ publications to
accompany a request for outside letters. It is not necessary to send reviewers everything. We
generally don’t send publications to NC public officials, but we do send them to non-NC public officials and academics reviewers. The decisions about which publications to send and to whom they’re sent are up to the committee and the faculty member. For convenience, consider sending links to online publications by email, or sending these and other publications as PDFs on a flash drive or other external file storage device. The Publications Division will provide copies of books to mail. The selected publications in whatever format they’re to be sent must be delivered to HR at the same time that names of outside reviewers are due to HR as shown on the promotion and tenure schedule.
Section 4. Guidance on Writing for School of Government Faculty Members

School of Government tenure-track faculty members have appointments that require research and writing, teaching, and advising, as is typical for academic appointments throughout the University. The School’s Appointment, Promotion, and Tenure policy outlines in clear terms the ways in which expectations for School faculty members are directly related to our mission of service to the state. Our unique mission has a direct impact on how faculty members spend their time, and on the nature of their research and writing. Specifically, the demands of direct service in the form of telephone, email, and in-service consultation, as well short-course teaching, are significant and year-round. Faculty members may not have significant blocks of time available for intensive research or writing projects. Writing projects vary in length, format, and delivery, and are often time-sensitive. The School’s long history of service and responsiveness has created expectations by public officials throughout the state for short-term, timely, and direct assistance. Our internal culture of responsiveness and service often makes it difficult for faculty members, especially new faculty members coming up through the tenure process, to prioritize time for writing.

The School values writing because it promotes the value of applied, engaged scholarship that is a part of the School’s and the University’s mission. Faculty members must make time for the research and writing that must be demonstrated for the award of tenure and promotion through the ranks. Although the public officials we hear from on a daily basis rarely ask for written material, we cannot answer their questions, develop their programs, or provide the written material they rely on unless we prioritize time for in-depth research and writing.

A major function of faculty advisory committees is to discuss with faculty members their progress in all areas of work, and to assist them in maintaining a balance that will help them meet the needs of public officials and succeed in the promotion and tenure process. Faculty members have developed various strategies for making time to do research and writing. No single model or preferred strategy is required. Faculty advisory committees can help new faculty members learn what strategies work best for them.

Examples of strategies include blocking out certain times of the day or specific days of the week for research and writing. Faculty members can manage their telephone and email traffic by using messages to indicate times when they will (or will not) be available to respond to inquiries. The demands of particular client groups vary, and this affects the flexibility faculty members have in making these kinds of arrangements. This flexibility is also affected by the extent to which there is overlap with other faculty members, and by whether outside resources are available to respond to client inquiries. While our clients value prompt responses to telephone and email inquiries, blocking out days or weeks for writing, like blocking out time for teaching, is an appropriate reason for a delay in responding. There is no precise formula for determining when the time set aside for writing is sufficient to require approval as a writing leave. The key consideration is whether the needs of clients are continuing to be met by the
faculty member (or by colleagues who share the field, without a significant impact on their normal share of the work), or whether instead, the time set aside for writing requires other arrangements for meeting those needs.

At the School, a “writing leave” is a period of time during which a faculty member is doing research and writing in such a way that he or she is completely unavailable for regular advising or teaching responsibilities, and alternative arrangements (whether internal or external) are required to meet these needs. Consultation with a faculty member’s advisory committee (where applicable) and approval by the Dean are required for a faculty member to take a writing leave. Approval of writing leaves will be based on several factors, (these are not necessarily in order of priority): (1) the need expressed by the faculty member and the faculty advisory committee, especially when reappointment, tenure or promotion deadlines are approaching; (2) the impact on colleagues who would be required to fill the gap (this includes consideration of available internal and external capacity); (3) the availability of grant funding for a project that requires completion of work within a specified time frame; (4) other unique opportunities to focus on a particular project requiring a dedicated effort and displacement of other obligations; and (5) other justification determined to be compelling and in the best interest of the faculty member and the School. The use of a writing leave is not viewed negatively in reappointment, promotion, or tenure decisions.
Section 5  Teaching Evaluation

Review of Teaching Materials. The review by a faculty member’s advisory committee should include at least three different examples of teaching materials, each of which should be selected by the person being reviewed. The review should be conducted, if possible, by an advisory committee member knowledgeable about the subject matter covered by the materials. The faculty member and the reviewer should meet before the review takes place, to discuss the context for which the materials were prepared, what the instructor was attempting to accomplish with the materials, and how the materials relate to the teaching methods used by the instructor in the session. When the review is completed, the reviewer should prepare written comments that are shared with the faculty member.

Peer and Committee Observations of Classroom Teaching. Two peer teaching evaluations are required in connection with reappointment or promotion. The faculty member should arrange for this not later than six months prior to the faculty advisory committee’s initial review (see timelines in Section 2 of these guidelines). One of the peer observations may be conducted by the faculty member’s teaching mentor, but at least one must be obtained from a faculty member who is not a member of the person’s faculty advisory committee. In any case, each member of the faculty member’s advisory committee should observe the faculty member’s teaching as part of the evaluation for promotion or tenure. If the faculty member’s teaching involves one or more MPA courses, at least two sessions of a course should be observed.

There is no set format for peer observations, but the write-up of the observation should indicate the dates and subjects of the sessions observed. Previous examples have discussed the following types of things: command of the subject matter, clarity of teaching objectives for the session, effectiveness of the presentation and techniques used, extent of engagement with and by the audience, responsiveness to questions, time management, and appropriateness of the amount of material covered. Written peer observations of teaching must be submitted to the committee for review and forwarded to the Dean with the committee’s final report.
Section 6  Elements of a Teaching Statement and Teaching Portfolio

Faculty members submitting documents for reappointment, promotion, or tenure must prepare a reflective teaching statement. That statement should be no longer than three pages.

The reflective teaching statement is one of the documents that must be submitted as part of the promotion documents (see Section 3, Documentation Requirements for Faculty Reappointment, Tenure, and Promotion), and should be included in the teaching portfolio. The teaching portfolio is considered within the School only—it does not go up for review to other parts of the university. The advisory committee and reviewing faculty within the School examine the candidate’s teaching portfolio as a part of their evaluation of the candidate’s teaching (see discussion of “Teaching” at p. 15 - 16 of the School’s APT Policy).

The reflective teaching statement is an essential element of a teaching portfolio. The statement helps inform readers about your philosophy of teaching and learning, as well as how you implement that philosophy. It is also an avenue for you to assess your strengths and progress as a teacher.

The following kinds of issues may be addressed in a reflective statement.

(1) Why do you like teaching?

(2) What kinds of teaching do you do? (e.g. MPA classroom teaching, continuing education, mentoring, advising, etc.).

(3) How has your teaching changed over time?

(4) How do you think students best learn the subjects you teach?

(5) How do you motivate students to learn?

(6) What are barriers to student learning that you encounter, and how do you try to overcome them?

(7) In what ways do you hope students are “different” after you’ve taught them?

(8) What are the most important student learning outcomes from your teaching?

(9) What are examples of your most successful teaching? Why do you consider them successful?

(10) What innovations have you tried in your teaching and what were the results?
Faculty creating reflective teaching statements should review the statements on file with the HR as part of the collection of teaching portfolios created by faculty for the promotion process in the past. Colleagues are also willing to share copies of their statements and provide advice.

The *teaching portfolio* represents an opportunity for the candidate to showcase his or her teaching talents for faculty colleagues. The materials listed below are typically included in a teaching portfolio. HR has a collection of teaching portfolios created by faculty for the promotion process in the past.

--a copy of the curriculum vitae the candidate will submit as part of their promotion package
--the candidate’s reflective teaching statement
--the candidate’s research statement (not required for lecturers)
--sample written materials/class handouts used in teaching
--samples of power points presentations or other visual aids used in teaching
--sample discussion questions used in teaching or prepared for group discussions
--student course evaluations
--external reviews and/or letters you may have received regarding teaching or other aspects of your work (these are *not* the outside evaluation letters required by Section 7 of the School’s APT policy; these may be reviews or comments you received about teaching or other services)
--syllabi for MPA courses, if applicable
--sample exams for MPA courses, if applicable
--any other material the candidate feels will help with the evaluation of their teaching.
Section 7    Elements of a Research Statement

Faculty members submitting documents for reappointment, promotion, or tenure must prepare a research statement for the university review process. This requirement does not apply to lecturers, but lecturers may prepare and submit them when their work includes a research component. A research statement should be a 2-3 page document that accomplishes these five goals.

(1) Describes how your research and publishing serves the School's mission of improving the lives of North Carolinians by engaging in practical scholarship that helps public officials understand and improve state and local government. The statement should stress the School's focus on practical research and public service and discuss how research is both reactive and proactive.

(2) Describes the research and publishing you've done in terms of (a) the disciplines and topics you have covered, (b) who it serves, and (c) the formats in which your work has appeared. Discuss why research was undertaken when appropriate (for example, appearance of a common problem within a client group might lead to a particular publication). You should mention any and all forms of publishing, including formats like electronic presentation, bench books, manuals, reports of committees or commissions, substantial revisions to General Statutes, local ordinances or policies, and other similar kinds of writing. You should mention notable things about your publications—for example, special innovations in the presentation of information, original research and creative approaches, exceptional praise from clients or reviewers, awards, or appearance in leading journals.

(3) Specifically discusses linkages among teaching, advising, and research and publishing you have done.

(4) Describes future directions in which you expect your research and writing to continue or expand.

(5) If you work in fields such as public administration, finance, or management—and if you teach two courses in the MPA Program—you should also discuss how your work contributes to your scholarly field beyond the central mission of serving North Carolina's local and state government.