

School of Government
University of North Carolina
at Chapel Hill

Policies and Procedures on Faculty Appointment, Promotion, and Tenure

Internal Guidelines for the Faculty Appointment, Tenure, and Promotion Process

March 2016

Publication Note

The School's *Policies and Procedures on Faculty Appointment, Promotion, and Tenure* (SOG/APT) is intended to provide guidance internally for School faculty members (both those being reviewed and those conducting reviews) and externally for the University's Advisory Committee on Appointments, Promotion, and Tenure. It explains who we are and what we do, and it describes how we evaluate the contributions of faculty members in advancing the School's mission. It also places our work in the context of other faculty in higher education—it highlights what is different and distinctive about the School and describes how those differences are incorporated into the standards we use to evaluate ourselves.

This document should be the touchstone for how faculty are evaluated for appointment, promotion, and tenure. Faculty advisory committee members and faculty members under evaluation should make themselves familiar with the policy.

While the policy itself will change infrequently, University requirements for process and paperwork change periodically. A separate document, *Internal Guidelines for the Faculty Appointment, Tenure, and Promotion Process*, provides more detailed information about the paperwork and deadlines for promotion packages and will be updated regularly. The current version is included at the end of this publication. A faculty member should refer to this document and consult with the Director of Human Resources or the Associate Dean for Faculty Development for up-to-date information on these details. These documents and future updates will be available on the School's employee intranet.

The SOG/APT document was first produced by a committee comprising Dean Mike Smith, Greg Allison, David Ammons, Bob Joyce, Janet Mason, Jill Moore, Jessie Smith, Tom Thornburg, Aimee Wall, and Richard Whisnant. Mike Smith chaired the group, and he was the primary drafter. The committee met several times between January and June 2005 to discuss content and review drafts.

Faculty discussed a draft of the policy at the July 11, 2005, faculty meeting, and revisions were made in light of that discussion. Dean Smith then shared the document with the Chair of the University Advisory Committee on Appointments, Promotion, and Tenure at the time; the Chair of the Faculty Council; and the Provost's Office. Executive Vice Chancellor and Provost Robert Shelton approved the document in this form on April 17, 2006.

Minor revisions were made in October 2007, mainly to remove the appendices, which were incorporated into the *Internal Guidelines* document referenced above.

Additional revisions were made in March 2016 to accommodate changes in University policies and to adjust and update provisions relating to standards for promotion. Changes were reviewed and discussed with a representative group of faculty members, and the proposed revisions were presented to the full faculty for comment.

Frayda Bluestein, Associate Dean for Faculty Development
Tom Thornburg, Senior Associate Dean

June 2016

Policies and Procedures on Faculty Appointment, Promotion, and Tenure

School of Government
The University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill

APPROVED BY THE OFFICE OF THE PROVOST ON APRIL 17, 2006

REVISED OCTOBER 2007*

REVISED MARCH 2016

This document sets forth the School's policies and procedures governing the appointment, reappointment, and promotion of its faculty members.

Section 1. University Policies and Procedures

The School must comply with the most recent editions of the following policies and procedures adopted by the UNC-Chapel Hill Board of Trustees and by the UNC Board of Governors.

1. *The Code of the Board of Governors*, The University of North Carolina, July 1, 2001. <http://www.northcarolina.edu/apps/policy/index.php?pg=toc&id=s11>.
2. *Trustee Policies and Regulations Governing Academic Tenure*, The University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill. <http://policy.sites.unc.edu/files/2013/04/tenure.pdf>.
3. *EPA Equal Opportunity Plan*, The University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill. The most current version is available at http://equalopportunity-ada.unc.edu/files/2011/12/Equal_Opportunity_Plan_for_EPA_Employees_March_2014-February_2015.pdf.

The criteria and guidelines contained in this document conform to the above policies without repeating all of them. In particular, the School's policy emphasizes the substantive performance standards for faculty that will reinforce our distinctive mission. Faculty members and others should consult the preceding documents as necessary to address questions about their appointment, reappointment, and promotion.

*The October 2007 revisions removed the appendices and made other technical changes. The appendices have been modified and are now part of a separate document called *Internal Guidelines for the Faculty Appointment, Tenure, and Promotion Process*. No substantive aspects of the policy were affected by these revisions.

Section 2. Mission of the School of Government

General

The mission of the University explicitly includes the extension of “knowledge-based services and other resources . . . to the citizens of North Carolina and their institutions to enhance the quality of life for all people in the state. . . .”¹ Carolina’s genuine commitment to serving its own state has distinguished it from other major public research universities. This did not happen by accident. In 1915, President Edward Kidder Graham declared that University service is “the radiating power of a new passion” that goes beyond “thinly stretching out its resources” to the state.² According to Graham, “[t]he State of North Carolina is the constituency of the University of North Carolina; therefore, its needs and aspirations are that University’s chief concern.”³ This passion for service influenced the work of Frank Porter Graham, Albert Coates, Bill Friday, John Sanders, and many others throughout Carolina’s history, and the University’s mission continues to emphasize public engagement with North Carolina. Chancellor James Moeser reaffirmed that “[s]ervice and engagement must be an integral part of a university’s life, not something we practice if we have extra time or if the mood strikes us or if our schedule permits or if it happens to be convenient. We must consider it an obligation and a responsibility, something that we owe society.”⁴ The University’s academic plan (“Reach Carolina”) builds on this tradition, stating, “Because the University exists to serve not only its students but also the state, nation, and the world, *Reach Carolina* embraces enthusiastically a comprehensive approach to engagement that will recognize, stimulate, and reward excellence in teaching and research on the part of all members of the campus community.”⁵ Carolina is a research university with a mission that has always included and rewarded public service and engagement.

The School of Government’s mission flows from this rich history of engagement with the people of North Carolina. Pursuit of its mission directly advances the greater mission of

1. Institutional Self-Study Report, *All Useful Learning—Initiating a Third Century of Distinction* (The University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, 1995), 167.

2. E. K. Graham, *Education and Citizenship and Other Papers* (New York: G.P. Putnam’s Sons, 1919), 15.

3. H. W. Odum, ed., *Southern Pioneers in Social Interpretation* (Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press, 1925), 209.

4. Address by Chancellor James Moeser, 10th Anniversary of the Friday Center (March 27, 2001). Chancellor Moeser also declared that “[w]e must very clearly send the message far and wide to all parts of our campus and all corners of our state that we take public service just as seriously and value it just as highly as we do teaching and research. That it is equally important and equally necessary for us to fulfill our obligation to North Carolina citizens. So as we look at tenure and post-tenure review, we must consider how public service and engagement fit into the formula. We must send a message loudly and clearly from the highest levels of the University that service is valued, just as teaching and research are.”

5. The University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, *Academic Plan* (2011), <http://academicplan.unc.edu/index.php>. See “Theme Five: Engaged Scholars and Scholarship.”

the University. **The School’s mission is to improve the lives of North Carolinians through engaged scholarship that helps public officials understand and improve state and local government.**⁶ Throughout its more than 80-year history, the School of Government (formerly the Institute of Government) has pursued its mission while adhering to core values of nonpartisanship, nonadvocacy, policy neutrality, and responsiveness. The School of Government is unique both within Carolina and nationally because its mission of statewide public engagement is carried out through the work of tenure-track and other faculty members. A commitment to North Carolina government enables the School’s faculty members to understand deeply the special challenges facing state and local officials and encourages them to work closely with officials over time in addressing those challenges. In addition to possessing expertise in their academic disciplines, the School’s faculty members must have the ability to make complicated subjects understandable without sacrificing subtlety and complexity.

The University created the School of Government in 2001 in recognition of the role of the former Institute of Government and the quality and impact of its faculty’s scholarship.⁷ Creation of the School was not intended to change the longstanding mission of service to North Carolina exemplified by the Institute. Rather, the intent was to enhance the standing of the faculty by “building upon the Institute’s reputation as a premier public service institution focused on the concerns of state and local government.”⁸ The charter creating the School recognized that its mission “differs from other professional schools” and acknowledged “that its criteria for reappointment and promotion also will be different.”⁹ To avoid any possible future misunderstanding about those criteria, the charter further provided that “[t]he University has recognized these differences for the Institute of Government and it will continue to recognize them for the School.”¹⁰

6. The School uses the term “public officials” in its broad sense to include elected and appointed North Carolina government officials. Faculty members also help citizens whose activities relate closely to government. For example, nonprofit organizations partner with governments in a variety of ways, including the delivery of important government services. School faculty members work with nonprofits and other individuals and organizations when doing so advances the work of state and local government. Faculty members also help the media and other citizens understand North Carolina government and the actions of government officials.

7. The Institute of Government was established in 1931 to provide educational, advisory, and research services for state and local governments. It has a long history of serving North Carolina. The Institute’s historic mission was adopted as the School’s mission in 2001.

8. *A Proposal to Create the School of Government* (March 28, 2001), 1. The cited document became the School’s charter when it was adopted and signed by Chancellor James Moeser and Executive Vice Chancellor and Provost Robert Shelton.

9. *Ibid.*, 3.

10. *Ibid.*, 4.

The School's highly specialized and valued academic role at the convergence of scholarship and practice will continue only if promotion criteria and practices continue to reinforce its unique mission.¹¹ Its charter recognizes the School's ongoing value by providing that its faculty will continue to be reappointed and promoted on the basis of excellence in engaged scholarship for North Carolina public officials. In accepting the University's invitation to become the School of Government, the faculty renewed its commitment to the Institute of Government's original mission and promised vigilance to ensure its continued strength.

Core Faculty Work for North Carolina Public Officials

Each faculty member specializes in areas of public law or public administration and management. Approximately two-thirds of the School's faculty members have law degrees, and many of these lawyers have other advanced degrees related to their fields of work. This emphasis on law as a core discipline is a distinctive feature of the School—no other school of government is built upon a foundation of public law. The School has expanded and complemented its public law expertise for state and local officials over the years by appointing faculty members in the academic disciplines of public administration and management. The result is a multidisciplinary faculty that works in a comprehensive way to improve North Carolina government.

The School's faculty are experts in their academic fields—whether law, public administration, or related fields—and they apply their scholarship to help North Carolina public officials. Faculty must convey knowledge from complex academic fields in ways that are practical without being superficial. Furthermore, because public officials may serve for an extended period of time—perhaps an entire career—the School's faculty members must work with them in ways that become more sophisticated over time in order to remain helpful. The School of Government's faculty work very effectively at this convergence of scholarship and practice.

Faculty members carry out the School's mission for North Carolina public officials by working in three basic scholarly dimensions—teaching, advising, and research and publication. Responsiveness to the needs of North Carolina public officials is an important core value of the School, and it applies to all dimensions of faculty work in advancing the School's mission. In deciding which courses to offer or which publications

11. The School has worked over many years to align its promotion criteria and practices with its distinctive mission, and that mission is aligned closely with the University's mission. It is well understood that “[t]he closer the match between the mission of an institution and the priorities described in the tenure and promotion system, the more productive the faculty will be in helping the institution reach the goals that have been identified.” R. M. Diamond, *Aligning Faculty Rewards with Institutional Mission* (Bolton, Massachusetts: Anker Publishing Company, Inc., 1999), 1.

to create, for example, faculty members choose those that will be the most helpful to public officials. The School's faculty can make those choices wisely because they are in regular contact with officials through advising and teaching. For instance, multiple telephone and email inquiries from across North Carolina on a difficult topic may prompt a faculty member to write a monograph or offer a special seminar on that subject. Or a faculty member may anticipate an emerging issue for public officials and address it through teaching or a publication before it becomes a day-to-day challenge. The School's faculty members choose their work because it responds to the needs of North Carolina public officials.

Teaching

The School of Government's faculty members annually offer more than 200 courses for over 12,000 North Carolina public officials and teach in hundreds of programs sponsored by professional associations. Courses for public officials range in length from one day to several weeks. Some courses prepare newly elected and appointed officials to assume their upcoming responsibilities, but most address the continuing need of public officials for developing knowledge in their professional fields. In addition to classroom teaching, faculty members reach their students through webinars, videoconferencing, computer-based training, and other multimedia formats.

Advising

Faculty members advise North Carolina public officials and others who are interested in government. A faculty member may work closely with a legislative study commission, for example, or with an agency committee developing model policies. This dimension of the School's work might include drafting legislation or working with a governing board over time to improve its effectiveness. In addition to longer-term advising, each year the School's faculty members provide immediate assistance by answering thousands of telephone and email inquiries from state and local officials, media, and private citizens. This daily contact ensures that faculty members are responsive to the officials' needs and also keenly aware of the practical issues facing the officials in their fields of expertise.

Research and Publication

Consistent with the School's mission, all faculty members conduct research and create publications that focus on issues that face North Carolina public officials. Faculty members' research adds to the body of knowledge in their individual fields and has a local, state, and sometimes national audience, depending on the area of focus. Faculty members in public law fields are experts in North Carolina and federal law and its implication for public officials, governments, and government agencies in this state. Their work integrates

federal and North Carolina law and emphasizes its impact on North Carolina officials through publications that reach these officials. Faculty members in public administration and allied fields focus on research that is relevant and valuable to North Carolina public officials and often equally applicable to national academic and practitioner audiences.

Faculty members produce a variety of written products that share original research findings, offer insights on pressing issues in government, and inform public officials. Faculty members produce books, articles, and monographs and also blogs and other forms of electronic scholarship. Sometimes their writing involves work that is not formally attributed to the faculty member. Examples include bench books for judges, committee or commission reports, model policies and procedures, state legislation, and local ordinances. Online publications share equal standing with print publications.

For all faculty, the School places great value on publications focused on North Carolina practitioner audiences. Such publications directly advance the School's mission because of their targeted audience. Thus, School faculty members produce many specialized publications, including comprehensive guidebooks and web-based resources for government officials in multiple roles within the judicial system and throughout state and local government. The School also publishes multiple bulletin series, including the *Administration of Justice Bulletin*, which reaches public officials in the court system, and the *Local Government Law Bulletin*, which reaches local government officials. The School also hosts several blogs, which provide a convenient and timely venue for the dissemination of short substantive pieces. Blogs sometimes contain news and commentary, but many blogs focus on substantive research and analysis, including analysis of legislation and judicial decisions at the state and federal level.

Faculty Participation in the Master of Public Administration Program

The School assumed responsibility for the Master of Public Administration (MPA) program in 1997.¹² Most School of Government faculty members do not teach in the MPA program because they work in specialty areas that are not core or elective subjects for public administration students. Those who do teach in the program combine scholarship and practice in carrying out the School's mission for North Carolina public officials, which makes them ideally suited to offer professional education for MPA students. Faculty members work with public officials every day on real-world issues and then draw on that practical experience to enrich the teaching in their MPA classrooms.

12. Accreditation is by the Network of Schools of Public Policy, Affairs, and Administration (NASPAA). The MPA program was most recently reaccredited in 2010. In 2012, the School began offering the MPA in an online format (<https://onlinempa.unc.edu/>).

The School has worked hard to avoid creating two rigid categories of faculty—faculty working exclusively with MPA students and faculty dedicated exclusively to North Carolina public officials. The concern is that creating a separate category of MPA faculty would introduce and institutionalize a false dichotomy between scholarship only for the academy and engaged scholarship for state and local officials. The School is strongly committed to continuing the combination of scholarship and practice that has made it successful, and as a result its approach to participation in the MPA program is consistent with the School’s larger mission.

No faculty members teach in the MPA program full time. A small number of faculty members at the School have primary appointments in the MPA program with the understanding that they will have a significantly greater responsibility for the MPA program than most of their colleagues. They typically teach two MPA courses each year rather than the normal full load of four courses per year for nine-month faculty in other academic units. Like all of their colleagues at the School, these faculty members also are expected to work with North Carolina officials in their areas of public administration expertise. In collaboration with colleagues and in consultation with the Dean, faculty members with primary appointments in the MPA program will develop their own combination of activities that likely will include more teaching and advising for MPA students than for public officials. They also are expected to write for refereed public administration journals. Publication in these journals and by leading book publishers is important for the MPA program’s standing as a national leader. There is no prescribed number of refereed publications for promotion, however, and these faculty members also are expected to write for practitioners in their fields. Because of these multiple demands on their time—working with practitioners and MPA students—the School anticipates that these public administration faculty members may produce fewer peer-reviewed publications than faculty members in other academic departments.

Faculty members in public administration who do not have primary appointments in the MPA program, as well as those who work in other academic disciplines that are directly relevant to public administration students—such as budgeting, public leadership, or local government law—may contribute to the MPA program. They may teach one course in the MPA program every year or only occasionally, and they may advise and support students and review student portfolios. Faculty members who do not have primary appointments in the MPA program focus most of their attention on the School’s core mission for North Carolina officials. Like all faculty members at the School, these faculty members engage in teaching, advising, and research and publication. Some of these faculty members, especially those with a Ph.D. in public administration or a related field, typically publish some of their work in refereed journals in order to advance their professional standing in their fields and to promote the reputation of the MPA program and the School. Other

faculty members in this category, especially those with different academic backgrounds or those with areas of expertise not typically addressed in public administration journals, may more frequently choose different avenues of publication. There is no single mix of publications that is appropriate for all faculty members or that is prescribed for reappointment, tenure, or promotion. (See “Scholarly Research and Publication” in Section 6 for specific criteria.)

Section 3. The Scholarship of Engagement—A Broader Context for Understanding the School

After World War II, “*scholarship* came to be viewed as synonymous with basic research and publication.”¹³ Ernest Boyer’s classic report, *Scholarship Reconsidered*,¹⁴ challenged universities to embrace a more expansive and flexible definition of scholarship. Collectively, faculty members offer a wonderful “mosaic of talent,” and counting more of their diverse contributions as scholarship could bring “renewed vitality to higher learning and the nation.” Boyer encouraged institutions of higher education “to support and reward not only those scholars uniquely gifted in research, but also those who excel in the integration and application of knowledge”¹⁵ School of Government faculty members are involved in both kinds of work—original research and its application. This view of faculty work has become known as the *scholarship of engagement*, which broadly means connecting “the intellectual resources of the academy to make the world a better place for all of us.”¹⁶ It also has been called “public scholarship” and “scholarship for the common good.”¹⁷ The engaged faculty member is one who “draws on the expertise of the discipline, makes connections with audiences beyond the campus, and connects the faculty career to the community.”¹⁸

Like all University faculty members, the School’s faculty members conduct original research. Teaching and advising by School faculty members involves the subtle and complex application of their research to practical issues confronting public officials. “To be considered *scholarship*,” writes Boyer, “service activities must be tied directly to one’s

13. K. Ward, *Faculty Service Roles and the Scholarship of Engagement*, vol. 28, no. 5, *ASHE-ERIC Higher Education Report* (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 2003).

14. E. L. Boyer, *Scholarship Reconsidered: Priorities of the Professoriate* (Princeton, NJ: Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, 1990).

15. *Ibid.*, 27.

16. Ward, *Faculty Service Roles*, 115.

17. *Ibid.*, 112.

18. *Ibid.*

special field of knowledge and relate to, and flow directly out of, this professional activity.”¹⁹ This definition of service as scholarship includes “serious, disciplined work that seeks to interpret, draw together, and bring new insight to bear on original research.”²⁰ Scholarship involves asking, “How can knowledge be responsibly applied to consequential problems? How can it be helpful to individuals as well as institutions?” And further, ‘Can social problems *themselves* define an agenda for scholarly investigation?’²¹ In discussing possible forms of scholarly publications, Boyer noted that “[w]riting for nonspecialists . . . also should be recognized as a legitimate scholarly endeavor. . . . To make complex ideas understandable to a large audience can be a difficult, demanding task, one that requires not only a deep and thorough knowledge of one’s field, but keen literary skills, as well.”²² These descriptions of engaged scholarship describe the work of faculty at the School of Government.

The School’s long and successful experience with faculty engagement foreshadowed the national engagement movement.²³ Faculty members have been leaders in engaged scholarship for many years without necessarily describing their work as engagement—even though it is clear that the School’s values and practices reflect the philosophy underlying the scholarship of engagement. According to the Institute of Government’s founder, Professor Albert Coates, “[t]he officials can bring badly needed practical insight to students and teachers who in turn can bring just as badly needed theoretical backgrounds to practical officials. The book-men need the practice; the practice-men need the books; and the college campus needs the interlocking relationships of both in order to do its duty by the state in which it lives and moves and has its being.”²⁴ Albert Coates relied on plain language to describe his vision for the Institute, though today he

19. Boyer, *Scholarship Reconsidered*, 22.

20. *Ibid.*, 19.

21. *Ibid.*, 21.

22. *Ibid.*, 35.

23. Different terminology is used to describe public service and its many variations. This document will use the term “engaged scholarship” because it has been the School’s practice and because it applies to virtually all aspects of faculty work at the School. In fact, the charter of the School of Government indicates that it “will be organized and operated in ways that best serve its fundamental mission of outreach and engagement.” *A Proposal to Create the School of Government* (March 28, 2001), 2. The charter also adopted the key characteristics of engagement identified by the Kellogg Commission on the Future of State and Land-Grant Universities in its report *Returning to Our Roots: The Engaged Institution*. It further indicated that “[t]he School will be guided by those characteristics, all of which have been central in the work of the Institute [of Government], and its teaching, research, and service will be ‘sympathetically and productively involved with [its] communities, however community may be defined.’” Kellogg Commission on the Future of State and Land-Grant Universities, *Returning to Our Roots: The Engaged Institution*, 3rd report (Washington, DC: National Association of State Universities and Land Grant Colleges, Feb. 1999).

24. A. Coates, *The Story of the Institute of Government* (Bloomington, IN: The National University Extension Association, Studies in University Extension Education, 1944).

would include women in his description, and he brilliantly anticipated the philosophy behind the scholarship of engagement.²⁵

Universities have developed ways to assess the engaged scholarship of their faculty members because traditional ways of evaluating academic work—refereed publications and teaching evaluations—are not especially helpful indicia of engagement.²⁶ What counts as engaged scholarship? How is it documented? How is it evaluated? What motivates faculty members to become involved in engaged scholarship? How is its impact measured? In trying to identify standards for evaluating engaged scholarship, some have focused on universal dimensions of *the scholarly process*—clear goals, adequate preparation, appropriate methods, significant results, effective presentation, and reflective critique.²⁷ Engaged scholarship will have credibility only if faculty can demonstrate that their work meets the highest performance standards. In other words, “[e]xcellence is the yardstick by which all scholarship must be measured.”²⁸

25. This appreciation of practical scholarship is not surprising given that Albert Coates was deeply influenced by Edward Kidder Graham, who became President of the University of North Carolina in 1914. Graham believed in “the interpretation of scholarship in terms of service.” R. D. W. Connor, “Edward Kidder Graham—Apostle of Culture and Democracy,” in *Southern Pioneers in Social Interpretation*, ed. H. W. Odum (Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press, 1925), 214. Graham “saw no indignity to scholarship in making it serviceable, and he was convinced that democracy in all its various social and economic phases had much to gain from contact with the spirit and methods of scholarship.” Odum, ed., *Southern Pioneers*, 214. This focus on practical scholarship also is not surprising given the influence on Coates of his professor at Harvard Law School, Dean Roscoe Pound, whose “sociological jurisprudence” was closely tied to the methods of John Dewey at Columbia and to the innovations of the American pragmatists such as Charles S. Pierce and William James. Wrote Pound, “The sociological movement in jurisprudence is a movement for pragmatism as a philosophy of law; for the adjustment of principles and doctrines to the human conditions they are to govern rather than to assumed first principles; for putting the human factor in the central place and relegating logic to its true position as an instrument.” D. R. Pound, “The Scope and Purpose of Sociological Jurisprudence,” part II, *Harvard Law Review*, vol. 25 (1912): 489. Pound also stated, “What is law depends not merely upon the facts of the past and of the present but also upon the will of those who prescribe and those who administer rules of conduct by the authority of the state; and this will is determined not a little by their theory of what they do and why they do it.” D. R. Pound, “The Scope and Purpose of Sociological Jurisprudence,” part I, *Harvard Law Review*, vol. 24 (1911): 591. Coates noted with obvious pride that he shared his early ideas for the Institute with Dean Pound, who paid his own way to come to Chapel Hill at the Institute’s inception and expressed his enthusiasm for Coates’ early work. Coates, *The Story of the Institute*, 32–33.

26. The Committee on Institutional Cooperation (CIC) (Big Ten universities and the University of Chicago) created a special committee to define and benchmark engagement, including the identification of strategies for building engagement into the faculty reward system. A draft report offers tentative recommendations for “generating benchmarks to allow CIC institutions to monitor their effectiveness in achieving the goals of engaged universities” CIC Committee on Engagement, *Resource Guide and Recommendations for Defining and Benchmarking Engagement* (rev. Oct. 22, 2004).

27. C. E. Glassick, M. T. Huber, and G. I. Maeroff, *Scholarship Assessed: Evaluation of the Professoriate* (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1997).

28. Boyer, *Scholarship Reconsidered*, 28.

Explicitly recognizing the School of Government’s work as engaged scholarship places the School’s mission in the larger context of modern academic life. Performance satisfying the standards contained in this document must also satisfy the University’s standards for scholarly accomplishment, even if the particular criteria vary from those of other campus units with different missions. In other words, School faculty members do not confront two separate standards—School standards for work with North Carolina public officials *and* different University standards. There is one standard for scholarship at the University—excellence—and it can be satisfied in different ways depending on the mission of each academic unit. The policies and procedures in this document have evolved over time to ensure that the School’s faculty members are recognized for their excellent engaged scholarship in ways that continue to advance the School’s mission for North Carolina.

In 2009, the UNC Task Force on Promotion and Tenure Policies and Practices analyzed future trends in university tenure and promotion and specifically noted the trends in engaged scholarship and new forms for scholarly work. The recommendations from its report (available at <http://provost.unc.edu/files/2012/10/Taskforce-on-Future-Promotion-and-Tenure-Policies-and-Practices-FINAL-REPORT-5-8-09.pdf>) included explicit consideration of the faculty member’s interactions and engagement with communities outside the traditional scholarly community; revision of dossier documents and CV guidelines to highlight engaged faculty work; and revision of personnel documents to include guidelines for the evaluation of new forms of scholarly communication, including review and feedback from users, students, and other audiences for the new forms of scholarly work. The University has embraced engaged scholarship and now requires it to be recognized in promotion and tenure policies. The standard format for CVs now includes categories for “products of engaged scholarship” and “digital and other novel forms of scholarship (with electronic links displayed, if relevant).”²⁹

Section 4. Faculty Appointments

General

For any appointment there must be evidence that a person understands and embraces the School’s unique mission, its definition of scholarship, and its culture of responsive engagement with North Carolina public officials. This personal commitment to the strong

29. See “Presentation of an Effective Dossier to the APT Committee” at <http://academicpersonnel.unc.edu/faculty-policies-procedures-guidelines/faculty-appointments/tenure-track-appointments/dossier-format-for-tenure-track-or-tenured-faculty-review/>.

service culture of the School is necessary for all appointments, including faculty who are expected to have significant responsibility in the Master of Public Administration Program. All School faculty members have twelve-month appointments to carry out this mission. See Section 7 for qualifications for faculty consultation on initial appointments.

Tenure Track Appointments

Instructor

This rank is for a person who is expected to progress to the rank of assistant professor. It is used mainly as an interim designation for a new faculty member who meets all criteria for appointment as an assistant professor except the completion of doctoral degree requirements. The appointment as assistant professor becomes effective automatically upon completion of the degree requirements. The term of appointment is one year with a maximum of four terms.

Assistant Professor

This rank is for a person who has very little or no experience in an academic position and who has demonstrated the potential to meet all of the requirements for tenure. A person usually will hold a law degree or a doctoral degree or its equivalent at the time of appointment. The initial appointment is for a four-year probationary term, with a possible reappointment for a three-year term. Review for reappointment occurs in the third year of the initial four-year appointment as assistant professor.

Associate Professor

This rank confers permanent tenure if a person is promoted from the rank of assistant professor. Review for promotion to this rank occurs in the second year of the three-year reappointment as assistant professor.

A person may be appointed to a five-year probationary term as an associate professor without tenure if the person has significant professional experience and there is a reasonable expectation that he or she will meet the requirements for tenure by the end of the fourth year. Review for conferring tenure occurs in the fourth year of the five-year appointment. Review may occur earlier, but University policy prohibits granting of tenure before the person has been in active employment for at least 18 months. The typical profile for an initial appointment at this rank is a person who has advanced expertise in a field based on many years of practical experience and has demonstrated the potential to meet all of the requirements for tenure. An initial appointment may be made with tenure at the rank of associate professor only if a person meets all of the

requirements for tenure. This might occur, for example, when someone already is tenured at another university but does not meet the requirements for full professor.

Professor

This rank always confers tenure and in most cases the person will be promoted from associate professor. Review for promotion to this rank occurs in the fourth year of the five-year appointment as associate professor with tenure. An initial appointment as professor will be rare because it requires evidence that a person has all of the same qualifications and qualities as a person in the School who has been promoted from associate professor.

Fixed-Term Appointments

Lecturer

This appointment is for a person who will be engaged primarily in teaching and advising activities. There is no expectation that a lecturer will engage in scholarly research and publication. Nevertheless, a lecturer may produce publications in his or her field, and although it is not required, this work will be recognized and rewarded. The initial fixed-term appointment and succeeding terms may be made for a period of one to five years. A person must hold at least a bachelors degree at the time of appointment.

Senior Lecturer

A lecturer who has at least seven years of distinguished service is eligible for promotion to the rank of senior lecturer. Promotion to senior lecturer requires evidence of distinguished service beyond that which is expected of a lecturer, based on the promotion criteria set forth in Section 6 of this policy—recognizing, however, that lecturers are not expected to produce scholarly research and publications. This is a mid-rank appointment for fixed-term faculty, similar to the rank of associate professor for tenure track faculty. A person may be hired as a senior lecturer with seven years of service as a lecturer or equivalent relevant experience.

Teaching Professor

A senior lecturer who has at least six years of distinguished service at that rank is eligible for promotion to teaching professor. Promotion to teaching professor requires evidence of

distinguished service beyond that which is expected of a senior lecturer, based on the promotion criteria set forth in Section 6 of this policy—recognizing, however, that lecturers are not expected to produce scholarly research and publications. This is a high-rank appointment for fixed-term faculty, similar to the rank of full professor for tenure track faculty. A person may be hired as a teaching professor with six consecutive years of service as a senior lecturer or equivalent relevant experience.

Professor of the Practice

This appointment is reserved for a person who has been a distinguished practitioner in higher education administration or outside of higher education. It typically will be reserved for people with many years of experience. The initial fixed-term appointment and succeeding terms may be made for periods of one to five years.

Adjunct Faculty

This part-time appointment is for a person who is employed outside the University, is retired, or has a primary appointment in another academic unit within the University. The person will have limited responsibilities in the areas of teaching, advising, and research and publication that are of special benefit to the School. This appointment is not honorary and it will not be extended simply as a courtesy. In many cases a person will be compensated for specific activities performed for the School, but in other cases the adjunct faculty member will serve without compensation. The initial fixed-term appointment and succeeding terms may be made for periods of one to five years.

Section 5. Standard for Reappointment and Promotion

University Standards

The *Trustee Policies and Regulations Governing Academic Tenure in the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill*³⁰ provide that tenure “requires an assessment of institutional needs and resources and evidence of service to the academic community, potential for future contribution, commitment to the welfare of the University, and demonstrated professional competence, including consideration of commitment to effective teaching, research, or public service.”³¹ The *Trustee Policies* provide further

30. The University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, *Trustee Policies and Regulations Governing Academic Tenure*, <http://policy.sites.unc.edu/files/2013/04/tenure.pdf>.

31. UNC Chapel Hill, *Trustee Policies*, sec. 2.a.

that reappointment and tenure decisions may take into account “any factors deemed relevant to total institutional interests”³² The conferral of tenure represents a judgment by one’s peers, as well as the institution, that a person has demonstrated a level of competence consistent with the best traditions of the University. It is an invitation to continue participating as a valued colleague in the ongoing advancement of the University and its mission.

The qualitative standard mentioned explicitly in the *Trustee Policies* is “demonstrated professional competence,” but the policies are silent on the meaning of that critically important standard. A decision about reappointment or tenure by the School and subsequent University reviewers necessarily includes a mix of objective and subjective judgments. The specific requirements for tenure can never be described with precision. Ultimately a group of decision makers guided by clear criteria makes its best consensus judgment about whether a person’s work is of the highest quality.

Each academic unit is responsible for establishing faculty performance criteria that advance its particular mission within the University. After becoming familiar with the written criteria for each academic unit (including those in this document), the University’s Advisory Committee on Appointments, Promotion, and Tenure reviews each appointment, promotion, and tenure recommendation to determine whether a unit has followed its own procedures and rigorously applied its own criteria.

School of Government

*The standard for reappointment, promotion, and tenure at the School of Government is excellence in meeting the needs of North Carolina public officials and (if applicable) MPA students.*³³ All faculty members carry out the School’s mission of engaged scholarship through teaching, research and publication, and advising. (As noted earlier, fixed-term faculty members are not required to engage in research and publication activities, but they are rewarded in the promotion process if they choose to do so.) Many different combinations of activities can provide a successful path within the School. Each faculty member, in consultation with the Dean and the faculty member’s faculty advisory committee and in collaboration with other colleagues, determines the best way to meet the varied needs of public officials in his or her field and decides upon the appropriate mix of teaching, research and publication, and advising. Thus, not every faculty member produces the same amount of work for public officials in each dimension. The School

32. UNC Chapel Hill, *Trustee Policies*, sec. 4.a.

33. The standard is the same whether a faculty member is supported by a continuing state appropriation or has been appointed contingent on the availability of funds from another source.

expects and supports differences in the *quantity* of teaching, writing, and advising from its faculty members. The School demands excellence in the *quality* of *all* faculty work.

A faculty member must show clear evidence of regular, continuous, focused, and significant work to satisfy the standards for reappointment, promotion, and tenure. The decision will be based on a consideration of work completed rather than on unrealized potential. The faculty member also must show promise of continuing achievement at a very high level. This is the expectation for faculty members in tenure track and fixed-term appointments and at every rank.

Consistent with the specific criteria for reappointment and promotion and the commitment to meeting the needs of public officials, there is no single prescription for demonstrating accomplishment sufficient for promotion. For instance, scholarly research and publication that is sufficient for promotion may take many forms and need not necessarily be manifested as a book or, for most faculty, as peer-reviewed articles. (See “Scholarly Research and Publication” in Section 6.) As stated earlier, however, faculty members with primary appointments within the MPA program are expected to publish in peer-reviewed journals. There is no prescribed number of refereed publications for these faculty members and they also are expected to write for practitioners in their fields.

The School expects all faculty members to demonstrate progressively greater accomplishment and effectiveness at each successive academic rank. As a faculty member progresses in rank, the School expects the faculty member to show sustained productivity reflecting a continuous increase in breadth and depth of expertise in the faculty member’s field(s). This standard of accomplishment and productivity is evaluated across all aspects of faculty work: teaching, advising, and research and publication. Promotion is a high faculty honor and it signifies that its recipient has demonstrated sustained achievement and is likely to continue meeting an exemplary standard of professional ability and service.

The standards for promotion to higher rank must be applied with due consideration for the specific context of School of Government faculty work. Faculty members’ work is typically driven by the needs of the public officials for whom and with whom they work. The School recognizes that the mix of work produced will vary among faculty members. The expectation is that faculty members will extend and deepen their expertise and will continue to disseminate practical scholarship in all three dimensions of faculty work (teaching, advising, and research and publication) that reflects continued mastery of the subject area. Evidence of greater accomplishment and effectiveness in research and publication should not be viewed as a requirement for a book or other lengthy publication or a singular work of scholarship. Evidence of work worthy of promotion does not

necessarily require a distinct or new type of publication. It could include regular updates of a key resource in the faculty member's field of expertise as well as work in multiple formats that blends publication, teaching, and advising. The standard for promotion requires a quality and quantity of work that demonstrates a high level of productivity, taking into consideration, in addition to publication, the scholarly research and expertise that informs teaching and advising. The School recognizes that the evidence of accomplishment and productivity is increasingly represented in media that are integrated into teaching, advising, and publication. The review process requires evaluation of the quantity and quality of scholarship that underlies the faculty work as reflected in all three of these main categories of work.

A faculty member may seek, or be asked to consider, a change to a new field of work when changes in his or her original field justify a reallocation of resources or when a vacancy or new position exists. Such a change must be approved by the Dean, based on considerations including the benefit of the change for faculty retention, the faculty member's demonstrated potential to provide excellent service in the new field, and (in the case of a vacancy or new position) the potential benefits, including increasing diversity, of conducting a search to fill the vacant position. When the School has approved a faculty change of field, subsequent review for promotion will be based on the entire body of work, and excellence in meeting the needs of public officials in both the original field and the new field of work will be evaluated. Such review will take into consideration the timing of the change and the extent to which the faculty member is able to develop expertise in the new field prior to the review.

A fixed-term faculty member may seek, or be asked to consider, changing to a tenure-track appointment. Such a change will typically require a search and must be approved by the Dean, based on considerations including the benefit of the change in terms of faculty retention, the faculty member's potential to provide excellent service in the new appointment, and the potential benefits, including increasing diversity, of conducting a search to fill the appointment. When the School has allowed such a change, subsequent review for reappointment and promotion will be based on the entire body of work completed during both appointments.

Section 6. Specific Criteria for Reappointment and Promotion

General

Many factors bear on the School's evaluation of whether a faculty member is doing an excellent job of meeting the needs of public officials and (if applicable) MPA students. This section addresses a wide range of relevant performance categories and offers guidance for documenting performance. To the extent possible, this policy uses criteria that can be objectively measured. But reappointment and promotion determinations also involve subjective assessments of relative contributions in different aspects of the School's work. The approach taken by this policy is to provide the decision makers at all levels with the best information to make those decisions in as rational and objective a manner as possible.

The School encourages collaboration and partnerships, and thus collaborative contributions by faculty members are valued as much as individual contributions. Because collaborative works are not necessarily proportionally attributable, a faculty member will be asked to describe the nature of his or her contribution.

The effort to emphasize objective measures does not minimize the importance of assessing the extent to which faculty members promote a positive organizational culture in which all of these activities occur. The culture of the School of Government values and promotes the following:

- High ethical standards
- Intellectual integrity
- Responsiveness to the needs of audiences served
- Reliability, punctuality, and responsibility in approaching one's work
- Good judgment that avoids situations that reflect adversely on the School or the University
- Commitment to the common good of the School, as reflected in a willingness to assist colleagues, teach in colleagues' classes, and work on pan-School projects—all in a manner that promotes collegiality
- Good humor
- A demonstrated commitment to professional development, including mentoring colleagues

While these characteristics cannot easily be quantified, they are important to the successful operation of the School, and the absence of any of these qualities is considered in reappointment and promotion recommendations.

Impact

The School considers evidence of the impact of the faculty member's work on the professional conduct of the public officials served. For example, has a faculty member's work resulted in the creation or development of new systems for the improvement of government in North Carolina? Have the activities affected government policies and programs? Has work in one government organization resulted in invitations from other organizations to help plan, organize, or conduct similar activities? In making these assessments, it is important to determine the extent to which the particular circumstances of a faculty member's relationship to public officials makes that kind of evidence likely to be available. As discussed in more detail in Section 7, below, the School asks officials for evaluation letters because they are in a good position to assess the impact of a faculty member's work.

The School recognizes that assessing the impact of a faculty member's work is very difficult, since exposure to School training, advising, and research and publication is only one factor in shaping the behavior of public officials and MPA students. Impact reasonably may be inferred from evidence that a faculty member is meaningfully engaged with state or local officials. This evidence of engagement with officials may take many forms—such as telephone and email inquiries, visits to a faculty member's website, strong attendance at programs offered by a faculty member, and requests for other kinds of assistance. The assessment of impact is complicated further by the School's fundamental principle of nonadvocacy. The role of a School faculty member usually is not to suggest that a particular course of action be taken but to provide an improved basis for the public official to make his or her own judgment.

The fact that assessing impact is difficult and that the information to do so is not always available does not diminish its value as an important indicator of the effectiveness of School work. As a faculty member is evaluated along the dimensions of teaching, advising, and research and publication, impact will be an important consideration.

Reputation

The School of Government enjoys a national reputation for effective scholarly engagement with public officials in North Carolina. To be effectively engaged, faculty members are expected to develop over time stronger and more extensive reputations in

North Carolina with state and local officials in their fields. Consideration of state reputation is required for reappointment or promotion. Because the School’s mission focuses on North Carolina officials rather than a national audience, most School faculty members appropriately strive for a state reputation rather than a national reputation. Nevertheless, some faculty members develop national reputations because their work is relevant to public officials in other states. The law affecting government varies from state to state, and the work of lawyer faculty members emphasizes law that impacts North Carolina officials. If faculty members made their legal work more broadly and generically relevant to officials in other states, it would be correspondingly less helpful to North Carolina officials. Faculty members in the field of public administration, on the other hand, have the opportunity to reach a national audience without reducing their effectiveness for North Carolina officials. In fact, faculty members who have significant responsibilities in the MPA program (in general, those who regularly teach two courses in the program) are expected to publish in national refereed journals. There is a corresponding expectation that those faculty members develop a national reputation, but it may happen more slowly than for faculty in other academic departments because they also are expected to write for and advise North Carolina public officials.

Faculty members carry out the School of Government’s mission through their work in the following areas. The order carries no implication of priority—each activity is important and the precise mix will vary over the course of a faculty member’s career.

Teaching

The School’s commitment to excellent teaching has been a significant factor in its success with North Carolina public officials and MPA students.³⁴ The evaluation for reappointment and promotion therefore includes a thorough review of a faculty member’s teaching materials and peer observations of classroom teaching by the Advisory Committee (see discussion under “Faculty Advisory Committees” in Section 7 and in the School’s *Internal Guidelines for the Faculty Appointment, Tenure, and Promotion Process*).³⁵ The evaluation also includes a careful review of student teaching evaluations covering at least the past three years, as well as a faculty member’s teaching portfolio.³⁶

34. See the description of teaching under “Core Faculty Work for North Carolina Public Officials” in Section 2.

35. See the School’s *Internal Guidelines for the Faculty Appointment, Tenure, and Promotion Process* for a description of the review and evaluation of teaching.

36. See the School’s *Internal Guidelines for the Faculty Appointment, Tenure, and Promotion Process* for the elements of a faculty member’s teaching statement and teaching portfolio.

In addition to providing direct instruction, faculty members also are responsible for organizing schools and conferences that include topics outside of their fields and require other instructors from inside and outside the School. Effective programs for public officials depend on careful planning and administration—identifying the instructional needs of officials, providing clear guidance to instructors, developing logical connections between sessions, and relating individual programs to long-term curriculum planning. Faculty members spend a significant amount of time on this important work. The review of teaching includes an evaluation of the quality of a faculty member’s course planning and administration.

The critical question is whether the person is doing an excellent job *through teaching* to meet the needs of North Carolina officials and (if applicable) MPA students in his or her field of expertise. The quantity of teaching varies among faculty members based on the varied needs of public officials and students in their fields. The School expects excellence in the quality of a faculty member’s teaching—regardless of the amount. The Advisory Committee, the qualified faculty, and the Dean consider all relevant information about a faculty member’s teaching, including the following measures:

- Accuracy, analytical precision, and comprehensiveness of teaching materials
- Responsiveness of the oral presentation and written classroom materials to the needs of audiences served
- Coherence of the oral presentation and written classroom materials
- Incorporation of the latest information and developments in a field
- Quantity of teaching
- Evaluation by students
- Number and percentage of students in the target audience who choose to participate in class offerings, reviewed over a substantial period of time
- Development of new courses
- Service as a mentor or other contributions to the teaching of other faculty
- Effective use of audiovisual aids
- Use of innovative teaching methods, including distance education and other instructional technology
- Extent to which students are engaged by the teacher
- Extent to which the teacher fosters a respectful learning environment
- Peer observations of classroom teaching

- Nomination for or receipt of teaching awards
- Implementation of accepted adult education principles
- Participation in teaching development activities
- Ability to manage the class
- Grants awarded to carry out teaching
- Emulation of the faculty member’s courses or use of the teaching materials by others
- Development and administration of successful programs, including the integration of topics outside the faculty member’s area of expertise

Advising

Advising is one of the most meaningful and distinctive ways that faculty members fulfill the School’s mission of improving government in North Carolina.³⁷ Unlike faculty elsewhere in the University, School of Government faculty members are expected to respond to requests for assistance by public officials as part of their regular work—and to do so in a timely, thorough, and helpful manner. Faculty members also help the media and other citizens understand North Carolina government and the actions of public officials. This work often involves original research and innovative analysis as faculty members confront novel questions in their fields. Advising is evaluated carefully in making recommendations for reappointment and promotion. The critical question is whether the person is doing an excellent job *through advising* to meet the needs of North Carolina officials and (if applicable) MPA students in his or her field of expertise. The quantity of advising will vary among faculty members based on the varied needs of public officials and students. The School expects excellence in the quality of a faculty member’s advising—regardless of the amount. The Advisory Committee, the qualified faculty, and the Dean consider all relevant information about a faculty member’s advising, including the following measures:

- Accuracy, analytical precision, and comprehensiveness
- Coherence and clarity
- Feedback from public officials, MPA students, and colleagues
- Responsiveness to the needs of audiences served and timeliness

37. See the description of advising under “Core Faculty Work for North Carolina Public Officials” in Section 2.

- Accessibility for advising
- Efficient time management with respect to advising
- Quantity of the activity or activities, in terms of the scope of projects undertaken, as well as the overall number
- Tangible work products produced as a result of advising efforts
- Grants and contracts awarded to carry out advising projects
- Emulation by others of the methods, materials, or approaches taken in consultations
- Special innovations in the manner or approach taken to providing advising services
- Extent to which the clients served return to the faculty member for future advice, measured over a substantial period of time
- Any awards or other recognition received by the faculty member for advising or by a project as a result of the faculty member's advising

Scholarly Research and Publication

After considering a faculty member's publications and statement,³⁸ the critical question is whether the person is doing an excellent job *through scholarly research and publication* to meet the needs of North Carolina officials and (if applicable) other public administration practitioners and scholars in his or her field of expertise.³⁹ The reappointment and promotion decision will be made on the basis of completed works, including published works, works that are submitted for internal publication and are in the editorial process, and works that have been accepted for external publication.

The School has a long tradition of faculty publications that combine depth of scholarly understanding with clear and thoughtful writing. Because the School's intended audience is so different from that of a traditional academic unit, the type of publications most faculty members produce necessarily will be quite different from traditional academic publications. Original research and careful analysis are necessary, however, and so is the ability to make complicated subjects accessible without sacrificing complexity and subtlety. This combination of qualities is the essence of engaged scholarship.

38. See the School's *Internal Guidelines for the Faculty Appointment, Tenure and Promotion Process* for the elements of a faculty member's research statement.

39. See the description of research and publication under "Core Faculty Work for North Carolina Public Officials" in Section 2.

The quantity of publications will vary among faculty members based on the varied needs of public officials in their fields and their involvement in the MPA program. Each faculty member is expected to be productive; however, there is no prescribed number of publications. Because of their workloads of teaching and advising, the School's faculty members will rarely produce the quantity of publications typical of a faculty member in another academic unit. The School expects excellence in the quality of a faculty member's publications—regardless of the amount or category.

Faculty members create publications that will advance the School's mission of engaged scholarship, but their responsibilities are not uniform. The School's expectations for faculty members therefore differ from faculty member to faculty member, depending on the nature of each individual's work, academic discipline, and degree of involvement with the MPA program.

All faculty members publish for North Carolina public officials, whether their discipline is law, public administration, or a closely related discipline. The nature of his or her appointment and the academic discipline of each faculty member influence publication expectations, as outlined below:

1. Faculty members with primary appointments in the MPA program (that is, those appointed to teach two or more MPA classes each year) are expected to write not only for North Carolina officials but also for refereed public administration journals, many of which have practitioner and academic audiences.
2. Other faculty members who work in an academic discipline that is relevant to public administration students may have lesser responsibility within the MPA program. Some of these faculty members, especially those with a Ph.D., typically publish at least some of their work in refereed journals in order to advance their professional standing in their fields and to promote the reputation of the MPA program and the School. Other faculty members in this category, especially those with different academic backgrounds or those with areas of expertise not typically addressed in public administration journals, may more frequently choose different avenues of publication. There is no single mix of publications that is appropriate for all faculty members or that is prescribed for reappointment, tenure, or promotion.
3. A large proportion of faculty members, including most in public law, do not have direct responsibilities within the MPA program. These faculty members are not required to publish in refereed public administration journals for reappointment and promotion. They may contribute occasionally to law reviews, public administration journals, or journals in a related discipline,

however, which counts for reappointment and promotion even though it is not required.

The form of the publication is not as important to the School as the quality of the work. “Publication” is conceived broadly to include conveying important ideas for improving government in any form (print, websites, blogs, apps, or other digital media) that communicates effectively with the School’s primary audiences. Electronic publications and instructional multimedia, for example, may serve North Carolina officials as well as print publications, and in the future they may turn out to be even more important. High-quality, high-impact works, regardless of the choice of medium, count the same for purposes of reappointment and promotion. A book does not count more than a series of bulletins that demonstrates the same overall quality and impact, for example, and a high-quality video representing comparable expertise may count as much as a book or a series of bulletins. There is no categorical criterion and there is no book requirement for reappointment or promotion. Furthermore, the School does not expect or encourage faculty members to choose a book format for promotion purposes when a different format would be more effective for the intended audience. The School’s faculty members are encouraged to experiment with innovative ways of reaching public officials. The same measures that apply to traditional print publications apply to electronic publications.

In assessing a faculty member’s contribution to the scholarly research and publication function of the School, the Advisory Committee, the qualified faculty, and the Dean will consider measures such as the following:

- Extent to which the written material reflects a careful, accurate, and systematic analysis of the subject matter field in which the faculty member is writing
- Coherence and clarity
- Extent to which the written material reflects original research and creative approaches to issues
- Appropriateness and effectiveness of the form selected for reaching the intended audience
- Responsiveness to the needs of audiences served
- Number and scope of publications and other writings produced
- Published evaluations of written work
- Extent to which the written work is reproduced or cited in other published works or other public records

- Works in which the faculty member serves as editor
- Awards and recognition of the quality of the work by entities other than the School
- Special innovations in the presentation of material in published form

Service to the School, the University, and the Profession

Faculty members must share in the work necessary to maintain and improve the School, the University, and their profession. These types of service generally are not related to a faculty member's substantive fields of work. However, a faculty member's effectiveness in carrying out the School's mission ultimately depends on the strength of these institutions. Not every person will have the same opportunity or ability to provide this kind of service, and the opportunities to do so tend to increase with experience. The key question is whether a faculty member willingly has served the School, the University, and the profession consistent with those opportunities.

Service to the School

In assessing the degree to which an individual has provided service to the School, the Advisory Committee, the qualified faculty, and the Dean will consider the extent to which the individual participates in the following kinds of activities and the extent to which that participation contributes to the School:

- Editing a publication of interest to readers beyond the faculty member's substantive fields
- Serving on the Legislative Reporting Service (for lawyer faculty members only)
- Assuming administrative responsibility for the MPA program—such as serving as director, working as a member of the admissions committee, or serving on portfolio committees
- Administering or assisting with the administration of a program for traditional students—such as the Summer Law Clerk Program
- Assuming responsibility for a major course that is outside a faculty member's usual area of responsibility—such as the Municipal and County Administration course
- Chairing or serving on a committee

- Assuming responsibility for multi-author publications that serve several different groups of public officials
- Advising graduate and professional students
- Assuming responsibility for other administrative projects or assuming general management responsibility within the School
- Any other similar service to the School

Service to the University or to the Profession

In assessing the degree to which a faculty member has provided service to the University or his or her profession, the Advisory Committee, the qualified faculty, and the Dean will consider the extent to which the person participates in the following kinds of activities and the extent to which that participation contributes to the improvement of the institutions served:

- Serving as chair or a member of a committee on this campus or within one's professional organizations
- Serving on editorial boards of journals
- Working on projects sponsored by the University administration, either on this campus or through the Office of the President
- Serving in a leadership role in a professional organization
- Any other service that is relevant to the work of the University or to one's profession

Section 7. Review Process for Reappointment, Tenure, and Promotion⁴⁰

Faculty Advisory Committees

Upon initial appointment, each nontenured and fixed-term faculty member is appointed a three-person faculty advisory committee to offer guidance on overall professional

40. This review process applies to the reappointment of assistant professors, the promotion of assistant professors to associate professor with tenure, the reappointment with tenure of probationary-term associate professors, the reappointment of lecturers, and the promotion of lecturers to senior lecturer and teaching professor. The same process also applies to the promotion of full professors, except that the review is conducted by an ad hoc committee appointed by the Dean rather than an existing advisory committee.

development.⁴¹ These committees are a resource for new faculty members as they plan their work and develop their fields of expertise. One member of the committee serves as the new faculty member's teaching mentor. Advisory committees meet at least twice each year, and the committee prepares a written report after each meeting that addresses teaching, advising, and research and publication, along with an overall summary of the faculty member's progress. The advisory committee also serves as the review committee in recommending whether a faculty member has satisfied the School's standard for reappointment and tenure. The faculty advisory committee is disbanded after a faculty member becomes tenured or, in the case of fixed-term faculty, becomes a senior lecturer. The School will reconvene the same committee (with new members if necessary to replace members who are no longer available to serve) to review faculty members for promotion to full professor or teaching professor.

A faculty member who is appointed with tenure may also be assigned a faculty advisory committee to provide orientation to the work of the School and for guidance in managing and responding to external demands and opportunities. This type of faculty advisory committee will continue for as long as it is deemed useful by the faculty member and the School.

Review and Evaluation

Faculty Advisory Committee

The advisory committee meets with the faculty member under review for reappointment, tenure, and promotion to describe the process and answer any questions or concerns.⁴² The faculty member is responsible for submitting all of the documentation required for the review.⁴³ The advisory committee conducts an independent quality review of the faculty member's work—after reviewing its own past reports on a person's progress, the committee examines a faculty member's publications, observes his or her teaching, and evaluates the person's advising. It also considers the faculty member's summary

41. See the School's *Internal Guidelines for the Faculty Appointment, Tenure, and Promotion Process* for the complete advisory committee guidelines.

42. The advisory committee is responsible for ensuring that the faculty member has been notified about the schedule of required actions (internal review, internal decisions, and external decisions) for reappointment and tenure. The Director of Human Resources annually will prepare a schedule of promotions and reappointments and distribute it to the faculty. The Associate Dean for Faculty Development will be responsible for ensuring that the advisory committees and their faculty advisees are aware of upcoming promotion and reappointment decisions.

43. See the School's *Internal Guidelines for the Faculty Appointment, Tenure, and Promotion Process* for the documentation requirements for reappointments and promotions and for a description of the time lines for the review process.

assessments submitted as a part of the annual faculty reporting process.⁴⁴ The committee evaluates whether a faculty member's work is both intellectually rigorous and practical, both of which are important in advancing the School's unique mission at the convergence of scholarship and practice. Committee members understand that a poorly performing colleague undermines the reputation of the School and jeopardizes its effectiveness with North Carolina public officials.

In reviews for tenure or promotion to full professor, and for promotion of lecturers to senior lecturer or teaching professor, the committee also considers outside evaluation letters, discussed in more detail below. The advisory committee in any review may seek further information from anyone who has had the opportunity to observe and assess the candidate's professional performance, including other faculty members at the School, public officials and others outside the University, and other faculty members at Carolina or other universities. The information may be obtained orally or in writing. In gathering information and making its recommendation to the Dean, the advisory committee will be guided by the School's standard for reappointment, promotion, and tenure and the specific criteria outlined in the preceding sections.

Timing of Review

The School maintains a detailed schedule for faculty reviews, which incorporates the timing for review as required by University policies. Generally, review occurs in the year prior to the expiration of the current appointment. A decision on reappointment as assistant professor is made in the third year of the four-year probationary appointment. A decision on promotion to associate professor conferring tenure is made in the second year of the three-year reappointment as assistant professor. A decision on promotion to full professor is made, at the earliest, in the fourth year of the five-year appointment as associate professor, or in any year thereafter, should the faculty member choose to waive consideration at the earliest time.

Lecturers will be reviewed for promotion to senior lecturer, at the earliest, during the seventh year as lecturer, and for promotion to teaching professor, at the earliest, during the sixth year as a senior lecturer.

Early Promotion

The School believes that the best course is for a faculty member to progress along the standard time line as set out in this policy. A committee may, however, recommend that a faculty member should be reappointed, granted tenure, or promoted to full professor

44. The summary assessments do not become part of a faculty member's portfolio. They remain internal personnel documents in order to encourage candid self-appraisals by faculty members.

ahead of the normal schedule. This action will be appropriate to reward faculty members who demonstrate extraordinary accomplishments, beyond what is expected or typical of faculty in that rank and stage of career, and should be taken only in rare cases. Early promotion also may be recommended when necessary for retention of high-performing faculty members. A person is eligible for early promotion only if he or she meets or exceeds the School's standards for the next rank at the time of the early promotion. Every faculty member is eligible for consideration for early promotion, and faculty members may request such consideration from their committee or the Dean. University policy requires that a person granted tenure must have been in active employment for at least 18 months.

Outside Evaluation Letters

The School depends on outside evaluation letters to help assess whether a faculty member's publications, advising, and teaching are effective in meeting the School's applied goals. A tenure-track faculty member must have a minimum of four outside letters of evaluation for promotion and tenure. A lecturer must have a minimum of two outside letters of evaluation for promotion to senior lecturer or teaching professor. The committee will consider and forward all of the evaluation letters. Outside evaluators may include public officials and other distinguished professionals—they need not all be faculty members. A required element for all outside letters—regardless of an evaluator's background—is an impartial and objective assessment.

Typically, North Carolina officials are the most informed and best qualified people to offer guidance on whether a faculty member has satisfied the School's goals. Experience has shown that these officials provide a conscientious and critical evaluation of faculty work because they have a long-term interest in receiving the highest quality teaching, advising, and publications from School faculty members. The School asks North Carolina officials to assess all dimensions of a faculty member's professional performance, rather than focusing almost exclusively on a person's written scholarship. The assessment typically is based on the evaluator's direct experience with the faculty member's teaching, advising, and publications. Publications are important in advancing the School's mission with North Carolina public officials, but this facet of performance is not central to tenure and promotion decisions (and thus to the outside review) as it may be in some academic departments. In assessing a faculty member's publications, the School asks North Carolina public officials about the practical value of that research and writing in their experience. There is no substitute for the kind of rigorous scrutiny that comes from public officials who rely on a publication to address the issues that arise in the course of their work.

The University's Appointment, Promotion, and Tenure Committee believes that an impartial assessment from someone who is not a North Carolina public official will help it determine whether a faculty member's publications are effective in meeting the applied goals of the School. Accordingly, the advisory committee, in consultation with the faculty member, will ask at least one outside evaluator other than a North Carolina public official to provide a letter. (This requirement does not apply to lecturers.) The source of the letter will depend on the responsibilities of each faculty member. The School has worked hard to avoid creating two rigid categories of faculty—faculty working exclusively with MPA students and faculty dedicated exclusively to North Carolina public officials. The responsibilities of School faculty are not uniform. The School's expectations for faculty members therefore differ from faculty member to faculty member, depending on the nature of each individual's work, academic discipline, and degree of involvement with the MPA program, and the expectations in each particular case will be communicated to the Appointment, Promotion, and Tenure Committee in the Dean's letter.

All faculty members work with North Carolina public officials, whether the individual's discipline is law, public administration, or a related discipline. Only a portion of these faculty members are expected to publish in peer-reviewed journals and to have an evaluation letter from a faculty member doing similar work at another university, as outlined below:

1. Faculty members with primary appointments within the MPA program (that is, those appointed to teach two MPA classes or more each year) are expected to write not only for North Carolina officials but also for refereed public administration journals, many of which have practitioner and academic audiences. These faculty members are required to have an evaluation letter from a faculty member at a peer academic institution or program whose rank is at or above the rank for which the faculty member is being considered and who has expertise in the faculty member's area(s) of work.
2. Other faculty members who work in an academic discipline that is relevant to public administration students may have lesser responsibility within the MPA program. They may, for example, teach one course. These faculty members are not required to publish in refereed public administration journals for reappointment and promotion. They may contribute occasionally to law reviews, public administration journals, or journals in a related discipline, however, which counts for reappointment and promotion even though it is not required. Although these faculty members are not required to have a letter from a faculty member at another university, their outside letters must include at least one from an outstanding practitioner in their field (not a North Carolina public

official) or an academic peer whose rank is at or above the rank for which the faculty member is being considered and who has expertise in the faculty member's area(s) of work.

3. A large proportion of faculty members, including most in public law, do not have direct responsibilities within the MPA program. These faculty members are not required to publish in refereed journals for reappointment and promotion, and there is no expectation that they will have a letter from an academic peer. The School's faculty members working in public law fields do not have peers in other universities doing similar work. Rather, they will typically have a letter from a practitioner with an outstanding reputation in the field (not a North Carolina public official). These faculty members may contribute occasionally to law reviews, public administration journals, or journals in a related discipline, however, which counts for reappointment and promotion even though it is not required. They may choose to have a letter from a faculty member in another department or institution, but they will do so only if they believe the person is in a good position to independently and fairly evaluate their work.

It will be especially important that all outside *faculty* evaluators understand that the School's publications are tailored to its mission, which will likely be significantly different from the mission of the evaluator's academic unit. All evaluators must understand and appreciate the School's mission of serving North Carolina officials through engaged scholarship, and they must be able to assess the faculty member's performance in excelling at that mission.

The faculty member's advisory committee asks the candidate for a list of at least six people who are qualified to offer a candid evaluation. The committee, with the faculty member's knowledge, may solicit evaluations from other people who are not on the list. The evaluators may include other faculty at the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill who are outside the School of Government. None of the four evaluation letters may come from anyone with a relationship that might raise questions about the person's impartiality, such as someone who has co-authored a publication with the faculty member.⁴⁵ In evaluating a faculty member's advising, it is appropriate to include letters from people who have received the advising services—they may be in the best position to assess the impact and quality of the work and provide details about the nature of the work.

45. These people may be a good source of information about a candidate and advisory committee members and others may contact them informally for advice and input, but letters from them may not be used as one of the four required from formal external evaluators.

The final selection of outside evaluators rests with the advisory committee in consultation with the Senior Associate Dean and the Associate Dean for Faculty Development. Letters to evaluators are prepared by the Director of Human Resources and signed by the Dean. The people from whom written evaluations are requested are told that their letters routinely will be read by people outside the School, and that under state law, the letters will be available to the faculty member. Outside reviewers send their letters to the Director of Human Resources, who provides copies to the committee chair when they are received. The committee forwards all of the evaluation letters with its final report to the Dean and to the faculty member.

Advice of Qualified Faculty on Initial Appointments, Reappointments, and Promotions

The Dean will consult with qualified faculty members on initial appointments, reappointments, and promotions as follows:⁴⁶

Initial appointments:

- Initial appointments of assistant professors, associate professors without tenure, and full professors: Full professors.
- Initial appointments of associate professors with tenure: All tenured faculty members.
- Initial appointments of lecturers: Full professors and teaching professors.
- Initial appointments of senior lecturers: All tenured faculty members, senior lecturers, and teaching professors.⁴⁷
- Initial appointments of teaching professors: Full professors and teaching professors.
- Initial appointments of professors of the practice: Full professors, teaching professors, and professors of the practice.

Reappointments:

- Reappointment of assistant professors: Full professors.
- Reappointment of lecturers: Full professors and teaching professors.
- Reappointment of senior lecturers: All tenured faculty, senior lecturers, and teaching professors.

46. A chart depicting this information is contained as an appendix to this policy.

47. See Faculty Code, Art. 5, Sec. 5.3.

- Reappointment of teaching professors: Full professors and teaching professors.
- Reappointment of professors of the practice: Full professors, teaching professors, and professors of the practice.

Promotions:

- Promotion to associate professor with tenure: All tenured faculty.⁴⁸
- Promotion to full professor: Full professors.
- Promotion to senior lecturer: All tenured faculty, senior lecturers, and teaching professors.
- Promotion to teaching professor: Full professors and teaching professors.

Members of faculty advisory committees will be invited to attend the meeting at which their recommendation is being considered and may participate fully in the discussion, but only faculty members qualified to consult will be allowed to vote. Retired faculty members with active part-time appointments may vote. Other retired faculty members may give advice to the Dean, but they may not vote.

The faculty member under review will be notified of the date and time of the meeting. The committee's recommendation is distributed to the qualified faculty before the meeting for consideration, and copies of the faculty member's writing and teaching materials are displayed for review. The Dean will give the faculty member a copy of the advisory committee's recommendation before the meeting, and the faculty member may respond in writing to the committee's report before the meeting. A copy of the faculty member's response will be provided to the faculty qualified to consult before the meeting.

At the meeting, the chair of the advisory committee and its members will have the opportunity to elaborate on the reasons for their recommendation, and the Dean will encourage a full and active discussion in order to gain the best possible advice. In order to encourage a candid assessment, the discussion and deliberations must be kept confidential. The open vote of the faculty qualified to consult is advisory to the Dean, and it must be reported to the Provost and the University's Advisory Committee on Appointments, Promotion, and Tenure. The Dean also may seek advice on a faculty member's qualification for reappointment, promotion, or tenure from anyone who has had the opportunity to observe and evaluate the candidate's professional performance.

48. See Faculty Code, Art. 5, Sec. 5.3.

The Senior Associate Dean will provide notice of the meeting to vote on promotion and will solicit feedback on the faculty members under consideration from any person who is eligible but unable to attend the meeting. Guidelines from the Provost's office require the Dean to report the vote of the professors, including any "no" votes and abstentions. University guidelines indicate that faculty members should be required to provide reasons for "no" votes or abstentions and that the School should present and address those concerns.⁴⁹

The Dean will make a final decision based on all available relevant information. The Dean will prepare and submit a final recommendation letter to the Provost along with the faculty member's portfolio. The Dean will meet with the faculty member to inform him or her of the final recommendation and will also provide the faculty member and the advisory committee with a copy of the recommendation letter. The Dean also will inform the faculty member about the next steps in the campus review process after the recommendation leaves the School.

Section 8. Process for Amending This Policy

This policy may be revised when necessary to reflect changes in University requirements and as deemed necessary by the Dean. Faculty members are encouraged to propose to the Dean any changes they believe will improve the policy. The Dean will consult with faculty before amending the policy unless a change is required under University policies and the School has no discretion about how it is implemented.

49. Dossier: Format for Tenure Track or Tenured Faculty Review, <http://academicpersonnel.unc.edu/faculty-policies-procedures-guidelines/faculty-appointments/tenuretenure-track-appointments/dossier-format-for-tenure-track-or-tenured-faculty-review/>.

Appendix: School of Government Qualifications for Consultation on Faculty Appointments and Promotions

Action	All Tenured Faculty	Full Professors	Senior Lecturers	Teaching Professors	Professors of the Practice
Initial Appointment of					
Associate Professor without Tenure		●			
Associate Professor with Tenure	●				
Full Professor		●			
Initial Appointment of and Reappointment to					
Assistant Professor		●			
Lecturer		●		●	
Senior Lecturer	●		●	●	
Teaching Professor		●		●	
Professor of the Practice		●		●	●
Promotion to					
Associate Professor with Tenure	●				
Full Professor		●			
Senior Lecturer	●		●	●	
Teaching Professor		●		●	

Internal Guidelines for the Faculty Appointment, Tenure, and Promotion Process

School of Government
The University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill

OCTOBER 2007
REVISED JUNE 2013
REVISED MARCH 2016

Table of Contents	Page
Section 1 Advisory Committee Guidelines	2
Section 2 Timelines for Review Process	6
Section 3 Documentation Requirements for Faculty Reappointment, Tenure, and Promotion, and Guidelines for Preparing Materials	9
Section 4 Guidance on Writing for School of Government Faculty Members	12
Section 5 Teaching Evaluation	14
Section 6 Elements of a Teaching Statement and Teaching Portfolio	15
Section 7 Elements of a Research Statement	17

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 *Policies and Procedures on Faculty Appointment, Promotion, and Tenure*, 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 committee members 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 the committee members, the faculty member, the Dean, the 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 the 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 appointment, promotion, and tenure (APT) policy.

Obtaining Outside Letters in Support of Promotion

Outside letters are required for initial appointment, promotion to associate professor with tenure, promotion to full professor, promotion to senior lecturer, and promotion to teaching 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 he or she works to identify respected professionals and academics who can provide an objective evaluation of the faculty member's work—especially the faculty member's published work. For tenure-track faculty, the School requires 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 that provides 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. The School has 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 the School's standards for promotion are and how they differ from more traditional units. This is important because the School's standards differ from typical research university standards. The letters the Schools sends 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.

Tenure-track faculty must have at least four letters of review for promotion and tenure. Lecturers must have at least two letters for promotion to senior lecturer and teaching professor. It is a good idea for the committee to identify several additional potential reviewers in case one or more decline the request. It is okay to ask for more than the minimum number of required letters, but faculty members should 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 HR 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 School administration.* Although the School typically uses a collaborative process to select outside reviewers, University procedures require that they be identified in this way.

HR prepares the letters using standard forms, and they are sent out over the Dean's signature. The faculty member should also provide a selection of publications and a near-final version of his or her curriculum vitae (CV) 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 to HR is set out in Section 3 of these guidelines. Once received, outside letters are filed and maintained in HR.

Preparing the Committee's 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) and teaching evaluations and peer review of teaching, and it should be framed in terms of the criteria 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, the Senior Associate Dean, and the Associate Dean for Faculty Development.

Summary of Major Faculty Advisory Committee Chair Responsibilities

The major faculty advisory committee chair responsibilities are as follows:

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 the School's mission and the context and parameters of the requested review, 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 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 Teaching Professor

Advisory committees cease to function after a positive tenure decision and after a promotion to senior lecturer. 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 and teaching professor. For promotion to full professor or teaching professor, the original committee is reconvened, if possible, for development and review of the promotion package. (New members may be added to the committee if necessary to replace members who are no longer available to serve.) Responsibility for calling meetings, identifying and making individual contact with outside reviewers, and preparing the committee's report is the same as for tenure and promotion to senior lecturer. The committee makes a recommendation to the Dean regarding the faculty member's suitability for promotion to full professor or teaching professor.

Section 2. Timelines for Review Process

Timelines for promotion of tenure-track faculty members are set to comply with the *Trustee Policies and Regulations Governing Academic Tenure in the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill*, available online at www.unc.edu/campus/policies.html. Timelines for lecturers are set according to the School's APT policy. The *Trustee Policies* generally require that decisions about reappointment and promotion of tenure-track faculty be made "no less than 12 months before the end" of a term of employment. Decisions about reappointment and promotion for lecturer-track faculty are typically made no less than three months before the end of the term of employment. Consequently, timelines work back from these deadlines. 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

The faculty member begins work on review materials.

The 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.
 - Compile teaching evaluations (see Section 3, "Documentation Requirements for Faculty Reappointment, Tenure, and Promotion, and Guidelines for Preparing Materials").
 - Draft teaching and research statements (see Section 6, "Elements of a Teaching Statement and Teaching Portfolio," and Section 7, "Elements of a Research Statement"). *Note:* Lecturers are not required to submit research statements but may choose to do so in order to document research completed or planned.

- Update CV in proper order and format (see Section 3, “Documentation Requirements for Faculty Reappointment, Tenure, and Promotion, and Guidelines for Preparing Materials”).
- Prepare teaching portfolio (see Section 6, “Elements of a Teaching Statement and Teaching Portfolio”).
- Assemble publications for committee review.
- Arrange for peer reviews of teaching (see Section 5, “Teaching Evaluation”).

Committee Begins Review

The 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

At this time, the list of names for outside reviewers is due in HR.

The committee chair should:

1. Forward six 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. Lecturers forward three names with the top two choices noted.
2. Forward to HR a list of publications to be sent to outside reviewers. (Not required for lecturers.)
3. Identify which reviewers are chosen by the faculty member and which are chosen by the committee. Although faculty members and their committees typically collaborate and agree on the choice of outside reviewers, the University requires the School to indicate each reviewer as either a faculty member or committee choice.

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 the committee chair.

Four Months After Initial Committee Review

At this time, the finalized packet of materials must be submitted to the chair.

The 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 (research statement is not required for lecturers). HR is available to review CVs in advance of this deadline to assure proper format.
2. Provide portfolio with CV to HR so publications and other materials 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

At this time, the committee report is due.

The 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

The following is a checklist of materials required for the reappointment, tenure, and promotion review:

- Updated CV
- Teaching statement
- Research statement (not required for lecturers)
- Peer reviews 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 from HR)
- Outside letters of review (tenure, full professor, senior lecturer, and teaching professor actions only)—indicate which reviews were chosen by the faculty member and which were chosen by the committee
- 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 CVs, teaching portfolios, and teaching and research statements are available from HR.

Preparing the CV

Guidelines for 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. The faculty member should (1) date the CV so reviewers will know that they have the most recent version, (2) make sure pages are numbered, and (3) include dates of teaching, advising, and consulting activities.

CV Format and Order

The CV should contain the following information in the order listed below:

- Personal (address, phone number, and email address).
- 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 unrefereed 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 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 client 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. If the faculty member has a heavy public official teaching load, the list can be limited to the past five years of teaching sessions.
- 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.
 - Service to the discipline or profession. Some faculty members list pre-publication review of manuscripts for outside journals or other peer reviewed publications here.
 - Service 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-sponsored programs. This information is provided to HR for use in the promotion and tenure process. Faculty members may obtain this information from HR, and they 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

The School typically sends representative selections of tenure-track faculty members’ publications along with a request for outside letters. It is not necessary to send reviewers everything. The School generally doesn’t send publications to North Carolina public officials, but it does send them to non-North Carolina public officials and academic reviewers. The decisions about which publications to send and to whom they’re sent are up to the committee and the faculty member. HR works with the faculty member and the reviewers to provide publications in formats preferred by the reviewers. Options include sending hard copies, providing links to online publications by email, or sending 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. A near-final version of the CV must also be provided at this time to be included with the letters, but it can be updated at any time prior to the internal decision.

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 APT policy outlines in clear terms the ways in which expectations for School faculty members are directly related to the School's mission of service to the state. The School's unique mission has a direct impact on how faculty members spend their time and also 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 method 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. Its 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 who contact the School on a daily basis rarely ask for written material, it is impossible to answer their questions, develop their programs, or provide the written material they rely on unless faculty members 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 which strategies work best for them.

One such strategy is to block 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 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 cover those duties. 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 a writing leave will be based on several factors (not necessarily in the following 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 resources); (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 the timelines in Section 2). *One of the peer observations may be conducted by the faculty member's teaching mentor, but at least one must be conducted by 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: 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

Teaching Statement

Faculty members submitting documents for reappointment, promotion, or tenure must prepare a *reflective teaching statement*. The 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 “Teaching” in Section 6 of the School’s APT policy).

The reflective teaching statement is an essential element of a teaching portfolio. The statement helps inform readers about the faculty member’s philosophy of teaching and learning, as well as how he or she implements that philosophy. It is also an avenue for the faculty member to assess his or her strengths and progress as a teacher.

A faculty member may address the following questions in a reflective teaching 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 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.

Teaching Portfolio

The *teaching portfolio* represents an opportunity for the candidate to showcase his or her teaching talents for faculty colleagues. The following materials are typically included in a teaching portfolio:

1. A copy of the curriculum vitae the candidate will submit as part of his or her promotion package
2. The candidate's reflective teaching statement
3. The candidate's research statement (not required for lecturers)
4. Sample written materials/class handouts used in teaching
5. Samples of power point presentations or other visual aids used in teaching
6. Sample discussion questions used in teaching or prepared for group discussions
7. Student course evaluations
8. External reviews and/or letters the candidate may have received regarding teaching or other aspects of his or her work (these are *not* outside the evaluation letters required by Section 7 of the School's APT policy; they may be reviews or comments the candidate received about teaching or other services)
9. Syllabi for MPA courses, if applicable
10. Sample exams for MPA courses, if applicable
11. Any other materials the candidate feels will help with the evaluation of his or her teaching.

HR has a collection of teaching portfolios created by faculty for the promotion process in the past.

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 such statements when their work includes a research component. A research statement should be a two- to three- page document that accomplishes the following five goals:

1. Describes how the candidate's 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 the candidate has done in terms of (a) the disciplines and topics covered, (b) who it serves, and (c) the formats in which the work has appeared. When appropriate, the statement should discuss why the research was undertaken (for example, appearance of a common problem within a client group might have led to a particular publication). The statement should mention any and all forms of publishing, including formats such as electronic presentation, bench books, manuals, reports of committees or commissions, substantial revisions to General Statutes, local ordinances or policies, blogs, and other similar kinds of writing. It should also mention notable things about the 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.
4. Describes future directions in which the candidate expects his or her research and writing to continue or expand.
5. For candidates in fields such as public administration, finance, or management—and those who teach two courses in the MPA Program—discusses how that work contributes to the candidate's scholarly field beyond the central mission of serving North Carolina's local and state government.