

# **Appointment, Promotion and Tenure Manual**

*(Formerly Promotion & Tenure Manual)*

**School of Dentistry**

**University of North Carolina**

**Revised August 2016**

## Table of Contents

1. Introduction .....	5
2. Definitions and Acronyms .....	7
3. Types of Appointments .....	9
A. Tenure-Track/Tenured Faculty Appointments .....	9
B. Fixed Term Faculty Appointments .....	11
i. Clinical Track.....	11
ii. Research Track.....	11
C. Adjunct.....	12
D. Visiting.....	12
E. Joint.....	12
F. Administrative.....	13
4. Standards for Appointments and Promotions: Tenure Track and Fixed Term Track.....	14
A. Teaching.....	14
i. Quality.....	15
ii. Innovation.....	15
iii. Impact upon Student.....	15
iv. Degree of Responsibility.....	16
B. Scholarly Activity .....	16
i. Research, Scholarship and Publication .....	16
C. Service.....	17
i. Patient Care .....	17
ii. Continuing Education.....	18
iii. Other Service to the University, the Profession, or the Community.....	18
iv. Community Engagement.....	19
v. Administrative Responsibilities .....	19
5. Criteria for Appointments and Promotions: Tenure Track Ranks .....	21
A. Teaching.....	21
i. Methods of Evaluation .....	21
B. Scholarly Activity .....	22
C. Service and Engagement.....	23
6. Timing of Appointments, Reappointment: Tenure Track Ranks.....	24
A. Assistant Professor.....	24
B. Associate Professor.....	24
C. Joint Appointments .....	25
D. Time in Rank and Early Promotions.....	25
E. Special Provisions for Extending the Maximum Probationary Period .....	26
(Extension of the Tenure Clock) .....	26
7. Sequence of Actions for Appointment, Reappointment and Promotion of Tenure Track Faculty.....	27
A. Required Documents.....	27
B. Early Review.....	27
C. Mandatory/Non-mandatory Review .....	28
D. Intradepartmental Review for Promotion .....	29
E. Promotion and Tenure Advisory Committee (PTAC) Review .....	30

i.	Composition .....	30
ii.	Committee Charge.....	30
iii.	Committee Meetings and Management of Conflict of Interest.....	30
F.	School of Dentistry Full Professors Advisory Committee (FPAC).....	31
i.	Committee Charge.....	31
ii.	Committee Meetings .....	32
G.	Dean’s Review .....	32
H.	Additional University Review for all Tenure-Track and Tenured appointments .....	32
i.	Health Sciences Advisory Committee (HSAC) .....	32
ii.	Appointment, Promotion Tenure (APT) Sub Committee .....	32
iii.	Appointment, Promotion Tenure (APT) Committee.....	32
iv.	Board of Trustees (BOT).....	33
I.	Negative Decisions for Tenure Track Faculty Members.....	33
i.	Decisions Not to Reappoint Upon Expiration of Probationary Terms.....	33
ii.	Appeals – Administrative Conferences Following Decision Not to Reappoint.....	33
iii.	Request for Review by Hearing Committee - Scope of Review .....	34
iv.	Conduct of Hearing .....	35
8.	Criteria for Appointments and Promotion: Clinical and Research Fixed-Term Ranks .....	36
A.	Clinical Track Appointments .....	36
i.	Teaching .....	36
ii.	Scholarly Activity .....	37
iii.	Service and Engagement .....	37
B.	Research Track Appointments .....	37
C.	Adjunct Appointments .....	38
D.	Joint Appointments .....	38
9.	Timing of Promotion Reviews for Fixed Term Faculty .....	39
10.	Sequence of Actions for Appointment, Reappointment and Promotion of Fixed Term Faculty.....	40
A.	Required Documents.....	40
i.	Recommended Cycle and Requested Reviews .....	40
B.	Intradepartmental Review for Promotion .....	41
C.	Promotion and Tenure Advisory Committee (PTAC) Review.....	41
D.	School of Dentistry Full Professors Advisory Committee .....	41
E.	Dean's Review and University Approval.....	41
F.	Negative Decisions for Fixed Term Faculty Members.....	42
11.	Responsibility of Chair and Candidate for Preparation of Documents (Tenure Track and Fixed Term Track) .....	43
A.	Letter of Recommendation from the Department Chair to the Dean.....	43
B.	Official Letters of Recommendation from External Reviewers (Four Letters for Tenure Track; Two Letters for Fixed Term Track).....	44
C.	Additional Letters of Recommendation.....	44
D.	Updated Curriculum Vitae.....	44
E.	Reflective Statement .....	44
F.	Teaching Portfolio .....	45
G.	Peer Evaluations of Teaching .....	45
H.	Mentoring Team Report.....	45

12. Post-Tenure Review.....	46
A. Background.....	46
B. Purpose.....	46
C. Policy.....	46
D. Principles.....	47
E. Procedure.....	47
i. Self-Assessment by Faculty Member.....	48
ii. Background Information.....	48
iii. Consultation between Faculty Member Being Reviewed and the Post-Tenure Review Committee.....	48
iv. Consultation between the Chair or Administrative Supervisor of the Faculty Member Being Reviewed and the Post-Tenure Review Committee.....	48
v. Determination of Overall Performance.....	48
vi. Recognition of Outstanding Performance.....	49
vii. Establishing and Monitoring of Development Plan.....	49
viii. Maintenance of Confidential Written Record.....	49
ix. Appeals and Reports to the Provost of Finding of Substantial Deficiencies and Development Plans.....	49
x. Annual Reports Filed with Provost.....	50
13. Appendices.....	51
A. Curriculum Vitae (CV) Format from Provost Office.....	51
i. Sample CV.....	54
B. Teaching Portfolio (limited to 25 pages).....	59
i. Teaching Portfolio Definition.....	59
C. How to Present an Effective Dossier.....	60
i. Recommended Order of Documents.....	60
ii. Chair's Letter.....	60
iii. Letters of Evaluation.....	61
iv. Teaching and Service Record.....	62
v. Final Word of Advice for Chairs to Give to Candidates.....	63
D. Sample Solicitation Letter for External Letter of Recommendation.....	63
i. Tenure Track Faculty candidate.....	63
ii. Fixed Term Faculty candidate.....	65
E. Procedures.....	66
F. Checklist for Required Documentation.....	67
i. Tenure Track Documentation Checklist.....	67
ii. Fixed Term Documentation Checklist.....	67
G. Levels of Review for Tenure Track Faculty Appointments.....	68
H. Levels of Review for Fixed Term Track Faculty Appointments.....	69
I. Peer Assessment of Teaching Evaluation Form.....	70
J. Links.....	72

## 1. Introduction

The purposes of this document are to provide information regarding faculty appointments in the School of Dentistry, to facilitate the evaluation of faculty in the promotion process by describing criteria to be applied in making promotion and tenure decisions and to provide a set of guidelines that may be useful in guiding individual professional development. It describes guidelines and clarifies requirements for faculty appointments, reappointments, and promotions in the School of Dentistry. The information allows consideration of a wide range of activities of all faculty members.

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

“While academic tenure may be withheld on any grounds other than those specifically stated to be impermissible under Section 4 hereof, its conferral requires an assessment of institutional needs and resources and evidence of service to the academic community, potential for future contribution, commitment to the welfare of the University, and demonstrated professional competence, including consideration of commitment to effective teaching, research, or public service.” Section 4 of the Trustee Faculty appointments, reappointments, and promotions in the School of Dentistry are recommended in accordance with *The Trustee Policies and Regulations Governing Academic Tenure in the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill*.

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

Faculty appointments, reappointments, and promotions in the School of Dentistry are recommended in accordance with [\*The Trustee Policies and Regulations Governing Academic Tenure in the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill\*](#).

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

Faculty may be evaluated in terms of their teaching, scholarship, and professional and community engagement/service. For the period being evaluated for the current promotion, the

weights applied to these three areas in reaching a promotion and tenure decision generally will reflect the proportion of time allocated to each area in the candidate's Terms and Conditions of Appointment Statement as may be modified by the Chair with input from the faculty member during their employment. Discussion of time allocation to each of the three areas should be a topic at each departmental annual review of the faculty member. Any modification must be approved by the Executive Associate Dean. Service implies a donor recipient relationship in which one party, generally the community, receives benefit from interaction with the faculty member. "Community engagement is the application of institutional resources to address and solve challenges facing communities through collaboration with these communities." The defining aspect of engagement is the collaboration and mutuality of benefits.

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

## 2. Definitions and Acronyms

**Adjunct:** Adjunct faculty members are part-time temporary faculty members who serve in a variety of very valuable roles in the School of Dentistry including teaching, research, or community-engagement/service. Adjunct faculty are generally a subset of “fixed-term faculty” who hold temporary appointments. If adjunct faculty do not have funding and/or are not paid by the appointing department, they may have “at will” temporary appointments.

**Appointment:** Refers to the faculty title and/or rank assigned to an individual .

**Fixed term:** Faculty members who are appointed for a specified period of time of 1-5 years. The academic rank will generally have a prefix-qualifier, such as Adjunct, Clinical or Research, depending on the nature of the appointment. Non tenure-track appointments are referred to as fixed-term appointments.

**Full-Time:** Equal to 1.0 FTE. All tenure-track and tenured faculty appointments are expected to be full-time (1.0 FTE) appointments unless specific circumstance in the interests of the appointing department and the University dictate otherwise.

**Lecturer Equivalent:** A group of fixed-term faculty ranks that are not on the tenure track: i.e., “lecturer,” “senior lecturer,” or “teaching professor.” Such faculty appointments are appropriate for individuals who possess unusual qualifications for teaching, research, or dentistry practice, but for whom the regular faculty ranks are not appropriate because of the limited duration of the mission for which they are appointed, because of concern for continuing availability of special funding for the position, or for other valid institutional reasons.

**Part-Time:** For tenured and tenure-track faculty work schedules, any FTE other than 1.0. For employee fringe benefit plan participation, Part-Time status is any FTE below .75 and may affect an employee’s eligibility for participation in some benefit plans. Regular - May be either Full-time or Part-time with an of .50 or greater

**Probationary Term:** Refers to the maximum period of time at the Assistant Professor or Associate Professor rank that a person may serve prior to reappointment and/or promotion with the award of tenure, and includes a “terminal year” if the decision is negative. Initial appointments as an Assistant professor are always probationary for a term of four (4) years. An initial appointment as a probationary Associate Professor is for a term of five (5) years.

**Promotion:** Refers to an increase in faculty rank.

**Temporary:** May be either Full-time or Part-time; faculty appointments at FTE’s less than .50 must be designated as Temporary

**Tenure:** refers to the protection of a faculty member against involuntary suspension, demotion, discharge, or termination from employment by the University except upon specified grounds and in accordance with specified procedures.

**Tenured / Tenure-track:** Faculty members who have either earned permanent tenure or who are appointed to probationary positions with eligibility for tenure.

**APT:** Appointment, Promotion, and Tenure Committee

**BOG:** Board of Governors

**BOT:** Board of Trustees

**CV:** Curriculum Vitae

**EHRA:** Exempt from Human Resources Act

**FPAC:** Full Professors Advisory Committee

**HSAC:** Health Sciences Advisory Committee

**PTAC:** Promotion and Tenure Advisory Committee

**RU/VH:** Research Universities (very high research activity)

**SHRA:** Subject to Human Resources Act

**SOD:** School of Dentistry

### 3. Types of Appointments

#### [Faculty Ranks, Appointment Tracking, and Working Title Guidelines](#)

Appointments, promotions, and tenure in the School of Dentistry are governed by University regulations in [The Faculty Code of University Government; Trustee Policies and Regulations Governing Academic Tenure in the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, and Academic Personnel](#). These documents are incorporated herein by reference and in case of conflict; the policies set forth therein are to be considered governing. A general description of appointment at each rank is as follows:

#### A. Tenure-Track/Tenured Faculty Appointments

*Professor* - Appointment or promotion to the rank of professor confers permanent tenure. After a faculty member has been promoted to the rank of Full Professor, his/her performance must be reviewed within every five years according to the guidelines for post-tenure review defined by the UNC Board of Governors, by the UNC-CH Board of Trustees, and by the UNC School of Dentistry Post Tenure Review Policy.

*Associate Professor* - Promotion to the rank of Associate Professor from the rank of Assistant Professor confers permanent tenure. Under exceptional circumstances, an initial appointment with permanent tenure may be made. Typically a new faculty member who is appointed at the rank of Associate Professor is on a probationary period of five years without tenure. The review for reappointment as Associate Professor with tenure can occur anywhere from 18 months into the appointment to the beginning of the fourth year of the probationary term. The reappointment as Associate Professor with tenure, which must be approved by the UNC Board of Trustees, may be effective as early as the beginning of the fifth year and no later than the beginning of the sixth year depending on the timeline of all the levels of review. Postponing a review is not an option unless the faculty member requests and is granted an extension as outlined in Special Provisions for extending the maximum probationary period (Extension of the Tenure-Clock). If the decision is not to reappoint, the SOD follows the procedure as outlined in the Trustee Policies and Regulations Governing Academic Tenure in the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill: Initiation, review, and approval of appointments, promotions, and reappointments.

#### [Trustee Policies and Regulations Governing Academic Tenure in the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill](#)

Associate Professors with tenure must have their performance reviewed at least every five years according to the guidelines for post-tenure review defined by the UNC Board of Governors, by the UNC-CH Board of Trustees, and by the UNC School of Dentistry Post Tenure Review Policy. If the intradepartmental review at five years results in a recommendation for promotion, the evaluation for promotion will replace the post-tenure review for that cycle.

The permanent rank of Associate Professor should be considered an acceptable and honorable attainment rather than as an inevitable step on the path to Full Professor. Promotion to the rank of Full Professor represents the highest academic award ordinarily available within the institution and is considered exceptional if the candidate has spent fewer than five years in rank as an

Associate Professor.

Assistant Professor – Initial appointment to the rank of Assistant Professor, or promotion to the rank of Assistant professor from the rank of Instructor, is for a probationary term of four years. Pending successful review of the faculty member's performance within their third probationary year, they are subsequently reappointed for a second probationary term of three years. It is important to emphasize that the *Trustee Policies and Regulations Governing Academic Tenure in the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill* require that the faculty member receive written notice of a decision to reappoint and/or promote for the reappointment to the second probationary term and for promotion to Associate Professor after the second probationary term at least one year before the end of their current term. Therefore, the review for reappointment to a second probationary term starts at the beginning of the third year of the initial probationary term, and review for promotion to Associate Professor starts at the beginning of the second year of the second probationary term. These reviews are initiated by the Department Chair, in consultation with the assembled Full Professors of the Department. A faculty member is not required to spend the seventh year at the Assistant Professor rank if approved for reappointment or promotion; he/she can be promoted immediately after the action has been reviewed and approved by the Board of Trustees. Therefore, six years is the usual maximum time to serve as Assistant Professor. However, there may be a special circumstance that warrants the use of the seventh year; in such cases the Department Chair must explain this in the letter of recommendation.

It should be emphasized that a promotion from Assistant Professor to Associate Professor that would occur at the beginning of the sixth year in rank (one year early) will be considered accelerated; at the beginning of the fifth year (two years early), extraordinary.

There are two options when an Assistant Professor is either not reappointed to a second probationary term, or not promoted to Associate Professor after her/his second probationary term. In certain instances, the faculty member may be considered as a candidate for a position in the fixed term track. More typically, however, the faculty member will need to seek employment elsewhere, and the final year of the probationary appointment serves as the requisite "terminal year." It is for this reason that the review and outcome concerning the reappointment or promotion must be completed a full year before the end of the probationary term.

Instructor--This rank is appropriate for persons for whom there is a reasonable expectation that in the normal course of events he or she will progress to the regular rank of Assistant Professor. The appointment is for a probationary term of one year, renewable for three additional successive one-year terms: a total of four years. No reappointment beyond four years is allowed.

## **B. Fixed Term Faculty Appointments**

Faculty appointed for a fixed term make important and continuing contributions to the vitality and excellence of the University. There are two distinct types of fixed-term faculty at the SOD: Clinical and Research (it should be noted that paid “Adjunct” faculty are considered temporary fixed-term faculty but for the purposes of this section the focus is on research and clinical fixed term faculty). These faculty members may enjoy satisfying academic experiences and professional growth through the pursuit of activities primarily in two of the three areas (teaching, scholarship/research, service/ engagement). Although the criteria within the SOD for evaluation of faculty in the tenure track and faculty in the fixed-term track are the same for each area, the different concentrations of activities between fixed-term and tenure-track faculty result in circumstances that merit additional specification.

### **i. Clinical Track**

It is expected that faculty in the clinical track will be evaluated primarily on the effectiveness of their teaching, supplemented by consideration of their community engagement/service or research activities. Even though the expectations for the amount of teaching are greater for faculty in this track, the criteria for evaluation of effectiveness in teaching are the same as for faculty in the tenure track. In addition, if a clinical track faculty member is evaluated for teaching and community engagement/service, there is still the expectation that they will participate in scholarly activity defined in its broadest sense (see section on Scholarly Activity, page 22). This requirement is imposed in the spirit of maintaining the academic viability of the teacher rather than requiring data-based research activity. Clinical Track ranks include Clinical Professor, Clinical Associate Professor, Clinical Assistant Professor, and Clinical Instructor.

### **ii. Research Track**

It is expected that faculty in the research track will be evaluated primarily on the quality of their research, supplemented by consideration of their teaching or community service/ engagement activities. It is recognized that research track faculty operate under particular restrictions imposed by the need for their salaries to be funded primarily from research activities. Research productivity should be commensurate with the time allocated to research. Achieving the status of an independent investigator is expected to occur sooner than in other tracks. It also is recognized that for research track faculty, teaching roles involving activities as a research mentor, thesis advisor and committee work, and graduate level teaching may be more compatible with their prime source of salary support than clinical, preclinical and didactic teaching of pre-doctoral students. However, he or she may be assigned as the primary instructor of a course, may co-teach a course, or may be invited to give guest lectures in courses. Research Track ranks includes Research Professor, Research Associate Professor, Research Assistant Professor, and Research Instructor.

Recommendations about employment, including initial appointment and reappointment, remain the sole responsibility and prerogative of the Chair, in consultation with the assembled Full Professors of his or her department. Responsibility for final decisions rests with the Dean.

Fixed term faculty members who have successfully completed an initial appointment or have otherwise demonstrated their effectiveness and contribution to the various missions of the School of Dentistry may be offered renewable employment contracts that range in length from one to five years. Such contracts, however, must always be contingent on the continued availability of funds, including funds generated by the individual's own productivity.

### **C. Adjunct**

Adjunct faculty members are usually part-time faculty members who serve in a variety of very valuable roles in the School of Dentistry. Occasionally an adjunct faculty will be appointed on a full-time temporary basis. Adjunct faculty includes individuals who provide teaching, research, or community engagement/service with time commitments that range from one or two days per semester to one to five days per week. Dental personnel who provide supervision to students on extramural rotations and educational experiences also have adjunct faculty appointments. Some adjunct faculty members are paid and others receive no compensation. All such faculty members have demonstrated their commitment to promote the academic and professional interests of the School of Dentistry. Their contributions to these efforts are recognized through appointment at higher rank when appropriate. Initial non-compensated adjunct appointments are for one year; non-compensated adjunct reappointments are at-will appointments.

### **D. Visiting**

"Visiting" appointments are generally made where an individual with a faculty appointment at another academic institution will perform short-term (typically one year or less) temporary faculty duties at UNC Chapel Hill.

Such appointments may also be authorized for individuals who may not presently hold faculty credentials at another institution but who are otherwise qualified for faculty rank and for which there is a special need by the Department/School for an appointment of less than one year and for which a competitive recruitment will be waived by the University's Equal Employment Opportunity (EEO) Office.

### **E. Joint**

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

recommendation put forward shall be one jointly concurred by the departments concerned.

#### **F. Administrative**

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

## **4. Standards for Appointments and Promotions: Tenure Track and Fixed Term Track**

The areas of activity evaluated in these decisions are: **A.** teaching; **B.** scholarly activity, the essential component being research; and **C.** service/ engagement. These areas are interrelated and mutually supportive; participation in one enhances performance in the others. In addition, faculty who provide direct patient care are expected to do so in an exemplary manner, employing current, state-of-the-art methods that are respected by patients and peers within the University and in the professional community. All faculty are expected to conduct themselves in an ethical and professional manner in all circumstances and interactions. The extent to which a faculty member meets this obligation should be addressed in the Chair's letter of recommendation.

### **A. Teaching**

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

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

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

Evaluation of teaching effectiveness does not lend itself solely to quantitative measurement and, in the final analysis, may be largely subjective. However, input into the evaluation from peers, department chairs, students and other sources can help maximize the validity of the value judgments that must be made. For full-time faculty, a teaching portfolio is the required method to document teaching ability and effectiveness. All faculty in the tenure track or fixed term track must develop a teaching portfolio for evaluation for promotion and tenure.

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

Teaching criteria pertinent to all promotion decisions are as follows:

### **i. Quality**

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

Teaching of superior quality may be characterized by:

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

### **ii. Innovation**

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

Some examples of innovations in teaching are:

- Taking advantage of new digital and other educational technologies to improve teaching effectiveness
- Developing new courses and programs or unique learning experiences
- Using educational research (e.g., developing methods to evaluate individual teaching, courses, or curriculum)

### **iii. Impact upon Student**

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

Some examples of informal evaluation are:

- Students pursue independent study as a result of interaction with the faculty member
- Students provide unsolicited evaluation of faculty
- Students under faculty mentorship earn awards or other recognition
- Students co-author publications

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

- Presents a balanced point of view with stated objectives
- Treats students with respect
- Provides constructive criticism
- Is reasonably available for consultation
- Is fair and reasonable in evaluation of students
- Compliments students for appropriate contributions or performance
- Continually evaluates his/her own teaching
- Meets teaching obligations by being prompt and available throughout the teaching/clinic session
- Presents material at the appropriate level for the type of students being taught
- Takes opportunities presented to teach individual students in the clinical setting
- Follows course guidelines as to appropriate classroom, laboratory and clinical objectives and methods
- Is effective in leading discussions in small groups or seminars
- Devotes appropriate time in mentoring students and displays organizational skills that result in student achievement.
- Is sensitive to special needs of students.

Student input in faculty evaluation is essential, but is only a portion of the information considered. Such input must be used in conjunction with the other factors that affect the quality of teaching.

#### **iv. Degree of Responsibility**

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

### **B. Scholarly Activity**

Scholarly activity is a central mission of a research university. The components of scholarly activity consist of the following: the compilation, synthesis, and transmission of current knowledge and the generation of new knowledge through original research and publication of the findings. All tenure-track faculty and appropriate fixed-term faculty must engage in scholarly activity. For faculty on the tenure track a major portion must be original research.

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

#### **i. Research, Scholarship and Publication**

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

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

Other forms of scholarship include publishing in electronic/digital platforms such as MedEdPortal, publication of innovative or novel educational approaches, textbook authorship or editorship, and electronic and on-line educational resource development.

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

### **C. Service**

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

Service and engagement activities are important ways in which a faculty member connects the resources of the University to social and health issues faced in society. However, service and engagement activities will not be considered as the scholarship of service unless they are formal and meet the criteria identified in the previous section on "Scholarly Activity."

#### **i. Patient Care**

Patient care will be evaluated only when it is an assigned responsibility of the faculty member. Such faculty members are expected to provide exemplary patient care, using current methods that are respected by patients and peers both within the University and in the professional community.

Examples of additional activities relating to patient care are:

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

- Acquisition of patents on clinical materials or instruments
- Membership on dental/dental hygiene licensure boards

## **ii. Continuing Education**

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

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

Examples of continuing education activities to be considered for promotion include:

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

## **iii. Other Service to the University, the Profession, or the Community**

All faculty members must share in the work necessary to maintain the operation of the institution.

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

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

- Service on boards and committees or other assignments within the School of Dentistry, University, or profession
- Leadership in curriculum development and implementation, of clinical activity, creation of curriculum-related research programs, etc.
- Contribution to faculty government

- Contribution to professional organizations
- Service to professional journals as a manuscript referee, reviewer, etc.
- Service as a consultant to accrediting and other educational review boards
- Service on boards and committees in the community-at-large in a professional capacity
- Building partnerships with communities to develop and diversify the healthcare workforce
- Delivering community-based quality health care
- Translating research into practice and policy and disseminating research findings to communities
- In-service training activities within the School or University (e.g., infection control and medical emergency updates)

#### **iv. Community Engagement**

An emerging area of service involves community engagement. Community entails a group of people who share a common location, interests, values, work or identity, and who have an association due to common traditions, or political, civic, social, cultural or economic interactions. "Community engagement is the application of institutional resources to address and solve challenges facing communities through collaboration with these communities. Community engagement can also be considered scholarship. Community- engaged scholarship involves the faculty member in a mutually beneficial partnership with the community" (CCPH 2005). It can be interdisciplinary or draw on the principles of community-based participatory research. According to the 2005 Report of the Commission on Community-Engaged Scholarship in the Health Professions, "It is important to point out that not all community-engaged activities undertaken by faculty are scholarship. For example, if a faculty member devotes time to developing a community-based health program, it may be important work and it may advance the service mission of the institution, but unless it includes the other components that define or represent standards for scholarship (e.g., clear goals, adequate preparation, appropriate methods, reflective critique, rigor and/or peer review) it would not be considered scholarship."

#### **v. Administrative Responsibilities**

A variety of administrative activities exists to serve the School of Dentistry, the University or the profession that should be considered when evaluating contributions to professional service.

It is recognized that there are a few faculty whose appointments are based on a need by the School for administrative leadership. These faculty members are heavily committed to administrative roles that are both essential to, and valued by, the School. Fixed-term faculty in these roles are eligible for consideration for promotion based on evaluation of either teaching or research and community- service engagement. Tenured and tenure track faculty in these roles will be evaluated as other tenure track faculty with emphasis on the Service criteria.

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

Examples of administrative roles may include:

- Assistant or Associate Dean
- Department Chair or Program Director, including Graduate Program Directors and Center Directors
- Special activity director or coordinator(e.g., DDS group practice director)
- Leadership role in faculty governance or professional organizations
- Serving in the capacity of a journal editor

## **5. Criteria for Appointments and Promotions: Tenure Track Ranks**

### **A. Teaching**

It is expected that all faculty will support and participate in the teaching mission of the School of Dentistry.

The standards for teaching effectiveness that shall be considered in promotion decisions to Assistant, Associate, and Full Professor in tenured / tenure track appointments are listed on page 19-22. These standards include the quality of teaching, innovation in teaching, innovation in methods for evaluating students, impact upon students, and nature and extent of responsibilities.

It is recognized that authoring a textbook is scholarly activity but the book itself can be viewed as evidence of teaching. The School of Dentistry may consider authorship of textbooks as either teaching or scholarly activity, usually at the discretion of the candidate.

The following are examples of activities that support the teaching mission of the School of Dentistry:

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

#### **i. Methods of Evaluation**

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

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

development of instructional materials.

Evaluations will include student and peer assessments and a “self-evaluation.”

## **B. Scholarly Activity**

The quality of research can be most readily measured through two peer review mechanisms: publication in refereed journals and the acquisition of grant funds from sources that evaluate proposals using a quality peer review system.

For faculty members in the tenure track, documentation of progressive academic productivity and independence in research is required. There should be a record of a substantial number of original, peer reviewed research papers in widely respected refereed journals.

Other forms of scholarship include:

- Authoring literature reviews/systematic reviews
- Publishing in electronic/digital platforms such as MedEdPortal
- Publication of innovative or novel educational approaches
- Textbook authorship or editorship
- Electronic and on-line educational resource development

While not required, a record of continued external grant support as an independent researcher is also an important criterion for excellence in research.

To be considered for promotion to Associate Professor, the Assistant Professor must be regarded by the department chair and peers as one who has developed, or can develop the background, talent and commitment to do good research even though a tangible measure of research productivity may not yet be evident. Specific numbers of publications in each case are not as important as the quality and significance of the work. The quantity of publications required for promotion may be impacted by the Terms and Conditions of Appointment Statement, type of research, the quality of the publications, and the quality of the journal in which the paper is published and whether or not the work is primarily part of team research. If the research is part of a team then the candidate’s role must be well identified within his/her CV or elsewhere within the candidate’s review materials. Guidance regarding expected/recommended numbers of publications may be obtained from the Department chair and/or mentoring team.

The Associate Professor who expects to be promoted to Full Professor must show continuing research development. Sustained activity as an independent investigator or collaborator and reasonable first author / senior author activity should be evident. The faculty member should be a recognized authority nationally / internationally in his/her discipline and, as such, should be committed to guiding the development of young faculty in their scientific endeavors. The quantity of publications required for promotion will vary depending on Terms and Conditions of Appointment Statement, type of research, the quality of the publication, the quality of the journal in which the paper is published and whether or not the work is primarily part of team research. Guidance regarding expected/ recommended numbers may be obtained from the Department

chair and/or faculty mentors.

### **C. Service and Engagement**

It is expected that the level of professional service will be commensurate with the proposed rank. Faculty at Associate and Full Professor ranks are expected to perform service activities that reflect their more senior status, such as chairing important school committees and providing service at the professional, community, state, University, national and international level. See pages 23-26 for a comprehensive list of service activities.

## 6. Timing of Appointments, Reappointment: Tenure Track Ranks

### A. Assistant Professor

Initial appointment to the rank of Assistant Professor, or promotion to the rank of Assistant Professor from the rank of Instructor, is for a probationary term of four years. Pending successful review of the faculty member's performance within their third probationary year, they are subsequently reappointed for a second probationary term of three years. .

It is important to emphasize that the *Trustee Policies and Regulations Governing Academic Tenure in the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill* require that the faculty member receive written notice of a decision to reappoint and/or promote for the reappointment to the second probationary term and for promotion to Associate Professor after the second probationary term at least one year before the end of their current term. Therefore, the review for reappointment to a second probationary term starts at the beginning of the third year of the initial probationary term, and review for promotion to Associate Professor starts at the beginning of the second year of the second probationary term. These reviews are initiated by the Department Chair, in consultation with the assembled Full Professors of the Department. A faculty member is not required to spend the seventh year at the Assistant Professor rank if approved for reappointment or promotion; he/she can be promoted immediately after the action has been reviewed and approved by the Board of Trustees. Therefore, six years is the usual maximum time to serve as Assistant Professor. However, there may be a special circumstance that warrants the use of the seventh year; in such cases the Department Chair must explain this in the letter of recommendation.

It should be emphasized that a promotion from Assistant Professor to Associate Professor that would occur at the beginning of the sixth year in rank (one year early) will be considered accelerated; at the beginning of the fifth year (two years early), is extraordinary.

There are two options when an Assistant Professor is either not reappointed to a second probationary term, or not promoted to Associate Professor after her/his second probationary term. In certain instances, the faculty member may be considered as a candidate for a position in the fixed term track. More typically, however, the faculty member will need to seek employment elsewhere, and the final year of the probationary appointment serves as the requisite "terminal year." It is for this reason that the review and outcome concerning the reappointment or promotion must be completed a full year before the end of the probationary term.

### B. Associate Professor

Promotion to the rank of Associate Professor from the rank of Assistant Professor confers permanent tenure. Under exceptional circumstances, an initial appointment with permanent tenure may be made. Typically a new faculty member who is appointed at the rank of Associate Professor is on a probationary period of five years without tenure. The review for reappointment as Associate Professor with tenure can occur anywhere from 18 months into the appointment to the beginning of the fourth year of the probationary term. The reappointment as Associate Professor with tenure, which must be approved by the UNC Board of Trustees, may be effective

as early as the beginning of the fifth year and no later than the beginning of the sixth year depending on the timeline of all the levels of review.

Associate Professors with tenure must have their performance reviewed at least every five years according to the guidelines for post-tenure review defined by the UNC Board of Governors, by the UNC-CH Board of Trustees, and by the UNC School of Dentistry Post Tenure Review Policy. If the intradepartmental review at five years results in a recommendation for promotion, the evaluation for promotion will replace the post-tenure review for that cycle.

The permanent rank of Associate Professor should be considered an acceptable and honorable attainment rather than as an inevitable step on the path to Professor. Promotion to the rank of Professor represents the highest academic award ordinarily available within the institution and is considered exceptional if the candidate has spent fewer than five years in rank as an Associate Professor.

### **C. Joint Appointments**

In joint appointments where the School of Dentistry is the primary school, the faculty member will be evaluated by the School of Dentistry Appointment, Promotion, and Tenure Guidelines. If the School of Dentistry is the secondary school, the faculty member shall be reviewed for promotion and tenure only for those aspects defined as responsibilities and duties to the School of Dentistry. These duties shall be specified in the initial appointing document Terms and Conditions Appointment. However, reviews of faculty holding joint tenure-track or tenured faculty appointments must be coordinated simultaneously administratively between all schools and a single dossier submitted to campus for the recommended action.

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

### **D. Time in Rank and Early Promotions**

No recommendation for a promotion or reappointment, which under the provisions hereof will confer permanent tenure, may be initiated until the faculty member has been in the active employment of the University for at least 18 months. No such recommendation may be initiated which would have an effective date more than 18 months after initiation, except as thus expressly limited, promotions in rank may be made at any time during a faculty member's employment. It should be emphasized that a promotion from Assistant Professor to Associate Professor that would occur at the beginning of the sixth year in rank (one year early) will be considered accelerated; at the beginning of the fifth year (two years early), extraordinary.

### **E. Special Provisions for Extending the Maximum Probationary Period (Extension of the Tenure Clock)**

Faculty members who hold either a probationary Assistant or Associate Professor appointment may anticipate that they will require additional time in probationary status prior to review for reappointment and/or promotion with tenure due to any number of circumstances. The Tenure Regulations state:

For reasons of health, requirements of childbirth or child care, or similar compelling circumstances, a faculty member holding a probationary term of appointment at the rank of Assistant Professor or Associate Professor may request a written memorandum of amendment extending the term of the current appointment and thereby the maximum probationary period with no resulting change in normal employment obligations, in order to provide the faculty member additional time to demonstrate fully his or her professional qualifications for reappointment or permanent tenure. Extensions under this subsection (iii) may be granted in increments not to exceed 12 months, up to a maximum of 24 months (including any extensions that may have been granted under subsection (ii), above). [Amended May 20, 2004.]

[Trustee Policies and Regulations Governing Academic Tenure in the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill](http://policy.sites.unc.edu/files/2013/04/tenure.pdf) – <http://policy.sites.unc.edu/files/2013/04/tenure.pdf>

Any request pursuant to the above must be initiated not later than 24 months before the end of the term to which it is to apply and must be approved by the Chancellor. A second request for 12 months following the initial request (of 12 months) requires the same paperwork. The extension granted cannot exceed a total of 24 months. A request for extension initiated during the third or fourth year of an initial probationary term at the rank of Assistant Professor shall be granted only upon the condition that the initial appointment is renewed.

The provisions above do not apply to informal temporary adjustments of the regularly assigned duties of faculty members by the department chair who is responsible for their direct supervision nor to the granting by the University of extended leaves of absence with or without compensation.

## 7. Sequence of Actions for Appointment, Reappointment and Promotion of Tenure Track Faculty

### A. Required Documents

The Chair or his/her designee will make available to each faculty member the web links regarding the location of the University and the School of Dentistry criteria and process for the promotion of tenure track faculty. These materials must be presented to each faculty member at the beginning of initial employment and at the beginning of the year in which each subsequent review is scheduled to occur. Faculty can meet with the Departmental Chair, Director of Faculty Development or other members of the administration should questions arise about the process. The Department Chair initiates all recommendations for appointment, reappointment, and promotion. The assembled Full Professors in the Department must be consulted regarding the recommendation. Once scheduled for promotion and/or tenure review, the faculty member will meet with the Director of Faculty Development to finalize the CV, Teaching Portfolio, and other documents required for review process.

Required documents include:

- Chair's Letter
- Updated CV in SOD format
- Teaching Portfolio
- Peer evaluations of teaching (2) (conducted over a 12 month period prior to the review)
- Outside letters of recommendation (**minimum of 4: two from reviewers at or above the recommended faculty rank selected by the candidate and two from reviewers at or above the recommended faculty rank selected by the chair; the communications soliciting the 4 external letters of review must come from the department chair**) All letters solicited or received must be included in the dossier.
- Research Statement
- Teaching Statement

Optional documents include:

- Reflective statement (candidate can decide if he/she wishes to include the reflective statement)
- Mentoring Team Chair Report (if applicable)

### B. Early Review

The department may elect to initiate an off-cycle promotion or tenure action. The decision to recommend a faculty member for "early" promotion demands documentation of outstanding qualifications. Tenure may not be granted to a faculty member with an initial appointment at the Associate Professor level until the faculty member has been with the University for a minimum of 18 months. It should be emphasized that a promotion from Assistant Professor to Associate Professor that would occur at the beginning of the sixth year in rank (one year early) will be considered accelerated; at the beginning of the fifth year (two years early), extraordinary.

### **C. Mandatory/Non-mandatory Review**

Assistant Professors are appointed for an initial 4-year term, and can be reappointed for one additional three-year probationary term pending successful review of their performance within the first probationary term. Assistant professors are reviewed approximately 18-months prior to the end of their initial appointment and at approximately 18 months prior to the end of their reappointment.

Reappointments to Assistant Professor for a second probationary term of three years are not reviewed by the PTAC in the SOD. These actions are reviewed by the Departmental Full Professors/Associate Professors, SOD FPAC, HSAC, Provost, and BOT. No external letters are required for reappointments. Many departments now encourage candidates to assemble all other elements of the package required for promotion to Associate Professor to facilitate the later process.

However, the University's minimum requirements for reappointment to a second-term appointment at the Assistant Professor level are:

- Letter from the department chair endorsed by the dean recommending reappointment
- AP2 form: Recommendation for EPA Personnel Action
- CV
- Teaching Evaluations
- Peer Evaluations (if applicable)
- In addition, the SOD requires that a Mentoring Team Report be included in the packet for all assistant professors who have a mentoring team.

The mandatory review for promotion from Assistant Professor to Associate Professor begins with the Intra-departmental review (see below). Reviews of faculty holding joint tenure-track or tenured faculty appointments must be coordinated simultaneously administratively between all schools and a single dossier submitted to campus for the recommended action.

The mandatory review of probationary Associate Professors (tenure track) for tenure at five years begins 18 months prior to the end of the five year appointment. Truly outstanding individuals may be considered for early promotion although it is not recommended unless the productivity has been exemplary.

Tenured Associate Professors have an initial mandatory post-tenure review within five years after the award of tenure and then within every five years thereafter. The five-year post-tenure review will include a discussion between the department chair and the faculty member concerning promotion. A decision to promote must be made in consultation with the department Full Professors. Non-mandatory Review: Generally it is recommended that the faculty member be reviewed for promotion on the recommended timeline. An Associate Professor may request an informal discussion about promotion with the Department Chair at any time. No additional consultation with the Full Professors is needed for this purpose. The faculty member may also request (in writing) for a formal intradepartmental review off cycle (on a 2.5 year cycle after

the first mandatory five-year review). The intradepartmental review must include consultation with the Full Professors of the department but does not require external letters of review unless the decision is to recommend promotion to Full Professor. Documents that will be reviewed include a current CV in UNC/SOD format and Teaching Portfolio including teaching evaluations. If the decision is not to recommend promotion, the Full Professors should provide specific recommendations on how the candidate can prepare for the next review. The letter reporting the outcome of the intradepartmental review and the recommendations for improvement will be provided to the candidate in a letter generated by the Department Chair with a copy to the candidate, the Assistant Dean for Human Resources and the Dean.

The permanent rank of Associate Professor should be considered an acceptable and honorable attainment rather than as an inevitable step on the path to Full Professor. Promotion to the rank of Full Professor represents the highest academic award ordinarily available within the institution and is considered exceptional if the candidate has spent fewer than five years in rank as an Associate Professor.

#### **D. Intradepartmental Review for Promotion**

At the individual department level, an intradepartmental Full Professors committee convenes, consisting of at least three tenured professors and, if appropriate, tenured Associate Professors. This committee reviews Assistant Professors who are being evaluated for reappointment to a second term as an Assistant Professor and also Assistant Professors seeking promotion to Associate Professor. The intradepartmental committee reviews the CV of the candidate, external letters (not required for reappointments to a second term) and a draft Teaching Portfolio and makes a recommendation to the department chair. Both positive and negative decisions regarding promotion and tenure will be forwarded by the department to the School of Dentistry Human Resources Office for further review by the PTAC (for Assistant Professor promotions to Associate Professor) and the School of Dentistry Full Professors Advisory Committee.

In departments with fewer than three Full Professors, the following arrangements will be made:

- For reviews for reappointment to a second term as an Assistant Professor or promotion to Associate Professor: There must be at least three Full Professors and/or Associate Professors with tenure on the departmental review committee.
- If a department has fewer than three Full Professors, the tenured Associate Professors in the department will meet with the existing Full Professors to review the candidate's CV and supporting documentation.
- In the case where there are fewer than three Full and Associate Professors with tenure, the Department Chair shall consult with the Full Professor(s) and designate one or more Full Professors from outside the department, who along with the existing full and/or tenured Associate Professors, will comprise the departmental review committee.
- In the case where there are no Full Professors, the Department Chair, in consultation with the Dean, shall appoint one or more Full Professors to sit on the departmental review committee in conjunction with existing tenured Associate Professors. There must always be at least one Full Professor on the departmental review commit

For promotion to Full Professor, the committee must consist of at least three Full Professors. If there are fewer than three Full Professors, the Department Chair shall meet with the existing Full Professors of the department and designate one or more Full Professors from outside the department to sit on the departmental review committee. If there are no Full Professors in the department, the Department Chair will designate, in consultation with the dean, Full Professors from outside the department to serve on the review committee.

### **E. Promotion and Tenure Advisory Committee (PTAC) Review**

The next level of review is the Promotion and Tenure Advisory Committee (PTAC). This committee reviews the following recommendations: Initial appointments of tenured Associate Professors, promotions of Assistant Professor to Associate Professor conferring tenure, reappointments of probationary Associate Professors to the rank of Associate Professor with tenure and promotions from Associate Professor to Professor.

#### **i. Composition**

The committee shall consist of seven (7) full-time faculty members as follows:

- Elected by the faculty
  - One Full Professor
  - One Associate Professor
  - One Assistant Professor
- Appointed by Dean (From School of Dentistry)
  - One Full Professor
  - One Associate Professor (tenured)
  - One Assistant Professor
  - One tenured faculty member outside the School of Dentistry
  - One member of the committee is appointed as Chair by the Dean.

#### **ii. Committee Charge**

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

#### **iii. Committee Meetings and Management of Conflict of Interest**

The PTAC normally meets two times per year, usually in January and July, for as long or often as necessary to thoroughly review each candidate. An official vote of the PTAC requires a quorum of two-thirds of the committee. The committee also meets to review the procedures and update them, if necessary. Documents used in the review of candidates consist of the curriculum vitae, the chair's letter, letters evaluating the candidate, articles submitted to outside reviewers, the

optional candidate's statement, the Teaching Portfolio, and peer assessments of teaching. The PTAC review has two components. The first is to make sure the information documenting the action conforms to the recommended form and style. The second component pertains to the qualifications of the candidate and primarily is based on the School of Dentistry Appointment, Promotion and Tenure Guidelines. The committee discusses each candidate and the committee Chair prepares a report to the Dean indicating the strengths and weaknesses found, along with a recommendation and a tally of the secret ballot. The PTAC report minus the ballot results accompanies action for further University reviews.

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

All recommendations by PTAC, positive and negative, are reported to the School of Dentistry Full Professors Advisory Committee by the PTAC Chair.

## **F. School of Dentistry Full Professors Advisory Committee (FPAC)**

### **i. Committee Charge**

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

## **ii. Committee Meetings**

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

## **G. Dean's Review**

For purposes of Promotion and Tenure, the University looks upon the Dental School as a department with the dean being the equivalent of a department chair. The dean reviews the candidate's documentation, the PTAC report, and comments from the Full Professors Advisory Committee in order to come to a decision regarding the proposed action. This decision is then forwarded with appropriate documentation for University review.

## **H. Additional University Review for all Tenure-Track and Tenured appointments**

### **i. Health Sciences Advisory Committee (HSAC)**

This committee is comprised of faculty members from each of the Health Affairs Schools and is advisory to the Executive Vice Chancellor and Provost for tenured and tenure-track faculty appointments, reappointments and promotions. [APT Process and Submission Schedule](#) – click link to access full document.

### **ii. Appointment, Promotion Tenure (APT) Sub Committee**

This subcommittee is composed of three members of the APT committee, chosen in rotation from the full APT each month. The subcommittee reviews all dossiers and reports to the full APT Committee.

### **iii. Appointment, Promotion Tenure (APT) Committee**

This committee is comprised of twelve members of the University faculty holding permanent tenure at the rank of professor: Four (4) members with primary appointments in the College of Arts and Sciences; four (4) members with primary appointments in the School of Medicine, and four (4) members with primary appointments within the professional schools other than the School of Medicine (School of Government, School of Law, School of Information and Library Science, School of Journalism and Mass Communications, School of Education, School of Nursing, School of Public Health, School of Dentistry, School of Pharmacy). Members are elected by the voting University faculty at large for a three-year term. Terms are staggered so that at least one term from each of the three constituencies expires each year. Elected members of the APT Advisory Committee, the Faculty Executive Committee, the Faculty Hearings Committee, and the Faculty Grievance Committee are not eligible to serve on the committee.

The committee serves in an advisory capacity to the Executive Vice Chancellor and Provost with respect to: appointments, reappointments, and promotions that have the effect of conferring permanent tenure; promotion to a higher rank of persons holding permanent tenure at the rank of Associate professor or Assistant professor; and appointment to a distinguished professorship that is not restricted by the terms of the endowment to a particular school or department. The committee holds regular meetings once each month throughout the calendar year.

#### **iv. Board of Trustees (BOT)**

All tenure and tenure track faculty actions favorably reviewed by the Chancellor are sent forward to the Board of Trustees (BOT). The UNC BOT has final approval authority for tenure-track and tenured faculty appointments, reappointments and promotions.

### **I. Negative Decisions for Tenure Track Faculty Members**

If the decision at the department level is negative, a letter so informing the faculty member must be sent to the faculty member with a copy to the Dean. Negative decisions for promotion and/or tenure at the department level for tenure-track faculty also will be reviewed by PTAC and the School's Full Professors Advisory Committee.

#### **i. Decisions Not to Reappoint Upon Expiration of Probationary Terms**

[Trustee Policies and Regulations Governing Academic Tenure in the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill](#) – page 6 click link to access full document

A decision not to reappoint upon expiration of a probationary term at the rank of Instructor, Assistant Professor or Associate Professor may be made in the first instance by the Chair of the department after consultation with the assembled full professors of the department; or it may be made, following a recommendation to reappoint by the department, by any other officer of administration charged with reviewing such a recommendation. By whatever officer of administration made, a decision not to reappoint is final except as it may subsequently be reviewed in accordance with the provisions of Sections 4 and 8. Permissible and impermissible grounds for making a decision not to reappoint are as provided in Section 4.a. hereof. Each decision not to reappoint shall be communicated for information through the administrative channels prescribed for review of a recommendation to reappoint; and notice thereof shall be communicated in writing to the faculty member by the department within the times prescribed by Sections 2.b.(2), (3), and (4) hereof. [Amended 6/20/80]

#### **ii. Appeals – Administrative Conferences Following Decision Not to Reappoint**

Within 14 calendar days after receiving written notice of non-reappointment, a faculty member may in writing request a private conference with the officer of administration who made the decision, to discuss the reasons for non-reappointment. If the identity of the officer is not known to the faculty member, the department chair shall provide the information forthwith upon request of the faculty member. The request for conference shall be granted and the conference held

forthwith, within seven calendar days after receipt of the request, if possible. Within seven calendar days after completion of the conference the officer of administration shall give a simple unelaborated written notice to the faculty member as to whether the original decision remains in effect.

If the notice is that the original decision remains in effect, the faculty member may proceed as follows. When the decision not to reappoint was made by an officer of administration in review of the recommendation of a department chair to reappoint, the faculty member may thereupon proceed, in accordance with succeeding subsections, to request review by the standing committee of the faculty charged with reviewing discharges under Section 3 hereof.

When the decision was made in the first instance by the department chair, the faculty member may, within seven calendar days after receipt of the notice, in writing request a conference with the officer of administration in immediate supervision of the department chair. This request shall be granted and the conference held forthwith, within seven calendar days after receipt of the request if possible. Within fourteen calendar days after completion of the conference, the reviewing officer of administration shall in writing communicate his or her evaluation of the matter to the faculty member and to the department chair.

The evaluation may be in the form of an unelaborated concurrence with the decision; an expression of disagreement with the decision, with or without supporting reasons; or a recommendation for reconsideration of the decision, with or without suggestions for specific procedures to be followed upon reconsideration. Whatever form the evaluation may take it is merely recommendatory and not binding upon the department chair, nor final as to the faculty member.

Within seven calendar days after receipt of an evaluation which involves disagreement with the decision or recommendation for its reconsideration, the department chair shall in writing notify the faculty member and his or her immediate supervisor of his or her response.

A faculty member's failure to abide by the timelines specified herein shall finalize the reappointment decision and terminate the faculty member's otherwise available recourse to further review by the hearing committee, the Chancellor, and/or the Board of Governors.

### **iii. Request for Review by Hearing Committee - Scope of Review**

If the faculty member has timely requested and participated in the administrative conferences provided in subsection b. and has received notice of unfavorable action resulting therefrom, the faculty member may within 14 calendar days after receipt of such notice request a review of the decision by the standing committee of the faculty charged with conducting hearings on faculty discharges. Such review may be had solely to determine whether the decision not to reappoint was (1. based upon any of the grounds stated to be impermissible in [Subsection a. of Section 4](#) – page 14, or (2. affected by material procedural irregularities. Whether procedural irregularities occurred shall be determined by reference to those procedures which were in effect when the initial decision not to reappoint was made and communicated. The hearing committee shall ask the Chancellor to certify what procedures were then in effect if that is a matter of dispute. For

purposes of these procedures “material procedural irregularities” means departures from prescribed procedures governing reappointment that cast doubt upon the integrity of the original decision not to reappoint.

The request for review shall be in writing and addressed to the chair of the hearing committee. It shall specify the grounds upon which it is contended that the decision was impermissibly based or affected by material procedural irregularities, and shall include a short and plain statement of facts which the faculty member believes support the contention.

Submission of such a request constitutes on the part of the faculty member: (1. a representation that he or she can support his or her contention by factual proof and (2. an agreement that the institution may offer in rebuttal of his or her contention any relevant data within its possession.

The hearing committee shall consider the request and shall grant a hearing if it determines after a preliminary review that the request contains a contention that the decision was impermissibly based or affected by material procedural irregularities and that the facts suggested, if established, might support the contention. If the request is not granted, the committee shall make a recommendation to the Chancellor to uphold the decision not to reappoint. If the request is granted, a hearing shall be held within 14 calendar days after receipt of the request, provided that the faculty member shall be given at least seven calendar days' notice of the hearing. [Amended 6/20/80; 1/9/87; 10/20/09]

#### **iv. Conduct of Hearing**

The question before the committee shall be decided by the committee. However, the committee may delegate the duty of conducting a hearing to a panel of at least three members. The hearing shall be conducted informally and in private; only the members of the committee, the faculty member, the officer of administration who made the decision, and such witnesses as may be called shall attend except that the faculty member and the officer of administration may each be assisted or, in their absence, represented by a spokesman designated in writing so to act. Committee members who hold appointments in the faculty member's department or school or who will testify as witnesses, or who have any other conflict of interest are disqualified. A professional court reporter, or similarly reliable means, shall be used to enable the production of a verbatim written transcript of the hearing and to maintain a record of the documents received by the committee. Upon the request of the faculty member, a transcript of the proceedings shall be made and provided to the faculty member at the University's expense. The committee may consider only such evidence and such written and oral arguments as is presented at the hearing and need consider only such evidence or argument offered which it considers fair and reliable. All witnesses may be questioned by members of the committee, the faculty member, and the officer of administration or the respective spokesmen of the faculty member and the officer of administration except as herein provided, the conduct of the hearing is under the control of the committee chair or the member designated by the chair for this purpose. [Amended 6/20/80]

## **8. Criteria for Appointments and Promotion: Clinical and Research Fixed-Term Ranks**

Clinical and Research fixed-term faculty members may enjoy satisfying academic experiences and professional growth through the pursuit of activities primarily in two of the three areas (teaching, community engagement/service, scholarly activity/research). Although the criteria for evaluation of faculty in the tenure track and faculty being considered for fixed-term appointment at a higher rank are the same for each area, the different concentrations of activities between fixed-term and tenure-track faculty result in circumstances that merit additional specification.

### **A. Clinical Track Appointments**

It is expected that faculty in the clinical track will be evaluated primarily on the effectiveness of their teaching, supplemented by consideration of their community-engagement/service or scholarly activity/research. They must show excellence in two of the three areas. (See pages 8-13 for specific criteria for teaching and service/engagement).

#### **i. Teaching**

Even though the expectations for the amount of teaching are greater for faculty in this track, the standards for evaluation of effectiveness are the same as for faculty in the tenure track and include the quality of teaching, innovation in teaching, innovation in methods for evaluating students, impact upon students, and nature and extent of responsibilities. (See pages 19-22 for specific criteria for teaching).

It is recognized that authoring a textbook is scholarly activity but the book itself can be viewed as evidence of teaching. The School of Dentistry may consider authorship of textbooks as either teaching or as scholarly activity usually at the discretion of the candidate.

In addition, if a clinical track faculty member is evaluated for teaching and community-engagement/service, there is still the expectation that they will participate in scholarly activity defined in its broadest sense. This expectation is in the spirit of maintaining the academic viability of the teacher rather than requiring data-based research activity from all faculty members.

The following are examples of activities that support the teaching mission of the School of Dentistry:

- Participating as a didactic, laboratory or clinical faculty member
- Service as a course director, graduate program director, or residency director. Such activities provide an opportunity to demonstrate organizational, testing, feedback, mentoring, and student remediation skills beyond those demonstrated by simply participating as a course member.
- Broad contributions to the teaching profession, such as authorship of textbooks, curriculum offerings or teaching materials adopted by other institutions, publication of reports involving innovative new educational or evaluation techniques, development of new

- programs, and/or publication of conceptual articles regarding dental education
- Contributions to the teaching mission outside the University such as participation in regional, national, and international educational activities, participation as a visiting professor or outside speaker (non-research), and activity in national organizations devoted to teaching
- Publication of peer-reviewed articles on new educational methodologies, clinical techniques, or clinical case studies appropriate to the teaching mission

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

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

## **ii. Scholarly Activity**

For the faculty member in a Clinical Track appointment, research and scholarship activity may consist of:

- Original research culminating in peer reviewed publications
- Other forms of scholarship include authoring literature reviews/systematic reviews, publishing in electronic/digital platforms such as MedEdPortal, publishing innovative or novel educational approaches, textbook authorship or editorship, electronic and on-line educational resource development, and publishing case reports.
- Acquiring contracts and grants for research activity

## **iii. Service and Engagement**

It is expected that the level of professional service will be commensurate with the proposed rank. Faculty at Fixed Term Associate and Professor ranks are expected to perform service activities that reflect their more senior status, such as chairing important school committees, and service at the professional, community, state, University, national and international level. See pages 23-26 for a comprehensive list of service activities.

## **B. Research Track Appointments**

It is expected that faculty in the Research Track will be evaluated primarily on the quality of their research, supplemented by consideration of their teaching or community-service/engagement activities. It is recognized that research track faculty operate under particular restrictions imposed by the need for their salaries to be funded primarily from research activities. Research productivity should be commensurate with the time allocated to research, and achieving the status of an independent investigator is expected to occur sooner than in other

tracks. It also is recognized that for research track faculty, teaching roles involving activities as a research mentor, thesis advisor and committee work, and graduate level teaching may be more compatible with their prime source of salary support than clinical, preclinical and didactic teaching of pre-doctoral students.

### **C. Adjunct Appointments**

Due to their generally part-time work schedule, appointment at a higher rank for adjunct faculty ordinarily will be at longer intervals than full-time faculty. Initial review of part-time faculty with a commitment of one-half day a week or more will occur at seven years, with subsequent reviews occurring at five-year intervals thereafter. The departmental Full Professors committee (including Fixed Term Professors) and the department Chair may conclude that more or less time is needed for consideration for appointment at higher rank based on the scope, value, and quality of the part-time participation of the individual. Such consideration is highly relevant for individuals who have less than weekly commitments to the School of Dentistry. Adjunct faculty who do not have a continuing relationship with the School of Dentistry will not be considered for higher ranks.

Adjunct faculty will be reviewed only in those areas designated for their specific responsibilities. Therefore, the review may be limited to a single area. Criteria for evaluation can include, but will not be limited to, teaching evaluations, Department Chair's evaluations, CV, supporting letters, and any available faculty evaluations. Documentation for adjunct faculty who supervise students at extramural sites would rely primarily on student reports and evaluation by the Director of the extramural rotation program. This category includes: adjunct Professor, adjunct Associate Professor, adjunct Assistant Professor, and adjunct Instructor. It is the Department Chair's responsibility to initiate all procedures to begin the promotion review process of adjunct faculty. In addition, recommendations to consider promotion of adjunct faculty may be initiated by the Full Professors Advisory Committee and sent to the Department Chair of the adjunct faculty member.

### **D. Joint Appointments**

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

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

## **9. Timing of Promotion Reviews for Fixed Term Faculty**

The timeline for promotion review for promotion within the fixed term track is similar to that described for tenure track faculty with the exception that one year advance notice of reappointment or promotion is never required for faculty members in the fixed term track. Fixed term appointments range from one to five years in duration. Fixed Term Assistant Professors are typically considered for promotion to the rank of Clinical/Research Associate Professor at the beginning of the seventh year as Assistant Professor. Clinical/Research Associate Professors generally are considered for promotion Clinical/Research Professor at the beginning of the fifth year as Associate Professor and reviewed not less frequently than every five years thereafter. Truly outstanding individuals may be considered for early promotion.

## 10. Sequence of Actions for Appointment, Reappointment and Promotion of Fixed Term Faculty

### A. Required Documents

The Department Chair or his/her designee will make available to each faculty member the web links regarding the location of the University and the School of Dentistry criteria and process for promotion of fixed term faculty. These materials must be presented to each faculty member at the beginning of initial employment and at the beginning of the year in which each subsequent review is scheduled to occur. Faculty can meet with the Department Chair, Director of Faculty Development or other members of the administration should questions arise about the process.

The Department Chair initiates all recommendations for promotion of fixed term faculty. The assembled Department Full Professors (tenured and fixed term) must be consulted regarding the recommendation. Once it has been determined that a faculty member will be reviewed for promotion, the faculty member will meet with the Director of Faculty Development to finalize the CV, Teaching Portfolio, and other documents required for the review process.

Required documents include:

- Chair's Letter
- Updated CV in SOD format
- Teaching Portfolio
- Peer evaluations of teaching (2) (conducted over a 12 month period prior to the review)
- Outside letters of recommendation (**minimum of 2: one selected by the candidate and one selected by the chair**) All letters solicited or received must be included in the dossier.

Optional documents include:

- Reflective statement (candidate can decide if he/she wishes to include the reflective statement)
- Mentoring Team Chair Report (if applicable)

The review process for promotion of fixed term faculty is similar to the process for tenure track faculty. As with tenure track faculty, individual faculty members are primarily responsible for their own career development. Mentoring is available through the Department Chair, mentoring committee (for Assistant Professors) and other faculty within and outside of the School of Dentistry.

#### i. Recommended Cycle and Requested Reviews

Generally it is recommended that the faculty member be reviewed for promotion on the recommended timeline. However, the fixed term faculty member may request an informal discussion about reappointment to a higher rank with the Department Chair at any time. No additional consultation with the full professors is needed for this purpose. The faculty member may also request (in writing) a formal intradepartmental review off cycle. A request should be made to the Department Chair and should be made no more often than every 2.5 years after

initial employment and/or promotion. The intradepartmental review must include consultation with the full professors (including fixed term professors) of the department but does not require external letters of review unless the decision is to recommend reappointment to a higher rank. Documents that will be reviewed include a current CV in UNC/SOD format and Teaching Portfolio. If the decision is not to recommend reappointment to a higher rank, the full professors should provide specific recommendations on how the candidate can prepare for the next review. The letter reporting the outcome of the intradepartmental review and the recommendations for improvement will be provided to the candidate in a letter generated by the Department Chair with a copy to the candidate, the Assistant Dean for Human Resources and the Dean.

### **B. Intradepartmental Review for Promotion**

At the individual department level, an intradepartmental full professors committee, consisting of at least two tenured Professors and, if appropriate, Associate Professors (for review of Clinical/Research Assistant Professors seeking promotion of Clinical/Research Associate Professor), is the first level of review. In addition, at least one fixed term faculty above the rank of the candidate seeking promotion shall be included in the full professors committee for the intradepartmental review. In the case that there are no fixed term faculty who meet this criteria in the candidate's department, the Dean or his/her designee will assign one representative from another department to participate. The intradepartmental committee reviews the CV of the candidate, external letters and a draft Teaching Portfolio and makes a recommendation to the Department Chair.

### **C. Promotion and Tenure Advisory Committee (PTAC) Review**

The next level of review is the Promotion and Tenure Advisory Committee (PTAC). This committee reviews all recommendations for promotion for fixed term faculty members (Clinical/Research Assistant Professor to Clinical/Research Associate Professor; Clinical/Research Associate Professor to Clinical/Research Professor).

### **D. School of Dentistry Full Professors Advisory Committee**

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

### **E. Dean's Review and University Approval**

For purposes of Promotion and Tenure, the University looks upon the Dental School as a department with the Dean being the equivalent of a Department Chair. The Dean reviews the candidate's documentation, the PTAC report, and comments from the Full Professors Advisory Committee in order to come to a decision regarding the proposed action. If the Dean's decision is to approve promotion, the School of Dentistry Human Resources Office reviews the

appropriate paperwork for each promotion and then transmits it to the Office of the Executive Vice Chancellor and Provost. After University approval, the Provost sends the faculty member a formal appointment letter.

## **F. Negative Decisions for Fixed Term Faculty Members**

Negative decisions on fixed term faculty promotions may occur at the department level or at the School level. At the department level, the following types of promotions are subject to review:

- Promotion from Clinical/Research Instructor to Clinical/Research Assistant Professor
- Promotion from Clinical/Research Assistant Professor to Clinical/Research Associate Professor
- Promotion from Clinical/Research Associate Professor to Clinical/Research Professor

In the case of a decision not to recommend promotion by the intradepartmental review, the Chair informs the faculty member and the Dean (via the School of Dentistry Human Resources Office) within one week of the review process. A decision not to recommend promotion may be appealed by the faculty member (in writing) to the Executive Associate Dean. The faculty member in question is given an opportunity to submit any written materials to an external reviewer within five business days. The external reviewer is a Department Chair from another department who has been selected for this role by the Executive Associate Dean. In conducting the review, the Dean or his/her designee may consider both the merits of the decision and the procedures employed in making it.

The reviewer may recommend that the appointing department reconsider a decision not to recommend promotion. This process is not intended to encroach on the principle of departmental autonomy in faculty personnel decisions to any greater degree than is already implied in review of positive recommendations to reappoint or promote. The ultimate decision rests with the Dean, who has the authority to override recommendations from either the candidate's department or the external reviewer.

In the case of a recommendation against promotion by the Promotion and Tenure Advisory Committee and/or the Full Professors Advisory Committee, the ultimate decision rests with the Dean, who has the authority to accept or override the recommendation from any of the advisory committees.

A decision by the Dean not to recommend promotion is immediately communicated to the Department Chair, who is given an opportunity to provide further information. In addition, the Chair must immediately notify the individual faculty member of this decision. If the fixed term faculty member is not recommended for promotion, he / she should consult with the Department Chair, mentoring team or other resources in the School of Dentistry to receive guidance about how to prepare for the next review. For Fixed Term Assistant and Associate Professors, the next intradepartmental review would be scheduled in five years but could be requested by the faculty member in as few as 2.5 years.

## **11. Responsibility of Chair and Candidate for Preparation of Documents (Tenure Track and Fixed Term Track)**

To assist in the evaluation process, all candidates are required to prepare appropriate supporting documentation. At minimum, this will include the curriculum vitae (CV) in the Provost and School of Dentistry (SOD) format. Candidates who are full-time faculty are also required to identify persons who can provide meaningful letters of evaluation. All letters received will be used in the evaluation process and will become part of the dossier that will be reviewed at all levels. Full-time candidates must also prepare a Teaching Portfolio appropriately documenting their teaching contributions. While not required, the candidate may elect to include a separate reflective statement/Candidate's Statement (no more than three pages), summarizing the main contributions and including plans for future contributions. The reflective statement should strive to be factual and objective, rather than purely self-promotional.

For candidates who have written a textbook, the candidate should communicate with the Department Chair whether the textbook is to be considered as either Teaching or Scholarly Activity evidence. This information should be incorporated into the Chair's letter.

The candidate should meet with the Director of Faculty Development during the preparation of the CV, Teaching Portfolio and Reflective Statement. It is imperative that all supporting documentation be prepared to the highest possible standard, with principal emphasis on the content of the documentation and the requested SOD format.

It is the Department Chair and the Candidate's responsibility to prepare all material and meet all deadlines to avoid a delay in the review. The Department Chair has the responsibility to assemble and send forward to the SOD Human Resources Office all materials necessary for an appointment, reappointment, promotion and tenure by the requested deadline. Prior to the deadline, it is recommended that the Department Chair meet with his or her human resources consultant to finalize the dossier.

Following is a list of items that are prepared by the Department Chair and Candidate and are required for the promotion and tenure review:

### **A. Letter of Recommendation from the Department Chair to the Dean**

It is recommended that the Departmental Chair refer to the Provost Report Presentation of an Effective Dossier to the APT Committee: Chair's Letter—**The Most Important Recommendation**. The letter should clearly show the considerations influencing the Chair's decision to recommend the candidate for tenure and/or promotion; the actual vote of the departmental full professors (i.e., in favor of, opposed to, abstain); the specific contributions made by the individual to the teaching, research/scholarship and service/engagement missions of the School; and in the case of an early promotion, specific language defining the justification for such a recommendation. Chair's letters must contain an explanation of "no" votes or abstentions by voting full professors.

## **B. Official Letters of Recommendation from External Reviewers (Four Letters for Tenure Track; Two Letters for Fixed Term Track)**

The purpose of these letters is to provide an independent and unbiased assessment of the individual's merit for promotion as well as their national and international reputation. The external reviewers who prepare and submit these letters are expected to be individuals who can make an unbiased assessment of the faculty member under review through their academic productivity and scholarship. The letters may not be from individuals who have been directly involved with a candidate (e.g., a collaborator, mentor, previous co-worker, former or current class co-teacher, former dissertation chair), but may be from individuals who know the candidate through professional interactions (e.g., reviewed the candidate's publications or served on review committees together). Two of these letters should come from individuals who have been identified by the faculty member under review (one letter for fixed term), and two letters should come from individuals selected by the faculty member's Chair and/or mentor (one for fixed term). Each of these four (or two) official letters of recommendation must be specifically identified in the promotion packet by designating either "Candidate's Selection" or "Chair's Selection" in the top right corner of the letter. External reviewers should be at a higher rank than the faculty they are evaluating and also from comparable institutions.

## **C. Additional Letters of Recommendation**

Additional letters in support of the recommended personnel action may be solicited from individuals either within or without the University. In addition, unlike the official external letters described above, these letters may come from individuals who have a current or a prior academic and/or professional affiliation with the faculty member who is being reviewed. It is important to emphasize, however, that the University requires that **all letters** that are received on behalf of any personnel action being recommended must be submitted as a part of the promotion packet. It is against University policy to submit a selected subset of the letters received on behalf of a given individual.

## **D. Updated Curriculum Vitae**

The *Curriculum Vitae* must be as current as possible. It should be prepared in the standard format developed by the University (Provost) and the School of Dentistry.

## **E. Reflective Statement**

This **optional** document, prepared by the candidate, should include the main contributions in the areas of teaching, research/scholarship and service/engagement and include plans for future contributions. The reflective statement should strive to be factual and objective, rather than purely self-promotional.

## **F. Teaching Portfolio**

Formal Teaching Portfolios are required of all faculty in the Tenure or Fixed Term Tracks. See Appendix B for a recommended outline of what is to be included in the Teaching Portfolio. The Teaching Portfolio should include a summary of the candidate's teaching skills from didactic, laboratory and clinical student evaluations. For Fixed Term Research faculty, if he/she has taught in a class, laboratory or clinic, he/she should include a summary of teaching evaluations even if they do not create an optional Teaching Portfolio.

## **G. Peer Evaluations of Teaching**

Each faculty member is required to have two peer evaluations conducted over a twelve month period prior to the review. The assessments can be conducted by the candidate's Department Chair, course director; faculty peer (at a higher rank) or a member of the faculty's mentoring team. The University requires that dossiers include peer evaluations of classroom teaching. See Appendix H for a recommend peer assessment tool. The peer assessment letter may be generated from this form or the completed form itself may be submitted.

## **H. Mentoring Team Report**

In the case of a candidate who has a mentoring team (Tenure Track and Fixed Term Assistant Professors), a summary report should be submitted from the mentoring team chair. The purpose of the report is to provide an assessment of the mentoring team's progress over the period in which the candidate has had a mentoring team.

## 12. Post-Tenure Review

### A. Background

The Board of Governors of the University of North Carolina approved a Policy for Review of Tenured Faculty that became effective 1 September 1998. The current Post Tenure Review Policy was revised in May of 2015 and includes mandatory online UNC System training for all faculty participating in the Post Tenure Review Process, including reviewers and those scheduled to undergo Post Tenure Review, at <http://old.northcarolina.edu/aa/tenuretraining/index.php>. Each constituent campus has developed its own policy for review of tenured faculty that is consistent with the UNC Board of Governors policy. Academic units with tenured faculty appointments within each campus developed revised corresponding policies to go into effect in FY2015-16.

### B. Purpose

Post-tenure review is a systematic process for the periodic, comprehensive review of the performance of all faculty members having permanent tenure and whose primary duties are teaching, research and service. The goals of post-tenure review are to promote faculty development, ensure faculty productivity and provide accountability. The post-tenure review process should respect the basic principles of academic freedom. Post-tenure review does not abrogate, in any way, the due process criteria or procedures for dismissal or other disciplinary action established under the *Trustee Policies and Regulations Governing Academic Tenure*. The policies and procedures incorporate the basic principles of the policies established by the Board of Governors in the [UNC Policy Manual, Chapter 400- Academic Programs, 400.3-Tenure and Teaching in the University of North Carolina, 4003.3- Performance Review of Tenured Faculty, 400.3.3.1\(G\)-Guidelines on Performance Review of Tenured Faculty](#). This information was formerly identified in Board of Governors Memorandum #371.

More specifically, in the School of Dentistry, post-tenure review process serves as an additional means of fostering the School's mission of excellence in teaching, research/scholarly activity, service and patient care. To achieve this purpose, the review process assists individual faculty members in their ongoing professional development as they strive to enhance their skills as teachers, their accomplishments as scholars, and their contributions to the profession and the public. The review process is intended to foster constructive dialogue among colleagues that will be characterized by fairness, mutual respect, a desire to learn, open-mindedness, and appreciation for the importance of academic freedom. The process of review also will serve to enhance a sense of accountability within the School of Dentistry and the University.

### C. Policy

Effective upon the award of tenure, and coincident with the start of each post-tenure review cycle, faculty should develop, in consultation with their department chairs, five-year goal(s) or plans that are aligned with annual performance evaluations and consistent with the expectations of the department/school. These five-year plans can be modified annually by the faculty member in consultation with their department chair.

Each faculty member is subject to post-tenure review at least once every five years following the conferral of permanent tenure. Reviews must examine all aspects of a faculty member's academic performance and should be flexible enough to acknowledge different expectations in various disciplines and changing expectations at different stages of faculty careers. The review will be conducted by the Post-Tenure Review Committee which is a School of Dentistry standing committee whose membership is composed of faculty peers. The members are appointed by the Dean upon recommendations from the faculty. Comprehensive evaluations conducted for other purposes, such as a review for promotion, may be substituted for, or combined with, post-tenure review. A review may be delayed for compelling reasons approved by the Provost.

#### **D. Principles**

The faculty believes that the post-tenure review process should be as simple, straightforward, fair, functional and flexible as possible, so that the purposes of the review process are achieved in both an effective and time-efficient fashion. All matters relating to post-tenure review will be regarded as confidential. All faculty members who participate as members of the Post-Tenure Review Committee or otherwise advise on individual cases will take seriously their obligation to abide by this requirement. Each faculty member who is to undergo review in a given year will take an active role in the post-tenure review process by assisting with planning, preparing relevant background information, engaging in constructive dialogue with colleagues and the Dean, and if needed, undertaking a development plan to address deficiencies in performance. The Post-Tenure Review Committee of the School of Dentistry will consist of three tenured faculty members appointed by the Dean on an annual basis, one of whom will serve as Chair. The Committee shall serve in an advisory capacity to the Dean.

The system of post-tenure review will complement other systems of review, including those relating to tenure and promotion, annual feedback in years prior to tenure, appointment to distinguished chairs, salary determinations, yearly evaluations, or personnel actions taken pursuant to University policies on promotion and tenure and other matters relating to faculty conduct and performance. To eliminate redundancy of effort, post-tenure review will be waived in cases when the review is concomitant with a scheduled review for promotion to Professor, or with an administrative review for reappointment of an administrator.

#### **E. Procedure**

The procedures for the conduct of post-tenure reviews are administered by the Executive Associate Dean. All faculty participating in either providing peer review for Post Tenure Review or scheduled to undergo Post Tenure Review are required to complete the mandatory UNC General Administration Post Tenure Review training at <http://old.northcarolina.edu/aa/tenuretraining/index.php> prior to any such activity.

In September of each academic year, the Dean (or his designee) will communicate to the Chair of the Post-Tenure Review Committee the names of the faculty to be reviewed. The Chair of the Committee will then contact the faculty member(s) and inform them of the process. The review process will be conducted in a way that provides the faculty member being reviewed, the Dean, and the members of the Post-Tenure Review Committee with relevant information concerning

the faculty member's accomplishments and plans in the areas of teaching, research, service and patient care. Information to be considered will include, but not be limited to, the following:

**i. Self-Assessment by Faculty Member**

The faculty member being reviewed will prepare a brief written self-assessment (not to exceed two pages) indicating his or her accomplishments during the past five years (and, in the case of the initial review, his or her accomplishments during the period since tenure or promotion to full Professor). A one page prospective list of academic goals for the upcoming five years also will be provided.

**ii. Background Information**

The faculty member also will prepare a file that includes a current curriculum vitae and a summary of teaching evaluations (that have been maintained on file by both the faculty member and the Associate Dean for Education). In some cases, additional information may be requested for documentation of effort including a "teaching portfolio," scholarly work completed since the last review (with an indication of the three most important works); information concerning significant professional and public service; and other relevant materials. These materials are not required for all reviews, and will be requested only if questions exist in one or more areas of effort.

**iii. Consultation between Faculty Member Being Reviewed and the Post-Tenure Review Committee**

A brief interview with the Post-Tenure Review Committee will be scheduled with the faculty member being reviewed. This meeting is intended to allow the faculty member to discuss accomplishments in teaching, scholarship, service, and patient care. Additionally, it affords the faculty member the opportunity to comment on work load, deployment, and other factors or circumstances that may have had a bearing on performance. It also allows the faculty member an opportunity to express thoughts on ways in which the School could assist him/her in their professional development.

**iv. Consultation between the Chair or Administrative Supervisor of the Faculty Member Being Reviewed and the Post-Tenure Review Committee**

A brief interview with the Post-Tenure Review Committee will be scheduled with the faculty member's Department Chair or Administrative Supervisor. The intent of this interview is to allow the Chair or Supervisor to provide salient insights regarding the faculty member's performance and any recommendations for a development plan, should one be indicated. In the case of joint appointments, either supervising Chairs or administrators will be invited to provide input.

**v. Determination of Overall Performance**

The Post-Tenure Review Committee will advise the faculty member being reviewed and the

Dean whether it believes that the faculty member is performing at a superior level, satisfactory level or has substantial deficiencies in performance that need to be addressed through creation of a development plan. The Dean will share this information with the faculty member's Chair or Administrative supervisor. The Committee also may provide informal peer advice and recommendations to the faculty member being reviewed and the Dean.

**vi. Recognition of Outstanding Performance**

In instances in which the faculty member being reviewed is found to have evidenced outstanding overall performance, the Dean will endeavor to recognize that performance through appropriate forms of positive recognition, including but not limited to nominations for awards.

**vii. Establishing and Monitoring of Development Plan**

In the event that the Post-Tenure Review Committee concludes that the faculty member being reviewed has a record of overall performance that reflects substantial deficiencies that need to be addressed, and has recommended the establishment of a development plan, the Dean and the faculty member being reviewed will meet to generate a development plan designed to assist the faculty member in eliminating deficiencies in performance.

This plan will be formulated in consultation with the faculty member's Chair or Administrative supervisor. The development plan will identify clear goals, indicators of goal attainment, a clear and reasonable time frame for the completion of goals, any resources or support needed to facilitate the plan, and a statement of possible consequences if the goals are not reached. The performance of a faculty member who has been found to have substantial deficiencies in overall performance and who is working on completion of a development plan will be reviewed by the Dean in consultation with the faculty member's Chair or Administrative supervisor on an annual basis for a period of up to three years until such time as substantial deficiencies have been remedied. In the event that substantial deficiencies in performance continue to exist at the end of the three-year period, the Dean will consider whether action should be initiated pursuant to the Trustee Policies and Regulations Governing Academic Tenure or other steps taken to address the substantial deficiencies in performance.

**viii. Maintenance of Confidential Written Record**

The Post-Tenure Review Committee will develop a brief written summary of the Committee's conclusions and will share that summary with the Dean and the faculty member being reviewed for comment. The faculty member being reviewed may submit written comments to the Committee and the Dean in response to the written summary. The Dean will maintain the Committee's written summary and the response, if any, by the faculty member being reviewed as part of that faculty member's confidential personnel file, along with all background information and other materials used in connection with the review.

**ix. Appeals and Reports to the Provost of Finding of Substantial Deficiencies and Development Plans**

Faculty members found by the Post-Tenure Review Committee and the Dean to have substantial

deficiencies in performance and for whom a development plan is established may appeal the finding of substantial deficiency or the terms of the development plan within 30 days of receiving a final letter from the Dean including such findings and development plan. Appeal rights are as provided in the University's policy on post-tenure review.

**x. Annual Reports Filed with Provost**

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

## 13. Appendices

### A. Curriculum Vitae (CV) Format from Provost Office

The following is the preferred order for presentation of the CV. In every subheading, list items in reverse chronological order with most recent items first. Please date the CV so reviewers will know that they have the most recent version and number pages.

- **Personal Information**
  - Office Address
    - Phone number
    - Email address
  - Home Address
    - Phone number
- **Education**
  - Institution, Degree, Date Conferred, Major
    - Postdoctoral Training (Residency/Fellowship)
    - Graduate School
    - Dental School
    - College
  - Licensure and Certification (including dates)
    - State licensure
    - Specialty certification
- **Professional Experience**
  - Military Service
    - Dates of service
  - Academic or other professional appointments
    - Dates of appointments
  - Hospital appointments
    - Dates of appointments
  - Private dental practice
    - Dates, Type of Practice, Location
- **Honors and Awards**
  - Dates of honor or award
- **Bibliography (show author order)**
  - Books & chapters published, accepted or submitted for publication; none in process (include pages)
  - Refereed papers/journal articles published, accepted or submitted for publication; do not include works in process (include pages)
  - Published Refereed abstracts (include journal citation)
  - Refereed other products of scholarship (with electronic links displayed, if relevant)
  - Invited oral presentations (state, national, international)
  - Continuing education courses presented
  - Other un-refereed works (include book reviews, dissertations, and monographs).
  - Sample format:

- Journals (list all authors)
    - Gibson GB, Richardson AS, Patton RE, Waldman R. A clinical evaluation of occlusal composite and amalgam restorations: one- and two-year results. J Am Dent Assoc 1982;104:335-37.
  - Corporate Author
    - Federation Dentaire Internationale. Technical Report No. 28. Guidelines for antibiotic prophylaxis of infective endocarditis for dental patients with cardiovascular disease. Int Dent J 1987;37;235.
  - Books and Monographs
    - Tullman JJ, Redding SW. Systemic disease in dental treatment. St. Louis: The CV Mosby Co;1983:1-5.
  - Chapter in a book
    - Johns R. Restorative needs and methods. In: Cohen B, Thomson H, eds. Dental care for the elderly. London: William Heinemann Medical Books; 1986:142-77.
  - Agency Publication
    - Miller AJ, Brunelle JA, Carlos JP, Brown LJ, Loe H. Oral health of United States adults. Bethesda, Maryland: National Institute of Dental Research, 1987; NIH publication no. 87-2868.
  - Dissertation or Thesis
    - Author. Title. [Thesis]. City, State: Institution, date. # pgs.
- **Teaching Activities**
  - Major Responsibilities
    - Courses since in academia. Include the number of hours taught and the number of students taught.
    - Pre-doctoral research mentoring projects supervised. Give dates, research title and names of students supervised.
    - Postdoctoral/MS degree thesis mentoring since employment at UNC-Chapel Hill. Give dates, thesis title, names of students, degree conferred.
    - Other thesis and pre-doctoral research committees. Give dates, title of thesis/research and your role.
- **Grants (role, total direct grant amount, % effort, agency, dates, etc.) List most recent first. Include:**
  - Starting and ending dates (e.g., 2008-2013)
  - Source (e.g., NIH/NIDR)
  - Type and number (e.g., RO1 DE018236)
  - Title (e.g., Prevention of Dental Caries in Early Head Start Children)
  - Name of PI (if you are not the PI)
  - Your role and time % effort on the grant (e.g., PI or Co-I or Investigator; 10%E)
  - Total direct costs (e.g., \$4,889,304 for 5 years)
  - Sample format:
    - 2008-2013. NIDCR/NIH Grant# R01DE018236 “Prevention of Dental Caries in Early Head Start Children” PI: RG Rozier, Investigator: JY Lee 10% effort. Total Award: \$4,889,304
    - 2007-2012 NIDCR/NIH Grant# R01DE018045 “Examination of Oral

Health Literacy in Public Health Practice” PI: JY Lee, 20% effort. Total Award: \$1,809,928. You may also include grant applications that were approved but not funded, but you must include the score and percentile.

- **Professional Service**
  - UNC-Chapel Hill (School of Dentistry, University)
  - To discipline (international, national, state) including consultant, committees, reviewer/editorial boards of refereed journals
  - Professional society memberships, offices held
- **Reflective Statement**
  - Research Statement
  - Teaching Statement

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

In addition, the School of Dentistry PTAC or HR may request additional information.

**i. Sample CV****CURRICULUM VITAE****NAME**

Date: (07/2016)

**PERSONAL INFORMATION**

Home Address

Phone #

Office Address

Phone #

Fax#

Email

**EDUCATION**

<u>Institution</u>	<u>Degree</u>	<u>Date Conferred</u>	<u>Major</u>
University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill School of Public Health	PhD	June 2006	Health Care Access
University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill School of Dentistry	Certificate	June 2004	Periodontology
Tufts University School of Dental and Oral Surgery	DDS	May 2000	Dentistry
Wake Forest University	BS	May 1996	Biology

Licensure and Certification

2001 North Carolina Dental Practice License  
2000 North East Regional Boards  
1996 Basic Life Support Certification

Specialty Certification

2008 Diplomate, American Board of Periodontology

**PROFESSIONAL EXPERIENCE**

Academic Appointments

2004-07 Assistant Professor, Department of Periodontics, School of Dentistry  
University of North Carolina

Hospital Appointments

2004-present University of North Carolina Hospitals

Private Dental Practice

2004-present UNC Dental Faculty Practice

**HONORS**

2014 American Academy of Pediatric Dentistry “Pediatric Dentist of the Year”  
2007 International Association for Dental Research  
Wright Award for Distinguished Research in Genetics  
2000 Omega Kappa Upsilon Dental Honor Society, Alumni Member Induction

**BIBLIOGRAPHY**

Book Chapters

1. **Lee JY**, Leonard R, Stamm JW. Intramural Faculty Practice Plans: Their Place in Contemporary Dental Education. Brown LJ and Meskin L. The Economics of Dental Education. American Dental Association Policy Research Center, Chicago, IL 2006. Pages 161-177.

Book Chapters (In Press/Submitted) (include information as in example above and include, year and total number of typed pages; do not include “in process” books or chapters not formally submitted for publication)

1. **Lee JY**, Vann WF Jr. Children’s Oral Health. In: Kotch JB, ed. Maternal and Child Health: Programs, Problems and Policies in Public Health, 3rd ed. Boston, MA: Jones and Barlett Publishing: 2011 (In press) 30 pages.

Journal Articles (\*Refereed) (do not included “in press/submitted” articles here)

1. **\*Lee JY**, Bouwens T, Savage MF, Vann WF Jr, Examining the Cost-effectiveness of Early Dental Visits. *Pediatr Dent* 2006;28:102-105.

2. \*Milano M, **Lee JY**, Donovan K, Chen JW, Factors Associated with Caries Experience Among Asthmatic Children. *Pediatr Dent* 2006 28: 398-402.

Journal Articles in Press/Submitted (for refereed articles only) (include year and total number of typed pages; do not included “in process” articles not formally submitted for publication)

1. Hom J, **Lee JY**, Divaris K, Baker D, and Vann WF Jr. Oral Health Literacy and Knowledge among First-time Pregnant Women. *J Am Dent Assoc* (In press) 22 pages.

Published Journal Abstracts (\*Refereed)

1. \*Gong D, **Lee JY**, Rozier RG, Talekar B, Richman J, Vann WF Jr TOHFLiD: Instrument Validation and Testing. *J Dent Res* 2005; 84:2654.
2. \*Richman J, **Lee JY**, Rozier RG, Talekar B, Gong D, Vann WF Jr Development of an Oral Health Reading Recognition Instrument. *J Dent Res* 2005; 84:2820.

Refereed other products of scholarship (with electronic links displayed, if relevant)

- Products of interdisciplinary scholarship
- Products of engaged scholarship
- Products of creative activity such as performances and exhibitions
- Digital and other novel forms of scholarship (with electronic links displayed, if relevant)

Invited Oral Presentations and unpublished abstracts (National and International)

- 2015 Oral Health Literacy Health Behaviors and Health Outcomes, Friends of NIDCR Annual Conference, Washington, DC
- 2007 Health Literacy in Public Health Practice, NC Oral Health Summit, State Oral Health Section/Public Health Section, Boone, NC

Continuing Education Courses (AHEC, SOD courses, CE that is not invited)

- 2015 Diagnosis and Treatment of Dental Trauma in Children, Forsyth Dental Society, Winston Salem, NC
- 2007 Diagnosis and Treatment of Dental Trauma in Children, Charlotte AHEC, Charlotte, NC
- 2006 Access to Dental Care for Young Children, Charlotte Dental Society Lobby Day, April,

Other, including Book Reviews and Other Products of Scholarship (with electronic links displayed, if relevant)

**TEACHING ACTIVITIES (list all teaching activities since time in academia)**Major Teaching and Administrative Responsibilities (Courses)

- 2007-present Program Faculty, Clinical Research Scholars Program, UNC School of Dentistry (T32 Grant. 6-12 research fellows a year)
- 2007-present Director, Clinical Research Scholars/Oral Epidemiology Journal Club (8-15 students, post docs, faculty)
- 2005-present Course Director, OMSU 803: Introduction to General Anesthesia Department of Periodontics, UNC-CH School of Dentistry (3 periodontology and 6 pediatric dentistry residents)

Predocctoral (DDS) Research Mentoring Projects Supervised

- 2006-08 Use of Dental Services during Pregnancy among EHS Women. Shannitta Bridgers
- 2008 American Association of Public Health Jong Research Award
- 2008 American Association of Women Dentists Research Award
- 2007 AADR Abstract Presentation
- 2007 Procter and Gamble Oral Care Excellence in Science Award
- 2004-07 Parental Acceptance of Behavior Management Techniques. Nozomu Yamauchi
- 2005-06 Summer Research Fellowship Winner
- 2006 IADR Research Presentation

Postdoc/ Master's Thesis Committees Directed

- 2005-08 Examination of a Dental Home among EHS Families  
Rhonda Kearney, Pediatric Dental Resident, MS Thesis
- 2008 AAPHD Leverett Award 1st Place Winner
- 2007 AADR Research Presentation

Postdoc/Master's Thesis Committees (Membership)

- 2006-08 Nurse Practitioners' Knowledge and Behaviors regarding periodontal disease and its impact on Preterm Labor and Low Birth Weight. Katie Thomas, MS Thesis, Mentor: Prof Rebecca Wilder

**GRANTS AND CONTRACTS**

- 2008-2013 NIDCR/NIH Grant # T32-DE017245 "Clinical Research Training in Oral Diseases for Future Academicians PI: J. Beck, Investigator: JY Lee 10% effort. Total Award: \$2,215,000
- 2006-2007 Provost Office, Junior Faculty Award, "Development of Oral Health Literacy Instruments" PI: JY Lee. Total Award: \$7,500

## **PROFESSIONAL SERVICE**

### University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill

- 2013-present Member—Mentoring Team Committee for Dr. Tung Nguyen
- 2006-present Member—UNC-CH Surgical Operations Taskforce
- 2004-present Member—Institutional Research Advisory Committee, School of Dentistry
- 2007-08 President-elect—North Carolina Section of the American Association of Dental Research
- 2004-06 Member—Research Incentive Committee, School of Dentistry

### National/State (Dentistry)

- 2004-present Expert Consultant—AAPD Council on Scientific Affairs
- 2004-present Expert Consultant—AAPD Council on Postdoctoral Programs
- 2004-present Consultant—North Carolina Institute of Medicine

### Service and engagement activities

- 2003-present Member—Orange County Partnership to End Homelessness
- 2004-06 Member—Orange County Committee of Personal and Dental Health

### Peer review journals and editorial boards

- 2005-present Editorial Board—Journal of Public Health Dentistry
- 2004-present Editorial Board—Dental Traumatology
- 2004-present Reviewer—Journal of Dental Research

### Society memberships

- 2005-present American Dental Education Association
- 2004-present American Association of Dental Research
- 2000-present Omicron Kappa Upsilon Dental Honor Society
- 2000-present American Dental Association

## **RESEARCH STATEMENT**

(Your research philosophy and goals - 3 pages or less)

## **TEACHING STATEMENT**

(Your teaching philosophy and goals – 3 pages or less)

**SERVICE and ENGAGEMENT STATEMENT:** (The service and engagement philosophy and goals-three pages or less)

## **B. Teaching Portfolio (limited to 25 pages)**

### **i. Teaching Portfolio Definition**

Definition: A selective summary of an individual's teaching effectiveness. It contains documents suggesting scope, individuality, innovation and accomplishment in teaching. The portfolio should be reflective of the candidate's own unique teaching experience. It is not expected that teaching portfolios from different candidates will be exactly the same. These items are not all-inclusive and candidates may include other relevant teaching activities as deemed appropriate. Candidates are encouraged to obtain advice in the composition and presentation style of the portfolio from the Director of Faculty Development.

### **Teaching Portfolio Table of Contents**

1. Statement of Teaching Responsibilities
  - 1.1 Summary of courses taught and directed
  - 1.2 Student mentorship
  - 1.3 Student research committees
2. Efforts to Improve Teaching
  - 2.1 Formal courses in education
  - 2.2 Conferences and workshops attended
3. Enhancement of Existing Courses
  - 3.1 Addition of tutorials, role playing, case studies, new technologies etc.
  - 3.2 Incorporation of writing skills, oral presentation skills in course
4. Information from Students
  - 4.1 Summary of student ratings of teaching effectiveness
  - 4.2 Statements from former students
  - 4.3 Listing of papers published by students
  - 4.4 Honors earned by students
5. Service to Teaching
  - 5.1 Membership on teaching related committees
  - 5.2 Membership on student examining committees
6. Information from Colleagues
  - 6.1 Summary of peer evaluations of course materials
  - 6.2 Summary of peer reviews of teaching related research
  - 6.3 Comments from colleagues
7. Information from Other Sources
  - 7.1 Guest lecturers to other faculties
  - 7.2 Continuing education lectures
  - 7.3 Honors and awards
8. Future Teaching Goals

## C. How to Present an Effective Dossier

The following guidelines have been adopted to prescribe the format of faculty dossiers for presentation to higher level University review committees including the Health Sciences Appointments Committee (HSAC) and the University's Appointment, Promotion, and Tenure (APT) Committee. These guidelines are intended to ensure that dossiers are transmitted in a consistent format to aid in efficient review and decision making. Questions regarding these guidelines should be addressed to the EPA manager at the School of Dentistry at 966-1052.

### i. Recommended Order of Documents

The following is the recommended "standard order" of documents for inclusion in the faculty dossier to be presented to the APT Committee:

- Form AP-2
- Curriculum Vitae (CV)
- Teaching statement
- Research statement
- Chair's letter
- PTAC report
- Sample solicitation letter for outside letters of reference
- Outside letters of reference
- Any other necessary material, including teaching evaluations if appropriate

It is essential to verify that all dates of prior appointments and employment are accurate on the Form AP-2. Incorrect dates can result in delays or return of appointment/promotion submissions.

### ii. Chair's Letter

**The appointing Chair's letter is the most important recommendation** and it should clearly show the considerations influencing the Chair's decision to recommend the candidate for tenure and/or promotion. The Chair should also frankly discuss any of his or her misgivings, reflected in negative votes or abstentions by any member of the department, or noted in any of the letters of reference. Open discussion of misgivings gives the Chair's ultimate decision much more credibility than an unalloyed letter of praise when the dossier indicates that some people have misgivings. If the Chair quotes from a departmental committee report, it should be attached.

**The letter must show the vote of the assembled full professors: yes, no, abstain.** If departmental policy permits the vote of other tenured faculty ranks, they also should be reported. The letter should include an explanation of any negative votes, abstentions or absences of voting faculty members. (Abstentions are perceived as mildly negative votes.) State whether voting is closed (secret ballot) or open.

**The letter should discuss the research/scholarship career thrust, strategy and emphases of the candidate:**

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

**The letter should set the entries in context:**

- Explain departmental standards and expectations for scholarship, teaching and service.
- Explain the importance, percentage of articles accepted, and relative standing of the journals in which the candidate has published.
- If the discipline is one of the rare ones in which certain conferences outrank the journals, explain that.

**The letter should discuss the research record in some detail:**

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

**iii. Letters of Evaluation**

A minimum of four (4) letters of evaluation are required: all four (4) from outside the University, all from individuals independent of the candidate, two from a list provided by the candidate and two from individuals selected by the Department Chair or Dean, as appropriate. Ideally, all of the letters should come from research universities (RU/VH) with very high research activity. For Fixed Term faculty, only 2 letters of recommendation are required. Both should be from outside the institution.

The purpose of these letters is to provide an independent and unbiased assessment of the individual's national and international reputation. Therefore, the request from the Department Chair or Dean to prospective writers of outside letters of evaluation should be phrased neutrally and should not solicit an affirmative response or recommendation. **A copy of the letter requesting an evaluation of the candidate should be included in the dossier.**

The letters may not be from individuals who have been directly involved with a candidate (e.g., a collaborator, mentor, previous co-worker, former dissertation chair), but may be from individuals who know the candidate through professional interactions (e.g., reviewed the candidate's publications or served on review committees together). In the appointment/promotion packet, each outside letter should have a designation in its upper right hand corner indicating whether the writer of the letter was suggested by the candidate or was chosen by the Department Chair or Dean. As required by rule and ethics, all the letters received must be submitted, not a selected subset.

The letter to outside reviewers should include the following statement: "Under current policies of this institution, peer evaluations, such as that being requested from you, are regarded as confidential within limitations imposed by law. They are for limited use within the University. However, North Carolina state law provides that such written evaluations become part of the personnel file of the individual. As such, they become open by petition to the faculty member about whom they are written."

Tell any personal connection between candidate and external reviewer, e.g., dissertation advisor, post-doc mentor. Explain why each external reviewer was selected and the standing of each external reviewer in the field, especially those of rank other than Professor or from institutions that might be considered as lower rank than Carolina. Please don't quote extensively from the external letters; a summary of each letter is appropriate, keep in mind members of the APT review committee read the letters as well as your summation of them.

A sample letter soliciting an external letter of recommendation can be found in Appendix D

In addition to the minimum four required independent letters, supplemental letters from any source also may be submitted. They may be from individuals within the institution with whom the candidate has collaborated or from former colleagues, collaborators, mentors or other individuals connected with the candidate. All letters of evaluation that are received will be made an official part of any appointment, promotion, and tenure package and must be part of the evaluation process of the candidate under consideration.

#### **iv. Teaching and Service Record**

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

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

Discuss the service record. The importance of service varies from unit to unit. Explain its role within the School or Department, and discuss the candidate's service record.

**v. Final Word of Advice for Chairs to Give to Candidates**

The dossier is an important and effective tool used by internal departmental review committees to evaluate the teaching, research, and service activities of a faculty member's readiness for reappointment or promotion. Information provided should reflect an accurate and efficient assessment of the faculty member's credentials and achievements. It is important to document such achievements in a forthright manner, ensuring the focus remains on those that are substantive and meaningful in the context of the totality of one's professional career to date.

**D. Sample Solicitation Letter for External Letter of Recommendation**

**i. Tenure Track Faculty candidate**

Dear \_\_\_\_\_:

The School of/Department of \_\_\_\_\_ at the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill is reviewing the qualifications of \_\_\_\_\_, for promotion from Assistant Professor to Associate Professor with tenure (or Associate to Full Professor with tenure, or Associate without tenure to Associate with tenure). The School/Department will base its recommendation concerning \_\_\_\_\_ on the value of his/her research, teaching, and service. I write to seek your opinion about \_\_\_\_\_ qualifications for this promotion. To aid in your review of his/her qualifications and contributions, his/her curriculum vitae and most recent and (according to him/her) most important publications are enclosed.

We are particularly interested in placing \_\_\_\_\_ work in a national context (teaching, research/scholarship, and service/engagement). We would value, therefore, your evaluation of the importance of his/her area of study and of the significance of his/her contributions to it. We are also interested in your opinion of his/her stature relative to his/her peers nationally.

Please refer to the following criteria of the School/Department Tenure and Promotion policy in giving your assessment of \_\_\_\_\_. [List criteria here]

In addition, \_\_\_\_\_'s percent allocation of time is as follows: \_\_\_\_\_% Teaching; \_\_\_\_\_% Scholarship/Research; \_\_\_\_\_% Service.

Appointments or promotion to the rank of Associate Professor must demonstrate outstanding ability. The candidate must demonstrate outstanding scholarly contributions, show independence and leadership in research or practice, and have a growing national reputation in his/her area of expertise. Please understand that, here at UNC-CH, promotion from Assistant to Associate Professor is tightly linked to a decision regarding the granting of tenure. Thus, either \_\_\_\_\_ will be promoted and granted permanent tenure or he/she will typically have no choice but to leave the University. In this letter, we are asking for your opinion as to

\_\_\_\_\_ suitability for promotion and/or tenure according to the Appointments, Promotion and Tenure criteria described above that are in place here at UNC-Chapel Hill. It would not be helpful, nor would it be relevant to state that: “*Dr. \_\_\_\_\_ would qualify for promotion at our institution, but would not yet be appropriate for tenure.*” For promotion to the rank of Full Professor the candidate must continue to demonstrate high quality teaching, make outstanding scholarly contributions, and have a national reputation in his/her area of expertise. There must be strong evidence that his/her scholarly work has stimulated the work of other researchers or practitioners, has provided "breakthroughs" in the field, and that, in general, other scholars are paying close attention to the candidate's work.

In addition to the above, we would appreciate your comments concerning \_\_\_\_\_ collegiality and interpersonal skills, organizational / institutional citizenship, and other relevant observations to the extent you are able to provide them

Also, we appreciate any assessment you are able to make about the quality of \_\_\_\_\_ teaching and professional service contributions. While we do recognize that these areas are often more difficult to assess than is scholarship, any evaluative comments that you can provide to us will be valued. In addition, we will benefit from having your thoughts regarding \_\_\_\_\_ interpersonal skills, his/her institutional citizenship, as well as any other intangibles you might be able to share with us.

In preparing your response, we do ask that you provide us with the following information:

- a. Your opinion as to whether or not you would recommend \_\_\_\_\_ for this promotion
- b. A brief summary of your reasons for this opinion
- c. A description of your relationship (if any) with \_\_\_\_\_

Under current policies of this institution, peer evaluations, such as that being requested from you, are regarded as confidential within limitations imposed by law. They are for limited use within the University. However, North Carolina state law provides that such written evaluations become part of the personnel file of the individual. As such, they become open by petition to the faculty member about whom they are written.

Thank you very much for your willingness to assist us with this important process. We do recognize the substantial amount of time and effort required to provide us with this assessment of \_\_\_\_\_. Please understand that time is of the essence in this process. Therefore, we ask that you notify Dr. Chair's Name as soon as possible if you will not be able to provide us with your review by date. His/her e-mail address is: name@unc.edu. You can send either an electronic copy on official letterhead or a hard copy in the mail. My or His\Her mailing address is \_\_\_\_\_.

(A final paragraph of thanks, the deadline, whom to contact for further information, etc.)

Sincerely

**ii. Fixed Term Faculty candidate**

Dear \_\_\_\_\_:

The School of/Department of \_\_\_\_\_ at the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill is reviewing the qualifications of \_\_\_\_\_, for promotion from Clinical Assistant / Associate Professor to Clinical Associate Professor / Professor . The School/Department will base its recommendation concerning \_\_\_\_\_ on the value of his/her teaching and service. Scholarship is also required but not at the same level as teaching and service. (For Research Fixed Term Faculty this sentence will be written as: The School/Department will base its recommendation concerning \_\_\_\_\_ on the value of his/her research and *teaching/service*). *Teaching* or *Service* is also required but not at the same level as \_\_\_\_\_ and \_\_\_\_\_. I write to seek your opinion about \_\_\_\_\_ qualifications for this promotion. To aid in your review of his/her qualifications and contributions, his/her curriculum vitae and most recent and (according to him/her) most important publications are enclosed.

We are particularly interested in placing (Candidate's name) work in a national context. We would value, therefore, your evaluation of the importance of his/her areas of emphasis and of the significance of his/her contributions to it. We are also interested in your opinion of his/her stature relative to his/her peers nationally.

Please refer to the following criteria of the School/Department Tenure and Promotion policy in giving your assessment of \_\_\_\_\_. [List criteria here]

In addition, \_\_\_\_\_'s percent allocation of time is as follows: \_\_\_\_\_% Teaching; \_\_\_\_\_% Scholarship/Research; \_\_\_\_\_% Service.

Appointments or promotion to the rank of Clinical/Research Associate Professor must demonstrate outstanding ability in two of the three areas (teaching, scholarship/research/ service and engagement). (Insert this next sentence if for a Clinical Track Promotions). Even if the candidate shows excellence in teaching and service/engagement it is still expected that he/she will participate in scholarly activity defined in its broadest sense. (Insert this next sentence if for a Research Track Promotion). It is expected that faculty in the Research Track will be evaluated primarily on the quality of their research, supplemented by consideration of their teaching or community-service/engagement activities

For promotion to the rank of Clinical/Research Professor the candidate must continue to demonstrate high quality teaching, make outstanding scholarly contributions, and have a national reputation in his/her area of expertise. There must be strong evidence that his/her scholarly work has stimulated the work of other researchers or practitioners, has provided "breakthroughs" in the field, and that, in general, other scholars are paying close attention to the candidate's work. (This paragraph will need to be adapted according to the track and rank of promotion.)

In addition to the above, we would appreciate your comments concerning \_\_\_\_\_ collegiality and interpersonal skills, organizational/ institutional citizenship, and other relevant observations

to the extent you are able to provide them.

Under current policies of this institution, peer evaluations, such as that being requested from you, are regarded as confidential within limitations imposed by law. They are for limited use within the University. However, North Carolina state law provides that such written evaluations become part of the personnel file of the individual. As such, they become open by petition to the faculty member about whom they are written.

Thank you very much for your willingness to assist us with this important process. We do recognize the substantial amount of time and effort required to provide us with this assessment of \_\_\_\_\_. Please understand that time is of the essence in this process. Therefore, we ask that you notify Dr. (Chair's Name) as soon as possible if you will not be able to provide us with your review by (date). My or His/her e-mail address is: name@unc.edu. You can send either an electronic copy on official letterhead or a hard copy in the mail. My or His\Her mailing address is \_\_\_\_\_.

Sincerely,

## **E. Procedures**

### **General**

The Department Chair has the responsibility to assemble and send forward to SOD Human Resources Office all material necessary for an appointment, reappointment, promotion and tenure.

### **Equal Opportunity**

All appointment and promotions must comply completely with equal opportunity rules and regulations. It is the policy of the School of Dentistry to enforce vigorously the University's equal opportunity procedures in both letter and spirit. The details of these procedures are published in the Equal Employment Opportunity Plan, a copy of which can be located at <http://eoc.unc.edu/> but may be stated briefly as giving all candidates, including minority, racial and ethnic groups, and women, equal opportunity to know of, apply for, and receive genuine consideration for any available position. Furthermore, such employees shall receive equal treatment in salary increase decisions and promotion considerations.

All departments within the School are required to use the following approved EEO statement for all faculty recruitments and advertisements:

*The University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill is an equal opportunity, affirmative action employer and welcomes all to apply regardless of race, color, gender, national origin, age, religion, genetic information, sexual orientation, gender identity or gender expression. We also encourage protected veterans and individuals with disabilities to apply.*

## **Conversion**

Options are available for a full-time faculty member to convert from a Fixed Term appointment to a Tenure Track appointment or from a Tenure Track appointment to a Fixed Term appointment. These options should be discussed with the faculty member's department chair. In order for faculty to move from a Fixed Term appointment to a Tenure Track appointment, the faculty member must apply for an open position through the University's recruitment process.

## **F. Checklist for Required Documentation**

### **i. Tenure Track Documentation Checklist**

- CV – (See Appendix A)
- Teaching Portfolio (contains the teaching, research and service statements)
- Recommendation letter from Chair to Dean
- Chair's Solicitation Letter
- All external letters of review (Minimum of 4)
- Supplemental letters if applicable
- Peer assessment of teaching (2)
- \*AP2 form- will be sent by HR after FPAC review

Optional Documents:

- Reflective statement
- Mentoring Team Report is to be included if the candidate has a mentoring team (if applicable)

### **ii. Fixed Term Documentation Checklist**

- CV – (See Appendix A)
- Teaching Portfolio (contains the teaching, research and service statements)
- Recommendation letter from Chair to Dean
- Chair's Solicitation Letter
- All external letters of review (Minimum of 2)
- Supplemental letters if applicable
- Peer assessment of teaching (2)
- \*AP2 form- will be sent by HR after FPAC review

Optional Documents:

- Reflective statement
- Mentoring Team Report is to be included if the candidate has a mentoring team (if applicable)

### G. Levels of Review for Tenure Track Faculty Appointments

Personnel Actions	School Committees			Campus Committees				
	Dept.	PTAC	FPAC	HSAC	Provost	APT Sub	APT	BOT
<b>Promotion – Tenure Track</b>								
Associate Professor ( <i>confers tenure</i> )	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Professor ( <i>already tenured</i> )	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
<b>Reappointment – Tenure Track</b>								
Associate Professor ( <i>confers tenure</i> )	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Assistant Professor ( <i>2nd term</i> ) 1st review	X		X	X	X		X	X
Assistant Professor ( <i>confers tenure</i> ) 2nd Review	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Instructor/special degree provision			X	X	X		X	
<b>New Appointment – Tenure Track</b>								
Professor			X	X	X	X	X	X
Associate Professor ( <i>confers tenure</i> )			X	X	X	X	X	X
Associate Professor ( <i>probationary for 5 yrs.</i> )			X	X	X		X	X
Assistant Professor			X	X	X		X	X
Instructor/special degree provision			X	X	X		X	X
Instructor/no degree provision			X	X	X		X	
Joint tenured appointment			X	X	X	X	X	X
Joint tenure track appointment ( <i>secondary</i> )			X	X	X		X	X
<b>Other Actions – Tenure Track Only</b>								
Deferral Decisions and/or Decisions Not to	X	X	X		X			
Non-Renewals	X			X	X			
Tenure Track Reduction in FTE			X		X			
Extension of Probationary (Tenure Track)			X		X			
Designation to Named Professorship			X	X	X	X	X	X
Tenure Track departmental faculty transfer			X	X	X	X	X	X
End of Employment					X			

## H. Levels of Review for Fixed Term Track Faculty Appointments

Personnel Actions	School Committees			Campus Committees				
	Dept.	PTAC	FPAC	HSAC	Provost	APT Sub	APT	BOT
<b>Promotion Fixed-Term</b>								
Clinical/Research Associate Professor	X	X	X		X			
Clinical/Research Professor	X	X	X		X			
<b>Reappointment – Fixed-Term</b>								
Clinical/Research Associate Professor			X		X			
Clinical/Research Assistant Professor			X		X			
Clinical/Research Instructor			X		X			
<b>New Appointment – Fixed-Term</b>								
Clinical/Research Professor			X		X			
Clinical/Research Associate Professor			X		X			
Clinical/Research Assistant Professor			X		X			
Clinical/Research Instructor			X		X			
Joint Appointment			X		X			
Joint Appointment ( <i>secondary</i> )			X		X			
<b>Other Actions – Fixed-Term</b>								
Non-Renewals					X			
Reduction in FTE					X			
Designation to Named Professorship				X	X	X	X	X
Departmental Faculty Transfer					X			
End of Employment					X			

## I. Peer Assessment of Teaching Evaluation Form

### Peer Evaluation of Teaching for Classroom Presentations UNC School of Dentistry

Name of Faculty \_\_\_\_\_  
 Course name and number / Section # \_\_\_\_\_  
 Faculty Reviewer \_\_\_\_\_  
 Date \_\_\_\_\_

**Strongly Agree (SA)—4 points; Agree (A)—3 points; Disagree-2 points; Strongly Disagree-1 point; Not Applicable (N/A)**

<b>Organization:</b>	<b>Strongly Agree</b>	<b>Agree</b>	<b>Disagree</b>	<b>Strongly Disagree</b>	<b>Not Applicable</b>
1. Appropriate utilization of allocated class time.	4	3	2	1	N/A
2. Instructor was prepared.	4	3	2	1	N/A
3. Purpose/objectives of presentation were presented.	4	3	2	1	N/A
4. Explained how presentation relates to past/future topics.	4	3	2	1	N/A
5. Material was presented in an organized manner.	4	3	2	1	N/A
6. Appropriate uses of instructional media.	4	3	2	1	N/A

<b>Content:</b>	<b>Strongly Agree</b>	<b>Agree</b>	<b>Disagree</b>	<b>Strongly Disagree</b>	<b>Not Applicable</b>
1. Presentation followed the outline and/or syllabus.	4	3	2	1	N/A
2. Material presented was up-to-date and accurate.	4	3	2	1	N/A
3. Displayed a good command of the material.	4	3	2	1	N/A
4. Handouts or other materials reinforced the key points.	4	3	2	1	N/A
5. Presented appropriate amount of information.	4	3	2	1	N/A
6. PowerPoint slides were easy to read and contained appropriate amount of content.	4	3	2	1	N/A
7. Presented material at an appropriate level of complexity.	4	3	2	1	N/A
8. Emphasized or restated the most important points.	4	3	2	1	N/A
9. Readings and assignments were current and reflected the best available evidence.	4	3	2	1	N/A

<b>Style of Presentation</b>	<b>Strongly Agree</b>	<b>Agree</b>	<b>Disagree</b>	<b>Strongly Disagree</b>	<b>Not Applicable</b>
1. Spoke in a clear, strong voice that could be easily heard.	4	3	2	1	N/A
2. Demonstrated engagement with the student.	4	3	2	1	N/A
3. Encouraged & facilitated active participation of students.	4	3	2	1	N/A
4. Displayed enthusiasm for subject matter.	4	3	2	1	N/A
5. Asked multilevel of questions (e.g., knowledge, interpretation, comprehension, application, analysis, synthesis, and evaluation).	4	3	2	1	N/A
6. Used various teaching strategies to engage the student in critical thinking.	4	3	2	1	N/A

7. Presented without distracting mannerisms or verbal expressions (“um”, “you know”, “like”).	4	3	2	1	N/A
---	---	---	---	---	-----

**Observations Specific to Class Session :**

**Suggested Areas for Improvement:**

**Additional Comments:**

When complete, please return form to the Director of Faculty Development, Room 3270 First Dental Building and a copy to the faculty member.

## **J. Links**

To access link press ctrl button and click link:

**[Faculty Ranks, Appointment Tracking, and Working Title Guidelines](#) – page 9**

[Trustee Policies and Regulations Governing Academic Tenure in the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill](#) – page 7, 9, 10, 24, 31 and 32

[APT Process and Submission Schedule 2016-2017](#) – page 30

[The Most Important Recommendation](#) – page 40

[UNC Policy Manual, Chapter 400- Academic Programs, 400.3-Tenure and Teaching in the University of North Carolina, 4003.3- Performance Review of Tenured Faculty, 400.3.3.1\(G\)- Guidelines on Performance Review of Tenured Faculty](#) – page 43