



**Criteria and Procedures Used at Department and College Levels  
to Conduct Reappointment, Promotion, and Tenure Reviews  
in the College of Education**

**at**

**The University of North Carolina at Charlotte**

**Seventh Edition: Adopted January 16, 2017**

**Sixth Edition: 2013**

**Sixth Edition: 2012**

**Fifth Edition: 2004**

**Fourth Edition: 2000**

**Third Edition: 1996**

**Second Edition: 1995**

**First Edition: 1994**

## Table of Contents

|  |    |
|--|----|
| Introduction.....  | 3  |
| Section One: Undergirding Principles .....   | 4  |
| Section Two: Broad Expectations of All Faculty in the Cato College of Education .....  | 5  |
| Section Three: The Specific Standards for Reappointment as Assistant Professor (Tenure Track).....                                   | 6  |
| Section Four: The Specific Standards for Promotion to Associate Professor with Conferral of<br>Permanent Tenure (Tenure Track).....  | 9  |
| Section Five: The Specific Standards for Promotion to Full Professor (Tenure Track) .....  | 12 |
| Section Six: The Candidate’s Dossier for Reappointment, Promotion, and Tenure Review .....   | 16 |
| Section Seven: Faculty Review Committees for Reappointment/Promotion/Tenure Reviews for<br>Tenure-Track and Clinical Faculty .....   | 21 |
| Section Eight: Criteria and Procedures for Reappointment and Promotion of Clinical Faculty in the Cato<br>College of Education ..... | 23 |

## **Introduction to the Seventh Edition**

This document, *Criteria and Procedures Used at Department and College Levels to Conduct Reappointment, Promotion, and Tenure Reviews in the Cato College of Education at the University of North Carolina at Charlotte*, is designed to help faculty fulfill the College's mission and to guide administrative and peer reviews in making fair and appropriate recommendations for reappointment, promotion, and/or tenure. The document, originally developed in 1994, is a living document that has been modified in 1995, 1996, 2000, 2004, 2013, and 2017.

This current version arose from requests made by several faculty members at the Dean's Listening Meetings that a more equitable process be developed through a revision of the RPT process and criteria. Specifically, requests were made to examine equity related to the composition of Departmental Review Committees and the inclusion of a check on possible implicit bias of all those who review dossiers.

The leadership team asked for volunteers to work on the revision. The deans of the College selected from among the ten people who volunteered and included every faculty member of color who volunteered, given the reasons for the revision, and then selected representatives from every department and professorial level. Two volunteers (full professors) who were not selected, were thanked for volunteering. The following members comprised the committee:

- Lyndon Abrams - Counseling
- Valerie Balog - Counseling
- Erik Byker - REEL
- Mark D'Amico - EDLD
- Paul Fitchett - MDSK
- Charles Hutchison - MDSK
- Florence Martin - EDLD
- Erin Miller - REEL
- Shawnee Wakeman - SPCD
- Charlie Wood - SPCD

### Revision Process:

#### *Spring 2016:*

The committee members created an RPT Revision Moodle site. On this page, they provided resources used by the Task Force as they work on the RPT revision. The information contained on this site was open to the entire Cato College of Education. They provided narrative updates on the site each month.

The committee members created a survey to solicit recommendations from faculty on ways to revise the RPT guidelines. Then, on May 23 and 24, the committee held two open forums to (1) discuss survey feedback and other relevant information and (2) engage in dialog on each section of the RPT document. Data from the survey and open forums were used to shape the first revised draft.

#### *Summer 2016:*

The RPT Task Force met to review and discuss draft revisions of the RPT document. The RPT Task Force members independently reviewed drafts and assembled its recommended changes to be made available at the beginning of the academic year. They posted the recommended changes in both "Clean" and "Track Changes" versions to the Moodle site by August 15 for all to review. The committee chair gave a brief update at the August 19<sup>th</sup> College meeting and encouraged attendance at two open forums to provide feedback on the draft.

*Fall 2016:*

Two open forums were held Monday, August 29 at 10:00am and Tuesday, August 30 at 2:00pm, 2016. In addition to the forums, the Task Force took feedback on the recommendations through the discussion board on the Moodle site, through email, in person. Twenty-three individuals from the College participated in one or both of the open forums on the draft revision.

The Task Force discussed the feedback at its mid-September 2016 meeting. Additionally, the Task Force chair had a discussion with the Faculty Council on August 31, 2016 for additional feedback. They created a second version of the revision. This version was discussed at the September 23, 2016 COED meeting.

An online faculty vote distributed by email was completed by October 15, 2016 which allowed three weeks for faculty members to review the current document prior to final votes being cast. A total of 80 responses to the online ballot provided this result:

Yes-70, No-8, Abstain-2.

## **Section One**

### **Undergirding Principles**

1. Faculty personnel decisions at UNC Charlotte are governed by University Policy 102.13, Tenure Policies, Regulations and Procedures of the University of North Carolina at Charlotte and UNC Charlotte Academic Personnel Procedures Handbook-Section C, Review for Reappointment, Promotion, and Conferral of Permanent Tenure.
2. The procedures for personnel reviews that are described in this document are intended to be consistent with those described in the University documents named above. In the event of a conflict between this document and the University policies and procedures in #1, the terms of the University documents shall have precedence.
3. In the Cato College of Education, the criteria and procedures used at department levels are consistent with the criteria and procedures used at the college level.
4. Responsibility for presenting the case for personnel reviews rests with the faculty candidate, who, through narrative statements and supporting documentation collected in an electronic dossier, addresses how the standards are met and how the candidate is contributing and will contribute to the mission of the College.
5. Standards are presented in two categories: the broad expectations of all faculty in the Cato College of Education and specific standards relevant to teaching, research, and service/outreach/engagement. Standards are differentiated at the various levels of review.
6. It is expected that different profiles of faculty achievement will be demonstrated through the review process. This document offers a strengths-based model for building a faculty record of achievement.
7. Based on their assessment of the evidence presented and available to them, the review committees, chairs, and dean are expected to independently consider the total profile presented by each candidate, including both broad expectations and specific standards, and to make independent holistic judgments about the candidate's performance and potential as a faculty member in the College.
8. All reviews of unfavorable RPT decisions will follow University Policy 102.13, Tenure Policies, Regulations and Procedures of the University of North Carolina at Charlotte.

**Section Two**  
**Broad Expectations of All Faculty in the Cato College of Education**

All faculty members in the Cato College of Education are expected to do the following:

1. Support the mission and programs of the College and University appropriate to one's role;
2. Demonstrate integrity and high standards of ethical and professional behavior;
3. Be collaborative and respectful of diversity (as defined by the Cato College of Education Diversity Commitment) through interactions with students, staff, other faculty, and professional colleagues in the field;
4. Continue to grow as a professional through reflective practice, active learning, and engagement in relevant contexts;
5. Maintain continuing appointment to the Graduate Faculty of the University (unless one's program responsibilities are exclusively at the undergraduate level); and
6. Recognize the interconnectedness of the professional domains of teaching, research, and service/outreach/engagement by demonstrating a thematically integrated professional focus across these domains as appropriate to the faculty member's job description.

Specific standards relevant to teaching, research, and service/outreach/engagement are presented in the following pages by level of review:

Reappointment as Assistant Professor (Section Three)

Promotion to Associate Professor and Conferral of Permanent Tenure (Section Four)

Promotion to Full Professor (Section Five)

Reappointment and Promotion for Clinical Faculty (Section Eight)

### **Section Three**

#### **The Specific Standards for Reappointment as Assistant Professor (Tenure-Track)**

An Assistant Professor at the time of reappointment is expected to satisfy the broad expectations of a faculty member in the Cato College of Education (Section Two).

In addition, an Assistant Professor at the time of reappointment is expected to demonstrate satisfactory achievement in the three domains of professorial activity (teaching, research, and service/outreach/engagement) and to demonstrate the potential to be successful at the subsequent tenure/promotion review. Review for reappointment as Assistant Professor is mandatory at the time specified in University Policy 102.13, Tenure Policies, Regulations and Procedures of the University of North Carolina at Charlotte, UNC Charlotte Academic Personnel Procedures Handbook-Section C. Review for Reappointment, Promotion, and Conferral of Permanent Tenure, and as delineated in the candidate's letter of offer. Any variations in the time for the reappointment review must be approved according to appropriate University policies (e.g., Family Medical Leave Act).

#### **Specific Standards Relevant to Three Domains of Scholarship: Teaching, Research, and Service/Outreach/Engagement**

**TEACHING:** Representing knowledge in one's field by:

Standards to be addressed by everyone:

1. Teaching
  - a) Articulates a statement of one's teaching philosophy and teaching responsibilities
  - b) Has in-depth understanding about content field and pedagogy
  - c) Reflects the UNC Charlotte conceptual framework, incorporates appropriate assessments, and integrates diversity throughout the coursework (for additional information see the College of Education Diversity Commitment)
  - d) Clearly aligns teaching to programmatic objectives and accreditation standards
  - e) Assesses and values student learning and adjusts instruction appropriately using multiple sources of data (course evaluations, peer evaluation, etc.) to improve practice
  - f) Demonstrates growth in teaching expertise and effectiveness
  - g) Appropriately incorporate instructional technology in teaching
  - h) Participates in and reflects upon the Peer Observation of Teaching process
  - i) Presents a statement of teaching goals that demonstrates reflective practice and the promise of a teaching record recognized for its quality and its contribution to the teaching mission of the College
  
2. Developing course and program curriculum which can be demonstrated through any of the following activities:
  - a) Participates in course and program development and/or revision that is based on emerging research, best practices, and/or sustained experience with stakeholders in one's field and in response to programmatic need
  - b) Is knowledgeable of emerging needs in one's field and community
  - c) Is knowledgeable of changes in licensure, certification, and accreditation standards in one's field
  - d) Refines, updates, and improves courses

In addition to the standards addressed above, faculty members at the time of reappointment can address any of the following for further consideration of their ability to demonstrate expectations appropriate for reappointment:

3. Advising/mentoring students appropriate to role and program assignment
  - a) Contributes to student learning and professional development through an active role in advising
  - b) Participates in supervising student-directed scholarship (e.g., research, comprehensive examinations, required evidences, independent study projects, theses, Master's degree projects, dissertations, honors requirements)
  - c) Is consistently accessible to students when appropriate
  - d) Provides consistent and accurate advice to students and is knowledgeable about programs, policies, and procedures
  - e) Is considered by students and colleagues to be a helpful and conscientious advisor
  
4. Clinical supervision appropriate to role and program assignment
  - a) Presents a record of positive impact on University students' clinical growth
  - b) Presents a record of development of new or revised resources for students, agencies and/or schools; for example, handbooks and/or evaluation instruments related to supervision
  - c) Provides productive mentoring experiences for new clinical supervisors
  - d) Participates in department/college events related to clinical supervision
  - e) Demonstrates ongoing professional development and reflective practice
  - f) Disseminates best practices in clinical supervision, based on research/evaluation data

**RESEARCH:** Expanding the knowledge base in one's discipline through generating, synthesizing, and/or integrating new knowledge:

Standards to be addressed by everyone:

1. Articulates a clearly defined research agenda and focus which is related to the professional themes that define the candidate's work
2. Possesses a record of peer-reviewed publications that include systematic methods of inquiry
3. Presents a statement of research goals and record of works-in-progress that demonstrate the promise of continued contributions and productivity

In addition to the standards addressed above, Assistant Professors at the time of reappointment can address additional criteria for further consideration of their ability to demonstrate expectations appropriate for reappointment, such as:

4. A record of published work that translates research into practice to improve professional practices and outcomes and/or synthesizes knowledge through literature reviews which identify critical themes and needs
5. A record of community engaged scholarship (e.g., technical or program evaluation reports)
6. Efforts to obtain funding to support one's research agenda
7. Research contributions that reflect both collaboration and leadership
8. A record of disseminating research and knowledge at multiple levels (e.g., state, national, and international conferences)

**SERVICE/OUTREACH/ENGAGEMENT:** Applying knowledge in one's field through engaged scholarship and outreach to communities and practitioners, engagement with the profession, and service to the institution:

Standards to be addressed by everyone:

1. Has a record of involvement within the community of practitioners/professionals in one's field
2. Is involved in professional organizations and associations in one's field (e.g., some combination of state, regional, nation/international levels)
3. Contributes to the mission of the program, department, college, and/or university through active engagement in committees or task forces that are addressing issues of importance
4. Presents a statement of service goals that demonstrates the promise of increased contributions in service/outreach/engagement recognized for their quality and impact

**Section Four**  
**The Specific Standards for Promotion to Associate Professor with the Conferral of Permanent Tenure**  
**(Also applicable to faculty who hold the rank of Associate Professor who are seeking tenure)**  
**(Tenure Track)**

The conferral of permanent tenure, usually accompanied by promotion to Associate Professor, signifies the end of a probationary period of service and the beginning of a new phase of the academic career, with increased opportunities and responsibilities to work for the common good. (See *1940 Statement of Principles on Academic Freedom and Tenure*, American Association of University Professors.)

At the time of review for promotion to Associate Professor with conferral of permanent tenure, the faculty member is expected to satisfy the broad expectations of a faculty member in the College of Education (Section Two).

In addition to satisfying the broad expectations of a faculty member in the College, the faculty member at the time of this review is expected to present a strong record of accomplishment with promise of continued contribution and productivity in all three domains of professorial activity: teaching, research, and service/outreach/engagement. While individual faculty profiles are expected to vary, a record of at least satisfactory achievement in each of the three domains is required for a successful promotion/tenure review.

Review for promotion to Associate Professor with conferral of permanent tenure is mandatory at the time specified in University Policy 102.13, Tenure Policies, Regulations and Procedures of the University of North Carolina at Charlotte, UNC Charlotte Academic Personnel Procedures Handbook-Section C. Review for Reappointment, Promotion, and Conferral of Permanent Tenure, and as delineated in the candidate's letter of offer. Similarly, tenure reviews for Associate Professors are also mandatory at the time specified in the letter of offer. Any variations in the time for promotion/tenure review must be approved according to appropriate University policies (e.g., Family Medical Leave Act).

**Specific Standards Relevant to Three Domains of Scholarship: Teaching, Research, and Service/Outreach/Engagement**

**TEACHING:** Representing knowledge in one's field by:

Standards to be addressed by everyone.

1. Teaching
  - a) Articulates a statement of one's teaching philosophy and teaching responsibilities
  - b) Has in-depth understanding about content field and pedagogy
  - c) Reflects the UNC Charlotte conceptual framework, incorporates appropriate assessments, and integrates diversity throughout coursework
  - d) Clearly aligns teaching to programmatic objectives and accreditation standards
  - e) Appropriately incorporates instructional technology in teaching
  - f) Assesses and values student learning and adjusts instruction appropriately to enhance that learning, using multiple sources of data (e.g., course evaluations, peer evaluation) to improve practice
  - g) Demonstrates growth in teaching expertise and effectiveness
  - h) Participates in and reflects upon the Peer Observation of Teaching process
  - i) Presents a statement of teaching goals that demonstrates reflective practice and a record of achievement in teaching recognized for its quality and its contributions to the mission of the College.

2. Developing course and program curriculum which can be demonstrated through any of the following activities.
  - a) Participates effectively and successfully in course and program development and/or revision that is based on established research, best practices, and/or sustained experience with practitioners in one's field
  - b) Is knowledgeable of emerging needs in one's field and community
  - c) Is knowledgeable of changes in licensure, certification, and accreditation standards in one's field
  - d) Refines, updates, and improves courses
  - e) Engages in efforts to obtain funding to support course and program development

In addition to the standards addressed above, faculty members at the time of promotion and tenure can address any of the following for further consideration of their ability to demonstrate expectations appropriate for tenure and promotion:

3. Advising/Mentoring students appropriate to role and program assignment
  - a) Contributes to student learning and professional development through an active role in advising
  - b) Is consistently accessible to students when appropriate and possible
  - c) Provides consistent and accurate advice to students and is knowledgeable about programs, policies, and procedures
  - d) Is considered by students and colleagues to be a helpful and conscientious advisor
  - e) Supervises student-directed scholarship (e.g., research, comprehensive examinations, required evidences, independent study projects, theses, Master's degree projects, dissertations, honors requirements)
4. Clinical Supervision appropriate to role and program assignment
  - a) Presents a record of positive impact on University students' clinical growth
  - b) Presents a record of development of new or revised resources for students, agencies and/or schools; for example, handbooks and/or evaluation instruments related to supervision
  - c) Provides productive mentoring experiences for new clinical supervisors
  - d) Participates in department/college events related to clinical supervision
  - e) Demonstrates ongoing professional development and reflective practice
  - f) Disseminates best practices in clinical supervision, based on research/evaluation data

**RESEARCH:** Expanding the knowledge base in one's discipline through generating new knowledge and synthesizing and integrating knowledge:

Standards to be addressed by everyone:

1. Articulates a clearly defined research agenda and focus that has grown in its quality and impact over time. Measures of quality and impact could include the following: journal acceptance rates, number of citations, circulation, publication notes (e.g., special mention, best paper award), journal impact factor, recognition at the national and/or international level, and quality of book publisher. It is incumbent upon the candidate to provide a strong and clear rationale for how the research described is situated in relation to a larger body and how the work has contributed to the advancement of their area of expertise.
2. Possesses a record of peer-reviewed publications that include systematic methods of inquiry

3. Presents a statement of research goals and record of works-in-progress that demonstrates continued contributions and productivity
4. Makes research contributions that reflect collaboration and leadership over time

In addition to the standards addressed above, faculty members at the time of promotion and tenure can address any of the following for further consideration of their ability to demonstrate expectations appropriate for tenure:

5. Presents a record of published work that translates research into practice to improve professional practices and outcomes and/or synthesizes knowledge through literature reviews which identify critical themes and needs
6. Demonstrates a record of community engaged scholarship (e.g., technical or program evaluation reports)
7. Engages in efforts to obtain funding to support one's research agenda
8. Demonstrates recognition of the quality of one's research
9. Presents a sustained record of disseminating research and knowledge at multiple levels (e.g., state, regional, national, and international conferences)
10. Engages in research that can be used to mentor and create opportunities for students and provides an emerging record of research collaborations with students

**SERVICE/OUTREACH/ ENGAGEMENT:** Applying knowledge in one's field through engaged scholarship and outreach to communities and practitioners, engagement with the profession, and service to the institution:

At the time of review for promotion to Associate Professor with conferral of permanent tenure, the faculty member is expected to demonstrate sustained and impactful service in each of the three areas for service/outreach/engagement.

Standards to be addressed by everyone:

1. Has a record of sustained involvement within the community of practitioners/professionals in one's field
2. Is actively involved in professional organizations and associations in one's field (e.g., some combination of state, regional, national/international levels including elected or appointed roles which may include editorial service)
3. Contributes to the mission of the program, department, college, and/or university through active engagement in committees or task forces that are addressing issues of importance
4. Presents a statement of service/outreach/engagement goals that shows continuing contributions and a record of service/outreach/engagement that is recognized for its quality and impact

## **Section Five**

### **The Specific Standards for Promotion to Full Professor (Tenure Track)**

A Full Professor in the Cato College of Education is expected to be a leader in the University and in the profession, contributing in a major way to the mission of the College and to the advancement of knowledge and practice in the professional field.

Review for promotion to Full Professor is not mandatory but tenured faculty in the Cato College of Education are encouraged to build a record of distinguished professional accomplishments and service that leads to this recognition. Reviews for promotion to Full Professor are encouraged and invited five years after promotion to Associate Professor and each five-year anniversary thereafter. Faculty members who decline review for promotion to Full Professor participate in the (Tenured Faculty Performance Review). Faculty members may request a review for promotion to Full Professor at times other than the five-year anniversaries of the promotion to Associate Professor/tenure decision. All reviews will be consistent with University Policy 102.13, Tenure Policies, Regulations and Procedures of the University of North Carolina at Charlotte and UNC Charlotte Academic Personnel Procedures Handbook-Section C. Review for Reappointment, Promotion, and Conferral of Permanent Tenure.

To achieve the rank of Full Professor, candidates in the Cato College of Education are expected to function successfully as tenured faculty members, meeting expected standards and making continuing contributions across the three professorial domains of teaching, research, and service/outreach/engagement. They are expected to act as good citizens of the professional learning community in the College and function as contributing colleagues to their peers, meeting the broad expectations of all faculty members (Section Two). Finally, they must demonstrate a record of distinction through leadership and impact in at least one of the three professorial domains of teaching, research, or service/outreach/engagement.

At the time of review of promotion to Full Professor, faculty members are expected to present a record that not only continues the record of achievement at the time of the last review but is qualitatively different in scope, level of contribution, leadership, and evidence of impact.

Candidates are required at the time of review to identify the professorial domain(s) to be reviewed as the area(s) of distinction.

#### **Specific Standards Relevant to Three Domains of Scholarship: Teaching, Research, and Service/Outreach/Engagement**

**TEACHING:** Representing knowledge in one's field by:

Standards to be addressed by everyone.

1. Teaching
  - a) Articulates a statement of teaching that shows exemplary instruction informed by ongoing analysis of instructional practice and student learning outcomes
  - b) Exhibits an in-depth understanding of the field and is a teacher-scholar who integrates current and relevant knowledge about content fields, teaching, learning, and assessment into instructional practice
  - c) Demonstrates leadership in mentoring colleagues, particularly junior faculty, in their teaching
  - d) Makes substantive contributions in teaching and the professional development of education professionals by conducting professional development seminars and/or developing curriculum materials at the local, state, national, and/or international levels

2. Advising/Mentoring students
  - a) Provides excellent advising and/or mentoring for students
  - b) Mentors colleagues in advising students
  - c) Creates opportunities and involves students in professional activities beyond the classroom
  - d) Supervises student-directed scholarship (e.g., research, comprehensive examinations, required evidences, independent study projects, theses, Master's degree projects, dissertations, honors requirements)
  - e) Fosters publication and presentation opportunities for students
  
3. Developing course and program curriculum
  - a) Participates effectively and successfully in course and program development that is based on established research, professional standards, best practices, and/or sustained experience with practitioners in one's field
  - b) Engages in efforts to obtain funding to support course and/or program development
  - c) Demonstrates leadership in course and program development
  - d) Demonstrates leadership in accreditation and program approval efforts and activities
  - e) Contributes to regional, state, national, and/or international curriculum development in one's field

In addition to the standards addressed above, faculty members at the time of promotion can address any of the following for further consideration of their ability to demonstrate expectations appropriate for full professor:

4. Clinical supervision appropriate to role and program assignment
  - a) Demonstrates a continuous record of positive impact on University students' professional growth
  - b) Demonstrates a continuous record of involvement in development of materials and resources related to clinical supervision
  - c) Provides evidence of frequent and sustained mentoring of new clinical supervisors
  - d) Provides evidence of sustained leadership positions in department and/or college events related to clinical supervision
  - e) Provides strategic leadership in designing and implementing clinical education at UNC Charlotte
  - f) Presents a sustained record of dissemination of best practices in clinical supervision, based on research/evaluation data and evidence of impact and importance of this work

In addition to the above standards, faculty candidates can demonstrate **distinction in teaching** through a history of leadership and impact in any of the following ways:

- Engage in the scholarship of teaching, including investigating and implementing innovations in course and curriculum design and assessing impact on student learning and the success of graduates in the field; this work should lead to peer-reviewed publications and presentations
- Attain recognition in the College and University for the quality of one's teaching
- Provide leadership in improving the educational experience of students and their learning at UNC Charlotte and/or through state, national, and/or international initiatives in the candidate's discipline
- Generate funding to support teaching and learning
- Participate in junior faculty mentorship
- Contribute to the improvement of the quality of teaching within the department, college and university

**RESEARCH:** Expanding the knowledge base in one's discipline through generating new knowledge and synthesizing and integrating knowledge by:

Standards to be addressed by everyone:

1. Articulates a clearly defined research agenda and focus that has grown in its quality and impact over time. Measures of quality and impact could include the following: journal acceptance rates, number of citations, circulation, publication notes (e.g., special mention, best paper award), journal impact factor, recognition at the national and/or international level, and quality of book publisher. It is incumbent upon the candidate to provide a strong and clear rationale for how the research described is situated in relation to a larger body and how the work has contributed to the advancement of their area of expertise.
2. Possesses a record of peer-reviewed publications that include systematic methods of inquiry
3. Providing leadership in research which can be demonstrated by any of the following:
  - a) Demonstrates leadership in mentoring colleagues, particularly junior faculty, in their efforts to generate new knowledge in their field and in synthesizing and integrating knowledge
  - b) Demonstrates leadership in mentoring students in their efforts to generate new knowledge in their field and in synthesizing and integrating knowledge
  - c) Demonstrates leadership in building successful collaborative teams locally and/or nationally/internationally

In addition to the standards addressed above, faculty members at the time of promotion can address any of the following for further consideration of their ability to demonstrate expectations appropriate for full professor:

4. Presents a record of published work that translates research into practice to improve professional practice and outcomes and/or synthesizes knowledge through literature reviews which identify critical themes and needs
5. Presents a record of community engaged scholarship (e.g., technical or program evaluation reports)
6. Engages in efforts to obtain funding to support one's research agenda
7. Receives recognition by others of the quality of one's research
8. Presents a sustained record of disseminating research and knowledge at multiple levels (e.g., state, regional, national, and international conferences)
9. Engages in research that can be used to mentor and create opportunities for students and provides an emerging record of research collaborations with students

In addition to the above standards, faculty candidates who seek **distinction in research** will present evidence of how their research demonstrates leadership and impact, such as:

- Presents a record of single- or lead-author research
- Reviews or referees research
- Serves on research panels
- Gives invited or keynote presentations on candidate's research

- Presents a record of securing funding through internal and external grants, contracts, and/or direct awards to support candidate's research agenda

**SERVICE/OUTREACH/ENGAGEMENT:** Applying knowledge in one's field through engaged scholarship and outreach to communities and practitioners, engagement with the profession, and service to the institution.

Standards to be addressed by everyone, including evidence of leadership in any of the following:

1. Presents a record of sustained involvement within the community of practitioners/professionals in one's field
2. Is actively involved in professional organizations and associations in one's field (e.g., some combination of state, regional, national/international levels), including elected or appointed roles which may include editorial service
3. Contributes to the mission of the program, department, college, and/or university through active engagement in committees or task forces that are addressing issues of importance
4. Presents a statement of service/outreach/engagement goals that shows sustained contributions and a record of service/outreach/engagement that is recognized for its quality and impact

Faculty candidates who seek **distinction in service/outreach/engagement** will document the quality and impact of service/outreach/engagement leadership in one or more of the following ways:

- Provides evidence of quality and impact of sustained and focused leadership in service to communities and practitioners
- Presents a record of substantial leadership in professional service and engagement through documentation of the quality and impact of professional service
- Documents the impact of leadership in service to the institution through evidence such as external accreditation reviews, curriculum approvals, strategic plans, program creation/revision, and descriptions of changes/improvement in the professional learning community as a result of the candidate's leadership

## **Section Six**

### **The Candidate's Dossier for Reappointment, Promotion, and Tenure Review**

The candidate's dossier for reappointment, promotion, and tenure decisions is prepared by the candidate, with some elements added by the department chair and later by the dean. The annual reports provide a foundation for the preparation of the dossier. Chairs' feedback letters to faculty members' annual reports should clearly address the extent to which the faculty member is progressing toward success at the next phase of the RPT process.

Materials included in the dossier are designed to provide evidence about the faculty member's achievements in teaching, research, and service/outreach/engagement, the promise of future contributions, and through the candidate's narrative statement, the contexts for understanding the nature and purpose of the work. The narrative statement provides the candidate with an opportunity to present an overview of how the faculty member is meeting the professorial role expectations for a faculty member in the College of Education, including both the broad expectations and the specific standards for teaching, research, and service/outreach/engagement. The candidate and the reviewers should be guided in the preparation and the review of the dossier by the broad standards that are listed in Section Two and by the specific standards, appropriate to the level of review, listed in Sections Three, Four, or Five.

All documents posted in the candidate's dossier must be in PDF format. When going up for Reappointment, Promotion, and Tenure Review the dossier needs to be submitted by or before 11:55pm, on September 1.

#### **Required Sections of the Candidate's Dossier**

1. The candidate's current vita (See *Dossier Preparation Handbook* for recommended outline)

The vita should document all of the candidate's professional activities, including those prior to joining the UNC Charlotte faculty. It should include information about the candidate's educational background (baccalaureate through doctoral degrees, dates, institutions, majors and minors); professional experience in education or related fields (dates, employers, job responsibilities, etc.); professional licenses or certifications, publications and presentations (complete citations in APA-style); and service to the institution, engagement with the profession, and outreach to communities and practitioners. Please refer to the *Dossier Preparation Handbook* for guidance in the classification and ordering of professional activities.

Throughout the vita, specific entries should be ordered consistently from most recent to least recent, and the most current APA style should be used to list publication, presentations, research projects, etc. Related entries should be cross-referenced or presented together (e.g., reprints of articles in other journals, presentations subsequently published in conference proceedings or in refereed journals, or closely related articles or research reports based on the same data source).

The vita should include an asterisk (\*) at the end of the citation of the publications and presentations that use systematic methods of inquiry appropriate to the research goals and a pound sign (#) for those that are peer-reviewed.

2. The candidate's narrative statement/self-assessment

The narrative statement should be written in the first person.

The candidate's narrative statement/self-assessment is presented in four parts, each of which will be described below:

- Narrative statement overview
- Teaching narrative
- Research narrative
- Service/outreach/engagement narrative

The four elements of the narrative statement should be posted as separate documents so that reviewers may consider the appropriate element in conjunction with the supportive evidence provided later in the dossier.

Narrative statement overview (limited to 4 single-spaced pages)

The narrative overview should include the following information:

- The candidate's roles, responsibilities, and commitments in the department and college, including a description of the candidate's workload
- The evolution of the candidate's professional interests and priorities in teaching, research, and service/outreach/engagement, including relevant background information that relates to the candidate's current roles, responsibilities, and professional commitments such as the commitment to diversity
- The unifying themes (areas of focus) in the candidate's teaching, research, and service/outreach/engagement (typically 2-4 themes are delineated)
- Self-reflection on personal accomplishments to date, including strengths, challenges, areas for growth
- Major professional goals in research, teaching, and service for the next 3-5 years

Teaching narrative (limited to 3 single-spaced pages plus charts)

The teaching narrative should include the following information:

- A statement of the candidate's teaching philosophy or belief system about teaching and learning
- The nature/role of the courses taught by the candidate in the academic program and how they connect to the *Conceptual Framework*
- Brief contextual statement to introduce course syllabi, including information about how courses have been revised and improved
- An analysis of how the candidate has interpreted and used student and peer evaluations to improve instruction, including trend analysis and how instruction has been revised and improved, based on feedback
- A description of how the candidate assesses and values student learning and has adjusted instruction to enhance learning based on measures of student learning outcomes
- Description of advising responsibilities, including the supervision of student scholarship (e.g., number/type of advisees and/or roles and responsibilities in directing student scholarship)
- Description of contributions to curriculum development including how the candidate aligns the curriculum to accreditation standards
- Description of efforts related to diversity in the professional domain of teaching
- Description of efforts related to inclusion of instructional technology in the professional domain of teaching
- (For Promotion to Full) Description of leadership contributions in teaching (e.g., mentoring, peer observation, curriculum leadership) and the impact of that work

Research narrative (limited to 3 single-spaced pages plus charts)

The research narrative should include the following information:

- A description of the candidate's research agenda, including major areas of focus and the relevance/importance of the research questions to the field
- A rationale for the selection of the five exemplar publications in the dossier (e.g., why these articles are good representations of the candidate's achievements in research)
- A description of the research methodologies employed by the candidate
- The evolution of the candidate's research and scholarship in terms of focus, audience, quality of publication outlet, etc.
- A chart of in-progress work to show continued contributions and productivity.
- The nature of the candidate's contributions to the work of research teams, engaged scholarship with communities, and/or work with students
- Future directions
- (For promotion to Associate and promotion to Full) Evidence of quality and impact of scholarship
- (For promotion to Full) Description of leadership in research (e.g., mentoring, editorial leadership, leadership of research teams) and the impact of that work

Service/outreach/engagement narrative (limited to 3 single-spaced pages)

The service narrative should include the following information:

- A description of the candidate's agenda for service to the institution, engagement with the profession, and outreach to practitioners and communities and how this agenda links to the candidate's areas of professional focus
  - Provide examples of the impact of one's service
  - (For promotion to Full) Description of leadership in service, outreach, and community engagement and the impact of that work
3. Copies of all prior annual evaluation letters to the candidate since the last review (or the most recent 3 years, whichever is shorter) and copies of the dean's recommendations for all prior reappointment, promotion, and tenure recommendations (posted by chair)
  4. Materials relevant to teaching
    - Copies of one course syllabus for each of the different courses (a maximum of five) taught by the candidate during the prior three years
    - All student evaluations collected since the candidate's last review for reappointment, promotion, or tenure, including both quantitative and qualitative information (or the last three years, whichever is shorter) (posted by chair)
    - Peer observation reports and observation signature form (posted by chair)
    - When appropriate: Student comments on the effectiveness of advisement (including the supervision of student scholarship), (e.g., accessibility, responsiveness, knowledge and effectiveness of guidance). Such comments will be solicited by the chair, in consultation with the faculty candidate, and will reflect the specific advising roles and responsibilities of the faculty candidate. (posted by chair)
    - Teaching charts (see *Dossier Preparation Handbook*)
  5. Materials relevant to research
    - Copies of five research publications, selected by the candidate, to provide reviewers with an understanding of the candidate's research areas of focus, quality of research, and impact. The research examples may be journal articles, book chapters, or books (not the entire book but representative chapters plus table of contents.) Specific guidance about the selection of the research examples is provided below:
      - While most selected materials should be in print, items *in press* or under review may be included if in the candidate's view, the manuscripts contribute important

information about the research record. In these cases, any correspondence with journals about the publication status of the manuscripts should be included with the manuscript.

- While most selected materials should be published since the last review, if one or two earlier articles (or books or book chapters) provide important information about the research record, such earlier work may be included.
  - At least two of the submissions should be research that reflects use of systematic methods of inquiry and peer-reviewed appropriate to one's research goals.
- For tenure and promotion reviews (but not reappointment reviews), three to five letters from external reviewers who have been asked to review the selected publications or products of the candidate's research and then, based on that review, assess both the quality of the research and its contributions to the candidate's field of specialization (placed in dossier folder by chair).
    - All of the reviewers must be outside UNC Charlotte, none should be a close colleague or collaborator with the candidate, and the majority should be selected independently by the department chair in consultation with the dean. When the chair solicits the external reviews, he or she will inform the candidate regarding the names of the reviewers, the materials sent to each, and the questions(s) they have been asked to address.
    - Chart listing external reviewers, their expertise, and who recommended them will be added to the dossier by the chair (Template provided, *Dossier Preparation Handbook*).
  - Research charts (Template provided, *Dossier Preparation Handbook*)

#### 6. Materials relevant to service/outreach/engagement

- Descriptions or products of the candidate's most significant service activities (a maximum of five items), along with evaluation of the quality of that work and its impact (if available)
- For tenure and promotion reviews (but not reappointment reviews), three to five letters from appropriate individuals who have in-depth knowledge of one or more of the candidate's service activities and who have been asked to assess the quality and impact of that service. It is the responsibility of the candidate's department chair to obtain these assessments of the candidate's service to the profession and to practitioners in his or her field. Working with the candidate, the chair will identify and select three to five appropriate individuals who have in-depth knowledge of one or more of the candidate's service/outreach/engagement activities and who are in a position to assess objectively the quality of service and contribution made by the candidate to his or her profession or to a specific group of practitioners in the field. Ideally, these reviewers should be knowledgeable of the candidate's work, but not collaborators or close colleagues. When the chair solicits the external reviews, he or she will inform the candidate regarding the names of the reviewers, any materials sent to them, and the questions(s) they have been asked to address.
- The chart listing external reviewers of service and their expertise will be added to the dossier by the chair (Template provided, *Dossier Preparation Handbook*)

### Timeline and Checklist for Tenure/Tenure-Track Dossier Preparation

In the Cato College of Education, the candidate's dossier is submitted electronically for review by the Departmental Review Committee, the department chair, the College Review Committee, and the dean. Additionally, an abbreviated paper version of the dossier that includes the required elements from Academic Affairs is prepared for review by the provost. The department chair is responsible for preparing the paper version of the materials to be sent to the provost and will forward the paper file to the dean's Office when departmental-level reviews are completed. In the chart below, the elements of the dossier, the person responsible for completing and including those elements, deadlines for submission, and whether the elements are included only in the electronic submission or in both the electronic and paper submissions are noted. Each of the required elements has been described in the previous pages.

If significant new information is received by the candidate after the 11:55pm, September 1 submission date, the candidate may request that the chair add the new material to the dossier. The chair will notify the appropriate committee if new material is added. No additional material may be added after the close of the Fall semester.

| Elements   | Person Responsible | Deadline | Electronic Submission | Paper Submission |
|--|--------------------|----------|-----------------------|------------------|
| AA-20 Cover Form with signatures and votes recorded  | Chair              | Oct. 15  |                       | X                |
| AA-27 Affirmative Action Form  | Chair              | Oct. 15  |                       | X                |
| Vita*  | Candidate          | Sept. 1* | X                     | X                |
| Candidate's narrative statement/self-assessment*   | Candidate          | Sept. 1* | X                     | X                |
| Copies of prior annual evaluations (3 years)   | Chair              | Sept. 1  | X                     | X                |
| Copies of prior reappointment, promotion and tenure recommendations of dean (if applicable)    | Chair              | Sept. 1  | X                     | X                |
| Course syllabi   | Candidate          | Sept. 1  | X                     |                  |
| Student evaluations of instruction   | Chair              | Sept. 1  | X                     |                  |
| Peer observation reports   | Chair              | Sept. 1  | X                     |                  |
| Survey of students for whom candidate has provided guidance                                    | Chair              | Sept. 1  | X                     |                  |
| Chart of master's and doctoral committee service   | Candidate          | Sept. 1  | X                     | X                |
| Chart- course & curriculum contributions   | Candidate          | Sept. 1  | X                     | X                |
| Chart – teaching assignments   | Candidate          | Sept. 1  | X                     | X                |
| 5 research publications  | Candidate          | Sept. 1* | X                     |                  |
| External reviews of research*  | Chair              | Sept. 1* | X                     | X                |
| Chart of external reviewers of research*   | Chair              | Sept. 1* | X                     | X                |
| Chart- published and <i>in press</i> work, including evidence of quality and impact            | Candidate          | Sept. 1  | X                     | X                |
| Chart – works in progress  | Candidate          | Sept. 1  | X                     | X                |
| Chart – external funding   | Candidate          | Sept. 1  | X                     | X                |
| Description of 5 most significant service contributions, with evaluation of quality and impact | Candidate          | Sept. 1  | X                     |                  |
| External reviews of quality and impact of service*   | Chair              | Sept. 1* | X                     | X                |
| Chart of external reviews of service/outreach/engagement                                       | Chair              | Sept. 1  | X                     | X                |
| DRC recommendation letter to Department Chair  | DRC Chair          | Oct. 15  | X                     | X                |
| Department Chair's recommendation letter to dean   | Chair              | Nov. 1   | X                     | X                |
| CRC recommendation letter to Dean  | CRC Chair          | Dec. 1   | X                     | X                |
| Dean's recommendation letter to Provost  | Dean               | Jan. 2   | X                     | X                |

\*Candidates for promotion/tenure must work with their chair to develop a list of external reviewers to be solicited by the chair for external reviews. By **June 1**, candidates must provide advance copies of the following materials to their chair so that the chair can send these materials to external reviewers who have agreed to conduct reviews: Vita; research narrative; service narrative. These elements may be revised/updated for the September 1 dossier submission. Candidates are encouraged to schedule a meeting with their chair on or around August 15 to review this checklist and ensure that all documents are in the dossier or will be added before the due dates (above).

## Section Seven

### Faculty Review Committees for Reappointment/Promotion/Tenure Reviews for Tenure-Track and Clinical Faculty

Reviews for reappointment, promotion, and conferral of permanent tenure are guided by University Policy 102.13, Tenure Policies, Regulations and Procedures of the University of North Carolina at Charlotte, UNC Charlotte Academic Personnel Procedures Handbook-Section C. Review for Reappointment, Promotion, and Conferral of Permanent Tenure. All committee members and administrators with responsibility for these reviews should review the policies, regulations, and procedures as delineated in the relevant policies and procedures. This material provides essential guidance on the areas of performance to be reviewed and the responsibilities of the Department Review Committee, the department chair, the College Review Committee, and the dean in analyzing the strengths and weakness of the candidate's record and in presenting the resultant recommendation.

The tenure document describes the responsibilities of the reviewers in conducting the review sessions, permissible and impermissible grounds for decisions, the channels of review, and notifications.

#### Review Committees

##### 1. Department Review Committee (DRC)

Each academic department in the College of Education has a Department Review Committee consisting of three members. The assembled DRC provides recommendations to the department chair on reappointment, promotion, and tenure.

The committee is elected from the permanently tenured faculty of the department who hold full-time appointments. Members are elected for staggered terms of two years each. At least one member of the committee must hold the academic rank of Professor. Permanently tenured faculty members from other departments within the College of Education may be selected as voting members if necessary to constitute the DRC. The committee elects its chair from its membership.

DRC members will receive yearly training/updates on the RPT policies and procedures, standards, and ethical guidelines.

A faculty member may not serve consecutive terms and must sit off the DRC for a period of at least one year before being eligible to again serve on the DRC.

One member of the elected committee will be appointed by the department chair to serve as the DRC Diversity Representative. This individual will receive additional training on inclusion and fairness and be invested with the responsibility of monitoring the processes of the committee for fairness and equity.

During years when a Clinical Faculty Member will be reviewed for promotion, the department will elect one clinical faculty member to serve as a voting member of the DRC during the clinical review. This member will serve in addition to the members identified above. In the event that a department has no clinical member eligible to serve, a member of another department may be selected to serve.

## 2. College Review Committee (CRC)

The College Review Committee provides the dean with recommendations on reappointment, promotion, and the conferral of permanent tenure.

The College Review Committee is elected from the permanently tenured faculty of the College who hold full-time appointments and has a history of service as a Departmental Review Committee member. Each academic department elects one member for service on the CRC for two-year staggered terms and two additional members are elected at-large by the College for one-year terms. A faculty member may not serve consecutive terms and must sit off the CRC for a period of at least one year before being eligible to again serve on the CRC.

CRC members will receive yearly training/updates on the RPT policies, standards, and ethical guidelines.

When necessary for clinical faculty reviews, the CRC will be expanded to include two senior level Clinical Faculty Members. These committee members are elected at the time of the yearly college election and serve two year staggered terms. (Note: Senior Level clinical faculty is defined as a member who has successfully been appointed as a Clinical Associate Professor, Clinical Professor, or Senior Research Associate.)

One member of the elected committee will be appointed by the dean to serve as the CRC Diversity Representative. This individual will receive additional training on inclusion and fairness and be invested with the responsibility of monitoring the processes of the committee for fairness and equity.

For election of the at-large members of the CRC, a ballot of eligible faculty will be prepared by the dean. Excluded from eligibility are faculty who are undergoing a review in the coming year and their immediate family members, department chairs and deans, and faculty who have been elected to serve on a Department Review Committee. The list of eligible faculty will be distributed to eligible voters by an electronic ballot. Faculty may vote for two CRC members. The two CRC nominees with the highest number of votes are elected to the committee.

The committee elects a chair from its membership.

## Section Eight

### Criteria and Procedures for Reappointment and Promotion for Clinical Faculty in the College of Education (Non-Tenure Track)

The purpose of this section is to provide criteria and procedures for the reappointment and promotion of clinical faculty and guidance to those faculty members who seek reappointment or promotion.

#### Descriptions of Clinical Ranks

If a faculty appointment is not an appointment to the Professorial Ranks (as defined in [Tenured Policies, Regulations, and Procedures](#)), then the University titles this a Special Faculty Appointment. All Special Faculty Appointments are for a specified term of service and do not include the opportunity to achieve tenure. The letter of appointment indicates the length of the term of service and whether or not the appointment is renewable. Faculty members in Special Faculty Appointments are not eligible for permanent tenure. In the College of Education, Special Faculty Appointments are designated as Clinical Faculty Appointments.

In the Cato College of Education, clinical faculty hold a variety of positions, with diverse job responsibilities and expectations. Below is a description of various clinical faculty roles and ranks and their characteristics within the College of Education.

- **Lecturer**  
A lecturer holds a Master's degree from an accredited college or university, appropriate licensure in the field, and has evidence of potential to fulfill all assigned teaching and/or supervision, advising, and service/outreach/engagement duties.
- **Senior Lecturer**  
A senior lecturer holds a Master's degree from an accredited college or university, appropriate licensure in the field, and has a minimum of five years of successful experience in teaching and/or supervision, advising, and/or service/outreach/engagement in higher education.
- **Clinical Assistant Professor**  
A clinical assistant professor holds a terminal professional degree from an accredited college or university and appropriate licensure in the field. Responsibilities typically focus on teaching, advising, and/or supervision, and service/outreach/engagement.
- **Clinical Associate Professor**  
A clinical associate professor holds a terminal professional degree from an accredited college or university, holds appropriate licensure in the field, and has a minimum of five years of successful experience in teaching, advising, supervision, research, and/or service/outreach/engagement in higher education. While clinical associate professor positions do not typically have the same research expectations as tenure-track faculty positions, faculty who hold the clinical associate professor rank are expected to have a demonstrated record of leadership and contributions to the development and/or dissemination of best professional practices in the field. This expectation is in addition to the duties of teaching, advising, and/or supervision, and service/outreach/engagement.
- **Clinical Professor**  
A clinical professor holds a terminal professional degree from an accredited college or university, holds appropriate licensure in the field, and has a minimum of ten years of successful experience in teaching and/or supervision, advising, and/or research, and service/outreach/engagement in

higher education. While clinical professor positions do not typically have the same research expectations as tenure-track faculty positions, faculty who hold the rank of Clinical Professor are expected to present a record of scholarship in their field. A record of leadership and distinction in teaching/supervision, research, and/or service/outreach/engagement and documentation of the impact of the work is necessary for the rank of clinical professor.

- **Research Associate**  
A research associate holds a master's degree or doctoral degree from an accredited college or university and has evidence of potential to fulfill all assigned research and service initiatives as outlined in the position description. Research associate positions are supported by external grants or contracts.
- **Senior Research Associate**  
A senior research associate holds a terminal degree from an accredited college or university and has a minimum of five years successful experience designing and implementing research and providing extensive service to the field. Senior research associate positions are supported by external grants or contracts.

### **Initial Appointment**

The initial appointment to a faculty position is made as a result of the search by a department using the search process and procedures in compliance with College and University policies. Individuals with experience and years of service commensurate with qualifications of rank may be appointed to that rank as an initial appointment as approved by the dean upon the recommendation of the appropriate chair or director and in consultation with the appropriate faculty committee. Changes in rank may occur after promotion reviews as described below or upon completion of the terminal degree in the discipline.

### **Broad Expectations of All Clinical Faculty in the Cato College of Education**

A clinical faculty member in the College of Education is expected to fulfill the broad expectations as delineated in Section Two of this document.

### **Professorial Roles and Responsibilities of Clinical Faculty in the Cato College of Education**

The specific responsibilities of a clinical faculty member are defined in the position description at the time of hiring. The job description and expectations may be modified on an annual basis by the chair in consultation with the faculty member and in response to changing needs and opportunities. Clinical faculty positions, for example, may have a primary focus on:

- Supervision of student teachers and/or graduate interns or practicum students, or
- Instruction (e.g., 4:4 teaching load; 80% effort in teaching and 20% effort in service/engagement), or
- Research (e.g., 100% effort on an externally funded research project), or
- Departmental advising (e.g., a preponderance of effort on academic advising with 25% effort in teaching and 20% in service/outreach/engagement)
- Administrative/leadership responsibilities such as director of an office or program or service domain within the College of Education; administrative effort should be configured in the job description when appropriate (e.g., 60% administration, 20% teaching, 20% service)

Sections Three, Four, and Five of this document delineate specific expectations for faculty in the domains of teaching, research, and service/outreach/engagement at the professorial ranks of Assistant, Associate, and Full Professor. Those expectations are applicable for clinical faculty in accordance with the specific

elements of the job description. Thus, for example, the specific expectations in research (expanding the knowledge base in one's field) are appropriate for those in research associate position, but the expectations in teaching are not applicable given the nature of the position. Similarly, the specific expectations in teaching (representing knowledge in one's field) are appropriate for clinical faculty in instructional positions, but the expectations in research are not required given the instructional teaching load of clinical faculty in this particular role. Accomplishments in domains outside of the primary assignment (e.g., instruction, research) are meritorious and will be considered in reappointment and promotion reviews.

All clinical faculty, whatever their specific job description, are expected to provide service/outreach/engagement in support of the mission of the College and its programs. The nature of that service/outreach/engagement will vary according to the specific job description. For example, instructional faculty may be deeply engaged in curriculum development and assessment for their program while Research Associates may provide outreach to communities by leading research-based training for school personnel. Additionally, all clinical faculty are expected to continue to grow as professionals through reflective practice, active learning, and engagement. For all candidates, such professional growth should also manifest itself in active engagement in University opportunities and/or professional societies specific to the discipline.

### **Reappointment/Promotion Procedures and Timeline**

All clinical faculty must be reviewed for reappointment during the final year of their initial contract. If so desired and appropriate (i.e., the candidate has five years of experience), faculty may request appropriate promotion reviews at this time according to the specific guidelines that follow.

In general, a successful reappointment review (which is mandatory) will reflect sustained work of high quality as delineated in the job description.

In general, a successful promotion review (which is voluntary) will reflect not only sustained work of high quality but also a record of increased leadership, quality, and impact, consistent with the standards delineated in Sections Two, Three, Four, and Five as appropriate to the job description of the candidate.

Clinical Faculty will submit a dossier of their work as outlined in the Dossier Section (described below for review for promotion.

For post appointment reviews (the year prior to the end date of existing contract), clinical faculty will submit the following to the department chair: the job description of the faculty candidate, a current vita, and annual reviews for the last three years.

#### **A. Reappointment**

During the final year of the candidate's initial contract, the department chair will gather the annual reviews of the candidate as well as any necessary documentation from the candidate (delineated by the specific role). The documents will be reviewed by the department chair and if appropriate, by the dean. Contracts may be renewed for a period of time ranging from the minimum of one year to the maximum of five years.

The reappointment review for a Research Associate is scheduled in accordance with the funding cycle of the funded project and is completed by the Principal Investigator and any Co-Principal Investigators for the grant. Reappointment is contingent upon both satisfactory performance and funding availability.

## B. Promotion from Lecturer to Clinical Assistant Professor

The rank of Clinical Assistant Professor requires the terminal professional degree. Upon earning the terminal degree, a lecturer may be recommended for promotion to the rank of clinical assistant professor by the chair or director at the beginning of the academic year at any point in the contractual period. The date for contract renewal (reappointment) will remain the same as the date specified in the current contract.

## C. Promotion within the Clinical Professorial Ranks

Promotion within the clinical professorial ranks (e.g., from assistant to associate, from associate to full, and from research associate to senior research associate) requires the terminal degree and is based on issues of merit, excellence, and increasing leadership, impact, and engagement in the field. Promotion reviews are voluntary and are initiated by the faculty member.

Promotion reviews may occur during the final year of the current employment contract and serve as a review for contract renewal as well as the promotion review. Promotion reviews for clinical assistant to clinical associate must, in most cases, be preceded by a successful reappointment review. Faculty must hold the rank of clinical associate professor for at least one contractual period before being considered for promotion to clinical professor.

A promotion review for a clinical faculty member will always encompass a reappointment (contract renewal) review. Possible outcomes for a promotion/reappointment review include: (1) Reappointment and promotion to a new rank, (2) Reappointment but not promotion to a new rank; (3) Non-reappointment.

## Timeline

1. Notification: At the time of the faculty annual report one year before the end of the current contractual period, administrators will notify faculty candidates about the upcoming reappointment or post appointment review that will take place during the next academic year. Faculty candidates should notify the department chair (and the Director of the Office of Field Experiences or the Principal Investigator as applicable) of their intent to seek a promotion review at that time.
2. Dossier submission: The candidate for promotion submits the dossier on or before January 30. Dossier submissions will be electronic.
3. Review calendar (*see the final page of this section for the complete timeline and checklist*):
  - a) The Department Review Committee will complete its review and make a recommendation to the chair by February 21.
  - b) The chair completes the chair's review and submits a recommendation to the dean by March 15.
  - c) The Expanded College Review Committee will complete the review and submit a recommendation to the dean by April 30.
  - d) The dean will communicate the results of the promotion reviews to the clinical faculty member by May 15.
  - e) With successful reviews, new contracts will reflect, when applicable, a new rank. These will be offered to the clinical faculty member by May 15 and will go into effect July 1 of that year.

## Dossier

1. The following are required elements for the dossier for **all** clinical faculty who seek reappointment:
  - a) The job description of the faculty candidate
  - b) The current vita, as described in Section Six of this document, using relevant sections from the template in the *Dossier Preparation Handbook*
  - c) Copies of annual review letters for the last three years or since last review, whichever is shorter
  
2. The following are required elements for the dossier for **all** clinical faculty who seek promotion
  - a) A narrative statement (limited to no more than 4 single-spaced pages)
  - b) Section Six of this document provides guidance for the narrative statement, as appropriate to the candidate's job description. The narrative statement should begin by reflecting the domain(s) designated by the position responsibilities of the candidate. A pie chart or other graphic may accompany this reflection to clarify the percentage of effort for each indicated domain. Candidates should include specific information from the job description for their position as part of the narrative. Candidates should clearly describe their job at the time of appointment/reappointment and then (when applicable) define the documented evolution of their responsibilities since their previous reappointment or promotion review. In addition, the narrative should represent an overview of how the candidate is meeting and perhaps exceeding the expectations of the roles and responsibilities aligned with the designated domain(s). Candidates may describe the use of data and other information that they have gathered or used to improve their job performance. Candidates should identify clear and appropriate goals for the next contractual period
  - c) The narrative is to be written in first person. Based upon domain(s) in the faculty member's job description, candidates should include specific information as appropriate regarding accomplishments, improved practice, and goals in teaching, research, and service/outreach/engagement
  - d) Candidates seeking promotion to Clinical Associate, Clinical Full Professor, Senior Lecture or Senior Research Associate should address the standards delineated in Sections Three, Four, and Five of this document that are relevant to the job description. In addition, candidates should include a description of leadership and contributions to the development and/or dissemination of best professional practices in the field.
  - e) Candidates should include appropriate charts (from the *Dossier Preparation Handbook*) as appendices to the narrative statement. The charts may be in addition to the 10-page limit.
  
3. For faculty candidates with teaching responsibilities, the dossier should address standards in Sections Three, Four, and Five and follow the guidance in Section Six of this document that are relevant to the job description, including evidence of teaching practice and achievement such as:
  - a) A statement of teaching philosophy and beliefs, within the narrative (limited to 3 single-spaced pages plus charts)
  - b) All student evaluations of course and instructor since the last review or the last three years, whichever is shorter
  - c) All Peer Evaluations of Teaching since the last review or the last three years, whichever is shorter. At least one peer evaluation is required
  - d) A table of analysis and use of data to improve instructional practice based on student and peer evaluations
  - e) An example of a syllabus for each different course taught during the review period, with a maximum of five

For faculty candidates with advising responsibilities, the dossier should address these responsibilities as part of the teaching narrative. Evidence may include:

- a) A statement of advising philosophy and beliefs, within the teaching narrative
  - b) A recent survey sampling the candidate's advisees regarding the quality of the academic advisement provided to them. This survey will be collected by and provided for the dossier by the candidate's department chair
  - c) A description of innovations and improvements brought to departmental advising by the candidate since last review
4. For faculty candidates with supervision responsibilities, the dossier should address standards in Sections Three, Four, and Five and follow the guidance in Section Six of this document that are relevant to the job description, including evidence of supervision practice and achievement such as:
    - a) A statement of supervision philosophy and beliefs, within the narrative (limited to 3 single-spaced pages plus charts)
    - b) All student teacher/intern and cooperating teacher evaluations of supervision since the last review or the last three years, whichever is shorter
    - c) A table of analysis and use of data to improve supervision practice based on student teacher and cooperating teacher evaluations
    - d) Examples of materials developed for use in seminar, orientations, evaluation, or other situations applicable to the role of supervisor
5. For faculty candidates with research responsibilities, the dossier should address standards in Sections Three, Four, and Five and follow the guidance in Section Six of this document that are relevant to the job description, including evidence of research productivity, quality and impact such as:
    - a) An articulation of the research agenda and focus, within the narrative (limited to 3 single-spaced pages plus charts)
    - b) Three to five examples of research dissemination such as published articles and professional presentations
    - c) A table of research publications that includes the title, authorship, and candidate's role, and the impact of the work. (See *Dossier Preparation Handbook*) The table which describes funded projects should be included in this section when applicable (See *Dossier Preparation Handbook*)
6. In keeping with the expectation that all clinical faculty provide service/outreach/engagement in support of the mission of the College and its programs, the dossier should provide evidence appropriate to the job description such as:
    - a) A service narrative (limited to 3 pages) including a description of the candidate's agenda for service to the institution, engagement with the profession, and outreach to practitioners and communities and how this agenda links to the candidate's areas of professional focus
    - b) Examples of the impact of one's service
7. For candidates seeking promotion to the rank of Clinical Associate Professor or Clinical Professor, the dossier must include:
    - a) A description of the candidate's record of leadership and contribution to the development and/or dissemination of best professional practices in the field, within the narrative
    - b) Three external letters of review commenting on the quality and impact of the candidate's work and contributions to the field. Section Six of this document provides guidance for the selection of external reviewers. No more than one letter may be internal to the College of Education
    - c) The chart listing external reviewers and their expertise will be added to the dossier by the chair (template provided in the *Dossier Preparation Handbook*)

### **Timeline and Checklist for Clinical Dossier Preparation for First Reappointment Review and Promotion Reviews**

In the Cato College of Education, the clinical candidate's dossier is submitted electronically for review by the Departmental Review Committee, the department chair or director, the Expanded College Review Committee and the dean. In the chart below, the elements of the dossier, the person responsible for completing and including those elements, and deadlines for submission are noted. Each of the required elements has been described in the previous pages. Section Seven of this document provides guidance for selecting evidences that address standards appropriate to the job description.

If significant new information is received by the candidate after the January 30 submission date, the candidate may request that the chair add the new material to the dossier. The chair will notify the appropriate committee if new material is added.

| <b>Elements</b>   | <b>Person Responsible</b>  | <b>Deadline</b>   | <b>Electronic Submission</b>   |
|---|--|---|--|
| Job description memo  | Candidate  | Jan. 30   | X  |
| Vita  | Candidate  | Jan. 30   | X  |
| Narrative statement, including charts appropriate to narrative (as appendices)  | Candidate  | Jan. 30   | X  |
| Evidences appropriate to job description, e.g., teaching, research, supervision, advising, administration/leadership, and service/outreach/engagement. Up to 20 evidences may be submitted. A cover memo should describe the rationale for selection of each evidences. | Candidate  | Jan. 30   | X  |
| Copies of prior annual evaluations (3 years)  | Chair/Supervisor   | Jan. 30   | X  |
| Copies of prior reappointment and promotion recommendations by dean (if applicable)   | Chair/ Supervisor  | Jan. 30   | X  |
| Student evaluations of instruction and/or student teacher evaluation of supervision (3 years) (if applicable)   | Chair/Supervisor   | Jan. 30   | X  |
| Survey of students for whom candidate has provided guidance (if applicable)   | Chair/ Supervisor  | Jan. 30   | X  |
| Chart of external reviewers* (if applicable)  | Chair/ Supervisor  | Jan. 30   | X  |
| External letters of review (if applicable)  | Chair/ Supervisor  | Jan. 30   | X  |
| Recommendation letters <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• DRC</li> <li>• Chair</li> <li>• CRC</li> <li>• Dean</li> </ul>  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• DRC Chair</li> <li>• Chair/Supervisor</li> <li>• CRC Chair</li> <li>• Dean</li> </ul> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Feb. 21</li> <li>• March 15</li> <li>• April 30</li> <li>• May 15</li> </ul> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>X</li> <li>X</li> <li>X</li> <li>X</li> </ul> |

\*Candidates for promotion must work with their chairs/supervisors well in advance of the deadline to develop a list of external reviewers to be solicited by the chair or supervisor for external reviews.