

## **Promotion and Tenure**

### **Tips, Policies and Practices**

#### Dean/Chair's Letter

1. Must show the vote of School's Faculty Personnel Committee.
2. The letter must show the vote of the full professors: yes, no, abstain. Separately report the vote for other professorial ranks, if they also vote.
3. Attach any documents produced by the School's Tenure and Promotion Committee. Should 1) require faculty members provide reasons for "no" votes and abstentions; and 2) present that information in their review letter. Should address any articulated concerns reflected in negative votes by School's committee or full professors.
4. Explain departmental standards and expectations for scholarship, teaching, engagement and service.
5. The Chair's letter should clearly show the considerations influencing the Chair's decision to recommend or not recommend the candidate for tenure and/or promotion.
6. The Dean/Chair should also frankly discuss the misgivings, reflected in a substantial negative votes (e.g., if quarter or more of the votes are negative) or multiple abstentions, or noted in any of the letters of reference.
7. In the dossier, please describe how the department evaluates teaching quality.
8. Explain relative roles in multi-authored works and the significance of author order, if possible.
9. Check the current policy guidance on CV formatting and content.
10. Consider separately the relative importance of works produced before and after joining the UNC faculty, where appropriate.

#### External Letters of Evaluation

1. A minimum of four letters from outside UNC are required for tenure or promotion actions. Two letters are from a list of names provided by the candidate and two from individuals selected by the Department Chair or Dean, as appropriate.
2. 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).
3. Ideally, all of the letters should come from Peer Institutions.
4. Reviewers should be above the rank of the person being nominated, optimally Full Professors.
5. Do not ask the reviewer if the person up for promotion would hypothetically be promoted at their institution.

6. All letters should be from individuals independent of the candidate. Letters may not be from individuals who have significant involvement with a candidate, e.g., a collaborator, mentor, previous co-worker, former dissertation chair, dissertation committee member, friend, etc., but may be from individuals who know the candidate through professional interactions, e.g., reviewed the candidate's publications or served on review committee together.

7. Additional letters from any source may also be submitted. These may be from individuals within the institution with whom the candidate has collaborated or from former colleagues, collaborators, mentors, community members, or other individuals connected with the candidate.

8. All letters of evaluation that are received must 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. Deans and department chairs are required to include all the letters received, not a selected subset.

Rev. 6/2014