

**Guidelines for
Appointment, Reappointment and Promotion of Faculty
School of Medicine
University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill
(Revised January 2014)**

Introduction

Faculty appointments, reappointments, and promotions in the School of Medicine are recommended in accordance with *The Trustee Policies and Regulations Governing Academic Tenure in the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill*. This document provides guidelines and serves to clarify additional requirements for faculty appointments in the School of Medicine.

Faculty in the School of Medicine may be appointed, reappointed, and/or promoted in one of two separate tracks: the tenure track or the fixed term track. The track to which new faculty members are recruited must be established and known at the time of their recruitment and must be clearly described in the offer letter that they receive and sign. The Department Chair must also review with new faculty members the differences between the two tracks, explaining the criteria that they are expected to meet in order to qualify for reappointment or promotion. In addition, the Department Chair should emphasize to his or her new recruit that track assignment shall be largely invisible to the outside world: i.e., regardless of the track to which an Assistant Professor has been assigned, he/she will be referred to as “Assistant Professor.” However, the modifiers “Clinical” or “Research” must still be used in certain administrative situations: e.g., in the formal appointment and promotion letters for each faculty member.

Promotion in the School of Medicine on either of the two tracks requires unequivocal evidence of excellence. Furthermore, regardless of the track to which the appointment is made, each faculty member in the School of Medicine is expected to make a positive contribution to the teaching mission of the School of Medicine. In addition, those faculty members who provide direct patient care are expected to do so in an exemplary manner. They are expected to employ current, state-of-the-art methods that are respected by patients and peers both within the University and in the professional community.

While all faculty members are responsible for their own career success, it is expected that their Chair, Division Chief, and/or another specifically designated senior faculty member will mentor them towards promotion.

I. Tenure Track

A. Criteria for Appointment, Reappointment, and Promotion of Tenure Track Faculty

Each faculty member in the tenure track is expected to demonstrate unequivocal evidence of scholarship. While all faculty members in the tenure track are expected to exhibit

scholarship, it is important to emphasize that this activity may include: the scholarship of discovery; the scholarship of integration; and the scholarship of dissemination.

Each faculty member is expected to exhibit excellence in one of three areas: research, clinical scholarship, and educational scholarship. Excellence in more than one area will be considered exceptional. Finally, promotion on the tenure track requires evidence of a substantial positive contribution to the teaching mission of the School of Medicine.

1. Criteria for Promotion to Associate Professor with Tenure

Preamble

Promotion of faculty members on the tenure track to associate professor with tenure in the School of Medicine requires unequivocal evidence of excellence in one of three areas: research, clinical scholarship, or educational scholarship. Specific criteria for faculty members being promoted based on excellence in research, clinical scholarship, or educational scholarship are outlined below. Every faculty member on the tenure track in the School of Medicine is expected to make a substantial positive contribution to the teaching mission of the School of Medicine. Additionally, those faculty members 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 a 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.

Teaching

Teaching is required of all tenure track faculty members and should constitute a component of every faculty member's total effort. School of Medicine policy requires an assessment of teaching as part of any recommendation for reappointment, promotion and/or conferral of tenure. The teaching contribution should be addressed in the reflective statement, teaching summary, and the Chair's letter of recommendation. The reflective statement should be a component of the candidate's *Curriculum Vitae* and should include a summary of the candidate's activities as an educator and a statement describing the candidate's specific area(s) of expertise and accomplishments. The Chair's letter must include a paragraph documenting the faculty member's teaching contributions and placing the candidate's contributions (both their quality and quantity) into the overall context of the Department's teaching responsibilities. Teaching activities include professional, graduate and postgraduate teaching, course or clerkship directorship, residency and fellowship directorship, and mentorship for professional, doctoral and post-doctoral students. As described below, a formal Teaching Portfolio is required for all faculty members being recommended for promotion on the basis of excellence in educational scholarship. Individual departments may require that a candidate for promotion and/or tenure document his or her specific teaching assignments and activities in a separate Teaching Portfolio. However, School of Medicine policy requires a formal Teaching Portfolio only for those faculty members whose recommendation for promotion is being based on educational scholarship.

Service

All faculty members are expected to demonstrate good citizenship through service activities for their department, the School of Medicine, or the University. The traditional scholarly community is typically thought to encompass a faculty member's discipline, department, and

school as well as the broader University. Faculty service activities also include interaction and engagement with communities outside the traditional scholarly community. These communities would include the local community in which the faculty member resides or works. Professional service contributions by a candidate shall be considered as part of any decision regarding promotion and tenure.

Examples of professional service include:

1. Peer review and curriculum committees
2. Participation in the committees of the faculty member's Department, School of Medicine, Health Care System, and/or the University
3. Important contributions as a faculty member in the operation, development, and improvement of the Department and/or School of Medicine
4. Serving on committees to develop clinical practice guidelines or to formulate healthcare policies
5. Providing service to the professional or lay community through education, consultation or other roles
6. Membership and active participation in leading national scientific societies of the candidate's field

The Chair's letter must include a paragraph documenting the faculty member's service contributions and placing the candidate's contributions (both their quality and quantity) into the overall context of the Department's service responsibilities and activities.

Criteria for Promotion Based on Excellence in Research, Clinical Scholarship, or Educational Scholarship

Research. For candidates being recommended for promotion for excellence in research, documentation of progressive academic productivity and independence in research is required. Specific criteria for faculty members being promoted to associate professor with tenure on the basis of excellence in research include:

1. Documentation from letters of reference that the candidate is an excellent researcher.
2. A record of a substantial number of original, peer-reviewed research papers in widely respected refereed journals, judged on the quality as well as the quantity of research publications, since the faculty member became an assistant professor. Typically 1–2 publications on average per year as first or senior author since the candidate became an assistant professor is expected, although consideration is also given to the type of research, the impact factor of the publications, and to faculty whose work is primarily part of team research. In this latter instance the candidate may not be the first or senior author on the publications but their contributions should be clearly described. Authorship of important review articles, chapters, books, and other forms of enduring scholarly work and communication are additional important indicators of research scholarship. The Chair's letter should clearly state the expectations for publication productivity within the candidate's department and discipline and whether the candidate meets these expectations. Additionally, if the candidate is significantly involved in interdisciplinary research activities, his or her exact role in such activities should be fully documented.

3. A record of external grant support as an independent researcher is also an important criterion for excellence in research. This record is generally evidenced by a history of at least one active investigator-initiated grant from a federal funding source or its equivalent on which the candidate is the principal investigator, but significant alternative funding sources and evidence of excellent potential for continued future funding are additional indicators. The chair's letter should address the candidate's funding record within the context of the amount of time devoted to research.
4. Evidence that the candidate is recognized at a national level for his/her professional contributions. This recognition may be evidenced in multiple ways, such as invitations to present research results at prestigious national conferences or symposia, election to office in national academic and/or professional societies, participation in NIH study sections or grant review panels, membership on the editorial boards of prominent journals or serving as a reviewer for major journals in the candidate's field, editorship of prominent journals, participation in scientific committees advisory to government or foundations, or national scientific awards.
5. Evidence that the faculty member will continue to be productive and an asset to the institution throughout his or her career.

Clinical Scholarship. Specific criteria for faculty members being promoted to associate professor with tenure on the basis of clinical scholarship include:

1. Documentation from letters of reference that the candidate is an excellent clinician.
2. A record of substantial clinical scholarship, judged on the quality as well as the quantity of the publications, since the faculty member became an assistant professor. Typically 1–2 peer-reviewed publications on average per year as first or senior author since the candidate became an assistant professor is expected, although consideration is also given to the type of research, the impact factor of the publications, and to faculty whose work is primarily part of team research. In this latter instance the candidate may not be the first or senior author on the publications but their contributions should be clearly described. Authorship of important review articles, chapters, books, and other forms of enduring scholarly work and communication are additional indicators of clinical scholarship. The Chair's letter should clearly state the expectations for publication productivity within the candidate's department and discipline and whether the candidate meets these expectations. Additionally, if the candidate is significantly involved in interdisciplinary research activities, his or her exact role in such activities should be fully documented.
3. Evidence that the candidate has an emerging national reputation for his/her clinical scholarship. This recognition may be evidenced in multiple ways, such as emerging national reputation and success in clinical trials or new drug discoveries, a record of external grant support, patient referrals from a multi-state or national area, participation in national boards and leadership groups within the candidate's field (e.g. board examiner, specialty boards, ACGME RRCs, site visitor, etc.), invitations to present at prestigious regional and national conferences or symposia, invited professorships at other academic institutions, participation in NIH study sections or grant review panels, membership on the editorial boards of prominent journals or serving as a reviewer for major journals in the candidate's field, participation in scientific committees advisory to government or foundations, and awards from professional organizations.

4. Evidence that the faculty member will continue to be productive and an asset to the institution throughout his or her career.

Educational Scholarship. Specific criteria for faculty members being promoted to associate professor with tenure on the basis of excellence in educational scholarship include:

1. Documentation from letters of reference that the candidate is an excellent educator.
2. A record of substantial educational scholarship, judged on the quality as well as the quantity of the publications, since the faculty member became an assistant professor. Typically 1-2 peer-reviewed publications per year on average as first or senior author since the candidate became an assistant professor is expected, although consideration is also given to the type of research, the impact factor of publications, and to faculty whose work is primarily part of team research. In this latter instance the candidate may not be the first or senior author on the publications but their contributions should be clearly described. Authorship of review articles, chapters, books, and other forms of enduring scholarly work and communication are additional important indicators of educational scholarship. Other important indicators would include publication of innovative or novel educational approaches, textbook authorship or editorship, electronic and on-line educational resource development, development of original and innovative educational programs, methods, or educational materials (for graduate students, post-graduates, medical students, residents and fellows, continuing education, outside professionals and the public), or attainment of grant support for educational programs or educational research. The Chair's letter should clearly state the expectations for publication productivity within the candidate's department and discipline and whether the candidate meets these expectations. Additionally, if the candidate is significantly involved in interdisciplinary research activities, his or her exact role in such activities should be fully documented.
3. A description of how the educational scholarship of the candidate has been applied to, and positively impacted his or her own teaching activities, or that of others, either here or at other institutions. A formal Teaching Portfolio is required for all faculty members being recommended for promotion on the basis of excellence in educational scholarship. The Teaching Portfolio must be included in the documentation submitted to the Dean's office. This portfolio must contain a reflective statement, detailed summary of the candidate's teaching activities, and a summary of qualitative and quantitative evaluations of the candidate's teaching activities collected from students, peers, and supervisors. Teaching quality can be documented via learner evaluations, supporting letters from current or former learners, and evidence of achievement of learners (e.g., post-docs who have become independent researchers.) Teaching quality may also be evidenced by teaching awards, and/or recognition as an outstanding academic role model or mentor for medical, allied health, graduate students, house staff, and fellows.
4. Evidence that the candidate has an emerging national reputation for his/her educational scholarship. This may be documented in multiple ways, such as participation in leading national educational societies and boards of the candidate's field, participation in regional or national boards and leadership

groups (e.g. SGEA, ACGME, LCME, NBME), invitations to present at prestigious regional and national conferences or symposia, invited professorships at other academic institutions, participation in grant review panels, membership on the editorial boards of prominent journals or serving as a reviewer for major journals in the candidate's field, participation in committees advisory to government or foundations and awards from professional organizations.

5. Evidence that the faculty member will continue to be productive and an asset to the institution throughout his or her career.

2. Criteria for Promotion to Full Professor in the UNC School of Medicine

Preamble

Promotion of faculty members on the tenure track to full professor in the School of Medicine requires unequivocal evidence of excellence in one of three areas: research, clinical scholarship, or educational scholarship. Specific criteria for faculty members being promoted based on excellence in research, clinical scholarship, or educational scholarship are outlined below. Every faculty member on the tenure track in the School of Medicine is expected to make a substantial positive contribution to the teaching mission of the School of Medicine. Additionally, those faculty members 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 a 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.

Teaching

Teaching is required of all tenure track faculty members and should constitute a component of every faculty member's total effort. School of Medicine policy requires an assessment of teaching as part of any recommendation for reappointment, promotion and/or conferral of tenure. The teaching contribution should be addressed in the reflective statement, teaching summary, and the Chair's letter of recommendation. The reflective statement should be a component of the candidate's *Curriculum Vitae* and should include a summary of the candidate's activities as an educator and a statement describing the candidate's specific area(s) of expertise and accomplishments. The Chair's letter must include a paragraph documenting the faculty member's teaching contributions and placing the candidate's contributions (both their quality and quantity) into the overall context of the Department's teaching responsibilities. Teaching activities include professional, graduate and postgraduate teaching, course or clerkship directorship, residency and fellowship directorship, and mentorship for professional, doctoral and post-doctoral students. As described below a formal Teaching Portfolio is required for all faculty members being recommended for promotion on the basis of excellence in educational scholarship.

Service

All faculty members are expected to demonstrate good citizenship through service activities for their department, the School of Medicine, or the University. The traditional scholarly community is typically thought to encompass a faculty member's discipline, department, and school as well as the broader University. Faculty service activities also include interaction

and engagement with communities outside the traditional scholarly community. These communities would include the local community in which the faculty member resides or works. Professional service contributions by a candidate shall be considered as part of any decision regarding promotion and tenure.

Examples of professional service include:

1. Peer review and curriculum committees
2. Participation in the committees of the faculty member's Department, School of Medicine, Health Care System, and/or the University
3. Important contributions as a faculty member in the operation, development, and improvement of the Department and/or School of Medicine
4. Serving on committees to develop clinical practice guidelines or to formulate healthcare policies
5. Providing service to the professional or lay community through education, consultation or other roles
6. Membership and active participation in leading national scientific societies of the candidate's field

The Chair's letter must include a paragraph documenting the faculty member's service contributions and placing the candidate's contributions (both their quality and quantity) into the overall context of the Department's service responsibilities and activities.

Criteria for Promotion Based on Excellence in Research, Clinical Scholarship, or Educational Scholarship

Research. Specific criteria for faculty members being promoted to full professor on the basis of excellence in research include:

1. Documentation from letters of reference that the candidate is an excellent researcher.
 - a. A record of a substantial number of original, peer-reviewed research papers in widely respected refereed journals, judged on quality as well as quantity of research publications, since the faculty member became an associate professor. Typically 1–2 publications on average per year as first or senior author since the candidate became an associate professor is expected, although consideration is also given to the type of research, the impact factor of the publications, and to faculty whose work is primarily part of team research. In this latter instance the candidate may not be the first or senior author on the publications but their contributions should be clearly described. Authorship of important review articles, chapters, books, and other forms of enduring scholarly work and communication are additional important indicators of research scholarship.
 - b. The Chair's letter should clearly state the expectations for publication productivity within the candidate's department and discipline and whether the candidate meets these expectations. Additionally, if the candidate is significantly involved in interdisciplinary research activities, his or her exact role in such activities should be fully documented.
2. A record of continued external grant support as an independent researcher is also an important criterion for excellence in research. This record is generally evidenced by a history of maintaining at least one active investigator-initiated grant from a federal

funding source or its equivalent on which the candidate is the principal investigator, but significant alternative funding sources and evidence of excellent potential for continued future funding are additional indicators. The chair's letter should address the candidate's funding record within the context of the amount of time devoted to research.

3. Evidence that the candidate is recognized at an international level for his/her professional contributions. This recognition may be evidenced in multiple ways, such as invitations to present research results at prestigious international conferences or symposia, election to office in national and international academic and/or professional societies, participation in NIH study sections or grant review panels, membership on the editorial boards of prominent journals, editorship of prominent journals, participation in scientific committees advisory to government or foundations, or national/international scientific awards.

Clinical Scholarship. Specific criteria for faculty members being promoted to full professor on the basis of clinical scholarship include:

- A. Documentation from letters of reference that the candidate is an excellent clinician.
 - a. A record of substantial clinical scholarship, judged on the quality as well as the quantity of the publications, since the faculty member became an associate professor. Typically 1–2 peer-reviewed publications on average per year as first or senior author since the candidate became an associate professor is expected, although consideration is also given to the type of research, the impact factor of the publications, and to faculty whose work is primarily part of team research. In this latter instance the candidate may not be the first or senior author on the publications but their contributions should be clearly described. Authorship of important review articles, chapters, books, and other forms of enduring scholarly work and communication are additional indicators of clinical scholarship. Additionally, if the candidate is significantly involved in interdisciplinary research activities, his or her exact role in such activities should be fully documented. The Chair's letter should clearly state the expectations for publication productivity within the candidate's department and discipline and whether the candidate meets these expectations. Additionally, if the candidate is significantly involved in interdisciplinary research activities, his or her exact role in such activities should be fully documented.
 - b. Evidence that the candidate is recognized at a national level for his/her clinical scholarship. This recognition may be evidenced in multiple ways, such as national reputation and success in clinical trials or new drug discoveries, a record of external grant support, patient referrals from a multi-state, national or international area, participation in national boards and leadership groups within the candidate's field (e.g. board examiner, specialty boards, ACGME RRCs, site visitor, etc.), invitations to present at prestigious national conferences or symposia, invited professorships at other academic institutions, participation in NIH study sections or grant review panels, membership on the editorial boards of prominent journals, editorship of prominent journals, participation in scientific committees advisory to government or foundations, and awards from professional organizations.

Educational Scholarship. Specific criteria for faculty members being promoted to full professor on the basis of excellence in educational scholarship include:

1. Documentation from letters of reference that the candidate is an excellent educator.
2. A record of substantial educational scholarship, judged on the quality as well as the quantity of the publications, since the faculty member became an associate professor. Typically 1-2 peer-reviewed publications per year on average as first or senior author since the candidate became an associate professor is expected, although consideration is also given to the type of research, the impact factor of publications, and to faculty whose work is primarily part of team research. In this latter instance the candidate may not be the first or senior author on the publication but their contributions should be clearly described. Authorship of review articles, chapters, books, and other forms of enduring scholarly work and communication are additional important indicators of educational scholarship. Other important indicators would include publication of innovative or novel educational approaches, textbook authorship or editorship, electronic and on-line educational resource development, development of original and innovative educational programs, methods, or educational materials (for graduate students, post-graduates, medical students, residents and fellows, continuing education, outside professionals and the public), or attainment of grant support for educational programs or educational research. The Chair's letter should clearly state the expectations for publication productivity within the candidate's department and discipline and whether the candidate meets these expectations. Additionally, if the candidate is significantly involved in interdisciplinary research activities, his or her exact role in such activities should be fully documented.
3. A description of how the educational scholarship of the candidate has been applied to, and positively impacted his or her own teaching activities, or that of others, either here or at other institutions. A formal Teaching Portfolio is required for all faculty members being recommended for promotion on the basis of excellence in educational scholarship. The Teaching Portfolio must be included in the documentation submitted to the Dean's office. This portfolio must contain a reflective statement, detailed summary of the candidate's teaching activities, and a summary of qualitative and quantitative evaluations of the candidate's teaching activities collected from students, peers, and supervisors. Teaching quality can be documented via learner evaluations, supporting letters from current or former learners, and evidence of achievement of learners (e.g., post-docs who have become independent researchers.) Teaching quality may also be evidenced by teaching awards, and/or recognition as an outstanding academic role model or mentor for medical, allied health, graduate students, house staff and fellows.
4. Evidence that the candidate is recognized at a national level for his/her educational scholarship. This may be documented in multiple ways, such as membership and participation in leading national or international educational societies and boards of the candidate's field, participation in national boards and leadership groups (e.g. ACGME, LCME, NBME), invitations to present at prestigious national conferences or symposia, invited professorships at other academic institutions, participation in grant review panels, membership on the editorial boards of prominent journals, editorship of prominent journals, and awards from professional organizations.

B. Timing of Appointments, Reappointments for Tenure Track

In the School of Medicine, there are four ranks in the tenure track: Instructor, Assistant Professor, Associate Professor, and Professor. Each rank in the tenure track beyond that of Instructor has its own specified term length, builds on the experience of the prior rank, and progresses toward conferral of tenure, which normally occurs when an individual is promoted from Assistant Professor to Associate Professor. Prior time in rank at other institutions may be counted in the timeline for appointment and promotion recommendations at UNC, although this is not an absolute requirement.

Because of illness, requirements of childbirth or childcare, or other compelling circumstances, a faculty member holding a probationary appointment at the rank of Assistant or Associate Professor may request a written *memorandum of amendment* to extend the term of the current appointment (not to exceed 12 months) and thereby the maximum probationary period with no resulting change in normal employment obligations. If possible, this type of request should be initiated not later than 24 months before the end of the term to which it is to apply and must be initiated before the process for evaluating the faculty member for reappointment has begun. The Chair, Dean, and Chancellor must approve this request.

Instructor

The rank of Instructor in the tenure track may be considered for initial appointments. For the purposes of this document, there is no substantive difference between an Instructor in the tenure track or the fixed term track.

Assistant Professor

An Assistant Professor normally serves two probationary terms. The first of these is 4 years in duration, and the second is (technically) 3 years. However, in most cases, the promotion from Assistant to Associate Professor will become effective at the beginning of the 7th year. 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 both final approval of reappointment to the second probationary term and of promotion to Associate Professor after the second probationary term must occur a full year before the end of the preceding term. Therefore, the review for reappointment to a second probationary term starts at the beginning of the 3rd year of the initial probationary term, and review for promotion to Associate Professor starts at the beginning of the 2nd year of the second probationary term. These reviews are initiated by the Department Chair, in consultation with the assembled Full Professors of the Department. It is important to emphasize that a promotion from Assistant Professor to Associate Professor that would occur at the beginning of the 6th year in rank (1 year early) will be considered accelerated; at the beginning of the 5th year (2 years early), extraordinary.

There are two options when a faculty member is not promoted to Associate Professor after his or her 6th or 7th year as an Assistant Professor. 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. It is for this reason that the review and outcome concerning the promotion must be completed a full year before the end of the probationary term.

Under unusual circumstances, it is possible to reappoint an individual to a third term as an Assistant Professor with tenure. Anyone considering such a possibility must contact the Executive Associate Dean for Faculty Affairs and the School of Medicine Human Resources Office at the beginning of the second year of the second probationary term as Assistant

Professor. Review of a tenured Assistant Professor's performance will be conducted no less often than every five years according to guidelines for post-tenure review defined by the UNC-Chapel Hill Board of Trustees and by the UNC Board of Governors, and by the School of Medicine Post-Tenure Review Policy.

Associate Professor

Probationary Associate Professor. If a faculty member is initially given a 5-year appointment at the rank of Associate Professor without tenure, his or her review for reappointment as Associate Professor with tenure should be initiated at the beginning of the 4th year of the probationary term. The reappointment as Associate Professor with permanent tenure, which must be approved by the UNC Board of Trustees, may be effective as early as the beginning of the 5th year and no later than the beginning of the 6th year depending on the timing of all levels of review. Deferring review is not an option for a probationary Associate Professor. When a faculty member is given an initial appointment at the rank of Associate Professor without tenure and is subsequently reappointed as Associate Professor with permanent tenure, he or she must be reviewed at the beginning of the 10th year as Associate Professor (i.e., at the beginning of the 5th year after reappointment with tenure) and then not less frequently than every 5th year thereafter to determine his/her qualifications for promotion to the rank of Full Professor.

Tenured Associate Professor. The review of an Associate Professor with tenure is initiated at the beginning of the 5th year in rank as an Associate Professor. This review is initiated by the Department Chair, in consultation with the assembled Full Professors of the Department. This review, which takes place during the 5th year may, but need not include consultation with reviewers external to the University. However, letters from at least 4 external reviewers must accompany any recommendation for promotion.

The outcome of the 5th year review shall be one of the following: 1) a decision to recommend promotion to Full Professor; or 2) a decision not to promote, but to review again at a period not to exceed 5 years from the date of the initial 5 year review and no less often than every five years thereafter. As stated in the guidelines for post-tenure review defined by the UNC-Chapel Hill Board of Trustees, by the UNC Board of Governors, and by the School of Medicine Post-Tenure Review Policy, the performance of all tenured faculty members must be reviewed every five years.

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 Professorship. 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 less than 5 years in rank as an Associate Professor.

Professor

After a faculty member has been promoted to the rank of Full Professor, his or her performance is reviewed every 5 years according to guidelines for post-tenure review defined by the UNC-Chapel Hill Board of Trustees and by the UNC Board of Governors, and by the School of Medicine Post-Tenure Review Policy. However, in the case of Full Professors who also hold senior administrative appointments in the School of Medicine (i.e., Department Chair, Center Director, Executive Associate Dean, etc.), Post-Tenure Review is conducted as a part of their administrative review that occurs every five years from the date of the administrative appointment.

Post-Tenure Review

The UNC-Chapel Hill Board of Trustees and the UNC Board of Governors have defined Guidelines for the Post-Tenure Review of all senior faculty members. Therefore, each tenured faculty member in the School of Medicine will undergo a rigorous review once every 5 years. With the exception of those Full Professors described in the paragraph above who hold senior administrative appointments, these Post-Tenure Reviews will be conducted under the School of Medicine policy for Post-Tenure Review.

C. Process for Appointment, Reappointment, and Promotion of Tenure Track Faculty

The Department Chair initiates all recommendations for appointment, reappointment, and promotion. The assembled Full Professors in the Department must be consulted regarding the recommendation. In the case of a faculty member being recruited who specializes in a discipline that is not well represented among the established medical school departments, the Chair's letter recommending the initial appointment must assure the Dean that a thorough peer review has been conducted. When a joint appointment is being proposed, the joint department is consulted, and encouraged to concur in the action.

The Chair must make available to each faculty member written copies of the University, the School, and the Departmental criteria and process for the promotion of tenure track faculty. These materials must be presented to each faculty member before his or her initial employment, and at the beginning of the year in which each subsequent review is scheduled to take place. A record of these discussions must be maintained in the departmental personnel file where a faculty member's primary appointment is held.

After consultation with the assembled Full Professors, the Chair forwards the recommendation to the Dean (via the School of Medicine Human Resources Office). The Dean then sends the letter of recommendation, along with all supporting documentation, to the appropriate Appointment and Promotion Committee for its review and recommendation.

Before final approval, each appointment, reappointment, and/or promotion in the tenure track is reviewed at several levels. The number of committees that review the packet depends upon whether the action being proposed is for a probationary appointment, to confer tenure, or to promote an individual who has already been granted permanent tenure. In each case, it is essential that the process be initiated with sufficient lead-time such that the process will be completed before the effective date that is required for the specific action under consideration.

All appointments, reappointments, and promotions that confer permanent tenure, and promotions subsequent to conferral of tenure, are reviewed by one of the School of Medicine's Appointments and Promotions Committees and by the Dean's Advisory Committee (Department Chairs in Executive Session). Probationary appointments that occur at the ranks of Instructor, Assistant Professor, or Associate Professor are not reviewed by either of these committees. Final approval for all appointments, reappointments, and/or promotions in the tenure track (whether probationary or not) resides with the UNC Board of Trustees, subsequent to further committee review at the University level.

Composition of the School of Medicine Promotion Committees

The School of Medicine has two tenure track committees. One considers appointments, reappointments, and promotions to the rank of Associate Professor and the other considers

appointments and promotions to the rank of Full Professor. Both of these committees serve in an advisory capacity to the Dean.

The Associate Professor Committee consists of nine full-time (100% FTE) tenured faculty members at the rank of either Associate or Full Professor. The Full Professor Committee consists of nine full-time (100% FTE) tenured faculty members at the rank of Full Professor. Each committee includes individuals with scientific, clinical, and teaching expertise. The Dean selects all of the committee members from among the basic science and clinical departments. Each individual member is appointed for a 3-year term. In addition, each year the Dean appoints a new Chair for the two committees, selecting the Chair from among the experienced members on each of the two APT committees.

Committee Process

The Committee for Review of Appointments and Promotions to Associate Professor (referred to as the Associate Professor APT Committee) reviews the following recommendations: initial appointments of tenured Associate Professors, promotions of Assistant Professors to Associate Professors conferring tenure, and reappointments of probationary Associate Professors to the rank of Associate Professor with tenure. This committee also reviews any proposal that recommends conferral of tenure at the Assistant Professor level.

The Committee for Review of Appointments and Promotions to Full Professor (referred to as the Full Professor APT Committee) reviews the following recommendations: initial appointments at the rank of Full Professor and all promotions from Associate Professor to Full Professor.

For each review, a 3-member subcommittee is selected. The subcommittees are asked to serve as fact-finding teams for the full committee. The primary appointment of each subcommittee member must be in a department other than that of the specific faculty member under review. The Subcommittee Chair and one of its other members should be from the same type of department as the faculty member under review (i.e., basic science department or clinical department). The third member of the subcommittee should be from a department of the alternate type.

The documentation that is reviewed by each of the School of Medicine's APT Committees consists of:

1. **A letter of recommendation from the Department Chair to the Dean.** This letter should include: the one specific area of excellence upon which the reappointment or promotion is being based (i.e., research, clinical scholarship, educational scholarship); the actual vote of the full professors (i.e., in favor of, opposed to, abstain); the specific contributions made by the individual to the teaching mission 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.
2. **Four official letters of recommendation from external reviewers.** The four external reviewers who prepare and submit these letters are expected to be individuals who are familiar with the faculty member under review through their academic productivity and scholarship. By contrast, none of these four external reviewers should have a current or a prior academic and/or professional affiliation with the faculty member who is being reviewed. Two of these letters should come from individuals who have been identified by the faculty member under review, and two letters should come from individuals selected

by the faculty member's Chair and/or mentor. Each of these four official letters of recommendation must be specifically identified in the promotion packet. In addition, the promotion packet must indicate which of these individuals the candidate identified and which had been selected by the Chair.

3. **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 four official letters described in paragraph 2 immediately 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. By contrast, it is against University policy to submit a selected subset of the letters received on behalf of a given individual.
4. **An updated *Curriculum Vitae*.** The *Curriculum Vitae* must be as current as possible. It should be prepared in the standard format developed by the University and include a Reflective Statement (see #5 below)
5. **A Reflective Statement.** This document, prepared by the candidate, should include: a summary of his/her area(s) of expertise, accomplishments, and vision for the future, particularly as related to his/her scholarly activities, be they clinical, educational, and/or research. In addition, it must contain a summary of the candidate's various activities as an educator, and it should reflect upon his/her overall teaching philosophy.
6. **Teaching Summary.** This document summarizes the candidate's teaching skills. This can be a summary of evaluations from learners and trainees, an assessment of teaching from a colleague or supervisor, or other evaluations that are separate from the chair's letter.
7. **Teaching Portfolio.** Formal Teaching Portfolios are not required to be included with the documentation that is being submitted on behalf of probationary faculty members. The sole exception in this regard relates to an individual whose recommendation for promotion and/or tenure is being based upon educational scholarship. In this instance, a formal Teaching Portfolio must be prepared and submitted along with the other materials described in this section.

The subcommittee reviews the documentation contained in the packet that has been submitted; seeks verification or any new information that may be deemed necessary; and then reports its findings to the full membership of the appropriate APT Committee. This report serves as the basis for the recommendation from the full Committee to the Dean. A copy of the material is kept on file in the School of Medicine Human Resources Office.

The Department Chairs receive and review the documents supporting each appointment, reappointment, or promotion recommendation. These documents include the letter of recommendation from the Department Chair to the Dean, all submitted letters of support, and a copy of the faculty member's current *Curriculum Vitae*. The materials also include the report from the APT Committee that reviewed the recommendation. The Dean's Advisory Committee (Department Chairs in Executive Session) vote by electronic ballot to approve or disapprove each candidate. It is important to emphasize that the Dean's Advisory Committee (Department Chairs in Executive Session) does have the authority to override both affirmative and negative recommendations from either of the APT Committees. Ultimately, however, the final decision rests with the Dean who has authority to override recommendations of the APT Committees and/or the Dean's Advisory Committee

(Department Chairs in Executive Session). Thus, if the Dean's final decision is to approve the promotion, the entire packet is forwarded to the University for its further review and concurrence. Following approval by the University, the Chancellor sends a formal appointment letter to the faculty member.

D. Negative Decisions for Faculty in the Tenure Track

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

1. To reappoint an Instructor at the same rank
2. To promote an Instructor to Assistant Professor
3. To reappoint an Assistant Professor for a second probationary term
4. To reappoint an Assistant Professor at the same rank with tenure (rare)
5. To promote an Assistant Professor to Associate Professor
6. To promote an Assistant Professor with tenure to Associate Professor when made in the course of subsequent mandatory reviews
7. To reappoint an Associate Professor at the same rank with tenure
8. To promote an Associate Professor without tenure to Professor when made in the course of subsequent mandatory reviews
9. To promote an Associate Professor with tenure to Professor when made in the course of subsequent mandatory reviews

All negative departmental decisions concerning promotion must be fully explained in a letter from the Chair to the faculty member. The Chair also must fully explain a negative departmental decision concerning promotion in a letter that is submitted to the Dean (via the School of Medicine Human Resources Office). This Chair's submission to the Dean should also include an updated *Curriculum Vitae* for the specific faculty member.

The specific faculty member in question may appeal a negative decision. The Executive Associate Dean for Faculty Affairs selects an external reviewer, typically a Department Chair from another department, for this role. The faculty member is given the opportunity to submit any written materials to the external reviewer. In conducting the review of a departmental decision not to reappoint or promote, the external reviewer is authorized to consider both the merits of the decision itself and the procedures that were employed in reaching the decision. The external reviewer may recommend to the Dean that the appointing department reconsider the decision not to reappoint or promote under such instructions as may be appropriate. Negative decisions made at the departmental level are provided to the Dean's Advisory Committee (Department Chairs in Executive Session) for informational purposes only.

At the School level, the types of reappointment or promotion subject to review include those indicated in Section D above (d through i only). Negative decisions may occur at the level of the APT Committees, the Dean's Advisory Committee (Department Chairs in Executive Session), the Dean, or the Dean's designee.

The APT Committees may recommend approval or denial of a proposed appointment, reappointment, or promotion. Additionally, the committee may return the recommended action to the department, either to improve it within the existing time constraints or to allow more time in rank to accrue before the proposal is resubmitted. If the APT Committees return the proposal to the department for either of these reasons, the Chair of the specific APT Committee submits a letter of explanation to the Department Chair. In the case of a

recommendation against promotion by an APT Committee, the Chair has two options: 1) to follow the recommendation of the APT Committee; or 2) to bring the proposal forward to the Dean and Dean's Advisory Committee (Department Chairs in Executive Session) as submitted by the department.

A negative decision by the Dean is immediately communicated to the Department Chair, who is given a reasonable opportunity to provide further information. In addition, the Chair must immediately notify the individual faculty member of the decision. The Dean provides the Executive Vice Chancellor and Provost with appropriate documentation and justification of the decision. This documentation includes: a copy of the letter from the Chair to the Dean; a copy of the letter from the Chair to the faculty member; and a copy of the faculty member's current *Curriculum Vitae*. In the case of a negative departmental decision, letters from external reviewers are not required to accompany the materials submitted from the Chair to the Dean and from the Dean to the Executive Vice Chancellor and Provost.

The Trustee Policies and Regulations Governing Academic Tenure in the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill describe the process of review that is provided for a faculty member who has been notified of a decision not to be reappointed upon expiration of a probationary term.

II. Fixed Term Track

Fixed term faculty members are absolutely vital to the success of the UNC School of Medicine and most of these individuals serve in roles that are critical to its various missions.

Fixed term faculty members whose focus is clinical activity include the range of individuals in the School of Medicine whose roles and contributions are vital to the School's multiple missions, but whose activities and accomplishments are incompatible with the criteria that the University requires of its tenure track faculty. It is especially important to emphasize that the teaching role of many clinical fixed term faculty members is essential to the academic mission of the School of Medicine. However, in many cases, these teaching activities take place at the bedside and more local "classrooms" rather than in national or international fora.

Fixed term faculty members whose focus is research include individuals who make major contributions to the research mission of the School of Medicine. In some cases, these individuals go on to obtain their own, independent, peer-reviewed grant support, and may thus become logical candidates for tenure track positions if/when such positions become available. In other cases, however, they remain as permanent members of the fixed term track, often filling important institutional roles either by directing or by serving as key members of institution-wide core laboratory facilities.

As with faculty members on the tenure track, fixed term faculty are also expected to make positive contributions to the teaching mission of the School of Medicine.

Beginning in 2005, recommendations for promotion of fixed term faculty at 50% effort or more include review not only at the departmental level but also at the School level. It is important to emphasize that decisions regarding the promotion of fixed term faculty members are separate from decisions regarding the employment of such individuals. Decisions 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. It is important to understand, however, that the University considers the change in rank of a fixed term faculty member to be an initial appointment at a higher rank rather than as a promotion.

Except for the official appointment letters and personnel action forms that must be completed to process appointments, reappointments, and promotions, the titles of fixed term faculty members do not have any adjective/qualifier associated with them. Thus, these individuals are referred to as “*Instructor*,” “*Assistant Professor*,” “*Associate Professor*,” or “*Professor*.” As has been customary, part-time faculty members (i.e., less than 50% total paid effort) as well as community-based clinicians and others who serve on a voluntary basis will continue to use such modifiers as: “*Clinical*,” “*Research*,” or “*Adjunct*” along with their academic rank title (e.g., Clinical Assistant Professor, Adjunct Professor, etc.).

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 Medicine 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.

A. Criteria for Promotion of Fixed Term Faculty

The promotion of a fixed term faculty member requires demonstrated evidence of both excellence and productivity in one of the following five areas: clinical activity; teaching, research, administration, community professional service.

Specific criteria for these five areas are outlined below. The School of Medicine does not mandate that fixed term faculty achieve national reputations in their given area(s), nor does the School insist that they demonstrate unequivocal evidence of scholarly productivity (e.g., publication of scholarly articles and chapters). However, it is important to emphasize that these are the School of Medicine criteria for the promotion of fixed term track faculty members, and as such, represent minimum standards. Individual departments may establish more stringent criteria for promotion in the fixed term track (e.g., requiring evidence of scholarship, etc.), provided that these criteria are explicitly documented and that they are made known to all faculty members at the time of their initial appointment. In addition, each department has the option of setting its own process for the promotion of its fixed term faculty. However, all such processes must fit within the framework of the School of Medicine Guidelines for Appointment and Promotion as is summarized in this document.

It is important to emphasize that departments may allow promotion on the basis of excellence in administration only in the fixed term track. Promotion recommendations in the fixed term track may also be based on excellence in community professional service (e.g., providing care for indigent patients, participating in local charities, etc.). In such instances, candidates must document that their activities exceed what most faculty members do in their routine professional capacity.

Additionally, those faculty members 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 a 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.

Teaching

Teaching is considered to be an important activity of the School of Medicine, and all candidates for promotion in the fixed term track must demonstrate positive contributions to this mission. School of Medicine policy requires an assessment of teaching as part of any recommendation for reappointment or promotion. The teaching contribution should be addressed in the reflective statement, teaching summary, and the Chair's letter of recommendation. The reflective statement should be a component of the candidate's *Curriculum Vitae* and should include a summary of the candidate's activities as an educator and a statement describing the candidate's specific area(s) of expertise and accomplishments. The Chair's letter must include a paragraph documenting the faculty member's teaching contributions and placing the candidate's contributions (both their quality and quantity) into the overall context of the Department's teaching responsibilities. Teaching activities include professional, graduate and postgraduate teaching, course or clerkship directorship, residency and fellowship directorship, and mentorship for professional, doctoral and post-doctoral students. As described below, a formal Teaching Portfolio is required for all faculty members being recommended for promotion on the basis of excellence in teaching.

Teaching Portfolio

A formal Teaching Portfolio is required for all faculty members being recommended for promotion on the basis of excellence in teaching. The Teaching Portfolio must be included in the documentation submitted to the Dean's office. This portfolio must contain a reflective statement, detailed summary of the candidate's teaching activities, and a summary of qualitative and quantitative evaluations of the candidate's teaching activities collected from students, peers and supervisors. Teaching quality can be documented via learner evaluations, supporting letters from current or former learners, and evidence of achievement of learners (e.g., post-docs who have become independent researchers) Teaching quality may also be evidenced by teaching awards, and/or recognition as an outstanding academic role model or mentor for medical, allied health, graduate students, house staff and fellows.

Service

All faculty members are expected to demonstrate good citizenship through service activities for their department, the School of Medicine, or the University. The traditional scholarly community is typically thought to encompass a faculty member's discipline, department and school as well as the broader University. Faculty service activities also include interaction and engagement with communities outside the traditional scholarly community. These communities would include the local community in which the faculty member resides or works. Professional service contributions by a candidate shall be considered as part of any decision regarding reappointment and promotion.

Examples of professional service include:

1. Peer review and curriculum committees
2. Participation in the committees of the faculty member's Department, School of Medicine, Health Care System, and/or the University.
3. Important contributions as a faculty member in the operation, development, and improvement of the Department and/or School of Medicine.
4. Serving on committees to develop clinical practice guidelines or to formulate healthcare policies

5. Providing service to the professional or lay community through education, consultation or other roles
6. Membership and active participation in leading national scientific societies of the candidate's field

The Chair's letter must include a paragraph documenting the faculty member's service contributions and placing the candidate's contributions (both their quality and quantity) into the overall context of the Department's service responsibilities and activities.

1. Criteria for Promotion to Associate Professor on the fixed term track

Clinical Activity

1. Documentation of substantial clinical activity and productivity.
2. Evidence of excellence in outcomes of clinical activity, including peer review of clinical skills.
3. Excellent local reputation as a clinician documented in letters of reference external to the department.
4. A record of one or more of the following:
 - a. Innovation in clinical activity
 - b. Scholarship related to clinical activity
 - c. Excellent teaching of clinical activity
 - d. Funding for support of clinical programs
 - e. Leadership in development of clinical programs
 - f. Invited presentations at local or regional meetings

Teaching

1. Documentation of substantial teaching activity and productivity.
2. Evidence of superior effectiveness as a teacher, as judged by learners and peers and/or evidence of achievements of learners (scores, awards, projects, publications). This evidence should be included in the Teaching Portfolio.
3. Excellent local reputation as an educator documented in letters of reference external to the department.
4. A record of one or more of the following:
 - a. Innovation in education
 - b. Scholarship of teaching
 - c. External grant support
 - d. Leadership role in the development of teaching programs
 - e. Invited presentations at local or regional national meetings

Research

1. Documentation of substantial research activity and productivity.
2. Excellent local reputation as a researcher documented in letters of reference external to the department.
3. A record of one or more of the following:
 - a. Scholarship related to primary research area.
 - b. Successful operation of a core/service facility
 - c. External funding for research program
 - d. A key role in facilitating research activity of a department or a center
 - e. Invited presentations at local or regional research meetings

Administration

1. Documentation of substantial administrative activity and productivity.
2. Excellent local reputation as an administrator documented in letters of reference external to the department.
3. A record of one or more of the following:
 - a. Novel and/or innovative program development
 - b. Scholarly contributions to the administrative discipline
 - c. A leadership role in a department or a center
 - d. Invited presentations at local or regional research meetings

Community Professional Service

1. Documentation that the candidate has had significant interaction and positive engagement with communities outside the traditional scholarly community.
2. Documentation of community professional service that makes a substantial contribution to the health of the community over and above what most faculty do in their professional capacity.
3. An excellent local reputation for community professional service documented in letters of reference external to the department.
4. A record of one or more of the following:
 - a. Novel and/or innovative service program development and implementation
 - b. Acquisition of external funding in support of service programs
 - c. Scholarship related to community professional service
 - d. Invited presentations at local or regional research meetings

2. Criteria for Promotion to Full Professor on the fixed term track

Clinical Activity

1. Documentation of substantial clinical activity and productivity.
2. Evidence of sustained excellence in outcomes of clinical activity, including peer review of clinical skills.
3. Excellent regional or truly exceptional local reputation as a clinician documented in letters of reference external to the department.
4. A sustained record of one or more of the following:
 - a. Innovation in clinical activity
 - b. Scholarship related to primary clinical area
 - c. Excellent teaching of clinical activity
 - d. Funding for support of clinical programs
 - e. Major leadership role in development of clinical programs
 - f. Invited presentations at regional or national meetings

Teaching

1. Documentation of substantial teaching activity and productivity.
2. Evidence of superior effectiveness as a teacher, as judged by learners and peers and/or evidence of achievements of learners (scores, awards, projects, publications) should also be provided.
3. Excellent regional or truly exceptional local reputation as an educator documented in letters of reference external to the department.

4. A sustained record of one or more of the following:
 - a. Innovation in education
 - b. Major leadership role in the development of educational programs
 - c. Invited presentations at regional or national meetings
 - d. Scholarship of teaching
 - e. External grant support

Research

1. Documentation of substantial research activity and productivity.
2. Excellent regional or truly exceptional local reputation as a researcher documented in letters of reference external to the departmental.
3. A sustained record of one or more of the following:
 - a. Scholarship related to primary research area
 - b. Successful operation of a core/service facility
 - c. External funding in support of research program
 - d. A major leadership role in facilitating research activity of a department or a center
 - e. Invited presentations at regional or national research meetings

Administration

1. Documentation of substantial administrative activity and productivity.
2. Excellent regional or truly exceptional local reputation as an administrator documented in letters of reference external to the department.
3. A sustained record of one or more of the following:
 - a. Evidence of novel and/or innovative program development and implementation
 - b. Evidence of a major leadership role in a department or a center
 - c. Scholarship related to primary administrative area
 - d. Invited presentations at regional or national meetings

Community Professional Service

1. Documentation that the candidate has had significant interaction and positive engagement with communities outside the traditional scholarly community.
2. Documentation of community professional service that makes a substantial contribution to the health of the community over and above what most faculty do in their professional capacity.
3. An excellent regional or truly exceptional local reputation for community professional service documented in letters of reference external to the department.
4. A sustained record of one or more of the following:
 - a. Community professional service that makes a substantial contribution to the health of the community over and above the individual's research, teaching, or clinical activity
 - b. Evidence of novel and/or innovative service program development and implementation
 - c. Acquisition of external funding in support of service programs
 - d. Scholarship related to community professional service
 - e. Invited presentations about community professional service at regional or national meetings

B. Timing of Promotion Reviews for Fixed Term Faculty

The timeline for promotion review within the fixed term track is similar to that described for tenure track faculty with one exception: 1-year advance notice of reappointment or promotion is never required for faculty members in the fixed term track. However, fixed term appointments range from one to five years in duration. Departments set their own timelines for periodic review of fixed term faculty for reappointment and promotion that may differ from the timeline for tenure track faculty. It is only in the case of consideration for promotion to the rank of Associate Professor or Full Professor that the recommendation comes to the level of the School of Medicine for further review.

Assistant Professors typically are considered for promotion to Associate Professor at the beginning of the 7th year as Assistant Professor. Associate Professors generally are considered for promotion to Full Professor at the beginning of the 5th year as Associate Professor and are reviewed not less frequently than every 5 years thereafter. As with the tenure track, truly outstanding individuals may be considered for early promotion. In addition, while prior time in rank at UNC or at outside institutions may be considered, this is not required in the timeline for appointment and promotion recommendations.

It should be emphasized that the rank of Associate Professor is an acceptable and honorable attainment and is not considered an inevitable step to Full Professorship. As in the tenure track, fixed term Full Professors are reviewed every 5 years. However, these Full Professors reviews take place only at the departmental level.

C. Process for Promotion of Fixed Term Faculty

The review process for promotion of fixed term faculty runs, as much as possible, in parallel with the process for tenure track faculty. As with tenure track faculty, individual faculty members are primarily responsible for their own career development. It is expected that the Chair, a division chief, a center director, or a designated faculty mentor will provide the guidance and mentoring that is necessary for the individual faculty member.

The Chair must make available to each faculty member written copies of the University, School, and departmental criteria and process for promotion of fixed term faculty. These materials will be presented to faculty members before their initial employment, and at the beginning of the years in which subsequent reviews are scheduled. A record of these discussions must be maintained in the personnel file of the individual faculty member in the department where his or her primary faculty rank is held.

The Department Chair or the Chair's designee initiates all recommendations for promotion of fixed term faculty. Where a joint appointment exists, the joint department is consulted and invited to concur in the action. Departments may define a role for a departmental promotion committee. Departmental review will include both quantitative and qualitative data. Quantitative data could include such information as: number of annual outpatient visits; service statistics for inpatient units; numbers of publications; numbers of lectures, seminars, and/or tutorials; number of service functions (e.g. assays or assessments) completed; etc. Qualitative data include such information as: impact of publications; external evaluations of publications; ratings of teaching or training activities when compared with departmental norms; peer evaluation of clinical performance; etc. An analysis of the productivity of the candidate will always be a major component in these reviews. In addition, letters from peers of the reviewee, which may be from within or outside the institution, will be critically important to this process.

After consultation with the assembled Full Professors, whose recommendation is advisory to the Chair, the Chair forwards his/her recommendation to the Dean (via the School of Medicine Human Resources Office). When considering the promotion of fixed term faculty members, the assembled Full Professors must include both tenure track and fixed term faculty members at the rank of Full Professor. The Dean then sends the letter of recommendation, with supporting documentation, to the Fixed Term Promotions Committee for their review and recommendation.

Composition of Committee

The Fixed Term Promotions Committee considers recommendations for promotion of fixed term faculty to both Associate Professor and Full Professor. It consists of twelve full-time (100% FTE) faculty, including individuals with scientific, clinical and teaching expertise, elected from among the basic science and clinical departments. All full-time (100% FTE) faculty members of the School of Medicine (both tenure track and fixed term) at the rank of Associate Professor or higher are eligible to serve. Associate Professors who serve on this committee may neither review nor vote on fixed term faculty promotion recommendations to the level of Full Professor. Therefore, at least half of the members of the Committee must be Full Professors. At least half of the members will also be fixed term faculty in order to assure balanced representation. Each member will have a term of three years. In addition, each year the Dean appoints a new Chair from among the experienced members on the committee.

Committee Process

The Fixed Term Promotions Committee reviews the information provided by the Department Chair and seeks verification or requests any new information that is deemed necessary. These materials are used to establish the Committee's recommendation to the Dean which is based on the promotion criteria for the School of Medicine. All of the findings are kept on file in the Human Resources Office of the School of Medicine.

The documentation that is reviewed by the Fixed Term Promotions Committee consists of the following:

1. **A letter of recommendation from the Department Chair to the Dean.** This letter should include: the specific area of excellence upon which the promotion is being based; the current rank and faculty title modifier of "Research" or "Clinical" (e.g., Clinical Associate Professor); the rank and modifier of the proposed position; the actual vote of the full professors (i.e., in favor of, opposed to, abstain); and a paragraph documenting the faculty member's teaching contributions, putting these contributions (both their quality and quantity) into the overall context of the Department as a whole; 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.
2. **A minimum of two letters of recommendation.** Because fixed term faculty members are not required to have a national reputation, these letters can be requested from either internal or external reviewers. In addition, 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.

3. **An updated *Curriculum Vitae*.** The *Curriculum Vitae* must be as current as possible. It should be prepared in the standard format developed by the University.
4. **A Reflective Statement.** This document, which is to be prepared by the candidate, should include: a summary of his/her area(s) of expertise, accomplishments, and vision for the future. In addition, it should review in some detail the candidate's various activities as an educator and it should reflect upon his/her teaching philosophy.
5. **Teaching Summary.** This document summarizes the candidate's teaching skills. This can be a summary of evaluations from learners and trainees, an assessment of teaching from a colleague or supervisor, or other evaluations that are separate from the chair's letter.
6. **Teaching Portfolio.** Formal Teaching Portfolios are no longer required to be included with the documentation that is being submitted on behalf of faculty members. The sole exception in this regard relates to an individual whose recommendation for promotion and/or tenure is being based upon excellence in teaching. In this instance, a formal Teaching Portfolio should be prepared and submitted along with the other materials described in this section.

The Dean (via the School of Medicine Human Resources Office) provides all of this documentation to the School's Fixed Term Promotions Committee for their review and recommendation.

The Department Chairs receive and review the documents supporting the promotion recommendation for each fixed term faculty member. These documents include the recommendation letter from the Department Chair to the Dean, all submitted letters of recommendation, and a copy of the faculty member's current *Curriculum Vitae*. The materials also include the report from the Fixed Term Promotions Committee. The Dean's Advisory Committee (Department Chairs in Executive Session) vote by electronic ballot to approve or disapprove each candidate. Following this vote, if the Dean's final decision is approval of the promotion recommendation, the School of Medicine Human Resources Office reviews the appropriate paperwork for each promotion and then transmits it to the Office of the Executive Vice Chancellor and Provost. The promotion becomes effective at the earliest appropriate date following completion of the review by the Dean's Advisory Committee (Department Chairs in Executive Session). After University approval, the Provost sends the faculty member a formal appointment letter.

D. Negative Decisions for Fixed Term Faculty

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 promotion are subject to review:

1. To promote an Instructor to Assistant Professor
2. To promote an Assistant Professor to Associate Professor
3. To promote an Associate Professor to Professor

In the case of a decision not to promote by the assembled Full Professors in the department, the Chair informs the faculty member and the Dean (via the School of

Medicine Human Resources Office). A decision not to promote may be appealed to the Dean or his/her designee. The faculty member in question is given a reasonable opportunity to submit any written materials to an external reviewer. The external reviewer is a Department Chair from another department who has been selected for this role by the Executive Associate Dean for Faculty Affairs. In conducting the review, the Dean or his/her designee shall be free to 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 promote under such instructions as the group may find appropriate. This policy 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 Dean's Advisory Committee (Department Chairs in Executive Session) has the authority to override both affirmative and negative recommendations from the Fixed Term Promotions Committee. However, the ultimate decision rests with the Dean, who has the authority to override recommendations from both the Fixed Term Promotions Committee and the Advisory Committee.

In the case of a recommendation against promotion by the Fixed Term Promotions Committee, the Chair has two options: 1) to follow the recommendation of the Fixed Term Promotions Committee; or 2) to bring the proposal forward to the Dean and Dean's Advisory Committee (Department Chairs in Executive Session) as submitted by the department.

A decision by the Dean not to promote is immediately communicated to the Department Chair who is given a reasonable opportunity to provide further information. In addition, the Chair must immediately notify the individual faculty member of this decision.

III. Other Faculty

Faculty who are geographically located at sites other than the UNC-Chapel Hill campus may be assigned to either of the academic appointment tracks described above provided that a major component of their job is related to University activities. Such activities may include: teaching, clinical activity, research, administration, and/or community professional service. The track to which such an individual is assigned will be based on the most appropriate fit for their respective activities.

N.C. Area Health Education Centers (AHEC) Program Faculty. Faculty members who are based at the six UNC-affiliated AHEC sites are critical to the educational mission of the School of Medicine as medical students from UNC complete over 45% of their clinical experiences in the various AHEC settings. Given the nature of these AHEC appointments and the heavy emphasis on teaching and clinical service, it is anticipated that most of the AHEC faculty members will hold appointments in the fixed term track. The tenure track will continue to remain an available option for AHEC faculty. However, it is important to emphasize that these individuals shall be judged by the same criteria of scholarship as all UNC-Chapel Hill-based faculty (i.e., a record of progressive academic productivity and a national reputation for excellence). In addition, as for UNC-Chapel Hill based tenure track faculty, AHEC faculty in the tenure track who are recommended for promotion on the basis of teaching must maintain a

Teaching Portfolio. As is the case for UNC-Chapel Hill-based faculty, the track assignment for AHEC faculty members is largely invisible in terms of faculty rank/description (i.e., they are referred to as “Assistant Professor” regardless of the track to which they are assigned).

Part-Time and Voluntary Faculty. The UNC School of Medicine depends, for its success, on a number of community-based clinicians. These individuals provide important, but limited, service to the University (i.e., less than 50 percent time and effort). The majority of these clinicians are voluntary teachers who host students in their practices for a few months each year. These community-based preceptors may be recognized by fixed term appointment as either clinical, research or adjunct faculty (e.g., “Clinical Assistant Professor,” “Research Assistant Professor,” or “Adjunct Assistant Professor”). Appointment and promotion review within this group will be the responsibility of the appointing department. Some departments also use adjunct faculty appointments for part-time, typically non-paid research collaborators who are based outside the University. As with part-time and voluntary (non-paid) faculty, appointment and promotion review of adjunct faculty will be the responsibility of the appointing department.

IV. Additional Resources

1. School of Medicine Teaching Portfolio
<http://www.med.unc.edu/oed/teachingportfolio/welcome.htm>
2. School of Medicine Policy for Post-Tenure Review
 - a. <http://www.med.unc.edu/admin/ptenure.htm>
3. [UNC Standardized CV](#)
4. [UNC Promotion/Tenure Dossier Guidelines](#)
5. EPA Personnel Guidelines, The University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, April 2004
<http://www.unc.edu/provost/policies.html>
 - a. (under revision to reflect changes in UNC Tenure Regulations effective 7/1/04)
6. Trustee Policies and Regulations Governing Academic Tenure in The University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill
 - a. <http://www.unc.edu/faculty/faccoun/tenure/index.html>
7. The Faculty Code of University Government, The University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill
 - a. <http://www.unc.edu/faculty/faccoun/code/index.html>
8. Faculty Handbook, The University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill
<http://www.unc.edu/faculty/faccoun/handbook/toc.htm>
9. The Code of the University of North Carolina Board of Governors
 - a. <http://www.unc.edu/faculty/faccoun/tenure/Appendix.html>