

**UNCG Department of Philosophy
College of Arts & Science
Reappointment, Tenure, and Promotion Processes and Guidelines**

(1998; Revised March 23, 2001; February 22, 2006; April 13, 2011, Revised March 16, 2018 and posted to Philosophy website.)

Prologue:

Philosophy Department faculty members are expected to display intellectual and personal integrity, collegiality, and a commitment to the University community.

Sources of external support are very limited in Philosophy; however, efforts by faculty at all levels to secure external funding are encouraged and viewed positively by the Department.

Interdisciplinary, multidisciplinary, and collaborative research by faculty at all levels is valued by the Department of Philosophy. Such research will be evaluated in terms of its quality, originality, significance, and impact, and in terms of the candidate's degree of contribution to the research.

Community-based scholarship and research are valued by the Department of Philosophy. Scholarship and research of this kind will be evaluated in terms of its quality, originality, significance, and impact.

The Department will evaluate faculty in terms of the three basic areas of teaching, research, and service, but not in terms of the optional fourth area of directed professional activity.

All departmental regulations and guidelines for reappointment, tenure, and promotion set forth in this document are subsumed by, and required to be compatible with, the successively broader sets of regulations and guidelines set forth in the reappointment, tenure, and promotion documents of the College of Arts and Sciences, the University of North Carolina at Greensboro at large, and the system-wide Code of the University of North Carolina.

Processes:

The review of a candidate for tenure and/or promotion to Associate Professor or Professor involves the solicitation of letters of evaluation from external reviewers, accompanied by a vita and a narrative description of the candidate's program of research to be prepared by the candidate. In order to provide sufficient lead time for all of this to occur, our tenure and/or promotion process will begin early in the spring of the academic year prior to the year when the College and University will consider the candidate's application. During the spring semester before the academic year in which a review for reappointment, tenure, or promotion is scheduled, the Head of the Department of Philosophy will establish a timetable for the departmental review process which ensures that all phases will be completed prior to the date when all materials must be sent to the Dean. The

Department Head will distribute the timetable to the tenured faculty of the Department, and provide the candidate, in writing, with the timetable along with a clear statement of what information the candidate must provide and the dates when each item is due.

Each year, a promotion and tenure schedule is provided by the provost's office and a deadline is set for submission of dossiers to the Dean's Office (generally around October 1st). It is expected that the portfolio/dossier will be complete by the deadline, but occasionally it is necessary to add materials after the deadline has passed. In order to ensure that candidates are treated equally, and that all levels of review (Department, College, University) have access to the same materials, the University places strict limitations on materials that may be included after the submission deadline [See *Promotion, Tenure, Academic Freedom, and Due Process Regulations, The University of North Carolina at Greensboro*—henceforth *UNCG Regulations*—Section 4.B.i.g. (2) and 4.B.i.g. (3)].

Candidates for promotion and/or tenure must write three narratives describing and analyzing their activities and achievements and their significance in the areas of teaching, research, and service. These narratives will be included in the final dossier for review. If the candidate's research has a significant and substantial community-engaged or applied component, the candidate should explicate this in his or her research narrative. The candidate-written narratives must be ready for inclusion in the candidate's portfolio/dossier no later than the first Monday of August of the candidate's year of review.

Other time constraints to be reflected in the Department's time-table for a promotion or tenure case include the following. The *written summary and the results of the vote* of the Department's Committee on Promotion & Tenure must be provided to the Department Head and the candidate (in their departmental mailbox) *at least ten days before* all materials are due to the Dean of the College. The *deliberations/vote meeting* of that committee must be held at least one week before this written summary and the results of that vote are due to the Department Head. Committee members must deliver any written dissenting opinions to the Department Head (in his or her departmental mailbox) at least five business days before all materials are due to the Dean. After reviewing and signing the completed dossier, the candidate has the right to respond in writing to the committee's written summary. If the candidate decides to exercise that right, then he or she must deliver that written response to the Department Head (in his or her departmental mailbox) no later than four business days after the committee's written summary has been delivered to their mailbox. The Department Head will complete her or his independent review, incorporate it into the candidate's portfolio/dossier, and make it available to the voting faculty and candidate at least three business days before all materials are due to the Dean.

This document describes five sorts of reviews: (i) reviews for reappointment, (ii) reviews for tenure and promotion from Assistant to Associate Professor, (iii) reviews for tenure at the rank of Associate Professor for faculty hired at that rank without tenure, (iv) reviews for tenure at the rank of Professor for faculty hired at that rank without tenure, and (v) reviews for promotion from Associate Professor to Professor.

The reappointment review of tenure-track faculty in the Department of Philosophy will take place in the third year of the initial four-year probationary term. The purpose of the review is to evaluate the

candidate's record and progress towards promotion and tenure and to decide whether the candidate's appointment will be renewed for a second probationary term of three years.

Philosophy Department faculty members hired at the rank of Assistant Professor are normally reviewed at the College level for tenure and promotion early in the sixth year of their appointment; the promotion and tenure review of such faculty will normally begin toward the end of the candidate's fifth year of his or her appointment.

Associate Professors hired without tenure shall be reviewed for tenure or for promotion and tenure at the College level early in the penultimate year of the probationary term. Accordingly, the review process in the Department of Philosophy will normally begin in the spring of the antepenultimate year of the initial appointment. When a candidate is hired as an Associate Professor without tenure, the department may, following its formal review, either recommend tenure at that rank or recommend tenure with promotion to Professor. If the latter is recommended, it will be necessary for two votes to be taken in the department by the tenured Professors: one vote on the question of tenure, and another vote on the question of promotion. These votes should be reported separately in the portfolio/dossier. In such cases, it is possible for reviewers at the College or University level to endorse the recommendation for tenure but not that for promotion.

Professors hired without tenure shall be reviewed for tenure at the College level early in the penultimate year of the probationary term. Thus, the review process in the Department of Philosophy will normally begin in the spring of the antepenultimate year of the initial appointment. Only tenured Professors may vote on the conferral of tenure on an untenured Professor.

The formal process of reviewing an Associate Professor for promotion to Professor is described below. Either the department head and/or a majority of the department's Professors may begin the formal process of reviewing a tenured Associate Professor for promotion to Professor at any time. However, a candidate who has not been formally reviewed for promotion to Professor has the right to a formal review after his or her sixth year in rank as a tenured Associate Professor at UNCG, upon request. To exercise this right, the candidate shall write to the department head by March 1 of that year requesting review. The formal review must begin by the following August 1, that is, by August 1 of the seventh year following conferral of tenure. If a formal review of an Associate Professor for promotion does not culminate in the promotion of the candidate to Professor, the candidate may next request a review during the third year following his or her unsuccessful previous attempt by writing to his or her department head as described above. (See *UNCG Regulations*, Section 3.E.iii.c.).

The departmental tenure and/or promotion review begins early in the spring before the year in which the candidate's dossier is scheduled to go forward. As part of this process, the Department seeks external letters to evaluate the candidate's research record.

The external letters will be sought from philosophers who are experts in the candidate's field and above the candidate's rank. The function of the external letters is to assist the department in judging the strength of the dossier.

In early spring, the candidate will provide a list of four outside scholars to do the reviews and may also request that certain individuals not do reviews because of personal animosities or other matters

unrelated to professional expertise. At that time, the candidate will also prepare a description of his or her program of research to be sent to the external reviewers, together with a vita and copies of his or her selected published or forthcoming articles, chapters, and/or books as appropriate. This narrative description aids reviewers in evaluating the candidate's record, provides a context for assessing the contributions of individual works, and can serve as the basis for the narrative description of his or her research that the candidate will write for inclusion in the final dossier. The Head (or some other senior faculty member involved in the preparation of the candidate's dossier) will provide, in consultation with other senior department faculty and professional contacts, a list of at least four additional outside scholars qualified to do the reviews. The senior faculty member in question will initially select four individuals from among the pool of scholars suggested and write them to request that they review the candidate's research.

The final dossier should include at least three external letters. Thus, if some of the requests for external letters prove unproductive, it may be necessary for the senior faculty member in charge of preparing the dossier to make further requests for external letters from other scholars in the pool. *All* letters received will be included in the dossier.

The reviewers who are selected may not be previous mentors or formal advisors of the candidate at any stage of his or her education; collaborators; or anyone else for whom there is reason to believe that they would not provide an objective review. It may sometimes be difficult to find reviewers who are unacquainted with the candidate, particularly in cases of promotion to Professor, and it is not necessary for the candidate and the reviewers to be unknown to one another. What is necessary is that the reviewers be impartial and have the necessary professional credentials to provide an authoritative assessment of the candidate's work. Each reviewer will be asked to describe his or her acquaintance with the candidate (if any) in the letter so that readers of the dossier can make their own evaluation of the reviewer's objectivity. Any apparent departure from the requirement of impartiality should be explained in a statement from the Head/Chair.

The letters requesting an external review of the candidate's research will follow the following format.

Dear [Name]:

Thank you for agreeing to provide an evaluation to assist in our review of [candidate's name] for [tenure and promotion to Associate Professor, or other action being contemplated].

University regulations require that every candidate for tenure or promotion is externally reviewed regardless of the Department's assessment of the merits of the case and that all cases, whether or not supported at the department level, be sent forward for review by the College and University. I have enclosed a copy of the Department of XXX's Tenure and Promotion Guidelines and ask that you provide your evaluation in relation to the expectations described in that document. You may also consult the College and University promotion and tenure documents at the following locations:

We would appreciate your candid assessment of the candidate's qualifications and any other information you can provide that will help us in making a wise decision. We are especially interested in your assessment of the quality and significance of the candidate's professional publications [and/or creative work] and his/her national reputation and relative standing in the field. I enclose a copy of [candidate's] vita, a description of his/her program of

research/creative activity, and a representative sample of his/her work. I will be glad to provide you with additional material on request.

Applicable law and University regulations require that candidates be given the opportunity to review all the materials in their dossier, including unredacted outside letters of evaluation, before it is sent forward from the department. I need to receive your review no later than [date]. If you anticipate any problems in meeting this deadline, please let me know as soon as possible. Thank you again for your assistance with this important task.

Sincerely,

The portfolio/dossier will include a brief biographical sketch of each reviewer, explaining to those unfamiliar with the field why the reviewer's opinion is considered to be authoritative. It is not necessary to include a full vita for each reviewer [*Note: The University P&T Committee may require a full vita*] – the biographical sketch should include their present position, significant previous positions, contributions to the field, honors and awards, and any other information that demonstrates their professional accomplishments.

In certain cases, additional letters will be requested in order to explain certain aspects of the candidate's work, rather than to evaluate it. For example, if a significant number of publications derive from a long-term collaboration with another researcher, a letter from the collaborator will be included describing the candidate's role in that research program. When requesting letters of this type, it is important to emphasize that the writer is being asked for a description or explanation, not an evaluation (which would be inappropriate in the example just given, where the writer is a close collaborator). Such letters will be placed separately from letters of evaluation and their role in the dossier clearly explained.

Only tenured Philosophy faculty may serve on the Department's *Committee on Promotions and Tenure* and thus be eligible to participate in decisions involving reappointment and promotion & tenure. All available tenured members of the Department of Philosophy will serve on this Committee consistent with the following four eligibility requirements.

1. With respect to decisions about whether to recommend reappointment of an untenured Assistant Professor — all and only tenured faculty.
2. With respect to decisions about whether to recommend an Assistant Professor for tenure and promotion to Associate Professor — all and only tenured faculty at the rank of Associate Professor or above.
3. With respect to decisions about whether to recommend an untenured Associate Professor for tenure or promotion to Professor – all and only tenured Professors.
4. With respect to decisions about whether to recommend an untenured Professor for tenure — all and only tenured Professors.

Faculty must be physically present, or at least able to interactively participate in the meeting, in order to vote. If necessary, the Dean may be asked to give permission for faculty who cannot be physically present to participate in the meeting remotely by electronic means. Proxy or absentee voting is not permitted.

In tenure and/or promotion reviews, as well as reappointment reviews, the Department's *Committee on Promotions and Tenure* and the Department Head will conduct *independent reviews*, as follows. The Department Head will charge this committee and is entitled to participate in the initial phase of the committee's work in which *the evidence of the candidate's teaching, research, and service is discussed and clarified*, but the Department Head will *not* participate in the committee's *final deliberations and vote*.

The committee will elect a Chair. In addition to presiding over the committee's work, the Chair's responsibilities include informing the Department Head of the committee's final vote as well as providing the Department Head with a written statement summarizing the committee's reasoning in reaching its recommendations. In particular, the chair of the department's deliberations/vote meeting has the following responsibilities: The Chair presides over the meeting(s) of the faculty at which the candidate's application for promotion and/or tenure is reviewed, discussed and voted upon. This meeting must be divided into evidence-gathering and deliberative phases, followed by a secret ballot vote. The Head will not be present beyond the evidence-gathering phase. The vote must be by secret ballot and must be administered and counted by the chair of the deliberations/vote meeting. Another member of the voting faculty shall double-check the vote count for accuracy. If the faculty vote results in a tie, the vote is considered a vote in favor of tenure/promotion. Faculty who oppose tenure/promotion may write a dissenting opinion (discussed in detail later in this document).

In cases where spouses or domestic partners hold positions in the same department, they may not participate in decisions about the other's tenure or promotion (or any other personnel matters).

When a candidate is hired as an Associate Professor without tenure, the Department of Philosophy may either recommend tenure at that rank or recommend tenure with promotion to Professor. If the latter is recommended, it will be necessary for two votes to be taken by the departmental faculty: one vote by the tenured Associate Professors and Professors on the question of tenure, and another vote by the tenured Professors alone on the question of promotion. These votes will be reported separately in the dossier.

The Chair of the Department's *Committee on Promotion and Tenure* is responsible for preparing a written summary of the faculty meeting(s). The summary must fairly reflect both majority and minority views on the candidate's suitability for tenure and/or promotion.

The written summary should include sections devoted to evaluations of the candidate's teaching, research, and service. The Head, in consultation with the Chair of the Department's *Committee on Promotion and Tenure*, may assign specific voting-eligible faculty members to assist the Chair with the preparation of specific subsections of the written summary. A draft of the summary must be made available to all voting faculty for feedback prior to submission of the final written summary.

At the conclusion of the deliberations/vote meeting, the Chair will record the vote and have the faculty sign the *Signature Sheet* included in the *University Promotion and Tenure Form*. The Chair shall immediately inform the department head of the vote and the *Signature Sheet* shall be inserted immediately into the candidate's portfolio/dossier.

The Department of Philosophy will submit to the Dean either a positive or a negative recommendation regarding reappointment, tenure, and/or promotion. A negative recommendation to reappoint, promote and/or grant tenure only occurs when the majority of the voting faculty AND the Head concur in this negative decision. In all other cases, the department forwards the candidate's application as a positive recommendation, supporting the proposed action. All applications must go forward to the next level of review regardless of the recommended action (see *UNCG Regulations*, Section 4.B.). Any faculty members who did not vote in accordance with the department's recommended action may (but need not) write dissenting opinions.

Dissenting opinions may be written by the following voting faculty members in the following sorts of cases. (See *UNCG Regulations*, Section 4.B.i.h.) In the first sort of case, a majority of the faculty and the Head support tenure/promotion. In this sort of case, a positive recommendation is forwarded to the dean. Faculty who oppose tenure/promotion may write a dissenting opinion. In the second sort of case, a majority of the faculty support tenure/promotion but the Head does not. In this sort of case, a positive recommendation is forwarded to the Dean. Faculty who oppose tenure/promotion may write a dissenting opinion. In the third sort of case, a majority of the faculty vote against tenure/promotion but the Head supports it. In this sort of case, a positive recommendation is forwarded to the Dean. Faculty who oppose tenure/promotion may write a dissenting opinion. In the fourth sort of case, a majority of the faculty vote against tenure/promotion and the Head does not support it. In this sort of case, a negative recommendation is forwarded to the Dean. Faculty who support tenure/promotion may write a dissenting opinion.

Dissenting opinions may be written by individual faculty members; alternatively, two or more dissenting faculty may write a single opinion. All dissenting opinions must be signed and must be limited to objective evaluations of the candidate's professional work. They may not include hearsay, statements about the candidate's age, gender, ethnicity, political or religious beliefs, or anything that might be construed as personal malice, as defined by the University's regulations on academic freedom. If necessary, a *limited* amount of documentary evidence supporting a dissenting opinion may be included.

All written dissenting opinions must be given to the Head in their final form at least five business days prior to the date when all materials are due in the College office.

After the portfolio/dossier has been completed but before it is submitted to the College office, the candidate must be allowed to review it and sign the statement to this effect following his/her review. The candidate may, but is not obliged to, write a response to the portfolio/dossier or to opinions expressed in it. This response is not the place to include new evidence or information, which the candidate should have included in the appropriate narrative section. It provides an opportunity to draw attention to points that the candidate believes have been overlooked or given inappropriate emphasis, to rebut dissenting opinion, or to correct errors of fact. (See *UNCG Regulations*, Section 4.B.i.g. (2) (c)).

Two unusual kinds of cases may arise in cases of promotions to Professor. The first is when the candidate being considered for promotion is the Department Head. The second is when the department has too few Professors to prepare a recommendation for the promotion of an Associate Professor. In either case, the Department Head, or another senior member of the faculty, will consult well in advance with the Dean on how to proceed.

Faculty members are entitled to take leave for medical or personal reasons and in such cases, the probationary period before mandatory tenure review may be extended. Faculty may also request extensions to the probationary period on grounds of personal exigency without taking a leave. Upon request, the Department Head will explain the consequences of taking a leave to any untenured faculty. All agreements regarding changes to the probationary period must be documented in writing and have the approval of the Dean and the Provost. (See *UNCG Regulations*, Sections: 3.C., 3.C.i, 3.C.ii., and 3.C.iii.).

Faculty members appointed at the rank of Assistant Professor are normally reviewed at the College level for tenure and promotion early in the sixth year of their appointment; faculty members appointed at the rank of Associate Professor or Professor without tenure are normally reviewed early in the penultimate year of their term. However, exceptional accomplishments may provide grounds for an early recommendation and such early decisions are permitted when they are clearly appropriate. In such a case, the Department Head will consult with the Dean before sending forward an early recommendation. If, after review of the portfolio/dossier at the College level, the Dean believes that the case does not support a positive recommendation for early tenure, the candidate will be advised to withdraw the dossier before it is submitted for review at the University level. Resubmission of a dossier following a negative tenure decision by the Chancellor is not permitted. Withdrawal of a portfolio/ dossier for early tenure will not prejudice a subsequent review that takes place at the normal time.

In some cases, faculty may be hired with a specific written agreement to be considered for tenure at a specified time (normally no more than three years) before the end of the maximum probationary period, with work done at another institution included in the dossier for consideration. On the recommendation of the Department Head, and with the approval of the Dean and the Provost, a separate agreement with the candidate will be prepared specifying the date of review for tenure and the previous work that will be considered in the review.

Any subsequent request to extend the modified probationary period for reasons of personal exigency must be made in writing by the candidate to the Department Head before the end of the academic year preceding the year in which the review is expected (see <http://provost.uncg.edu/documents/personnel/exigency.pdf>). The extension requires the approval of the Dean and Provost and will not be granted solely on the grounds that the candidate's progress has been less rapid than what is required by the applicable promotion & tenure guidelines and regulations.

The candidate may, at his or her discretion, withdraw his or her portfolio/dossier from consideration at any stage of review before it is submitted to the chancellor for a final decision. (See *UNCG Regulations*, Section 4.A.iii. and Footnote).

Evaluation Guidelines:

1. Guidelines for reappointment as an Assistant Professor on tenure-track.

Teaching: A candidate for reappointment is expected to demonstrate responsible, competent, and effective teaching as evidenced by, among other things, student evaluations, formal peer reviews, syllabi, course assignments, and examinations, the development of new courses and other curricular innovations, a consistent record of commitment to students (availability to students outside of scheduled classes, willingness to undertake student advising, and so forth), a willingness to accept teaching assignments, and to be responsive to department needs. There should also be evidence that the candidate has displayed growth as a teacher and has the potential for continued growth.

Research. A candidate for reappointment is expected to demonstrate reasonable progress toward meeting research expectations for promotion with tenure to the rank of Associate Professor. This includes reasonable progress towards publishing articles in refereed journals in the field and/or peer-reviewed scholarly books as well as presentations at scholarly conferences. The Department will inform a candidate of its ranking of professional journals and publishers and of appropriate vehicles for the dissemination of their research. Scholarly expectations for promotion to Associate Professor with tenure will be discussed further below.

Service. The Department does not expect major service in the first two years of employment at the rank of Assistant Professor. Thereafter, the expectation is that the candidate will have a continuous record of service in the Department, and seek to have one in the College, University, and/or profession. Professionally relevant service to the community is highly desirable. The Department will advise the candidate about service opportunities.

1. **Guidelines for Promotion with Tenure to the Rank of Associate Professor.**

Teaching. A candidate for promotion with tenure to the rank of Associate Professor is expected to demonstrate responsible, competent, and effective teaching as evidenced by, among other things, student evaluations, formal peer reviews, syllabi and examinations, a consistent record of commitment to students, and a willingness to accept teaching assignments and to be responsive to departmental needs. There should also be evidence that the candidate has displayed growth as a teacher and has the potential for continued growth, as evidenced by design of courses, giving tutorials, the authorship of textual materials, and so forth.

Research. A candidate for promotion with tenure to the rank of Associate Professor is expected to have a continuous and substantial record of scholarship. In particular, such a candidate should have a substantial and a continuous record of publication in refereed scholarly journals, and/or publication of one or more refereed scholarly books. The high quality, originality, and significance of such publications are especially important to their overall assessment. At this stage of the candidate's career, an assessment of the impact of publications is of less importance. Scholarly papers, commentaries, and presentations made by the candidate in professional settings, in particular, national professional meetings, have positive weight. Overall, a candidate should also show promise of achieving a level of distinction that will lead to promotion to the rank of professor.

The Department does not recognize any *essential difference* between published work and work in its final form that has been accepted for publication and is forthcoming, though, in general, published work is more likely to have an impact which can be assessed.

Refereed publications have significantly more weight than non-refereed publications of the same type, e.g., articles, books, etc.

All other things being equal, published books (other than edited anthologies, compilations, and the like) have significantly more weight than articles.

Judgments of quality, originality, and significance will be informed by evidence about factors such as the prestige of the journals or publishing houses in question (which may be evidenced by their acceptance rates of works submitted for publication), awards and honors achieved, comments of external reviewers, published reviews, critiques, or commentaries addressing the candidate's research, and citation data.

Service. A candidate for promotion with tenure to the rank of Associate Professor is expected to demonstrate a commitment to university and professional citizenship and to have made satisfactory service contributions to the Department, College, University, and profession of a sort appropriate for an Assistant Professor.

3. Guidelines for Promotion of an Associate Professor to the Rank of Professor.

Teaching. The candidate for promotion to the rank of Professor should demonstrate continuous commitment to and effectiveness in teaching, as described above and in the *College of Arts and Sciences Guidelines on Promotion and Tenure*.

Research. A candidate for promotion to the rank of Professor should have a record of significant scholarly accomplishment and an ongoing program of scholarship. In particular, such a candidate should have a substantial and continuous record of publication in refereed scholarly journals and/or publication of one or more refereed scholarly books. The high quality, originality, significance, and impact of such publications are especially important to their overall assessment. The candidate's research should have had a significant impact on his or her area(s) of research.

The Department does not recognize any *essential difference* between published work and work in its final form that has been accepted for publication and is forthcoming. However, in general, published work is more likely to have an assessable impact; at this stage of a candidate's career, an assessment of this impact is of central importance to the promotion decision.

All other things being equal, published books (other than edited anthologies, compilations, and the like) have significantly more weight than articles.

When non-refereed publications are indicative of the candidate's high standing in the field, and of the impact and significance of the candidate's previously published work, they have a comparable weight to refereed publications of the same type, e.g., articles, books, etc.

Judgments of quality, significance, originality, and impact will be informed by evidence about factors such as the prestige of the journals or publishing houses in question (which may be evidenced by their acceptance rates of works submitted for publication), awards and honors achieved, comments of external reviewers, published reviews, critiques, or commentaries addressing the candidate's research, and citation data.

Service. The candidate should have made important service contributions to the department, scholarly profession, or community, and have generally performed in a role of leadership.

Significant service at the College and University levels is expected.