

To: Chancellor Carter  
From: Promotion and Tenure Review Committee (PTRC)  
Date: May 13, 2013  
Re: Promotion and Tenure Processes

---

The PTRC convened in October of the Fall 2012 semester to review the Promotion and Tenure processes at UNCP in general and to consider the specific items addressed in your memo of May 9, 2012.

The Committee began its review by assigning members of the committee to research each of the items listed in the memo in terms of our own university, other universities in the UNC System, and universities deemed to be comparable to our own. In November, we reviewed the material gathered from these inquiries, which highlighted potential problem areas with our processes and provided possible alternatives to consider based on other universities. We then divided up the committee to draft statements of our findings regarding your specific items. These statements were used as starting points for group discussion.

In January, we reviewed the draft statements and considered the possibility of a campus forum to gather input from the General Faculty. Ultimately, we decided that the next best step was to conduct a survey of the faculty regarding various aspects of the Promotion and Tenure Process. We had the results of this survey at the end of March.

The following includes a point-by-point response to the items addressed in your memo. We attempted to share with you the variety and complexity of our discussions and findings, so each itemized response includes introductory material and makes some suggestions for possible future action. The Committee wants to stress that it considers the following material to be a work-in-progress. We have not finished fully exploring all the items involved with Promotion and Tenure on this campus. The material below, while definitely representing the discussions of the committee, do not necessarily constitute final recommendations of the committee, nor is it meant to suggest that all recommendations received equal support from committee members. This memo serves both as an informational document on our preliminary findings and as a starting point for this Committee in Fall of 2013.

## **“University Standards and Expectations” (Dr. Cannata)**

1. University Standards and Expectations. The current university standards, eligibility criteria, and criteria for promotion and tenure are open to interpretation. Although they need to be broad to apply to all disciplines, they can be revised to more clearly reflect the current values of the institution.

Two items in the first sentence, “eligibility criteria” and “criteria for promotion and tenure,” relate to two other sections (“Promotion and Tenure Degree Requirements” and “Disciplinary Statements”), so those specific items will be addressed below.

That leaves two items: “current university standards” and the idea that all parts of the promotion and tenure process should “reflect the current values of the institution.”

The Committee has discussed the concern that we have a written document about P & T (the handbook) that seems to conflict with a verbal culture, namely, information provided by the TLC workshops, information conveyed to junior faculty via deans and chairs, and information conveyed by colleagues. This subject has been addressed by our committee, and it was agreed that mixed messages are given regarding expectations in the three areas of evaluation (teaching, scholarship, service).

These mixed messages suggest that “the current values of the institution” are unclear. Are we still considered a “teaching institution,” and, if so, what exactly does that mean? Is that a formal term used by GA? Our teaching load indicates that teaching is a primary mission at this university, and this is supported by the faculty evaluation model (e.g., faculty members can put up to 70% in their teaching). However, oral culture seems to put more emphasis on scholarship. Additionally, the new 3/4 course load policy indicates that those who opt for this load should have more scholarly output (e.g., a faculty member choosing the 3/4 load cannot put more than 50% into teaching).

Our mission statement includes the following phrases/sentences: “UNC Pembroke exists to promote excellence in teaching and learning,” “commitment to personalized teaching,” “dedicated to active student learning, engaging scholarship [though I think this is supposed to be “engaged,” but what that means is unclear], high academic standards, creative activity, and public service,” and “working from a strong foundation in the liberal arts, we will increase opportunities to infuse our curriculum with interdisciplinary innovation while promoting undergraduate and graduate research.” Is promoting student research part of scholarship or part of teaching or part of service?

**The PTRC agrees that University standards and expectations should reflect the current values of the institution. Given that these values are unclear, the University must determine its identity in ways that lay out clear expectations for its faculty, and these expectations should complement the University mission statement. All forms of dissemination of those expectations (handbook, administrators who directly partake in evaluation, TLC) must be consistent.**

**This might be achieved by the following:**

- **Include a preamble to the Promotion and Tenure Section of the Handbook that addresses expectations in a way that is consistent with our identity/values**
- **Remove the responsibility of P/T workshops for junior faculty from the TLC and assign that responsibility to a group of faculty consistently involved in the process (e.g., members of the PTC, chairs, deans)**
- **Create departmental/discipline-specific standards that complement handbook material**

## **“Promotion and Tenure Degree Requirements” (Dr. Scott)**

**Area of Investigation per Chancellor’s Memo:** Item #2 Promotion and Tenure Degree Requirements. Our current policy would be strengthened by clear and explicit degree requirements for promotion and tenure. It should take into account disciplinary uniqueness on terminal degrees and professional work experience. Not all disciplines require the Ph.D. Professional programs may legitimately recognize alternative credentials as proxies for terminal degrees. These should be established in policy with sufficient clarity to render consistent decisions. Further, it is my opinion that the decision should remain in the administrative realm, i.e. chair, dean and provost.

### **Divisional Input as gathered by the PTRC committee member Marisa Scott from current Department Chairpersons**

- 1) Within all three divisions, tenure eligible faculty comprised primarily Ph. D. or Ed. D degrees. However, within the School of Business, and College of Arts and Sciences- MBAs, MFAs, and DBAs were considered appropriate in some cases.
- 2) Within the College of Arts and Sciences, a faculty member’s experience in the corporate world/ professional experience had been considered in the past and therefore was viewed as an option regarding the terminal degree requirement.
- 3) Exceptions to requiring a terminal degree where made on a case by case basis.

### **The Faculty Survey**

- 1) Questions 32-35 sought to gather feedback from UNCP faculty regarding promotion and tenure requirements. More than half of the respondents (59%) felt that without exception that all tenure-track appointments should require a terminal degree. Moreover, these same respondents felt that each department should determine what constitutes an appropriate terminal degree in the field and then apply that standard to all tenure-track appointments. (which suggests that current faculty would not be in support of professional programs may legitimately recognize alternative credentials....as indicated in item #2 of the Chancellor’s Memo)
- 2) When asked to select a preferred option regarding the terminal degree requirement, no single response was selected by the majority of respondents. However, ‘faculty without a terminal degree should not be eligible for promotion beyond the rank of assistant professor’ received the highest percentage (36%), followed by the option of ‘when a faculty member is hired into a tenure-track line without a terminal degree, the question of that individual’s ability to apply for later promotions should be addressed at the point of entry and memorialized in the letter of appointment. No further determination should be required’ with (31%). (which suggests that clear and explicit degree requirements for promotion and tenure would be supported)

### **PTRC’s Discussion and Conclusions** **Hiring Practices**

- 1) The PTRC acknowledges that previous hiring practices have included hiring faculty for tenure-track positions who did not hold a terminal degree . Therefore, some of the current tenure-track faculty do not hold a terminal degree in their field of study.

- 2) The PTRC also acknowledges that such hiring practices as indicated in #1 above where often not memorialized in writing and little to no consideration was given to how or if the individual would go through the process of promotion and/or tenure.
- 3) Within the scope of the PTRC's investigation of promotion and tenure degree requirements, there appears to be a concern by current UNCP faculty regarding tenure-track faculty who do not hold terminal degrees.
- 4) PTRC noted that current hiring practices (Fall 2012 to present) have become more explicit in defining degree requirements and if necessary, documenting in writing any exceptions made.

### **Terminal degree definitions**

- 1) There seems to be limited campus-wide knowledge regarding what constitutes an acceptable terminal degree in each respective field.
- 2) The PTRC noted that each program/field of study has a degree that is denoted as being the terminal degree. Although the PTRC acknowledged that a Ph. D. may not be considered as the highest degree to be conferred in all programs, it is felt that the credentials of new tenure-track hires should reflect the appropriate terminal degree.
- 3) The PTRC suggested that clearer language be provided in the Faculty Handbook to address the various degrees that would be appropriate based on the field of study.
- 4) The PTRC explored the idea of soliciting Department support in identifying a list of appropriate terminal degrees that could be voted on by Faculty Senate. Such a measure could possibly assist the PTC in better understanding the variance in terminal degrees and therefore, sustaining the focus on the individual's teaching, scholarship and service rather than the terminal degree held (or in some cases not held).

Overall, the PTRC investigation supported Item #2 of the Chancellor's Memo.

## “Disciplinary Statements” (Dr. Kitts)

### Disciplinary Standards for Promotion and Tenure

During the 2012-13 academic year, the Promotion and Tenure Task Force examined the question of disciplinary statements for promotion and tenure from a number of different perspectives.

We reviewed the current language of the *Faculty Handbook* to determine the extent to which it acknowledges the role of discipline-specific expectations in promotion and tenure decisions. From the section on the Faculty Evaluation Model:

- “Individual faculty members have latitude in the roles they assume as they fulfill their responsibilities to the University and its mission. The Model encourages flexibility in applying the principles and criteria for each area of faculty evaluation, allowing for the varying needs and traditions of different academic disciplines.” (p. 116)
- “Scholarship is evaluated primarily against specialized criteria appropriate to the disciplines of each department and consistent with a department’s evaluation plan.” (p. 119)
- “The Provost/Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs is responsible for collaborating with Department Chairs and Deans to develop a uniform set of norms for interpreting the meaning of the Standard Performance Rating Scale. These norms will necessarily represent some discipline-related variations across departments, especially in the area of scholarship.” (p. 123)

We also reviewed examples of “Collegial Review Documents” from Western Carolina University as that institution is known for its work in crafting discipline-based statements of expectations for tenure and promotion at the department level.

The survey distributed to faculty in March contained five questions that focused on this question. A majority of respondents agreed that, despite whatever encouragement or requirements currently exist in the *Faculty Handbook*, we do not currently use disciplinary statements in the promotion and tenure review process. As one respondent noted, any such guidelines that currently exist at the departmental level are “purely advisory.”

When asked whether a more formal system of disciplinary statements should be introduced, a majority of respondents said yes. A total of 150 faculty responded to this question. Of those, 61% were in favor of the statements. Among the positive comments offered:

- Would benefit tenure-track faculty and make P&T less of a moving target
- Preferable for decision guidelines/rules to be stated rather than implicit
- Would capture important differences in types of scholarship and service between disciplines
- Would help educate faculty outside department (and especially on P&T Committee) on disciplinary standards and norms

“Not sure” was the next most common response with 21%.

Those opposed to the idea of disciplinary statements represented only 19% of the respondents. Among the negative comments offered:

- Difficult to come up with written statements that capture range of faculty activity, even within discipline/program/department

- Fear of uneven application; some departments would be more apt than others to embrace marginal standards of performance
- Written standards could end up curtailing faculty innovation if too restrictive

When the vote was broken down by tenure status, the support for disciplinary statements cut across tenure lines, with 63% of tenure-track respondents and 59% of tenured respondents supporting the idea. In addition to the comments that were positive or negative, other respondents posed questions regarding the implementation and use of a system of disciplinary statements:

- How would P&T Committee be asked to recognize or observe candidate compliance with disciplinary statements?
- Would statements be drafted at program, department, or school level?
- How would statements drafted at lower level be reviewed and approved to ensure consistency across departments?

When queried about what the disciplinary statements should contain, the response that garnered the most support was the “detailed list of appropriate activities for each area (teaching, scholarship, service) reflective of your discipline.”

Discussion of disciplinary statements by the Promotion and Tenure Task Force has touched on most of these points. There is some consensus among the membership that the statements would be a useful addition to our promotion and tenure process. We recognize the value of having a better defined set of performance criteria at a level that is sensitive to differences between disciplines. Having such criteria formally stated and approved would go far in helping other evaluative parties, such as the PEC or P&T Committee, make informed and equitable judgments about candidate performance. This should make the review process somewhat less arbitrary.

At the same time, there are concerns within our membership regarding the disciplinary statements as this move would represent a significant departure from current practice. Chief among these are concerns noted above regarding difficulty in getting program or departmental faculty to agree on standards for promotion and tenure, difficulty in ensuring some degree of consistency across programs or departments in terms of rigor, and difficulty in ensuring that candidate performance relative to approved statements is recognized by all parties in the evaluative process.

The Promotion and Tenure Task Force recognizes there may be some difficulty in determining the level at which disciplinary statements should be developed. In some UNCP academic departments more than one discipline is represented (e.g., ENG/THE, PHI/REL) and in some single-discipline departments there are program areas that differ substantially in meaningful ways (e.g., studio art and art education in ART). Careful attention to these issues will be important as the process moves forward. Additional thought would also need to be given to the ways in which these statements could impact the area weight system that is currently in place at UNCP.

## **“Peer Evaluation Committee” (Dr. Beem)**

### **Promotion and Tenure Task Force: Findings Concerning Peer Evaluation Committees**

**Our task:** whether the current model for the Peer Evaluation Committee (Afterward PEC) for promotion and tenure should be modified and the potential problems arising from implementing change.

**Potential problems:**

There are wide variations in department size and the ratio of tenured and untenured faculty in these departments. Additionally, Charles Beem’s survey of department chairs revealed that there is wide variation in the composition of PECs campus wide, with a number of chairs implementing procedures not authorized in the faculty handbook, so a means to enforce established policies is clearly lacking. Indeed, the Beem survey MAY understate the degree of non-compliance as some respondents simply said “I follow the Handbook” and didn’t say what that meant. We do not know if those chairs follow the actual Handbook procedure or follow their erroneous interpretation of it, as some chair responses began with “I follow the Handbook” but the procedures subsequently described by those chairs were definitely NOT Handbook procedures. We have discussed that

some form of campus wide enforcement of current faculty handbook policies is a tangible goal to pursue.

**Other factors to keep in mind:** while our task force is looking at promotion and Tenure only, whatever is recommended for the PECs may need to be applied across the board for initial contract renewals as well as post-tenure reviews; if changes are recommended for P&T, it is hard to imagine how using the old system for everything else could continue to be justified. So we may want to keep in mind that whatever we recommend for the PECs may need to be applied for other facets of the faculty review process, such as the initial review committee.

**The Faculty Survey**

In varying degrees, a majority of both tenured and untenured faculty did not indicate that they favored any *substantial* changes to the system of PECS as currently instituted. Nevertheless, it has come to our attention that there exists a disconnect between the ratings of faculty at the department level (PECs and department chair evaluations) and the findings of the campus wide Tenure and Promotion Committee, principally over the issue of achievement of scholarship. We have discussed devising a means that encourages a more critical P & T evaluation process at the departmental level.



## **“Department Chairs and Deans” (Dr. Gay)**

4. Department Chairs and Deans. The roles of the department chairs and deans must be clearly defined, holding them accountable for both mentoring faculty to be successful in reaching promotion and tenure, but also holding them accountable when they do not. They must use the annual evaluation to monitor progress. Faculty should understand whether or not they are on track to reach their goal. If it becomes clear they are not, these administrators have the responsibility of taking corrective action, and if that fails, they must inform the faculty they will not be supported. In this past evaluation there were several examples of faculty who had not met the expectations during annual evaluations, yet they were recommended for promotion and/or tenure. Chairs and deans must be given training how to utilize the evaluation process to promote professional development and to make appropriate decisions relative to performance. Probationary contracts for tenure-track faculty should be structured in a manner that aligns with these expectations (Chancellor’s memo).

The respective roles of department chairs and deans in the evaluation process are defined in various passages of the Faculty Handbook. In general the Handbook addresses the logistics of the P&T process rather than providing instruction on mentoring and how to best assess performance. The faculty survey conducted by PTRC indicated 61% of the faculty responding believe the department chair should be the most helpful source of information for faculty preparing for P&T; however, only 36% of the faculty responding believe their department chair was/is the most helpful source of information. The numbers suggest that chairs could be doing better jobs mentoring faculty seeking P&T. The survey results also indicated 39% of the faculty responding found their colleagues to be the most helpful source of information about preparing for P&T. An over-reliance on colleagues for information about P&T could contribute to the development of an oral culture that does not accurately reflect published P&T policies.

As outlined below, the chair’s role as mentor is poorly defined in the Faculty Handbook and located in illogical sections. Given the lack of clearly defined responsibilities concerning mentoring, the lack of training and accountability in this area is not surprising.

- The mentoring of faculty through the tenure and promotion process is not mentioned in the department chair’s responsibilities as outlined under “Department Governance (Chair Responsibilities, Terms, Rotation, and Evaluation)” (FH, section 3, 45-46). Mentoring could be assumed in phrases such as “shows commitment to productive scholarship and research in relation to teaching load and service by facilitating faculty endeavors and through faculty evaluation,” “providing career counseling,” “ensures that the department members meet all University requirements” and “evaluating of and recommending tenure or promotion for faculty” (45).
- There is no mention of mentoring faculty in the portion of the Handbook addressing the ‘Responsibilities of the Department Chair’ under ‘Procedures for Tenure and/or Promotion Evaluation (FH, section 6, 129-30).
- Neither the importance of the Annual Chair’s Evaluation Report for tenure and promotion nor its function as a mentoring opportunity is articulated in discussion of that report (FH, section 6, 126).
- Using annual evaluations to monitor professional growth is indicated in discussion of the appropriateness of area weights. Although the passages are located oddly in a paragraph about special demands on a department in “Procedures for Evaluation Faculty: General Considerations (FH, section 6, 124).

- The chairs are responsible for “promoting the professional growth of the department’s faculty”, as noted in the section ‘The Department Chair’ under “Participants in Faculty Evaluation.’ However, in “years prior to tenure and/or promotion decisions, the Department Chair is [only] strongly encouraged [not required] to provide each faculty member with constructive, timely guidance about the means by which any deficiencies can be corrected” (HB, section 6, 121).
- Collective mentoring is implied in passages discussing optional supplemental advisory evaluations for tenure-track faculty. Advisory evaluations, initiated by a chair or the faculty member, ‘are proactive steps to help faculty members improve performance and become more able to achieve tenure.” (FH, section 6, 135) Such evaluations may include a PEC to identify areas that may prove problematic for receiving a positive tenure decision. However, “advisory evaluations have no formal consequences for decisions about contract renewal, tenure, or promotion (135). The option for such advisory evaluations suggests mentoring opportunities outside and independent of annual chair evaluations.

The Dean’s role the evaluation process is likewise vaguely defined and focuses on oversight. Deans “are responsible for monitoring the evaluation process for compliance with the Faculty Evaluation Model as well as for overall fairness and equity” (FH, section 6, 122.)

Given the lack of clearly defined responsibilities concerning mentoring, accountability is problematic, if not impossible. The Faculty Handbook needs explicitly to include the mentoring of faculty as a responsibility of the department chair. Concerning accountability, the need for increased administrative oversight to ensure adherence to all policies and procedures in the Faculty Handbook has been expressed by the Faculty Senate and is supported by the PTRC. Once the expectation of mentoring is clearly defined, chairs will be more aware of this responsibility and how to utilize the evaluation process to promote professional development.

## **“Promotion and Tenure Committee” (Dr. Dooling)**

*From the Chancellor’s memo:*

### **5. Promotion and Tenure Committee.**

*This group appears to take its job very seriously and is making critical judgments in the best interest of the institutional standards. Still, it has a very difficult task because five individuals cannot know the nuances of all disciplines across the university. There are two ways to increase the committee’s effectiveness: increase its size and provide them with disciplinary statements developed by the departments (see below). I have served at four other institutions where there was a University wide promotion and tenure committee. In each instance the committee consisted of a minimum of 12 individuals, half elected by the faculty and the other half appointed by the Provost to assure broad disciplinary representation. The Provost chaired the committee but did not vote. He was present to assure the consistent interpretation of the policies and procedures and provide staff support. As Provost I found value in chair the committee because the discussions better informed my final decision.*

**The PTRC does agree that some change needs to be made to the Promotion and Tenure Committee. Along with the Chancellor’s concerns the PTRC identified the following issues.**

- Insufficient representation from different disciplines.
- Lack of consistency from year to year in how decisions are made.
- Poor adherence by the PTC to policies that are already in place.
- A poor understanding by faculty of which materials should be submitted due to dissemination of information contradictory to the *Faculty Handbook*.
- Poor adherence by the PTC to established area weights in the handbook.
- Lapses in confidentiality by the PTC.
- Differing interpretations of what justifies good teaching, good research and good service.
- Of specific concern is the heavy weight given to research especially in view of the differing interpretations of what constitutes good research.
- Perceived changes in expectations by the different UNCP administrations.

**The PTRC has discussed different remedies based on suggestions by the Chancellor and from examining policies at peer institutions. Some possibilities are,**

- A larger PTC with broader representation.
- More specific departmental guidelines on what constitutes good research, teaching and service.
- More specific departmental guidelines on what is expected with area weights.
- Better accountability by the PTC. When issuing a decision, especially a negative decision, the PTC should quote specific passages of the standardized policy. So, if tenure or promotion is denied, the specific areas of failure have to be stated and identified with regards to the specific policies such as those in the *Faculty Handbook* and those developed by the departments.

**The PTRC has voiced general concerns with these possible remedies.**

- A larger PTC might be unwieldy and difficult to fill with a school the size of UNCP

- A concern with a loss of flexibility with more restrictive guidelines at the departmental level.
- A concern with uneven expectations across departments should individual departmental guidelines be developed.

**In general, the PTRC supports the idea of,**

- Better representation on the PTC through a limited expansion of its membership.
- A PTC membership that continues to be elected by the faculty.
- More specific departmental and university wide standards to guide the PTC. However, there is concern that these policies should not be too constraining. These policies should be made public to help to ensure consistency in rigor across departments and Colleges.
- More accountability on the part of the PTC so that its decisions seem less subjective. The rationale behind negative decisions should quote specific sections of the departmental standards and university standards that apply to the decision.
- Promotion and tenure decisions will be based on those policies that were in place when the faculty member was hired.
- It is also preferred that the Provost should not be a member of the PTC. However, the PTC should fully brief the Provost in person on each of its decisions after those decisions have been delivered to the candidates. In this way the Provost can poll the PTC about its decisions on each candidate.

## **“P&T Calendar of Events” (Dr. Denny)**

[Editor’s Note: Dr. Denny annotated the calendar below in response to concerns about difficulty in finding relevant information about promotion and tenure in the *Faculty Handbook*. The calendar as presented below is a draft document with suggestions in red font.]

### **Typical Calendar of Events for Tenure and/or Promotion**

The events listed below are intended as guidelines only; dates are approximate and may be altered as conditions warrant. Specific policies and procedures are found in the full Faculty Evaluation Plan **in the *Faculty Handbook* sections noted**. If a date listed in this table falls on a weekend or holiday, the deadline is automatically moved to the next business day.

<b>DATE</b>	<b>EVENT OR DOCUMENT</b>
April 1-14	Spring Student Evaluation: Faculty members collect student evaluations (The schedule varies by surname and year. <b>See section entitled “Student Evaluations of Instruction”</b> ).
August 1	Early Review Petition: The faculty member petitions for early review for tenure or promotion, if desired. <b>(See section entitled “Early Tenure”)</b>  Optional Promotion Review: If a faculty member wishes to undergo review for promotion in addition to a required post-tenure review, or if a Lecturer wishes to apply for promotion to Senior Lecturer, the faculty member must notify the Department Chair by this date. <b>(See sections entitled “Procedures for Evaluation of Tenured Faculty (Post-Tenure Review)” and “Full-Time Appointments: Lecturer, Senior Lecturer, Adjunct, and Visiting Faculty” for more information about optional promotions. Also see the section entitled “Promotion Standards” under “TENURE AND PROMOTION POLICIES AND PROCEDURES” for criteria for promotion to various ranks.)</b>
August 15	Evaluation Announcement: The Department Chair notifies the faculty member, the Dean, the chair of the Promotion and Tenure Committee (PTC), and the Provost and Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs of the impending major evaluation by this date. <b>(See section entitled “Notification and Scheduling of Tenure and Promotion Evaluations”)</b>
August 29	Submission of Materials: The faculty member submits materials to the Department Chair including the PEC nomination form. <b>(See sections entitled “Procedures for Tenure and/or Promotion Evaluation” and “Responsibilities of the Faculty Member Being Evaluated”)</b>
September 7	PEC Formation: The Department Chair announces the composition of the Peer Evaluation Committee (PEC). <b>(See section entitled</b>

**“Responsibilities of the Department Chair”)**

- September 17 Transmittal of Materials: By this date, the Department Chair meets with the PEC, reviews its charge, and gives the PEC the full set of the candidate’s materials, including previous Chair evaluations (or Dean evaluations for the Chairs.) The PEC elects its chair after meeting with the Department Chair. (See sections entitled **“Responsibilities of the Department Chair”** and **“Responsibilities of the Peer Evaluation Committee”**)
- September 17- November 1 External Review Initiation: If desired, external review of the faculty member’s scholarly or creative work is initiated by either the faculty member or the PEC (through the Department Chair). (See sections entitled **“Responsibilities of the Faculty Member Being Evaluated”** and **“Responsibilities of the Peer Evaluation Committee”**)
- Observations of Teaching: Observation of the candidate's teaching is carried out by the Department Chair and members of the PEC. If the faculty member is teaching online, provisions must be made for observation of online teaching. (See sections entitled **“Responsibilities of the Department Chair”** and **“Responsibilities of the Peer Evaluation Committee”**)
- PEC Evaluation: The PEC deliberates on all materials, observations, etc., to reach a recommendation. A report is drafted and the PEC Tenure, Promotion and Renewal Form is completed and signed by the PEC members. (See sections entitled **“Responsibilities of the Peer Evaluation Committee”**)
- Chair’s Evaluation: The Department Chair prepares and signs an independent report and completes and signs the Tenure, Promotion, and Renewal form. (See section entitled **“Responsibilities of the Department Chair”**)
- November 5 Two copies of the PEC report, including any minority report, and two copies of the Department Chair’s report are due to the faculty member by this date. The Department Chair and PEC chair confer separately with the faculty member. (See sections entitled **“Responsibilities of the Peer Evaluation Committee”** and **“Responsibilities of the Department Chair”**)
- Report transmittal + 3 business days Faculty Signatures: The faculty member signs the reports and the Tenure, Promotion and Renewal Forms from PEC and Department Chair,

acknowledging content but not necessarily agreement. The faculty member retains one signed copy of each report. (See sections entitled **“Responsibilities of the Peer Evaluation Committee”** and **“Responsibilities of the Department Chair”**)

Report signing +10 business days Optional Rebuttal: The faculty member may submit a rebuttal of the PEC and/or Department Chair's report, if desired, to the Dean of the faculty member's school or college within 10 business days of signing the report. (See section entitled **“Responsibilities of the Faculty Member Being Evaluated”**)

November 8 Report Submission: Department Chair and PEC submit their reports signed by the faculty member to the Dean of the relevant school or college. The chair submits the candidate's materials to the relevant Dean. Any minority PEC report is also submitted. (See section entitled **“Responsibilities of the Peer Evaluation Committee”** and **“Responsibilities of the Department Chair”**)

December 1 Dean's Evaluation Report for Promotion and Tenure: The Dean will prepare and sign two copies of the Dean's Evaluation Report for each faculty member in his or her school or college being considered for promotion or tenure. These reports must be delivered to faculty members under review by this date. (See section entitled **“Responsibilities of the Dean”**)

Report transmittal+ 3 business days Returning Dean's Evaluation Report: The faculty member has three (3) business days after receipt of Dean's evaluation to review the evaluation materials, and to sign and return one copy to the Dean. (See section entitled **“Responsibilities of the Dean”**)

Report signing +10 business days Optional Rebuttal of Dean's Evaluation: If the Dean's evaluation disagrees with that of the Department Chair or PEC, the faculty member may submit a rebuttal of the Dean's evaluation to the Promotion and Tenure Committee (PTC) via the office of the Provost and Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs within 10 business days after signing the report. (See section entitled **“Responsibilities of the Dean”**)

December 15 Dean submits the Dean's report, Chair's report, PEC report (including any minority reports and rebuttals), and the candidate's materials to the Promotion and Tenure Committee (PTC) via the Office of Academic Affairs. (See sections entitled **“Responsibilities of the Dean”** and **“Responsibilities of the Promotion and Tenure Committee”**)

The PTC may request, if they desire, a counter rebuttal or corrected report responding to candidate's rebuttal to PEC or Department Chair report. (See section entitled "**Responsibilities of the Promotion and Tenure Committee**")

April 1 Submission of Promotion and Tenure Committee Report: The Chair of the PTC should submit the Committee's report, the completed PTC Tenure, Promotion and Renewal Form, and all reports and materials received to the Provost and Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs. Any PTC minority report is also submitted to the Provost and Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs. The faculty member must be given a copy of the PTC report, including any minority report, and the PTC Tenure, Promotion and Renewal Form by this date. The faculty member is not required to sign these materials. (See section entitled "**Responsibilities of the Promotion and Tenure Committee**")

Report transmittal + 10 business days Optional rebuttal to the PTC Report: If the PTC report is unfavorable, the faculty member may, within 10 business days of receiving the report, submit a rebuttal to the Provost and Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs. (See section entitled "**Responsibilities of the Promotion and Tenure Committee**")

May 1 The Provost and Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs sends his or her recommendation for promotion and/or tenure to the Chancellor. (See sections entitled "**Responsibilities of the Provost and Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs**" and "**Responsibilities of the Chancellor**")

May Administrative Report: The Provost and Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs sends a report of Chancellor's decision, vote of PTC, and other information to candidate. (See sections entitled "**Responsibilities of the Provost and Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs**" and "**Responsibilities of the Chancellor**" )

The faculty member under consideration for tenure and/or promotion is to receive a copy of the various reports as they are submitted. Note that the UNCP Board of Trustees approves tenure and promotion decisions. (See the section entitled "**History of The University of North Carolina**" for a review of the university's governing structure and see section entitled "**Initiation, Review, and Approval of Appointments, Promotions, and Reappointments**" for information about the Board of Trustees's involvement in promotion and tenure decisions.)