



THE UNIVERSITY *of* NORTH CAROLINA
GREENSBORO

School *of* Education



Guidelines for Promotion and Tenure

Revised July 2023

Table of Contents

Overview.....	3
Department-Level Review.....	4
School-Wide Review and Criteria.....	5
Reappointment at Rank of Assistant Professor.....	5
Teaching.....	5
Research and Creative Activity.....	6
Service.....	6
Directed Professional Activity.....	6
Promotion to the Rank of Associate Professor with Tenure	
Teaching.....	6
Research and Creative Activity.....	7
Service.....	7
Directed Professional Activity.....	7
Promotion to the Rank of Professor.....	7
Teaching.....	8
Research and Creative Activity.....	8
Service.....	8
Directed Professional Activity.....	8
Promotion for Clinical Activity.....	9
Policy Appendices.....	12
A. SOE P&T Committee Membership and Structure.....	12
B. SOE P&T Procedures for Tenure-track Candidates for Reappointment.....	13
C. SOE P&T Procedures for Candidates for Promotion to Associate Professor with Tenure and Candidates for Promotion to Full Professor.....	14
D. External Reviewers for Promotion and Tenure/ Promotion.....	15
E. External Reviewers for Clinical Faculty Seeking Promotion.....	17
F. Model Letter for External Reviewers (Boyette).....	19
G. Reminders, Requests, and Helpful Hints.....	23
H. Tasks and Timeline: Reappointment, Promotion and Tenure Tenure-track, Promotion Tenured and Clinical and Faculty.....	27
I. COVID Impact Statement Guidelines.....	32

Overview

In the School of Education, candidates' credentials are reviewed by the faculty at two levels and by the Dean. First level review occurs in the department; Department-level consideration of candidates involves department tenure and promotion committees and department chairs. Second-level consideration is a responsibility of the School of Education Promotion and Tenure Committee. The Dean reviews credentials, the recommendations of the department, and the reviews conducted by the SOE P&T Committee. According to the University-wide guidelines, the primary responsibility for recommendations concerning the promotions and tenure of faculty members rests with the units.

Procedures are consistent with departmental, School, University, and System procedures, standards, and regulations. Among University-documents that are particularly relevant to these processes are:

- Chapter VI, Section 600 of the UNC Code -- Freedom and Responsibility in the University Community.
<http://www.northcarolina.edu/policy/index.php?tag=Section+600>
- Chapter VI, Section 602 of the UNC Code - Academic Tenure
<http://www.northcarolina.edu/policy/index.php?tag=Section+602>
- UNCG's Promotion, Tenure, Academic Freedom, and Due Process Regulations
[https://drive.google.com/a/uncg.edu/file/d/0B3_J3Uix1B4UWjIQYWhodDdvaDA/vi
ew](https://drive.google.com/a/uncg.edu/file/d/0B3_J3Uix1B4UWjIQYWhodDdvaDA/vi
ew)
- UNCG's University-Wide Evaluation Guidelines for Promotion and Tenure document
[https://drive.google.com/a/uncg.edu/file/d/0B3_J3Uix1B4UZGhreWVPCFI2NWM/v
iew](https://drive.google.com/a/uncg.edu/file/d/0B3_J3Uix1B4UZGhreWVPCFI2NWM/v
iew)
- UNCG's Promotion and Tenure Policies
<https://provost.uncg.edu/policies-procedures-forms/promotion-tenure-policies/>

In accordance with these guidelines, the School of Education recognizes the educative framework in which its faculty succeeds in teaching, research and creative activity, and service, and thus considers candidates holistically for tenure and promotion. Procedures followed at both the department level and the School level require assessment of candidates' performance in the areas of (1) teaching, (2) research and creative activity, and (3) service (UNCG P&T Guidelines, p.2). UNCG is designated as a Community-Engaged Institution and as such fully supports community-engaged teaching, research, and service therefore, if involved, a candidate should include his/her contributions in the appropriate section. Candidates are asked to develop representative profiles of their work in accordance with unit expectations. Any candidate along with their department has the option of including a fourth additional category, *directed professional activity*, the terms of which must be delineated in writing between the department chair and candidate. Following

University guidelines, it is understood, “The emphasis given to a specific category can vary among faculty members. Each activity must manifest the basic features of scholarly and professional work. The work should show a high level of discipline-related proficiency, be creative or original, be amenable to documentation, be peer or constituent-reviewed, and have a significant impact.” (UNCG P&T Guidelines, p. 2-3).

Directed Professional Activity:

Although all faculty members are expected to perform in the categories of teaching, research and creative activity, and service, the particular assigned responsibilities may also include professional activities that merit separate classification and delineation. In such cases these activities are a significant part of the faculty member's contributions to the University and other communities. For those faculty members desiring to use this category, each activity must be carefully defined, with the purpose and significance of the directed professional activity clearly delineated in a written agreement between the faculty member and the department chair before or after reappointment and well in advance of submitting materials for promotion and tenure. Directed professional activities together with research and creative activities and service activities may take up to one half of a faculty member's full-time assignment each semester. (UNCG P&T Guidelines, p.13).

Community-Engaged Teaching, Research, and Service:

Community-Engaged work is recognized by the University as a lens through which teaching, research/creative activities, and service can coalesce “to realize [the university’s] full potential as an inclusive, collaborative, and responsive public research university making a difference in the lives of the individuals and communities it serves” (<http://communityengagement.uncg.edu/icee/>). “...[C]ommunity engagement refers to research/creative activities, teaching, and service activities that are collaboratively undertaken by faculty members with community partners, staff, and/or students through processes that exemplify reciprocal partnerships and public purposes (<http://communityengagement.uncg.edu/definitions/>). As such, the University has developed specific examples for each evaluation category within the University’s Promotion and Tenure Guidelines. (see UNCG P&T Guidelines, pp. 4, 8, and 12).

Department-Level Review

Overview

Departmental-level review is the first level of review in the Promotion and Tenure or Reappointment process in the School of Education. Department Chairs must provide a written context situating the discipline and its various methodologies. This context statement establishes the significance of the candidate’s work and sets the stage for the Candidate’s profile as it illustrates the expectations of the discipline in which they work, department, unit, and University. Candidates organize documentation that will feature their contributions in the relevant categories for evaluation. Together, Departments and Candidates create and provide the documentation required for the School-level review. As a result of the COVID Pandemic over the course of 2020-2021, candidates may include a COVID Impact Statement. Department chairs, department committees, and unit committees must also account for the contents of the statement in their documentation. Please see Appendix I for details.

School-Wide Review And Criteria

Reappointment at Rank of Assistant Professor

Assistant Professors normally receive an initial appointment of four years. They are reviewed in their third year for reappointment to a second term of three years

Teaching:

The concept of "teaching" as understood for the purpose of assessing a candidate's performance is construed broadly and embraces both traditional classroom instruction and more diverse methods and settings, including community-engaged teaching as defined by the UNCG P&T Guidelines (8/1/11). At this stage, a candidate should demonstrate satisfactory teaching effectiveness and a commitment to improve teaching and student learning, as well as show promise of making continuing contributions to teaching and student learning.

Criteria:

Consult University guidelines, (pp. 3-6),

https://drive.google.com/a/uncg.edu/file/d/0B3_I3Uix1B4UZGhreWVPcFI2NWM/view

Research and Creative Activity:

This category embraces all forms of scholarship appropriate to the multiple missions of the individual departments in the School of Education, including community-engaged research and creative activity as defined by the UNCG P&T Guidelines (8/1/11). At this stage, a candidate should show evidence of success in his/her efforts to make contributions to the knowledge base in his/her field, as well as provide evidence of continued progress of a research or scholarly contributions to his/her field.

Criteria:

Consult University guidelines, (pp.7-10),

https://drive.google.com/a/uncg.edu/file/d/0B3_I3Uix1B4UZGhreWVPcFI2NWM/view

Service:

The category of service embraces services and leadership activities that may operate on many levels from within the University to the broadest possible external arenas, including community-engaged service as defined by the UNCG P&T Guidelines (8/1/11). At this stage, a candidate should show contributions of leadership and service, based on his/her expertise as a faculty member that may be at any level within the University (program, department, school, university), the profession, or any other communities external to the University and the profession, as well as provide evidence of likelihood of continued contributions.

Criteria:

Consult university guidelines, (pp.11-13),

https://drive.google.com/a/uncg.edu/file/d/0B3_I3Uix1B4UZGhreWVPcFI2NWM/view

Directed Professional Activity:

Directed professional activity is defined as a University activity that makes a contribution so sufficiently distinctive that its significance in overall faculty effort is diminished when embedded in any of the three other categories of teaching, research and creative activities, and service. The principal objective in the evaluation of directed professional activity is to assess the nature and quality of this contribution and its significance to, or impact on, the University. At this stage, candidates should establish in writing the nature and scope of the directed activity.

Criteria:

Consult University guidelines, (pp. 14-16),

https://drive.google.com/a/uncg.edu/file/d/0B3_I3Uix1B4UZGhreWVPcFI2NWM/view

Promotion to the Rank of Associate Professor with Tenure

Assistant Professors are normally reviewed for promotion to Associate Professor with tenure in their sixth year of employment (the second year of their second term of employment as Assistant Professor). The review for promotion and conferral of permanent tenure may occur before that time, however, if it is deemed appropriate by the candidate's department chair in consultation with the department's tenured faculty and the Dean.

Teaching:

The concept of "teaching" as understood for the purpose of assessing a candidate's performance is construed broadly and embraces both traditional classroom instruction and more diverse methods and settings, including community-engaged teaching as defined by the UNCG P&T Guidelines (8/1/11). At this stage, a candidate should have sustained a record of "good" to "excellent" evaluations in the area of teaching as documented by evidence that may include (but not necessarily be limited to) peer reviews and student course evaluations based on all courses taught.

Criteria:

Consult University guidelines, (pp. 3-6),

https://drive.google.com/a/uncg.edu/file/d/0B3_I3Uix1B4UZGhreWVPcFI2NWM/view

Research and Creative Activity:

This category embraces all forms of scholarship appropriate to the multiple missions of the individual departments in the School of Education, including community-engaged research and creative activity as defined by the UNCG P&T Guidelines (8/1/11). At this stage a candidate's record should show evidence of scholarly productivity in accordance with the norms and expectations of his/her specialized area of expertise, including a pattern of regularly contributing to peer-reviewed outlets where high quality and impact is prized more than volume.

Criteria:

Consult University guidelines, (pp. 7-10),

https://drive.google.com/a/uncg.edu/file/d/0B3_I3Uix1B4UZGhreWVPcFI2NWM/view

Service:

The category of service embraces services and leadership activities that may operate on many levels from within the University to the broadest possible external arenas, including community-engaged service as defined by the UNCG P&T Guidelines (8/1/11). At this stage, a candidate should present a record of success and commitment to contributions of leadership and service that must include service to the Department, School, University, and the profession, and may include service contributions to communities beyond the University. At this level, the candidate's overall record of service to his/her unit has been reflected by overall ratings of "good" to "excellent" on performance reviews conducted by his/her department head.

Criteria:

Consult University guidelines, (pp. 11-13),

https://drive.google.com/a/uncg.edu/file/d/0B3_I3Uix1B4UZGhreWVPcFI2NWM/view

Directed Professional Activity:

Directed professional activity is defined as a university activity that makes a contribution so sufficiently distinctive that its significance in overall faculty effort is diminished when embedded in any of the three other categories of teaching, research and creative activities, and service. The principal objective in the evaluation of directed professional activity is to assess the nature and quality of this contribution and its significance to, or impact on, the university. At this stage, this category should encompass previously agreed upon leadership responsibilities provided to the unit, program, or community. The candidate presents a record of success and commitment to the aforementioned and documented responsibilities designated under Directed Professional Activity.

Criteria:

Consult University guidelines, (pp. 14-16),

https://drive.google.com/a/uncg.edu/file/d/0B3_I3Uix1B4UZGhreWVPcFI2NWM/view

Promotion to the Rank of Professor

Promotion to the rank of Professor is based on achievement, distinction, and impact of contributions, not on duration of employment. An Associate Professor may be recommended for promotion at any time. It is expected that candidates who are approved for the rank of Professor will have achieved distinction, as viewed by peers, in terms of reputation in at least one of these areas: teaching, research or creative activity, and service.

Teaching:

The concept of "teaching" as understood for the purpose of assessing a candidate's performance is construed broadly and embraces both traditional classroom instruction and more diverse methods and settings, including community-engaged teaching as defined by the UNCG P&T Guidelines (8/1/11). At this stage, a candidate's record should reflect a continued pattern of commitment to effective teaching and student learning that may have been recognized in a variety of ways, including, but not limited to, student and peer testimonials, grants and contracts to share instructional expertise in other settings, and

invitations to share special instructional expertise at meetings of professional groups. The candidate has sustained a record of "good" or "excellent" teaching evaluations as documented across all courses and peer reviews.

Criteria:

Consult University guidelines, (pp. 3-6),

https://drive.google.com/a/uncg.edu/file/d/0B3_J3Uix1B4UZGhreWVPcFI2NWM/view

Research and Creative Activity:

This category embraces all forms of scholarship appropriate to the multiple missions of the individual departments in the School of Education, including community-engaged research and creative activity as defined by the UNCG P&T Guidelines (8/1/11). A candidate should show evidence of continuous productivity in a defined area of scholarship relevant to his/her specialization. The candidate's contributions to the knowledge base of his/her area of specialization are acknowledged to be of high quality and impact and are weighed more heavily than quantity.

Criteria:

Consult University guidelines, (pp. 7-10),

https://drive.google.com/a/uncg.edu/file/d/0B3_J3Uix1B4UZGhreWVPcFI2NWM/view

Service:

The category of service embraces services and leadership activities that may operate on many levels from within the University to the broadest possible external arenas, including community-engaged service as defined by the UNCG P&T Guidelines (8/1/11). A candidate should show contributions of service that may likely include leadership roles in activities that range across the School, University, profession, and external communities.

Criteria:

Consult University guidelines, (pp. 11-13)

https://drive.google.com/a/uncg.edu/file/d/0B3_J3Uix1B4UZGhreWVPcFI2NWM/view

Directed Professional Activity:

Directed professional activity is defined as a university activity that makes a contribution so sufficiently distinctive that its significance in overall faculty effort is diminished when embedded in any of the three other categories of teaching, research and creative activities, and service. The principal objective in the evaluation of directed professional activity is to assess the nature and quality of this contribution and its significance to, or impact on, the university. At this stage, this category encompasses previously agreed upon leadership responsibilities provided to the unit, program, or community. Candidates presents a record of success and commitment to the aforementioned and documented responsibilities designated under Directed Professional Activity. A candidate should present a record of success and commitment to the aforementioned and documented responsibilities designated under Directed Professional Activity.

Criteria:

Consult University guidelines, (pp. 14-16),

https://drive.google.com/a/uncg.edu/file/d/0B3_I3Uix1B4UZGhreWVPcFI2NWM/view

Promotion to Associate or Full Clinical Professor

Promotion of clinical faculty is handled in the same fashion as promotion of tenure track faculty (i.e., dossier reviews by the department Promotion and Tenure Committee, external peer reviewers, department chair, School of Education Promotion and Tenure Committee, and dean), except that there is no review required by UNCG administration. Candidates should consult the School of Education Guidelines for procedures and timeline. Promotion requires that individuals meet the general criteria of the rank for which they are being considered. Thus, an individual appointed as a clinical assistant professor would have to meet the criteria for clinical associate professor to be eligible for promotion to that rank.

Criteria for promotion include evidence for competence in the areas of the candidates assignment, including teaching, supervision, service, and/or other relevant activities, consistent with appointment documents. Clinical faculty members may engage in research and creative activities, and they may include such evidence in their dossiers, but these activities are not required unless specifically articulated in their appointment documents.

1. For Promotion to Clinical Associate Professor:

- Candidates may apply for promotion to clinical associate professor during the Fall of the 5th year of their appointment(s) as an assistant clinical professor or its equivalent at an institution of higher education.
- Evidence of the following: (a) professional growth in teaching or clinical practice; (b) contributions to program development (e. g., curriculum, instruction, recruitment, assessment); (c) participation in relevant professional organizations, including presenting and/or leadership; and (d) service beyond the Departmental and School levels.

2. For Promotion to Clinical Professor:

- Candidates may apply for promotion to clinical professor during the Fall of their 10th year of teaching experience as an associate clinical professor or its equivalent at an institution of higher education.
- Evidence of the following: (a) professional growth in teaching or clinical practice; (b) leadership in program development (e. g., curriculum, instruction, recruitment, assessment); (c) leadership in professional organizations at the regional, state, or national levels; and (d) service at all levels of the University and within the community.

Evidence for Promotion

1. *Teaching*

Teaching embraces activities related to instruction and learning that occur both inside and outside the classroom, including community-engaged teaching, international experiences, and other diverse modalities and settings. (*University-wide Guidelines for Promotions and Tenure*, p. 3).

a. *Documentation of teaching or supervision effectiveness may include, but is not limited to, the following:*

- Course load, number of credits, number and level of students.
- Student academic advising
- Student evaluations of teaching
- Peer evaluations of teaching and/or clinical practice
- Development and dissemination of new or improved teaching methods or clinical practices
- Program and/or course development or revision
- Awards for teaching excellence
- Membership on doctoral dissertation committees
- Community-based instruction, such as service learning experiences, on-site courses, or collaborative programs
- Professional development activities (e. g., workshops, non-credit courses)
- Local, regional, state, or national recognition of professional practices or contributions to the field
- Other teaching activities

2. *Service*

Service embraces activities that enable the University to carry out its mission, contribute to the function and effectiveness of the faculty member's profession and discipline, and reach out to external communities and constituencies, such as government agencies, business, and the arts, where academic knowledge intersects with practical affairs and problem solving. (*University-wide Guidelines for Promotions and Tenure*, p. 10).

a. *Documentation of service may include, but is not limited to, the following:*

- Participation in department, School of Education, and UNCG committees
- Leadership in department, School of Education, and UNCG committees
- Participation in professional activities and organizations at local, state, regional, and national levels (e. g., conference proposal reviews, manuscript review)
- Leadership in professional activities and organizations at local, state, regional, and national levels (e. g., election to office, editor, committee chair)
- Invited presentations or keynote addresses
- Participation and leadership in community activities
- Service-related awards

- Advising student organizations

3. *Research and Creative Activity*

As noted earlier, research and creative activity are not required of clinical faculty members unless expressly identified in their appointment. However, if they do engage in research or creative activity, the following definitions for research and creative activity will apply.

Research and creative activities include all forms of discovery and integration of knowledge such as the solution of practical problems; critical analyses; the organization, creation, analysis and dissemination of knowledge resources; the creation and performance or exhibition of works of art; and their public dissemination. Clinical faculty members may engage in significant research or creative activities as appropriate to their fields or disciplines, the appointment description as determined within their department, their continuing professional growth, and the mission of the University. (*University-wide Guidelines for Promotions and Tenure*, p. 7).

- a. *Documentation of research and creative activities may include, but is not limited to, the following:*
 - Presentations at professional meetings
 - Writing or serving on grants or contracts as related to position
 - Publication of professional handbooks, curriculum guides, policy briefs, or other community-related products
 - Publication of book reviews
 - Publication of books or chapters
 - Publication of articles published in peer-reviewed professional journals
 - Publication of non-refereed articles published in professional journals
 - Articles in press
 - Grants or funding received from professional organizations
 - Other creative activities (e. g., creative performances or directorial activities)

School of Education Promotion and Tenure Appendices

A. SOE P&T Committee Membership and Structure

The School of Education Tenure and Promotion Committee conducts the School-wide review. The Committee is comprised of two representatives elected by each department; both must be tenured and at least one must be a full professor. Members serve for a three-year term; terms within the department are staggered. Department Chairs may not serve on the Committee. A tenured member of the School of Education Access and Equity Committee, selected by that committee, serves as an ex-officio, non-voting member of the Promotion and Tenure Committee. In addition, when Clinical faculty members are to be reviewed by the Committee for promotion, The Promotion and Tenure Committee Chair shall appoint an at-large Clinical faculty member as a voting member of the Committee; the at-large Clinical faculty member will not be a member of a Clinical faculty member's department and will hold a rank above that of any Clinical faculty candidate for promotion.

Promotion and Tenure Committee members elect a Chair, who serves in this capacity for two years. (See Appendix B and C for additional information regarding procedures followed by the P&T Committee during its meetings.)

In its deliberations, the SOE P&T Committee considers school-wide criteria as described in the subsection that follows.

These conditions apply to the candidate materials presented to the Promotion and Tenure Committee for consideration:

- The preparation of materials for consideration for promotion and/or tenure is the responsibility of the candidate.
- The presentation of materials should follow the organization outlined in the online Promotion and Tenure Review process in the content management system.
- **The candidate's narrative statement is a maximum total (across the all sections) of 15 pages, double-spaced, excluding the required documentation. The committee will only read up to 15 pages of text. The course evaluations chart, advising chart, list of publications and service activities should only be included at the end of the statement. These charts and lists are not a part of the 15-page text limit, but should be referenced in the narrative**
- For tenure-track candidates seeking promotion to associate professor with tenure or promotion to full professor, and for Clinical faculty members seeking promotion to associate or full Clinical professor, up to 4 letters of external review should be requested, at least 3 should be included in the candidate's materials, and all external letters received should be included. (See Appendix D and E for guidelines for selecting external reviewers and materials sent to them.)

B. SOE P&T Procedures for Tenure-track Candidates for Reappointment

Note: Candidates must follow the outline (e.g., order of presentation of documents) as specified in new UNCG P&T Promotion and Tenure Primary Dossier Format (submitted online, effective March 2011), as further clarified by SOE guidelines and timeline. The completed document should include all candidate and departmental materials, as specified in the UNCG P&T format, excluding the reappointment memo and external reviews). Candidate and departmental materials should be submitted online via the content management system.

SOE P&T meetings

- A. Decision-making meeting
 1. Evidence-gathering phase (includes faculty members from department of candidate, FAEC representative; per UNCG guidelines, the Dean may be present). Discussion based on documents in content management system.
 2. Deliberative phase (includes faculty members from department of candidate, AEC representative; per UNCG guidelines, the Dean may not be present) During deliberative phase, committee can choose to go back to evidence-gathering phase as needed.

One committee member assigned to each candidate to take notes, write draft letter (summary and recommendations) following template (see below for template for the content and outline of the letter). Letter shared with other committee members for review and revision before submitting to Dean and Department Chair.

3. Vote (to exclude faculty members of department of candidate as, per UNCG guidelines, they are not eligible to vote but must have voted at the departmental level; and FAEC member). To be conducted as a secret ballot.

Note: Content of SOE P&T meetings is confidential. The evaluation letter is the only way P&T deliberations and voting outcomes should be communicated. The letter is uploaded to the content management system. The Department Chair and Dean will, in turn, meet together with the candidate to discuss the vote/recommendations.

Template for Evaluation of Candidate for Reappointment

- Comments on strengths and/or areas of concern under categories of Teaching, Research and Creative Activity, and Service; Directed Professional Activity (as appropriate)
- Recommendations to the candidate
- Recommendations to the department
- Overall strengths/areas of concern, including summary of both majority and dissenting opinions
- Committee recommendation (vote)

C. SOE P&T Procedures for Candidates for Promotion to Associate Professor with Tenure and Candidates for Promotion to Full Professor

Note: Candidates must follow the outline (e.g., order of presentation of documents) as specified in the UNCG (submitted online, effective March 2011) and other guidelines and procedures specified by the UNCG Promotion and Tenure Committee (P&T) and as further clarified by the School of Education promotion and tenure guidelines, including criteria and process for identifying external reviewers and timeline for steps in the process.

SOE P&T meetings

A. Decision-making meeting/s

1. Evidence-gathering phase (includes faculty members from departments of candidates, FAEC representative; per UNCG guidelines, the Dean may be present)
Discussion based on notes, in response to questions based on review at initial meeting
2. Deliberative phase (includes faculty members from department of candidate, AEC representative; per UNCG guidelines, the Dean may not be present)
During deliberative phase, committee can choose to go back to evidence-gathering phase as needed. One committee member assigned to each candidate to take notes, write draft report (summary and recommendations) following template (see below). Report shared with other committee members for review and revision before submitting to Dean and Department Chair.
3. Vote (to exclude faculty members of department of candidate as, per UNCG guidelines, they are not eligible to vote but must have voted at the departmental level; and FAEC member). To be conducted as secret ballot. Associate Professors are eligible to vote for candidates seeking promotion to full.

Note: Content of SOE P&T meetings is confidential. The evaluation letter is the only way P&T deliberations and voting outcomes should be communicated. The letter is uploaded to the content management system. The Department Chair and Dean will, in turn, meet together with the candidate to discuss the vote/recommendations.

Template for Promotion to Associate with Tenure/Promotion to Full Professor

- Comments to include references to reappointment memo from P&T committee
- Comments on strengths and/or areas of concern under categories of Teaching; Research and Creative Activity, and Service; Directed Professional Activity (as appropriate)
- Overall strengths/areas of concern, including summary of both majority and dissenting opinions
- Committee recommendation (vote)

D. External Reviewers for Promotion and Tenure/Promotion

Criteria for Selecting External Reviewers and Explanations Provided in the Dossier

(See also Appendix F. Form letter to external reviewers provided by Alan Boyette)

(See also Appendix H. Tasks and Suggested Timeline for Promotion and Tenure)

- External reviewers must hold rank at or above the rank for which the candidate is being considered for promotion.
- Up to 4 letters of external review should be requested, at least 3 should be included in the candidate's materials, and all external letters received should be included in the candidate's dossier. Per UNCG guidelines: The candidate submits the names of up to four potential reviewers to the department chair; the department chair consults with the faculty senior to the candidate in rank to create a list of no fewer than four additional potential reviewers; the department chair selects no fewer than four reviewers from the combined list; the list of selected reviewers contains no less than one name submitted by the candidate.
- External reviewers should be chosen on the basis of their perceived capacities to evaluate a candidate's record of research and creative activity in a balanced, thoughtful, and careful manner.
- External reviewers should be "arm's length" reviewers. External reviewers should not have conflicts of interest relevant to their being able to provide an objective evaluation (e.g., be a co-author, collaborator, doctoral/dissertation committee chair or committee member, post-doc supervisor, or have had extended personal contacts with the candidate).
- External reviewers should be chosen so that, together, they can provide a comprehensive review of the candidate's body of work in research and creative activity (e.g., address each strand of the candidate's research, methodology(ies), contribution to the field, significance of the research focus, etc.).
- External reviewers are selected to review the candidate's research and creative activity and, potentially, professional service, but are not asked to comment on the candidate's teaching record.
- External reviewers should be asked to include a copy of their current curriculum vita along with their evaluation letter.
- External reviewers also should include in their evaluation letters a statement regarding the extent of any professional and/or personal relationship with the candidate.
- The dossier should include a brief statement (written by the department chair, department faculty member, etc., but NOT by the candidate) explaining why this person was selected as an external reviewer for the candidate. The list of external reviewers and explanations should be placed at the front of the section that includes the external reviewers' letters.

Note: Candidates should NOT contact individuals about their willingness or availability to serve as an external reviewer. The department chair makes the initial contact with potential external reviewers and determines their availability. The SOE Dean sends the follow-up letter securing their agreement.

Materials to be sent to External Reviewers

The following materials, and only these materials, should be sent to each External Reviewer, and should be packaged in the order as listed below:

1. Letter from Dean (see model letter from Alan Boyette)
2. Copy of SOE and UNCG guidelines for promotion and tenure
3. Candidate's curriculum vita
4. Candidate's statement regarding research (prepared for the dossier)
5. Three to four selected scholarly works, chosen in consultation with the Department Chair

E. External Reviewers for Clinical Faculty Seeking Promotion

Criteria for Selecting External Reviewers and Explanations Provided in the Dossier

- External reviewers should have an understanding of/familiarity with the role of clinical faculty.
- External reviewers in academic settings may include tenure-track and non-tenure track (clinical) faculty members.
- External reviewers in academic settings must hold rank at or above the rank for which the candidate is being considered for promotion.
- External reviewers also may include persons in non-academic positions who have knowledge/experience/expertise to evaluate the clinical faculty member's work, contributions, and accomplishments. Examples include personnel in leadership positions in school systems or the Department of Public Instruction, leaders of relevant professional organizations, etc.
- Up to 4 letters of external review should be requested, at least 3 should be included in the candidate's materials, and all external letters received should be included in the candidate's dossier. Per UNCG guidelines: The candidate submits the names of up to four potential reviewers to the department chair; the department chair consults with the faculty senior to the candidate in rank to create a list of no fewer than four additional potential reviewers; the department chair selects no fewer than three reviewers from the combined list; the list of selected reviewers contains no less than one name submitted by the candidate.
- External reviewers should be chosen on the basis of their perceived capacities to evaluate a candidate's record in a balanced, thoughtful, and careful manner.
- External reviewers should be "arm's length" reviewers. External reviewers should not have conflicts of interest relevant to their being able to provide an objective evaluation (e.g., be a co-author, collaborator, doctoral/dissertation committee chair or committee member, post-doc supervisor, co-chair of a task force, or have had extended personal contacts with the candidate).
- External reviewers should be chosen so that, together, they can provide a comprehensive review of the candidate's work based upon the criteria established for promotion and responsibilities outlined in the clinical faculty member's contract.
- External reviewers should be asked to include a copy of their current curriculum vita along with their evaluation letter.
- External reviewers also should include in their evaluation letters a statement regarding the extent of any professional and/or personal relationship with the candidate.
- The dossier should include a brief statement (written by the department chair, department faculty member, etc., but NOT by the candidate) explaining why this person was selected as an external reviewer for the candidate. The list of external reviewers and explanations should be placed at the front of the section that includes the external reviewers' letters.

Note: Candidates should NOT contact individuals about their willingness or availability to serve as an external reviewer. The department chair makes the initial contact with potential

external reviewers and determines their availability. The SOE Dean sends the follow-up letter securing their agreement.

Materials to be sent to External Reviewers

The following materials, and only these materials, should be sent to each External Reviewer, and should be package in the order as listed below:

1. Letter from Dean (see model letter from Alan Boyette, revised to reflect the conceptual differences between clinical faculty and tenure-track faculty, and that the process ends with a decision by the Dean)
2. Copy of SOE guidelines for promotion of clinical faculty
3. Statement summarizing the responsibilities, role, and expectations of the clinical faculty member (e.g., % teaching, % service, % administrative, etc.), as specified in the clinical faculty member's contract
4. Candidate's curriculum vita
5. Candidate's statement regarding his/her work, contributions, and accomplishments within the categories specified in his/her contract (e.g., teaching, service, administrative assignments) (prepared for the dossier)
6. As appropriate/relevant, three - four selected examples/illustrations/products representing the clinical faculty member's work, chosen in consultation with the Department Chair.

F. Model Letters for Potential External Reviewers

P&T and Promotion (tenure stream)

Dear (Potential External Reviewer):

We are writing to thank you for agreeing to serve as an external reviewer of (Candidate), (Rank) in the (Department / Unit) at The University of North Carolina at Greensboro, who is a candidate for tenure and promotion to the rank of (Rank). Essentially, you are being asked to provide us with your candid evaluation of the candidate's research and scholarly contributions. Enclosed please find a copy of (Candidate's) curriculum vita, research statement, and several research/scholarly publications that are representative of (his/her) work as well as the SOE guidelines for promotion to (Rank) and departmental guidelines.

Please provide your candid evaluation of the candidate's research/scholarly contributions including your assessment of the enclosed publications and any other research activities of which you are aware. When preparing your letter of evaluation we ask that you address the following issues.

1. Association with the Candidate

How long have you known the candidate and in what capacity?

2. Quality of the Work

What is the quality of the candidate's research and scholarly work? Is there evidence of achievement in research and scholarship that has earned the candidate recognition not only from his or her peers on campus, but at least from those at the state and regional level? Is the quality of the research and scholarship unambiguous and unequivocal? Is the research/scholarship published in the best journals in the discipline?

3. Significance of the Work

What is the significance or impact of the candidate's research or scholarly work?

4. Candidate's Productivity

How does this candidate's productivity over the past (Number) years compare with other faculty members seeking this rank?

5. Candidate's Potential

What is the candidate's potential for future growth as a scholar/researcher and for continued contributions to the discipline? Is there evidence and strong reason to believe that the candidate has the potential as a researcher and scholar to meet the requirements for promotion to the rank applied for ?

6. Candidate's Standing

How would you compare the candidate's research/scholarly work and professional reputation with others in the same discipline who are at the same stage in their careers?

7. Additional Aspects

What other aspects of the candidate's research and scholarly work should be addressed?

Although it would not be expected that external reviewers would be in a position to evaluate the candidate's achievement in the other areas of faculty activity (i.e. teaching and service), please feel free to comment on these areas if you have insight or knowledge that might help the committees involved in this process reach a decision. Because of differences in institutional needs and missions, please do not state whether (Candidate) would be (promoted and/or tenured) at your institution. This decision needs to be made by the promotions and tenure committees and administrators at the unit and University levels.

As a matter of UNCG policy, we cannot ensure the confidentiality of any documents that you provide. Letters from external reviewers become part of the candidate's promotion and tenure folder, which is available to all involved parties within UNCG, including the candidate.

We would very much appreciate your response on or before (Date), as we are under a formal itinerary that involves multiple levels of sequential review. We would request that your evaluation take the form of a letter addressed to me and that you include a current copy of your curriculum vita. If for any reason you cannot provide your review by that date, or if you decline to provide a review of this candidate, please let us know as soon as possible.

We realize that preparing your letter of evaluation will be time consuming. However, as you are aware, academic programs are built on the quality of faculty, and external evaluations from recognized scholars such as yourself are essential in helping us make decisions that will enhance that quality.

If we can provide you with any additional information, please do not hesitate to contact us. We thank you in advance for your assistance with this very important process.

Sincerely,

Enclosures:

1. Curriculum Vita
2. Copies of research/scholarly publications
3. Candidate's statement of research activities
4. SOE P&T Guidelines

Clinical Faculty, Promotion

Dear (Potential External Reviewer):

We are writing to thank you for agreeing to serve as an external reviewer of (Candidate), (Rank) in the (Department / Unit) at The University of North Carolina at Greensboro, who is a candidate for promotion to the rank of (Rank). Essentially, you are being asked to provide us with your candid evaluation of the candidate's professional contributions.

Enclosed please find a copy of (Candidate's) curriculum vita, promotion statement, and several representative samples of (his/her) work.

Also enclosed is a copy of the SOE guidelines for promotion to (Rank). Please provide your candid evaluation, in relation to the expectations of these guidelines, of the candidate's teaching/service contributions including your assessment of the enclosed work. When preparing your letter of evaluation we ask that you address the following issues.

1. Association with the Candidate

How long have you known the candidate and in what capacity?

2. Quality of the Work

What is the quality of the candidate's work? Is there evidence of achievement in teaching and service that has earned the candidate recognition not only from his or her peers on campus, but at least from those at the state and regional level? Is the quality of the work unambiguous and unequivocal?

3. Significance of the Work

What is the significance or impact of the candidate's work?

4. Candidate's Productivity

How does this candidate's productivity over the past (Number) years compare with other faculty members seeking this rank?

5. Candidate's Potential

What is the candidate's potential for future growth and for continued contributions to the discipline? Is there evidence and strong reason to believe that the candidate has the potential to meet the requirements for promotion to the rank applied for?

6. Candidate's Standing

How would you compare the candidate's teaching/service work and professional reputation with others in the same discipline who are at the same stage in their careers?

7. Additional Aspects

What other aspects of the candidate's work should be addressed?

Although it would not be expected that reviewers would be in a position to evaluate the candidate's achievement in the other areas of faculty activity (i.e. research), please feel free to comment on these areas if you have insight or knowledge that might help the committees involved in this process reach a decision. Because of differences in institutional needs and missions, please do not state whether (Candidate) would be (promoted) at your institution. This decision needs to be made by the promotions and tenure committees and administrators at the unit and University levels.

As a matter of UNCG policy, we cannot ensure the confidentiality of any documents that you provide. Letters from external reviewers become part of the candidate's promotion folder, which is available to all involved parties within UNCG, including the candidate.

We would very much appreciate your response on or before (Date), as we are under a formal itinerary that involves multiple levels of sequential review. We would request that your evaluation take the form of a letter addressed to me and that you include a current copy of your curriculum vita. If for any reason you cannot provide your review by that date, or if you decline to provide a review of this candidate, please let us know as soon as possible.

We realize that preparing your letter of evaluation will be time consuming. However, as you are aware, academic programs are built on the quality of faculty, and external evaluations from recognized scholars such as yourself are essential in helping us make decisions that will enhance that quality.

If we can provide you with any additional information, please do not hesitate to contact us. We thank you in advance for your assistance with this very important process.

Sincerely,

Enclosures:

1. Curriculum Vita
2. Several representative samples of (his/her) work
3. Candidate's promotion statement
4. SOE Guidelines for Promotion

G. SOE P&T Reappointment and Promotion Documents Reminders, Requests, and Helpful Hints

For Candidates, Chairs and Mentors:

The following “reminders and requests” are items that have been confusing and/or forgotten in some reviews. Attending to these items will avoid the SOE P&T Committee having to request them with a short turn-around time.

- Please make clear which publications are peer reviewed. (Do this in the document as well as on the curriculum vita).
- Please separate out internal and external grant proposals/funding. (Do this in the document as well as on the curriculum vita).
- Be sure to include the annual reviews from the department chair.
- The content management system will prompt candidate to acknowledge review at each level and to provide a response if necessary, attend to each prompt in a timely manner.
- Be explicit as to the nature of the work and what portions are either pedagogical, research or service in cases where there is confusion regarding the category for work or a product (i.e., teaching, research and service). Think about both intent and outcome in making these distinctions.
- Please follow the conflict of interest and conflict of commitment guidelines for any service that also generates income. Additionally, any engagement not related to your responsibilities as an employee of the university should be clearly indicated in your cv.

Helpful Hints for Preparing Reappointment, P&T, and Promotion Documents

The following “helpful hints” are based in the School of Education Promotion and Tenure Committee’s experience with the review of candidates for the last few years. The intent is to provide some suggestions for helping the candidate situate his/her work and educate the audience who reads the documents so that readers understand what the candidate’s work has involved. These helpful hints are not prescriptive but examples; a candidate should include those that best fit her/his own profile, adapt the suggestions as appropriate to his/her profile, and/or include other information not listed here that helps provide the context for the candidate’s documents.

Teaching

The following should be included in Part B.I.a. in content management system:

- Include data from the course evaluations (means, SDs preferred) for each course. The evaluation form should be in Part B.I.b.
- Include a summary chart of the two standard course evaluation items at the end of Part A narrative (quality of course and quality of instructor).
- Include the *n* (number of students) who provided the evaluations for each course.
- Include a representative sampling of student comments to open-ended questions in Part B.I.b.
- For doctoral committees the candidate is co-chairing, name the co-chair and briefly describe the role of the candidate.

Research/Scholarship

- For each journal where the candidate's work has been published, include context for the publication outlets (e.g., acceptance rates, citations, or estimates of circulation). When possible/appropriate, include similar information for other publication outlets.
- Briefly describe the candidate's contribution as a co-author of publications.
- Required publication lists should be in 10 pt font and single spaced.

Service

- Provide explanation in the narrative about the impact of service activity and its relevance to the candidate's position at the university.
- Make clear any necessary distinctions between consulting work and local/national/international work.
- For journal review work, indicate whether the candidate is an ad hoc reviewer or has been appointed to the editorial board (for what term). Include the number of manuscripts reviewed and scope of the work (e.g., evaluative review only, serving as a mentor to help the author move the piece toward publication)
- Required service activity lists should be in 10 pt font and single spaced.

❖ **Organization of Dossier on Content Management System and Responsibilities (For Candidates and Department Chairs)**

□ Part A: Candidate

*Candidate CV, Part A-Summary of Work Form, 3-4 sample publications (if going up for P&T and Promotion) and Covid Impact Statement : (actual form is on Provost website, *candidate completes and uploads all of these*)

***The candidate's narrative statement is a maximum of 15 pages (across teaching, research and service), double-spaced, excluding the required documentation. The committee will read up to 15 pages of text. At the end of the statement include course evaluations chart, advising chart, list of publications and service activities. These lists should be referenced in the narrative, but only included at the end.**

□ Part B: Department

*1. Statement of Context: (*Department Chair writes and consults Covid Impact Statement*)

*2. Early Review Agreements: (any previously agreed upon documentation of shorter P&T review)

*3. P&T Guidelines document: (SOE and departmental guidelines)

*4. Workload Policy document

*B.I.a. Student Evaluations of Teaching: (summary chart of course evaluations and raw data)

*B.I.b. Departmental Student Teaching Evaluation Instrument

*B.I.c. Peer Reviews of Teaching: (one per year)

*B.I.d. Additional Evidence of Teaching Impact including related Community Engagement

- *B.II.a. External Letters for Research/Creativity Activity including related Community Engagement: (*Dean's Executive Assistant uploads*)
- *B.II.a.i. Copies of Reviewers' CVs: (*Dean's Executive Assistant uploads*)
- *B.II.b. Additional Evidence of Research Impact
- *B.III.a. Letters of Commendation for Service including related Community Engagement
- *B.IV.a. External Letters for Directed Professional Activity
- *B.IV.a.i. Reviewers' Biographical Sketches or CVs for Directed Professional activity: (*Dean's Executive Assistant uploads*)
- *B.IV.b. Other Reviews of Directed Professional Activity
- *B.V.a. Annual Reviews
- *B.V.b. Reappointment Letter: (required for candidates for P&T only)
- *B.V.c. Workload Agreements

Part C: Departmental Vote and Evaluation

- *C.I.a. Faculty's Written Evaluation: (required, **one** concise letter speaking to teaching, research and service)
- *C.I.b. Summary of Faculty Deliberation and Vote
- *C.I.c. Signatures of Faculty Present for the Vote
- *C.II.a. Dissenting Opinion
- *C.III.a. Head's Recommendation and Written Evaluation

Part D: Candidate Responses & Updates

- *D.I. Updates to the Dossier
- *D.II. Response from the Candidate to the Departmental Review
- *D.III. Response from the Candidate to the Unit Review

Part E: Unit Vote and Evaluation

- *E.I.a. and E.I.b. Unit P&T Committee Vote and Written Evaluation (**one** concise letter, *chair of unit P&T uploads*)
- *E.II.a. and E.II.b. Summary evaluation by the Dean and Written Evaluation (*Dean uploads*)

Part F: University P&T Committee

Part G: Appendix

Department Chairs

Context Statement Suggestions

Provide a description of the candidate's primary responsibilities since achieving his or her current rank, in terms of Teaching, Research and Creative Activity, and Service, as well as any contributions to Directed Professional Activity (if the candidate's evaluation is to include this category of work). Candidates may be reviewed for promotion and/or tenure with any mix of Teaching, Research and Creative Activity, Service, and Directed Professional Activity. The statement should be factual and descriptive, not evaluative, and should present the candidate's work within the context of the department, indicating norms or

specificities within that department, especially those that may differ from other departments. If the candidate has received special support from the institution such as start-up funds, TA/RA support beyond that normally granted to a faculty member in his or her department, or a reduced teaching load, this should also be noted. Instances of collaborative research and collaborative teaching should be explained so that reviewers fully understand the distinct contributions of the candidate. This is also the place for the head to provide any context necessary for reviewers to understand the annual reviews included as part of the dossier. *Make sure to consult information in Covid Impact Statement if it is included in candidate's dossier.*

If work produced prior to employment at UNCG will be counted, a separate statement should be uploaded in Part B. 2., and specify what work will be included in the evaluation. 1-2 pages.

These sections might be helpful in constructing the statement:

- Professional responsibilities: (this is not about the specific scholarly work, courses or committees the candidate has engaged in, but rather what portion of their responsibilities is allotted to each, how has their work been distributed across these areas, etc.)
- Context of scholarship in the field: (what are the parameters of the field and expectations, describe the typical conditions within the field that help to understand the work, etc...)
- Criteria or expectations for evaluating quality in relationship to candidate's work

Candidate's Part A Statement Suggestions

Please make sure candidate's narrative is no longer than 15 pages. The committee will not read beyond that. Advising chart, course evaluation chart, list of publications and service activities must be included at the end of the narrative statement and should be referenced in the body, but not included.

-

Appendix H: UNCG School of Education TASKS AND SUGGESTED TIMELINE Promotion and Tenure / Promotion Tenure-Track and Clinical Faculty 2021-2022 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • • 	START DATE	END DATE	PERSON RESPONSIBLE
Early February- Department chairs provide written notification to the Dean's office and current chair of the P & T Committee regarding faculty members who will be going up for promotion.	2/5/23	2/16/23	Department Chair
March - Candidates meet with department chairs to generate a list of names, addresses, telephone numbers, and e-mail addresses of potential external reviewers. Per UNCG guidelines, the candidate submits the names of up to four potential reviewers. The candidate provides a brief rationale for why each person was placed on the list and a description of any relationship between the candidate and each potential reviewer.	3/1/2023	3/25/2023	Candidate / Department Chair
April - The department chair consults with departmental faculty members at or above the rank for which the candidate is being considered to create a list of no fewer than 4 additional potential reviewers. The department chair selects no fewer than 3 reviewers from the combined list; the list of selected reviewers contains no less than one name submitted by the candidate	4/1/2023	4/19/2023	Department chair
May - Department chair contacts potential external reviewers and determines their availability. SOE Dean sends follow-up letter securing their agreement.	5/1/2023	5/24/2023	Department chair and SOE Dean

May - Candidate prepares packet of materials to be submitted to external reviewers. (See SOE External Reviewers document)	5/1/2023	5/31/2023	Candidate and Department chair and/or Mentor
Mid-June - Dean's office staff sends candidate's materials to external reviewers.		6/14/2023	SOE Dean

Early September - External reviewers' letters due to the Dean's office.		8/29/2023	External Reviewers
Early September - Candidate uploads part A to content management system. Department uploads part B to content management system. FIRM DUE DATE		9/1/2023 9/4/2023	Candidate Department
September - Departmental P&T committee members complete review of candidate's materials (including departmental evaluations of teaching, research/scholarship, and service; directed professional activity as appropriate), write letter of evaluation with recommendation (vote) to department chair. Part C.I & C.II	9/4/2023	9/15/2023	Department P&T committee
September- Early October - Department chair completes review of candidate's materials and writes independent letter of evaluation to Dean. Department chair submits chair letter and departmental P&T committee letter to Dean's office. Part C.III	9/15/2023	9/29/2023	Department Chair

October - Candidate responds to departmental review Part D.I	9/29/2023	10/2/2023	Candidate
October – Candidates makes updates to dossier, Part D.II	10/2/2023	10/4/2023	Candidate
October - SOE P&T committee members review candidate’s materials and departmental letters of evaluation, deliberate following established procedures, vote, and write letter of evaluation with recommendation (vote) to Dean. Evaluation sent to Dean and Department Chair. Dean and Department Chair meet with candidate to review recommendation. *Note. If materials are modified or new materials are added to the content management system in response to the SOE P&T Committee's requests for clarification, the candidate should sign a statement indicating he/she is aware of the changes; the signed forms should be scanned and uploaded to the content management system. Part E.I	10/6/2023	10/27/2023	SOE P&T Committee
November - SOE Dean reviews candidate’s materials, P&T letter and departmental letters and writes letter of evaluation/recommendation to Provost. Part E.II	10/30/2023	11/8/2023	SOE Dean
November – Candidate responds to Dean’s review, Part F		11/10/2023	Candidate

November - All P&T recommendations and materials due to the Office of the Provost/Executive Vice Chancellor. FIRM DUE DATE		11/14/2023	Dean's Office
---	--	------------	---------------

Appendix H: UNCG School of Education TASKS AND SUGGESTED TIMELINE Reappointment 2021-22 Tenure-track	END DATE	PERSON RESPONSIBLE
October – Candidate submits Part A and Department submits Part B to the content management system. FIRM DUE DATE	10/2/2023 10/4/2023	Candidate and Department
October - Departmental P&T committee members complete review of candidate's materials (including departmental evaluations of teaching, research/scholarship, and service; directed professional activity as appropriate), write letter of evaluation with recommendation (vote). Part C.I & C.II FIRM DUE DATE	10/27/2023	Department P&T committee
October-November - Department chair completes review of candidate's materials and writes independent letter of evaluation with recommendation. Part C.III FIRM DUE DATE	11/6/2023	Department Chair
November- Candidate responds to departmental review Part D.I	11/7/2023	Candidate
November- Updates to Dossier Part D.II Unit Decision-Send to SOE P&T Committee	11/8/2023 11/10/2023	Dept Admin Dept Admin

<p>Late November - December - SOE P&T committee members review candidate's materials and departmental letters of evaluation, deliberate following established procedures, vote, and write letter of evaluation with recommendation (vote) to Dean. Evaluation sent to Dean and Department Chair. Dean and Department Chair meet with candidate to review recommendation. Part E.I. FIRM DUE DATE</p>	<p>11/10/23 -12/04/2023</p>	<p>SOE P&T Committee</p>
<p>January - SOE Dean reviews candidate's materials, P&T letter and departmental letters, and writes letter of evaluation/recommendation to Provost. Part E.II FIRM DUE DATE</p>	<p>1/19/2024</p>	<p>SOE Dean</p>
<p>January- Candidate responds to unit review, Part F</p>	<p>1/23/2024</p>	<p>Candidate</p>

Appendix I: COVID Impact Statement Guidelines

The COVID Impact Statement is an opportunity for faculty to describe both positive and detrimental effects of the pandemic on the mix or balance of their work activities and the types of work outcomes that they were able to achieve. Evaluators are asked to consider these impacts as they apply departmental and unit standards in faculty evaluation processes. Evaluators are also asked to recognize the individualized impacts of COVID and avoid taking a “universal” approach; for example, the same factor that presented an opportunity for one candidate may have presented a hardship for another. Please note that the inclusion of an impact statement is an option available to faculty members undergoing annual or post-tenure review, but it is not required.

A COVID impact statement must be no more than three pages and should include items that have affected teaching, research/scholarship/creative activities, and service. Below are some ways that COVID-19 may have impacted the work of faculty members that might be addressed in an impact statement:

- Provided opportunities to demonstrate innovation and creativity;
- Required modifications or increases to workload, activities or approaches;
- Canceled or delayed events, activities or work products;
- Reduced access to facilities, libraries, archives, performance venues, galleries or other locations, as well as reduction in personnel, access to human subjects, or access to community or other partners;
- Changes in the availability of external funds to support research or teaching, or changes in the timing of access to those funds; required off-contract work in the summer to redesign courses or provide COVID-related service work to the unit, school, college or university;
- Provided opportunities to address emergent issues related to the pandemic.
- Required additional service to sustain departmental or other operations or to support students that felt “invisible”; and/or
- Caused personal challenges that affected overall productivity (i.e., increased caregiving demands)

Such Impacts should be discussed explicitly in the faculty member’s statement as well as in the departmental, department head, college and/or dean’s assessments (extracted from Provost Communication December 2020).