

**Department of Sociology**  
**The University of North Carolina at Greensboro**

**Guidelines on Reappointment, Tenure, and Promotion**

The following document outlines the typical procedures to be employed with regard to tenure and promotion from the onset of employment through the appointment to full professor. The document makes reference to numerous additional external materials from the University and College, including: *University-Wide Guidelines for Promotions and Tenure* (2011), Promotion and Tenure Forms, the College of Arts and Sciences (CAS) *Guidelines on Reappointment, Tenure, and Promotion*, *CAS Regulations on Reappointment, Tenure & Promotion*, *CAS Best Practices in Tenure and Promotion*, *Personal Exigency: Guidelines and Procedures*, and the Faculty Senate Resolution “On the independence of departmental committees.” These guidelines are supplementary to College and University documents governing reappointment, tenure, and promotion. In the case of any conflict, the College and University documents take precedence.

This document was prepared in two parts. The first details the tenure and promotion calendar. The second part describes in substantive terms the expectations for academic performance in the three areas of teaching, scholarship/research, and service.

## **Part 1: Calendar**

### **Before Employment**

- Head discusses the procedures and criteria for tenure and promotion with the potential faculty member.
  - Discussion documented by signature of both parties (potential faculty member and Head).

### **First Semester of Employment**

- Head discusses procedures and criteria for tenure and promotion with the faculty member.
  - Head provides a copy of all documents and materials required for tenure and promotion. These materials are aggregated in *the Guidelines and Procedures Manual* compiled by the department.
  - New faculty are encouraged to review these materials early on and discuss with other faculty the kinds of materials that should be collected/documented in preparation for the reappointment review in the 3rd year.
  - Discussion documented by signature of both parties (faculty member and Head).

### **Annual Review Meeting (spring semester)**

- Annual reviews should include written comments specifically evaluating progress towards tenure and

promotion, including discussion of areas that are strong as well as suggestions for strengthening areas that may be weak. Any verbal comments should be consistent with those provided in writing.

- The Annual Review Committee providing part of this commentary is appointed by the Head and includes all tenured senior faculty who will eventually vote on the candidate's tenure.
- The Head constructs written and verbal comments for the junior faculty member based on the committee's recommendations as well as her/his own reading of the record.
- Document agreement with the written comments by having both parties sign. Each party receives a copy of the signed document. The candidate may express disagreement with the comments by refusing to sign the document and submitting in its stead a signed supplementary document explaining the candidate's position.
- See *CAS Best Practices in Tenure and Promotion* for further information on the annual review process.

### **Reappointment Review (fall term of 3rd year)**

- Candidates should begin to gather and organize third year review materials over the preceding summer.
- In the reappointment term, the Head must meet with the candidate to review College and Department tenure and promotion guidelines
- See *CAS Reappointment Review Guidelines* and CAS Reappointment Review Form.
- By November 15 of the 3rd year, the candidate delivers the documents to the Head who makes them available for review by all tenured faculty of higher rank.
- The tenured faculty meet to discuss the materials and vote on the reappointment.
- If discussion reveals that the vote might be a terminating vote, the procedure outlined in the Faculty Senate Resolution "On the independence of departmental committees..." in which the Head recuses her/himself before a vote, must be followed.
- If the vote is positive, the Head writes an evaluative statement for each area (research, teaching, and service) and a general statement summarizing the candidate's progress towards promotion and tenure. The Head meets with the candidate to review the material, providing suggestions on how to strengthen the candidate's position with regard to tenure and promotion. The Head forwards the reappointment form to the Dean's office.

### **Extension of Probationary Period ("stopping the tenure clock")**

- Extensions of the probationary term may be granted for reasons of personal exigency. Examples of personal exigencies that may justify an extension include, but are not limited to, extended illness, disability, childbirth or serious problems concerning the health or welfare of an immediate family member. Policies and procedures are described in the following documents: *Personal Exigency: Guidelines and procedures* and *CAS Regulations on Reappointment, Tenure, & Promotion*, Section V. G.
- The faculty member should thoroughly consult with his/her Department Head before making the request
- The request should be made as soon as the faculty member becomes convinced that circumstances warrant an extension. No requests will be granted later than the end of the spring semester that precedes the next to last year of the probationary period.

- It is the faculty member's responsibility to provide adequate documentation of the situation.
- After reviewing the request for extension the Department head and the Dean will forward it to the Provost together with their advice about the merits of the request.

### **Tenure and Promotion (Mandatory) Review (Years 5-6)**

- Fall of 5th year:
  - The Dean informs the Head of the candidates to be reviewed in the following fall.
  - All parties review the following; the candidate clarifies any questions with the Head:
    - University Promotion and Tenure Forms
    - CAS Guidelines on Reappointment, Tenure, & Promotion
    - CAS Regulations on Reappointment, Tenure & Promotion
- Best Practices in Tenure & Promotion
- The candidate begins collecting and organizing all relevant materials for the dossier.
- Early February of 5th year:
  - Head establishes a timetable for review and distributes it to candidates undergoing review as well as to senior faculty who will be involved in the review along with a clear statement of what information the candidate must provide and the dates when each item is due
- by May 1 of 5th year:
  - Candidates provide a list of up to four (4) potential external reviewers and names of those who are not appropriate to serve as reviewers. The Head reviews the list, selects from the list, and/or adds to the list and secures the agreement of the candidate on the final list. The aggregate list must contain at least eight potential reviewers from which no fewer than three are selected; at least one of the three must be someone suggested by the candidate. (See CAS Regulations VI.)
  - Head asks that reviews be returned no later than August 1.
- By June 1 of 5th year:
  - Candidates provide research description, updated CV and publications for external referees

- Summer of 5th year:
  - Candidate solicits non-evaluative letters where appropriate.
  - Candidate finalizes research, teaching, and service statements with Head
  
- By Aug. 1 of 6th year:
  - Candidate submits three narratives describing and analyzing his/her activities and achievements and indicating their significance in the areas of teaching, research, and service
  
- August of 6th year:
  - Head makes the dossier available for review by the tenured senior faculty.
  
- September of 6th year (in accordance with calendar established by Head in February)
  - Head and tenured senior faculty meet to discuss and review candidate's dossier. The Head recuses her/himself. The faculty elected 'Chair' ensures a thorough deliberation of the dossier, keeps detailed notes on the discussion, records the secret vote for and against, and ensures that all faculty sign the T & P Form. The Chair's vote is recorded with the faculty vote. (See CAS Regulations VIII for complete description of Committee and Committee Chair responsibilities)
  - The committee chair immediately reports the vote to the Head
  - Within four days the Chair distributes a draft of the committee report to committee members for review and editing
  - At least ten days prior to the date when materials must be forwarded to the Dean of the College the Chair must provide to the Head a signed written summary of the deliberations and the final vote. The Head reviews the dossier and writes an independent evaluation. The Head's evaluation must be available to the voting faculty and the candidate no later than three business days prior to the date when all materials are due to the Dean
  
- Dissenting Opinions (See CAS Regulations X)
  - Candidate must be allowed at least four business days to complete and forward his/her written comments in response to any aspect of the dossier to the Head. Commentary is optional.
  
- Early October of 6th year:
  - All sections of the Tenure & Promotion dossier are completed, and the dossier is submitted to the Dean's office. Candidates are permitted to make additions to their dossiers until such time as the dossier leaves the Sociology

Department Office. For rules regarding late submission of materials, see CAS Regulations, Section IV. Detailed information about assembling the portfolio/dossier can be found in the University Promotion and Tenure Forms and the CAS *Best Practices in Tenure and Promotion*.

- Early Decisions on Tenure and Promotion
- See CAS *Regulations on Reappointment, Tenure and Promotion*, Section V.H.

#### **Promotion from Associate to Full Professor**

- Formal review for promotion may begin at any time but must commence no later than August 1 of the seventh year following conferral of tenure if requested by the candidate (See CAS *Regulations*.)
- By March 1:
  - Faculty member must submit request to be considered for promotion to the Department Head.
- By May 1:
  - Candidates provide a list of up to four (4) potential external reviewers and names of those who are not appropriate to serve as reviewers. The Head reviews the list, selects from the list, and/or adds to the list and secures the agreement of the candidate on the final list. The aggregate list must contain at least eight potential reviewers from which no fewer than three are selected; at least one of the three must be someone suggested by the candidate. (See CAS Regulations VI.)
- By June 1:
  - Candidates provide research description, updated CV and publications for external referees
- Summer of review year:
  - Candidate solicits non-evaluative letters where appropriate.
  - Candidate finalizes research, teaching, and service statements with Head
- By Aug. 1 of review year:
  - Candidate submits three narratives describing and analyzing his/her activities and achievements and indicating their significance in the areas of teaching, research, and service

- August of review year:
- Head makes the dossier available for review by the review committee. For information about the appointment of special review committees see *CAS, Regulations, Section V.F.*
- September of review year (in accordance with calendar established by Head in February)
- Review committee meets to discuss and review candidate's dossier. The Head recuses her/himself. The faculty elected 'Chair' ensures a thorough deliberation of the dossier, keeps detailed notes on the discussion, records the secret vote for and against, and ensures that all faculty sign the T & P Form. The Chair's vote is recorded with the faculty vote. (See *CAS Regulations, Section VIII* for complete description of Committee and Committee Chair responsibilities)
- The committee Chair immediately reports the vote to the Head
- Within four days the Chair distributes a draft of the committee report to committee members for review and editing
- At least ten days prior to the date when materials must be forwarded to the Dean of the College the Chair must provide to the Head a signed written summary of the deliberations and the final vote. The Head reviews the dossier and writes an independent evaluation. The Head's evaluation must be available to the voting faculty and the candidate no later than three business days prior to the date when all materials are due to the Dean
- Dissenting Opinions (See *CAS Regulations, Section X*)
- Candidate must be allowed at least four business days to complete and forward his/her written comments in response to any aspect of the dossier to the Head. Commentary is optional.
- Early October of review year:
- All sections of the Promotion dossier are completed, and the dossier is submitted to the Dean's office. Candidates are permitted to make additions to their dossiers until such time as the dossier leaves the Sociology Department Office. For rules regarding late submission of materials, see *CAS Regulations, Section IV*. Detailed information about assembling the portfolio/dossier can be found in the University Promotion and Tenure Forms and *CAS Best Practices in Tenure and Promotion*.
- ◆ **Subsequent attempts**
- If the review is not successful, the candidate may request a new review during the third year following the unsuccessful attempt. (See *CAS Regulations, Section V.E.iii.*)

## Part 2: Academic Performance

The Department expects faculty to engage in teaching, research, and service. Adequate accomplishment in all three areas is expected for promotion and/or tenure. While some faculty may be stronger in one of these areas, promotion and/or tenure is not granted on the basis of performance in one area alone. This document describes departmental criteria in each of these areas and explains how performance is assessed.

### Teaching

Along with the College and University, the Department of Sociology recognizes teaching as a primary and integral part of our mission. All faculty are expected to be good teachers. At all levels a candidate's record should include evidence of competence in and commitment to teaching.

Good teaching may have a variety of meanings, but the Department recognizes the following as keys to good teaching: knowledge of the subject matter; organization of course materials in a clear and understandable fashion; respect for students and accessibility inside and outside the classroom; contribution to curriculum design and development; maintenance of high academic standards; ability to challenge students and motivate them to be active learners.

Both before and after tenure, faculty are expected to be committed to improving and enhancing their teaching by extending their knowledge of their fields or sub-disciplines and by keeping abreast of current pedagogical practices. The Department expects to see evidence of continued improvement in teaching. Assessment of teaching performance will be based on a series of both peer and student evaluations of a candidate's teaching performance and other relevant materials over a period of time.

Below is a list of materials typically included in dossiers prepared for reappointment, tenure, and promotion.

For **reappointment** candidates are required to provide:

- Statement of teaching responsibilities
- Student and peer evaluations
- Course syllabi
- Other information about teaching related activities (advising, curriculum development awards, etc.)

These materials are included in the primary (on-line) dossiers for **tenure and promotion**:

- \* Statement of teaching philosophy (required)
- \* Statement of teaching responsibilities (required)
- \* Summary of contributions to curriculum development (optional)
- \* Summary of Advising Responsibilities (required)
- \* Summary of Grants/Awards Relating to Teaching and Curriculum Development (optional)

These materials **must** be included in the secondary dossier (in hard copy format):

- \* Student and peer evaluations
- \* Representative course syllabi (nb. Keep in mind the university's requirement that student learning goals must be stated in measurable terms and be logically connected to course materials, pedagogy methods, and specific instruments of student assessment)

These materials **may** be included in the secondary dossier but are not required (this list is suggestive but not exhaustive):

- \* Use of technologies in teaching
- \* Links between research and teaching
- \* Future goals (nb. Teaching, like research, ought to a guided, career-long activity)
- \* Honors
- \* Invitations to speak or present papers about teaching
- \* Documentation of participation in pedagogical development (teaching workshops, and so forth)
- \* Letters/statements from colleagues at other institutions; letters/statements from alumni concerning quality of teaching
- \* Products of Teaching/Student Learning
- \* Letters/statements from students (solicited and unsolicited)
- \* Student scores on pre- and post-course examinations
- \* Examples of student work (course work, poster presentations, videos, blogs, publications, paper presentations, etc.)
- \* Record of students who go on for graduate school and/or work in the discipline
- \* Internet or distance learning
- \* Publications about teaching/learning
- \* Videos of lectures and/or teaching activities

We encourage faculty early in their academic careers to begin to develop a teaching portfolio that includes as many elements from the above list as possible.

## **Scholarship and Research**

Scholarly work is expected of all tenured and tenure track faculty and may take the form of research, reference, community-engaged, or theoretical work. For the purpose of evaluation, such work must reflect an organized intellectual agenda and be subjected to external peer review, publicly disseminated, and sustained.

Generally speaking, the following types of work may be used in assessment: papers published in referred journals, books, book chapters, invited publications, films, translations, conference presentations, and grant applications. Depending on the candidate's work, other categories may also be considered.

Work completed prior to appointment at UNCG:

Candidates may be able to count work done before coming to UNCG towards tenure; however, an agreement about the nature

of such credit and how it alters a candidate's timeline for engaging the tenure process must be reached with the Dean and Department Head prior to employment in the Department. Without such a standing agreement in place, only work published during the candidate's tenure at UNCG will be taken into consideration.

A candidate for **reappointment** should present evidence of success in conducting research as well as promise of continuing development toward the Department's research guidelines for successful promotion and tenure.

A candidate for **promotion with permanent tenure** must demonstrate "a sufficient quantity and quality of original, significant, peer reviewed, publicly disseminated, recognized and sustained scholarship." (CAS Guidelines, p. 2) The candidate's dossier should provide clear evidence of continued future scholarly productivity that justifies a tenured position. High quality, originality, and significance of contribution are more important than either the volume or type of scholarship represented. Our normal expectation is that an assistant professor will have published *the equivalent of* about one refereed article per year, which would amount to approximately five article length publications for a candidate coming up for consideration in the sixth year. Nonetheless, judgments are not based solely on the number of publications. In general, high quality, originality, and significance of the published research are considered more important than either quantity or type of scholarship. Some kinds of scholarship are more time-consuming than others and every scholarly career entails a unique trajectory. Thus, while there is no set number of publications that either ensures or precludes a positive decision on promotion with permanent tenure, candidates should demonstrate consistent engagement in scholarly activity throughout the probationary period. As a general rule, this entails:

- \* clear evidence of publication activity during each year of the probationary period
- \* clear evidence of post-dissertation scholarship, i.e. that the candidate has embarked upon new independent research activity beyond the scholarship evidenced in the dissertation

The usual expectations for **promotion to professor** include a record of sustained scholarship that is of high quality and has received good peer review. An individual needs to have a substantial publication record since having been promoted to associate professor. We define a substantial record as one that exceeds, in quantity and impact, the record that the Department expects one to compile for promotion to associate professor. In evaluating the research record, both quantity and quality are important. A smaller number of high quality articles may be considered superior to a larger number of lower quality articles. The publications should be recognized as good contributions to the field. Furthermore, the individual should have a sustained record of research that indicates that the individual will continue to actively conduct research and publish after promotion.

### **Quality of Scholarship**

In general the following sources of information are used to assess quality:

- \* The Promotion and Tenure Committee's independent evaluation based upon careful reading of the candidate's publications
- \* Evaluations solicited from outside experts in the candidate's field
- \* The status and quality of the venue in which the work is published

Evaluations of quality begin with objective evidence that the work is published in a recognized outlet for peer-reviewed scholarly work. "Recognized" peer-reviewed journals are those meeting any of the following criteria:

- \* included in a major citation index (e.g. Social Science Citation Index)
- \* affiliated with a recognized professional organization
- \* Established as recognized by the Department's P&T Committee prior to publication
- \* Designated as "recognized" during the candidate's prior annual review process

Evaluation of book publishers involves establishing the press as an academic press publishing for a scholarly audience.

Indicators include:

- \* Affiliated with a university
- \* Utilization of scholarly peer reviewers
- \* Established as recognized by the Department's P&T Committee prior to publication
- \* Designated as "recognized" during the candidate's prior annual review process

Journals and book publishers in sociology do vary in quality and some are generally recognized as being of very high quality.

The prestige and selectivity of the venue may be established using accepted indicators such as

- \* impact ratings
- \* citation indexes
- \* acceptance rates
- \* audience base
- \* reputation of editors/authors

Other scholarly venues will be evaluated when presented. For example:

- being requested to write a government or think tank publication which goes through an in-house review before publication can be considered.

### **Sustained scholarship/quantity of scholarship**

In assessing scholarship the Promotion & Tenure Committee takes the following into account:

- \* published books carry more weight than articles
- \* edited books and chapters in edited volumes may count less than recognized refereed journal articles or monographs, depending upon the prestige of the press and whether or not the publication was subjected to peer review
- \* book reviews and conference presentations, while a valuable indicator of sustained intellectual activity, do not count as publications toward tenure but do count as indicators of continued involvement in the discipline
- \* innovative pedagogical works (such as textbooks) may count as publications toward tenure, provided they "have a demonstrable influence on the discipline." (See CAS Guidelines)
- \* external research grants count as scholarly activity as does the preparation of major grant applications. The availability of grants varies greatly in sociology, depending on the candidate's area of study. All faculty are encouraged but not

required to apply for external funding.

- \* An article, book, or book chapter that is unconditionally accepted or “in press” is given as much weight as one actually published. If the work is “under review” or at the stage of “revise and resubmit” it counts merely as evidence of work in progress.

#### Collaborative/multi-authored work

- \* Multi-disciplinary work also is common for sociologists. Assessment will focus on the extent and nature of the candidate’s contribution to the research with particular attention given to the sociological dimensions of the work.
- \* Collaborative research and multi-authored publications are common in sociology. In assessing a candidate, the extent and nature of the candidate’s contribution to the research will be taken into account. Candidates are expected to request verification from collaborators of their role in the joint authored scholarship included in the dossier.
- \* Active participation in student research projects may entail a good deal of input of research ideas, though many professors do not attach their names to theses or papers.

#### Community Engaged Scholarship

Community engaged scholarship includes research/creative activities undertaken by faculty members in collaboration with community partners. It involves the collaborative production of knowledge. As noted in University documents (see *Community Engagement: Terms and Definitions for Promotion and Tenure Guidelines*) it involves **both** community engagement and scholarship. With respect to tenure and promotion, the Sociology Department utilizes the following standards of evaluation, which are derived from those established by The ASA Council.

#### Community engaged scholarship in sociology:

- \* draws on a body of sociological literature
- \* is research-based
- \* upholds rigorous methodological standards
- \* is subject to peer review

The Department follows ASA recommendations with respect to the selection of appropriate peer reviewers for community engaged scholarship. In judging whether or not a non-sociologist, non-academic reviewer is appropriate, the Department considers a reviewer’s: 1) educational background or professional training; 2) practical (non-degree related) experience in a particular policy or service area; 3) familiarity with research methodologies associated with public sociology work, e.g. community-based participatory research, participatory action research or participatory evaluation research; or 4) ability to judge impact/potential impact of a candidate’s research on the public, a specific organization, and/or a specific community.) As appropriate the Department Head may request the assistance of the ASA to help identify sociologists who are appropriate reviewers or who may be able to make recommendations of qualified non-sociologist and non-academic peers.

Evaluation of community engaged scholarship will be based upon review of research outcomes/products. These may include

- \* research reports completed for, and used by, non-academic organizations

- \* evaluation research instruments and outcomes;
- \* documentation of involvement in community-based research and educational activities;
- \* transcripts of public testimony at government policy hearings;
- \* visual media substantially utilizing a candidate's research
- \* evidence of impact of the candidate's community engaged scholarship activity, e.g. documentation that a report was used to expand an organization's services to more clients or community members or evidence that a report improved the quality of life in a specific community. In the cases of participatory research, non-academic participants should be invited to provide input as to the effectiveness of the candidate's contributions to their organization or community; these documents should be as detailed and precise as possible in communicating the quantitative and qualitative indicators of research impact.

Whether or not a candidate for promotion and/or tenure includes community –engaged research in his or her research package, that candidate would be expected to have produced some traditional scholarly works. These traditional scholarly publications might be directly related to or part of the individual's community-engaged research, but they might be in a different research area.

### **Applied research**

Applied research is another form of research in which faculty may engage. While applied research involves less ongoing collaboration with members of the community than does community-engaged research, the two often share many features. We regard applied research as a legitimate form of research, and we would apply similar standards to applied research that we would apply to community-engaged scholarship. Thus, the criteria outlined above for the evaluation of community-engaged scholarship will apply equally to applied research."

### **Service**

Academic and professional service is expected of all faculty members at UNCG. Consistent with University Guidelines the Sociology Department expects increasing service involvement at higher ranks.

**Service to the institution** is necessary to serve the University and Sociology recognizes service as an important aspect of a candidate's professional life. Service falls into three areas: departmental, college, and university. Candidates for tenure and promotion are encouraged to be involved in all three areas of service; however, involvement in all three areas is not a requirement for promotion and tenure. If College and University service opportunities become available, the candidate is encouraged to document such service. This documentation can include letters of appointment or appreciation of service from administrators and/or committee chairs.

**Service to the Department:** is required of all members of the Department and will be assessed and evaluated during the annual review process.

**Service to the profession:** Faculty are encouraged to maintain membership/professional ties with the academic profession. However, service to the profession goes beyond membership in the organization and might include: service on the committees or executive boards of academic or professional organizations; service on selection committees of external granting agencies; service on the editorial boards of academic, professional or scientific journals; organization of conferences or workshops, organizing, chairing, or commenting on a conference panel, etc.

**Service in the public sphere:** There could be a variety of recognizable ways of providing service to the community. These include presenting sociological knowledge to the general public through articles in the popular press and public speeches (i.e., “public sociology”), developing professional relationships with organizations, businesses, and public agencies; developing and participating in outreach programs beyond the confines of the University; developing and participating in partnerships (such as internship programs) between departmental programs and external agencies.

A candidate for reappointment should indicate a reasonable contribution of service to the Department. The Sociology Department does not expect assistant professors to engage in substantial amounts of service, especially in their first three years. Some service at the College and/or University level is welcomed but not required for reappointment. While service to the profession may be minimal at this point, there should be evidence that the candidate is developing the professional visibility that helps to create these opportunities.

For promotion with permanent tenure expectations are that the candidate has contributed to the Department’s mission in a reasonable manner. We do not expect assistant professors to engage in significant service activities outside the Department as we believe that they need to concentrate on their teaching and research; however, we do expect them to have some university and professional service beyond that provided to the Department.

For promotion from associate professor to professor expectations are that the individual has a substantial service record, normally including both external and university service.

These guidelines are supplementary to College and University documents governing reappointment, tenure, and promotion. In the case of any conflict, the College and University documents take precedence.

Approved: April 21, 2011