

UNC Charlotte Department of Theatre
Criteria and Procedures for Reappointment, Promotion and Tenure
Guidelines for Evaluation of Research

(Approved January 28, 2016; Amended by Faculty Vote on August 25, 2016; April 12, 2017;
September 20, 2018; August 22, 2019)

Introduction

The following criteria and procedures of the Department of Theatre for reappointment, promotion and tenure practice (RPT) is in accordance with *The Code of the Board of Governors of The University of North Carolina*, the *Tenure Policies, Regulations, and Proceedings of the University of North Carolina at Charlotte* and the *College of Arts and Architecture Procedures for Reappointment, Promotion, and Conferral of Permanent Tenure*. Any aspect of the departmental review process not described below may be found by consulting university or college policies and procedures.

Procedural Guidelines: Department Review Committee Process

In keeping with University policy, the Department Review Committee is convened to provide a comprehensive disciplinary review of a candidate's review dossier. The DRC provides a report and recommendation to the department chair.

As per University and College policy, elections for DRC members occur in the spring semester (no later than May 15 or the end of the 9-month faculty contract, whichever is sooner). All tenure-line faculty shall vote by ballot for the members of the DRC. After the election the committee meets as soon as possible to select its chair and prepare for upcoming reviews. The DRC meets with the Chair the first week of class in the fall semester to establish its timetable for the upcoming year; thereafter, the Committee meets as often as necessary to conduct its business.

As per University policy and Department of Theatre faculty vote (August 25, 2016), the chair of the DRC shall request testimony from the Theatre faculty at the outset of the review process (once the review dossier has been delivered to the chair by the Dean's office). It is the right of all members of the tenured faculty who are at or above the rank for which a candidate is under consideration to review the candidate's dossier (CV, Research, Service, Teaching folders), and to provide testimony to the DRC in the form of a formal written letter. DRC members, School Administrators, and permanently tenured faculty members at or above the candidate's rank, who review a candidate's CV, Overview Statement, and Supporting Factual Evidence shall treat as confidential all documents submitted or created in connection with the process. Both the information contained therein and information derived from any discussions that are part of the formal review process shall be kept confidential. All letters from qualified faculty members must be submitted to the chair of the DRC no later than Sept. 15th.

As per University policy, the report must contain:

- A vote count which records the number of votes "for," "against," and/or "abstaining."
- Substantial reference to the evaluation provided by the external objective reviewers.

All promotion review files include the following:

1. Confidential review documents including the external reviewer's letters (for the tenure and promotion to full cases only), peer teaching evaluations (if available), peer outside reviews of creative scholarship (if available), annual reviews, and Reappointment documents (for tenure cases). The Confidential documents will be uploaded by the Chair to the CoAA RPT drive as per the instructions issued by the dean.
2. Research dossier, including research statement: uploaded and accessed electronically as per the instructions issued by the dean.
3. Teaching dossier, including teaching statement: uploaded and accessed electronically as per the instructions issued by the dean.
4. Service dossier, including the service statement: uploaded and accessed electronically as per the instructions issued by the dean.
5. A current curriculum vitae.

Please adhere to University and College protocol:

- Do not speak directly to a candidate about your process. If you need additional information in order to make a decision, please request that information through the department chair.
- Do not conduct any kind of sidebar dialogue about a case or a candidate. University protocol stipulates that all discussion of a review file be contained within officially scheduled DRC meetings with all members present.
- Maintain complete confidentiality regarding all aspects of the review process. Members shall treat as confidential all documents submitted or created in connection with the process. Both the information contained therein and information derived from any discussions that are part of the formal review process shall be kept confidential.

Section 1: Criteria

Theatre faculty at all professorial ranks are expected to demonstrate competence in (1) traditional (text-based) scholarly research and/or creative practice research and/or community-engaged scholarship research; (2) teaching; and (3) service. The Department recognizes that, because of the diversity of its faculty and the range of their professional expertise, individual programs of teaching, research, and service will take a variety of directions. Competence in traditional (text-based) scholarly research and/or creative practice research and/or community-engaged scholarship research is defined as a program of research and dissemination that contributes to the discovery of new knowledge in the field of theatre studies, or to the art/aesthetics of theatre, or to the creation, transmission, and application of knowledge to address the needs of individuals and society, all at levels of quality and quantity established in the discipline. Competence in teaching is defined as proficiency in the classroom (from the preparation of instructional materials to the mentoring of students in alternative educational settings) as demonstrated in a candidate's teaching portfolio and as measured by indices of student satisfaction and peer review. Competence in service is defined as effective contributions to the administrative and governance efforts of the Department, College, and University, together with external professional and community work, as appropriate to an individual's rank, expertise, and experience.

1. For reappointment as assistant professor, a candidate is expected to have articulated a clearly defined research agenda that demonstrates the promise of discernible professional impact, and also to have met departmental standards in teaching and service.
2. For permanent tenure and promotion to associate professor, a candidate is expected to have a clearly defined research agenda (including quality and quantity of creative, scholarly and/or community-engaged accomplishment), to have met disciplinary standards in research, to have had a documented professional impact, and to have met departmental standards in teaching and service.
3. For promotion to full professor, a candidate is expected to have demonstrated significant, continuing accomplishment in their research area(s) including achieving distinction as measured by the sustained professional impact of the candidate's work, and to have met departmental standards in teaching and research.

At each level of review, the quality of a candidate's aggregate achievement must be substantiated by means of objective documentation and peer review. The general indicators of professional success are (1) *positive trajectory*, which means that the candidate's work demonstrates steady and continuing development, as measured by frequency and quality of publication, performance and/or community-engaged research activities, as well as teaching effectiveness and responsible service; (2) *breadth of scope*, which means that a candidate's accomplishments and reputation over time transition from local to national and/or international venues, as measured by publication in distinguished journals or presses, opportunities to perform, design, or direct with recognized companies, and invitations to speak, read, coach, teach, consult, or engage in professional service beyond the campus; N.B.: In the case of community-engaged scholarship and research, the above definition of breadth of scope does not negate the value of sustained community-engaged research in a local setting/context; and (3) *positive comparative evaluation*, which means recognition by her or his peers as measured by reviews, letters of recommendation, honors or awards, written critiques, citations, grants, juried or refereed performances, and invited professional work.

In addition to College and University review criteria, the Department's review standards follow guidelines articulated by the professional organizations of the discipline of Theatre. Supporting documents include: *The Work of Arts Faculties in Higher Education*, (1993) from the National Office for Arts Accrediting Associations; *Guidelines for Evaluating Teacher/Artists for Promotion and Tenure* (2000), from the Association for Theatre in Higher Education (ATHE); and *Tenure and Promotion Guidelines* (2000) from the United States Institute for Theatre Technology (USITT).

A. Design, Production, and Performance Research

According to the USITT: "Participation in theatrical productions is the normal mode of professional endeavor for theatrical design, production, and technologies faculty. The creative process is documented by the graphics and organizational materials prepared in the planning of the production and by the visual record of the production. Together, such work is considered

creative/research activity.”¹ USITT guidelines also state that: “creative/research activities of design, production, and technologies faculty are equivalent to publication” and the USITT “recommends that all off- campus design and production work be considered the equivalent of juried, refereed, publication.”² The character of the selection process and venue may be evidenced by the location and size of the theatre, the pool of applicants, the length of the production run, the theatre's visibility in local and national media reviews, or other criteria supplied by the candidate.

Theatre is both a collaborative and an ephemeral art. Performance is the conclusion of an integrated process entailing direction, dramaturgy, acting, scene design, costume design, lighting design, sound design, technical direction, choreography, scenic artistry, production management, and stage management. Playwriting and historical, technical, or other types of research are also commonly included among these activities. The resulting achievement, a live performance, exists only in the moment; its documentation (apart from immediate witness) is necessarily retrospective and only suggestive of the quality of the performance itself. Hence, when evaluating the creative work of a candidate for promotion and/or tenure, the Department appreciates that the candidate's contributions are legitimately assessed both in themselves and in the context of the success of the production as a whole. The candidate's work need not be singled out in reviews and other documentation in order to be credited for the success of the ensemble. Moreover, the Department accepts the inherent complexity of judging a performance retrospectively, and therefore allows appropriate latitude, consistent with USITT and other guidelines, in the range of artifacts, including but not limited to sketches, models, design notes, photographs, peer reviews, and public recognition, that may legitimately testify to the quality of a candidate's work.

A.1 Creative Activity Research

Examples of creative research activities include but are not limited to:

- Work successfully produced in an exceptional venue (such as a nationally or internationally recognized theatre or professional company) as determined by peers or sanctioned by professional theatrical unions or organizations.
- Work successfully produced in other substantial, off-campus venues as determined by peers.
- Work successfully produced on campus, provided it is subject to external peer-review and/or leads to documented external activities (which may include conference presentations, articles, or external productions).
- Work successfully produced for exhibits and competitions.
- Work successfully produced in electronic media venues.
- Scripts or adaptations that have been read in significant venues, produced as live performance, or published.
- Dramaturgical work in significant venues.
- *Candidates whose primary work is in design, production, or performance also receive full promotion and/or tenure credit for traditional scholarly research and*

¹ “Areas of Evaluation: A. Creative/Research Activities,” USITT, *Tenure and Promotion Guidelines* (2000).

² “Preamble,” USITT, *Tenure and Promotion Guidelines* (2000).

community-engaged scholarship research, provided they meet the standards articulated above.

A.2 Standards for Evaluating Creative Activity Research

The Department Review Committee's (DRC) judgment regarding "professional impact" and "distinction" in design, production, and performance work are defined by conventional benchmarks in the discipline of Theatre as well as College and University standards.

- A candidate's work should describe a history of sustained productivity over time and a clearly defined creative/artistic/scholarly agenda. All records of artistic accomplishment, including those compiled prior to employment at the University, are counted in a review. However, the candidate's work undertaken at UNC Charlotte will serve as the primary evidence used in making RPT decisions.
- Peer reviews are an essential indicator of significant accomplishment, especially written evaluations by professionals in the area of a candidate's particular expertise, or by other theatre professionals, or by members of an external production team.
- The process by which an artist is chosen to perform (for example, an actor's audition or a designer's portfolio presentation) is rigorously competitive in significant venues and therefore constitutes a peer review, which a candidate should document.
- Adjudication reports from regional or national festivals and reviews by professional theatre critics are also useful indicators.
- A candidate should demonstrate the ability to attract invitations to work in substantial venues, as described above.
- Repeated engagements in a substantial venue are a particularly noteworthy indicator of successful work.
- Invitations or commissions to work for professional theatre companies or election to competitive union memberships or election to leadership positions in professional contexts indicate growing reputation.
- Inclusion in juried competitions or exhibits also indicates a growing reputation.
- Candidates may also enhance professional standing by presenting on panels and programs of professional organizations as well as by securing opportunities to teach master classes or lead intensive workshops.
- Awards, honors, and prizes offer helpful testimony of artistic accomplishment and should be listed in the curriculum vitae and explained in the personal commentary.

- Awards of externally sponsored funding, together with a record of successful grant proposal writing, are valuable credentials and should be accurately documented in the curriculum vitae and described in the personal commentary.
- The judgments of peers, including the referees who submit evaluations of the candidate in support of promotion and/or tenure review, should indicate that a candidate has achieved professional standing outside the Department to the degree that is appropriate for the rank the candidate is seeking.

Note: A mix of professional accomplishments and measures of distinction or impact is desirable, and it is the burden of a candidate, in consultation with the Chair, to explain in their personal statement how the complete body of work, including teaching and service, illustrates the candidate's strengths, furthers their career goals, and reveals a coherent plan for creative and/or scholarly growth.

B. Theatre Studies Research

The ATHE *Guidelines for Evaluating Teacher/Artists for Promotion and Tenure* define theatre research and scholarship as follows: "Research may lead to publication in the form of journal articles, books (including electronic publication), performance reviews, and authorship of original play scripts. Other scholarly activities may include presentations at professional conferences (e.g., scholarship presented in papers, poster sessions, workshops, etc.), authorship of grants, and editing journals or other publications. In academic theatre, research and publication may be centered on the specialization area (e.g., directing or design), but it may also include pedagogical research examining the teaching of theatre."³

B.1 Scholarly Research Activities

Examples of scholarly research activities include but are not limited to:

- Books or textbooks, authored, co-authored, edited, or translated, with academic, literary, or professional presses, in electronic or visual media;
- Refereed journal (including e-journal) articles, interviews, book or performance reviews, and review essays;
- Refereed chapters, essays, or articles in reference texts, proceedings, collections, and anthologies.⁴
- Non-refereed publications, including production notes and other research, play programs, interviews, book reviews, review essays, occasional essays, and grant-related, governmental, or other professional reports;
- Juried papers given at international, national, regional, or local professional conferences;

³ "III Areas of Evaluation: A. Research and Scholarship," *Guidelines for Evaluating Teacher/Artists for Promotion and Tenure*, ATHE (2000).

⁴ A "refereed" publication is one whose acceptance is the result of editorial or other peer review in a competitive venue. The candidate is responsible for distinguishing between refereed and non-refereed publications on the curriculum vitae, and for explaining the nature of non-traditional published or professional work in the personal commentary.

- Invited addresses, keynotes, or papers given at international, national, regional, or local professional conferences;
- Production of computer software;
- Film or video production;
- Reports and materials derived from consulting activities in universities, schools, government agencies, business, or industry;
- Funded grant proposals for basic or applied research, curriculum development, or professional service;
- Editorial service, either as editor or on an editorial board;
- Manuscripts accepted for publication.
- *Candidates whose primary work is in traditional scholarly research also receive full promotion and/or tenure credit for creative research and community-engaged scholarship research, provided they meet the standards articulated above.*

B.2 Standards for Evaluating Scholarly Research Activities

The DRC's judgment regarding "professional impact" and "distinction" in scholarship depends on a variety of conventional benchmarks in the discipline of Theatre Studies and in the past practice of the University:

- A candidate's work should describe a history of sustained productivity over time and a clearly defined creative/artistic/scholarly agenda. All records of accomplishment, including those compiled prior to employment at the University, are counted in a review. However, a candidate's work undertaken at UNC Charlotte will serve as the primary evidence used in making RPT decisions.
- A candidate should demonstrate the ability to place refereed articles in respected journals, and/or to place book manuscripts with recognized academic, literary, or professional presses. When the candidate is aware of a submission/acceptance rate at a particular journal or press, the information should be included on the curriculum vitae or in the personal commentary under the section devoted to scholarship or creative work.
- Reviews of a candidate's published work and citations in the research of other scholars may provide helpful testimony regarding the impact of that work.
- Substantial awards of externally sponsored funding, together with a record of successful grant-proposal writing, constitute important scholarly credentials and should be accurately documented on the curriculum vitae and described in the personal commentary.
- Publication awards and prizes from presses, journals, or professional associations, provide helpful testimony of scholarly or artistic accomplishment and should be listed on the curriculum vitae and explained in the personal commentary.
- Invitations to present papers or keynote addresses at prestigious national or international gatherings argue for growing prominence in a field and should be noted in the personal commentary.
- The judgments of peers, including the referees who submit evaluations of the candidate in support of promotion and/or tenure review, should indicate that a

candidate has achieved professional standing outside the Department to the degree that is appropriate for the rank the candidate is seeking.

Note: A mix of professional accomplishments and measures of distinction or impact is desirable, and it is the burden of a candidate, in consultation with the Chair, to explain in their personal statement how the complete body of work, including teaching and service, illustrates the candidate's strengths, furthers their career goals, and reveals a coherent plan for creative and/or scholarly growth.

C. Community-Engaged Scholarship/Research

The University's mission is to "discover, create, transmit, and apply knowledge to address the needs of individuals and society. This mission is accomplished through instruction, through research, scholarship, and creative activities, and through public service." In 2012, UNC Charlotte's Faculty Council adopted language in the Academic Personnel Procedures Handbook (Section VI.C: Areas of Performance to be Reviewed) to "integrate community-engaged scholarship within the institution as an optional component to the criteria used in reappointment, promotion, and tenure decisions." This is consistent with the university's recognition as an Engaged University by the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching.

To advance these university goals, the Department of Theatre defines Community-Engaged Scholarship as scholarship that connects the faculty member with the community, whether local, national, or international, in an integrative approach to research. This type of scholarship should include the pursuit and creation of new knowledge within the context of solving community issues and needs. To qualify as scholarship, the activities should include specific components such as clear goals, appropriate methods, reflective critique, rigor, and peer review. The intent is not to replace other forms of scholarship but rather to expand the way scholarship is viewed within the college.

Examples of Community-Engaged activities include but are not limited to:

- Projects created in partnership with identified communities (local, regional, national and international). Projects may be comprised of or include performances, exhibitions, oral histories, workshops, training programs, and other community-building practices that satisfy the university's call to "discover, create, transmit, and apply knowledge to address the needs of individuals and society."
- Books or textbooks, authored, co-authored, edited, or translated, with academic, literary, or industry publishers, in electronic or visual media;
- Refereed journal (including e-journal) articles, interviews, book or performance reviews, and review essays;
- Refereed chapters, essays, or articles in reference texts, proceedings, collections, and anthologies.⁵

⁵ A "refereed" publication is one whose acceptance is the result of editorial or other peer review in a competitive venue. The candidate is responsible for distinguishing between refereed and non-refereed publications on the curriculum vitae, and for explaining the nature of non-traditional published or professional work in the personal commentary.

- Publications in non-refereed community-oriented publications that serve the community-engagement agenda.
- Publications in non-refereed venues/platforms, including field research notes, production notes, play programs, interviews, book reviews, review essays, occasional essays, grant-related, governmental, or other professional reports;
- Juried papers given at international, national, regional, or local professional conferences;
- Invited addresses, keynotes, or papers given at international, national, regional, or local professional conferences;
- Film or video production disseminating findings from community-engaged research activities.
- Reports and materials derived from consulting activities in universities, schools, government agencies, business, or industry;
- Funded grant proposals for community-engaged research activity
- Editorial service, either as editor or on an editorial board;
- Manuscripts accepted for publication.
- *Candidates whose primary work is in community-engaged scholarship also receive full promotion and/or tenure credit for creative research and traditional scholarly research, provided they meet the standards articulated above.*

C.2 Standards for Evaluating Community-Engaged Research Activities

The DRC's judgment regarding "professional impact" and "distinction" in community-engaged scholarship/research depends on a variety of conventional benchmarks in the sub-disciplines defined as community-based, applied and/or social justice research and in the past practice of the University:

- A candidate's work should describe a history of sustained productivity over time and a clearly defined community-engaged agenda. All records of accomplishment, including those compiled prior to employment at the University, are counted in a review. However, a candidate's work undertaken at UNC Charlotte will serve as the primary evidence used in making RPT decisions.
- A candidate should demonstrate the ability to create and successfully implement community-engaged research projects, including a demonstrated ability to write, receive and manage grants awards intended to finance such projects.
- A candidate should demonstrate the ability to disseminate the findings of their community engaged research. This might include placing articles, reports, essays and data findings in peer-reviewed journals and in non-peer-reviewed industry and community-based venues/platforms. When the candidate is aware of a submission/acceptance rate at a particular journal or press, the information should be included on the curriculum vitae or in the personal commentary under the section devoted to scholarship or creative work.
- Peer or industry reviews of a candidate's community-engaged projects or published work and citations in the research of other scholars may provide helpful testimony regarding the impact of that work.

- Substantial awards of externally sponsored funding, together with a record of successful grant-proposal writing, constitute important scholarly credentials and should be accurately documented on the curriculum vitae and described in the personal commentary.
- Publication awards and prizes from presses, journals, or professional associations, provide helpful testimony of scholarly or artistic accomplishment and should be listed on the curriculum vitae and explained in the personal commentary.
- Invitations to present papers or keynote addresses at prestigious national or international gatherings argue for growing prominence in a field and should be noted in the personal commentary.
- The judgments of peers, including the referees who submit evaluations of the candidate in support of promotion and/or tenure review, should indicate that a candidate has achieved professional standing outside the Department to the degree that is appropriate for the rank the candidate is seeking.

Note: A mix of professional accomplishments and measures of distinction or impact is desirable, and it is the burden of a candidate, in consultation with the Chair, to explain in their personal statement how the complete body of work, including teaching and service, illustrates the candidate's strengths, furthers their career goals, and reveals a coherent plan for creative and/or scholarly growth.

D. Teaching

The Theatre Department places a high value on the quality of its teaching, and does not consider excellence in scholarly and/or performance activity as a substitute for excellence in teaching. Candidates for reappointment, promotion, and tenure will present as evidence of their competence the following materials: (1) a statement of teaching philosophy and general classroom practice, incorporated in the personal commentary; (2) syllabi, exams, and other course materials; (3) in the case of tenure track faculty, all student course evaluations, both written and numerical; in the case of tenured faculty, all evaluations since the last mandatory review; and (4) peer observations and evaluations as required by the UNC Charlotte *Academic Personnel Procedures Handbook*: Section VI.A "Review of Teaching."

The DRC will also assess other documented evidence of teaching excellence or engagement, including:

- development of new programs, courses, or teaching methods;
- peer assistance, teacher mentoring;
- pedagogically-oriented consulting work;
- team-taught and interdisciplinary courses;
- curriculum development grants;
- supervision of independent studies and/or directed readings;
- supervision of internships;
- sponsorship of and participation in extracurricular events or activities that support student learning;
- teaching honors/ awards.

Competence in teaching may be demonstrated by but is not limited to the following:

- command of the appropriate disciplinary subject areas;
- effective organization and presentation of course materials;

- articulate philosophy of teaching, manifest in course design and classroom method;
- evidence of clear assignments and careful assessments of student work;
- performance at or near the Theatre Department's norms, according to written student evaluations and peer evaluations.
- performance at or near the Theatre Department's means, according to student evaluations.

A faculty member may choose to focus their research agenda on the scholarship of teaching and a candidate who has achieved distinction in the scholarship of teaching may be promoted on the basis of that accomplishment. "Distinction" in this instance entails national recognition for educational achievements (teaching awards, etc.), peer reviewed publications (articles and/or books) and other normative professional activities (conference papers, etc.), that have resulted in a demonstrable improvement of the quality of teaching, learning, curriculum, educational technology, or the administration of schools. The Standards for Evaluating Scholarly Work outlined above also apply to the scholarship of teaching.

E. Service

Service activities contribute to the governance of the Department, College and University, the support of the profession, and the flourishing of the community. They also testify to the collegiality of individual faculty. At a minimum, Theatre faculty are expected to attend Department meetings and to play responsible roles on committees to which they are assigned.

Tenure track faculty are expected to assume meaningful but not burdensome service duties in elected or appointed committee assignments in the Department or, less typically, the College or University.

Tenured faculty are expected to share the routine responsibilities of departmental administration and governance, to take leadership roles in the Department, College, and University, and to perform in those professional or community service capacities for which their interests, expertise, and experience may qualify them.

For both tenure track and senior faculty members, academic and community service activities must be documented in the individual's employment file. Documentation may include references in the CV and Personal Statement, references in annual faculty performance reviews, letters from committee or task force chairs, testimonials from community members or groups, and news reports. Examples of academic and community service activities include but are not limited to:

E.1 Academic Service Activities

- serving on Departmental, College, or University committees and task forces;
- chairing committees, or accepting special committee or subcommittee assignments;
- creating, chairing, or serving on ad hoc committees;
- administering academic or support programs;
- helping to create new academic or support programs.

E.2 Professional Service Activities

- serving and/or holding office in local, regional, national, or international professional associations;
- reading manuscripts for journals or book publishers (including textbooks);
- performing external tenure/promotion reviews.

E.3 Community Service Activities

- consulting, related to professional expertise, with universities, schools, theatre companies, government agencies, business, or industry;
- service or volunteer work, related to professional expertise, in civic, cultural, educational, and/or religious organizations;
- performances, readings, stagings, and presentations to civic, cultural, educational, and/or religious organizations;
- judging community competitions.

Section 2: Procedures

A. Preparation for Review

The candidate is expected to present their career achievements in the three areas of professional accomplishment: Teaching, Scholarly/Creative Research Activities, and Service, in an accurate and complete curriculum vitae. Candidates are also required to write three personal statements amounting to no more than nine pages in total (Research statement will be no more than four pages; Teaching statement will be no more than three pages; Service statement will be no more than three pages) addressing his or her creative or scholarly work, teaching and service. The purpose of the statements is to explain the coherence and significance of the candidate's professional efforts to colleagues within and beyond the Theatre Department. For example: the research statement should articulate the candidate's scholarly/creative/community-engaged agenda, reflect on accomplishments during the period of review, discuss present activities and work in progress, and outline future plans. This statement is an important guide to the candidate's review file, and the DRC will study it closely in the process of evaluation. It is also critically important to colleagues outside of Theatre who will participate in College or University levels of review. Candidates are also required to assemble an RPT Portfolio.

The RPT Dossier is composed of four separate Folders. Each Folder is composed of two distinct sections: 1) the personal statement; and 2) supporting materials. The supporting materials may be subdivided as is appropriate to its contents (i.e., conference papers, book chapters, reviews of professional productions, production photos, articles, etc). A carefully crafted document allows reviewers to focus closely on the work and to produce a careful and thorough evaluation. PLEASE NOTE: In the CoAA FILE SYSTEM GUIDELINES (May 2019) it is stated that the college "prefers" that the supporting documents be structured as a single pdf document.

Tenure track faculty normally undergo their reappointment review during the third year of their initial, four-year contract. Presuming successful reappointment, the review for permanent tenure and promotion to associate professor normally occurs during the candidate's sixth year. A candidate's tenure "clock" may occasionally be accelerated or temporarily halted under special circumstances, the former if a faculty member comes to the University with time in grade elsewhere, the latter if a faculty member receives family medical leave, or encounters other circumstances that may interrupt full-time employment. Decisions about altering the tenure "clock" are made at the provost level. Tenured faculty may elect to stand for promotion at any time, and the decision whether or not to undergo review is usually negotiated with the Chair. The "tenure clock" **may not** be extended in the case of research or professional leave. Such activities

are considered a normative aspect of an academic career and contribute to the production of the research plan, which benefit candidates on their path to tenure or promotion.

In the spring of the year prior to review (no later than March 1), candidates for reappointment or promotion with permanent tenure are notified in writing by the Dean to prepare their RPT file. All faculty seeking reappointment and/or promotion are encouraged to consult with the Chair regarding the format of the curriculum vitae, the content of the personal statement, and creation of their RPT materials.

The RPT research dossier is the only evidence provided to external reviewers (required for tenure and promotion reviews). Candidate will be asked to submit the names of at least six potential external reviewers who work in the specific field(s) represented by the candidate's work. Excluded from this list should be those who would have an obvious conflict of interest, such as dissertation committee members and co-authors, past or present. (For more information see the UNC Charlotte "Academic Policies and Procedures" website.) The Chair will select at least one of the reviewers proposed by the candidate, and will select additional reviewers from nominations provided by the chair, department faculty-at-rank or outside consultants in related areas of expertise. The Chair will contact between four and six external reviewers; University guidelines require a minimum of three reviewers.

NOTE: The portfolio intended for external review must be completed and submitted to the chair no later than May 15 of the spring semester preceding the review year. All other materials are due on the first day of class of the fall semester and must be submitted to the Dean's office per college protocol.

B. Departmental Review

According to College and University policy, the DRC is exclusively designated to provide recommendations to the Chair regarding a candidates' suitability for reappointment, tenure, and/or promotion. Committee members are elected from the Department's cadre of tenured faculty in accordance with Departmental Bylaws.

The tenured faculty of the department, other than those who will participate in the review process at another level, who are at or above the rank for which a candidate is under consideration, will have an opportunity to evaluate the candidate's dossier and provide advice to the DRC. Eligible faculty should regard it as a professional responsibility to assist the Committee in its deliberations by offering written opinions for inclusion in the review dossier.

Evaluations of the candidate's dossier by the DRC and by the Chair are separate and independent, although the DRC may invite the Chair into its discussions if it unanimously determines that doing so will assist its work. After deliberating in confidential session, the DRC will submit its recommendation(s) and rationale(s) concerning reappointment, tenure, and/or promotion to the Chair in writing. After consulting with the DRC, the Chair will submit a recommendation and rationale, together with those of the DRC, to the Dean of the College.

In accordance with the CoAA RPT policy (Fall 2019), each positive or negative determination and the rationale for such determination on reappointment, promotion, or conferral of Permanent Tenure made by a Chair/Director shall be provided in writing to the Faculty Member to whom it pertains simultaneously with its transmittal to the next administrative level. If the Chair/Director's determination is negative, he or she shall meet with the faculty member to explain the faculty member's right of rebuttal and to provide the faculty member a copy of the recommendation(s) and rationale(s) of the DRC/SRC. Within fourteen days after this meeting, the Faculty Member may submit to the Dean and the Chair/Director his or her written rebuttal to the Chair/Director's determination.⁶ Upon receipt of the faculty member's rebuttal, or at the end of fourteen days after the Chair/Director meets with the Faculty Member if the faculty member does not submit a rebuttal, the Chair/Director shall submit his or her determination and rationale, the recommendation(s) and rationale(s) of the DRC/SRC, and the faculty member's rebuttal (if any), and the faculty member's dossier, to the Dean of the College.

Section 3: College and University Review

Procedures governing personnel actions beyond the Departmental review are detailed in the *College of Arts and Architecture Procedures for Reappointment, Promotion, and Conferral of Permanent Tenure* and the *Tenure Policies, Regulations, and Procedures of the University of North Carolina at Charlotte*. In brief, all cases for reappointment, tenure, and/or promotion, whether judged positively or negatively in the Department, proceed to the College Review Committee, and subsequently to the Dean, for their independent evaluations, before proceeding finally to the Provost, who is the first University official to make a binding decision, as opposed to a recommendation, for or against a candidate. At every level of review, each positive or negative determination and its rationale is provided in writing to the candidate prior to its transmittal to the next administrative level. In addition, the candidate has the right to access (upon written request) all documents that are part of the decision-making process. However, the decisions of the Provost can only be appealed on procedural grounds, not on the merits. A faculty member who contends that the decision was based on "impermissible grounds" or "material procedural irregularities" may seek a hearing on that contention in accordance with protocols described in *Tenure Policies, Regulations, and Procedures of the University of North Carolina at Charlotte*.

Works Cited or Consulted:

"Academic Policies and Procedures": <https://provost.uncc.edu/policies-procedures/academic-policies-and-procedures>

"Areas of Evaluation: A. Creative/Research Activities," USITT, *Tenure and Promotion Guidelines* (2000).

"Community-Engaged Scholarship," CLAS: <https://inside-clas.uncc.edu/handbook/faculty-evaluation/#4>

⁶ "The word 'Day' ... shall mean any day except Saturday, Sunday, or an institutional holiday except when calendar day is specified. In computing any period of time, the Day in which notice is received is not counted but the last Day of the period being computed is to be counted." The Tenure Policies, Regulations and Procedures of the University of North Carolina at Charlotte (Section 1, Subsection 1.3).

“Preamble,” USITT, *Tenure and Promotion Guidelines* (2000).

“III Areas of Evaluation: A. Research and Scholarship,” *Guidelines for Evaluating Teacher/Artists for Promotion and Tenure*, ATHE (2000).