

Guidelines for Reappointment, Tenure, Promotion and Tenured Faculty Performance Review

Department of Mathematics and Statistics
University of North Carolina Charlotte
Revised and Approved Unanimously on 2/1/2016

Part I. Guidelines for Reappointment, Tenure and Promotion

The candidates are evaluated for promotion to the various ranks, for tenure, and for reappointment in the areas of teaching, research and service on the basis of the same RTP criteria used by the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences as listed in the following criteria (not in a ranked order).

For reappointment of an assistant professor:

- Effective teaching.
- High quality research/creative activity.
- Appropriate service contributions at the department level.
- Projected growth as a teacher, scholar, and university citizen that shows promise of satisfying criteria for promotion to associate professor with conferral of permanent tenure.

Promotion of an Assistant Professor to Associate Professor:

- A demonstrated record of effectiveness as a teacher.
- A continuous and distinctive record of peer reviewed publication and/or peer-reviewed creative activity, and an appropriate external funding activity in the candidate's field of specialization.
- Demonstrated commitment to service, with a level of engagement appropriate to the discipline, the department and, where possible, the College and the University.

- Projected growth as a teacher, scholar, and university citizen that will lead to promotion to the rank of Professor.
- The rationale for early promotion must provide compelling justification using the above criteria.

Promotion of an Associate Professor to Professor:

- A record of academic achievement that has led to national or international recognition as a scholar, creative performer or teacher.
- A cumulative record of teaching effectiveness since promotion to associate professor.
- Substantial peer-reviewed publications and/or peer-reviewed creative activity; grantsmanship where appropriate; a demonstrated growth in scholarship since promotion to associate professor.
- A significant service record within the individual's academic profession and also within the university community at large.
- It is recognized that tenured faculty sometimes replace their normal duties with professional or university service such as acting as a funding agency program officer or assuming administrative roles in the University. In such cases, faculty must still meet department requirements for promotion to Full Professor, but assessment of scholarly and teaching achievement should take into account this departure from named duties.

Evaluation of Teaching: In evaluating teaching, the department considers the following for all candidates.

1. Summaries of the student evaluation data on selected questions from the student questionnaire.
2. Summaries of other course statistics which are compiled annually by the department. These include grade distributions and performance of classes on departmental common final exams (when appropriate).

3. Any written comments from students collected during the evaluations.
4. The yearly evaluations of the candidate's teaching record contained in the annual merit evaluation.
5. Peer classroom visitations by colleagues and their reports on them.
6. The teaching portfolio prepared by the candidate. The candidate is encouraged and is free to submit any relevant information.

The evaluation may also consider items such as:

7. Evidence of significant extra efforts in teaching such as special lecture notes or materials, special course developments, computer assisted materials, audio-visual materials, special projects which result in significant written student output, directed studies, theses, *etc.*
8. Curriculum (course and program) development or experimentation.
9. Teaching-related service such as serving as course coordinators, authors/readers of department common final exams, supervisors, mentors or committee members of graduate students and/or teaching assistants, ad hoc committee members for text book selection and syllabus preparation, *etc.*

In the case that the candidate has had some problems with teaching, it is important that he or she demonstrate improvement and document efforts at improvement. Whatever is involved in these efforts can be considered as part of the teaching evaluation. The following are a few such examples:

10. Video recording and/or critical analyses of the classes by colleagues in the department or experts from other departments within UNCC.
11. Close consultation with experienced faculty members concerning teaching lessons, planning, testing, *etc.* Again, the faculty involved may be asked for an evaluation of what they have observed.
12. Letters solicited directly from the students after a course is completed.

Evaluation of Research and Professional Activity: In evaluating research and professional activity, the department considers the following for all candidates.

1. The collected professional works, including an evaluation of the quality of the outlets, and an assessment by outside reviewers of quality and impact of research. The outside reviewers must include recognized, top experts in the field of specialization. Internal evaluations of the research may also be included if the department has faculty members with expertise in the research area of the candidate.
2. In the case that a large proportion of the candidate's work is joint, the candidate needs to describe his or her contributions and his/her co-authors may be asked to comment on the contributions of the candidate.
3. Evidence of professional activity such as regular talks at conferences, refereeing of papers, refereeing of grant proposals, journal/proceedings editorial work, *etc.*
4. Receipt of internal and external grants in support of research or professional activity, with an emphasis on the external grants.
5. Documented significant efforts in applying for internal and external research grants, with an emphasis on the external grants.

Other possible considerations include:

6. Organization of professional conferences.
7. Serving as an outside referee for tenure and promotion cases or for theses.
8. Citations of the faculty member's work in papers or books.
9. Consulting work involving the faculty member's expertise in significant ways. Here someone familiar with the project may be asked for an evaluation and reports may be inspected.

Evaluation of Service: In evaluating service, the department considers the service on various departmental, college, and university committees, as well as service to the community. Examples of these include the following.

1. Serving on search committees within the department or outside the department.
2. Serving on the Department Review Committee.
3. Serving as a program director or coordinator.
4. Representing the department in faculty government.
5. Serving on certain state or national boards or committees that are concerned with educational matters of importance to the university.
6. Serving as a faculty associate or as a university student advisor.
7. Taking on special assignments, which are important to the department, the college or the university.
8. Serving in an administrative capacity, *e.g.*, as chairperson, associate chairperson or coordinator(s).
9. Serving as a faculty advisor for an honorary society or a student club.
10. Serving on national committees or as an officer in a professional society.
11. Serving the community in ways which use the individual's professional expertise.

Part II. Guidelines for Tenured Faculty Performance Review (TFPR)

The TFPR review consists of examining the faculty member's current vita, his/her past five years annual merit reviews and a current five-year plan with set of goals. The faculty member may also submit an optional statement describing his or her professional accomplishments in teaching, research, and service (including part-time administrative responsibilities) related to his or her five-year plan. The DRC writes a report to the Department Chair and the Department Chair writes a formal report to the Dean of the College (both reports will be submitted to the Dean). In accordance with University and College guidelines, this report shall conclude with one of the three findings "Exceeds Expectations", "Meets Expectations", or "Does Not Meet Expectations", as determined by the standards described in the next paragraph. In the last case the DRC shall state the faculty members primary responsibilities and in its report describe the performance deficiencies as they relate to the faculty members assigned duties and the goals established.

A faculty member is given the performance rating "Exceeds Expectations" if his annual merit evaluation ratings over the past five years are all *Very Good* or above, with at least three *Excellent* ratings. A faculty member is given the performance rating "Does Not Meet Expectations" if his annual merit evaluation rating in at least three of the past five years is *Does Not Meet Expectations*. A faculty member is given the performance rating "Meets Expectations" in all other cases. In the case that a faculty members performance rating is "Does Not Meet Expectations" a Developmental Plan may be prepared by the Department Chair in consultation with the DRC. (Annual merit review ratings are *Excellent*, *Very Good*, *Good*, *Meets Expectations*, and *Does Not Meet Expectations*.)

Supplement: Instruction on Preparing the Five-Year Plan

1. Guideline from CLAS:

Every faculty member must have a written plan in the three clearly identified areas of teaching, research and service over the five year period between their TFPR or since their most recent promotion, whichever is most recent. The five-year plan will be prepared by the faculty member. It may vary according to department expectations, but will include at a minimum a description of the faculty member's plans for the five year period in the three areas noted above. It may also include specific performance goals during this period, timetables for meeting these goals and anticipated resources (grants, reassignment of duties, library, laboratory or other research resources, etc.) that will assist the faculty member in fulfilling their plans in each of the three areas noted above. The five-year plan may be revised or reevaluated by the faculty member and Chair annually at the time of the faculty member's annual review.

The five-year plan will be reviewed by the departmental committee charged with annual review and the Chair in their annual evaluation of the faculty member. Adjustments to the plan may be made, as necessary, by the faculty member in consultation with the chair of his/her department to complement the professional activities of the faculty member in the areas of teaching, research and public service.

2. It is recommended that the five-year plan to brief and be kept within one to two pages.

3. Keep in mind that the five-year plan can be updated/revised on an annual basis. The faculty member can do that at the time of annual activity report.