1. INFOPORTE ROUTING

☐ Your request route should indicate “A&S Dean’s Office HR” as the final stop for approval.
☐ Routing Assistance: Please contact Jocelyn Brooks at jocelyn_brooks@unc.edu.

2. AP-2 FORM

☐ Use most recent version of AP-2 form – currently dated 1/8/2016.
☐ Sections 4 and 5: Ensure that all dates (degrees awarded dates and prior employment dates) correspond with CV.
☐ Section 12: An Assistant Professor reappointment for a second term is for a probationary term of 3 yrs.
☐ Section 13: Select the correct box – Early, On-time, or Late.

3. CURRICULUM VITAE (CV)

☐ Contains the date of latest revision.
☐ Dates of degrees awarded and prior employments correspond with dates on AP-2 form.
☐ All pages of CV are numbered.
☐ Does not include any personal information, i.e., date of birth, marital status, citizenship, references to medical/parental or personal leaves, etc.
☐ APT format has been followed, in particular:
  • In every subhead, items should be in reverse chronological order, most recent first.
  • Refereed publications must be marked.
  • Include the number of students taught by course/semester for the prior three year period.
  • All grants should include the person’s role (PI or Co-PI), dollar amount (direct award amount only), period of grant, funding agency, and percentage of effort.
  • Teaching and Research Statements are included. Service and engagement statement, if applicable.

4. LETTERS OF RECOMMENDATION

☐ Letters have been labeled in the upper right-hand corner as to which list the reviewer was selected (department chair/personnel committee or candidate). In Infoporte, upload the “department chair/committee selected” letters together and the “candidate selected” letters together. All letters received must be made an official part of the dossier for the evaluation process and must be forwarded to the Dean’s Office.
☐ Dossier contains four independent reviewers. Note: If there are more than four external letters and some are not from an independent reviewer (such as a collaborator or mentor) then those letters must be marked as "additional" letters. Letters of recommendation, for Full Professorships, should not come solely from the individuals who reviewed the candidate for his/her Associate Professor promotion. No more than two of the requisite four letters may come from previous reviewers, and the Chair’s letter should disclose that these recommendations come from people who reviewed the candidate for promotion to Associate Professor with an explanation as to why these reviewers were used again.

☐ Recommendation letters have been solicited and received from acceptable ranks:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank of New Appointment</th>
<th>Letters are Acceptable From</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Instructor w/ Special Provision</td>
<td>Tenure track Assistant Professor or higher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant Professor</td>
<td>Tenure track Assistant Professor or higher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate Professor</td>
<td>Associate Professor with tenure or higher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professor</td>
<td>Professor or higher</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

☐ Electronic Recommendation Letters: Currently we may accept scanned copies of actual letters, letters with a stamped electronic signature on letterhead and letters without a stamped signature on letterhead that have been emailed. Please include a copy of the email to provide documentation that the individual sent the letter. At this time, we are unable to accept electronic letters that are not on letterhead or recommendations typed into the body of an email.

☐ Chair’s solicitation letter written for external letters of recommendation has been included. A sample letter is attached (see Attachment 2).

5. PEER TEACHING REPORTS/EVALUATIONS

☐ Peer Teaching Reports are included:
   At least two faculty members have observed at least one full class session, preferably in different courses.
   - For cases of reappointment to assistant professor and promotion to associate professor with tenure, these class observations have been carried out by associate professors with tenure or full professors. For cases of promotion to full professor, these observations have been carried out by full professors.
   - Class observations carried out as part of a personnel decision are normally carried out in the 12 month period prior to the department meeting regarding the decision; they should preferably be carried out in the same semester as the department decision.

☐ Each faculty member participating in a peer faculty observation has provided a written report for each class session observed, employing the attached template (see Attachment 1).

☐ Peer Faculty Teaching Observation Reports are part of the personnel file sent forward, and are summarized in the internal personnel committee report and/or the Chair’s letter.

☐ Student Evaluations are included:
   - Quantitative data should be provided in addition to qualitative data.
   - Copies of on-line course evaluations for the preceding three years have been provided.

6. CHAIR’S LETTER

☐ The first paragraph of the Chair’s letter includes the candidate’s name, and either the positive action being recommended, including conferment of tenure if applicable and the effective date of the action, or the negative decision that was reached. If the action confers tenure, the Chair’s letter identifies whether or not the action is early (for an assistant professor, this means tenure will be conferred prior to the candidate’s seventh year at UNC) or on time. If the recommendation is early, the chair explains
the reason(s) for the early recommendation. Here’s an example of a clear explanation of an early promotion:

Dr. <name> received his Ph.D. in <degree> from the <name of institution> in <year degree conferred>. He served as an assistant professor in <the department of> at the <name of institution> from <2008> until <2013>. As our department views <name of department at prior institution> as a peer department, we view his five full years of service as an assistant professor there to equate to an equivalent duration of service here. Thus, as Dr. <name> is completing his second academic year at UNC, in total, at the end of this semester he will have served seven academic years as an assistant professor. Given this fact, combined with Dr. <name’s> completion of the requisite at least 18-months-of-service at UNC, I believe he is procedurally eligible for tenure. And as the following will make clear, Dr. XXXX deserves promotion and tenure based on the merits of his case.

☐ Faculty votes are recorded by rank to include the number of Yes, No or Abstentions for each rank voting. Note: The College requires a vote of a minimum of four full professors. The Chair must explain “no” votes and abstentions in his/her letter. This information should also be included in the first paragraph of the Chair’s letter. Only faculty present at the meeting should be included in the formal vote. Those faculty providing a recommendation outside of the meeting should be listed separately.

Faculty votes should be recorded using the following format which is preferred by the Office of the Provost:

Full Professors – XX Yes, XX No, XX Abstain
Associate Professors – XX Yes, XX No, XX Abstain
Assistant Professors – XX Yes, XX No, XX Abstain

☐ The Chair’s letter should: 1) clearly explain why recommendation letters are considered valid if received from referees who do not hold an academic appointment (or do not have academic credentials); 2) explain why referees are not from peer institutions; and 3) explain if there is any relationship between the candidate and the recommender.

☐ Do not include in the Chair’s letter: 1) tenure clock extensions with details of why the extension was granted, and 2) names pertaining to spousal or target hires, and 3) references to medical/parental or personal leaves.

☐ External Letters: The chair’s letter includes: 1) why each referee was selected and the standing of each referee in the field, especially those of rank other than professor or from institutions that might be considered as lower rank than Carolina; 2) which referees were solicited from the candidate’s list and which were selected by the department chair/personnel committee without any suggestion from the candidate; 3) an explanation of any collaborations (on research grants or other projects) between the reviewer and candidate.

☐ Include a line for the Dean’s signature. Example -

Approved____________________________________Date__________

Kevin M. Guskiewicz, Dean

☐ Include Committee Report, if applicable.

7. HARDCOPY OF DOSSIER

☐ Do not forward a hardcopy to the Dean’s Office until documents in Infoporte have been reviewed and approved.

☐ Tabs have been inserted for Curriculum Vitae, Chair/Dean’s Letter, Committee Report (if applicable), Letters of Recommendation, and Peer Evaluations. Do not include teaching evaluations in the hardcopy dossier.
Hardcopies of dossiers can be dropped off at 205 South Building or sent via campus mail to Janet Farrell or Teresa Wilkinson, CAS Business Operations, CB# 3060, 100 Europa Drive, Suite 320.

This is only a quick reference checklist on formatting dossiers, for additional information please click here.

REVISED 08/09/2016
Attachment 1

PEER FACULTY TEACHING OBSERVATION REPORT

Faculty Member Name and Department:__________________________________________________
Evaluator Name, Title and Department:__________________________________________________
Signature of Faculty Evaluator:________________________________________________________

Full Name of Course: _____________________ Course Dept. and Number: _________________

Date of Observation: _____________________ Time of Observation: _________________

Location: _______________________________ Number of Students in Attendance: ______

Class Enrollment:  
- [ ] 25 or fewer  
- [ ] 26 to 50  
- [ ] 51 to 100  
- [ ] over 100

Comments (including type of teaching being observed, extent and nature of class interaction, and a critical evaluation). If you wish to use a rating scale, please define each rating point.

You may attach an additional or separate document.
Sample Request for an External Letter of Recommendation for a Tenure Track Position

Dear ____________:

The School of/Department of ______________ at the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill is reviewing the qualifications of ______________, for promotion from Assistant Professor to Associate Professor with tenure (or Associate to full Professor with tenure, or Associate without tenure to Associate with tenure). The School/Department will base its recommendation concerning ________ on the value of his/her research, teaching, and service. I write to seek your opinion about ______ worthiness for this promotion. To aid in your review of his/her qualifications and contributions, his/her curriculum vitae and most recent and (according to him/her) most important publications are enclosed.

We are particularly interested in placing ____________ scholarly work in a national context. We would value, therefore, your evaluation of the importance of his/her area of study and of the significance of his/her contributions to it. We are also interested in your opinion of his/her stature relative to his/her peers nationally.

Please refer to the following criteria of the School/Department Tenure and Promotion policy in giving your assessment of ____________. [List criteria here]

Appointments or promotion to the rank of Associate Professor must demonstrate outstanding ability. The candidate must demonstrate outstanding scholarly contributions, show independence and leadership in research or practice, and have a growing national reputation in his/her area of expertise. Please understand that, here at UNC-CH, promotion from Assistant to Associate Professor is tightly linked to a decision regarding the granting of tenure. Thus, either ____________ will be promoted and granted permanent tenure or he/she will have no choice but to leave the university. In this letter, we are asking for your opinion as to ____________ suitability for promotion and/or tenure according to the APT criteria described above that are in place here at UNC-CH. It would not be helpful, nor would it be relevant to state that: “Dr. ____________ would qualify for promotion at our institution, but would not yet be appropriate for tenure.”

For promotion to the rank of Full Professor the candidate must continue to demonstrate high quality teaching, make outstanding scholarly contributions, and have a national reputation in his/her area of expertise. There must be strong evidence that his/her scholarly work has stimulated the work of other researchers or practitioners, has provided "breakthroughs" in the field, and that, in general, other scholars are paying close attention to the candidate's work. In addition to the above, we appreciate any assessment you are able to make about the quality of ____________ teaching and professional service contributions. While we do recognize that these areas are often more difficult to assess than is scholarship, any evaluative comments that you can
provide to us will be valued. In addition, we will benefit from having your thoughts regarding _________ interpersonal skills, his/her organizational citizenship, as well as any other intangibles you might be able to share with us.

In preparing your response, we do ask that you provide us with the following information:

a. Your opinion as to whether or not you would recommend ____________ for this promotion

b. A brief summary of your reasons for this opinion

c. A description of your relationship (if any) with ____________

Under current policies of this institution, peer evaluations, such as that being requested from you, are regarded as confidential within limitations imposed by law. They are for limited use within the University. However, North Carolina state law provides that such written evaluations become part of the personnel file of the individual. As such, they become open by petition to the faculty member about whom they are written.

Thank you very much for your willingness to assist us with this important process. We do recognize the substantial amount of time and effort required to provide us with this assessment of ____________. Please understand that time is of the essence in this process. Therefore, we ask that you notify Dr. Chair’s Name as soon as possible if you will not be able to provide us with your review by date. His/her e-mail address is: name@unc.edu. You can send either an electronic copy on official letterhead or a hard copy in the mail.

Sincerely,