

**POLICIES, PROCEDURES, AND CRITERIA GOVERNING INITIAL
APPOINTMENTS, REAPPOINTMENTS, PROMOTIONS, AND TENURE
FOR THE FACULTY OF THE
DEPARTMENT OF EXERCISE AND SPORT SCIENCE
THE UNIVERSITY OF NORTH CAROLINA AT CHAPEL HILL**

Revised: December 2005

Revision Committee:

Diane Groff
Kevin Guskiewicz
Anthony Hackney
Barbara Osborne
Darin Padua
Margaret Pomerantz

I

Introduction

All policies and regulations in this document are pursuant to and in subordination to the Trustee Policies and Regulations Governing Academic Tenure in the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill (July 1, 1987) [Hereafter referred to as the *Trustee Policies*], and to the EPA Employees Affirmative Action Plan, The University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill (March 1, 1993) [Hereafter referred to as the *Affirmative Action Plan*]. These two documents, along with the memorandum "Personnel Procedures in the College" from the Dean of the College of Arts and Sciences of July 22, 1993 provide a minimum framework for policies and regulations governing initial appointments, reappointments, promotions, and tenure in the Department of Exercise and Sport Science [Hereafter referred to as the *Department*].

Mission statement: To discover, create, and promote knowledge of human movement to improve the quality of life of individuals and society (as approved on August 19, 2005). To accomplish its mission, the Department hires faculty to fill subdisciplinary needs or combinations of subdisciplinary needs. Faculty colleagues are hired under different conditions, with different departmental and institutional emphasis; and therefore different specific departmental expectations exist for each faculty member. Decisions of appointment, reappointment, promotion, and tenure will be made following fundamental judgment of an individual's actual and/or potential contributions to the mission of the Department and ultimately to the mission of the University.

The Dean of the College [Hereafter referred to as the Dean] and the Subcommittee on Instructional Personnel of the College [Hereafter referred to as the Subcommittee], and the Affirmative Action Plan recognizes the differences between departments and curricula in size, function, institutional history, and disciplinary focus...and therefore believes that no single statements of procedures or criteria for faculty personnel actions are appropriate and would not effectively serve for the College as a whole. Furthermore, they explicitly stat that each department or curriculum must establish its own set of procedures, define, interpret, and weigh criteria with respect to its particular activities and needs and according to the role played by the particular faculty member. So it must follow that no set of detailed criteria can exist for the College or the Department, the mere attainment of which will ensure a recommendation for appointment, reappointment, promotion, or the conferral of tenure. Particularly for reappointment, promotion, or the conferral of tenure it is quite the contrary. A review is a consideration and weighing of the total contribution, the many ways a faculty member has served the Department and University during his or her years of service in the Department, with each case viewed as unique and individual.

Within this context, few such judgments can be made entirely or even substantially by means that require no subjective judgments or opinions since these judgments deal essentially with qualitative consideration how well the candidate has performed as a teacher, researcher, administrator, advisor, writer, clinician, professional colleague, or in other roles pertinent to his or her departmental responsibilities in the past and how well he or she can be expected to perform those, or new roles, in the future. The importance of individual quality is additionally stressed to insure that personnel reviews neither be subordinated to obvious and measurable factors such as length of service nor to a "Checklist" of criteria. Thus it is imperative, for personnel review an assessment, that the policies regulations, and criteria governing such decisions be fair and equitable for all. Within an overall context of excellence, recognition of

unique individual contributions is imperative. Concurrently there must be an absolute standardization of procedures and consistent, albeit flexible, application of criteria from one faculty member to another. Standardization of procedures is accomplished relatively easily. It is the application, including interpretation and weighing of criteria in the review process that requires the greatest vigilance to both maintain excellence as a standard for the Department and University and to insure fairness for the candidate. All faculty members being reviewed can rightfully expect and receive consistent and fair application of both departmental and institutional procedures and criteria.

Although it may be a part of other personnel actions, tenure is of such enduring consequence for the Department and the University that it requires being addressed as a specific topic. The Department unquestionably supports the concept of tenure and its importance as presented and supported by the College and the University. This special privilege...to search for knowledge, to disseminate to students, fellow scholars, and the broader public, and to do this in a collaborative setting with other colleagues forms the basis of the University and of the Department. In making a recommendation to confer tenure upon a member of its faculty, the Department comprehends the magnitude and lasting effect upon itself and the University of this particular personnel action and takes such action only after the completion of specified procedures and the appropriate application of criteria.

Appointees to a tenure-track position must realize that such appointment does not by itself confer the right to tenure. To recommend tenure, the Department must not merely expect, but have a firm confidence that excellence in both professional and personal qualities will be maintained throughout the tenured faculty member's professional career at the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill.

The organization of this document follows recommendations of the College and University Procedures and criteria are presented separately for each major category of personnel action. Procedures are to be followed explicitly. Although a framework is evident, specificity of criteria has been avoided so that each case is treated as unique and the Department is not limited in the range of matters the Trustee Policies, the Affirmative Action Plan, the College, and the Subcommittee authorize for consideration and to insure that each case may be viewed individually.

II

Procedural Steps in Making Personnel Decisions

These procedural steps are not intended to protect substantive faculty review and personnel issues from close examination by a claim that, "Appropriate procedures were followed." Questioning the procedural process and/or the quality of a decision relative to the interpretation and application of procedures or criteria, including whether or not the appropriate interpretation and weighting of the criteria were consistent with the spirit of this document, is always possible.

Voting: The maximum possible intradepartmental information and participation will be sought for personnel actions. This governing principle is reflected in the overall procedures as well as the voting process. Voting on the personnel actions addressed by this document will be further governed by the following guidelines:

- Generally, voting faculty for tenure and promotion decisions are those individuals who possess tenure.

- Only the assembled voting faculty or voting faculty assembled by ranks may vote on personnel actions. However, if a voting faculty cannot be present a proxy vote is permitted.
- All votes must be preceded by one or more meetings of the assembled voting faculty or voting faculty assembled by ranks for the purpose of discussion of the specific personnel action case.
- For initial appointments all voting faculty (including lecturers) may vote, regardless of the rank of the voting faculty and/or the proposed rank for the position being filled.
- For reappointments and promotions, no faculty member may vote on a UNC-CH colleague who is at the same or a higher rank, e.g., for lecturers the voting faculty includes all professorial ranks; for assistant professors the voting faculty is associate and full professors; and for associate professors the voting faculty is the full professors.
- Anytime faculty of more than one rank vote, a recording and reporting of the vote will be by rank.
- For initial appointments, reappointments, and promotions, the full professors will develop and formalize their consensus recommendation to the Department Chair, and will meet separately as an assembled body with the Chair for additional discussion and a formal vote.

A. Initial Appointments to Faculty Ranks: Instructor, Lecturer, Assistant Professor, Associate Professor or Professor

The rank of Instructor may be issued with special provisions. That is, some newly hired faculty member may be given the rank of Instructor “with special provision” if they have not yet completed the requirements for the Ph.D. degree. Upon conferral of the specified academic degree, the instructor will be re-appointed at the rank of assistant professor. When that occurs, the effective date of the appointment at the rank of Assistant Professor will be retroactive to the effective date of the current appointment as Instructor, or to July 1 or January 1 immediately preceding the conferral of the degree.

The rank of Lecturer is not a tenure-track appointment. The attainment of tenure is not possible under any circumstances, regardless of the number of years of reappointment to and service in that rank. An initial appointment to the rank of Assistant or Associate Professor is normally a probationary appointment that places the individual in a tenure track position from which it is possible to attain tenure. It is also possible for an initial appointment to Associate Professor to be with tenure, and an initial appointment to the rank of Professor always confers permanent academic tenure.

Initial appointments to these ranks will be made only after the following procedures are completed:

1. Needs and Competencies Identification: Before beginning any position search, voting faculty of the Department shall, by consensus determine departmental personnel needs having the greatest priority and the specific discipline-related competencies a candidate must possess to fulfill those needs. The faculty will charge the search committee with the identification of candidates who will best fulfill those specific departmental personnel needs having the greatest priority and the specific discipline-related competencies a candidate must possess to fulfill those needs. The faculty will charge the search committee with the identification of

candidates who will best fulfill those specific departmental needs. All candidates must meet the overall criteria and possess the required competencies along with other desired collegial and personal qualities.

2. Dean's Approval of Search: The Department Chair will present to the Dean the specifics of the position and seek his or her approval to begin a search.
3. Search Committee Formation: Upon approval by the Dean, a departmental search committee consisting of four individuals will be formed by the Department Chair and Assistant Chair. The appointed committee members will be balanced across the department's specialization areas. At least one member should be from within the specialization most closely aligned to the position being filled. At its first meeting the Department Chair will appoint a search committee chairperson, and charge the committee with carrying out the search.
4. Position Description Development: The search committee will develop a written description to advertise the position based upon the needs and competencies previously identified. A condensed version of the job description will be developed for ads to be placed in journals or other publications. The voting faculty will approve, reject, or recommend modifications to the description. A rejection or recommendation for modification requires the search committee to develop and present to the voting faculty a new description or one with the requested modifications.
5. Dean/Equal Opportunity Approval: The position description will be submitted to the Dean of the College and to the University Equal Opportunity Officer for their approval.
6. Advertise Position and Accept Applications: Upon receiving approval to proceed with the position search from the Dean of the College and the University Equal Opportunity Officer, the search committee, through its chairperson and departmental manager, will advertise the position, collect and file all application materials, and correspond with prospective and actual candidates. The chairperson of the search committee and departmental manager are responsible for the completion of all interim and final Equal Opportunity Action reports as required and scheduled by the Equal Opportunity Plan.
7. Review and Selection of Candidates for Interview: The search committee chairperson will provide departmental faculty with an opportunity to review all candidate application materials and to make recommendations to the search committee. The search committee will fully evaluate the records of all candidates and present to the voting faculty a written list of candidates that it recommends be considered for the position. This list should contain a minimum of two candidates. The voting faculty will determine, by consensus, which of those candidates will be invited to campus for an initial round of interviews. All candidates recommended by the search committee remain viable candidates and may, at a later time, be invited for an interview. The Department reserves the right to continue a search until a suitable candidate is found, within the boundaries set by the Affirmative Action Plan and/or the Dean.
8. Interviews: All candidates selected by the voting faculty are extended an invitation for an interview by the Chair of the search committee, who will schedule and make all arrangements for the interviews. All faculty members will be afforded the opportunity to engage in the interview process and make recommendations to the search committee.
9. Voting: Faculty Recommendation: Upon completion of the interviewing process, the search committee will present its recommendations to the voting faculty. Following discussion of the search committee's recommended ranking of the candidates, the voting faculty will vote on all interviewed candidates by secret ballot, which will be immediately tabulated by the

Department Chair and Assistant Chair, and announced to the faculty. This vote, recorded by faculty rank, will serve as the faculty's recommendation to the Department Chair.

10. Department Chair's Recommendation: The Department Chair, at the meeting described in Procedure 9, or at a later time will inform the faculty of the candidate to whom he or she intends to offer the position and the specifics of the offer. If the Chair's decision differs from that of the recommendation of the faculty, the Chair must present to the assembled faculty the rationale for his or her decision, and provide an opportunity for full discussion of the issue(s). Following such discussion the faculty may, by consensus, request the Chair to reconsider his or her choice of candidates. The Department Chair will then carefully consider and weigh all issues identified by the faculty, and the strength of their recommendation to arrive at his or her final decision. This is to be done prior to the Department Chair making the offer of a position to any candidate.
11. Offering of the Position: The Department Chair will make the position offer to the candidate and seek the candidate's approval to submit his or her name to the Dean as the recommended candidate to fill the position. If approval is granted, the Chair will communicate in writing the vote by ranks along with his or her personal recommendation.
12. Notification of Candidate and Department: The Department Chair will notify the candidate of the Dean's decision, and all voting faculty of the acceptance or rejection of the offer.
13. Concluding or Continuing Actions: As soon as possible following an acceptance of a position offer, the chairperson of the search committee will notify all remaining candidates, not already so notified, that the position has been filled. If an offer is rejected, other candidates who were not eliminated from consideration may be considered by reverting to the appropriate step in these procedures.

B. Initial Appointments - "Visiting" Ranks

Initial "Visiting" faculty appointments are made for a term not to exceed one year in duration. A maximum of one reappointment to an additional one year term may be made. These appointments are primarily to fill short-term instructional needs of the department, e.g., regular faculty on leave. The procedures for making these appointments are usually less formal, since the hiring often occurs over summer breaks, or on short notice. State of North Carolina employee fringe benefits are not available to an individual holding a "Visiting" faculty appointment, and it is not possible for such positions to be changed into a regular faculty appointment. These appointments do not require the full search process as described in Section II. A. 1.-14. of this document. However, the following procedures are expected to be followed:

1. Identification of Specific - Short-term Needs and Specifics of Position: The Chair or any member of the departmental faculty may suggest filling specific short-term needs of the department through an appointment to a "Visiting" rank. The voting faculty will identify departmental needs that could be met with this type of appointment, outline the specifics of the position, and vote on the position.
2. Approval of Dean: The Department Chair will discuss the specifics of the position with and seek the approval of the Dean to search for the "Visiting" rank position.
3. Identification of Potential Candidates: Any departmental faculty member may recommend individuals to be considered for the position.
4. Potential Candidates Contacted/Credentials Requested: The Chair and/or Assistant Chair will

- contact the potential candidate(s) to discuss the temporary position. Any individual(s) wishing to be considered must submit an up-to-date vita and the names of three references to the Department Chair and Assistant Chair.
5. Credentials Reviewed: The Department Chair and/or Assistant Chair will make the vita(e) of the candidate(s) available to the voting faculty for their review. Ideally, a minimum of one week will be allotted for this review.
 6. Faculty Recommendation: Through discussions with available faculty, a consensus of the available faculty will be gathered by the Department Chair and/or Assistant Chair.
 7. Offering of the Position: The Department Chair and/or Assistant Chair will make the position offer to the candidate and seek the candidate's approval to submit his or her name to the Dean as the recommended candidate to fill the position. If approval is granted, the Chair will communicate in writing the vote by ranks along with his or her personal recommendation.
 8. Notification of Candidate and Department: The Department Chair and/or Assistant Chair will notify the candidate of the Dean's decision, and in writing, all voting faculty of the acceptance or rejection of the offer.
 9. Concluding or Continuing Actions: As soon as possible following an acceptance of a position offer, the Department Chair and/or Assistant Chair will notify all remaining candidates, not already so notified, that the position has been filled. If an offer is rejected, other candidates who were not eliminated from consideration may be considered by reverting to the appropriate step in these procedures.

C. Reappointments and Promotions: Which may include the awarding of tenure to the Regular Faculty Ranks of Assistant Professor, Associate Professor and Professor

Assistant Professors: Reappointment to a second probationary term at the rank of assistant professor is for a term of three years. This reappointment, non-reappointment, or promotion to associate professor decision is typically made in the third year of the initial four year appointment. Promotion is possible at this time, but without extremely compelling reasons to promote the option is reappointment or non-reappointment. Reappointment at the rank of assistant professor normally will not exceed a total of seven years in the rank and a review for possible promotion is made during the sixth year in the rank.

Associate Professors: Promotion to associate professor confers permanent academic tenure. Associate professors are initially reviewed for promotion and/or tenure during the fifth year in the rank. All associate professors not promoted in the fifth year will be reviewed every third year thereafter for promotion to full professor.

At the appropriate time for each personnel action, the Department Chair will notify, in writing, the candidate of the review. This communication will contain the following:

1. Notification and Request for Information and Materials: At least three months prior to the start of a scheduled review, the Department Chair will formally notify the faculty colleague of the review. The notification should contain a copy of this document and specify all information and materials required from the candidate and the date by which they must be submitted. Recommendation options open to the Department are also included, those being:
 - First-term Assistant Professors: Reappointment or non-reappointment - promotion at this point is not normally considered.

- Second-term Assistant Professors: Promotion and tenure or non-reappointment or, in exceptional circumstances, reappointment at the rank of Assistant Professor with tenure.
- Untenured Associate Professors: Reappointment with tenure, promotion to professor with tenure, or non-reappointment.
- Tenured Associate Professors: promotion to Professor or non-promotion.

Specific information and materials required from the candidate include, at minimum, the following:

- Completed AP-2 and AP-2a forms.
 - an up-to-date curriculum vita (Full Curriculum Vita): Personal, Education, Professional experience, Honors, Bibliography (show author order), Books and chapters (incl pgs), Refereed papers/articles (incl pgs), Refereed unpublished oral presentations and/or abstracts, Other unrefereed works (incl book reviews).
 - Copies of scholarly published or manuscript material, or other pertinent materials to be required if the candidate does not choose to exercise his or her option to waive a full review, in cases that allow this option (See Appendix A for an explanation of this option).
 - The names of a minimum of three persons outside the University who are qualified to evaluate his or her scholarly record, creative ability, artistic performances, or any other criteria being applied to the candidate. The candidate may present more than three names.
 - Materials and/or information to be used in evaluating the candidate's teaching. At minimum this will include:
 - Teaching: Activities/ Goals/Strategy: A brief written statement describing the candidate's teaching goals and strategies. If the candidate teaches at both the undergraduate and graduate levels, the statement must address both levels or a separate statement for each must be submitted. Teaching activities: List courses for the past 3 years, number of students taught by section. Give names of graduate students supervised, thesis titles, and completion dates for degree work since employment at UNC-CH. Undergrad honors projects should be included.
 - Course Syllabi: A detailed syllabus must be submitted for each course the candidate has taught in the previous three years.
 - Student Evaluations: Summaries of student evaluations of teaching for classes taught during the previous three year period. Summaries may also be submitted for prior years if the candidate wishes. These evaluations may be from administration of the Carolina Course Review or any personal or departmental instrument designed to solicit student evaluations of the candidate's teaching.
 - Other Evidence of Teaching Excellence: Candidates may, at their option, submit other indicators of their teaching effectiveness. This may include evidence of contributions of any nature to any departmental or University instructional programs supervised or in which the candidate was involved in a significant fashion.
 - Any additional materials the candidate feels is relevant to the criteria and that he or she formally requests be included in the review.
- External Reviewers Selected: A minimum of two people will be selected from the candidate's list of external reviewers. The Department Chair and the assembled voting faculty, will select

additional persons, if necessary, to total a minimum of four outside reviewers. The Chair and voting faculty may choose to add a minimum of two external reviewers from the candidate's list and two from their own list. The Department Chair will immediately notify, in writing, the candidate of the names of the external reviewers selected. The candidate may not veto the selection of any external reviewer; however, he or she may request a reconsideration of a selection. In addition to the minimum four required independent letters, any number of additional letters from any source may also be submitted. These may be from individuals within the institution with whom the candidate has collaborated or from former colleagues, collaborators, mentors or other individuals connected with the candidate.

3. External Reviewers Contacted/Materials Sent: All external reviewers are contacted and asked to serve in this capacity by the Department Chair. Materials relevant to the candidate's review is sent to each external reviewer with a letter of instruction developed for and specific to each individual candidate, including an appropriate requested return date for the letter of evaluation. Materials to be sent include, at minimum, copies of scholarly materials selected by the candidate, the vita of the candidate, and a copy of the criteria from this document for the particular personnel action. External reviewers are to be asked to comment on the candidate's contributions to the discipline and to the department.
4. Examination of Materials by Faculty: Once the dossier of the candidate is complete (all requested materials, other materials submitted by the candidate, and all external reviews) all faculty involved in the review process are notified by the Department Chair that the materials are available for their inspection. A minimum of one week, preferably longer, should be allowed for this purpose.
5. Candidate meets with Voting Faculty: The candidate will be invited to meet with the Department Chair and the assembled voting faculty who will vote on his or her case. This is optional for the candidate and he or she may decline the invitation without prejudice. The purpose of this meeting should be twofold. First, the candidate is given the opportunity to present his or her case, usually to specifically Identify and emphasize the evidence he or she feels supports their case for reappointment, or promotion... although the candidate is free to address his or her colleagues as they wish. Second, the assembled voting faculty will identify any significant deficiencies they perceive the candidate has, relative to the personnel action under consideration. The candidate will be afforded an opportunity to offer explanatory and/or corrective information relative to any deficiency perceived by any member of the voting faculty to be significant. A significant deficiency (or a group of minor deficiencies that collectively is considered significant) is one that could or would cause a member of the voting faculty to cast a negative vote for reappointment or promotion.
6. Faculty Personnel Action Meeting(s) Scheduled: The Department Chair will schedule an appropriate number of meetings of the assembled voting faculty. Ideally these meetings should be for the sole purpose of these personnel matters. If other matters must be on the agenda, although this is strongly discouraged, personnel actions should be first. A minimum of two meetings or two sets of meetings of the assembled voting faculty is to be devoted to each case. The first meeting (or first set of meetings) is for discussion of the candidate in question. The second (or second set of meetings) is for the purpose of developing the final consensus recommendation, including a formal vote, the faculty will make to the Chair. At this meeting the Chair will summarize what he or she perceives to be the consensus of the faculty. The faculty will react to and/or offer corrections to the perceived consensus.
7. Department Chair's Intended Recommendation: The Department Chair will, at this meeting

(#6 above), or at a later meeting, communicate to the faculty the recommendation that he or she intends to make for each candidate under consideration. If the Chair's decision differs from that of the consensus recommendation of the voting faculty the Chair must present to the assembled voting faculty the rationale for his or her decision and provide an opportunity for full discussion of the issue(s). The voting faculty may, at this time, request the Chair to reconsider his or her decision.

8. Candidate Notified of Intended Recommendation: The Department Chair will notify, in writing, the candidate of the recommendation he or she intends to make to the Dean. If the recommendation is to be for non-reappointment or non-promotion, a written summary of the reasons for this action must be provided to the candidate. Reasonable time is to be allowed for a response from the candidate. The candidate may, if he or she wishes, respond to and/or discuss the reasons with the Chair and/or the voting faculty. The candidate may request that the Chair and/or the voting faculty reconsider his or her case. Following discussion and a request for reconsideration the voting faculty may, by consensus, request the Chair to reconsider his or her decision. The Department Chair will carefully consider and weigh all issues identified by the candidate and the voting faculty, and the strength of their consensus recommendation, to arrive at his or her final decision. This is to be done prior to the Chair sending a recommendation to the Dean of the College.
9. Recommendation to Dean: Along with his or her personal recommendation the Department Chair will communicate the vote by ranks and a summary of the consensus recommendation of the faculty to the Dean. A copy of this communication is to be sent to all voting faculty and the candidate at the same time it is sent to the Dean.

D. Reappointments at the Rank of Lecturer or "Visiting" Ranks

1. Presentation to Departmental Faculty: The Department Chair will present to the assembled voting faculty the credentials, to include at minimum a complete and up-to-date curriculum vita, of the candidate. Typically individuals in these positions are fulfilling particular departmental needs in teaching and service; therefore a summary of student evaluations of teaching as well as peer observations of the candidate's teaching should be included as well. Evaluation of evidence of significant leadership in service functions should also be made. Departmental needs that have been and could continue to be met with this type of reappointment and with this particular candidate are to be identified.
2. Vote and Recommendation: The assembled voting faculty will, through both a discussion and formal vote, make their consensus recommendation known to the Chair. The Department Chair will summarize what he or she perceives to be the consensus of the voting faculty, who will react to and/or offer corrections to the perceived consensus. The assembled full professors and the Chair may then meet separately for the same purpose. The full professors may, through consensus and with agreement from the Chair, waive their separate meeting and vote.
3. Department Chair's Recommendation: At the meeting described in procedure #2, or at a later one, the Department Chair shall communicate to the voting faculty the recommendation that he or she intends to make for the candidate under consideration. If the Chair's decision differs from that of the recommendation of the voting faculty the Chair must present to the assembled voting faculty the rationale for his or her decision and provide an opportunity for full discussion of the issue(s). Following discussion and a request for reconsideration the voting faculty may, by consensus, request the Chair to reconsider his or her decision. This is

- to be done prior to the Chair sending a recommendation to the Dean of the College.
4. Recommendation to Dean: The Chair will communicate in writing the vote by rank and a summary of the consensus recommendation of the voting faculty to the Dean along with his or her personal recommendation. A copy of this communication is to be sent to all voting faculty and the candidate at the same time it is sent to the Dean.
 5. Offering of the Position: Following final approval of the Dean of the recommendation, the Department Chair will notify, in writing, the candidate and the voting faculty of the action taken.

III

Criteria To Be Applied in Personnel Decisions

- A. Initial Appointments, Reappointments, and Promotions to Tenure-Track Positions: All candidates for an initial appointment to any tenure-track rank, reappointment, or promotion within a tenure-track appointment will be evaluated by application of the following eight criteria areas.
 1. An earned doctorate in the area of specialization.
 2. Excellence in teaching and a continuing commitment to teaching excellence, especially in the area of specialization.
 3. Excellence in scholarly activities and a continuing commitment to excellence in scholarship.
 4. Excellence in professional service and a continuing commitment to professional service.
 5. The ability to function within a department as an academic colleague with a true spirit of collegiality.
 6. Personal qualities to include: integrity, initiative, industry, self-reliance, and the capacity for cooperation in maximizing total departmental productivity (EPA Employees, Affirmative Action Plan, UNC-CH March 1, 1993.).
 7. Possession of specific competencies which have been determined to be essential to meet specific needs of the department (see II. A. 1.).
 8. Any other criteria specified in the job description (see II. A. 1., 4., and 6., pages 3 and 4).
- B. Initial Appointments to Tenure-Track Ranks of Assistant Professor, Associate Professor and Professor.

The search committee and the Department's task are to assess the record of the candidate in light of the eight criteria areas, both general and specific to the position being filled. Evidence of specific competencies specified in the position description is a clear prerequisite for a candidate to be considered. A candidate's record will be verified and thoroughly evaluated in light of those criteria.

1. Assistant Professor

A candidate recommended for an initial appointment to Assistant Professor often possesses minimal experience. Having recently received the doctorate, he or she may have insignificant teaching experience, little or no record of scholarly activities (other than the dissertation), and little or no record of professional service. In these instances the search committee and the

Department have a difficult task - that of determining a candidate's potential to meet the criteria and ultimately the needs of the Department and the University. All available means of determining the candidate's potential and promise as an academic colleague within the Department must be undertaken.

2. Associate Professor

A candidate considered and recommended for an initial appointment to Associate Professor will normally have established a record of professional experience. For this rank the range of experience over all candidates may be quite large, in both quantity and quality; however, it is expected there will be some years of teaching experience, scholarly activity, and professional service that can be evaluated. These candidates will also likely have established a record that reflects specific competencies, their degree of academic collegiality and presence of desirable personal characteristics.

To be recommended for an initial appointment to this rank there must be clear evidence of achievement in all eight criteria areas. Equally important, a candidate's potential to continue to meet the criteria and ultimately the needs of the Department and the University must also be assessed... a difficult task at best, nonetheless one that must be undertaken with exacting rigor. After ascertaining that the candidate possesses all minimal qualifications every available means of determining the candidate's potential and promise as an academic colleague within the Department must be undertaken. Any record the candidate has relative to the criteria will be verified and evaluated thoroughly.

3. Professor

Except under most unusual circumstances a candidate considered and recommended for an initial appointment to Professor will have established a significant record of professional experience and will have many years of teaching experience, scholarly activity and professional service that can be evaluated. A history that reflects his or her degree of academic collegiality and presence of desirable personal characteristics should also be clearly evident. An individual recommended for an initial appointment to the rank of Professor will have clearly established a record of excellence in teaching, scholarship, service, academic collegiality, and will possess the personal characteristics outlined in the criteria. The search committee and the Department's task are to assess the record of the candidate in light of the criteria, both general and specific to the position being filled. Although past accomplishments weight heavily for this rank, the candidate's potential to continue to meet the criteria and ultimately the needs of the Department and the University must also be assessed, a particularly important task since an initial appointment at this rank confers permanent tenure. All available means of determining the candidate's potential and promise as an academic colleague within the department must be undertaken. The candidate's record relative to the criteria will be verified and evaluated thoroughly.

C. Reappointment and Promotion; and The Awarding of Tenure for the Ranks of Assistant Professor, Associate Professor, and Professor

The candidate will be assessed in light of the same eight criteria areas listed in III. A. 1-8, and for these personnel actions the department will have had the opportunity to directly observe and interact with the candidate at UNC-CH. An assessment can be made of the candidate's actual contribution to departmental productivity and the Department's and University's mission and the evidence is firsthand. This should also contribute to a better assessment of the candidate's potential for future contributions. Relative to criteria area 8 an individual's role in and responsibilities to the Department may have changed/evolved since his or her initial

appointment. Such changes in role and responsibilities, as well as the time frame, in which they occurred, will be duly noted and considered. Particular note and considerations will be made of circumstances beyond the control of the candidate.

1. Reappointment to a Second Probationary Three-Year Term as Assistant Professor. Typically the candidate will be reviewed for this reappointment in the third year of the initial probationary (four-year) appointment. From the date of initial appointment at UNC-CH the candidate must have a record indicating satisfactory progress in the fulfillment of all criteria and the clear potential to continue that progress toward excellence. Although considered a "junior" faculty member who is in an early developmental stage professionally, a total or serious deficiency in one or more of the eight criteria areas would be cause to question the prudence of reappointment.

2. Promotion to Associate Professor with Permanent Academic Tenure

For most candidates this review will occur in the second year of the second probationary (three-year) appointment to assistant professor. The review will occur in the fourth year of an initial appointment to associate professor without tenure. This decision is clearly a very important one for the Department and the University - one that may have significant and lasting impact on the Department's, and ultimately the University's, ability to fulfill its mission.

The conferral of permanent academic tenure is only made following an assessment of both institutional and departmental needs and resources, evidence of service to the Department and broader academic community, the potential for future contribution, a commitment to the welfare of the Department and University, demonstrated professional competence, including consideration of a commitment to effective teaching, scholarship, and public service. Given the Department's prerogative to make personnel decisions that incorporate its professional, personal, and collegial interests, consideration of individual qualities of a spirit of departmental academic collegiality, integrity, initiative, industry, self-reliance, and cooperation in maximizing total departmental productivity is essential. At the time of the review a candidate for promotion to associate professor will typically have had a minimum of five years experience at UNC-CH that permits direct evaluation of all criteria areas. To recommend promotion and permanent academic tenure the Department must be certain that the candidate has clearly met all criteria at the level appropriate for his or her role in the Department and this rank. For this personnel decision, progress toward meeting criteria becomes less important than attainment. The Department must also be as certain as possible that the candidate will continue to function at a level of excellence. The potential for future contributions to the departmental mission is of vital concern. Review of the candidate must include a thorough application of each criteria area, and in consideration of the significance of this decision for both the Department and University, a total or serious deficiency in one or more of the eight criteria areas would be cause to reject a recommendation for promotion.

3. Reappointment to Associate Professor with Permanent Academic Tenure

For candidates whose initial appointment was to the rank of associate professor without tenure a review will be conducted during the fourth year of the five-year term. At this time the candidate will have had three years of experience at UNC-CH that permits direct evaluation of all criteria areas and the evidence is firsthand. The same rigorous scrutiny will be applied for this decision as was for the promotion of an assistant professor to associate professor. In both cases, the awarding of permanent academic tenure is involved and the impact on the department and the University must be assessed. The same process and criteria described in 2 above will be applied.

4. Promotion to Professor

For both the candidate who was promoted to associate professor and who received an initial appointment to associate professor, this review will occur in the fifth year in the rank. Promotion to full professor is how the Department recognizes outstanding faculty in the areas of teaching, research and service. Although not a criterion, most recommendations for promotion to this rank comes after four to ten years of professional experience at UNC-CH in which the candidate is expected to have distinguished him or her self. The same qualities are sought in the full professor as for the associate professor; however, the degree of achievement is expected to be greater. A candidate for promotion to Professor has attained, far beyond some minimal level, all criteria and is recognized as having a high professional standing by his or her associates. A record of excellence in the teaching, scholarship, and service is required for promotion to this rank. Candidates should also be regarded as leaders in the field, as indicated in the external letters of recommendation. Although the candidate's professional record and standing is of significant importance for this personnel decision, the Department must also be as certain as possible that the candidate will continue to function at a level of excellence; the potential for future contributions to the departmental mission is of vital concern. Review of the candidate must include a thorough application of each criteria area, and, in consideration of the significance of this rank in the Department and University, a total or serious deficiency in one or more of the eight criteria areas would be cause to reject a recommendation for promotion. To recommend promotion to the University's highest rank the Department must be certain that the candidate has clearly met all criteria at the level appropriate for his or her role in the Department and this rank.

D. Reappointments to Non Tenure-Track Positions of Lecturer and "Visiting" Ranks.

Candidates for these personnel actions will not have the eight criteria areas applied in the same fashion as for colleagues in tenure-track positions. Individuals appointed to or reappointed to the rank of Lecturer or a "Visiting" rank will typically have specialized skills or competencies that meet very specific needs of the Department. Candidates will be expected to meet criteria areas 5, 6, 7, and 8 for appointment or reappointment to these positions. Criteria 1 may not be relevant for a particular position. Departmental needs most often will require the candidate to meet criteria 2, and 4. possibly with a primary emphasis on one or the other. Criteria area 3, scholarship, is not likely to be a primary expectation for a candidate to these ranks.

IV

Interpretation and Application of Criteria

A. Teaching

The Department is committed to excellence in educational programs including physical activity instruction, undergraduate and graduate programs. (*Long Range Plan*, 1993) Any faculty evaluation process that considers a recommendation for conferral of tenure, and/or promotion in rank must include a thorough evaluation of the candidate's teaching. An optimum set of traits associated with superior teachers combines concern for students with command of subject matter (i.e., scholarly competence), together with the classroom skills that convey concern and competence. Assessment of teaching will include, but not necessarily be restricted to, a compilation of the following materials:

1. Teaching Goals/Strategy: A brief written statement describing the candidate's teaching goals and strategies. If the candidate teaches at both the undergraduate and graduate levels, the statement must address both levels or a separate statement for each must be submitted.
2. Teaching activities: List courses for the past 3 years, number of students taught by section. Give names of graduate students supervised, thesis titles, and completion dates for degree work since employment at UNC-CH. Undergrad honors projects should be included.
3. Course Syllabi: A detailed syllabus must be submitted for each course the candidate has taught in the previous three years.
4. Student Evaluations: Summaries of student teaching evaluations for all classes taught, undergraduate and graduate, during the previous three year period. Summaries may also be submitted for prior years if the candidate wishes. These evaluations may be from administration of the Carolina Course Review or any personal or departmental instrument designed to solicit student evaluations of the candidate's teaching.
5. Class Visitation by Peers: The faculty colleagues who will vote on a candidate select a minimum of two faculty from its membership to observe the candidate's teaching. These observers will:
 - a. observes the candidate teaching on a minimum of two occasions within a specified semester.
 - b. following a discussion of their observations with the candidate, develop draft of a brief written report of the substantive material covered and the
 - c. presents a copy of the report draft to the candidate and, at the candidate's option, meets with the candidate for discussion of the report.
 - d. submits the final report, after any necessary revisions, to the faculty voting on the candidate.
6. Other Evidence of Teaching Excellence: Candidates may, at their option, submit other indicators of their teaching effectiveness. This may include evidence of contributions of any nature to any departmental or University instructional programs, including the identification of graduate theses and dissertations supervised or in which the candidate was involved in a significant fashion. It should be noted that involvement in thesis or dissertation research may simultaneously fall within the two areas of teaching and scholarship.

B. Scholarship

The Department provides leadership in research and scholarship in the discipline of exercise and sport science, and is committed to the discovery, interpretation, dissemination, and application of knowledge. Scholarship and research are sometimes used interchangeably, but neither is self defining. The Steering Committee for the Self-Study of the Research Mission of the University uses the general term "scholarly work", in the submission of its *Final Report* in 1985, to designate the means by which a university becomes a great center of learning. In that report scholarly work is described as ranging from the disciplined collection of data, through research that adjudicates contending theories, to the critical and creative activities that expand understanding provided by the humanities and performing arts. Both the Steering Committee and the Subcommittee clearly state that scholarly work will vary between disciplines and among scholars within a given discipline and further stipulates that such variation is seen as a strength insofar as differing perspectives engender new lines of inquiry, new prospects of understanding. Indeed, research as a form of scholarship includes all intellectual, critical, and creative activities

that diminish our ignorance, enlarge our vision, and increase our wisdom. This may involve the collection, analysis and interpretation of data and a discriminating evaluation of its worth relative to existing knowledge. It may mean the challenge of basic concepts, evaluation and criticism of institutions and ways of life in terms of human values. It may include historical scholarship, the fostering of creative activity, the invention and refinement of techniques, advancement of our knowledge of ourselves and the physical world, and the testing of knowledge and theory through application to concrete cases. Creative scholarly contribution can result from administration through sharing knowledge, skills, and insights relative to administrative matters with peers, colleagues and students, even if accomplished outside traditional classrooms or scientific journals. It is these intellectual activities, combined with instruction, that produces a research university, and the departmental faculty has traditionally reflected this great diversity of scholarly activity.

So it must follow that no one definition and no set of detailed criteria or "check list" can exist for the area of scholarship, the mere attainment of which will insure a recommendation for appointment, reappointment, promotion, or the conferral of tenure. The Department recognizes all types of scholarly activity, keeping a broad perspective and avoiding the application of undue weighting to a narrow definition of scholarship. Within broad categories the rich diversity of scholarship is encouraged; an encouragement that is particularly important considering the diversity of the departmental faculty and the functions, role, and mission of the Department. To assist in the evaluative process the following examples of scholarly activities are presented. These examples are for illustrative purposes only and indicate a possible range of activities that is expected of colleagues to be considered in appointment, reappointment, tenure and promotion decisions. Scholarly activities to be considered in a personnel review would include, but not necessarily be confined to (no hierarchy is intended by the order of presentation of these scholarly activities): publications in the form of: books and/or chapters in books relevant to the discipline, manuscripts in professional journals to include the reporting of all types of research as well as analyses and critical reviews on professional subjects, creative and insightful analyses and interpretations, synthesizing or organizing in new ways knowledge already discovered or produced, professional reference works, editorship of professional Journals, book reviews, abstracts, and publications resulting from theses/dissertations in which the candidate had a significant research role, etc.; papers presented at professional conferences; grants and contracts: from any source; significant roles in thesis/dissertation research, conduction, symposia and/or workshops that deal with professional problems or Issues, workshops, clinics, and conferences, consulting activity, curriculum development, etc.

All tenure-track and tenured faculty are expected to engage in scholarly activity and both the quantity and quality of scholarship will be considered in the evaluation of the candidate. No set number of publications or of any other scholarly activity is expected, but both quantity and quality will be assessed.

C. Service

The Department provides services to the university community including interactions with Athletics and Student Health Service, intramural recreational sports programs, sport club programs, fitness/wellness programming, and exercise rehabilitation and facilitates and promotes physical education, exercise and sport science with interested agencies and institutions. Additionally, professional, social and civic projects are important and service to the public is considered an important mission of the Department and the University. Service may take the

form of and/or be carried out through consultation, technical assistance, policy analysis, program evaluation, and the like. Other examples would include, but are not limited to: departmental and University administrative responsibilities, committee work at the departmental, College, and/or University level, offices held and committee work in , professional organizations, formal advisor responsibilities for departmental undergraduate and/or graduate students and General College students, consulting, etc. Significant weight should be given vital leadership positions in any of these areas. Frequently departmental committees are formed to deal with complex issues requiring the same. Evidence of significant and effective leadership in such service activities will be sought and evaluated.

D. Personal Qualities

The mission of the University and the Department is realized primarily through teaching, scholarly activity, and service. Excellence in all three of these areas is fostered by a sense of community and collegiality among faculty, as well as the method of departmental administration and the wisdom and farsightedness of its governance. Trusting collegial relationships of mutual respect enhances teaching, learning, scholarship and service in a department. Total departmental productivity and mission fulfillment is affected by the ability of faculty within the department related to each other both professionally and personally and through a mechanism of professional and personal collegiality establish a truly symbiotic relationship. An atmosphere of both professional and personal respect allows each faculty member to fully pursue the goal of excellence in all areas. The lack of this atmosphere most certainly prevents a department, as well as individual faculty within, from achieving true excellence. The Department will fully exercise its prerogative to evaluate and appropriately weigh, not only the professional, but also the personal, and collegial characteristics of a candidate for appointment, reappointment promotion, and tenure.

E. Competencies

Competencies refer primarily to the professional skills and knowledge possessed by the candidate, both qualitatively and quantitatively measured. These characteristics are reflected in the candidate's educational background, experience, skills, reputation, and potential for growth and achievement. Specific competencies of the candidate as they have impacted upon and continue to impact upon the responsibilities, both assigned by the Department and personally assumed by the individual faculty member, are of paramount concern. For initial appointments competencies sought in the candidate should be specified in the job description and subsequent reappointment, promotion, and tenure reviews must consider how well the candidate has applied those competencies to fulfill departmental responsibilities. It must be noted and recognized, however, that following initial appointments, faculty roles often evolve and may change considerably over time, eventually bearing little resemblance to the original position description. Such changing roles and the possible concomitant change in required competencies must be recognized preferably far in advance of evaluations and reviews as possible.

F. Weighing of Criteria

The professional responsibilities of full-time faculty members at universities are often evaluated according to the broad categories of teaching, scholarship and creative activity, and service (Faculty Handbook, Policies and Procedures Section III). It is within this context that the weighing of criteria for all faculty personnel actions must occur. That weighing of the criteria

occurs is inevitable and necessary; however, the weight assigned to criteria may vary from candidate to candidate. That is, a superior teacher with an impressive array of service missions may be promoted even though the publication record is adequate but not impressive. Conversely, a highly productive researcher who is a fine teacher may be promoted despite modest service. Just as there can be no set of detailed criteria, the mere attainment of which will ensure a recommendation for appointment, reappointment, promotion, or the conferral of tenure there can be no specific weight given to a specific criterion to be applied for all candidates for all personnel actions. A review is a consideration and weighing of the total contribution, the many ways a faculty member has served the Department and University during his or her years of service in the Department, with each case reviewed as unique and individual. Recognition of unique individual contributions to total departmental productivity in the pursuit of its mission is essential.

A departmental recommendation for promotion from one rank to another and the conferral of tenure should be to reward only those individuals whose sustained performance has visibly contributed to the continuing excellence of the Department and the accomplishment of its mission. Furthermore, the Department will recognize and reward both the ability and willingness of faculty to change and to serve the Department. In particular, there are significant administrative positions within the Department requiring considerable time and energy, as well as professional expertise. A fair review of a faculty colleague also considers departmental and institutional variables outside the faculty member's control that affect his or her performance in one or more of the criteria areas. Additionally, individual entrepreneurship in which work is more prescribed to individual career or financial goals is to be identified and separated from work more specifically directed toward the fulfillment of the departmental mission.

Acknowledgement: The current revision committee wishes to acknowledge the work and efforts of the 1993 revision committee (Edgar Shields, Charles Hardy, Fredrick Muller and John Silva).