A review of tenure-track Assistant Professors will take place in the third year of the initial four-year probationary term. The purpose of the review is to evaluate the candidate’s record and progress toward promotion and tenure and to decide whether or not the faculty member’s appointment should be renewed for a second probationary term of three years. The review should evaluate a faculty member in the following areas: scholarship or creative achievement, teaching, and service.

The reappointment review shall be conducted by the department head and by the tenured faculty of the department.

In order that the tenured faculty of a department and the department head can adequately evaluate a faculty member undergoing reappointment review, faculty members in the third-year of their first four-year term should prepare a dossier early in the fall semester of the third year. This dossier is not as extensive as those prepared for tenure and promotion, but the preparation of this document should serve as the beginnings of a future tenure and promotion dossier. At a minimum, the dossier should include the following items: brief narratives from the faculty member about their achievements in the areas of teaching, creative activities or research, and service; appropriate documentation of activity in each of these three areas; peer teaching evaluations; and curriculum vitae. Individual departments are free to determine the exact items required in the dossier, although letters of recommendation or support will not be required.

The review shall be conducted in accordance with the highest standards of fairness, integrity, and professional judgment. The review should be a cumulative review of the faculty member’s teaching, creative activities or research, and service during his/her UNCG career.

Reappointment will be recommended based on an evaluation of whether or not the dossier indicates the faculty member is likely to meet the criteria for a successful record in the areas of teaching, research, and service at the time of tenure and promotion (as defined by the department’s tenure and promotion guidelines). The review should indicate the specific strengths and weaknesses in the areas of teaching, creative activity or research, and service and the faculty member’s progress toward tenure and promotion. The review should also provide the faculty member with specific advice for helping the faculty member achieve a successful record at the time of tenure and promotion.

After the tenured faculty has had time to review the faculty member’s dossier, the department head will call a meeting of the tenured faculty, offer any necessary introductory comments, and then leave for the tenured faculty to conduct an independent deliberation and vote on whether or not to reappoint the faculty member. The results of the tenured faculty’s vote will be communicated to the head. The tenured faculty will also prepare a written evaluation and submit that to the Head. The Head will prepare an independent evaluation, enter a recommendation on the Reappointment Review form (see attached), and submit the form and both evaluations to the Dean. If the department does not recommend reappointment, then the candidate’s materials will be reviewed by the College and University Promotions & Tenure Committees, as required by the University P&T Regulations, Section 3.D.ii.a.(2)

In those cases where a department has fewer than three tenured faculty members, the Dean, in consultation with the department head and the faculty member, will appoint a committee of three faculty members to conduct a review of the reappointment dossier and make a recommendation to the department head.

To accommodate the College’s mid-January deadline for completing reappointment reviews, departments will typically complete their reappointment reviews by the end of the fall semester in a faculty member’s third year of his/her initial four-year term. Department deadlines for faculty members to submit their dossier for reappointment review should be set in a way that allows for the tenured faculty and the head to have appropriate time to review the materials.
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