

**Chairs/Directors  
Tenure and/or Promotion Applications  
Procedural and Formatting Guidelines**

1. View the training videos/transcripts in the Canvas site – Faculty Information System (FIS) Training (<https://usflearn.instructure.com/enroll/GGFJK4>) – before you begin to guide a candidate.
2. Review the relevant tenure and/or promotion guidelines as you guide the candidate.
3. When opening a candidate’s application for the first time, remember to complete the Agree to Integrity step (top right button). It may appear that you do not have access but look for the Agree to Integrity button as that is often the hold up.
4. Please note that tables in Archivum sometimes only show the first 5 (or so) items in a list. Be attentive to the arrows that allow navigation to subsequent pages of the table.
5. Chairs/Directors are responsible for reviewing all tables in Archivum to ensure accuracy.
6. Candidates are directed to have their Chair/Director review their narratives before submission. Candidates should not:
  - a. include quotes from students in the narrative section.
  - b. repeat information in the narrative if it is readily apparent in the tables/forms.
  - c. include self-assessment or self-congratulatory statements in the narratives.
7. Narratives should be written in a concise manner. Although the word limits are approximately 10,000 characters, please note that most narratives are well under that number.
8. In general, the timeframe for each section (research, teaching, service, etc.) is the past five years or years since last promotion, whichever is more recent. This timeframe should be the primary focus; however, it may be described in the context of the entire career to show trajectory and overall impact.
9. At each stage of the review, the reviewers must ensure that the count of publications/grants/etc. is consistent in faculty narrative, department chair narrative, and committee narratives. Each review team should check the counts of prior reviewers to ensure consistency. If a prior reviewer incorrectly stated the number of publications, the next review team should consult with the reviewer, clarify the number, and make a brief statement noting the correction (if needed) in their review.
10. All reviews should list the name(s) of the reviewers at the bottom so that it is clear who wrote the review. For committee reviews (department/school level or college level), the names of each of the committee members should be listed at the end of the review narrative, with the chair of the committee indicated.
11. After you submit your review, you will also get a notification to DocuSign your review. Please watch for that.

12. External reviewers are required for tenure track applications (tenure and/or promotion) and research track applications but not instructor promotion or mid-tenure reviews. A minimum of 3 but no more than 6 letters should be uploaded. When preparing the list of potential external reviewers for the Dean, include the name, current institution, and rank of the individual. While efforts should be made to obtain some reviewers from AAU institutions, not all top-ranked researchers are at AAU institutions so a mixture of institutional representation may be submitted as long as all reviewers from universities are from RU-VH institutions. A template for the list of potential reviews is shown below\*. Please note that a current CV (or link to a current CV) must be included. The CV is important so the Dean can (1) determine if the person is an active scholar and (2) can ensure there are no instances of potential conflict of interest.

a. Note: former colleagues of the candidate should not be suggested as external reviewers.

13. In the letters inviting external reviewers, the Chair/Director should highlight the need for the invited reviewers to clearly specify any significant relationship they may have had with the candidate, e.g., publications (co-authorship, edited book, other), grant activity, paid contractual relationships, prior mentorships, etc. If there is a significant relationship, the individual may not serve as an external reviewer.

- a. **Clarification regarding book chapter contributions:** If the individual served as the Editor of the book, the individual would be considered to have a potential conflict of interest. However, if the faculty member authored a chapter in a book, other contributors to the book would not be considered to have a conflict assuming they did not serve as co-authors with the faculty member seeking tenure and/or promotion.
- b. Note: a template for the letters to external reviewers may be found on the provost's tenure and promotion website.

14. Ideally, all external reviewers should hold the rank of Professor including those who are reviewing applications for promotion to Associate Professor. However, Associate Professors who have extraordinary careers and/or expertise may serve as reviewers for tenure/Associate Professor promotion applicants. All external reviewers should be active in scholarly productivity, have grant experience, and have peer-reviewed publications.

15. Individuals who have previously served as a reviewer for an applicant at a previous stage of tenure and promotion should not be invited to serve as a reviewer for a subsequent application. For example, if someone served as a reviewer for the applicant when he/she was promoted to Associate Professor, that individual should not be asked to be a reviewer for the promotion to the rank of Professor.

**Use of Prior Reviewers:** If a faculty member seeking promotion withdraws the application prior to being sent to the Provost's Office or if the faculty member is denied promotion, some of the same external reviewers may be invited to review subsequent applications for promotion for the same faculty member assuming these are within a reasonable timeframe (consult with the Dean to determine the timeframe for a particular reviewer). It is advisable to include some

new reviewers along with those who submitted previous external reviews.

16. Chairs/Directors are responsible for reading the letters closely for any statement that suggests affiliation of reviewer with the candidate.
17. The Chair/Director is responsible for preparing a narrative describing the **quality** of journals and publications of the faculty member. For tenure applications, the chair should include all journals (or other publications) in their analysis of faculty publications. For applicants seeking promotion only, the emphasis should be placed on the last five years but may include additional years. Chairs/Directors: Don't include just a description of the journals; write a brief summary statement regarding the quality of each journal or publication.
  - a. Note: This must be prepared even for those without a research assignment and no publications. For such cases, the Chair/Director must upload a document indicating that the candidate does not have a research assignment/no publications and thus this section is not applicable.
18. Articles in press should not be included in the counting of publications but should be separately stated as "in press," e.g., Dr. Smith published 35 articles and has 5 additional articles in press. At each review level, the counts described in the narratives should be consistent.
19. Published abstracts should not be considered peer-reviewed referred articles. In Archivum, these should be listed in the "other publications" section.
20. A journal article published online in advance of print publication is considered "published".
21. Articles submitted, under review, or in preparation should not be included in the counting of publications at all.
22. The Chair/Director is responsible for preparing a narrative describing the **quality** of teaching of the faculty member in the section entitled "Chair or Director Summary of Teaching". This may include a description of course ratings relative to Department/School averages, an explanation of any unusual ratings, and description of peer review or activities designed to enhance teaching. It **should not** include:
  - a. quotes from students.
  - b. repeat information if it is readily apparent in the tables.
23. The Department Chair/Director should include an explanation "Chair or Director Summary of Teaching" to describe any difference in assigned faculty duties for purposes of the tenure and/or promotion consideration (e.g., training grant may appear as research in assigned duties but should be included with teaching in the application).
  - a. Note: The "Chair or Director Summary of Teaching" must be prepared even for those without a teaching assignment and no course evaluations. For such cases, the Chair/Director must upload a document indicating that the candidate does not have a teaching assignment and thus this section is not applicable.

24. Following your review, the application will route to back to the candidate for response. If you are wondering why the application has not moved to the next stage of review, it may be in the candidate's queue.
25. Please note, for faculty from the Sarasota-Manatee and St. Pete campuses, an extra step of review is included, that of Regional Chancellor before the Dean.

\*Template for Potential External Reviewer List (goes to Dean)

**Trenette Clark Goings, PhD, LCSW**

Sandra Reeves Spears and John B. Turner Distinguished Professor  
Director, INSPIRED Lab  
University of North Carolina (AAU, R1)  
School of Social Work  
325 Pittsboro Street, CB 3550  
Chapel Hill, NC 27599  
919-843-2020  
[ttclark@email.unc.edu](mailto:ttclark@email.unc.edu)

**CV link (also send CVs as files to the Dean):** <https://ssw.unc.edu/wp-content/uploads/sites/509/2020/02/Trenette-Clark-Goings-CV-Upload-KK.pdf>

**Biography (pasted from web):**

Trenette Clark Goings, Ph.D., is the Sandra Reeves Spears and John B. Turner Distinguished Professor at UNC School of Social Work and founding director of the INSPIRED Lab at the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill. Her research focuses on racial and ethnic health disparities with a primary emphasis on the epidemiology, etiology, and prevention of substance use and other risky behaviors among youth and emerging adults of color. Dr. Goings is an international expert in substance use prevention among youth and emerging adults of color. Her work has been consistently funded — mostly by the National Institutes of Health — and has yielded publications in leading peer-reviewed journals including *Drug & Alcohol Dependence*, *Addiction*, *Development & Psychopathology*, *Addictive Behaviors*, and *Health Psychology*. She is currently principal investigator of two major grants funded by NIH/NIDA and SAMHSA. She serves on several national committees, including the Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration and the Society for Social Work and Research. She is a recipient of the very competitive and prestigious Society for Social Work and Research Deborah K. Padgett Early Career Achievement Award.

**Relevance:** substance use in youth/young adults of color; racial and ethnic health disparities

**Disclosures:** No collaborations in the past.