



Office of the Provost
105 Main Building
Lexington, KY 40506-0032

859 257-2911
fax 859 257-1333

MEMORANDUM

To: Deans

From: Kumble R. Subbaswamy
Provost

A handwritten signature in blue ink that reads 'Kumble R. Subbaswamy'.

Heidi M. Anderson
Associate Provost for Faculty Affairs

A handwritten signature in blue ink that reads 'Heidi M. Anderson'.

Subject: Appointment, Reappointment, Promotion and Tenure Procedures for
2011-2012

Date: August 17, 2011

Decisions to promote faculty and to award tenure are among the most important judgments made by any university. Those decisions determine the future quality of academic programs. As a comprehensive university, our richness is defined in part by the many kinds of activities faculty members engage in across the university. However, the variety of faculty assignments also contributes to the complexity of evaluating faculty performance. Therefore, the University must provide thoughtful, accurate and thorough guidance to all members of the academic community who participate in the evaluation of faculty for promotions and tenure. This memo is intended to offer such guidance.

The centrality of the educational unit faculty in the evaluation of faculty for appointment, reappointment, promotion and the granting of tenure cannot be overstated. It is within the department of the individual under review that the criteria for assessing faculty performance are best understood. As a promotion or tenure review dossier moves beyond the contexts of department and college, reviewers look to the judgments of the educational unit faculties, and the external reviewers they invite to participate in promotion or tenure cases, for their principal guidance. Indeed, considerable deference in tenure cases shall be shown by the Provost to the judgments emanating from the college, especially in cases where those college-level judgments (unit faculty, educational unit administrator, college advisory committee and dean) are nearly unanimous, either for or against the granting of tenure or promotion. In light of this weighty responsibility, educational unit faculties must engage in the evaluation of their fellow faculty with an unwavering commitment to the objectivity, rigor and integrity of the evaluative process,

fully cognizant of the fact that a judicious and defensible outcome is predicated on the proper application of the University's policies and procedures on faculty evaluation.

Candidates for review must be apprised of the department's expectations for excellence across all areas of assigned activity. Those discipline-specific expectations often include articulation in quantitative and qualitative terms (e.g., a scholarly book published by a reputable Press, articles in top-tier journals, professional recognition through an R01 or NSF grant, invited performance before a renowned audience, teaching evaluation scores at departmental norms, etc.). Such department-level evidences (which are required to be established in written form by each department faculty, *Governing Regulation GR VII.A.6(c)*) are useful, although sole reliance on their formulaic application is inadequate. What is paramount, and should be the yardstick by which we evaluate excellence, is the impact of an individual's work during the period in question on his or her scholarly community, on the students taught, on the community members or patients/clients served. Also important is the professional trajectory of the candidate and evidence that the individual will be able to sustain the expected trajectory, as gleaned from the cumulative profile to date. Written evaluations from individual faculty members, external reviewers, advisory committees, educational unit administrators and deans are most helpful if they are candid and balanced, judiciously identifying and discussing areas of strength and weakness in the candidate's record.

This university's approach to faculty tenure and promotion is based on an underlying assumption of enlightened recruitment, appropriate support and mentoring, and a presumption of success. It is also based on the expectation of significant achievement appropriate to a flagship, land-grant, research university of high ranking. These expectations must be well articulated, communicated, and applied consistently. The university's Top 20 mandate requires that we develop and apply expectations appropriate to achieving the goal. As the *Administrative Regulations* makes clear, time in rank is not an appropriate evaluative measure. Faculty should be considered for promotion or tenure as soon as his or her educational unit faculty and administrator believe that the individual's record of professional accomplishments across all areas of assigned activity has met or surpassed the appropriate criteria as codified in University regulations and contextualized in the unit's written statements on evidences (but not later than the sixth year for probationary faculty being considered for the granting of tenure).

Distribution of the regulations and policies

To maintain an atmosphere of transparency in the promotion and tenure process, please circulate this policy memo, the *Administrative Regulations*, and the information on the Faculty Affairs website to:

- all college faculty,
- educational unit administrators, and
- college advisory committees.

The website address for the *Administrative Regulations* is <http://www.uky.edu/Regs>. We strongly encourage all concerned to review *AR 2:1* and *other regulations related the*

appropriate faculty title series under Chapter 2 - Academic Appointment (Faculty). This memo and additional information on faculty evaluation, promotion and tenure is located at the website maintained by the Office of the Associate Provost for Faculty Affairs: http://www.uky.edu/Provost/APFA/Promotion_Tenure.

Preparation of the Faculty Personnel Action Dossier

The educational unit administrator, working closely with the dean's office, is responsible for preparing a thorough and accurate dossier in a timely manner. The attached Check List for Dossiers should be used as a guide for the preparation of a dossier. In addition, the faculty candidate is responsible for submitting in a timely manner those documents identified in *AR 2:1 Appendix II (Matrix of Dossier Contents)*, including the candidate's teaching portfolio (see attached *Appendix I* from AR 3:10). When done correctly, preparing the dossier is straight-forward, arising in large measure from materials that have been systematically accumulated during the probationary period by the candidate and educational unit administrator. All written judgments from [consulted individuals](#) shall be obtained only through the request of the educational unit administrator.

We strongly encourage educational unit administrators to give a candidate the opportunity to review all descriptive (factual) materials in the dossier *before* the external evaluative letters are added to the dossier and the dossier is submitted to the faculty for its evaluation. If there is a dispute about the inclusion or exclusion of some documents, the matter should be referred to the Associate Provost for Faculty Affairs. It is the responsibility of the educational unit administrator and dean to ensure that no procedural errors occur in the evaluative process.

It is not appropriate to add information to the dossier after it has been reviewed at any level, if that information was available at the time the dossier was assembled and reviewed; if a significant error is discovered after the fact, and the dossier needs to be corrected, the Associate Provost for Faculty Affairs must first be consulted as to the proper action to be taken. However, until December 15, if there are new achievements that might have an impact on the record, then that information should be added to the dossier and shared with all who have already acted on the dossier, with an opportunity given to them to modify their evaluation. The judgment on whether the new information has significant impact is that of the unit administrator. If the new information has no impact on the recommendation, then that is all that needs be indicated in writing.

Selection of Evaluators

Educational unit administrators are responsible for asking external and internal evaluators to make a substantive, professional judgment of the value and significance of a candidate's performance. They must inform the evaluators that their letters will be handled in a confidential manner but, upon request, the candidate has the right to review all letters placed in the individual's dossier. Furthermore, all evaluators should be informed that a university must be one institution in society where professional judgment of a colleague's work is offered without malice and without fear of retribution. The courts have made clear that judgments that are professionally rendered, and free of

personal bias, will be protected. When selecting letter writers external to the University for participation in tenure and promotion cases, an educational unit administrator must apply the policies and procedures enumerated in *AR 2:1-1 Section VII.G.* and *AR 2:1-2 Section III.F.*

Please ensure that (a) all letters received from external reviewers are included in the dossier, (b) that all the included letters are available to the consulted unit faculty before their evaluative letters are due, and (c) external reviewer letters arriving after consulted unit faculty letters are due are not included in the dossier, unless any dilatory letters are shared with the appropriate unit faculty and those faculty are given the opportunity to revise their evaluative letters.

In addition, we offer the following considerations for the selection of and guidance conveyed to outside evaluators:

- they are recognized experts in their disciplines;
- they are at peer or benchmark institutions;
- they stand at arms-length from the candidate (e.g., not dissertation advisor or post-doctoral supervisor).

We encourage educational unit administrators to ask candidates beforehand if there are external reviewers whom they wish to avoid for justifiable concerns about conflicts of interest. The department/college is then free to discuss and decide whether or not to accept any or all of the restrictions offered by the candidate.

The educational unit administrator (and perhaps the dean) must explain in his or her letter any deviations from the expected norms identified above (e.g., the leading expert in the world within the candidate's field happens to be at a four-year college).

In cases involving the initial appointment of a senior faculty member already holding tenure at the rank of Associate Professor or Professor at a research-oriented university, three letters solicited by the educational unit administrator will be sufficient. Letters from external reviewers provided by the faculty candidate during the recruitment process may also be included. For these expedited appointments, follow the procedures explained online at this link:

http://www.uky.edu/Provost/APFA/Promotion_Tenure/Senior_Faculty_Appointments.pdf

Solicitation of Letters

To ensure consistency and fairness throughout the process, the educational unit administrator shall solicit all letters from external evaluators. The educational unit administrator shall be responsible for:

- Sending the candidate's curriculum vitae, personal statements, sample of work (i.e., publications or other products as appropriate) related to the candidate's profile. The educational unit administrator should try to avoid any perception of bias in the selection of these materials (e.g., by consulting with the candidate in the selection).

- Enclosing a copy of the appropriate statements of evidences and university criteria for promotion and tenure (see AR 2:2-1/2, AR 2:3, AR 2:4 and AR 2:7).
- Asking the evaluator to describe any professional or personal relationships they have/had with the candidate.
- Requesting a brief biographical sketch (not a curriculum vitae) of the evaluator. (Note: if the external evaluators submit their curriculum vitae, summarize it into a brief bio to include in the dossier).
- Asking the evaluator to analyze the candidate's contributions in the appropriate work areas (e.g., instruction, research and service); and, based on this work, to indicate whether the candidate has made a real contribution and whether that contribution has made an impact or shows likelihood of impact on the field, demonstrating focus and independence. Furthermore, the evaluator should be asked to give concrete examples of such impacts and explain how the quality of the candidate's scholarship has been responsible for the effects they describe.
- Asking the evaluator to evaluate the significance of the venues in which the candidate has published and the grants/awards he/she has received.
- Asking the evaluator whether the candidate's work meets the University of Kentucky criteria for the granting of tenure, is consistent with the unit's statements on evidences, as well as national standards applied at leading institutions for a similar position, promotion or award of tenure. Since institutional criteria differ, asking the evaluator whether the candidate would receive tenure at his or her institution is not helpful.

Educational Unit Administrator's Report or Letter

The educational unit administrator should remember that a dossier will be evaluated by University colleagues from other departments. Therefore, the educational unit administrator is responsible for educating faculty reviewers outside of the candidate's home department whose disciplines share equally rigorous but different evaluative measures for judging excellence and impact. Within this context the educational unit administrator is asked to discuss:

- The usual expected qualitative and quantitative evidences (books, articles, etc.) in the discipline, and the usual time-table for promotion if different from other disciplines.
- The quality of the journals and presses published in, or conference presentations.
- The significance of co-authorships and of first or last authorships, in that discipline.
- What level and type of peer-review external funding is desirable (where applicable).
- Whether citation frequency is important, and if important, what is the relevant comparison?
- The significance of the candidate's distribution of effort in judging the quality and quantity of the individual's record of accomplishment.
- How the candidate's qualifications will advance the department's academic plan and fit into the unit's strategy for excellence.

- How important the candidate's field is within the broader discipline.
- Explain split views for and against promotion and/or tenure as reflected in the letters submitted by the unit faculty.
- For candidates whose work is highly interdisciplinary, discuss the evidences that speak to excellence within the candidate's interdisciplinary area.
- Include in the dossier a copy of the letter sent to each of the outside evaluators.

Documenting the Process Fully

The educational unit administrator shall include in the dossier an outline of the procedural steps that were followed in the conduct of the unit-level review process. When the educational unit administrator is advised by a unit-level faculty committee, the members of such an advisory committee shall be identified in the dossier by the educational unit administrator. In addition, if member(s) of a committee have a conflict of interest, they must be excused from all deliberations of the committee discussions about the candidate. Further, the committee should explain who was recused and why; and the educational unit administrator should document this as well.

Role of the Educational Unit Administrator's/ Dean's Letter

Faculty activities in instruction, research and service vary considerably across colleges, departments, disciplines and subfields. While the custom in one discipline might be for the lead author to be the most junior, in another it might be an alphabetical list. While a student evaluation score of 2.5 might be the norm for teaching a notoriously difficult course, it might be seen as problematic in all other courses. The educational unit administrator and dean have a joint responsibility to identify and carefully explain those differences in their evaluative letters. Such explanations become particularly critical when the candidate works in an emerging or highly interdisciplinary field. In dealing with collaborative work, the educational unit administrator should solicit specific comments about the role of the candidate in the collaboration and the significance of the candidate's contributions.

Furthermore, in contentious cases that are characterized by a mix of favorable and unfavorable judgments at the unit and college levels, the educational unit administrator and dean must include in their letters of evaluations balanced and thoughtful commentaries on the strengths and weaknesses of the case.

Good Practices in Tenure Evaluation: Clarity, Consistency, Candor, and Confidentiality

- The judgments from all evaluators should provide a balanced analysis.
- Educational unit administrators are expected to explain the reasoning of both the majority and minority views, and explain advisory committees' responses to negative views expressed in previous levels.
- The faculty, administration and advisory committees must strive for unerring fidelity to the policies and processes on promotion and tenure evaluation as articulated in [Governing Regulations](#) and [Administrative Regulations](#).
- The contents of the tenure dossier must contain the proper information as specified in the [written regulations](#) and any college or unit rules and those contents must be retained after the decision as described by the [regulations](#).

- An institution will likely create a more positive environment for faculty retention by providing tenure-track faculty with clear explanations of the requirements for tenure and clear advice about their progress.

After the decisional process on a tenure and/or promotion case is complete, all letters of evaluation must be placed in the candidate's Standard Personnel File. A faculty employee must have unimpeded access to his or her Standard Personnel File. Pursuant to *Kentucky Revised Statutes KRS 61.878(3)*, the written judgments of persons consulted in connection with appointments, promotions, and tenure decisions are handled in a confidential manner. However, under the Kentucky Open Records Law, a faculty employee undergoing a personnel action (e.g., tenure, promotion, reappointment, etc.) is entitled to inspect at any time the entire contents of a dossier that was compiled for the purpose of conducting an evaluation of the faculty person's performance, including all letters of evaluation submitted by faculty reviewers. Against this backdrop of access granted by law to the candidate under review, all persons who are asked to participate in the review of an individual must be diligent in maintaining confidentiality with respect to the materials and conversations related to that review.

2011-2012 Calendar of Process

Fall	Colleges review dossiers and make recommendations for promotion and tenure
January 16	Recommendations for promotions and tenure due in the Office of the Provost
January 30	Recommendations sent to the respective University Academic Area Advisory Committee
March 12	University Academic Area Advisory Committees submit recommendations to the Provost
April	Provost reviews and submits recommendations to the President
May (early)	Letters to deans notifying them of final decisions

kh

attachments

CHECK LIST FOR DOSSIERS

(refer to AR 2-1 – Appendix II)

Information is included in the dossier in the order listed, with a tab for each item.

Enclosed

For Dean's Office Use Only

1. Recommendation of college dean _____
2. Recommendation of college advisory committee _____
3. Recommendation of department chair _____
4. Recommendations of directors of centers, institutes or other departments with which the candidate may be associated. _____
5. Up-to-date curriculum vitae or resume _____
6.
 - a. List names and ranks of faculty members in the educational unit _____
 - b. Written opinion of each faculty member required to be consulted within educational unit. _____
7. Written opinions of other faculty members consulted _____
8. Letters providing evaluation of individual's abilities in teaching, research, service or other areas:
 - a. obtained by chair from persons outside the University not suggested by the individual (at least four); _____
 - b. obtained by chair from persons outside the University suggested by the individual (at least two). _____
9. Brief biographical information on persons outside the University from whom chair obtained letters and indication of which were suggested by candidate. _____
10. Copies of faculty merit reviews since the date of hire, and copies of the tenure (two- and four-year) progress reviews. _____
11. Description of the procedural steps used within the department and the college, and explanation of how these steps were communicated to the faculty member. Note: this includes more than attaching the department rules. _____
12. If adopted, statements at the department level describing the evidence of activity in teaching, research, and service that are appropriate to the field(s) of the department and date of formal adoption. _____
13. The Teaching Portfolio _____
14. Candidates personal statement on research _____

15. Candidates personal statement on service _____
16. Letters from students, undergraduate, professional and/or graduate, pertaining to candidate's instruction. _____
17. List of, and representative samples from research articles, books, patents, writings, or other creative productivity. _____
18. List of proposals submitted and grant or contract awards received. _____
19. Information or materials relating to professional status and activity, including copies of awards received for teaching or scholarship. _____
20. Information or materials relating to University and public service. _____
21. Distribution of Effort agreements since last promotion or appointment. _____
22. Description and criteria of special title series position or other assignment that differs from regular faculty position. Approved job description of Special Title Series that has been approved by an Area committee. _____
23. If the choice is not obvious, specification of which Area Committee should review the file and the candidate's written consent to be considered by this committee. _____
24. Official Transcript from institution from which highest degree was earned. (For Appointment of New Faculty Only) _____
25. Datasheet for Proposed Members of Graduate Faculty, if applicable. <http://www.research.uky.edu/gs/GraduateFacultyProposal.pdf> _____

APPENDIX I

Teaching Portfolio (University System)

A. Teaching Evaluation

The teaching portfolio is composed of a variety of materials related to teaching and advising collected and maintained by the faculty member. It serves as an instrument for review, evaluation, and improvement of teaching and advising. The teaching portfolio enables faculty to describe their teaching assignments, methods, and circumstances, which - of necessity - vary widely in a complex university environment. The portfolio concept encourages faculty to submit a variety of materials that describe, explain, and assess teaching, advising, and related activities. Just as publications, extramural grants, and peer evaluations testify to the nature and quality of a faculty member's research, materials contained in the portfolio document the nature and quality of a faculty member's teaching and advising.

The following items are required for documentation of teaching:

1. A brief reflective statement by the instructor which describes teaching and advising assignments, sets forth philosophies or objectives, and provides whatever information may be necessary to provide colleagues with a context for interpreting and understanding the other evaluative information.
2. For each semester under review, a list of all courses taught, with the title, course number, number of students enrolled, and - for each different course - a short description.
3. Representative course syllabi.
4. A quantitative and qualitative summary of student evaluations.

The following items are suggested but not required:

1. Materials prepared for teaching activities, such as assignments, exercises, handouts, examinations or other assessment materials.
2. Indicators of student learning: such as examples of graded work; reference to students who succeed in advanced courses of study and/or who earn academic awards; accomplishments of former students; evident of learning by use of pre-and post-testing procedures.
3. Evidence of peer regard: colleague class visitation reports; peer evaluations of course content, materials, assignments, and practices.

4. Documentation of teaching-related activity: curriculum and course development; consulting work; innovative teaching methods; participation in teaching programs of other units or at other universities.

5. Evidence of recognition: teaching related grants; publications related to teaching and advising; teaching awards and honors.

6. Enumeration and description of work with individual students: supervision of Honors students, graduate students, independent or experiential learning; consultation with students outside the department.

B. Advising Evaluation

Where advising is a portion of the faculty member's usual assignment, evaluation should include the extent of advising and its quality along with an indication of the grounds for evaluation.

The portfolio must include the following items:

1. A section of the reflective statement which describes the nature and extent of advising and any other information necessary to provide colleagues with a context for evaluation of advising.

2. For each semester under review, the number and level of undergraduate and graduate program advises, and a list of masters and doctoral students for whom the instructor served as a member of a thesis or advisory committee.

3. A list of those students for whom the professor served as preceptor, or director of a thesis or dissertation.

4. Summary of activities associated with student organizations and service on student-faculty committees.

5. Student evaluation of advising.

The following item is suggested but not required:

Evaluation of advising by unit colleagues or administrators.