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I. Introduction

A university capable of educating its students for work and citizenship in the twenty-first century must have an outstanding faculty. These procedures and criteria have been developed for the purpose of continually improving the quality and performance of the faculty in order to enhance the quality of the University's programs and permit the University to achieve its multiple missions.

The review required for promotion and granting of tenure is a summative evaluation of both the candidate's accomplishments over the entire probationary period and the candidate's future scholarly potential. It is based on the criteria set out in the Administrative Regulations, which require a consideration of information (e.g., the evaluations of external reviewers) that might not be available for the annual performance and tenure progress reviews.
Faculty appointments are in educational units and shall be of three types: (1) tenure-ineligible appointments; (2) tenured or tenure-eligible appointments; and (3) post-retirement appointments. (GR Part X, section B.1)

Before appointing a faculty employee, the educational unit must ensure that it has followed the established hiring policies and practices of the college, as codified in the college rules and unit rules, and all Governing Regulations and Administrative Regulations on appointments.

II. Entities Affected

This regulation applies to all faculty and educational units of the University.

III. Sources of Procedures and Criteria for Appointment and Advancement

A. Procedures

The procedures to be used in each educational unit for preparing recommendations for appointment, reappointment, promotion, and granting of tenure shall be those established by the University, the college and the faculty of the educational unit (GR Part VII, section B). The University procedures are those established in the Governing Regulations, the Administrative Regulations and as may be further elaborated by the Provost. In addition to the procedures prescribed here, college-level procedures may be established by the dean in consultation with the college faculty (GR Part VII, section A.4). Additional procedures at the level of the educational unit (hereafter referred to as “the unit”) are established jointly (GR Part VII, sections A.5 and 6) by the faculty of the unit and by the department chair, graduate center director, school director or the dean in a college without departments or schools (all referred to hereafter as the “educational unit administrator”).

B. Criteria and Evidences of Activity

1. The University-level criteria and evidences of activity to be used in evaluations for appointment, reappointment, promotion, and tenure for the various faculty title series are specified in various sections of the Administrative Regulations as indicated below:

   (a) Regular Title Series (see AR 2:2-1 and 2:2-2)

   (b) Extension Title Series (see AR 2:3)

   (c) Special Title Series (see AR 2:4)

   (d) Research Title Series (see AR 2:5)

   (e) Clinical Title Series (see AR 2:6)

   (f) Librarian Title Series (see AR 2:7)

   (g) Adjunct Title Series (see AR 2:8)

   (h) Emeritus Faculty (see sub-section III.C.4 below)

   (i) Lecturer Series — Unit criteria and evidences of activity, and procedures for appointment, reappointment, promotion, and merit review of Lecturer Series Faculty shall be developed by the faculty of those educational units that employ Lecturer Series faculty and submitted to the dean of the college for approval (see AR 2:9).
(j) Voluntary Title Series – Criteria for academic ranks of voluntary faculty shall be developed by the faculty of those educational units that employ Voluntary Series faculty and submitted to the dean of the college for approval. (see AR 2:10).

2. In addition to the above, each unit’s faculty shall develop policy statements describing the evidences of activity in instruction, research and other creative activity, and service that are appropriate to their field(s), for use in guiding evaluations for promotion and tenure. The departmental statement is operative in the unit upon approval by the dean (GR Part VII section A.6.c). If no such statements are approved for a unit, then only the specifications of the University-level regulations shall be used for evaluation.

C. Other Faculty Appointments

1. Joint Appointments – The constituent appointments relating to a joint appointment may be processed simultaneously or at different times; however, each appointment shall be processed independently and shall be considered on its own merits. An individual’s academic rank, though usually the same, may differ in the constituent appointments (see GR Part X, section B.1 (a) (ii)).

2. Faculty Employee Assignments at the Veterans Affairs and other academically affiliated non-UK hospitals and clinics – There are occasions when a regular faculty employee may be assigned to work at the Veterans Affairs or another non-UK hospital or clinic pursuant to an academic affiliation agreement. In such cases, salaries may be paid partially or totally by the University, or reimbursed by the affiliated institution. Faculty employees so assigned shall retain all the rights and privileges of regular faculty employees as described in the Governing Regulations and Administrative Regulations and are subject to all applicable University policies and procedures. Salary funding arrangements shall be defined by contract.

3. Named Professorships – Individuals appointed to named professorships shall meet all criteria for the rank of Professor and shall have acquired national recognition for excellence in instruction, research and other creative activity, or service in their disciplines. While normally reserved for exceptional professors, a named professorship may be granted to an exceptional associate professor. Each named professorship will provide specifically identified resources for program support of a professor, and it is ordinarily expected that a significant portion of the compensation and program support allocations will come from endowment income or extramural gifts (see AR 8:4). In exceptional circumstances (e.g., the recruitment or retention of a member of the National Academy of Science) named professorships may be submitted by the President to the Board of Trustees for approval for which funding may derive from revenue sources other than endowment income or extramural gifts.

4. Emeritus/Emerita Faculty - Upon retirement, tenured faculty members shall retain their titles with the designation of "emeritus" or "emerita" (e.g., Professor Emeritus). Faculty employees with emeritus/emerita status are entitled to the following rights and privileges: to be included in faculty lists in University bulletins and, upon request, to be provided a mailbox in the appropriate educational unit; to be assigned office and/or laboratory space and furnished supplies for creative work (upon request, subject to availability and approval of the concerned educational unit); to have faculty library privileges; to apply for research grants and publication subsidies funded by the Office of the Vice President for Research; to receive University identification cards; to receive parking privileges as specified in University parking policies; to participate, upon invitation by the respective unit faculty, as non-voting members of departmental or college faculties; to use University recreational facilities upon presentation of suitable identification; to purchase tickets to athletic events with previous priority status; to hold membership in the University of Kentucky Federal Credit Union; to make purchases at the University Bookstore at the employee discount rate; to participate in academic processions; to be appointed to represent the University at academic ceremonies at other institutions; to receive notices of University events; and to take part generally with the faculties in all social and ceremonial functions of the University.
5. Temporary Faculty Employees - An individual whose assigned duties and responsibilities should be completed within one year or less may be appointed as a faculty employee on a temporary basis. Temporary appointees are not eligible for tenure; however, time spent in a full-time faculty appointment on a temporary basis at the University of Kentucky may be counted as a part of the individual’s probationary period should the individual subsequently be appointed to a regular, full-time position in a tenure-eligible title series. Temporary faculty employees are not eligible for University contributions toward employee benefits, but may participate at their own expense in certain University benefit programs.

(a) Visiting Faculty - The designation "visiting" before an academic title indicates that the individual who holds an appointment at an academic institution or research center has been offered a temporary appointment for an academic year, semester, summer session, or other specified term not to exceed one year. The visiting title used should be appropriate to the appointee's home base academic rank (i.e., Visiting Professor, Visiting Associate Professor, Visiting Assistant Professor, or Visiting Instructor). Where the usual academic rank or title does not appear to be suitable, the title "Visiting Lecturer" shall be used. The final decision on such an appointment is made by the Provost upon recommendation of the educational unit administrator and the dean without reference to an Academic Area Advisory Committee. A visiting appointment is typically full-time, either salaried or unsalaried. The appointment is temporary, by definition, and the visitor is not eligible for faculty benefits. A visiting faculty employee with a salaried full-time appointment is not eligible for University contributions toward employee benefits, but may participate at their own expense in certain University benefit programs. A visiting faculty with total 0.75 or above FTE is eligible to receive the University contribution toward health plan coverage. Visiting faculty are not eligible for membership in the University Senate, but faculty membership, with or without voting privileges, may be extended to visiting faculty by the faculty of the educational units to which they are academically appointed. Visiting faculty are not eligible for tenure; however, time spent in a full-time appointment on a visiting basis at the University of Kentucky may be counted as a part of the individual's probationary period should the individual subsequently be appointed to a regular, full-time position in a tenure-eligible title series.

(b) Part-time Faculty - Part-time faculty employees have an official faculty appointment, receive a salary, and participate substantially, but less than full-time, in the program of an educational unit. The dean makes the final decision on appointments of part-time faculty employees at any rank. The appointment shall be for one year or other stated period not to exceed one year, subject to renewal. Appointees are not eligible for tenure, sabbatical leave, or membership in the University Senate. Appointees are not eligible for University contributions toward employee benefits, but may participate at their own expense in certain University benefit programs. A part-time faculty with total 0.75 or above FTE is eligible to receive the University contribution toward health plan coverage. Faculty membership, with or without voting privileges, may be extended to part-time faculty employees by the faculty of educational units to which they are academically appointed.

IV. The Comprehensive Tenure Review

In a comprehensive tenure review, a dossier is reviewed at multiple levels of the University (educational unit, college advisory committee and dean, academic area advisory committee and Provost), irrespective of the judgment, favorable or not, at the previous level of review. Considerable deference in tenure cases shall be shown by the Provost to the judgments emanating from the college, especially in cases where the Provost has determined that 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. The responsibilities of the Board of Trustees in tenure cases are codified in section X of this Administrative Regulation. The exercise of a comprehensive tenure review shall not affect a faculty person's right to appeal a tenure decision on the grounds of procedure, privilege and/or academic freedom, as provided below (see section XI.B below), or to appeal as provided in the Governing Regulations (GR I.F).
A tenure-eligible faculty employee is entitled to one (1) comprehensive tenure review, which shall be completed no later than the end of the next-to-last year of the probationary period. A comprehensive tenure review shall also be extended to a new faculty employee whose initial appointment at the academic rank of Associate Professor or Professor proposes immediate tenure. In addition, a comprehensive tenure shall be extended to a new faculty employee whose initial tenure-eligible appointment stipulates Professor (without tenure) and whose educational unit initiates a tenure review, and not a non-renewal of appointment, in the first year of service (see section VII.A.6 below).

V. Tenure Considerations during the Terminal Contract Year

A. By waiving his or her right to a comprehensive tenure review in the next-to-last year of the probationary period (see section VII.A.4 below), a faculty employee forfeits his or her right to a comprehensive tenure review. However, the possibility of consideration for tenure during the terminal contract year, subject to the terms stated in section V.B, immediately below, is not abridged.

B. After consultation with the unit faculty, an educational unit administrator may initiate a request to the dean for tenure consideration on behalf of a faculty employee who was placed on terminal contract either after a comprehensive tenure review or after waiving his or her right to a comprehensive tenure review (see section VII.A.4 below). If the dean finds insufficient evidence to warrant a new tenure consideration, the dean shall deny the request and notify the educational unit administrator that a terminal year consideration of tenure shall not be initiated. If the dean determines that the evidence in support of a favorable tenure decision has substantially strengthened, the dean may grant the request and authorize the educational unit administrator to initiate the review.

Once initiated, the terminal year tenure review shall be conducted in accordance with the procedural steps enumerated in sections VII-XIII below, except that the review process shall be stopped and the specified parties notified, if the dean renders a negative judgment on the tenure proposal. Prior to making his or her judgment, the dean and Provost shall obtain a written recommendation from the specified faculty advisory committee (see sections VIII.B.2 and IX.B.1 below).

VI. Tenure Review Prior to the Sixth Year

An educational unit administrator may initiate a tenure review prior to the sixth year of probationary service if, in the opinion of the tenured faculty of the educational unit and the unit administrator, the individual’s record of accomplishment across all areas of assignment is commensurate with the award of tenure. (The act of soliciting letters by the educational unit administrator from reviewers external to the University shall constitute the initiation of a tenure review.) The review shall follow the policies and procedures that govern the conduct of the sixth-year (tenure) review, as delineated in Section IV above and Sections VII-XIII below. However, unlike a tenure review conducted in the sixth year of the probationary period, a tenure review initiated prior to the sixth year can be suspended by the dean. The dean shall notify in writing the educational unit administrator of his or her decision to suspend the tenure review and indicate that the individual under review shall be entitled to an ordinary reappointment review at the appropriate time in that contract period and in subsequent contract periods.

A faculty employee whose tenure review has been suspended by the dean shall not be eligible for a subsequent tenure review until the sixth year of his or her probationary period. A sixth-year comprehensive tenure review of an individual whose previous tenure review was suspended by the dean shall be conducted according to the policies and procedures delineated in Sections IV above and VII-XIII below. The educational unit administrator shall include in the sixth-year (tenure) dossier, in addition to the external letters solicited for the comprehensive tenure review itself, those evaluative letters from the previously suspended tenure review that were submitted by reviewers external to the University.
VII. Procedural Steps Occurring at the Level of the Educational Unit

A. Initiating the Review Process

1. Recommendations for appointment, reappointment, terminal reappointment, joint appointment, post-retirement appointment, decision not to reappoint, promotion and the granting of tenure, concerning faculty of any rank or title series, shall be initiated by the educational unit administrator.

2. Reviews for reappointment or granting tenure shall be completed in time for the affected faculty employee to be notified of the result in accordance with GR X, section B.1.e. Except for circumstances identified in GR X, sections B.1.f., a faculty employee being considered for the granting of tenure shall not be asked to sign a terminal reappointment contract prior to a final decision by the Provost to disapprove tenure.

3. During the second year at the rank of Instructor, the individual shall be considered for promotion or terminal reappointment effective in the third year, unless the individual requests in writing that such not be done because of the intent to resign or willingness to accept a terminal reappointment.

4. An assistant professor shall be considered for promotion and tenure no later than the next-to-last year of a probationary period, unless the individual requests in writing that such consideration not be done because of the intent to resign or willingness to accept a terminal reappointment.

5. An associate professor without tenure may be considered for tenure at any time prior to the next-to-last year of the stated probationary period. However, a tenure-eligible associate professor shall be considered for tenure no later than the next-to-last year of a probationary period, unless the individual requests in writing that such not be done because of the intent to resign or willingness to accept a terminal reappointment.

6. A tenure-eligible professor shall be considered for tenure in the first half of a one-year probationary period, unless the individual requests in writing that such not be done because of the intent to resign or willingness to accept a notice of non-renewal of appointment.

B. Consultations Conducted by the Educational Unit Administrator

Individuals who have defined or assigned administrative roles and participate in the decision-making at or above the level of educational unit administrator shall not be involved as consulted faculty employees in the educational unit in which they hold an academic appointment.

C. Consultation with Applicants and New Faculty

1. Either before or at the time of interview of an individual for a faculty appointment, the educational unit administrator shall inform the individual about those parts of the Governing Regulations and the Administrative Regulations that deal with appointment, reappointment, promotion and tenure and shall provide access to these regulations as requested. At the time an appointment is offered, an individual shall be informed of the criteria for academic ranks by the educational unit administrator.

2. The educational unit administrator shall inform all new faculty employees, including temporary faculty employees, (within one month of the beginning of their employment) of the existence and locations of the following University documents: (a) the Governing Regulations; (b) the Administrative Regulations; (c) the Rules of the University Senate, in particular the Faculty Code; (d) the rules and procedures of their college; (e) the rules and procedures of their educational unit; and (f) the Student Rights and Responsibilities. Access to any of these documents shall be provided by the educational unit administrator as requested.
D. Consultation with the Faculty Candidate for Promotion or Tenure

Prior to the initiation of a recommendation concerning tenure for an individual during the next-to-last-year of a probationary period, the educational unit administrator shall consult with the faculty employee as to whether the individual waives the exercise and thereby stops the consideration. Any such waiver shall be in writing to the dean and the dean shall offer the individual a terminal reappointment. An assistant professor or associate professor with tenure whose promotion to a higher rank has not been considered by an academic area advisory committee for a period of six years may request such consideration by September 1 of the seventh or a subsequent year. The educational unit administrator shall make the individual aware of the option to submit such a request.

E. Assembly of the Dossier

1. The educational unit administrator is responsible for the assembly of a dossier associated with a faculty personnel recommendation. The dossier is prepared from materials in the Standard Personnel File (see below) and from additional materials supplied by the educational unit administrator and faculty employee. The dossier contents necessary for most faculty personnel actions other than annual faculty performance review are specified in Appendix II (Dossier Contents). In the preparation of a joint appointment dossier, the educational unit administrator in the secondary department shall develop the dossier for the secondary appointment.

2. All written judgments from consulted individuals shall be obtained only through the request of the educational unit administrator.

3. Pursuant to Kentucky Revised Statutes KRS 61.878(3), the written judgments of persons consulted in connection with appointments, terminal reappointments, promotions, and tenure decisions shall be handled in a confidential manner but, upon request, the candidate has the right to review all letters placed in the individual’s dossier. The writers of such judgments shall be notified when their judgments are solicited that the candidate, upon his or her request, shall be granted access to all letters placed in the individual’s dossier.

4. No materials will be made part of a faculty employee’s dossier other than those described above and specified in Appendix II (Matrix of Dossier Contents), except with the written permission of the faculty employee under review.

F. The Standard Personnel File

1. There shall be one Standard Personnel File maintained for each faculty employee. The Standard Personnel File contains the Notice of Academic Appointment and Assignment form, curriculum vitae, the teaching credentials certification form and, if appropriate, the teaching credentials justification form, and transcripts of academic work leading to advanced degrees. This personnel file also contains many of the crucial materials, particularly evaluation materials, needed for or taken from the dossier, which are defined below. The file contains Distributions of Effort forms, correspondence between the individual and educational unit administrator concerning academic employment conditions and salary, faculty merit or other evaluation reports, evaluations prepared by committees and those of educational unit administrators, and all other professional evaluation reports. The file shall also contain materials related to responsibilities that the faculty employee has to governmental or other agencies. The file contains regularly updated assessments of effectiveness in instruction, research and other creative activity, and service.

2. The Standard Personnel File shall be updated regularly and in particular completed by actions of the educational unit administrator, and also actions of the faculty employee. The faculty employee shall update his or her curriculum vitae annually and such other documents as he or she deems appropriate. The educational unit administrator shall update files as necessary to keep them reasonably current.
3. Unsolicited materials relevant to professional function may be included in the Standard Personnel File by the educational unit administrator provided the faculty employee sees them and is offered the opportunity to document his or her response to them. The faculty employee's written responses shall be placed by the educational unit administrator in the individual's Standard Personnel File.

4. The Standard Personnel File shall be kept in the office of the educational unit administrator or in the office of the dean as deemed appropriate for each educational unit by the dean. No other Standard Personnel File shall be kept. The Standard Personnel File shall always be available to the faculty employee and to such other persons who he or she authorizes in writing to see that file. The Standard Personnel File is always accessible to the educational unit administrator or higher administrative officer who is responsible for its maintenance and to such administrator's superior to him or her who request access to the file.

5. The Standard Personnel File may contain communications to or from the faculty employee, solicited or unsolicited letters or memos relating to professional function, which are not relevant to consideration for promotion or the granting of tenure.

G. Consultation with the Faculty in the Educational Unit

1. An educational unit administrator shall consult with appropriate faculty employees of the unit in preparing recommendations for appointments, reappointments, promotion and/or the granting of tenure, as delineated above, such consultation being in accordance with GR Part VII, section B.5. See also Appendix I (Matrix of Consultations and Written Judgments).

2. The following provisions apply to the solicitation of outside letters by the educational unit administrator:

   (a) A promotion or tenure dossier shall include a minimum of six (6) letters of evaluation from qualified persons outside the University. These outside letters are crucial in promotion and tenure reviews.

   (b) The letters from outside of the University shall be obtained by the educational unit administrator directly from appropriately qualified persons selected in part from, and in part independent of, suggestions of the individual being considered for promotion or tenure.

   (c) At least four (4) of the letters from outside of the University shall come from reviewers selected by the educational unit administrator independent of the candidate for promotion or tenure.

   (d) Outside letters from scholars at research-oriented universities shall be given the most serious consideration, except in promotion and tenure reviews involving faculty employees whose assignments do not include significant research responsibilities. Where deemed appropriate by the unit administrator, letters from persons affiliated with prestigious non-academic institutes, centers or specialized schools may be used.

   (e) The letters from outside of the University shall be accompanied in a promotion and/or tenure dossier by a written statement by the educational unit administrator indicating for each letter whether or not the name of the respondent had been suggested by the individual under consideration and, if known, whether or not the respondent had been a previous faculty colleague of the individual.

3. The educational unit administrator shall notify the consulted faculty employees when the dossier is available for their review. All letters from outside of the University received shall be included in the dossier and made available to consulted faculty employees prior to their providing individual written judgments to the educational unit administrator. The consulted faculty employees shall be expected to read and consider the contents of the dossier, including the outside letters, on matters of appointment, reappointment, promotion and/or the granting of tenure, before providing individual written judgments to the educational unit administrator.
H. Recommendation of the Educational Unit Administrator to the College Dean

The educational unit administrator shall add to the dossier all written judgments received from the unit faculty, and his or her written recommendation, and forward that completed dossier to the dean. Where disagreement occurs between the educational unit administrator and the consulted educational unit faculty concerning a recommendation, the educational unit administrator shall report this difference with adequate documentation to the dean and also notify the consulted unit faculty regarding such action.

VIII. Procedural Steps Occurring at the Level of the College

A. Completeness of the Dossier

The dean shall review the dossier for completeness (see Appendix II) and procedural compliance. If the dossier is not complete or procedurally compliant, the dean shall direct the educational unit administrator to secure the missing materials or procedural compliance and, as appropriate, to allow the consulted unit faculty to examine the new materials and contribute new consultative input to the educational unit administrator or to submit new written judgments.

B. Consultation with College Advisory Committee on Appointment, Reappointment, Promotion and Tenure

1. Each college with at least two educational units (e.g., departments, schools and graduate centers) within the college shall have a college advisory committee comprised of tenured faculty members from the college faculty, excluding educational unit administrators and assistant/associate deans. The college advisory committee shall be concerned with policy matters on, and individual cases related to, faculty appointment, reappointment, promotion and the granting of tenure. Its members may be elected by the college faculty, or appointed by the dean after consultation with an appropriate faculty body of the college as documented in the College Rules. Upon prior recommendation by the college faculty and approval of the dean and the Provost, a large college comprised of multiple departments representing a diversity of academic disciplines may establish multiple college advisory committees. Such an arrangement shall be documented in the College Rules.

2. Prior to making a recommendation or decision on terminal reappointments or decisions not to reappoint, the dean shall provide the dossier to the college advisory committee, and obtain its written recommendation.

3. The dean shall also obtain a written recommendation from the college advisory committee whenever an assistant professor, associate professor, or professor is considered for promotion and/or tenure.

4. A written recommendation from the college advisory committee shall also be sought for initial appointments at the ranks of associate professor or professor.

5. A member of a college advisory committee or an academic area advisory committee shall be excluded from any participation in that committee's consideration of a recommendation initiating from the educational unit in which the faculty employee holds a primary academic appointment. He or she shall participate fully in the unit-level evaluation of those candidates. Persons shall not serve at the same time as a member of both a college advisory committee and an academic area advisory committee.

C. Actions Taken by the Dean

1. The dean of a college shall make the final University decision to approve or disapprove a recommendation for those actions specified in Appendix III (Matrix of Authority of the Dean) as being delegated to the dean's final authority. The dean shall notify the candidate in writing of the action taken, with a copy of that notification to the educational unit administrator, and as specified in Appendix
III the dean shall communicate the action taken through the Provost to the President to be reported to the Board of Trustees.

2. If a dean disapproves an educational unit administrator’s recommendation for reappointment at any rank and offers a terminal reappointment instead, but the tenured members of the unit faculty reaffirm their positive judgment by majority vote and the educational unit administrator reaffirms his or her positive recommendation for reappointment, the Provost shall refer the matter to the pertinent academic area advisory committee.

3. In actions for which the dean is not delegated final approval (see Appendix III), the dean shall obtain, as appropriate, the written recommendation from the college’s advisory committee, and then act upon the recommendation from the educational unit administrator. If the dean approves a positive recommendation or overturns a negative recommendation of the educational unit administrator, the dean’s written recommendation and the written recommendation of the college advisory committee shall both be added to the dossier and forwarded to the Provost.

4. In cases involving a comprehensive tenure review, the dean shall first obtain the written recommendation from the college’s advisory committee on the tenure recommendation of the educational unit administrator. The dean shall then reach a judgment on the recommendation from the educational unit administrator. Finally, the dean shall add to the dossier both the written recommendation of the college’s advisory committee and the dean’s written recommendation, and forward the dossier to the Provost.

IX. Procedural Steps Occurring at the Level of the Provost

A. Completeness of the Dossier

The Provost shall ensure that the dossier is complete and procedurally compliant. (Appendix II) If the dossier is not complete or if there is procedural noncompliance, the Provost shall direct the dean to secure the missing materials or the procedural compliance and, as appropriate, to allow the consulted unit faculty, the educational unit administrator, the college advisory committee, and the dean to examine the materials and contribute new consultative input or to submit new written judgments or recommendations.

B. Recommendations from Academic Area Advisory Committee

1. The Provost shall forward the dossier to the appropriate academic area advisory committee for all cases involving appointment at, or promotion to the rank of Associate Professor or Professor, or the granting of tenure. In those cases that have not received near-unanimous support from all lower-level reviewers (external letter writers, unit faculty and educational unit administrator, college advisory committee and dean) the Provost shall require a written evaluation from the academic area advisory committee. The academic area advisory committee may elect to submit to the Provost a written evaluation on any case assigned to that committee. If the Provost is inclined to render a negative judgment on a case that has received near-unanimous support from all lower-level reviewers, but which has not been recommended on by an academic area advisory committee, the Provost shall first obtain a written recommendation from an academic area advisory committee.

2. For cases in which the Provost has received a dean’s recommendation for terminal reappointment of an individual, in contrast to the majority vote of the tenured faculty and educational unit administrator’s concurrence for reappointment, the Provost shall refer the matter to the appropriate academic area advisory committee for an independent written evaluation. The committee in its deliberations shall address itself to the individual’s scholarly potential, ability as an instructor, and other professional qualifications indicative of a probable eventual tenured appointment and shall submit a written recommendation to the Provost.
3. An academic area advisory committee may request the written advice of an ad hoc committee (appointed by the Provost) for further evaluation before returning the dossier with the ad hoc committee’s written advice, and the academic area advisory committee’s written recommendation, to the Provost.

C. Actions Taken by the Provost

1. The Provost shall make the final University decision to approve or disapprove a recommendation concerning Visiting Title Series faculty and promotion to Senior Lecturer. The Provost shall communicate approval through the President to the Board of Trustees and convey the substance of his or her final action (approval or disapproval) in writing to the dean. The dean shall notify the candidate in writing with a copy of that notification to the educational unit administrator.

2. For cases in which the Provost has received a dean’s recommendation for terminal reappointment of an individual, in contrast to the majority vote of the tenured faculty and educational unit administrator’s concurrence for reappointment, the Provost shall refer the matter to the pertinent academic area advisory committee and request a written recommendation. After reviewing the dean’s recommendation, the material forwarded through the dean from the educational unit and the written recommendation from the academic area advisory committee, the Provost shall either approve the proposal for terminal reappointment and report the action through the President to the Board of Trustees and notify the dean in writing, or disapprove and stop the terminal reappointment proposal and notify the dean in writing of the Provost’s decision for reappointment. The dean shall notify the candidate in writing of the Provost’s decision, with that notification by the dean being copied to the educational unit administrator.

3. For proposals involving the consideration of initial appointment (with or without tenure), reappointment, promotion, or the granting of tenure in the terminal year of a probationary period, the Provost shall review the dossier and all recommendations and either make a positive recommendation through the President to the Board of Trustees, which shall take final action, or disapprove, stop the personnel action and notify the dean. The dean shall notify the candidate in writing with a copy of that notification to the educational unit administrator.

4. In cases involving a comprehensive tenure review, the Provost shall first consider the written recommendation, if any, from the appropriate academic area advisory committee (see section VIII.B.11). The Provost shall then reach a judgment on the recommendation of the dean and either make a positive recommendation on the tenure case through the President to the Board of Trustees, which shall take final action, or disapprove, stop the tenure review and notify the dean. The dean shall notify the candidate in writing with a copy of that notification to the educational unit administrator.

X. Procedural Steps Occurring at the Level of the Board of Trustees

A. The Board of Trustees shall take final action on the proposal by approving or disapproving the Provost’s recommendation. The President, through the Provost, shall inform the dean in writing of the Board’s action. The dean shall notify the candidate in writing with a copy of that notification to the educational unit administrator.

B. The Notice of Academic Appointment and Assignment form constitutes the official appointment record. With the exception of salary, the precise terms and conditions covering each appointment shall be stated in writing on that form. The appointment, including salary, becomes final when it is approved by or reported to the Board of Trustees.

C. Notice of reappointment for tenure-eligible faculty shall be processed in a timely manner, preferably at least three months before the renewed appointment begins. It shall be the responsibility of the Provost to ensure compliance with this regulation.
D. The ending date of the probationary period in a tenure-eligible appointment shall be set by the dean prior to signing the initial Notice of Academic Appointment and Assignment form and shall not exceed seven years from date of initial appointment, except as permitted in GR X, section B.1(c). Previous full-time service with the rank of Instructor or higher at another institution of higher learning may be counted as part of the probationary period as negotiated between the appointee and the dean prior to initial appointment. Time spent in a full-time faculty appointment on a visiting or temporary basis at the University of Kentucky may be counted as a part of the individual's probationary period, as negotiated between the appointee and the dean, should the individual subsequently be appointed to a regular, full-time faculty position in a tenure-eligible title series.

XI. Procedural Steps Involving a Negative Recommendation to Reappoint, Promote, or Grant Tenure

A. Whenever a recommendation is disapproved at any level, this fact shall be reported back to the preceding level(s) and an opportunity provided for a thorough discussion of the recommendation among the concerned parties.

B. Any related formal appeal(s) to the President concerning procedural matters or privilege or to the University Senate Advisory Committee on Privilege and Tenure concerning procedural matters, privilege, or allegations of violation of academic freedom shall be initiated in writing by the faculty employee within 60 days after being notified in writing by the dean of the disapproval of the recommendation to reappointment, promote or grant tenure. When such an appeal to the University Senate Advisory Committee on Privilege and Tenure has been initiated in writing by a faculty employee, the chair of that committee shall inform the appropriate dean and Provost of that development.

XII. Final Disposition of the Dossier

At the conclusion of processes leading to negative decisions about appointments, reappointments, promotions or the granting of tenure, the dossier shall remain intact during the sixty (60) day period for filing an appeal, or, in cases where a formal appeal has been filed, until such time that a final decision has been rendered. Thereafter, the dossier shall not be retained, although all evaluative letters and reports or reviews contained in the dossier shall be added to the faculty employee’s Standard Personnel File. Representative examples of research and other creative activity included in the dossier as it was developed shall be returned to the faculty member for his or her retention. The teaching portfolio, or teaching materials submitted by the faculty employee, shall also be returned to the faculty employee.

XIII. References and Related Materials

Governing Regulations:
Part I: The University of Kentucky (Definition)
Part VII: University Organization
Part X: Regulations Affecting Employment

Administrative Regulations:
2:2-1 Procedures for Faculty Appointment, Reappointment, Promotion, and the Granting of Tenure
2:2-2 Appointment, Reappointment, Promotion, and the Granting of Tenure in the Regular Title Series
2:3 Appointment, Reappointment, Promotion, and the Granting of Tenure in the Extension Title Series
2:4 Appointment, Reappointment, Promotion, and the Granting of Tenure in the Special Title Series
2:5 Appointment, Reappointment, and Promotion in the Research Title Series
2:6 Appointment, Reappointment, and Promotion in the Clinical Title Series
2:7 Appointment, Reappointment, Promotion, and the Granting of Tenure in the Librarian Series
2:8 Appointment, Reappointment, and Promotion in the Adjunct Series
2:9 Lecturer Series Faculty
2:10 Voluntary Series Faculty; 8:4 Policies Governing Private Funding of Academic Positions
8:4 Policies Governing Private Funding of Academic Positions

Revision History


For questions, contact: Office of Legal Counsel
Appendices

A. Appendix I – Matrix of Consultation and Written Judgments

B. Appendix II – Dossier Contents

C. Appendix III – Matrix of Authority of the Dean
### Matrix of Minimum Consultation and Written Judgments

#### Evaluation Activity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Each Tenured Professor</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Each Tenured Associate Professor</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R³</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Each Untenured Professor</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R⁴</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Each untenured Associate Professor</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R³</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Each Assistant Professor</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Directors of GC/MDC</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>R</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**C** = The educational unit administrator must consult with the educational unit faculty in this category, but written judgments from those faculty are not required.

**R** = The educational unit administrator is required to consult with the faculty in this category and obtain their written judgments.
1 The faculty employees in the tenure-eligible title series of an educational unit at or above the rank of Assistant Professor may establish policies that extend the above minimum consultation requirements in faculty personnel matters to include the required or optional participation of other full-time faculty employees in any series in the department (see GR VII.B.5). Educational unit faculty on approved leaves and those with primary administrative, service or other assignments outside of the educational unit may elect to submit written judgments, but they are not required to do so.

2 On matters relating to appointment, decisions not to reappoint, reappointment, terminal reappointment, or promotions of persons in any tenure-ineligible series, the educational unit administrator shall consult with all full-time faculty employees in the tenure-eligible series of the educational unit. In cases of appointment and promotion pertaining to tenure-ineligible faculty, the educational unit administrator shall also consult with all full-time tenure-ineligible faculty employees in the series of the individual under consideration who are at or above the rank to which the individual would be appointed or promoted.

3 On matters involving an initial appointment, not associated with tenure, of a faculty employee at the rank of Associate Professor. If the initial appointment also considers the granting of tenure, then all tenured faculty employees shall be consulted and expected to submit written judgments.

4 On matters involving an initial appointment, not associated with tenure, of a faculty employee at the rank of Associate Professor or Professor. If the initial appointment also considers the granting of tenure, then all tenured faculty employees shall be consulted and expected to submit written judgments.

5 Directors of Graduate Centers and Multidisciplinary Research Centers and Institutes in which the candidate under review has or will have an assignment.

Revised April 2011
## Categories of Candidates

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dossier contents provided by the educational unit administrator</th>
<th>New temp. app't/ part-time faculty/ new Lecturer/ post-retirement</th>
<th>New app't tenure-track Asst. Prof./ instructor</th>
<th>New app't tenure-track Assoc. Prof. and Prof.</th>
<th>Re-appt.</th>
<th>Decision not to re-appt. (non-renewal of contract)</th>
<th>Terminal app't/ terminal re-appt.</th>
<th>Promotion to Assistant Prof.</th>
<th>Promotion to Associate Prof.</th>
<th>Promotion to Professor</th>
<th>Promotion to Senior Lecturer</th>
<th>Tenure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Educational Unit Administrator's recommendation</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Request for review by Area Committee different from that specified in the AEs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procedural steps for conducting tenure and/or promotion review</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approved description and criteria of special title series position or other assignment that differs from a faculty position in the regular title series</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Copies of DOEs since the date of hire, tenuring or most recent promotion</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Copies of faculty merit reviews since the date of hire, tenuring or most recent promotion</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Copies of all tenure progress reviews conducted by the department</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approved unit statements, if any, for use in guiding evaluations for promotion and tenure</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>List of evaluators outside UK selected independently by unit administrator</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

## Categories of Candidates

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dossier contents provided by the candidate</th>
<th>New temp. app't/ part-time faculty/ new Lecturer/ post-retirement</th>
<th>New app't tenure-track Asst. Prof./ Instructor</th>
<th>New app't tenure-track Assoc. Prof. and Prof.</th>
<th>Re-appt.</th>
<th>Decision not to re-appt. (non-renewal of contract)</th>
<th>Terminal app't/ terminal re-appt.</th>
<th>Promotion to Assistant Prof.</th>
<th>Promotion to Associate Prof.</th>
<th>Promotion to Professor</th>
<th>Promotion to Senior Lecturer</th>
<th>Tenure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Credentials from evaluators outside UK</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Letters from evaluators outside UK</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roster of unit faculty and their academic rank</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consultation with appropriate unit faculty</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Letters from appropriate unit faculty</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Written evaluations of candidate by individual graduate students</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Written evaluations of candidate by undergraduate student group, where appropriate</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Written evaluations of candidate by professional or graduate student group, where appropriate</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

### Notes

- The Standard Personnel File may contain communications to or from the faculty members, solicitations or consents (on or off-campus) or comments relating to professional behavior, which are not relevant to consideration for promotion or award of tenure.

---

* These materials would be included in the dossier not counted for consideration only if the faculty member requested. Materials and items received by the educational unit administrator may be placed in the dossier provided the faculty member were used and is offered the opportunity to discuss before a report. No materials other than those described in AB II and specified in this matrix shall be incorporated into the contents of a faculty member's dossier.
# Final Authority of the Dean

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of action as recommended by an educational unit administrator:</th>
<th>Authority of the Dean:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>New temporary appointment; part-time app’t. or post-retirement appt.</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New appointment asst. professor or instructor</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New appointment assoc and full professor, lecturer, senior lecturer or visiting faculty</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reappointment of assistant professor or instructor</td>
<td>F / L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reappointment associate professor, lecturer, senior lecturer or visiting faculty</td>
<td>L / L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decision not to reappoint</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Terminal Reappointment</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promotion to Associate Professor</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promotion to Full Professor</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenure</td>
<td>C / L / C</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Legend
- **F** - Final Authority [to approve or disapprove]
- **L** - Limited Authority [final authority to disapprove; may recommend approval to Provost]
- **C** - Contingent Authority [judgment required; dossier must be forward to Provost irrespective of judgment]

## Notes
1. If a dean disapproves an educational unit administrator’s recommendation for reappointment at the rank of instructor, assistant professor or associate professor and offers a terminal reappointment instead, but the tenured members of the educational unit reaffirm their written judgments by majority vote and the chair reaffirms his or her positive recommendation for reappointment, the Provost shall refer the matter to the pertinent Academic Area Advisory Committee.

2. A dean has limited authority, as defined above, in tenure reviews conducted during the terminal year of a faculty employee’s probationary period. In terminal-year tenure cases, if the dean renders a negative judgment, the review process will be stopped and the specified parties notified.
Frequently Asked Questions (FAQs) about the
Revised Administrative and Governing Regulations on Promotion and Tenure

The Administrative Regulation AR 2:1 (formerly AR II-1.0-1 Pages I-III) and sections of Governing Regulation VII have undergone revision. This FAQ provides a brief explanation of the key changes.

Overall Changes:
What are the key differences between the old and revised regulations?
- Increase in minimum number of outside letters
- Role of academic area advisory committees
- Role of Dean of Graduate School
- Written statements of evidence in assigned faculty areas of activity
- One comprehensive tenure review
- Terminal year tenure review
- Tenure review prior to the sixth year
- Mandatory consultation with faculty

Brief Explanations of the key revisions:

How many external letters are required for each dossier?
Under the revised regulations, a minimum of six (6) letters of evaluation are required from qualified persons outside of the University. At least four (4) are selected by the educational administrator independent of the candidate. Under the old regulation, four (4) were required.

What is the revised role of the academic area advisory committees (“area committee”)?
Under the revised regulations the area committee is required to prepare a written evaluation to the Provost for all cases in which the individual under review has not received near-unanimous support from all lower-level reviewers (external letter writers, consulted unit faculty, and educational unit administrator, college advisory committees and deans). The area committee may elect to submit an evaluation on cases assigned to them that have received unanimous or near-unanimous support. Under the old regulation, the advisory committee was required to prepare written evaluations for all cases. The effect of this change helps ensure that academic area advisory committees spend the majority of their time focused on those cases characterized by differing recommendations among the various lower levels of review.

How has the role of the Dean of Graduate School changed?
Previously, the Dean of the Graduate school evaluated each promotion and tenure case. The change has eliminated this required review and the Provost may seek the advice as needed.

What is the change regarding written statements of evidences?
This regulation has been updated to require the faculty of each department or school to establish written statements describing the evidence of activity in instruction, research and service that is appropriate to their field(s) for use in guiding evaluations for promotion and tenure. The faculty of a college without departments or schools shall undertake this responsibility. Previously this was only voluntary. In addition, once they are approved by the dean, these written statements will become part of the respective department rules document.
What is the deadline for completing these statements of evidence?
The approved statements are due on March 1, 2010 and at that time they will become part of the respective unit rules document.

When should these statements of evidence be included in the dossiers?
The statements of evidence will apply to faculty whose initial academic appointments begin on or after July 1, 2010.

How has the regulation about mandatory consultation with faculty changed?
The revision adopts the "best practice" in higher education circles, which dictates that mandatory consultation should exclude those unit faculty persons who hold academic rank at or below the academic rank of an individual being considered for appointment, reappointment, terminal reappointment or promotion. The revised language of this section of GR VII permits the tenured/tenure-track faculty of a unit to establish policies that extend the minimum consultation requirements (as prescribed in this revision) to include the specified participation of other full-time faculty employees in any series in the department.

What is the critical concern about a comprehensive tenure review?
In a comprehensive tenure review, a dossier is reviewed at all levels of the University (educational unit, college advisory committee, dean, academic area advisory committee, Provost and President) irrespective of the judgment of the previous level(s). Faculty who are tenure-eligible are entitled to one comprehensive review, which shall be completed no later than the end of the next-to-last year of the probationary period.

Are other faculty ranks entitled to a comprehensive tenure review?
Yes, a comprehensive tenure review shall be extended to a prospective faculty employee who is being considered for an initial appointment at the academic rank of Associate Professor or Professor, when the proposed appointment also includes immediate tenure at the time of appointment. Also, a comprehensive tenure review shall be conducted when the initial tenure-eligible appointment stipulates Professor (without tenure) and when the educational unit initiates a tenure review, instead of a non-renewal of appointment, in the first year of service (see section VI.A.6 of AR 2:1-1).

What is the requirement for a terminal contract year review?
After consultation with the unit faculty, an educational unit administrator may initiate a request to the dean for tenure consideration on behalf of a faculty employee who was placed on terminal contract either after a comprehensive tenure review or after waiving his or her right to a comprehensive tenure review. If the dean finds insufficient evidence to warrant a new tenure consideration, the dean shall deny the request and notify the educational unit administrator that a terminal year consideration of tenure shall not be initiated. If the dean determines that the evidence in support of a favorable tenure decision has substantially strengthened, the dean may grant the request and authorize the educational unit administrator to initiate the review.

What is the process for a tenure review prior to the sixth year?
An educational unit administrator may initiate a tenure review prior to the sixth year of probationary service if, in the opinion of the tenured faculty of the educational unit and the unit administrator, the individual's record of accomplishment across all areas of assignment is commensurate with the award of tenure. (The act of soliciting letters by the educational unit administrator from reviewers external to the University shall constitute the "initiation" of a tenure review.)

The review shall follow the policies and procedures that govern the conduct of the sixth-year (tenure) review (see AR 2:1-1) However, unlike a tenure review conducted in the sixth year of the probationary period, a tenure review initiated prior to the sixth year can be suspended by the dean. In such case, the
dean shall notify in writing the educational unit administrator of his or her decision to suspend the tenure review and indicate that the individual under review shall be entitled to an ordinary reappointment review at the appropriate time in that contract period and in subsequent contract periods.

A faculty employee whose tenure review has been suspended by the dean shall not be eligible for a subsequent tenure review until the sixth year of the probationary period. A sixth-year comprehensive tenure review of an individual whose previous tenure review was suspended by the dean shall be conducted according to the same policies and procedures as an individual whose tenure is reviewed for the first time during the sixth year. In this second review, the educational unit administrator shall include in the sixth-year (tenure) dossier those evaluative letters from the previously suspended tenure review that were submitted by reviewers external to the University.

Who is automatically regulated by the revised AR 2:1?
If your initial appointment date is on or after July 1, 2009, your tenure review will be conducted under the revised regulation (AR 2:1-1).

Who may elect to be considered under the revised AR 2:1?
If your initial appointment predates July 1, 2009, and you have not already been reviewed for tenure, you may elect to be reviewed by the revised policy (AR 2:1-1). This requires that you complete the attached form and return it to your department chair. If you are in your sixth year of probation, you must return the form by October 30, 2009. Other eligible individuals may return the form by April 1, 2010.

What if I do not complete and return the ‘opt-in’ form?
If you do not elect the revised policy, you will automatically be reviewed under the former policy (AR 2:1-2).
MEMORANDUM

To: Deans, Chairs and Directors

From: David W. Blackwell, Ph.D.
        Provost

Date: September 30, 2019

Subject: Appointment, Reappointment, Promotion, and Tenure Procedures for 2019-2020

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 institution. 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 educational unit 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 home unit and college, academic area advisory committee members and others look to judgments of the educational unit faculty members, and of 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 responsibility, educational unit faculties must engage in the evaluation of their members 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.

Discipline-specific expectations are often articulated quantitatively and qualitatively (e.g., a scholarly book published by a reputable press, articles in top-tier journals, creative products, professional recognition through grants, invited presentations or performances, evidence of teaching excellence). By University regulation (GR VII.E.3.e), all educational units in which faculty appointment is permitted have established statements for use in guiding evaluations for promotion and tenure, describing the evidences of activity in instruction, research and service that are appropriate to the field(s) represented in the unit (see Provost’s Policy on the Inclusion of Unit Statements on Evidences).
Such unit-level evidences are useful, although sole reliance on the evidences in a formulaic manner is inadequate. Colleges and departments are advised to periodically review and revise their Statements on Evidences, with special considerations for the value of accomplishments in collaborative team science, as well as products of intellectual property (e.g., copyrights, patents, discoveries, films, works of art, tangible research property), as broadly defined in AR 7:6.

Furthermore, we expect that a faculty member’s Distribution of Effort (DOE) has been assigned in a manner commensurate with promotion/tenure requirements. For cases for faculty in Special Title Series, the source of evidences for the evaluation ought to be the position description and criteria for ranks that were reviewed by the appropriate academic area committee and approved by the Provost. For cases for faculty in Research Title Series, the position description and criteria for ranks were reviewed and approved by the Dean of the Graduate School, Vice President for Research, and Provost. For cases for faculty in Clinical Title Series, these are approved by the Provost.

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 students taught or on 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 required 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 consistently applied. As the Administrative Regulations make clear, time in rank is not an appropriate evaluative measure. A faculty member 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 spelled out in the unit’s written statements on evidences and/or the position description (but not later than the sixth year for probationary faculty being considered for the granting of tenure).

**Distribution of this Memo and Availability of Regulations and Policies**

To maintain an atmosphere of transparency in the promotion and tenure process, I ask that all educational unit administrators (chairs and directors) circulate this policy memo among their unit faculty. Deans shall also share this memo with the members of their college advisory committee.

I strongly encourage all involved in the evaluation process to review AR 2:1 and other regulations related the appropriate faculty title series under Chapter 2 - Academic Appointment (Faculty). The website address for the Administrative Regulations is https://www.uky.edu/regs/administrative-regulations-ar. This memo and additional information on faculty appointment, promotion, and tenure can be found at the website maintained by the Office of the Associate Provost for Faculty Advancement (OFA).

**Preparation of the Review 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 Dossier Checklist enumerates the items to be included in the dossier and the order in which those documents shall appear. 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 straightforward, since it largely consists of materials
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accumulated during the probationary period by the candidate and educational unit administrator. The educational unit administrator, in accordance with University regulations and any applicable policies in the educational unit’s Rules, shall solicit written judgments from consulted individuals on matters of promotion and/or tenure. A candidate under review may also submit to the educational unit administrator a list of University of Kentucky faculty employees who are not members of the candidate’s primary appointment unit from whom the educational unit administrator shall request letters of evaluation on behalf of the candidate. No evaluative letters, with of course the exception of those required from qualified unit faculty, are to be included in the dossier without the expressed written consent of the candidate.

I 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 appropriate unit faculty members for their evaluation. If there is a dispute about the inclusion or exclusion of some documents, the matter shall be referred to the appropriate college-level administrator, who shall consult with the Associate Provost for Faculty Advancement. 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 Advancement must first be consulted as to the proper action to be taken. More information on the terms and timing of dossier updates can be found in the Provost’s policy statement.

Selection of Evaluators

Educational unit administrators are responsible for asking all evaluators to make a substantive, professional judgment of the value and significance of a candidate’s performance. All evaluators should also be reminded 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 are 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.

The educational unit administrator shall assure all evaluators that their letters will be handled in a confidential manner. However, the educational unit administrator must inform all evaluators that, upon request, the candidate has the right to review all letters placed in the individual’s dossier. Please ensure that all letters received from external reviewers, those external to the University and those external to the educational unit, are included in the dossier, and are made available to the consulted unit faculty before their evaluative letters are due. Also note that an external reviewer’s letter that arrives after the consulted unit faculty letters are due shall not be included in the dossier unless that dilatory letter is shared with the appropriate unit faculty and those faculty are given the opportunity to revise their previously submitted evaluative letters.

In addition, I 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 research institutions;
- they stand at arms-length from the candidate (e.g., not dissertation advisor or post-doctoral supervisor).
Teachers, advisors, mentors, and current faculty colleagues are not “arm’s length.” Co-authors and major research collaborators and former faculty colleagues are also not “arm’s length” unless the most recent association occurred 3-5 years prior to the promotion. We do not consider letters from persons who have served on a candidate’s thesis or dissertation committee to be “arm’s length.” While these kinds of letters can be especially helpful because these letter writers can be presumed to have a good sense of the candidate’s work, it is also true that their own reputations are involved in the work being evaluated. If such letters are included, they must be in addition to the minimum requirement of six “arm’s length” letters (four selected by the unit administrator and two recommended by the candidate). Letters from persons who do not know the candidate, but who may have a clear sense of the significance of the candidate’s qualifications, are of greater value.

I 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 unit/college is free to discuss and decide whether or not to accept any or all of the restrictions offered by a candidate. Some educational unit administrators report some difficulty in obtaining external reviewers willing to write, so identifying these evaluators early is highly recommended. Most educational unit administrators report greater success when reaching out to prospective external evaluators not later than the spring before the dossier submission in late-fall.

The educational unit administrator (and perhaps the dean) must explain in their 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, or the inclusion of outside evaluators from prestigious baccalaureate institutions is appropriate for a review candidate whose research focuses on the scholarship of pedagogy).

In cases involving the initial appointment of a senior faculty member already holding tenure at the rank of Associate Professor or Professor at an institution comparable to UK, the University has established an expedited review process. The modified procedures and policies for expedited reviews can be found at the OFA website. This process begins with the vetting of a candidate’s CV and recommendation letters well in advance of negotiating an offer.

**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 CV, personal statements about the individual’s major areas of assignment, and samples of work (e.g., publications or other products as appropriate). As delineated in Appendix II (Matrix of Dossier Contents) of AR 2:1, the educational unit administrator and the candidate under review have a shared responsibility for the assembly of the review packet that the educational unit administrator sends to the outside evaluators.
- Enclosing a copy of the appropriate statements on evidences, when those statements are a required item for inclusion in a dossier (see Provost’s policy memo on the inclusion of unit statements of evidences) and University criteria for promotion and tenure (see AR 2:2:2-1, AR 2:3, AR 2:4 and AR 2:7).
- Asking the evaluator to describe any previous or current professional or personal relationships with the candidate.
- Requesting a brief biographical sketch (not a CV) of the evaluator. (Note: If an external evaluator submits his or her CV, please use it to prepare a brief bio for inclusion in the dossier).
- Asking the evaluator to analyze the candidate’s contributions in the appropriate work areas (e.g., instruction, research, and service); and to indicate the extent to which the candidate’s accomplishments have furthered the candidate’s scholarly field.
- Asking the evaluator to evaluate the significance of the venues in which the candidate has published and the grants/awards they have received.
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• Asking the evaluator whether the candidate’s work in the areas that the outside reviewer has been asked to evaluate meets or exceeds the unit’s statements on evidences for promotion and/or the granting of tenure. Since institutional expectations differ, asking the evaluator whether the candidate would receive tenure at their institution is not helpful.
• A recommended template for letters to external evaluators may be found here.

**Educational Unit Administrator’s Letter**

The educational unit administrator shall produce a thoughtful, balanced, and comprehensive evaluation of the candidate’s record, informed by the letters from outside reviewers and unit faculty and guided by the unit’s statements on evidences, when those statements are **required for inclusion** in a dossier. The administrator’s letter shall also address, where appropriate, the following matters:
  
  • The significance of the candidate’s DOE in judging the quality and quantity of the individual’s record of accomplishment in each area of assignment;
  • Split views for and against promotion and/or tenure, as reflected in the letters submitted by the unit faculty; or,
  • The evidences that speak to excellence within the candidate’s interdisciplinary area for those individuals whose work is highly interdisciplinary.

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. The educational unit administrator’s responsibility goes beyond a summary of the opinions of the unit faculty to include the perspective of the administrator and any additional information that helps to explain key issues related to the faculty.

**Documenting the Procedural Steps in the Conduct of the Review**

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. Furthermore, the committee should explain who was recused and why; and the educational unit administrator should document this as well.

**Documenting and Explaining Differences of Practice and Opinion**

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 below the unit’s overall norm might be typical for teaching a notoriously difficult or large introductory course, it might be seen as problematic in 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.
- The educational unit administrator is expected to explain the reasoning behind divergent opinions among the unit faculty. Similarly, it is incumbent upon the dean to explain (1) the college advisory committee’s response to negative or mixed evaluations expressed in letters from unit faculty and (2) a negative response from a college advisory committee to a positive evaluation emerging from the unit.
- Unit faculty, college and Provost advisory committees, and faculty administrators must strive for unerring fidelity to the policies and processes on promotion and tenure evaluation as articulated in [Governing Regulations, Administrative Regulations](#), and established unit/college procedures.
- The contents of the tenure dossier must contain the proper information as specified in the University regulations 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.
- Letters solicited by the educational unit administrator in addition to those for which consultation and written judgments are required by Regulation should only be included with the documented concurrence of the candidate and should be placed under a separate tab in the dossier. Examples include letters from collaborators from other UK educational units or from entities external to the University, emeritus faculty members, faculty with a secondary appointment in the candidate’s home department, etc.

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. 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 their Standard Personnel File.

**2019-2020 Calendar of Process**

- May-July: Obtain agreement from external reviewers to write opinions
- Fall: Colleges review dossier and make recommendations for promotion and tenure
- December 20: Dean’s letter added to dossier
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January 10  Recommendations for promotion and tenure due in the Office of the Provost
January 24  Recommendations sent to the respective University Academic Area Advisory Committee
March  6   University Academic Area Advisory Committees submit recommendations to the Provost
March 27  Letters to deans notifying them of final decisions
Office of the Provost
Policy on the Inclusion of
Unit Statements on Evidences in
Promotion and/or Tenure Dossiers
(revised August 2012)

The Inclusion of Statements on Evidences in Tenure Dossiers
A Department or School's written statement of evidences pertaining to the
granting of tenure shall be included in the tenure dossier of a candidate only if
that Department or School adopted the statement on evidences prior to date that
individual was hired as a tenure-track faculty person. As a rule of thumb, the
unit's statements apply to a faculty person whose initial academic appointment in
a tenure-eligible title series was effective July 1, 2010 or thereafter.

The Inclusion of Statements on Evidences in Promotion Dossiers
A Department or School's written statement of evidences pertaining to promotion
shall be included in the promotion dossier of a candidate only if that Department
or School adopted the statement on promotion evidences prior to the date that
individual attained his or her current academic rank. As a rule of thumb, the
unit's statements apply to a faculty person who was appointed or promoted to the
individual's current academic rank on or after July 1, 2010.

One Other Consideration Regarding Promotion Dossiers
There is a circumstance pertaining to promotion review, not described above, of
the candidate whose appointment or advancement to the individual's current rank
(Instructor, Assistant Professor or Associate Professor) predated the adoption of
the unit's promotion statements. By the policy articulated above, the unit's
promotion statements would never apply to those persons among the unit faculty
who were promoted or appointed to Assistant Professor or Associate Professor
prior to the unit's adoption of its promotion statements. To address this
circumstance, a unit faculty may revise its policies to state that, upon the request
of the candidate under review, the unit administrator shall include the unit's
promotion statements in the individual's promotion dossier. As is the case with
any revision of written evidences adopted by a unit faculty, the unit administrator
must forward the revised policy to the Dean of the College for review and
approval.

Finally, to help ensure that faculty reviewers will easily find the unit's statements
on evidences in the review dossier, the Provost suggests that statements be
placed immediately after the letter from the unit administrator (e.g., Chair or
Director).
Office of the Provost  
Policy on Inserting Additional Materials into Promotion and/or Tenure Dossiers  
(revised August 2012)

The Provost’s policy on updating the contents of a dossier distinguishes between (1) the addition of supplemental materials related to a candidate’s record of accomplishment and (2) concerns raised by a candidate about judgments expressed by faculty evaluators in the individual’s dossier.

On the first matter, with some qualification addressed below, additional information about a candidate’s scholarly achievements (e.g., a grant award or publication acceptance) may be added to the individual’s review dossier. The qualifications are those that follow:

- Additional material may be added until such time that the Provost has rendered a final decision in the case.
- The distribution of the new material shall be guided by the disposition of the dossier at the time that the new evidentiary material has been received, as follows:
  - If the dossier has not left the Department or School, the Chair or Director shall share the new evidentiary material with the appropriate unit faculty and those reviewers shall be given the opportunity to revise their letters of evaluation. The new evidentiary material shall be incorporated into the dossier, along with any updates to unit faculty letters.
  - If the dossier has left the Department or School but has not left the College, the Chair or Director shall prepare a letter explaining the significance of the new material and forward that letter, along with the new evidentiary material, to the Dean of the College. The Dean, in turn, shall share the new evidentiary material and the unit administrator’s letter with the college advisory committee and offer an opportunity for the committee to revise its letter of evaluation. The Dean shall incorporate the new evidentiary material, the unit administrator’s explanatory
letter and a revised advisory committee letter, if submitted, into the dossier.

- If the dossier has left the College, the Dean shall forward the new evidentiary material to the Provost, along with the unit administrator’s explanatory letter and any commentary on the materials the Dean wishes to provide. In those cases where the Provost is required to seek the advice of an academic area advisory committee, the Provost shall share all materials forwarded by the Dean to the appropriate academic area advisory committee and offer an opportunity for the committee to revise its letter of evaluation.

On the second matter, if an *error of fact* is identified before a dossier has been sent forward to the Provost’s Office by the Dean of the College, the Associate Provost for Faculty Advancement shall be consulted. The Dean and the Associate Provost for Faculty Advancement shall evaluate whether or not the error of fact has had a negative impact on the judgments rendered about the case. If so, updates to the dossier shall be shared with the unit and college level reviewers (*unit faculty, Chair or Director, and college advisory committee*) who have previously rendered judgments on the merits of the case, and those reviewers shall be given the opportunity to revise their letters of evaluation.

A dossier will not be returned to previous levels of review if, in the opinion of the Dean and the Associate Provost for Faculty Advancement, the error has not adversely influenced the judgments of evaluators. However, the Dean of the College, in his or her letter of recommendation to the Provost, shall note the error and correct it.

Finally, a candidate may disagree with one or more judgments expressed in the individual’s dossier. The University's regulations provide no opportunity, *as a review process transpires*, for a candidate to insert the individual’s written opinion about judgments contained in his or her review dossier. The opinion held by a candidate about the judgments expressed in the individual’s dossier

---

Policy on Inserting Additional Materials into Promotion and/or Tenure Dossiers
(revised August 2012)
must await the conclusion of the review process, as rendered by the Provost in his final judgment. If a candidate feels aggrieved by the final outcome of the case, the individual is afforded avenues of appeal on questions of procedure or merit. All candidates being considered for promotion or the granting of tenure shall have unfettered access to the appeals processes identified in Administrative Regulation 2:1.
Procedure to File an Appeal
Concerning Denial of Reappointment, Promotion or Tenure and
Terminal Year Review Consideration

The University offers more than one appeal process under the Administrative Regulations (AR), Governing Regulation (GR) and University Senate Rules (SR). The following will briefly describe these processes and provide the appropriate regulation(s) and/or rule(s) to assist you in filing your appeal.

Appeal Routes:
You have the right to either an academic appeal or an administrative appeal. The ‘academic’ appeal is through the University Senate Advisory Committee on Privilege and Tenure (SACPT) and the ‘administrative’ appeal is through the Provost.

**Academic Route (SACPT):**
These cases are appealed to SACPT and are based on violations of: (1) procedures, (2) privilege and/or (3) academic freedom. For example, “the dossier was missing required document X, so let’s add document X and go through the process again”. This committee is composed of tenured faculty and makes a recommendation on the case to the President. The committee **CANNOT** be involved in an appeal that is based on the academic merit of your dossier. This committee ONLY hears appeals based on errors involving procedure/privilege/academic freedom. If you elect this route, you may file your case directly to SACPT. [SR 1.4.4.2]

**Administrative Route:**
These cases are appealed directly to the Provost [AR 2:1-1 XI A-C or AR 2:1-2 VIII A-C] and under certain conditions it may go to the President, and/or Board of Trustees Executive Committee. [GR 1.1] You can make the appeal be based on procedural/privilege/academic freedom or on the substantive merit of the decision itself. For example, “on the basis of the merit of my record, the administration made a substantive error in judgment that I ask be reversed”.

You are entitled to pursue either or both of these two different routes of formal appeal. NOTE: these two routes of appeal are not mutually exclusive. You can exercise one and not the other, or you can exercise both, and each process independently.

**Note:** any appeal shall be initiated in writing within 60 days after being notified in writing of the negative decision.

**Discussion Meetings --** Administrative Regulations and Senate Rules [AR 2:1-1 XI A-C or AR 2:1-2 VIII A-C SR 1.4.4.2]: When a Dean makes a decision to disapprove a proposal to promote/tenure, the Dean must notify the preceding level(s) so as to enable an opportunity for the parties to discuss the reasons for the disapproval.

You can request a meeting with the Dean to discuss the reasons for a negative decision. The decision on whether there will be a meeting is at the discretion of the Dean, usually college deans grant such a request. After the meeting with the Dean, you can request a meeting with the Provost to discuss the reasons for the negative decision. Again, it is at the discretion of the Provost to have such a meeting, typically this requested is granted.

Note that neither of the above meetings is considered by the regulations to be an exercise of “appeal” but rather they are an occasion for “discussion.” Hence, these meetings can be used to gather additional information if needed.

Appeal Process
Preparing Your Appeal (Information Gathering):
There is some information that you should collect to better prepare and help you decide on the above alternatives.

First, you have the right to obtain access to your complete dossier including all letters written by internal and external evaluators, by the college and university level administrators and committees. If you are Special Title Series, please also access (if not in your dossier) the original position description and associated promotion/tenure criteria that were approved for the position by an Academic Area Advisory Committee. [AR 2:A Section III]

Second, read, examine and review everything within your dossier. You may access your dossier from your Dean’s office. It is wise to read the entire dossier before any discussion meetings listed above.

Note: the university places full responsibility with the faculty member to assess the facts and circumstances of their case and to prepare any appeals that the faculty member might decide to exercise.

Tenure Consideration in the Terminal Contract Year: You can request that your unit administrator (i.e., department chair or director) make a request to the Dean and that the Dean approve a 7th (or final year) promotion/tenure dossier review. After consulting with the unit faculty, the unit administrator may initiate a request to the Dean for tenure consideration of the faculty employee. If the Dean finds insufficient evidence to warrant a new tenure consideration, the Dean shall deny the request and notify the unit administrator that a terminal year review of tenure shall not be initiated. If the Dean determines that the evidence in support of a favorable tenure decision has substantially strengthened, the Dean may grant the request and authorize the educational unit administrator to initiate the review.

1 SACPT established by University Senate in 1964
2 Procedure established in 1972 in the promulgation of the first UK Administrative Regulations on tenure
3 Faculty access to Board of Trustees under certain conditions dating to first promulgation of Governing Regulations in 1882
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I. Introduction

This Administrative Regulation establishes Academic Area Advisory Committees to provide the Provost and the President with advice from faculty employees on matters of appointment, promotion, and tenure. This regulation delineates the composition of these committees, terms of appointment, and any exceptions to the required review process.

II. Entities Affected

This regulation is applicable to all faculty employees.

III. Policy

The University utilizes Academic Area Advisory Committees to provide the Provost and the President with a broad base of advice from faculty employees regarding matters of appointment, promotion, and tenure. The Provost must seek the advice of an Academic Area Advisory Committee on matters involving appointment at the senior academic ranks, promotions, or the granting of tenure in accordance with the policies established in Administrative Regulation 2:1-1 and Administrative Regulation 2:1-2.
IV. List of Academic Area Advisory Committees

A. Biological Sciences
B. Extension Title Series
C. Health Care Clinical Sciences
D. Humanities and Arts
E. Librarian Series
F. Physical and Engineering Sciences
G. Social Sciences

V. Composition of Academic Area Advisory Committees

A. The membership of each Academic Area Advisory Committee ("Area Committee") must consist of no fewer than five members. In addition, each Area Committee must have one alternate who, with the exception described in the next paragraph, will be entitled to participate as a voting member at meetings when any regular member is absent and to attend any other meetings of the Area Committee as a non-participating observer.

B. Members and alternates are appointed by the President from a list of candidates provided by the Senate Council. The list must include at least twice as many names as there are vacancies. Members and alternates must be full professors who will serve staggered three-year terms. The President will designate the chair of each committee.

C. A member or an alternate of an Area Committee will be excluded from any participation in that Area Committee's consideration of a recommendation if the affected individual and the Area Committee member or alternate are assigned to the same educational unit.

VI. Selection of Members and Alternates of Academic Area Advisory Committees

A. The members and alternate of an Area Committee must have broad representation from the educational units which the Area Committee serves. No educational unit can be represented by more than one person. (See Governing Regulation VII.A.1, University Organization) Appointments as members and alternates on Area Committees will be rotated among educational units so that over a period of years all educational units will be represented.

B. The Health Care Clinical Sciences Academic Area Advisory Committee must consist of ten members, three from the College of Medicine, two from the College of Dentistry, and one each from the Colleges of Health Sciences, Nursing, Pharmacy, Public Health, and the Department of Veterinary Science.

C. Any Area Committee may recommend that the Provost appoint ad hoc committees to handle cases requiring additional expert advice from people well qualified in the particular discipline involved. Ad hoc committees will be discharged as soon as their reports are submitted to the Area Committees. The Area Committees will acknowledge the advice of any ad hoc committees in preparing their recommendations to the Provost.
VII. List of Educational Units Assigned to the Academic Area Advisory Committees

A. The Academic Area Advisory committee to which the Provost refers a faculty personnel matter (e.g. initial appointment at the senior academic ranks, promotion, the granting of tenure or other faculty matters as specified in various Governing and Administrative Regulations) will normally be the Area Committee associated with the concerned individual's educational unit as listed in the Appendix. In some cases, with prior agreement between the individual and the Provost, an evaluation and a recommendation may be obtained from an Area Committee other than the one normally associated with the educational unit to which the individual is assigned.

B. The President may exempt faculty of any educational unit from evaluation by an Area Committee when the standards of an accrediting agency make this desirable or when such an exemption appears to be in the best interests of the University.

C. The list of Educational Units assigned to the Academic Area Advisory Committees is set out in the Appendix. The list will be updated annually or as otherwise necessary.
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Appendix

Biological Sciences
- Anatomy and Neurobiology
- Animal and Food Sciences
- Anthropology (biological phase)
- Biology
- Biomedical Engineering
- Dietetics and Human Nutrition (biological phase)
- Entomology
- Forestry
- Gerontology (biological phase)
- Horticulture
- Microbiology, Immunology and Molecular Genetics
- Molecular and Cellular Biochemistry
- Pharmaceutical Sciences
- Pharmacology and Nutritional Sciences
- Physiology
- Plant and Soil Sciences
- Plant Pathology
- Psychology (biological phase)
- Toxicology and Cancer Biology
- Veterinarian Science (biological phase)

Extension Title Series

Health Care Clinical Sciences
- Anesthesiology
- Behavioral Science
- Clinical Sciences
- Emergency Medicine
- Family and Community Medicine
- Internal Medicine
- Neurology
- Neurosurgery
- Nursing
- Obstetrics and Gynecology
- Ophthalmology and Visual Sciences
- Oral Health Practice
- Oral Health Science
- Orthopaedic Surgery
- Otolaryngology-Head and Neck Surgery
- Pathology and Laboratory Medicine
- Pediatrics
- Pharmacy Practice and Science
- Physical Medicine and Rehabilitation
- Preventive Medicine
- Psychiatry
- Public Health
- Radiation Medicine
- Radiology
- Rehabilitation Sciences
- Surgery
Urology
Veterinary Science (clinical phase)

Humanities and Arts
Architecture
Art and Visual Studies
English
Hispanic Studies
Historic Preservation
History
Gender and Women's Studies (humanities phase)
Integrated Strategic Communication (special title series)
Interiors: Planning / Strategy / Design
Journalism and Telecommunications (special title series)
Landscape Architecture
Modern and Classical Languages, Literatures and Cultures
Music
Philosophy
Retailing and Tourism Management
Theatre and Dance
Writing, Rhetoric, and Digital Studies

Librarian Series

Physical and Engineering Sciences
Biostatistics
Biosystems and Agricultural Engineering
Chemical and Materials Engineering
Chemistry
Civil Engineering
Computer Science
Earth and Environmental Sciences
Electrical and Computer Engineering
Mathematics
Mechanical Engineering
Mining Engineering
Physics and Astronomy
Statistics

Social Sciences
Accountancy
Agricultural Economics
Anthropology (social phase)
Communication
Community and Leadership Development
Curriculum and Instruction
Dietetics and Human Nutrition (social phase)
Diplomacy and International Commerce
Early Childhood, Special Education, and Rehabilitation Counseling
Economics
Educational Leadership Studies
Educational Policy Studies and Evaluation
Educational, School, and Counseling Psychology
Epidemiology
Family Sciences
Finance and Quantitative Methods
Gender and Women's Studies (social phase)
Geography
Gerontology (social phase)
Health Behavior
Health Management and Policy
Integrated Strategic Communication (regular title series)
Journalism and Telecommunications (regular title series)
Kinesiology and Health Promotion
Library and Information Sciences
Management
Marketing and Supply Chain
Political Science
Psychology (social phase)
Public Policy and Administration
Social Work
Sociology
STEM Education
AREA COMMITTEE CHAIRS
2019-20

ACADEMIC AREA ADVISORY COMMITTEE FOR THE BIOLOGICAL SCIENCES
Francisco Andrade (Physiology)

ACADEMIC AREA ADVISORY COMMITTEE FOR THE EXTENSION TITLE SERIES
Ron Hustedde (Community and Leadership Development)

HEALTH CARE CLINICAL SCIENCES AREA ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Jill Kolesar (Pharmacy Practice and Science)

HUMANITIES AND ARTS ACADEMIC AREA ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Doug Slaymaker (Modern and Classical Languages, Literatures, and Cultures)

LIBRARIANS ACADEMIC AREA ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Jim Pauly (Pharmaceutical Sciences)

ACADEMIC AREA ADVISORY COMMITTEE FOR THE PHYSICAL AND ENGR SCIENCES
David Atwood (Chemistry)

ACADEMIC AREA ADVISORY COMMITTEE FOR THE SOCIAL SCIENCES
Pat Mooney (Sociology)
MEMORANDUM

To: Academic Area Advisory Committee Members
From: David W. Blackwell, Ph.D.
Provost
Subject: Policies, Practices and Guidelines
Date: August 28, 2019

Thank you for your willingness to serve on one of the University academic area advisory committees. These advisory committees provide advice to the Provost on matters involving promotions and/or the granting of tenure.

Our regulations state that the Provost shall require a written evaluation from the appropriate academic area advisory committee for all cases in which the individual under review has not received the near-unanimous support from all lower-level reviewers (external letter writers, unit faculty, educational unit administrator, college advisory committee, and dean). Because of the varying size of review bodies and the spectrum of support frequently expressed in individual letters, we intentionally provide no guidance as to the definition of “near-unanimous.” Opinions against the promotion and/or the granting of tenure, and the decisions that may follow from the gravity of those opinions, are among the most difficult judgments we are called upon to make. Timely and thoughtful advice from advisory committees is invaluable. An advisory committee may elect to submit a written evaluation on a case for which an evaluation is not required. In recent years, some academic area committees have chosen to at least designate a primary reviewer to verify the unanimity or near-unanimity of lower-level reviewers in the context of an area advisory committee’s perspective. Again, given the gravity of the decision being reached, this practice, while not required, is encouraged.

I welcome academic area advisory committee evaluations on any case. However, I most appreciate advisory committee judgments in cases that lack a clear consensus among reviewers internal to a college and external to the University. Ultimately, the University’s achievements and national stature will be determined by the quality of its faculty, and the guidance provided by advisory committees serves the long-term interests of departments and colleges that seek to deliver quality educational and research programs and thereby further elevate the stature of the University.
As you undertake this important assignment, your work should be guided by the following considerations.

The academic area advisory committee’s review of the dossier:

- Read the (AR 2:1-1) on appointment, promotion and the granting of tenure, and the associated with the candidate’s faculty title series (Chapter 2, AR 2:2-1 through AR 2:10).

- The evaluation of a faculty employee’s performance in each area of assigned activity should be commensurate with his or her approved distribution of effort agreements. Excellence in all areas of assigned activity is expected. All reviewers should be guided by the statements in letters submitted by outside evaluators and the unit faculty that address the faculty employee’s performance relative to the unit’s approved Statements of Evidence. Therefore, the advisory committee members are asked to read and carefully evaluate the letters of recommendation submitted by the unit faculty and faculty evaluators from outside the University.

- Read and carefully evaluate the letters of recommendation submitted by the unit administrator, the college advisory committee (as applicable), and the dean of the college. If the individual under review has an assignment in an institute or multidisciplinary research center, the unit director is also required to submit a letter of evaluation on the work performed in the institute or multidisciplinary research center. Please pay particular attention to any contextual information those letters may provide about unique expectations in the candidate’s discipline or other information particular to the candidate’s dossier.

- Read and carefully evaluate all other materials in the candidate’s dossier.

The academic area advisory committee’s letter of recommendation:

- The letter of recommendation from the advisory committee shall provide a detailed statement of the opinions of the committee, pro and con, on the candidate as well as the numerical vote (e.g., 4 to 1 in favor of promotion) of the participating committee members. The advisory committee’s letter must be rigorous but balanced. The letter should include not only a thoughtful analysis of the candidate’s record of past performance but also an evaluation of the prospect for the candidate’s continued productivity.

_N.B._ A member of an advisory committee shall be excluded from any participation in that committee’s consideration of a dossier in which both the candidate under review and the committee member hold a primary academic appointment in the same educational unit or involve an individual with whom an advisory committee member has even a remote familial tie.
Finally, academic area advisory committees are asked to adhere strictly to the following policies and practices:

- Maintain strict confidentiality about all cases under review. Now that we have migrated to use of a secure SharePoint site for key components of dossier review among academic area advisory committees, confidentiality of records should be enhanced and travel to view dossier content should be minimal. (Area Committee Chairs: Please note that the full content of all dossiers is always available for your review by contacting Ms. Margaret Leach, Director of Faculty Records.)

- Do not use the review process as an opportunity to voice a personal opinion about the direction of a program or college. Judgments made about each candidate should be focused solely on the professional qualifications of the candidates. Your recommendation should not be influenced by your opinions about whether the educational unit should be hiring someone in a particular area or on the directions in which a program should develop. Such decisions have already been made and, although some faculty members may attempt to continue the debate, you should not be distracted by these policy issues.

- Do not evaluate personalities. Please be cautious not to be influenced by personality issues that have nothing to do with the candidate’s professional qualifications or record of accomplishment.

- Do not assume that extramural funding alone is a proxy for scholarship.

The letter’s statements should reflect the basis for the judgments made and demonstrate the advisory committee’s commitment to fairness. Advisory committees may use the expression “some of us share the view” to express the majority view or even disparate views among the members. Kentucky’s Open Records Law does not abridge the advisory committees’ right to express their opinions. Phrases in the letter such as “in our opinion” will differentiate expressions of informed opinion, which is the legitimate role of the advisory committee following full review of and deliberation about the materials, from an assertion of fact. Advisory committees may find it helpful to include a statement such as, "In accordance with the University’s regulations, we are providing our advice on the case of Professor X." The advisory committee’s letter is part of the official file of the appointment, promotion, or tenure proposal and will be placed in the candidate’s Standard Personnel File after the review process is concluded.

Please note that the calendar of process this year has been somewhat compressed in an attempt to reach decisions on promotion and/or tenure earlier than in years past. Thank you in advance for your cooperation.

In conclusion, you play an important role in the tenure and/or promotion process, and your opinions will be given considerable weight. If you need additional information or assistance, the advisory committee chair should contact the Associate Provost for Faculty Advancement.

code: G.T. Lineberry
2019-2020 Calendar of Process

Fall

Colleges review dossiers and make recommendations for promotion and tenure

January 10

Recommendations for promotions and tenure due in the Office of the Provost

January 24

Recommendations sent to the respective University Academic Area Advisory Committee

March 6

University Academic Area Advisory Committees submit recommendations to the Provost

March 27

Letters to deans notifying them of final decisions
Policies for Faculty Performance Review

The following University policies are to be applied in the conduct of faculty performance reviews:

A. The performance of tenured faculty will be reviewed annually or, at the discretion of the dean, during the first year of each biennium with the rating applying for the biennium. Any tenured faculty employee, upon request, shall be granted an annual review.

The performance of non-tenured faculty will be reviewed annually. Special attention will be given to the evaluation of persons in their first year of employment to maximize effective guidance.

The educational unit administrator will review each faculty employee and recommend an evaluation rating to the dean of the college to which the educational unit is assigned. The performance of each faculty employee appointed in the extension title series will be reviewed by the educational unit administrator of the educational unit to which the individual is assigned and the dean of the college in which the individual's position is funded, using the evaluation instrument and appeal process of the college in which the individual's position is funded. For a faculty employee with a joint appointment, where the secondary appointment comprises no more than twenty percent of the faculty employee's effort, the educational unit administrator of the educational unit in which the faculty employee has a primary appointment will evaluate the performance of the faculty employee, with input from the educational unit administrator of the educational unit in which the individual has a secondary appointment. If the secondary appointment comprises more than twenty percent of the faculty employee's effort, the faculty employee will be evaluated by the educational unit administrators in the primary department and the secondary department.

In a Graduate Center, the Center Director will review each faculty employee assigned to the center and recommend an evaluation rating to the Dean of the Graduate School. A faculty employee who has a joint appointment, where the secondary appointment in a center or institute comprises no more than twenty percent of the faculty employee's effort, will be reviewed by the educational unit administrator of the educational unit in which the individual has a primary appointment, with input from the director of the respective center or institute. If the secondary appointment in a center or institute comprises more than twenty percent of the faculty employee's effort, then the individual will be evaluated in both the primary educational unit and the center or institute.

The performance of faculty on assignment in international programs or in other out-of-state programs shall be evaluated on the basis of their performances and accomplishments in their assigned areas of activity (see Section A of AR 3:4).

Exceptions to these performance review policies will apply in cases of (1) tenured faculty who will retire before or at the end of the current fiscal year, and (2) non-tenured faculty whose appointments will not be renewed.
1. A primary purpose of the performance review is individual and institutional self-improvement. To help in achieving this purpose, the performance review will determine for each faculty employee both a quantitative assessment and a qualitative judgment of the faculty employee’s activities during the review period in teaching and advising, research and scholarship, University and public service, and other appropriate activities with relative weightings based on a prior agreement pertinent to the distribution of effort among any or all of these activities.

2. To serve this purpose, inputs from students, colleagues, and administrators are to be used. Teaching, advising, research; and service assignments must be evaluated in annual and biennial reviews and in appointment, retention, promotion, and tenure. The results of these evaluations shall be considered in the decisions concerning retention, promotion, and merit ratings of each faculty employee.

The assessment of teaching shall include the results of student appraisals for at least one semester per year, peer faculty appraisals based upon review of course syllabi, course materials, text, learning exercises, exams and in class presentation where applicable, and also other relevant information. Colleges, working through appropriate University bodies, shall develop some means to evaluate the quality as well as the quantity of academic advising done by each faculty employee. As this procedure is developed and implemented, the results of this evaluation shall be considered in the annual performance review. The extent and character of each faculty employee’s teaching and advising should be documented by a body of supporting materials regularly maintained and updated by the faculty employee. Such documentation shall include a teaching portfolio as outlined in Appendix I.

3. Evaluation of Collaborative Efforts: The products of collaborative and multidisciplinary efforts in teaching, research, and service shall be evaluated. The faculty employee shall document the contribution he/she has made to the collective project. The appraisal of the faculty employee’s effectiveness as part of the collaborative or multidisciplinary effort should include evaluation statements by the other employees of the team.

4. The quantitative data are to be provided at least once annually by the faculty employee to the educational unit administrator through an instrument approved by the Provost.

5. These data are to be supplemented by other inputs of the educational unit as pertinent.

B. Reviews are to be based upon the distribution of effort performed by the faculty employee.

1. In any case for which an agreement on the distribution of effort has not been developed previously, the distribution of effort depicted by other approved instrument for the current year will be used.

2. During the spring semester of each year, the educational unit administrator of each educational unit with advice from the faculty employees of the unit will develop an overall distribution of faculty time for approval by the dean of the college or next administrative officer. In any case of disagreement that is not readily resolved, the decision of the dean or next administrative officer will be final.

3. A written agreement is to be developed annually between the educational unit administrator and the faculty employee on the distribution of effort expected of the faculty employee in major activities during the succeeding year. For any faculty employee who is or will be associated with a multidisciplinary research center or institute, the agreement shall be consistent with the conditions of establishment of the faculty position and signed by the faculty employee, director of the research center or institute, the educational unit administrator, and the dean. In case of lack of agreement on the distribution of effort, the next higher level of University administration will become involved in resolving any issues. In case of a significant change in the faculty employee’s distribution of activities during the review period, an appropriately revised agreement is to be negotiated. An individual who is hired with the prospect of becoming a tenured faculty employee shall be assigned
duties by the educational unit administrator commensurate with making due progress toward meeting requirements for tenure. The annual performance review of each non-tenured faculty employee shall include some discussion with the educational unit administrator of the individual’s progress toward consideration for tenure in terms of the educational unit’s expectations.

4. The educational unit administrator shall consult with the tenured faculty employees of the educational unit regarding the progress of each non-tenured faculty employee toward consideration for tenure in terms of the educational unit’s expectations. Consultation about a non-tenured faculty employee who has been or is on assignment in an international program or in some other out-of-state program shall include, if the individual is eligible to be considered for tenure, evaluations of the individual’s performance and accomplishments in assigned areas of activities in such programs (refer to Sections A and D of AR 3:4). For each non-tenured faculty employee who is associated with any multidisciplinary research centers or institutes, the educational unit administrator also shall consult with the directors of the pertinent centers or institutes. These discussions should occur at the end of the non-tenured faculty employee’s second and fourth years, but may occur more frequently at the educational unit administrator’s discretion. The results of these discussions should be communicated to the individual non-tenured faculty employee and a record maintained in the faculty employee file.

C. Rankings or ratings are to be used.

1. At least three evaluative groupings are to be used, whether letter, numerical, or descriptive designations.

2. The rankings are to be designed to recognize both outstanding and unsatisfactory performances as well as those appraised as degrees of good or satisfactory. Each educational unit must develop a clear set of expectations for satisfactory performance linked to the distribution of effort agreement.

D. An appeals process is to be developed for both the college and the Provost levels.

1. After being considered in the college, an appeal can be addressed by the Provost.

2. An appeal emanating from a college shall be considered by a committee appointed by the Provost. After a hearing, the committee will make a recommendation to the Provost whose decision shall be final.

E. The Provost is assigned the responsibility for developing the procedures by which the policies for faculty performance review are to be implemented.

1. The colleges are the focal points to which the review procedures are delegated.

2. The dean of each college is responsible for the exercise of the procedures.

References and Related Materials

AR 3:4 Guidelines for Employment or Assignment of Faculty and Staff Related to Out-of-State Programs

Revision History


For questions, contact: Office of Legal Counsel
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
MEMORANDUM

To: Deans, Chairs and Directors

From: David W. Blackwell, Ph.D.
Provost

Re: 2019-2020 Faculty Performance Review: Second Year of Biennium

Date: September 30, 2019

Please forward this memorandum to all full-time faculty employees in your unit.

The evaluation of faculty performance is one of the most important activities that educational unit administrators, working in close collaboration with deans and others, are asked to undertake. The purpose of the Faculty Performance Review is to provide guidance for continuing and meaningful faculty development and advancement. When done properly, the evaluation process is an effective means of communicating expectations, enhancing faculty productivity and acknowledging and rewarding accomplishments, as well as identifying and dealing with performance-related issues in the spirit of continuous improvement. In addition, faculty performance reviews are an important source of information for promotion and tenure reviews. Administrative Regulation (AR) 3:10 ("Policies for Faculty Performance Review") enumerates the policies and procedures for conducting performance evaluation of faculty at the University of Kentucky. This memorandum provides a brief summary of those policies and procedures.

Which faculty cohort is being reviewed this year?

Only full-time faculty employees in all title series shall undergo faculty performance evaluation, as this is the second year of the current biennium. Tenured faculty and senior lecturers in those colleges that conduct biennial reviews of those faculty are not evaluated this year. All full-time faculty employees in their first year of service at the University of Kentucky must also undergo faculty performance review this year, regardless of their title series, academic rank, or tenure status.

Exceptions to these performance review policies will apply in cases of (1) tenured faculty employees who will retire before or at the end of the current fiscal year, and (2) non-tenured faculty employees whose appointments will not be renewed. Faculty employees on out-of-state assignments in international or other programs shall be evaluated for purposes of performance review based on their performances and accomplishments in their assigned areas of activity in accordance with AR 3:4.
If agreed to by mutual consent of the dean and a faculty employee on a terminal contract in one of the tenure-ineligible title series, a faculty performance review may be conducted.

All educational unit administrators who have faculty employees on Phased Retirement shall take steps to ensure that those individuals are meeting or exceeding their unit’s performance expectations in their areas of assignment; however, formal faculty performance evaluation for faculty employees on Phased Retirement is not mandatory.

**How are faculty who have joint appointments evaluated?**
For a faculty employee with a joint appointment, where the secondary assignment comprises no more than twenty percent (20%) of the individual’s total Distribution of Effort (DOE), the unit administrator of the department, school, graduate center or college in which the faculty employee has a primary appointment will evaluate the performance of the faculty employee, with input from the unit administrator of the secondary unit. If a faculty employee’s secondary assignment comprises more than twenty percent (20%) of the individual’s total DOE effort, the unit administrators of each unit will evaluate the faculty employee’s performance.

**How are faculty associated with multidisciplinary research centers and institutes evaluated?**
Faculty employees whose assigned DOE effort in a multidisciplinary research center or institute is greater than twenty percent (20%) shall have the activity performed in the center or institute evaluated by the educational unit administrator of that unit. The unit administrator of the center or institute shall report the merit score(s) to the unit administrator of the individual’s primary unit. In cases where a faculty employee performs assigned DOE duties in a multidisciplinary research center or institute totaling twenty percent (20%) or less DOE effort, the individual’s primary unit administrator will evaluate the activity performed in the center or institute with input from the educational unit administrator of the secondary unit.

**What policies and procedures inform the faculty review process?**
Deans and educational unit administrators can help ensure the integrity of the performance review process by clearly communicating to faculty the specific University and college polices that inform the faculty performance review process. What follows is an overview of the salient University polices on faculty performance review.

Faculty performance shall be evaluated across all areas of assigned activity as recorded in the DOE agreement applicable to the review period. Faculty activity is broadly defined and includes: [1] instruction (i.e., teaching and advising); [2] research and/or other appropriate forms of creative activity; [3] service (includes service to the public, service to the profession, service to the institution, patient care unrelated to instruction, and other appropriate outreach activities); university service, public service, outreach services, professional leadership, and/or other appropriate activities; [4] administration; and [5] professional development.

Each faculty employee under review is responsible for preparing a summary of professional accomplishments in each area of assigned activity; where teaching has been assigned, the faculty employee will also prepare a teaching portfolio. This may be a traditional teaching portfolio as described in Appendix I of AR 3:10, or may be a more truncated version that includes the student appraisals for courses taught, peer faculty appraisals, and a brief narrative summarizing
instructional efforts for the review period. Results of the evaluation will be communicated in writing to the faculty employee by the chair or director, and to the dean.

Reviews are to be based on the composite DOE across the review period performed by the faculty employee in each area of assigned activity. Quantitative and qualitative information will be used and explained in making judgments about performance.

The evaluation instrument or forms that are used in each college are to be developed by the dean of the college and must involve consultation with an appropriate faculty governance body. Letter, numerical, or descriptive designations may be used in the evaluation instrument, but the rankings must clearly recognize at least three performance designations: outstanding, good or satisfactory, and unsatisfactory. Evaluators are expected to be both fair and constructive. Evaluations must contain sufficient written commentary to explain the assigned ratings, especially in areas of activity in which a faculty employee has received a rating below good or satisfactory.

It is also expected that the unit administrator will consider input from students, colleagues and administrators in determining merit ratings, consistent with AR 3:10. For best practices, contact the Office for Faculty Advancement.

The unit administrator will recommend a merit rating for each faculty employee consistent with the rating scale adopted by the college for each area of assigned activity. A composite merit score shall be calculated by the unit administrator and recorded on the merit report for each faculty person reviewed in the unit. An individual’s composite merit score is calculated by multiplying the merit rating assigned to an area of activity by the DOE percentage apportioned for that area of activity. The product of a merit rating for an area of activity multiplied by its DOE percentage is the merit score for that area. The composite merit score is the sum of those discrete merits scores. A dean may implement a college-wide practice of rounding all composite merit scores to the nearest integer.

The Appeal Process

All faculty employees are provided the opportunity to file a formal appeal with the college dean. The appeal may be based on a claim of procedural error and/or contested merit score(s) in the faculty employee’s faculty performance review. Procedures for college-level faculty appeals should be developed and clearly communicated to all faculty employees within the college. If a faculty employee appeals at the college level and is dissatisfied with the decision of the dean, an appeal may be made to the Provost. A faculty appeal committee will be appointed based on advice regarding committee composition from the Senate Council. This appeal committee will make its recommendation to the Provost, whose decision will be final. The procedural steps for Provost-level appeals have been posted to the Faculty Advancement website.

2nd and 4th Year Progress Reviews of Probationary Faculty

AR 3:10.B.4 requires mandatory progress reviews of untenured (tenure-eligible) faculty employees in their second and fourth years of probationary service. The policy requires that the unit administrator:

- Consult with the tenured faculty of the review candidate’s unit about the individual’s progress toward consideration for tenure in terms of unit expectations;
• Prepare a written review of the candidate’s progress; and,
• Discuss the written review with the individual under review.

The discussions and the written progress review that documents those discussions, along with the reappointment process that runs in tandem with those progress reviews, shall be concluded no later than the last day of the individual’s appointment contract in the second and fourth years of probationary service. Progress reviews may occur more frequently. The written review shall be sent to the dean of the college and a copy shall be given to the individual under review and placed in the individual’s Standard Personnel File.

2019-20 Calendar for Reviews*

The schedule for the review and evaluation process is as follows:

Fall 2019 Faculty employees undergoing review prepare their materials and submit them to the appropriate educational unit administrator(s).

February 10, 2020 Review completed by college and faculty employees informed of results.

March 2, 2020 Deadline for faculty employees to appeal at the college level.

March 23, 2020 Appeals at the college level completed.

April 13, 2020 Deadline for a faculty employee to appeal to the Provost.

Finally, if there are any aspects of the review process on which you wish additional guidance, please feel free to contact the Office for Faculty Advancement.

*Please note that a small number of colleges are migrating to a fiscal year performance review cycle for faculty. In those instances, please adjust internal deadlines accordingly. In either cycle, most recently completed performance evaluation will serve as the performance record when making recommendation for any merit increase.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P w/tenure Promotion only</td>
<td>P w/tenure Promotion only</td>
<td>P w/tenure Promotion only</td>
<td>P w/tenure Promotion only</td>
<td>P w/tenure Promotion only</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AGRICULTURE</td>
<td>2/0</td>
<td>7/0</td>
<td>7/1</td>
<td>5/0</td>
<td>6/0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARTS &amp; SCIENCES</td>
<td>8/0 (one T.O.)</td>
<td>10/1</td>
<td>11/0</td>
<td>10/0</td>
<td>25/0 (one T.O.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BUSINESS &amp; ECONOMICS</td>
<td>3/0</td>
<td>3/1</td>
<td>1/0</td>
<td>1/0</td>
<td>3/0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMMUNICATIONS &amp; INFO</td>
<td>1/0</td>
<td>2/0</td>
<td>2/0</td>
<td>2/0</td>
<td>2/0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DENTISTRY</td>
<td>4/0</td>
<td>1/0</td>
<td>3/0</td>
<td>1/0</td>
<td>3/0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DESIGN</td>
<td>2/0</td>
<td>2/0</td>
<td>1/0</td>
<td>1/0</td>
<td>3/0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDUCATION</td>
<td>3/0</td>
<td>5/0</td>
<td>3/0</td>
<td>1/0</td>
<td>4/0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENGINEERING</td>
<td>5/2 (one T.O.)</td>
<td>9/0</td>
<td>8/1</td>
<td>4/0</td>
<td>4/0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FINE ARTS</td>
<td>3/0</td>
<td>6/0</td>
<td>1/0</td>
<td>5/0</td>
<td>1/0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GRADUATE SCHOOL</td>
<td>1/0</td>
<td>1/0 (one T.O.)</td>
<td>1/0</td>
<td>1/0</td>
<td>1/0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HEALTH SCIENCES</td>
<td>2/0</td>
<td>3/0</td>
<td>2/0</td>
<td>3/0</td>
<td>3/0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LAW</td>
<td>1/0 (one T.O.)</td>
<td>2/0</td>
<td>2/0</td>
<td>1/0</td>
<td>3/0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LIBRARIES</td>
<td>2/0</td>
<td>2/0</td>
<td>1/0</td>
<td>3/0</td>
<td>3/0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEDICINE</td>
<td>11/0 (one T.O.)</td>
<td>37/0</td>
<td>7/2</td>
<td>42/0</td>
<td>5/1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NURSING</td>
<td>3/0</td>
<td>2/0</td>
<td>4/0</td>
<td>1/0</td>
<td>3/0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PHARMACY</td>
<td>5/0</td>
<td>1/0</td>
<td>1/0</td>
<td>1/0</td>
<td>1/0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PUBLIC HEALTH</td>
<td>2/0</td>
<td>2/0</td>
<td>4/0</td>
<td>1/0</td>
<td>1/0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOCIAL WORK</td>
<td>1/0</td>
<td>1/0</td>
<td>3/0</td>
<td>1/0</td>
<td>1/0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SUB-TOTAL:</strong></td>
<td>49/2 (4%)</td>
<td>94/1 (1%)</td>
<td>58/5 (9%)</td>
<td>81/0 (6%)</td>
<td>67/1 (2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>GRAND TOTAL:</strong></td>
<td>143/3** (2%)</td>
<td>139/5** (4%)</td>
<td>168/1** (1%)</td>
<td>134/3** (3%)</td>
<td>158/2** (2%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* For each set of numbers separated by / *, the left side denotes "Considered" and the right "Not approved"
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>College</th>
<th>Dept Faculty</th>
<th>Chair</th>
<th>College Committee</th>
<th>Dean</th>
<th>Area Committee</th>
<th>Provost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Disapproved</td>
<td>Disapproved</td>
<td>Disapproved</td>
<td>Disapproved</td>
<td>Disapproved</td>
<td>Disapproved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Promotion</td>
<td>Promotion</td>
<td>Promotion</td>
<td>Promotion</td>
<td>Promotion</td>
<td>Promotion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>only</td>
<td>only</td>
<td>only</td>
<td>only</td>
<td>only</td>
<td>only</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AGRICULTURE</td>
<td>6/0</td>
<td>3/0</td>
<td>6/0</td>
<td>3/0</td>
<td>6/0</td>
<td>3/0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARTS &amp; SCIENCES</td>
<td>15/0 (two T.O)</td>
<td>11/0 (two T.O)</td>
<td>15/0 (two T.O)</td>
<td>11/0 (two T.O)</td>
<td>15/0 (two T.O)</td>
<td>7/0 (two T.O)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BUSINESS &amp; ECONOMICS</td>
<td>4/0</td>
<td>3/0</td>
<td>4/0</td>
<td>3/0</td>
<td>4/0</td>
<td>3/0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMMUNICATIONS &amp; INFO</td>
<td>2/0</td>
<td>2/0</td>
<td>2/0</td>
<td>2/0</td>
<td>2/0</td>
<td>2/0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DENTISTRY</td>
<td>1/0</td>
<td>1/0</td>
<td>1/0</td>
<td>1/0</td>
<td>1/0</td>
<td>1/0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DESIGN</td>
<td>3/0</td>
<td>1/0</td>
<td>3/0</td>
<td>1/0</td>
<td>3/0</td>
<td>1/0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDUCATION</td>
<td>2/0 (one T.O)</td>
<td>8/1 (one T.O)</td>
<td>2/0 (one T.O)</td>
<td>8/1 (one T.O)</td>
<td>2/0 (one T.O)</td>
<td>8/1 (one T.O)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENGINEERING</td>
<td>5/1</td>
<td>4/0</td>
<td>5/1</td>
<td>4/0</td>
<td>5/1</td>
<td>4/0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FINE ARTS</td>
<td>4/0</td>
<td>4/0</td>
<td>4/0</td>
<td>4/0</td>
<td>4/0</td>
<td>4/0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GRADUATE SCHOOL</td>
<td>1/0</td>
<td>1/0</td>
<td>1/0</td>
<td>1/0</td>
<td>1/0</td>
<td>1/0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HEALTH SCIENCES</td>
<td>1/0</td>
<td>3/0</td>
<td>1/0</td>
<td>3/0</td>
<td>1/0</td>
<td>3/0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LIBRARIES</td>
<td>1/0</td>
<td>1/0</td>
<td>1/0</td>
<td>1/0</td>
<td>1/0</td>
<td>1/0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEDICINE</td>
<td>6/0 (three T.O)</td>
<td>58/0 (three T.O)</td>
<td>6/0 (three T.O)</td>
<td>58/0 (three T.O)</td>
<td>6/0 (three T.O)</td>
<td>58/0 (three T.O)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PHARMACY</td>
<td>1/0 (one T.O)</td>
<td>4/0 (one T.O)</td>
<td>1/0 (one T.O)</td>
<td>4/0 (one T.O)</td>
<td>1/0 (one T.O)</td>
<td>4/0 (one T.O)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PUBLIC HEALTH</td>
<td>2/0</td>
<td>2/0</td>
<td>2/0</td>
<td>2/0</td>
<td>2/0</td>
<td>2/0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOCIAL WORK</td>
<td>1/0</td>
<td>1/0</td>
<td>1/0</td>
<td>1/0</td>
<td>1/0</td>
<td>1/0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Sr. Lecturer promotion(s): Area Comm do not review
T.O. (Tenure only)

Decisions through June 30, 2019