

DEAN'S GUIDELINES

PRETENURE, TENURE AND PROMOTION REVIEWS

(Accompanies Section 2.2 of the College Personnel Policy)

(Revised Spring 2008)

I. Pretenure Reviews

A. Notification

Each year the Dean's Office will distribute a list of all faculty members due for mandatory pretenure review. This review normally occurs at the mid-point of a faculty member's probationary period. In cases where an individual's career does not fit the normal pattern (for example, if an individual held a tenure-track position elsewhere before coming to the University of Louisville), the question of conducting a pretenure review shall be treated on its own merits, determining whether or not the hiring process itself constituted the pretenure review. In those cases where a faculty member's career diverges from the norm but where a pretenure review is deemed appropriate, the pretenure review will normally occur three years prior to the mandatory tenure review.

Every reviewee must be informed fully about the pretenure review process. By October 1 of the academic year in which the review is to take place, the chair of the division, department, or program (hereafter "unit") in which the reviewee holds primary appointment will inform the reviewee, in writing, about the nature of the review. The chair must make certain that each reviewee in his or her unit is aware of the criteria used in personnel actions by insuring that each reviewee has access to copies of the personnel policy documents of the College and of the unit.

B. Collecting Material for the Review File

Material for the pretenure file is collected by the same procedures used in tenure and promotion cases. Extramural reviews are optional for pretenure appraisals and typically are not solicited. However, extramural reviews may be requested by either the reviewee or the personnel committee of the reviewee's unit. Because the Arts and Sciences Personnel Policy provides that only reviewees or the personnel committees of their units may request extramural reviews, others involved in the pretenure evaluation may suggest that extramural reviews be solicited, but can not require them.

C. Review Bodies

The reviewers for pretenure appraisals include, in order of their review: the unit personnel committee; the unit chair; the Arts and Sciences Personnel Committee; and the Dean of the College of Arts and Sciences. The composition of unit

personnel committees in pretenure reviews is governed by the same policy that governs the composition of such committees in tenure reviews. Although the College Personnel Policy does not mandate a faculty vote in pretenure appraisals, a unit may conduct such a vote.

D. Evaluation of the Record

The general principles for evaluating the evidence in pretenure reviews are the same as those that govern evaluation in tenure and promotion cases. Because the purpose of pretenure appraisal is to judge whether the reviewee is making satisfactory progress toward tenure, pretenure reviews should be conducted rigorously and reported upon with candor and objectivity. Pretenure reviews are intended to help guide the reviewee during the critical probationary period.

Pretenure appraisals are internal to the College of Arts and Sciences and no administrative officer outside the College reviews these cases. This places a unique responsibility on all pretenure reviewers to provide the reviewee with an assessment of performance that will help the reviewee prepare for the future tenure review not only within the College, but also by the Graduate Dean, the University Provost and the President. Although the College Personnel Policy states that “a positive pretenure review is not a promise of an eventual tenure grant,” the pretenure review should provide some indication of how a reviewee’s performance is likely to be assessed in future personnel actions.

E. Rebuttals and Comments on Evidence

A reviewee in a pretenure appraisal has the same rights to comment on evidence as do reviewees in merit, promotion, and tenure reviews. The procedures for this process are described in the guidelines for tenure and promotion.

II. Tenure and Promotion Reviews

A. Notification

Each year, the Dean's Office will distribute to unit chairs a list of all faculty members in their units who are subject to mandatory tenure review. The Dean's Office will also obtain from chairs the names of those faculty members who wish to be reviewed for promotion to Professor and of those faculty members who wish to be reviewed for early tenure. Generally, promotion to Associate Professor is linked to the tenure decision so reviews for promotion to Associate Professor are usually mandatory in the same year as tenure reviews. The unit chair is responsible for verifying the accuracy of the list of faculty subject to mandatory tenure review and for informing those faculty members subject to such review. The unit chair is also responsible for obtaining requests for review for early tenure and for review for promotion to Professor, and for transmitting this information to the Dean's Office by the deadline announced.

Every reviewee must be informed fully about the tenure and promotion review process. The chair of the reviewee’s unit will inform the reviewee, in writing,

about the nature of the review. The chair must make certain that each reviewee in his or her unit has access to copies of the personnel policy documents of the College and of the unit.

B. General Principles Concerning Evidence and Procedure

The overriding principle guiding evidence is that the file should contain all the appropriate information available to help reviewers evaluate the reviewee's performance in the areas of activity associated with a faculty member's responsibilities at the University of Louisville. The Arts and Sciences Personnel Policy specifies several types of evidence that must be included in tenure and promotion files and there are other items of evidence that may appropriately be included in such files as well. However, the source of all evidence and the mechanisms by which it is solicited are important, since those aspects touch on the credibility of the materials. For example, if a reviewee asks students or others to write letters in support of a personnel action, that solicitation may color the objectivity of the evidence. If any reviewing body regards any evidence in the file as suspect, that body may seek information about its origin and should consider that information in making its recommendations.

In any case where mitigating circumstances make it impossible to adhere to College Policy or to the Dean's Guidelines in a tenure or promotion case, an explanation of those circumstances must be placed in the record. If there is a controversy over the acceptability of evidence or over a request for additional material while a case is being considered at the unit level, that controversy will be resolved by the Arts and Sciences Personnel Committee in consultation with the Dean.

In general, it is the responsibility of the unit personnel committee to collect from the reviewee and other sources all evidence necessary for a personnel review. However, the unit chair is expected to insure that the personnel committee fulfills its responsibility and the reviewee is expected to cooperate with the unit committee. The reviewee must, for example, provide a current *curriculum vitae* in a form approved by the College, copies of all professional works, and such other evidence as is requested by any review body, subject to the right of appeal of such requests. The reviewee may submit other materials for inclusion in the original review file and he or she may add new evidence to the file up until the time the Dean advances the file to the Office of the University Provost by signing his letter of recommendation addressed to the Provost. However, all prior reviewers must re-evaluate the entire record if new evidence is added and so the reviewee must assume the risk if adding evidence results in the submission of the case to the Office of the President past the published deadline for submission.

The chair of a unit may provide to the unit personnel committee relevant information regarding the reviewee before that committee formulates its recommendation. A report about the reviewee should contain information regarding aspects of the reviewee's performance that a chair has by virtue of his

or her unique relationship to the faculty. It must not, however, extend to a recommendation on the action under consideration.

Candidates under review for tenure and promotion have the right to examine all evidence in their files and to respond to recommendations before their files proceed to the next level of review within the College. However, once evaluations obtained under a pledge of confidence are in the file, reviewees may not examine that file unless all such evidence is removed and masked copies substituted. Therefore, it is convenient to provide access to the file before extramural reviews are added and to provide separate access to masked copies of confidential information.

The College will provide full opportunity for the insertion of written rebuttals to any evaluations in the file. Ordinarily there is a period of three working days provided for examining the evaluations and submitting the rebuttal. The unit chair or other individual responsible for the file at each stage of review will indicate the deadline for rebuttal on the form supplied by the Dean's Office, and that person will insure that anyone entitled to write the rebuttal receives notice of that deadline and that the notice is acknowledged by a signature on the form. If the practice of providing three days for submitting rebuttals would result in a case being unduly delayed, the period provided for rebuttals may be shortened to one or two days.

All candidates for promotion or tenure will be reviewed in terms of three primary areas of activity: Teaching, Research and Creative Activity, and Service. However, all reviewers in personnel cases should recognize that some efforts might result in contributions in more than one realm of activity. Reviewees who wish to have some of their activities considered as contributions in more than one area of activity, and those who wish to have an activity counted in an area with which it is not generally associated (for example, to have the writing of a textbook considered under the category of Research and Creative Activity, or to have some professional involvement in the community treated as a Teaching activity) are expected to justify their requests to those reviewing their cases.

C. The Area of Teaching

1. Scope of Activities

Teaching activities include those that involve direct or indirect contact with learners and those that advance education and learning outcomes through the development of instructional materials. Some examples are:

- Meeting with students in order to lecture, lead discussions, supervise laboratory work, or organize other pedagogical activities.
- Advising and counseling students; supervising independent studies, honors projects and internships; and directing graduate student research and theses.

- Preparing, critiquing and grading exams, papers, or other work produced by students.
- Creating new instructional opportunities and courses, initiating new teaching methods, or developing new instructional materials, including textbooks and workbooks.

2. Assessment

The assessment of performance in Teaching should include attention to the following questions:

- Has the faculty member carefully planned instructional work to stimulate active learning and encourage students to be critical, creative thinkers?
- Has the faculty member remained well informed in his or her teaching fields and shown a willingness to revise courses and create new courses and other instructional opportunities?
- Has the faculty member remained abreast of new teaching techniques and technologies?
- Has the faculty member shown a willingness to meet with and mentor students outside of class (for example, during office hours), to work with students on individual projects such as independent study papers or theses, and to participate in other education activities?
- Has the faculty member taken into account the learning goals established within the unit and developed ways to assess their achievement?
- Has the faculty member developed original teaching materials, either for use with his or her students or for wider dissemination?

3. Required Evidence

The evidence used in the assessment of performance in Teaching must include:

- Quantitative student course evaluations. Units must use the student instructional evaluation instruments adopted by the College, but may also employ unit-specific instruments in addition. The results of the College-mandated student course evaluations that are to be included in the personnel files submitted to the College Personnel Committee need not include complete student evaluation printouts. The files should, however, include the summary sheets that appear at the end of each student evaluation report, and the tally sheets that units are asked to prepare compiling various student evaluation data. Although the summary sheets and the tally sheets contain the same information, including both provides reviewers with data in their original form as well as in a form that will allow for the identification of trends. The tally sheets to be used by units are developed by the Office of the Dean.
- Peer Review. Assessment of performance in Teaching must involve peer review, which may include classroom visitation by peers and an

evaluation of course materials such as syllabi, exams, assignments, and handouts. Peer review may also include an examination of discursive student course evaluations. However, if student comment sheets for a particular class are included in a file, all comment sheets submitted for that class must be submitted.

D. The Area of Research and Creative Activity

1. Scope of Activities

Research and Creative Activity includes adding to the reservoir of knowledge in a faculty member's field and disseminating the new knowledge created. It may also include work that interprets and brings insight to bear on the original research of others. At times, activities in this area may involve the application of a faculty member's professional expertise to the solution of problems beyond the academic world. Some activities in this area may also take pedagogy as their subject matter, suggesting that accomplishments in the realms of Research and Creative Activity and in the realm of Teaching can at times be linked.

Examples of activities in the realm of Research and Creative Activity include the following:

- The dissemination of new knowledge through the publication of refereed books, monographs, journal articles and proceedings.
- Productions in art, literature, or theater.
- Presentation of papers at scholarly meetings and the publication of abstracts associated with those presentations.
- Efforts at writing grant proposals and success in obtaining funding for research and other creative activities.
- Cross-disciplinary investigations, meta-analyses and literature reviews.
- Writing for non-specialists in publications such as encyclopedias and books intended for the general public.
- Consulting and the preparation of reports.
- Conducting studies or surveys for public or private organizations.

2. Assessment

The quality, quantity, and consistent pace of the publications or creative endeavors of a candidate for promotion or tenure must be important considerations in the process of evaluation. All forms of research and creative activity are expected to exhibit a faculty member's originality and skill in exploring significant issues. In general, the originality, skill and significance of a faculty member's work are confirmed by the positive recognition it receives by acceptance of the work in peer-reviewed publications, exhibitions, or other such outlets.

In the case of research or creative activity that does not fit widely accepted understandings of appropriate efforts for a university professor, the burden is

upon reviewees to demonstrate how those efforts relate to their academic expertise and faculty role.

3. **Required Evidence**

There must be evidence in the record supporting any item listed on the *curriculum vitae* in the area of Research and Creative Activity. In the case of written works, complete copies must be supplied by the reviewee. In the case of exhibitions, productions, and similar types of activities, appropriate evidence such as brochures, reports, or reviews will represent proof of achievement.

Extramural reviews are mandatory in tenure and promotion cases. Where written works are to be evaluated, the process is as follows:

- **Compilation of list of reviewers.**

The unit chair and the reviewee, working together, will compile a list of experts deemed suitable to comment on the merits of the publications in each of the reviewee's areas of specialty. The names of a minimum of ten persons will be submitted for each specialty area. Unit chairs cannot be expected to have complete knowledge of the experts in the reviewee's field, so the reviewee has the primary responsibility for affirming that the list submitted contains recognized authorities in his or her field who have no bias either for or against the reviewee. A recognized expert in the field who is a personal friend or a former mentor of the reviewee, for example, would not be an appropriate extramural reviewer. Neither would a co-author or a close collaborator. In cases where there is a relationship, albeit distant, between the reviewee and a potential extramural reviewer, the reviewee must justify the inclusion of that person on the list of experts. If the chair and the candidate cannot agree on a satisfactory list of reviewers, the matter will be referred to the Arts and Sciences Personnel Committee for resolution. The chair will forward the list of names of potential reviewers to the Dean, who will select the reviewers and contact those persons.

If all the work of a reviewee is within a single specialty area, four extramural reviews will be sought. If the works are divided into two or more areas, three reviews will be sought in each area. If fewer than these numbers are obtained, the faculty member will be asked to agree to consideration of his or her case with a reduced number of reviews. If the reviewee refuses and if additional reviews have been pursued with diligence by the Dean's Office, the reviewee assumes the risk of delays caused by the continued attempt to obtain additional reviews.

- **Submission of materials.**

The Dean's Office provides a form for listing materials for review, categorized into areas of specialization. Generally, all work submitted as

evidence in a promotion or tenure case must be evaluated extramurally. However, if the work involved is voluminous, the reviewee, in consultation with his or her chair, may elect to exclude some works from the extramural review process. Nonetheless, copies of all works produced during the review period and listed on the *curriculum vitae* must be included in the reviewee's file and the entire corpus of works is subject to evaluation within the College and University. Although reviewees have the right to have all of their professional work evaluated extramurally, they are cautioned not to submit so much material for extramural review that the volume of that material delays the review process.

A given piece of work may be reviewed extramurally only once. However, all extramural reviews obtained by the College will be included in the review file. Thus, candidates for promotion to the rank of Professor will have in their files both reviews of work completed since the last major personnel action and reviews obtained in connection with that previous action. The extramural reviews will be identified as related to work completed since the last major action or to work completed prior to that action.

If there is a dispute between the reviewee and the unit committee regarding the acceptability of any given piece of work as falling within the category of Research and Creative Activity, the issue will be referred to the College Personnel Committee for resolution. If the College Committee itself raises objections concerning the acceptability of certain work, the Committee must justify its objections on the basis of College and unit policies and criteria.

- **Obtaining the Extramural Reviews.**

The Office of the Dean will contact potential extramural reviewers to determine their availability to serve. If a sufficient number of experts from the original list of potential reviewers is not available, the Dean will turn to the unit chair concerning the preparation of an additional list compiled according to the guidelines that governed the preparation of the original list.

When a reviewer agrees to serve, the Dean's Office will send that person the material to be reviewed, together with the reviewee's *curriculum vitae* and a request that the reviewer return an evaluation within four weeks. If necessary, the Dean's Office will contact delinquent reviewers to remind them of the time constraints involved.

- **Incorporation of Extramural Reviews in the File.**

The reviewee has an absolute right to see all material added to his or her review file. Therefore, the reviewee will be notified when extramural reviews have been collected in the Dean's Office and will be given an

opportunity to comment on these reviews. Since such evaluations are solicited with an agreement regarding confidentiality, all reasonable effort will be made to mask the identity of reviewers. As noted above, the reviewee will be given a deadline for submitting comments on the extramural reviews.

After all reviews have been received and the reviewee has had the opportunity to comment on the reviews, the reviews and comments will be added to the candidate's file. The extramural reviews in the file will be identified as to authorship so that this information will be available to evaluators of the case.

In the case of efforts in Research and Creative Activity that do not result in written works, including theatrical productions and exhibitions of artwork, extramural reviews will be obtained through a process developed by individual units and approved by the Arts and Sciences Personnel Committee and the Office of the Dean. The Department of Theater Arts and the Department of Fine Arts are expected to have standard extramural review policies in place. Other units may seek approval for a process of extramural review of non-written work as needed.

E. The Area of Service

1. Scope of Activities

To be considered activities in the category of Service, those activities must depend upon an individual's academic expertise or role as a faculty member. Service activities may assist in the proper functioning of academic units, the College or the University. They may also assist in the functioning of the infrastructure of one's profession or of the community of which one is a part, either at a local level or beyond. However, activities in which one might engage as an individual citizen without reference to his or her position as a university professor do not constitute Service activities for purposes of personnel reviews.

Participation in faculty governance is considered a responsibility of every faculty member and all faculty members are expected to be involved in Service activities, except where they have been specifically excused from such activities in written agreements with the administration of the College. Among other activities, faculty members are expected to participate in faculty meetings, to help in faculty searches, and to demonstrate a willingness to serve on elected committees.

2. Assessment

In assessing Service activities, reviewers shall consider the following factors:

- Amount: A quantitative assessment of numbers of service commitments should be made.

- Quality: The value of a faculty member's contributions to the work of a group should be assessed.
- Importance: The benefits that grow out of the projects in which a faculty member has been engaged should be considered.
- Time: Some service commitments take considerably more time than others and this should be considered in evaluating Service.

III. Reviewers in Tenure and Promotion Cases

The reviewers in tenure and promotion cases at the College level are, in order of their review: the unit personnel committee; the faculty of the candidate's unit; the chair of the candidate's unit; the Arts and Sciences Personnel Committee; and the Dean of the College of Arts and Sciences.

At every level of review there must be a critical examination of evidence and this examination should be reflected in any letters of recommendation prepared. Proficient performance in all areas of required activity must be demonstrated by the evidence available and letters of recommendation should include a critical discussion of that evidence in relation to the policies of the College and the unit.

The accomplishments of a reviewee must be considered against the background of the reviewee's distribution of effort as reflected in the Annual Work Plans for the period under review. It is particularly important to note this provision in cases where a very high percentage of effort has been allocated to one category. Moreover, the total contribution of the reviewee must be considered in evaluating his or her record. This means that overload teaching or service undertaken in connection with an A-12 contract is considered part of the record under review. Furthermore, in all reviews for tenure and for promotion, due consideration must be given to the promise of continuing performance at satisfactory levels or above.

A. Review by the Unit Personnel Committee.

There must be a unit personnel committee with a minimum of three faculty members to review every tenure and promotion case. The composition of that committee is determined by the regulations of the unit, but such regulations must comply with the College Personnel Policy. There are two situations in which a unit personnel committee must be augmented with the addition of at least one outside member:

- (1) When fewer than three persons within a unit are eligible for service on a personnel committee. The provisions for augmenting the committee in this case are specified in the College Personnel Policy.
- (2) When an individual under review has made a "significant contribution" to the work of the college outside his or her unit and that individual has requested an augmented committee. The definition of "significant contribution" and the

provisions for augmenting the committee in this case are specified in the College Personnel Policy.

After reviewing the evidence in a case, the unit committee shall write a letter of recommendation that includes a report on the numerical vote within the committee. The unit committee must also arrange for a faculty vote based on its recommendation. That vote is to take place after every eligible voter has had the opportunity to review the evidence in the case under consideration.

B. Review by the Unit Faculty.

Having considered the recommendation of the unit personnel committee, and having been given an opportunity to review the evidence in the case under consideration, the unit faculty will vote on that case. No one may cast more than one vote in any tenure and promotion case. Voting rights in tenure and promotion cases are governed by the following provisions of the College Personnel Policy: “Each probationary and tenured faculty member having principal appointment in a department shall have a single vote, and the Chair shall report the vote numerically. A faculty member may have to choose whether to vote as a personnel committee member, administrator, or as a member of the department at large. Department votes shall be by written ballot not marked with name, rank, tenure status, or other identifying information. The ballots shall become a permanent part of the file under review.” A parallel policy concerning voting shall apply when the unit in which a faculty member holds primary appointment is a division or program. Any faculty member eligible to vote in a tenure or promotion case may add a statement to the file, but the inclusion of such a statement is subject to the right of appeal by the reviewee or any reviewing body.

C. Review by the Unit Chair

After the unit personnel committee prepares its recommendation and a vote of the unit faculty is conducted, the chair will write a recommendation based on the evidence in the file and submit the complete file to the Office of the Dean. The chair’s recommendation should include a report on the numerical vote of the unit faculty. If the total number of votes reported by the chair is significantly lower than the number of eligible voters in a case, the chair should explain the discrepancy. If the individual under review is the chair of a division, department, or program, there will be no letter in the file equivalent to a chair's letter.

D. Review by the Arts and Sciences Personnel Committee

The Dean or the Dean’s designee will transmit each personnel case to the Arts and Sciences Personnel Committee, having first reviewed the contents of each personnel file to insure, to the extent possible, that it contains the required elements. The Arts and Sciences Personnel Committee is elected in accordance with the Constitution and Bylaws of the College of Arts and Sciences. That committee is responsible for writing a recommendation based upon the evidence in the file and criteria established in the policy of the College of Arts and Sciences and in the policy of the relevant unit.

Ordinarily, the Arts and Sciences Personnel Committee does not participate in any aspect of collecting material for a file, and the sole addition of evidence to the file by that committee is its written recommendation. However, the Arts and Sciences Personnel Committee must remit to the unit any case presented to it if essential evidence is missing. The committee also may request further evidence if that is deemed essential for evaluating the case. If there is controversy regarding the acceptability of the evidence requested, that controversy will be resolved by the Dean in consultation with the appropriate unit personnel committee.

The Dean's Office is responsible for informing the relevant unit about the College Committee's recommendation and about the deadline for rebuttals to that recommendation. The Dean's Office will also insure that any rebuttals submitted are inserted into the file.

E. Review by the Dean

The Dean of the College of Arts and Sciences will write a letter of recommendation to the Provost based upon the evidence in the file. As in the case of any other reviewer, the Dean has the right and responsibility to remit the case to previous reviewers if the file is deemed incomplete. The recommendation of the Dean must reflect implementation of the policies of the College of Arts and Sciences and the accepted criteria of the reviewee's unit.

F. Review by Bodies Beyond the College of Arts and Sciences

Reviewers beyond the College include: the Dean of the Graduate School, the University Provost, the President, and the Board of Trustees.

The record of candidates who have been accepted as members of the Graduate Faculty will be evaluated by the Graduate Dean as part of the tenure and promotion review process. The records of candidates for tenure and for promotion will also be reviewed by the University Provost and the President. Reviewees should understand that University policies, and not only those specific to the College of Arts and Sciences, govern those evaluations. Reviewees should also understand that the University Provost and the President have the right to ask the Graduate Dean to evaluate the record of any faculty member of a unit with a graduate program, even if that faculty member has not been admitted to the Graduate Faculty.

G. Review of Faculty Members with Primary and Secondary Appointments

If a faculty member has appointments in multiple units within the College of Arts and Sciences by action of the Board of Trustees, each of those units will evaluate his or her tenure or promotion file. In each of the units, a recommendation will be prepared by the personnel committee, a faculty vote will be conducted, and a chair's report will be prepared. The reports from all units will be inserted into the candidate's review file. In general, the unit of primary appointment will initiate the review process and oversee the creation of a review file, but all units involved will be expected to cooperate in the review of the faculty member. Once the review file reaches the

Office of the Dean, the review will continue as in the case of a faculty member with appointment in only a single unit.

If the reviewee has an appointment involving the College of Arts and Sciences and another academic unit within the University, the A&S unit involved will conduct its review in accordance with the policy and guidelines for tenure and promotion reviews in the College and, to the extent possible, the College will cooperate with the other University unit involved to help facilitate its review.