

RAYMOND A. KENT SCHOOL OF SOCIAL WORK

Faculty Personnel Review Procedures¹

I. Preamble

The faculty of the Kent School of Social Work is responsible for establishing minimum personnel policies, procedures, and standards that are consistent with The Redbook and University's Minimum Guidelines for Faculty Reviews. Policies and procedures contained herein shall govern the annual, pre-tenure, tenure, promotion, and periodic career review process for all term, probationary and tenured faculty in the Kent School of Social Work.

II. Policies Specific to the Appointment and Promotion of Nontenurable Faculty, Full & Part-time.

A. Appointment Policies for Part-time Nontenurable Faculty

- i. Adjunct Faculty appointments for Part-time instructors. Part-time faculty shall be those appointed by contract to teach specified courses and/or to engage in specialized instruction, research, or service less than full time. The Dean may appoint or reappoint part-time faculty for each academic term at the convenience of the University on standard contract terms approved by the Provost. The Annual Review for part time faculty is to occur each semester and be coordinated by the Associate Dean for Academic Affairs. The Promotion of Rank Review is to include the use of student evaluations (or equivalent), copies of all Annual Reviews for the past five years, and the evaluative comments of full time faculty as collected by the Personnel Committee. No part-time appointment, continuation, or renewal thereof, regardless of assignment or seniority, shall result in acquisition of tenure or implied renewal for subsequent periods. Part-time faculty are eligible for promotion in rank by determination of the Dean upon criteria stated in this section of this document. Part-time faculty are not eligible for sabbaticals or other academic leaves. Part-time faculty may participate in university and unit governance as permitted by University and Kent School Bylaws. Such service shall be accounted for and recognized in the individual contracts. The minimum service expectation for all adjunct faculty is to participate in sequence committee meetings if their teaching assignment includes a sequence course.

Part-time faculty with a masters degree as the highest degree attained may only be appointed as Adjunct Instructors. Those with earned doctorates may be appointed at the level of Adjunct Assistant Professor or higher.

The School designates three levels of Adjunct appointment at the Instructor level— Instructor I; Instructor II; and Instructor III, each with its own graduated salary and experience level. After five years of continuous satisfactory teaching at the Instructor I level, teaching an average of at least 2 courses per year or equivalent workload assignment in research or service, a part-time faculty member may be promoted to Instructor II. Faculty at the Instructor II level may be promoted to Instructor III after five more years of satisfactory teaching and averaging at least 2 courses per year. Full time faculty in a term position, who do not have a doctoral degree, are also eligible for promotion within the rank of Instructor.

¹ This document approved by the faculty of the Kent School on March 22, 2006

Those appointed with a Ph.D. at the Adjunct Assistant Professor level may be promoted to Adjunct Associate Professor after five years of continuous satisfactory teaching an average of at least 2 courses per year at the Adjunct Assistant Professor level. Faculty at the Adjunct Associate Professor level may be promoted to the Adjunct Professor level after five more years of satisfactory teaching of an average of at least 2 courses per year. Satisfactory teaching will be determined by student evaluation and by the Academic Associate Dean in collaboration with Program Directors and curriculum sequence chairs. If part time faculty members achieve doctoral degrees during their service as an Adjunct Instructor but before they have served the full five years of their current terms, they will be eligible for promotion beginning the next academic year.

- ii. Emeritus faculty. The honorary title of Emeritus faculty may be conferred upon retired faculty if requested by the Kent School faculty and the Dean, and if approved by the President and Board of Trustees. The University community can benefit greatly from Emeritus Faculty presence on campus and continued professional activities, including teaching, research, and service. Therefore, Emeritus Faculty should be provided library and email privileges and support facilities. They may also assist with undergraduate and graduate research projects and they may undertake primary supervision of new student research projects with the approval of the Dean.

B. Appointment Policies for Full-time Nontenurable Faculty

- i. All Nontenurable full-time faculty will be called Term Faculty.
- ii. Term faculty shall be full-time faculty appointments without tenure for a stipulated contract period not to exceed three years. Such appointments are not probationary appointments and no such appointments, continuation, or renewal thereof shall result in acquisition of tenure or implied renewal for subsequent terms. Term faculty are not eligible for sabbaticals or other academic leaves.
- iii. Term faculty may be funded through general funds, restricted funds, or clinical revenues. The number of term faculty appointments funded through general funds must be fewer than 50 percent of the total number of probationary and tenured appointments in the School.
- iv. Term faculty appointments may be renewed at the pleasure of the University if the Dean determines that the services of the incumbent are needed for the renewal term.
- v. Faculty on term appointments may apply for and be appointed to probationary appointments.
- vi. Participation in the School's Governance shall be specified in the By-Laws.
- vii. Annual review of term faculty is discussed in *Section III. Annual Review for Full-time Faculty.*
- viii. Term faculty will have access to the same grievance procedure as other full-time faculty. (See Redbook 4.4 Appendix 1.)

III. Annual Reviews for Full-time Faculty

- A. The purpose of Annual Review is the enhancement of faculty performance in the Kent School of Social Work. In keeping with University policy, these guidelines shall serve as a framework for Annual Reviews. Performance evaluations shall be based on the individual's accomplishments and contributions in helping Kent School meet its specific goals and objectives in the prior calendar year. All Annual Reviews shall become part of the record to be used in pre-tenure, tenure, promotion, and periodic career reviews.

- B. Each faculty member will submit to the Dean an Annual Review Report (see *Kent School Website for current approved form*), including any supplemental information and documentation the faculty member considers relevant. The Dean will meet with faculty members to discuss their activities and accomplishments over the past calendar year.
- C. In addition to submitting the Annual Review Report that summarizes the past year's efforts, the faculty member will develop with the Dean the next year's Annual Workload Agreement (see *Kent School Website for current approved form*) for approval by the Dean. When circumstances require significant changes in this work plan, the faculty member shall file an amended plan (including an explanation of the necessary changes) for the Dean's approval.
- D. The Dean will make a salary decision referenced against the Faculty member's Annual Workload Agreement and the criteria listed elsewhere in this document regarding promotion and tenure decisions (4.2.2.A). The decision and its rationale will be communicated in writing to the faculty member and retained for future pre-tenure, tenure, promotion, and periodic review decisions.
- E. The Dean is responsible for notifying faculty of the date each year that materials are due for review by the Personnel Committee.
- F. Annual Review. This date should allow a minimum of one-month notice for preparation of the report and the gathering of materials, as well as allow ample time for the appeal process if necessary.
- G. The Annual Review period is the calendar year. However, if the pool of monies for general faculty increases in either of the prior two years has been lower than the percent of the total faculty salary increases for the current year, faculty members may request that their annual reviews be extended to cover past performance. In no instance will more than three years' performance be included in an Annual Review.
- H. Should a faculty member wish to contest the Annual Review evaluation by the Dean, the faculty member has recourse to appeal to the Personnel Committee. A written request for reconsideration must be sent to the Dean with a copy to the Chair of the Personnel Committee, within two weeks of receiving the written outcome of the Annual Review from the Dean. The Personnel Committee will conduct an independent review and submit its written recommendations to the Dean, with a copy to the faculty member, within one month of receiving the request. This appeal review by the Personnel Committee may include discussions with the Dean and/or the faculty member regarding criteria and rationale for the contested decision.
- I. Annual Review salary increases are awarded based on a four level system. The four levels are as follows:
 - Level 0, Unsatisfactory: This level receives no salary increase. It is to be used when the overall performance of the faculty member does not meet qualifications to be considered minimally satisfactory, or when the faculty member fails to submit any material to the Dean. A decision by the Dean for a zero salary increase must be approved by the Provost and shall include the 1) reasons for the zero salary increase, and 2) specific expectations for improving performance where it is considered unsatisfactory.
 - Level I, Satisfactory, with Areas of Concerns: This level receives Annual Review

salary raises equal to one-half the percentage available that particular year. This level is to indicate that while minimally satisfactory job performance was achieved, there were concerns regarding the level of progress in some areas. A decision by the Dean for a Level 1 salary increase shall include the reasons for the decision, and specific expectations for overcoming the concerns identified.

- Level II, Commendable. This level receives Annual Review salary raises equal to the percentage available that particular year. This level is to indicate that overall performance was commendable in that all areas of work performance were satisfactory or above based on the workload agreement. A decision by the Dean for a Level II salary increase shall include the reasons for the decision.
 - Level III, Exemplary. This level receives Annual Review salary raises equal to the percentage available for that particular year as well as a share of the monies not used due to Level 0 or Level 1 determinations. The annual amount is dependent on the number of faculty attaining Level III and the amount of money unused in that particular year. This level is to indicate that job performance was clearly exemplary in achieving the goals and mission of the Kent School and overall performance was commendable based on the workload agreement. A decision by the Dean for a Level III salary increase shall include the reasons for the decision.
- J. An annual report shall be made by the Dean to the faculty and the Provost which contains the frequency distribution of the percentage salary increase received by all faculty in the unit, the number of faculty receiving salary adjustments for other reasons and a description of the evaluation system used to arrive at such salary increases. Individual faculty will not be identified in this annual report.
- K. The Dean must collect and preserve annual reviews for future personnel reviews.

IV. Tenure

A. Criteria for Tenure

A decision to recommend tenure for fellow faculty members in the Kent School of Social Work is based on the conclusive assessment by the faculty that the candidates have demonstrated their ability to be respected scholars and colleagues. This designation presumes our colleagues' ability to communicate ideas in the classroom, to utilize their skills in service to the university, profession and community, and to influence our field through scholarly contribution. Furthermore, colleagues granted tenure must have the ability to work collaboratively in all three areas of performance and to adhere to professional standards and ethics in all of their activities.

Because the field of Social Work spans a diverse practice with many service populations, the Kent School believes it important to encourage academic excellence and contribution across this spectrum. Within an overall context that values quality teaching, service, and scholarly activity in its many forms, the Kent School seeks to describe some consistent criteria that are to be used for judging satisfactory performance in tenure decisions.

Although the successful candidate for tenure must document that they have met all of the following criteria listed below, works in progress, grant applications, and exploratory work with

a colleague are examples of important activity that will be considered in the evaluation process to provide a fair and accurate assessment of a faculty member's abilities and efforts. (See Section IV.B: Performance Documentation for Promotion, Tenure, and Pre-tenure for further information on examples of work products and the suggested documentation). The criteria listed below are declared for the purpose of guiding candidates in understanding the standard by which the sum total of their work efforts will be measured.

The criteria are divided into the three traditional areas of work performance detailed in the Redbook.

The criteria for Teaching are as follows:

1. Faculty members should be able to demonstrate their ability to engage students in the exchange of ideas and consider the diversity of learning styles students use to reach their best performance.
2. Faculty members should demonstrate their ability to work collaboratively on the administrative tasks involved in teaching to include continued curriculum development, focused course management, and effective evaluation of student performance.
3. Faculty members should demonstrate their interest and ability in optimizing student / teacher relations with particular attention given to advising and mentoring of our students.
4. Faculty members should demonstrate their efforts and accomplishments in utilizing creative instructional techniques with particular attention to the use of technological innovations where appropriate.

The criteria for Service are as follows:

1. Faculty members should demonstrate a record of contributing time, talent, and leadership to the activities of school and university governance.
2. Faculty members should be viewed by their school and university colleagues as dedicated, collaborative and helpful in the tasks of academic governance.
3. Faculty members should demonstrate a record of professional service to the needs of the community on a regular and recognized basis.
4. Faculty members should have professional affiliation and work to improve the profession in ways appropriate to their skills and interests.

The criteria for Scholarship are as follows:

1. Faculty members should be able to demonstrate a consistent level of scholarly effort that includes publication of their work.
2. Although the Kent School encourages alternate venues for professional contribution, and scholarly work covering a wide array of activities is eligible for review in the tenure decision, faculty members should submit a significant portion of their work for peer review, and demonstrate a record of favorable review.
3. Although it is understood that faculty members develop their own interests, abilities and unique projects, it is also expected that faculty may work on collaborative, team-based, and/or interdisciplinary teams to complete scholarly projects of mutual or group interest.
4. A faculty member's scholarly work should be conducted in an ethical and professional manner.

B. Performance Documentation for Promotion, Tenure, and Pre-tenure

Preface

Although the successful candidate for tenure must document that they have met all of the criteria listed in *Section IV. A. Criteria for Tenure*, the criteria listed are not meant to narrow the scope of work product submitted to document a faculty member's efforts to meet that criteria. It is understood that many professional activities are involved in the academic life and that many of these activities, particularly those that fall into the scholarly area, are preparatory in nature. The candidate should document all activities directed toward meeting the criteria.

The Personnel Committee will consider appropriate for review those activities undertaken that the candidate considers applicable toward promotion, tenure, or periodic career review. Specific examples of documented achievement for promotion, pre-tenure, and tenure decisions appear in the following sections of this document. This documentation shall be used to direct the candidate in the preparation of materials and the committee in deliberations but should not be construed to state that meeting minimum documentation will ensure a positive review. The Dean will provide copies of all Annual Reviews and Workload Agreements (with salary information removed) to the Personnel Committee.

Examples of achievement are listed in separate and distinct categories. When an activity could fit into more than one category, it is the candidate's responsibility to assign the activity in the one most appropriate group and to reference that activity in other appropriate places (see *Appendix C*).

1. Documentation in Teaching.

Teaching is the guidance of learners in the acquisition of knowledge and skills and the development of attitudes and values. Teaching may include but is not limited to classroom, laboratory, or clinical instruction, field supervision, thesis and dissertation supervision, essay supervision in a professional component, instructional visits, the various forms of individualized instruction, student advising, counseling, program or project development, and course development and refinement. Teaching documentation may also include innovations in use of technology, such as web sites and use of the Internet.

Minimum documentation entails: student course evaluations for classroom, laboratory, or clinical instruction and/or letters, theses, term projects and field supervision, etc., which critique or offer evidence pertinent to one-on-one teaching (i.e., master thesis, independent study, clinical supervision, etc.). The examples listed in each category are samples of the types of activities that may be documented. These examples are meant to guide candidates but should not limit the materials candidates choose to submit for evaluation. The candidate must not solicit letters from students currently enrolled in Kent School and any of its programs.

Examples of Achievement	Examples of Documentation ¹
Develops and/or upgrades courses, curriculum (objectives, content, learning methods, evaluation methods, etc.)	Syllabi or portfolio. Faculty member must document their unique contribution.
Engages students in the exchange of ideas	Student Evaluations, Peer evaluations
Considers a diversity of learning styles in the classroom	Student Evaluations, Peer evaluations
Develops aids or upgrades instructional materials	Submit samples or describe
Organizes and supervises seminars, workshops, to benefit community agencies.	Syllabi, announcements, letters, etc.
Instructs, develops, designs, or coordinates continuing education courses	Indicate number of CEUs taught and submit brochures, outlines, syllabi etc.
Administers short courses, in-service courses, or continuing education activities.	Course outlines, syllabi or written documentation
Advises or tutors students about academic concerns, careers, professional certifications, etc.	Letters of written documentation
Attends courses or professional meetings leading to improved instructional competence	CEUs, transcripts, etc.
Coordinates clinical education component in the community.	Schedules of field visits, completed field evaluations, and performance evaluations
Participates in or develops grants or contracts	Copy of grant or contract related to teaching.
Develops activities for the classroom that promote the strategic goals of the university (i.e., i2A, Signature Partnership Initiative, community engagement)	Copy of curriculum with accompanying narrative to explain what was developed.

2. Documentation Service To The School, The University, The Community, and the Profession.

The service component of faculty members efforts will be evaluated to the extent that the service contributes to the advancement of the School, University, Community or Profession. Operation of the University involves both long-term and day-to-day activities including membership on school or university committees, informal student contact or counseling, participation in learned professional societies, administrative tasks, and philanthropic contributions to the community.

¹ In cases of collaborative or committee work the individual role of the faculty should be clarified in written narrative.

<i>School or University</i>	
Examples of Achievement	Examples of Documentation ¹
Serves on School or University committees	Letters from chairs or committee members, or files representing involvement
Chairs a School or University committee	Letters from chairs or committee members, or files representing involvement
Attends Faculty and Assembly Meetings regularly	List of dates attended and provides percent of meetings attended.
Volunteers for special assignment	Letters of written documentation
Contributes to Evaluations, self-studies and /or prepares accreditation reports	Self-study reports, graduate or employer follow-up studies, representing involvement
Attends Search Committee Colloquiums on a Regular Basis	Provide letters or evidence of participation.
Contributes to student organizations (advises, presents talks, organizes social activities, etc)	Announcements, brochures, letters, etc.
Recruits new students	Identifies numbers and methods employed
Mentors Colleagues	Letters from protégés
Organizes alumni affairs or is involved in special fund-raising projects	Letters of written documentation
Participates in or develops grants or contracts relevant specifically to service	Copies of grants or contracts
Serves on or attends task groups, conferences, and professional development activities related to the strategic goals of the university (i.e., I2A, Signature Partnership Initiative, community engagement)	Letters of documentation, products, and or summary narrative.

<i>Local, State and National Communities, and the Profession</i>	
Examples of Achievement	Examples of Documentation
Holds office or position of leadership in professional organizations	Announcements, brochures, letters, etc.
Serves on committees in professional organizations or other universities	Announcements, brochures, letters, etc.
Participates in public relations efforts (e.g. Seminars, interviews)	Letters of written documentation
Holds membership on external review boards (governmental agencies, health care facilities)	Announcements, brochures, letters, etc.
Serves as professional consultant (e.g. Community, state, nation, and internationally, in hospitals, schools, clinics etc)	Announcements, brochures, letters, etc.
Participates professionally in community affairs to enhance and engage the community (clubs, civics groups, schools)	Announcements, brochures, letters, etc.

¹ In cases of collaborative or committee work the individual role of the faculty should be clarified in written narrative.

Presents speeches in public relevant to professional activity and community engagement.	Announcements or reviews of talks provided
Appears on television or radio in professional capacity on subjects of benefit to the community.	Verification of appearance
Presents at or organizes cross-disciplinary workshops or courses.	Announcements, brochures, or syllabi
Provides clinical or casework services to help improve the community	Announcements, brochures, or syllabi
Serves professionally as an elected or appointed member of a governmental unit.	Announcements, brochures, letters, etc.

<i>Administrative Service</i>	
Examples of Achievement	Examples of Documentation
Performs program administrative tasks as required in workload agreements or as assigned	Supervisor, faculty, and/or peer evaluation
Administers curriculum sequence (e.g. goals, objectives, learning methods, evaluation methods, schedules)	Supervisor, faculty, and/or peer evaluation
Contributes to self studies and/or prepares accreditation reports	Self-study reports etc.
Provides administrative support for the development of grants or contracts	Copies of grants or contracts
Provides administrative support to promote the strategic goals of the university (i.e., i2A, Signature Partnership Initiative, community engagement)	Copies of products, letters of activity, narrative summaries.

3. Documentation in Scholarly Activity.

Scholarly activity is the act of knowledge creation or integration through the publication or dissemination of original or innovative scholarly work. Evidence of the scholarship of discovery may include copies of publications, professional papers, videotapes, technical reports and/or technical products such as CD's or software. Priority will be given to peer-reviewed work and the documented impact and significance of the scholarship. Research or publications in progress should be submitted and their stage of progress documented¹.

¹ For additional information on the relative weight given to work in progress see *Section 4.2.2.A* in this document.

Scholarly Activity	
Examples of Achievement	Examples of Documentation
Publishes papers (e.g. journal articles, books, chapter(s) of books, literature reviews, internet articles, Technical Reports, case reports, case projects, monographs, proceedings of symposiums ¹) and papers accepted for publication.	Copy of work required and a narrative on peer review process.
Presents papers at professional meetings	Copies of papers, abstracts, or poster presentations are required
Serves as reviewer for professional journals.	Letters
Serves as editor of refereed journal	Journal reference
Participates in or develops grants or contracts	Copies of proposals. Indicate if approved or funded, and level of involvement.
Successfully obtains and manages grants or contracts	Copies of grants, letters from funding sources
Produces creative projects, including instructional projects	Describe or submit copies of relevant material (e.g. papers, videos, computer programs)
Conducts presentations, writes grant, produces video(s), that promote the strategic goals of the university (i.e., i2A, Signature Partnership Initiative, community engagement)	Presentation announcements, copies of grants, letters of recommendation
Conducts academic presentations, writes grants, creates scholarly products that serve to engage and benefit the community.	Presentation announcements, copies of grants, letters of recommendation

C. Pre-tenure, Tenure and Promotion Review Procedures

Notification: The procedure for review of a faculty member who is eligible for pre-tenure evaluation or tenure evaluation is initiated in the Dean's office. The Dean has the responsibility to notify each faculty member and the Personnel Committee that the review is to be conducted. This notification must be made on or before July 1 preceding the fall semester of the year of the review. A faculty member who requests early tenure review has the responsibility of notifying the Dean in writing by June 1. Candidates may request only one evaluation for early tenure. An evaluation for early tenure, once originated, shall proceed unless the candidate requests its withdrawal. In Promotion reviews that do not involve a tenure decision, the candidates must notify the Dean of their interest in being considered for promotion by July 1st of the year they wish to be considered.

Timing of Pre-tenure Review Procedure: All probationary faculty shall receive pre-tenure reviews subject to the following schedule. If there is no prior service to be counted toward tenure, a pre-tenure review shall be conducted in the second half of the third year of service. If the contract specifies 1 year of credit, pre-tenure review would occur in the second half of the second year. In those cases where there are two years of prior service as assistant professor, the pre-tenure review shall be conducted in the second half of the first year of service at the University of Louisville.

If three years of credit are granted then the hiring process will serve as the pre-tenure review.

¹ Not written in order of importance

The pre-tenure review process requires that probationary faculty members demonstrate their progress toward the tenure criteria listed in this document.

The pre-tenure review will be conducted according to the tenure and promotion review process except that external evaluation of scholarly or creative activity shall not be required. Additionally, the pre-tenure review process ends with the presentation of the Personnel Committee's report to the probationary and tenured faculty members. No vote is taken in pre-tenure reviews. The pre-tenure review report is then forwarded to the Dean who meets with the probationary faculty under review for planning and discussion.

Preparation of Materials: The candidate, with the advice of the Chair of the Personnel Committee, shall be responsible for preparation of the evaluation file. The candidate is responsible for preparing and submitting to the Committee the documentation as outlined in the section, *IV.B Performance Documentation for Promotion, Tenure, and Pre-tenure*. The candidate may include other relevant material deemed necessary for completing the file, except that summaries should be substituted for voluminous material. The entire evaluation file, including the list of potential extramural reviewers if required, must be submitted to the Personnel Committee by September 1. The candidate may add newly available material at any time before the file is advanced to the Provost, but any substantive addition may require previous reviewers to reconsider the file.

Steps of Review Process: The candidate should be given copies of the external reviews, with all possibility of the identification of the reviewer removed, once all of the reviews are available or their due date has passed and the process needs to continue. In the case of negative reviews, the candidate is to have a maximum of three calendar days to write a rebuttal to the external reviews prior to the committee meeting to discuss the reports.

The Personnel Committee, or a duly appointed subcommittee of the Personnel Committee, shall conduct a thorough review of all of the materials, including external reviewer reports and faculty surveys, and make a written recommendation regarding promotion and/or tenure

Once the committee review process has been completed, the written opinion of the Personnel Committee shall be presented to the faculty member, the Dean, and the faculty, concurrent with providing those same faculty members access to the submitted materials.

The candidate must be given a maximum of three calendar days to write a rebuttal to the report before the faculty can meet to discuss the report. If a rebuttal of the Personnel Committee's report is submitted to the Dean, it must be distributed to all faculty who will be discussing and taking action on the evaluation. Consistent with the Kent School Bylaws, the tenured and probationary faculty will then meet (without the candidate present) to formally discuss the candidate's qualifications for tenure and promotion, and take action on the committee's recommendation. Term faculty shall not participate in the tenure review of a probationary faculty candidate. However, when the candidate under consideration is a Term Faculty member, the process is expanded to include other Term faculty members. The Personnel Committee's Report is submitted to and then voted on by term, probationary, and tenured faculty members,

The Personnel Committee Chair shall forward the faculty's vote and action to the candidate, and to the Dean of the Kent School of Social Work. This process will be completed based on the Personnel Calendar established by the Provost's office. In the case of a negative recommendation, the candidate will be given a maximum of three calendar days to submit a rebuttal to the Dean before the Dean forms a recommendation to the Provost.

The Dean shall then make a recommendation to the Provost and provide the written recommendation to the candidate based on the Personnel Calendar established by the Provost's office. If performance determination is negative with regard to granting tenure, the Dean may recommend that the contract not be renewed.

The Dean must review each personnel recommendation with the candidate. Candidates shall sign acknowledgements that they have reviewed all the materials and recommendations included in the evaluation file when it is ready to leave the School. If candidates disagree with any recommendation, the candidate has a maximum of three calendar days to add their written rebuttals to the evaluation file. Appeal of any decision will be covered by the policy stated in The Redbook.

The Dean's recommendation, along with the other materials accumulated in the personnel file, shall go forward to the Graduate Dean and then on to the Provost in accordance with the calendar established by the Provost. A copy of the Dean's recommendation to the Provost will be given to the Chair of the Personnel Committee and to the candidate.

D. External Review Procedure

The following External Review Procedures are to be used for all promotion, and tenure decisions for faculty in tenure track positions. It may also be followed on an optional basis for decisions regarding Term faculty¹ or tenure faculty under periodic review.

1. Candidates submit five names, addresses, and emails of external faculty² whom they consider qualified to evaluate submitted materials. The candidate should not discuss the review process with any potential reviewer. The Personnel Committee should initiate first and all contact. The list of names should be submitted concurrently with the submittal of materials.
2. With each name, applicants are asked to give a brief narrative that describes the reviewer's area of expertise and disclose any prior relationship the applicant has had with the reviewer. Applicants must limit their lists of names to individuals who are unbiased, positively or negatively. *Example:* A recognized expert in the field is unacceptable if that person is or has been a collaborator with the applicant on professional work.
3. The Committee will select three individuals from the list submitted and formally request the reviews by letter over the Dean's signature.
4. If for any reason the Committee does not receive names from the faculty member, the Chair of the Committee, in consultation with the Dean, will select the names of reviewers and make the requests for their participation. The candidates retain the right to challenge any evaluator for cause.
5. The Committee is ultimately responsible for selecting the materials to be sent to the reviewers, but the materials should typically include a complete bibliography of works published and in progress, and a representative sample of the candidate's publications (typically three or four pieces). Although the committee has this

¹ The option of using external reviews in decisions regarding Term faculty may be exercised by the Personnel Committee, the candidate or the Dean.

² The names submitted should be tenured faculty at other universities, at or above the rank to which the candidate seeks promotion. Alternate names can be submitted if the candidate feels that they are uniquely qualified to evaluate their materials. The applicant must defend these qualifications to the committee.

responsibility, it is important to involve the candidate in this process and, whenever possible, include materials they consider important. The formal letter sent to the external reviewers should indicate what specifically is requested of them. To acquaint extramural evaluators with the institutional context of the evaluation, the Dean's letter requesting extramural evaluation should enclose a copy of the Extramural Evaluation section of the Minimum Guidelines document, and a list of the school's criteria for granting tenure.

6. The candidate should be given a copy of each external report as it is received. In the case of a negative report, the candidate has three days to write a rebuttal before the Personnel Committee can meet to discuss the External Review.

V. Criteria for Appointment and Promotion in Rank

A. Instructor to Assistant Professor:

Candidates for promotion to assistant professor shall have an earned doctorate and demonstrate proficiency in their assigned duties as specified in their Annual Workload Agreements.

B. Assistant Professor to Associate Professor:

Typically, 5 years of experience at the rank of assistant professor is expected, however, exceptional merit may justify a shorter period. Candidates for promotion to associate professor who are in probationary positions shall demonstrate proficiency in scholarship, teaching and service as measured by the criteria listed in this document, *Section IV.A. Criteria for Tenure*. Candidates for promotion to associate professor in term positions shall demonstrate proficiency in those areas of scholarship, teaching and service required by their Annual Workload Agreements.

C. Associate Professor to Full Professor:

Typically, 5 years of experience at the rank of associate professor is required except where exceptional merit may justify a shorter period. Candidates for promotion to the rank of professor shall demonstrate proficiency in scholarship, teaching and service, as defined by their Annual Workload Agreements. Candidates for the rank of professor should demonstrate how their professional efforts have reached a level of distinction and recognition in their field. Candidates for promotion to full professor in term positions shall demonstrate proficiency in those areas of scholarship, teaching and service required by their Annual Workload Agreements.

VI. Periodic Career Reviews

- A. All faculty shall undergo periodic career review to evaluate their contributions to the University mission.
- B. Tenured faculty members shall undergo career review every five years. If the faculty member has had a recent tenure or successful promotional review, that review shall be considered the required career review, the next review being scheduled five years from the date of that review.
- C. Periodic career review of term faculty shall be part of their renewal process. No additional review is required.
- D. The career review five-year period will begin with the year following attainment of tenure or in the year following attainment of the Full Professorship. When the review period ends in a sabbatical (or other leave) year, the career review shall be deferred until the next academic year. A promotion review shall replace career review for the period in which the promotion occurs. The Dean shall report the results of all such reviews annually to the Provost.
- E. The Personnel Committee has two levels (Basic and Full) of review available for Periodic Career Review. A Basic Review entails a review of the past 5 years of Annual Review Reports. The Annual Review Reports for each faculty member eligible for Periodic Career Review shall be made available to the Personnel Committee as part of Periodic Career Review process in accordance with The Redbook. Faculty members under review will be considered proficient and satisfactory in their career performance if 1) they had not received a Level 0 within the five year time frame, and 2) they received no more than one Level I, and 3) their Level I year was not the year immediately prior to the scheduled Periodic Career Review.
- F. If a faculty member has more than one year in which their Annual Review resulted in a Level I or lower, or if their only Level I fell in the year immediately prior to the scheduled review, then the Personnel Committee will conduct a more detailed review, a Full Review, and will request additional documentation and materials from the faculty member.
- G. The minimum materials requested in a Full Periodic Career Review (*see Appendix B*) are an updated Curriculum Vitae demonstrating evidence of rank-appropriate proficiency in scholarship, teaching, and service, and a letter to the Personnel Committee describing and summarizing the faculty member's work over the past 5 years, their intentions or projections of activities for the next 5 years, and an explanation of how they have responded to past areas of concern. The candidate will select and submit materials that they believe best illustrate their proficient and satisfactory performance. The Personnel Committee may also request additional information and documentation.
- H. External reviews are not required for Periodic Review although the faculty member, the Personnel Committee or the Dean may request them when deemed useful. Such requests should not be routine but based upon the need to provide outside expertise to evaluate or inform a particular question.
- I. Tenured faculty members evaluated by the Personnel Committee as not meeting performance expectations for their rank shall prepare with the Dean a development plan within thirty days. The faculty member then has one year (or longer with the consent of the Dean) to complete the plan. After the completion of the plan, the faculty member has a year

to demonstrate satisfactory performance. At the end of this period, the faculty member shall undergo a second special career review using the same process described for periodic career review. If the faculty member is again evaluated as not meeting performance expectations, the Dean shall take appropriate disciplinary action.

- J. If faculty members believe they have outstanding performance records and that their salaries have not kept pace with this record, they may specifically request the Personnel Committee to conduct Full Reviews of their materials. The Personnel Committee, upon favorable review, may recommend the faculty member to the Dean for a special salary merit increase to reward career demonstrations of professional excellence.
- K. All Redbook rights of due process and appeal for probationary or tenured faculty shall apply in these reviews.

VII. Annual Work Plan and Presence at the University of Louisville

- A. As the Redbook describes, faculty of the Kent School of Social Work are expected to be in residence throughout the academic term except when an approved Annual Workload Agreement provides otherwise. When a faculty member's temporary absence from residency is necessary, and it does not fall under previously described activities in the Annual Workload Agreement (see section 4.3.2 of this document), it is incumbent upon the faculty member to work with the Dean to modify and update the workload agreement.

VIII. Grievance Procedures

- A. All faculty (part time, term, probationary, and tenured) have access to the grievance procedures established and detailed in the University of Louisville's Redbook, under Article 4.4: Resolution of Disagreements

IX. Work Outside the University

- A. Standard Procedure: Full-time faculty of the Kent School of Social Work may carry out professional work outside the University, with or without pay, within the time guidelines stated by the Redbook. All full-time faculty are required to describe their work in the Annual Review Report (or its equivalent approved by the Faculty) and to forecast expected activities for the coming year in their Annual Workload Agreement (or its equivalent approved by the Faculty). The general description of these activities within these documents allow the faculty member to document that 1) the work is appropriate to the faculty member's expertise, 2) the work is consistent with the mission of the University, and 3) the work does not conflict or interfere with the faculty member's schedule of assignments and responsibilities at the University of Louisville.
- B. Additional Procedures: The Kent School's standard procedures are intended to enhance the Dean's knowledge of the faculty member's professional interests and activities without creating a cumbersome permission process that could stifle productive professional activity. However, if a faculty member's Annual Review results in a judgment of unsatisfactory or minimally satisfactory performance (Level 0 or Level I), and the Dean indicates in the written review that the less than satisfactory performance may have been partially due to time spent

on work outside the university, then the Dean may institute an additional more detailed permission process for the faculty member's professional work outside the university. At the Dean's prerogative, this may include a more rigorous individualized monitoring and approval process of any or all of the faculty member's professional work outside the university. The more rigorous approach should be part of an overall plan to assist the faculty member in returning to satisfactory performance.

Appendix A

Term Faculty Promotions: Suggested Format for Materials

Candidates for promotion to associate professor or full professor in term positions shall demonstrate proficiency in those areas of scholarship, teaching and service required by their Annual Workload Agreements.

The following procedure for submittal of materials is the same for all requests for promotion. Only materials relating to activities since coming to the university are to be submitted.¹ In the case of advanced promotion, only materials relating to activities undertaken since the last the promotion decision need to be submitted.

Although the suggestions may seem detailed, they are designed to focus the Committee's review on the faculty member's accomplishments (versus how the materials are presented). Each of the suggestions is meant to solve actual problems that have occurred in past reviews.

- 1) The materials should be organized into separate boxes or containers, representing the different assignments of agreed upon workload. Because workload assignments vary considerably for Term faculty, there is no suggested categorization by the committee.

For example, a faculty member may have workload assignments that include work on two contracts, and a one course teaching assignment. This faculty member would best be served by dividing their materials into three areas, one for each contract and one for the teaching assignment.

Separating the materials by workload assists the committee in dividing up the materials and accomplishing a timely review. It also increases the chance that materials are not mixed up during review.

- 2) Each item or file in each box should be labeled with its contents and be identified with a coding number. The recommended code for teaching is T followed by the number of the document. For instance, the first item in the Teaching container would be T-1, followed by its title or description (i.e. T-1: Courses Taught). This same pattern would then be duplicated in each of the other boxes or containers, however candidates will create their own unique code based on their contract or workload assignment. An example of a unique category might be the faculty member who is responsible for activities under a contract with the Cabinet for Families and Children (CHR). They might use CHR as their designation for all activities on that contract (i.e. CHR-1, CHR-2).
- 3) Each separate box or container should have its own easily recognized **Index of Materials** placed in the front. The organization of the **Index of Materials** will again differ for each area; however, the committee has recommended an organizational scheme for Teaching Activities and it is described below. The purpose of each Index is to guide the reviewers through your materials and explain to committee members what they are viewing. A good Index describes each piece or file and comments on its significance. These descriptive comments can be very short (a couple of lines), but will aid the reviewer tremendously in understanding the importance of the material.
- 4) Some materials can legitimately be considered in more than one category. However, for the purposes of submitting materials they should not be submitted in more than one area. Candidates should place them where they feel they best belong. Candidates should also feel free to check with the Personnel Committee Chair prior to submitting if they would like some advice regarding where to place a given activity.
- 5) **Index of Materials: Teaching Related Activity.** It is recommended that this Index should be organized under the following sub-headings:
 - a) **Courses Taught**

¹ This does not apply to the resume, as it should be career inclusive.

- b) Student Course Evaluations**
 - c) Evaluations from others**
 - d) Unsolicited Student Comments on Teaching / Advising**
 - e) Curriculum Development Projects**
- 6)** Some Term faculty will have activities that go beyond literal contract workload assignments as defined for term faculty. For instance, they may have significant contributions in the Service area or in Research publications. Such a faculty may prefer to present these materials organized in a way similar to the way suggested for tenure faculty requests for promotion. In these situations, the committee suggests the Term faculty member follow the appropriate organizational suggestions for presenting Service and Research materials that is given in Appendix C of this document.

Appendix B

Full Periodic Career Review: Format for Materials

The following guidelines are only to be used when a faculty member has not been reviewed for any other purpose (i.e. promotion or tenure) within the last five years. If it has been five years since the last review and the faculty member is ready for promotion, then they should follow the guidelines elsewhere in this manual for promotion requests. When submitting materials for a Full Level Periodic Review, only materials relating to activities since their last review are to be submitted.¹

The Periodic Review Process is a peer review of a colleague's professional activity. The Personnel Committee views this as a constructive process aimed at supporting and assisting their colleague's continued professional development. As a reminder, this is a confidential process in which the Committee's Review Report goes only to the Dean (versus the whole faculty) to assist the Dean and the faculty member in their joint review.

Because the Periodic Review Process is ongoing and focuses on continued faculty development, the Personnel Committee does not request as much background material in Periodic Reviews. Occasionally additional information may be requested to help clarify and explain the faculty member's accomplishments. These additional requests should not be seen as an indication of problems, they are simply the result of trying to keep the initial submittal of material reasonable.

The Personnel Committee states the following requirements for submittal of materials:

- 1) RESUME: An up-to-date resume.
- 2) COPIES OF ANNUAL REVIEW LETTERS: If the letters have salary information on them, this should be blocked out prior to submitting to the committee.
- 3) PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT LETTER: A letter to the Personnel Committee describing and summarizing the faculty member's work over the past 5 years and their intentions or projections of activities for the next 5 years. This is meant to provide a career context for the committee so they can better understand the professional goals of their colleague. Utilizing sub-headings as indicated below, this letter should comment on contributions in Teaching, Service, and Research.
 - a) Suggested Outline of Letter
 - i) Overview of the Past Five Years
 - ii) Discussion of Teaching Activities
 - iii) Discussion of Service Activities
 - iv) Discussion of Research Activities
 - v) Plans for the Next Five Years
 - b) Referencing Backup Materials in the Letter
 - i) When discussing in the letter a particular activity for which the faculty member has provided materials, the Committee requests the insertion of a reference code at that point in the letter. The code can follow the same one suggested elsewhere in this manual, i.e. (T) for teaching, (S) for service, and (R) for research, all followed by the number and title of the appropriate file.

Example: *"For the past three years, I have tried to focus improvement on my teaching and*

¹ This does not apply to the resume, which should be career inclusive.

student advising. Although I have always maintained this area, the time I spent on sabbatical rekindled my interest in the mentoring aspects of our profession. I have been pleased with the results of this refocusing and have heard from students that they too have benefited (see T-3: Unsolicited Student Comments on Teaching). I feel particularly good about this given the increased time I have had to put into the curriculum revisions (see T-4: Curriculum Development Projects)."

- 4) **BACKUP MATERIALS:** The materials should be organized into three separate areas. One area for Teaching materials, one for Service related material, and one for Research materials (scholarly activity). Each item or file in each area should be labeled with its contents and be identified with a coding number. In Periodic Reviews, the Professional Development Letter serves the same function as an index of materials and therefore another index with the materials is not suggested.

Reminder: The committee does not expect faculty to submit the extensive materials common to tenure or promotion activities. Faculty members should submit items in each area that assist the committee in understanding their work.

- 5) **EXTERNAL REVIEWS:** External reviews are **not** required for Periodic Review although the faculty member, the Personnel Committee or the Dean may request them when deemed useful. Such requests should not be routine but based upon the need to provide outside expertise to evaluate or inform a particular question.

Appendix C

Promotion, Tenure, and Pre-tenure: Format for Materials

The following procedure for submittal of materials is the same for Promotion, Tenure or Pre-tenure. In the case of Tenure and Pre-tenure, only materials relating to activities since coming to the university are to be submitted. The exception to this rule is when a faculty member was granted a certain number of years of credit accumulated at another university. This should be explained in the candidates Overview Statement to the Committee. This does not apply to the curriculum vitae, as it should be career inclusive. In the case of promotion of tenured faculty, only materials relating to activities undertaken since the last the personnel decision should be submitted.

Although the suggestions may seem detailed, they are designed to focus the Committee's review on the faculty member's accomplishments (versus how the materials are presented). Each of the suggestions is meant to solve actual problems that have occurred in past reviews.

The Personnel Committee states the following requirements for submittal of materials:

- 1) RESUME: An up-to-date resume.
- 2) COPIES OF ANNUAL REVIEW LETTERS: If the letters have salary information on them, this should be blocked out prior to submitting to the committee.
- 3) PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT LETTER: A letter to the Personnel Committee describing and summarizing the faculty member's work over the past 5 years and their intentions or projections of activities for the next 5 years. This is meant to provide a career context for the committee so they can better understand the professional goals of their colleague. Utilizing sub-headings as indicated below, this letter should comment on contributions in Teaching, Service, and Research.
 - a) Required Outline of Letter
 - i) Overview of the Past Five Years
 - ii) Discussion of Teaching Activities
 - iii) Discussion of Service Activities
 - iv) Discussion of Research Activities
 - v) Plans for the Next Five Years
- 4) NOTE: The candidate has two options for submitting their materials. They may submit hard copies per the suggested guidelines that follow, or they may submit their materials electronically. If submitted electronically, the candidate should arrange their files and directories in a manner consistent with the suggested outline for the submittal of hard copy materials that follows. Formats should be PDF or Microsoft Office based.
- 5) The documentation materials should be organized into a minimum of three separate boxes or containers. One container for Service related material, one for Teaching materials, and one for Research materials (scholarly activity). This assists the committee in dividing up the materials and accomplishing a timely review. It also increases the chance that materials are not mixed up during review.
- 6) Each item or file in each box should be labeled with its contents and be identified with a coding number. The recommended coding is S for service, T for teaching, and R for research (scholarly activity). For instance, the first item in the Service container would be S-1 followed by its title or description (S-1: Kent

School Committee Assignments). This same pattern would then be duplicated in each of the other two boxes or containers (i.e. T-1, or R-1, R-2 etc.).

- 7) Each separate box or container should have its own easily recognized **Index of Materials** placed in the front. The recommended organization of the **Index of Materials** differs for each area and is described below (Number 9). The purpose of this Index is to guide the reviewers through your materials and explain to them what they are viewing. A good Index describes each piece or file and comments on its significance. These description/ comments can be very short (a couple of lines) but will aid the reviewer tremendously in understanding the importance of the material.
- 8) Some materials can legitimately be considered in more than one category. However, for the purposes of submitting materials they should not be submitted in more than one area. Candidates should place them where they feel they best belongs. It should be noted however, that in certain situations the Committee has considered material submitted in one area as documentation in another. This has always been done to strengthen a candidate in an area that the committee considered in need of extra activity. The candidate should also feel free to check with the Personnel Committee Chair prior to submitting if they would like some advice regarding where to place a given activity. The categories that follow should only be viewed as a suggested method of organization, not a list of required or expected materials. Likewise, the candidate is welcome to create additional categories, as they deem necessary to organize their work.
- 9) **Index of Materials: Service Related Activity.** It is recommended that this Index should be organized under the following sub-headings:
 - a) Service to the Kent School
 - b) Service to the University
 - c) Service to the Community
 - d) Service to the Profession
- 10) **Index of Materials: Teaching Related Activity.** It is recommended that this Index should be organized under the following sub-headings:
 - a) Courses Taught
 - b) Student Course Evaluations
 - c) Unsolicited Student Comments on Teaching / Advising
 - d) Unsolicited Comments from other on Teaching / Advising
 - e) Curriculum Development Projects
- 11) **Index of Materials: Research Related Activity.** It is recommended that this Index should be organized under the following sub-headings:
 - a) **Journal Articles**
 - (1) Articles published in refereed journals
 - (2) Articles published in non-referred formats
 - (3) Articles accepted but not yet in print
 - (4) Articles written or submitted but not yet accepted
 - b) **Books and Book Chapters**
 - (1) Books published
 - (2) Books under contract but not yet in print¹
 - (3) Book chapter(s) published
 - (4) Book chapter(s) under contract but not yet in print ¹
 - (5) Books or chapters in some other stage of progress

¹ Include contract correspondence.

- c) **Book Reviews**
 - (1) Book reviews published
 - (2) Book reviews invited but not yet in print

- d) **Professional Presentations**
 - (1) Peer reviewed state or regional presentations¹
 - (2) Peer reviewed national presentations

- e) **Grants and Contracts**
 - (1) Grants or contracts received
 - (2) Grants or contracts pending

- f) **Other forms of Scholarly Activity (project evaluation reports, training manuals, conference publications, etc.)**
 - (1) Completed activities
 - (2) Activities in progress

APPROVED BY KENT SCHOOL FACULTY:	March 22, 2006
APPROVED BY FACULTY SENATE:	December 1, 2010
APPROVED BY BOARD OF TRUSTEES:	February 8, 2011

¹ Workshops or “talks” given to public or private entities usually is seen as a service contribution to the community, and therefore should be listed under Service.