

MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE PERSONNEL COMMITTEE OF THE
UNIVERSITY OF LOUISVILLE BOARD OF TRUSTEES

January 13, 2011

In Open Session

Members of the Personnel Committee of the University of Louisville Board of Trustees met on Thursday, January 13, 2011, at 2:49 p.m., in the Jefferson Room of Grawemeyer Hall, Belknap Campus, with members present and absent as follows:

Present Ms. Debbie Scoppechio, Chair
 Mr. Brent Fryrear
 Ms. Marie Abrams
 Dr. Kevin Cosby
 Dr. Mark Lynn
 Mr. Frank Minnifield
 Dr. Robert Staat

Other Trustees

Present: Ms. Sana Abhari
 Mr. Ron Butt
 Mr. Owsley B. Frazier
 Dr. Salem George
 Dr. Robert Curtis Hughes
 Judge Rebecca Jackson
 Ms. Augusta Brown Holland
 Ms. Brucie Moore
 Mr. Robert W. Rounsavall, III
 Dr. William Selvidge
 Ms. Phoebe Wood

From the
University:

Dr. James R. Ramsey, President
Dr. Shirley Willihnganz, Executive Vice President and Provost
Dr. William Pierce, Interim Executive Vice President for Research
Ms. Angela D. Koshewa, University Counsel
Mr. Mike Curtin, Vice President for Finance
Mr. Keith Inman, Vice President for University Advancement
Mr. Dan Hall, Vice President for Community Engagement
Mr. Larry Owsley, Vice President for Business Affairs
Mr. Sam Connally, VP for Human Resources
Ms. Susan Howarth, Director of Budgets
Ms. Terri Rutledge, Associate VP for Business Affairs
Mr. Jason Tomlinson, Associate VP for Finance

Ms. Anne Rademaker, Director of Financial Reporting and
University Accounting
Mr. John Drees, Associate VP for University Advancement
Mr. Mark Hebert, Director, Media Relations
Ms. Carolyn Cochran, Assistant to the Provost
Mrs. Kathleen Smith, Assistant Secretary
Ms. Trisha Smith, Director of Special Programs
Ms. Debbie Dougherty, Board Liaison

I. Call to Order

Having determined a quorum present, Chair Scoppechio called the meeting to order at 2:49 p.m.

Minutes Approved

Mr. Minnifield made a motion, which Dr. Lynn seconded, to approve the minutes of November 11, 2010. The motion passed.

II. Action Item: Approval of Temporary Medical Benefits Program

Provost Willihnganz reported this action would align salary and benefit protections available to faculty, Board-appointed administrators, and staff employees that vary based on employment status. Providing up to three months of continuing health benefits for regular staff employees (after Family & Medical Leave and Catastrophic Shared Leave are exhausted, if applicable) will promote equity in the level of support provided to staff employees who become disabled while in active service to the University and support the University's Great Places to Work initiative. Mr. Fryrear made a motion, which Ms. Abrams seconded, to approve the

President's recommendation that the Temporary Medical Disability Program be revised to provide up to three months of continuing health benefits for staff employees who become disabled after completing 12 months of continuous service.

The motion passed.

II. Action Item: Approval of Changes to Personnel Documents in the Kent School of Social Work and Speed School of Engineering

Provost Willihnganz summarized the recommended changes to the personnel documents in the Kent School of Social Work and the Speed School of Engineering. Ms. Abrams made a motion, which Mr. Fryrear seconded, to approve the

President's recommendation that the Board of Trustees

approve the revised Kent School personnel document in the form attached, to be effective immediately; and

approve the revised Speed School personnel document in the form attached, to be effective immediately.

The motion passed.

IV. Executive Session

Mr. Fryrear made a motion, which Mr. Minnfield seconded, to go into executive session at 2:50 p.m. The motion passed.

V. Open Session Reconvened

The open session reconvened at 3:00 p.m. Chair Scoppechio reported that the Committee discussed personnel matters in executive session. Dr. Lynn made a motion, which Ms. Abrams seconded, to approve the

President's recommendation that the following personnel recommendations be approved by the Board of Trustees.

COLLEGE OF ARTS AND SCIENCES

Wendy E. Pfeffer, Ph.D., Professor of Classical and Modern Languages; promotion from Assistant Dean to Associate Dean of Graduate Education, July 1, 2011. The appointment as Associate Dean is at the pleasure of the Board of Trustees.

SCHOOL OF MEDICINE

Mostafa Fraig, M.D., Professor of Pathology and Laboratory Medicine (Term) and Professor of Medicine (Pulmonary, Critical Care, and Sleep Disorders Medicine) (Term); additional appointment as the William M. Christopherson Endowed Chair in Oncologic Pathology, March 1, 2011.

ADMINISTRATION

Donald G. Rizzo, M.S., Bradley University; Associate Vice President for Development, February 8, 2011. The appointment as Associate Vice President is at the pleasure of the Board of Trustees.

The motion passed.

Five Year Review, Dean, College of Business

Ms. Abrams made a motion, which Mr. Minnifield seconded, to approve the

President's recommendation that the Board of Trustees approve the continuation of Dr. R. Charles Moyer as Dean of the College of Business.

The motion passed.

VI. Adjournment

Dr. Staat made a motion, which Mr. Minnifield seconded, to adjourn the meeting at 3:05 p.m. The motion passed.

MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE PERSONNEL COMMITTEE OF THE
UNIVERSITY OF LOUISVILLE BOARD OF TRUSTEES

January 13, 2011

In Executive Session

Present Ms. Debbie Scoppechio, Chair
Mr. Brent Fryrear
Ms. Marie Abrams
Dr. Kevin Cosby
Dr. Mark Lynn
Mr. Frank Minnifield
Dr. Robert Staat

Other Trustees

Present: Ms. Sana Abhari
Mr. Ron Butt
Mr. Owsley B. Frazier
Dr. Salem George
Dr. Robert Curtis Hughes
Judge Rebecca Jackson
Ms. Augusta Brown Holland
Ms. Brucie Moore
Mr. Robert W. Rounsavall, III
Dr. William Selvidge
Ms. Phoebe Wood

From the
University:

Dr. James R. Ramsey, President
Dr. Shirley Willihnganz, Executive Vice President and Provost
Dr. William Pierce, Interim Exec. Vice President for Research & Innovation
Ms. Angela D. Koshewa, University Counsel
Mr. Mike Curtin, Vice President for Finance
Mr. Keith Inman, Vice President for University Advancement
Mr. Dan Hall, Vice President for Community Engagement
Mr. Larry Owsley, Vice President for Business Affairs
Dr. Sam Connally, VP for Human Resources
Ms. Carolyn Cochran, Assistant to the Provost
Mrs. Kathleen Smith, Assistant Secretary
Ms. Trisha Smith, Director of Special Programs
Ms. Debbie Dougherty, Board Liaison

I. Call to Order

Chair Scoppechio called the executive session to order at 2:52 p.m.

II. Personnel Matters

Monthly Personnel Recommendations

Provost Willihnganz briefed the Committee on personnel recommendations.


Continuation of Dean Charles Moyer, College of Business

Provost Willihnganz briefed the Committee on the five-year review and recommendation to continue Dean Moyer in the College of Business.

III. Adjournment

The executive session adjourned at 3:00 p.m.

Approved



Asst. Secretary

Speed School of Engineering Personnel Document
Approved by Faculty Senate
April 6, 2005

April 22, 2005

New Date 2008 ~~11 November 2004~~

PERSONNEL POLICY AND PROCEDURES

J.B. Speed School of Engineering

*****NOTE: Table of contents formatting and page numbering will be correct when mark-ups/changes are accepted in MS Word *** [REVISED 10-26-2010]**

Formatted: Font: Bold, Italic
Formatted: Font: Bold, Italic
Formatted: Font: Bold, Italic

Table of Contents

Article 1. Faculty Appointments and Tenure 1
Section 1.1 Types of Appointments 1
Section 1.2 Non-Tenurable Appointments 1
 A. Temporary Appointments 1
 B. Part-time Faculty 1
 C. Term Faculty 1
Section 1.3 Probationary Appointments 1
 A. Assistant Professor 1
 B. Associate Professor 2
 C. Professors 2
Section 1.4 Tenure Appointments 2
Section 1.5 Criteria for Graduate Faculty Membership 2
 A. Member of Graduate Faculty 3
 B. Roles and Responsibilities 3
 C. Nomination Process 4

Article 2. Faculty Personnel Reviews
42 General Criteria
42 Section 2.1 Annual Reviews (PBSI)
64 Section 2.2 Criteria for Tenure
75

~~A. Special Faculty 6~~
 ~~1. Graphics Faculty 6~~
 ~~2. Cooperative Education Faculty 6~~
 ~~3. Term Appointed Faculty 6~~
 AB. Pre-tenure reviews 87
 BC. Evaluation for tenure 87

Formatted: Tab stops: Not at 1.49"
Formatted: Tab stops: Not at 1.5"
Formatted: Tab stops: Not at 1.49"

	<u>CD</u>. Proficiency for tenure
<u>98</u>		
	Section 2.3 Criteria for Promotion in Rank
<u>109</u>		
	Section 2.4 Periodic Career Review
<u>119</u>		
	A. Faculty with Tenure Contract Review
<u>110</u>		
	B. Periodic Career Review: Stage 1
<u>120</u>		
	C. Periodic Career Review: Stage 2a
<u>134</u>		
	D. Periodic Career Review: Stage 2b
<u>142</u>		
	<u>E. Periodic Review of Graduate Faculty Status</u>	<u>15</u>
	Section 2.5 Procedures for Promotion and Tenure
<u>153</u>		
	A. Overview
	<u>153</u>	
	B. Support Data for Recommendations
	<u>164</u>	
	C. Responsibilities and Authority
	<u>165</u>	
	D. Schedule for Promotion and Tenure
	<u>186</u>	
	Article 3. Conditions of Faculty Employment
<u>198</u>		
	Section 3.1 Annual Work Plan
<u>2048</u>		
	Section 3.2 Compensation
<u>220</u>		
	Article 4. Amendments
<u>234</u>		
	Appendix
<u>242</u>		

Article 1. Faculty Appointments and Tenure

Section 1.1 Types of Appointments

Faculty appointments are "Full-time", "Part-time", "Emeritus", or "Other", as described in The Redbook, Section 4.1.1.

Section 1.2 Non-Tenable Appointments

A. Temporary Appointments

Temporary appointments to the various academic ranks may be made for specifically limited time periods less than one year or for special purposes. In no case shall temporary appointments or renewals result in the acquisition of tenure. Temporary appointees shall not be eligible for tenure or count toward time for acquisition of tenure, regardless of assignment or seniority.

B. Part-time Faculty

Faculty members holding part-time appointments in the J.B. Speed School of Engineering shall not be eligible for acquisition of tenure as long as they have part-time appointments.

C. Term Faculty

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 shall meet the standards for probationary appointment to the designated rank and shall participate in annual and career reviews for faculty of the J.B. Speed School of Engineering. Term faculty may apply for promotion in rank according to the criteria of the J.B. Speed School of Engineering. Term faculty appointments may be renewed ~~if the Dean determines that the services of the incumbent are needed for the renewal term by recommendation to the President or President's designee by the Dean, upon initiation of the department chair after recommendation by the department faculty or faculty committee~~. Faculty on term appointments shall be eligible to transfer to probationary appointments.

Section 1.3 Probationary Appointments

Probationary appointments shall be appointments of full-time faculty members without tenure, provided, however, that no probationary appointment to the J.B. Speed School of Engineering shall extend beyond the period when tenure is normally granted.

A. Assistant Professor

Probationary appointments to the rank of Assistant Professor shall be for stipulated terms not to exceed two years on the initial appointment, nor three years for appointments made thereafter. In

Field Code Changed

Field Code Changed

Field Code Changed

Field Code Changed

Field Code Changed

Field Code Changed

Field Code Changed

Field Code Changed

normal circumstances, persons appointed as Assistant Professors shall hold the recognized terminal degree in their field of specialization, or shall present evidence of having completed a body of research, scholarship or other creative activity equivalent in scope and quality to the similar component of such degree. They shall, in any event, give promise of proficiency in all areas of activity listed in Article 2.

B. Associate Professor

Probationary appointments to the rank of Associate Professor shall be for stipulated terms not to exceed two years on the initial appointment, nor three years for appointments made thereafter. In normal circumstances, persons appointed as Associate Professors shall hold the recognized terminal degree in their field of specialization, or shall present evidence of having completed a body of research or other creative activity equivalent in scope and quality to the similar component of such degree. Additional criteria for appointment (or promotion) to Associate Professor can be found in Section 2.3.

C. Professors

In normal circumstances, persons appointed or promoted to the rank of Professor shall hold the recognized terminal degree in their field of specialization, or shall present evidence of having demonstrated a level of research and/or service equivalent in scope and quality to the similar component of such degree. Professors shall be awarded tenure if employed subsequent to the initial probationary period. Additional criteria for appointment (or promotion) to Professor can be found in Section 2.3.

Section 1.4 Tenure Appointments

All personnel who have acquired tenure are subject to the criteria herein regarding tenure (Section 2.2) and the provisions governing termination only in their capacities as faculty members.

Section 1.5 Criteria for Graduate Faculty Membership

Graduate Faculty Membership may be awarded to any tenured or tenure-track faculty. A Member of the Graduate Faculty will be authorized to teach graduate courses and serve on thesis and dissertation committees as an advisor or chair (mentor).

Ad hoc appointments to the Graduate Faculty of the J.B. Speed School of Engineering can be granted to Speed School faculty without tenure or tenure-track appointments, faculty from other schools and colleges at the University of Louisville or other external institutions including, but not limited to, universities, national laboratories or commercial enterprises. An Ad hoc appointment is for a specified time period (typically 1-3 years) or for a specified purpose (e.g., service on a doctoral committee until submission of the dissertation).

All Graduate Faculty appointments require submission of an application, a current C.V., and a letter supporting the nomination from the Departmental Chair to the Associate Dean of Academic Affairs. *Ad hoc* appointments are granted by the Associate Dean of Academic Affairs upon request from the Departmental Chair.

All Graduate Faculty appointments terminate upon resignation or retirement unless the Department informs the ~~Graduate School~~ Associate Dean for Academic Affairs in writing that the faculty member is assuming Emeritus status. Emeritus Graduate Faculty retain their graduate faculty privileges.

A. Member of the Graduate Faculty

Qualification for membership in the graduate faculty shall be based upon the following fundamental consideration: the ability to convey knowledge at the graduate level as evidenced by the prospective member's professional academic training, or demonstrated past teaching performance, and continuing creative and/or integrative accomplishments in a recognized academic or professional area. Evidence of these qualifications will vary with discipline. Ordinarily, a prospective member of the graduate faculty will hold the terminal degree in his or her field. Holding the degree, however, will not be the sole evidence of creative/scholarly ability. Moreover, persons who have not earned the terminal degree in their fields but who have proven scholarly capabilities in other ways may be eligible for Member of the Graduate Faculty standing.

All current members of the Graduate Faculty at the time of implementation will be designated as Graduate Faculty.

A.2. Membership By Virtue of Position

Appointments to the following positions in the University shall include an appointment as Member of the Graduate Faculty:

- a) President, Executive Vice President and University Provost, Executive Vice President for Health Affairs, and Executive Vice President for Research.
- b) Dean of the J.B. Speed School of Engineering

B. Roles and Responsibilities

The Graduate Faculty of the J.B. Speed School of Engineering will be responsible for the teaching, training, and mentoring of graduate students and postdoctoral students within the Speed School. Membership in the Graduate Faculty shall be required to teach a course for which graduate credit is available and will be required to serve on a graduate student's thesis or dissertation committee in either an advisory or chairmanship capacity. The Graduate Faculty of other units may serve as external members of the committees. Additionally, membership in the Graduate Faculty will be required to act as mentors for the supervision of research by students working toward degrees authorized through the Graduate Program within the J.B. Speed School

Formatted: Font: Not Bold

Formatted: Font: Not Bold

Formatted: Font: Not Bold

Formatted: Font: Not Bold

Formatted: Font: (Default) Times New Roman, 12 pt

Formatted: Font: (Default) Times New Roman, 12 pt

Formatted: Font: (Default) Times New Roman, 12 pt

Formatted: Font: (Default) Times New Roman, 12 pt

Formatted: Font: (Default) Times New Roman, 12 pt

Formatted: Font: (Default) Times New Roman, 12 pt

Formatted: Font: (Default) Times New Roman, 12 pt

Formatted: Font: (Default) Times New Roman, 12 pt

Formatted: Left

Formatted: Font: (Default) Times New Roman, 12 pt

Formatted: Font: (Default) Times New Roman, 12 pt

~~of Engineering. The Graduate Faculty of the J.B. Speed School of Engineering will be responsible for the teaching, training, and mentoring of graduate students and postdoctoral students within the Speed School. Membership in the Graduate Faculty shall be required to teach a course for which graduate credit is available and will be required to serve on a graduate student's thesis or dissertation committee in either an advisory or chairmanship capacity. Additionally, membership in the Graduate Faculty will be required to act as mentors for the supervision of research by students working toward degrees authorized through the Graduate Program within the J.B. Speed School of Engineering.~~

Members of the Graduate Faculty with an *Ad hoc* appointment can be approved by the Associate Dean of Academic Affairs to teach a graduate course or serve as an advisor or chair (mentor) on a graduate thesis or dissertation committee for a limited and specified period of time upon request from the Departmental Chair.

C. Nomination Process

Membership in the Graduate Faculty will be by nomination from the department. The Department Chair shall send a letter of recommendation with the formal application and professional curriculum vitae of the prospective Graduate Faculty Member to the Associate Dean of Academic Affairs. The formal application will be provided during the orientation process for new faculty members. After reviewing the vitae and recommendation, the Associate Dean of Academic Affairs shall approve appointment to the Graduate Faculty.

Formatted: Font: Not Bold

Article 2. Faculty Personnel Reviews

General Criteria

The Redbook document requires unit documents to classify faculty activities into the areas of teaching, research and creative activity, and service. This classification is vital since a null performance in an area can result in a denial of tenure. However, there are sure to be activities omitted from any list, no matter how lengthy.

Criteria for promotion and tenure in J.B. Speed School of Engineering are based on, but not limited to, the following areas (The Redbook, 4.2.2.F and 4.2.3.A, respectively):

- Teaching;
- Research or creative activity;
- Service to the profession, the unit, the University or the community;

Field Code Changed

Field Code Changed

Field Code Changed

Field Code Changed

Field Code Changed

Field Code Changed

Field Code Changed

Field Code Changed

- ~~Collaboration with colleagues and rapport with students;~~
- ~~Adherence to professional standards.~~

In addition to the above university criteria, the J.B. Speed School of Engineering will also consider:

- Level of the highest degree, appropriate to job function,
- Registration/Licensure as a Professional Engineer or other forms of certification where appropriate,
- Overall professional development, including education and experience prior to University employment, and subsequent efforts to maintain and advance professional competency, and,
- University leadership capability and experience.

A positive record in these areas should strengthen a candidate's case for promotion or tenure.

The areas of teaching, research and creative activity, and service form a continuum of scholarship, which dynamically interact to form an interdependent whole. In this regard, if a department has duly established guidelines for evaluating its faculty, then all evaluations of these faculty shall take those guidelines into account.

Additionally, The individual may propose a classification for any activity, subject to a ruling of the J.B. Speed School of Engineering Promotion and Tenure (PAT) Committee. Generally, it is the intent of the J.B. Speed School of Engineering that classifications be flexible according to the wishes of the candidate. Activities which are ambiguous may be classified into any area, or distributed among areas, as desired by the candidate as long as the PAT Committee agrees that the classification is reasonable. Some examples are:

- Advising and counseling of students (Teaching/Service)
- Development of course or laboratory materials including textbooks (Teaching/Research and Creative Activity)
- Supervision of student research and/or design activities (Teaching/Research and Creative Activity)
- Supervision of Teaching Assistants (Teaching/Service)

- Industrial consulting or sponsored research (Research and Creative Activity/Service)
- A presentation before a national, state or local group (Teaching/ Research and Creative Activity/Service)
- A paper on education methodology (Teaching/Research and Creative Activity/Service)
- Professional society activity (Service).

Most forms of administration and committee work will be classified as service. All forms of teaching and research and creative activity will be acceptable for review. Reviewers will evaluate their quality and relevance in their recommendations.

Section 2.1 Annual Reviews

Each full-time and term faculty member shall be reviewed annually, and the annual reviews shall become part of the record for periodic career reviews as well as tenure and promotion files.

By January 31, faculty members will submit an annual work report to describe their efforts for the previous year to the department chair, ~~or appropriate non departmental faculty administrator (henceforth referred to as the reporting official)~~. All faculty activity during the year, including proposals prepared but not yet funded and papers written and submitted but not yet accepted for publication, should be included. Also included should be annual work plans and information relevant to quality of instruction for the review period. It is the faculty member's responsibility to attach supplemental information, which becomes part of this report, to assist the ~~reporting official~~ department chair in evaluating these activities.

After receiving the faculty activity reports, the ~~reporting official~~ department chair shall evaluate each faculty member's performance for the period. This evaluation will be based on the annual work report and merit, including contributions to the missions of the department, the J.B. Speed School of Engineering and the University. ~~The reporting official~~ department chair will make every effort to ensure uniform and professional standards in assessing the submitted documentation. Annual performance reviews will be based on a 1 to 6 rating scale system that defines performance as "not proficient (rating of 1 or 2)", "proficient (rating of 3 or 4)", or "exceptional (a rating of 5 or 6)". Overall annual performance reviews will be rated as "not proficient" (a rating of less than 3), "proficient" (a rating of 3 to less than 5) and "exceptional" (a rating of greater than or equal to 5). The ~~reporting official~~ department chair will also prepare a cover letter to the Dean.

Performance ratings of "not proficient" or "exceptional" must be explained in the cover letter, and performance ratings of "proficient" require no justification. If appropriate, the ~~reporting~~

~~official~~~~department chair~~ should acknowledge extraordinary effort and suggest improvements. When the annual review identifies weaknesses and/or deficiencies, the ~~reporting official~~~~department chair~~'s summary must include specific recommendations for improvement or for possible adjustments in workload concentration.

Each faculty member will meet with the ~~reporting official~~~~department chair~~ to discuss the evaluation. These meetings will be held by April 1. In the event a faculty member is dissatisfied with his/her evaluation, then the process is for the faculty member to attach a letter of rebuttal concerning the evaluation.

~~If requested by a faculty member, When all evaluations, meetings, and relevant letters have been complete~~ the ~~reporting official~~~~department chair~~ will forward ~~all evaluations, meetings, and relevant letters~~~~them~~, along with the annual work reports, to the departmental Faculty Activity Committee, ~~a committee appointed in each department as defined in Article 3~~. This Committee will look for serious disparities in evaluations and examine letters of rebuttal, and will discuss its findings with the ~~reporting official~~~~department chair~~ within two weeks of receipt of the materials. If concerns remain after this discussion, the committee and ~~reporting official~~~~department chair~~ will write separate letters to the Dean, who shall assist in resolving the committee's concerns before receiving the evaluations. Whatever the Committee's concerns and whatever their state of resolution when presented, the Dean has disposition authority for the matters under discussion.

The ~~reporting official~~~~department chair~~'s evaluations along with the annual work reports, relevant letters, and a summary report will be sent to the Dean, with appropriate copies to each faculty member, by May 1.

~~If requested by a faculty member, a~~ committee consisting of the non-student members of the Administrative Plans and Policies Committee and chaired by the Dean ~~shall will~~ review the performance evaluations for school-wide consistency. Evaluations of some ~~reporting official~~~~department chairs~~ may require adjustment to achieve this consistency.

The performance of ~~reporting official~~~~department chairs~~ will be evaluated as described above, but with the following differences:

The Dean will play the role of the ~~reporting official~~~~department chair~~.

~~Reporting official~~~~Department chairs~~' workloads and evaluations for a given year will center on the accomplishments of their administrative unit's mission and goals for the year. An annual faculty review of the ~~reporting official~~~~department chair~~ will be used as part of the evaluation.

Disagreements between the Dean and a ~~reporting official~~department chair regarding the ~~reporting official~~department chair's workload or evaluation will be resolved by the University Provost, if necessary.

Section 2.2 Criteria for Tenure

In normal circumstances, tenure shall be recommended for persons promoted to the rank of Associate Professor or Professor who already hold academic appointment in the J.B. Speed School of Engineering at the time of promotion. Tenure may be recommended for persons whose initial appointment is at the rank of Associate Professor or Professor.

In normal circumstances, persons recommended for tenure shall hold the recognized terminal degree in their fields of specialization, or shall present evidence of having completed a body of research or other creative activity equivalent in scope and quality to the similar component of such degree. They shall meet the same General Criteria as well as the specific criteria for those appointed as Associate Professor or Professor, depending upon their initial appointments. All waivers or accords about credit toward tenure shall be stipulated in the Provost's letter of appointment.

A. Special Faculty

~~Individual criteria for a particular position may be prepared in letter form by the Dean of the J.B. Speed School of Engineering. To provide faculty input, the letter requires the approval of the PAT Committee. A letter from the individual accepting the terms is required. These letters will not form a part of this document, but will be maintained in the files of the Office of the Dean and the PAT Committee. Individual criteria must meet The Redbook and Minimum Guidelines document standards.~~

~~1. Graphics Faculty.~~

~~The following different criteria will be utilized for evaluating Graphics Faculty in recognition of their different objectives and educational preparation. The Master's degree is the terminal degree in accordance with Accreditation Board For Engineering and Technology (ABET) criteria. Other criteria will remain the same.~~

~~Performance in teaching is rated as the highest priority for evaluation, since good teaching is recognized as the principal objective for the Graphics Faculty. Hence, service and research and creative activity should be oriented to further this objective.~~

~~2. Cooperative Education Faculty~~

~~The following criteria will be utilized for evaluation of Cooperative Education Faculty in recognition of their different objectives and educational preparation.~~

~~— The Master's degree is the terminal degree for this category.~~

~~— Performance in service is rated as the highest priority for evaluation, and is recognized as the principal objective for the Cooperative Education Faculty. Hence, teaching, research and creative activity should be oriented to further this objective. Other criteria will remain the same.~~

~~3. Term Appointed Faculty~~

As cited in The Redbook (Sections 3.3.1 and 4.1.2.B) term appointed faculty positions are not eligible for tenure. Term appointed faculty shall meet the standards for probationary appointment to the designated rank and shall participate in annual and career reviews for the faculty of J.B. Speed School of Engineering. Further, term appointed faculty may apply for promotion in rank according to the criteria of Section 2.3 of this document.

AB. Pre-tenure reviews

Pre-tenure review is a procedure whose purpose is to determine whether or not a faculty member is making satisfactory progress toward achieving tenure. A positive pre-tenure review is not a promise of an eventual tenure grant.

A pre-tenure review will take place at the mid-point of a faculty member's probationary period. No later than October 1 of the academic year in which the review is to take place, the ~~reporting official~~department chair shall inform the faculty member, in writing, that the review is to take place. The ~~reporting official~~department chair is responsible for the review. All such correspondence shall become a part of the faculty member's documentation. In the event that an individual's career pattern does not fit the normal progression (i.e., the case of an individual coming to the University with three or more years of credit toward tenure) that case shall be treated on its own merits, determining whether or not the hiring process constituted a pre-tenure review.

The standard for a positive pre-tenure review shall be a determination that continuation of activity, as documented, is expected to fulfill the stated tenure criteria. In the event that the departmental evaluation is negative, the written evaluation must include recommendations to the faculty member for changing the situation documented in the course of the review.

Pre-tenure review shall involve an examination of activity in the areas outlined in "General Criteria": Standards of judgment for the areas of activity shall be the same as those outlined in Section 2.3, and in departmental statements of criteria for tenure. For the purpose of pre-tenure review, extramural review is optional. This option may be exercised by either the faculty member or the departmental personnel committee. The record compiled for pre-tenure review shall be maintained intact as part of the evidence to be considered in tenure review.

BC. Evaluation for tenure

Each faculty member eligible for tenure must be evaluated within twelve months after five years of service applied to tenure. (This process is described in The Redbook, 4.2.2.H.) Completion of the probationary period with positive annual performance evaluations and pre-tenure review shall not in and of itself constitute sufficient grounds for tenure. Faculty members on probationary status shall be affected by any amendments to or changes in the criteria for tenure subsequent to their appointment. In such evaluations, appropriate consideration will be given to the amount of time remaining in their probationary period when the change becomes effective.

If the recommendation of the University Provost, the Dean, or the chair of the department is negative the faculty member may request a hearing before the University Faculty Grievance Committee. Any such request must be delivered on or before the tenth working day following the action challenged.

CD. Proficiency for tenure

Possible methods for evaluating proficiency in teaching include, but are not limited to: publications in peer reviewed journals, monographs, textbooks, conference proceedings, etc., on teaching methodology; evaluation of teaching based upon student questionnaires, letters from current or former students, classroom visitations by chairs or colleagues, or comments spontaneously received by the chair; syllabi and course material; the submission of proposals and success in obtaining funding of research directed toward improved teaching methods and/or the acquisition of equipment and instrumentation to enhance teaching effectiveness.

Proficiency in research and creative activity may be evidenced by publications in peer reviewed journals, monographs, edited books, textbooks, conference proceedings, and technical reports; oral or videotape presentations; computer software; the submission of proposals and success in obtaining funding of research directed toward the discovery of new knowledge. Publications of all kinds directly provide this type of evidence. Oral presentations may be evaluated in writing for the file by witnesses. Research in progress should likewise be documented by a colleague.

Proficiency in research also may be evidenced by any forum that demonstrates effectiveness in linking knowledge across fields of specialization. This would include presentations; computer courseware; public speeches, and television presentations. Proficiency in research and creative activity may also be evidenced by: publications in peer reviewed journals, monographs, textbooks, conference proceedings, etc., on teaching methodology; and the submission of proposals and success in obtaining funding of research directed toward improved teaching methods and/or the acquisition of equipment and instrumentation to enhance teaching effectiveness.

Additional evidence may be documentation of how faculty members have shared their expertise with the University, profession, or community, regardless of the method of compensation, if any. Such documentation would include and the submission of proposals, with success in

obtaining funding, for research directed toward making knowledge useful as a guide for policy or practice. It is imperative that the quality as well as the quantity of the research be considered. External review of research is required as specified in the Minimum Guidelines (Section IV.D.5).

Evaluations of service should be done like those of teaching and research to the extent possible. Most commonly, service does not automatically produce documentary results. Thus, written statements by witnesses, the people or organizations benefiting from the service, or colleagues evaluating such service may be obtained. Also included would be any products resulting from service activities along with evidence regarding the nature of the candidate's contribution. Minor activities, such as committee work of short duration, should have a less formal, aggregate evaluation.

~~Faculty members are expected to collaborate with colleagues and students. Faculty members are expected to adhere to statements of professional behavior and to the Engineers' Code of Ethics.~~

Section 2.3 Criteria for Promotion in Rank

The General Criteria and the following specific criteria represent the minimum levels of achievement for promotion to the following ranks:

Associate Professor - In order to be promoted to the rank of Associate Professor, the candidate shall have shown evidence of having attained proficiency in teaching, research, and service. The evidence of proficiency must include extramural evaluation as specified in the Minimum Guidelines (Section IV.D.5).

Professor - In order to be promoted to the rank of Professor, the candidate shall have shown evidence of (a) having maintained proficiency in teaching, research, and service; (b) superior achievement in at least one of the three areas, consisting of teaching, research, and service; and (c) having achieved professional recognition. The evidence of achievement in research, and the evidence of professional recognition, must include extramural evaluation as specified in the Minimum Guidelines (Section IV.D.5).

Achievement of these minimum levels does not imply that a promotion must be made. The level of performance above the minimum must be considered as well as the general criteria listed above. Candidates should be considered individually and not in competition with others. Seniority (normally six years in rank) is a consideration for all promotions, but lack of seniority alone shall not be grounds for a negative recommendation.

Term faculty may apply for promotion in rank according to the criteria of the J.B. Speed School of Engineering. The resulting promotion reviews will be based upon the same

Formatted: Indent: Left: 0", First line: 0.5"

documentation, standards, and schedule used for probationary or tenured faculty at the same rank. However, term faculty promotion assessment will be proportionately based upon performance only in the areas (i.e., teaching, research/creative activity, and/or service) established in their annual work plans in effect during the review period.

_____ For promotion to a given rank, the number of faculty in that rank, or the number of candidates for that rank, either in the department or the school, should not work to the detriment of the faculty member being considered for promotion. In addition, the gap between the salary of the faculty member being recommended and the average salary of the next higher rank should not work to the detriment of the faculty member. Where feasible, promotion to the rank of Associate Professor should be synchronized with the award of tenure, although these may take effect in different years.

Section 2.4 Periodic Career Review

Periodic career review includes pre-tenure review, review for tenure and/or promotion to Associate Professor, promotion to Professor, and other performance reviews conducted on a five-year cycle as defined below. Annual reviews of each faculty member shall be made available as part of the periodic career review.

Faculty members with tenure shall undergo a career review in every fifth year of service. When the review period ends in a sabbatical or other leave, the career review shall be deferred until the next academic year. A promotion shall replace a career review for the period in which the promotion occurs.

A. Faculty with Tenure Contract Review

All faculty shall be evaluated annually according to the J.B. Speed School of Engineering Performance Based Salary Increase (PBSI) policy as described in Section 2.1. In addition, all faculty shall undergo periodic career review to evaluate their contribution to the University, J.B. Speed School of Engineering and Departmental missions. These reviews shall promote the continued professional development of the faculty member reviewed. The J.B. Speed School of Engineering assumes that faculty will ordinarily discharge their professional responsibilities by proficient performance in all areas of scholarship as specified in "General Criteria" and in accordance with their annual work plans. Such holistic judgments should be made in the context of departmental mission. The periodic career review process is intended to confirm this assumption by examination of evidence and reviews compiled over a five-year cycle for faculty with tenure and over a three-year cycle, coincident with contract renewal, for term faculty. In those unusual cases where this assumption is shown to be mistaken, the review process provides mechanisms to support the faculty member by returning performance to or above the level of proficiency specified in the departmental guidelines and required by the J.B. Speed School of Engineering.

Copies of all evaluations, including any forms used, and all letters written by ~~reporting~~ official department chairs, committees, individual faculty, or the Dean as described in this document shall be forwarded to the Office of the Dean, where they will be kept in a master file for J.B. Speed School of Engineering. Files for an individual will be maintained until the individual's next periodic career review is completed.

The main purpose of a Stage 1 review is to identify those few faculty members whose performance is not satisfactory, and to facilitate a more extensive review and remedial plan, as needed. Stage 1 reviews also provide an additional mechanism to identify those faculty members whose performance is consistently superior during their five-year review period.

Stage 2 reviews are of two types. One, Stage 2a, describes review procedures to be followed when a faculty member has been identified as "unsatisfactory: not meeting department criteria" during Stage 1. The second, Stage 2b, describes review procedures for those faculty members whose performance is consistently superior and who would like to be considered for supplemental merit raises.

B. Periodic Career Review: Stage 1

Each department will develop a statement of expectations for "proficient performance" by tenured faculty. This statement will then form the basis for periodic career reviews. Statements will be reviewed by the Dean to insure consistency with the mission of the J.B. Speed School of Engineering. After approval, each department will submit the statement to the Promotion and Tenure Committee so that Stage 1 and Stage 2 reviews will have a contextual framework.

Annual reviews and the documentation supporting them will be used as the evidentiary base for periodic career reviews. The department Faculty Activity Committee, a committee appointed in each department as defined in Article 3, will review the five prior annual reviews. If a faculty member has five satisfactory reviews, the department Faculty Activity Committee will forward a current curriculum vita, a recommendation and summary of their examination of the record reviewed to the department chair. The chair will review this material and send the summary and the chair's recommendation to the J.B. Speed School of Engineering Promotion and Tenure Committee. This committee will review materials provided by the department, and forward their recommendation to the Dean. The review will then be complete, and the next five-year cycle will begin.

Under ordinary circumstances, proficient performance in teaching, research and scholarly activity, and service, specified in the annual work plan, will be expected; however, the policy allows for some variations in proficiency, which may arise from new teaching assignments, the initial development and preliminary stages of research, projects, or unusual service obligations. Therefore, if a faculty member has one unsatisfactory review during the five-year period, the departmental Faculty Activity Committee and chair will conduct a Stage 2A review to identify problems.

These recommendations of the Faculty Activity Committee and chair will be forwarded along with the summary of the review period to the J.B. Speed School of Engineering Promotion and Tenure Committee. The documentation supporting the recommendation, for instance, PBSI letters and the evidentiary base from which they were written, will be made available to the J.B. Speed School of Engineering Promotion and Tenure Committee if requested. The J.B. Speed School of Engineering Promotion and Tenure Committee will review summary materials and other requested documentation, and forward their recommendation for Stage 2 review to the Dean.

C. Periodic Career Review: Stage 2a

Stage 2a review will focus on tenured faculty selected for review during Stage 1 as not having met expected performance criteria. In general, the purpose of this review is to provide useful feedback and appropriate intervention and assistance to these faculty members.

The department chair will inform those selected for Stage 2a review. The faculty member will compile detailed information pertinent to the review. This information will in all cases include: (1) an up-to-date curriculum vitae, (2) annual reviews and annual work plans for the past five years; (3) Stage 1 documentation and recommendations. Other evidence supporting areas of activity as listed in "General Criteria" may also be included by the faculty member, or may be requested by any of the reviewing bodies. If requested by the faculty member or the department chair, any materials may be sent out for extramural review, following all procedures outlined in Section 2.5.B.

The Faculty Activity Committee will review all documentation and reviews and make a recommendation to the department chair. This recommendation can either state that the Stage 2A review is unwarranted, based on their professional judgment concerning the nature of the deficiencies and reasons for them, and that the faculty member is proficient, or that the Stage 2A process should continue. In all cases, the purpose of this review is to identify weaknesses, and make recommendations for their correction. Therefore, the department review must reflect the nature of the individual's field of work and must conform to fair and reasonable standards for performance. Also, in all cases, the J.B. Speed School of Engineering Promotion and Tenure Committee should be provided with copies of the department expectations for proficient performance, so that the J.B. Speed School of Engineering assessments can be balanced against those. This procedure must not conflict with The Redbook (Section 4.2.4.A.2).

Because its purpose is developmental, not punitive, the department review should identify strengths and weaknesses of the faculty member and define specific goals or outcomes that would help the faculty member improve. The faculty member then can review and rebut this recommendation. All documentation is then forwarded to the chair. The chair will respond to the documentation provided by the departmental committee in writing and, with the faculty member, develop a specific plan to overcome deficiencies. This plan will identify the specific weaknesses, define specific expected outcomes, outline the activities that will be taken to correct deficiencies, set

timelines for accomplishing this work, and specify how the new activities will be monitored and assessed. The Redbook specifies (Section 4.2.4.A.2) that this plan is for one year unless the Dean approves a longer period.

All documentation will be forwarded to the J.B. Speed School of Engineering Promotion and Tenure Committee for review, and their recommendation that the plan be accepted, modified, or rejected will be sent to the Dean. The Dean will give final approval to the plan.

The faculty member's plan will be monitored as part of the annual review. If the faculty member has not achieved the stated goals of the plan within one year, and is again evaluated as "unsatisfactory: not meeting unit criteria," the documentation will be sent to the Dean for appropriate action.

A faculty member can appeal this process, if and only if the disagreement meets at least one of the four causes stated in The Redbook (Section 4.4.3).

D. Periodic Career Review: Stage 2b

Stage 2b will focus on review procedures for faculty members whose performance is consistently superior and who would like to be considered for supplemental merit raises. The purpose of this review is to assess the appropriateness of performance-based salary increase awards over a longer period than annual reviews permit. Where evidence of outstanding performance over a long period warrants, reviewing bodies may recommend a supplementary salary increase to reward career demonstrations of professional excellence.

A faculty member may initiate a Stage 2b review by informing his/her departmental chair, or such a review may be initiated by the department chair or departmental Faculty Activity Committee. The faculty member will compile a triptych containing detailed information pertinent to the review. This information will in all cases include: (1) an up-to-date curriculum vitae, (2) PBSI reviews and annual work plans for the past five years; (3) Stage 1 documentation and recommendations. Other evidence supporting areas of activity listed in "General Criteria" might also be included by the faculty member, or may be requested by any of the reviewing bodies.

If requested by the faculty member or the department chair, any materials may be sent out for extramural review, following all procedures in the J.B. Speed School of Engineering Personnel Policy.

The department Faculty Activity Committee and chair will review the documentation and make a recommendation. This, and all relevant documentation, will be forwarded to the J.B. Speed School of Engineering Promotion and Tenure Committee for their recommendation. All documentation will be forwarded to the Dean for a final recommendation and approval.

A faculty member can appeal this process, if and only if the disagreement meets at least one of the four causes stated in The Redbook (Section 4.4.3).

E. Periodic Review of Graduate Faculty Status

Departments will periodically review the performance of their Graduate Faculty members. Procedures for this review will coincide with those of the periodic career review within the Department and shall be conducted at the same time with the same Departmental criteria. Recommendations from the Department Chair will be made to the Associate Dean of Academic Affairs concerning continuance or changes to the Graduate Faculty status. The Associate Dean will approve recommendations for changes.

Formatted: Font: Not Bold
Formatted: Font: Not Bold

Formatted: Font: Not Bold

Section 2.5 Procedures for Promotion and Tenure

A. Overview

The faculty member, ~~administrative officer~~department chair* or department Promotion and Tenure (PAT) Committee chair who initiated the review for promotion or tenure shall be responsible for compiling the evaluation file. Individuals under review may include any material they wish in their file, however, summaries should be substituted for voluminous material. The ~~administrative officer~~department chair and other reviewers within the J.B. Speed School of Engineering may also include other materials as long as they are made available to the individual and previous reviewers so that prior recommendations may be reconsidered.

Tenure and promotion files must be compiled with the aid of the faculty member under review and the faculty member must be able to add evidence at any time before the file is advanced to the University Provost (The Redbook 4.2.H.4). A faculty member must be permitted to see, copy, and respond to the material in his or her promotion and/or tenure file with the names and affiliations of the evaluators masked.

A faculty member may request only one evaluation for early tenure.

* ~~The terms "administrative officer", "chair", and "chairperson" hereafter are meant to be equivalent. However, it is necessary that the Dean designate someone to assume this role for non-departmental faculty.~~

As previously stated, departmental faculties may develop individual procedures for processing promotion and tenure recommendations. If they do not, the general procedure in this paragraph will be used. The departmental tenure committee will consist of those faculty in the

department who have tenure. The departmental promotion committee will consist of the faculty of higher rank than the individual under consideration. The recommendations of these committees will speak for the departmental faculty on the respective matters. Departmental faculty should take special care to review the individual's file and not assume that they are familiar with all of the person's work.*:

After the departmental faculty have made their recommendation, the chair will make a recommendation and will forward the file to the Promotion and Tenure (PAT) Committee. The committee will add its recommendation to the unit file and will forward the file to the Office of the Dean. The Dean of the J.B. Speed School of Engineering will add a recommendation and will forward the file to the University Provost. A faculty member has the right, as provided in The Redbook (Section 4.2.2.H.4), to rebut any recommendation at the time it is placed in the file, or before it is advanced to the provost.

B. Support Data for Recommendations

Promotion and tenure recommendations at all levels shall be based on documented facts and written opinions. Data should be quantified where appropriate. Such evidence should permit recommendations on the most objective basis possible. Recommendations shall be in written form and presented with a clear and concrete explanation supported by the evidence in the evaluation file.

The evaluation file shall include at least five reference letters from qualified persons who are familiar with the candidate's professional performance. At least two letters must be from sources not suggested by the candidate. However, the candidate must approve the use of any individual as a referee and may insist on the inclusion of reference letters from anyone. The candidate's approval of individual referees must be sought at least one week prior to contacting the referees. When letters of reference are requested, internal and external referees must be warned that they will not have anonymity, although their names and affiliations will be masked to the candidate. The faculty member under review may respond to these external reference letters. At least two external reviews are to be included.

All evidence used as support data must be unbiased and capable of providing a defensible measure of proficiency as outlined in Section 2.2.D. The choice of methods is delegated to the individual and the department with the following constraints. It is undesirable that comments spontaneously received by the chair be given undue weight. Further, the results of a school-wide questionnaire system developed by the Instruction and Learning Committee and approved by the faculty must be a part of the evaluation. These questionnaires must be gathered and tabulated under secure conditions. While the questionnaires are not to be released except to the individual and the department chair, a summary of the results, developed jointly by the chair and the individual, will form a part of the file used for promotion and tenure evaluations. The questionnaires themselves are considered to be too voluminous for inclusion in the file. Other aspects of instruction such as advising of students, thesis and dissertation supervision, etc., should also be considered.

C. Responsibilities and Authority

The PAT Committee shall serve as the representative faculty body on all matters pertaining to promotion, tenure, and when necessary, career review. When appropriate, it will advise the Dean and the faculty and prepare courses of action.

*: Faculty who have appointments in more than one department should be evaluated by each department.

The committee will function in an advisory capacity. None of its recommendations for promotion, tenure, or career review will be considered binding on the Dean. The committee members have the right to bring before the committee any matter relating to promotion, tenure, and career review. The committee has the right to obtain information as complete as possible on any matter brought before it. The committee shall obtain all available information required by The Redbook about a candidate for promotion, tenure, or career review.

The committee shall base its recommendations on a comparison of the record of accomplishment in the evaluation file to the criteria which appear in The Redbook, this document, and their addenda. Members should not act as advocates for any person or constituency, but rather as judges of the meeting of criteria. It should be emphasized that salary information relative to the individual and to the rank to which the individual is being recommended will not be considered by the committee since it is irrelevant to the criteria for promotions, tenure, and career reviews.

The committee shall grant a hearing to any faculty member on matters pertaining to promotions, tenure, and career reviews.

The committee meetings shall be held strictly confidential and the committee's recommendations will be given only to the Dean, the individual affected by the recommendation, and his or her ~~administrative officer~~department chair. The recommendation will also become a part of the promotion, tenure, and career review file.

The committee shall act on any claim for promotion, tenure, or career review brought before it by a faculty member or his/her ~~administrative officer~~department chair. Self initiation of the claim shall not work to the detriment of the candidate. However, the committee will not act upon a request for promotion, tenure, or a career review evaluation without prior referral to the appropriate departmental faculty committee and ~~administrative officer~~department chair for recommendations. Such recommendations must be made in a timely manner.

The committee shall, with the concurrence of the individual involved, initiate similar promotion review for any faculty member it deems deserving of such review, if such action is not initiated from another source.

Whenever a promotion, tenure, or career review evaluation must be made for a member of the PAT Committee, that member shall resign and be replaced according to J.B. Speed School of Engineering Bylaws.

Candidates for promotion and tenure may challenge the participation of no more than two members of the PAT committee. If a majority of the remaining members agree that the challenged members are prejudiced against the candidate, the challenged members shall not participate in the recommendation.

D. Schedule for Promotion and Tenure

Dates given should normally be followed unless circumstances warrant alterations. The majority of the cases considered by the committee relates to promotion effective on July 1; tenure dates are set by the individual's appointment. Steps in the evaluation procedure are described below and begin on September 15. Each year, after the Central Administration has notified the Dean of the final date for receiving the files of nominees from J.B. Speed School of Engineering, a schedule will be set for the remaining evaluation steps. The Dean shall formulate the schedule in consultation with the Promotion and Tenure Committee and Department Chairs. The schedule will be published no later than September 15.

Promotion and early reviews for tenure may not be stopped except with the permission of the faculty member involved.

The PAT committee will receive memoranda from ~~administrative officer~~department chairs indicating the names of faculty members who are under consideration for promotion or tenure by the departmental faculty. A copy of the memorandum will also be transmitted to the Office of the Dean, and to the individual faculty member under consideration.

The committee will receive memoranda from all faculty members who plan to submit claims for promotion or tenure on their own behalf. A copy of the memorandum will also be transmitted to the Office of the Dean, and to the appropriate ~~administrative officer~~department chair.

The committee will issue memoranda to the appropriate ~~administrative officer~~department chairs indicating that it plans to initiate a promotion review. A copy of the memorandum will also be transmitted to the Office of the Dean and to the concerned faculty member.

The committee will forward a complete evaluation file to each appropriate ~~administrative staff officer~~department chair for cases initiated by the PAT Committee or by the individual under consideration.

A copy of the memorandum of transmittal shall also be forwarded to the Office of the Dean and to the faculty member.

If the PAT Committee has not received a complete evaluation file from subject claimant prior to the cutoff date, the committee will transmit a memorandum to that effect to the appropriate ~~administrative officer~~department chair, to the Office of the Dean and to the individual faculty member concerned.

The committee will receive all evaluation files initiated by ~~administrative officer~~department chairs. A separate confidential copy of both the recommendations of the departmental faculty, and of the chair will be forwarded to the individual faculty member.

The committee will have returned to them by the ~~administrative officer~~department chairs all evaluation files which had previously been channeled through the PAT Committee by claimants for self-initiated promotion or tenure, or which had been initiated for promotion review by the PAT Committee. A separate confidential copy of both the recommendations of the departmental faculty, and of the chair will be forwarded to the individual faculty member. The Office of the Dean will not be informed of either the departmental faculty's or chair's recommendations at this juncture, but shall receive a copy of the letter of transmittal.

The committee will make its recommendations on the nominations and claims for promotion and tenure, and will forward the evaluation file to the Office of the Dean. A confidential copy of their recommendation will be forwarded to the individual faculty member under consideration and to the appropriate ~~administrative officer~~department chair.

The committee will be advised by the Dean of all actions taken on the committee's recommendations, and will be given an opportunity to respond for placement in the file before it is sent to the University Provost.

Each individual being considered for promotion or tenure will receive a confidential copy of the Dean's recommendation to the University Provost. The appropriate ~~administrative officer~~department chair will also receive a copy.

The Dean will forward the files to the University Provost.

It is recognized that in certain cases a nomination or a claim for promotion or tenure which is to be effective at a time other than July 1 may be received by the committee. In such cases, the committee will make its recommendation within two months from the date it receives the nomination or claim. One month after the committee's recommendation is made, the Dean will inform in writing the committee, the faculty member, and his or her ~~administrative officer~~department chair of the Dean's recommendation.

Article 3. Conditions of Faculty Employment

The performance of each faculty member shall be evaluated in accordance with the annual review. The goals of these reviews are to reward performance in the short term, to reinforce desirable patterns of career advancement, and to foster the development of excellence in J.B. Speed School of Engineering. Performance evaluations shall be based on merit, including contributions to the missions of the department, J.B. Speed School of Engineering, and the University.

During the spring semester of each calendar year, each full-time faculty member shall develop an annual work plan that describes the distribution of effort planned for the calendar year. Evaluations of performance must be made in accordance with annual work plans.

Every faculty member under review for a Performance Based Salary Increase (PBSI), upon being informed in writing of the recommendation at any stage of the review, may enter rebuttals in writing.

Each department ~~and the non-departmental faculty~~ shall have a Faculty Activity Committee consisting of at least three tenured faculty who are not administrators. This same committee will be referred to as the Departmental Faculty Activity Committee in this document. However, no person may participate during deliberation of his/her own case. Each department should develop a method for alternate selection, when needed.

The J.B. Speed School of Engineering Promotion and Tenure Committee will act as the school-wide Committee on Appeals. Any faculty member may request a review by the Promotion and Tenure Committee of the Dean's decision on a PBSI review. The result of that review will then be forwarded to the Dean as a recommendation.

Dates given in this section should be followed unless circumstances warrant their change.

Section 3.1 Annual Work Plan

In December of each year the ~~reporting official~~ department chair provides his or her faculty with a list of proposed instruction and other duties for the upcoming calendar year. Each faculty member then drafts an annual work plan agreement and submits it to the ~~reporting official~~ department chair by January 31. This plan shall define faculty activity based on teaching, research, and service. Evaluations must consider only those areas of activity for which the approved annual work plan indicates a faculty member's responsibility.

Annual work plans shall be initiated in the department where the faculty member holds primary appointment. For faculty appointed to administrative positions ~~and non-departmental~~

faculty, annual work plans will be negotiated with the Dean or his/her representative and the individual.

By March 1, the ~~reporting-official~~department chair shall evaluate the annual work plans and meet with each faculty member to negotiate a mutually agreeable plan. The plan should describe the faculty member's role in carrying out the mission and goals of the department while seeking to accommodate the individual's professional goals. If the ~~reporting-official~~department chair and faculty member cannot agree on a common annual work plan, the ~~reporting-official~~department chair will submit a plan, and the individual may choose to attach a letter stating and explaining points of disagreement. This attachment becomes an integral part of the annual work plan.

When all annual work plans have been completed, the ~~reporting-official~~department chair will forward them to the Faculty Activity Committee. The committee will look for serious disparities in workload and examine letters of disagreement and discuss its findings with the ~~reporting-official~~department chair within two weeks of receipt of the plans. If concerns remain after this discussion, the committee and ~~reporting-official~~department chair will write separate letters to the Dean, who shall assist in resolving the committee's concerns before receiving the annual work plans. Whatever the committee's concerns and whatever their state of resolution when presented, the Dean has disposition authority for the matters under discussion.

Annual work plans may be revised during the year by mutual agreement, and should be revised if a significant change in a faculty member's situation occurs.

In every personnel action, the accomplishments of the faculty member shall be reviewed against the background of the agreed upon distribution of effort for each year of the period under review. Accomplishments in proportion to the allocation of effort to each area of activity shall be required.

Annual work plans must be consistent with the program needs of Speed School and its departments, and fall within the limitations imposed by the budget.

The distribution of effort shall be expressed in terms of percent of effort allocated to each activity as defined in "General Criteria". The standard, in comparison to which the allocation of effort to any activity shall be estimated, is that normally a three-credit-hour lecture course requires ten percent of the work load of a faculty member on twelve month appointment. To allocate other than ten percent to a three-credit-hour course, or to allocate other than in proportion to this standard for courses carrying fewer or more hours of credit, shall require justification acceptable to the Dean. Each faculty member in full-time status for the year must account for 100 percent of a full work load by allocation of effort, in some combination, in the areas of activity listed in "General Criteria". Justification for allocations of effort shall take the form of listing the activities (e.g., courses to be taught, committee assignments, etc.).

All approved annual work plans shall respect both the individual faculty member's need to shape his or her own career and the School's various needs, and shall accordingly permit or require the faculty member to perform various functions at different stages in his or her career. In order to achieve this flexibility, a policy shall be applied to all tenured faculty in Speed School with appropriate adaptations when necessary to reflect Speed School's specific needs.

Subject to ordinary review, and to curricular and budgetary constraints, the allocation of effort for a specified period to special projects consistent with the objectives of the School shall be accommodated. Examples of such projects are: carrying a research project through some critical stage; completion of a significant writing project; special assignments in the area of course or curriculum development; or a career development program associated with periodic career review. In all such cases, the allocation of effort to such projects should be reflected in the plan, and such concentration should not work against the interest of the faculty member in salary considerations. In cases where grant or contract funds are used to pay a part of the base salary, the whole base salary obligation, including any increased allocation to any category, shall be shown on the agreement.

Section 3.2 Compensation

If there are funds for salary increments beginning July 1 of the year, merit increments for all faculty shall be subject to the following guidelines:

Faculty whose overall performance is proficient or better shall get a nonzero salary increment.

Increments should be based on a cumulative performance that takes into account the performance for the two preceding years as well as that for the current year, with the current year counting no less than previous years.

After distribution of PBSI funds to departments, awards to individuals will be made according to the approved departmental policy. No departmental policy shall be implemented until approved by the Dean.

In the event a faculty member is dissatisfied with his/her salary increment, the faculty member may submit a letter of appeal to the chair who must forward this to the Dean. The Dean has dispositional authority.

Departmental or unit performance assessments will be a significant factor in determining salary increments for ~~reporting official~~ department chairs who administer departments and academic support units, but will not be used in determining salary increments for faculty. Salary increments

for faculty will be based solely on how well the individual contributed to the department or unit mission as reflected in that person's evaluation.

Faculty who have outstanding post-tenure periodic career reviews but have not received the designated supplemental salary increases will receive the supplement.

The Dean will inform each faculty member in writing of his or her final performance evaluation and salary increment and, if appropriate, specific suggestions for improvement. An attachment to this will describe the procedure used to determine salary increments and the distributions of performance evaluations and salary increments for all Speed School faculty.

In years when funds for salary increments are budgeted, an individual's recommendation by the Dean for no salary increase must be submitted to the Provost for approval, and must include reasons for performance considered to be unsatisfactory, as well as specific suggestions for improving performance.

Article 4. Amendments

Amendments to this document must be approved by the J.B. Speed School of Engineering faculty. The vote will be made by mail ballot after discussion at a faculty meeting. Approval requires two-thirds of those voting but no less than a simple majority of all the faculty.

Appendix

A. Purpose

The Redbook requires units to adopt policy and procedure documents on faculty appointment, promotion, tenure, as consistent with its Minimum Guidelines. This document is intended to fulfill that requirement.

B. Scope

The criteria and procedures in this document apply on a school-wide basis, except that established departments may adopt procedures compatible with this document for processing their evaluations and recommendations. When, and if, such departmental procedures are developed, they should be made an addition to this document. ~~J.B. Speed School of Engineering faculty not in an established department may vote to establish a (single) similar addendum for faculty at large.~~

C. Definitions

1. Teaching

Teaching includes all work that involves the use of the faculty's expertise to communicate subject matter to students. The essential element of teaching is the didactic relationship between teacher and students. Good teaching also involves the ability to interact effectively with students. Pedagogical procedures must be carefully planned, continuously examined, and directly related to the subject taught. Good teachers stimulate active, not passive, learning, and encourage students to be critical, creative thinkers with the capacity to go on learning after their college days are over.

2. Research and Creative Activity

For most faculty, research, basic or applied, is delving into some question in that faculty member's field and seeking to add to the reservoir of knowledge. Such endeavors not only result in the creation of knowledge, but also invigorate student-faculty relationships inside the classroom and out. Research includes the act of knowledge creation through the publication or dissemination of original or innovative theoretical, empirical, or creative work. The intellectual excitement and progress that are generated by research are vital to a university such as ours.

Research also means making connections across the disciplines, placing the specialties in a larger context, illuminating data in a revealing way, and/or educating non-specialists. There is a need for scholars who give meaning to isolated facts by putting them in perspective. Research is also serious, disciplined work that seeks to draw together, interpret, and bring insight to bear on new developments.

Research also occurs when one applies information, interpretation, or techniques characteristic of one's discipline to consequential problems in the real world. The key to defining application is that the activity must be tied directly to one's special field of knowledge and relate to one's professional activity.

As a scholarly enterprise, teaching begins with what the teacher knows. Those who teach must be, above all, well informed, and steeped in the knowledge of their fields. Hard work and serious study underpin good teaching. Good teaching means that faculty, as scholars, are also learners. Research and creative activities aimed at teaching involve not only transmitting knowledge, but transforming and extending it as well.

3. Service

Service is the application of general academic expertise that results from experience as a university educator, as when one participates in faculty governance within the university or when service activities outside the university are linked to one's general academic expertise. Service is distinguished from research in that service does not require that the activity be related to one's area of professional expertise. Additionally, service does not include activities that one might engage in as a citizen of a civic community, but is restricted to those activities required by the students, department, college, university or profession.

4. Tenure

Tenure is the right of certain full-time faculty personnel who hold academic rank to continuous full-time employment without reduction in academic rank until retirement or termination as provided in Section 4.5.3 of The Redbook. Tenure is granted in an academic unit in accordance with the procedures established in Section 4.2.2.H of The Redbook.

5. Proficiency

Whenever used in this document, the word "proficient" shall be understood to mean "to satisfy capably all the special demands or requirements of a particular situation, craft, or profession."

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.

School or University	
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.

Local, State and National Communities, and the Profession	
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.

Administrative Service	
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

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.

publications (typically three or four pieces). Although the committee has this 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

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

under the following sub-headings:

- a) **Courses Taught**
 - 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 print¹
 - (5) Books or chapters in some other stage of progress
 - c) **Book Reviews**

¹ Include contract correspondence.

- (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

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.