

**POLICY FOR PROMOTION, APPOINTMENT AND TENURE
AND FOR PERIODIC CAREER REVIEW
SCHOOL OF PUBLIC HEALTH & INFORMATION SCIENCES
UNIVERSITY OF LOUISVILLE**

INTRODUCTION

This document presents the criteria and procedures employed by the University of Louisville (UofL) School of Public Health & Information Sciences (SPHIS) for the evaluation of promotion, appointment and tenure and for periodic career reviews. SPHIS recommendations for appointment and tenure are forwarded to the offices of the Executive Vice President for Health Affairs (EVPHA) and the University Provost. The University Provost, in consultation with the EVPHA, will make a recommendation to the President.

The Dean is responsible for assuring that the school achieves its mission. Faculty members within each department develop and update a mission statement and specific goals and objectives, which assist in the accomplishment of the SPHIS mission. Department chairs are responsible for assuring that their department achieves its mission. Faculty work assignments for promotion, appointment and tenure must be in alignment with both school and department missions. When making promotion, appointment, tenure, and performance review decisions, this policy should always be read in conjunction with the SPHIS Bylaws and the UofL Redbook. In the case of a conflict between this policy and the Redbook, the Redbook is the higher authority.

I. FACULTY APPOINTMENTS AND TENURE

A. Full-Time Faculty Appointments

1. Requirements and Contract. Appointment to a full-time faculty position in the SPHIS requires, at minimum, an advanced, usually doctoral degree, except for instructors and visiting faculty. The completion of a doctoral degree is required for appointment at the rank of assistant professor and above. Each faculty member receives an appointment letter, which serves as a contract, stipulating that the appointment is made subject to the regulations, policies, and provisions of employment at the University of Louisville, as they may be amended from time to time, including those set forth in the Redbook and stipulated in the Bylaws and Rules of the SPHIS.

2. Joint Appointment. Joint appointments are defined as appointments of full-time for faculty members in more than one academic department or unit. Recommendations and rules follow those in the Redbook Sec. 4.1.4.

3. Types of Full-Time Faculty Appointments. The types of full-time appointments in the SPHIS include: non-tenurable temporary, non-tenurable term, tenure-track (also referred to as probationary), and tenured.

a. Non-tenurable Temporary Full-Time Appointment (Redbook, Sec. 4.1.1.A1)

1.1. Definition and Time Limit. Temporary appointments to the various academic ranks, including instructors and visiting faculty, may be made specifically for limited time periods less than one year or for special purposes. A temporary appointment or renewal will not result in the acquisition of tenure.

b. Non-tenurable Term Full-Time Appointment (Redbook, Sec. 4.1.1.A2)

1.1. Definition and Time Limit. Term appointments are not tenurable, and no such appointments, continuation or renewal will result in the acquisition of tenure or imply renewal for subsequent terms. Term faculty may be appointed for a contract period not to exceed three years. Work assignments for term faculty members will emphasize teaching, research or service with a preponderance of effort in a single area (e.g. 75%).

1.2. Funding Source and Renewal. Term appointments may be funded through general funds, restricted funds, or clinical revenues. Term appointments funded through general funds must number less than 50% of the school's total number of probationary and tenured appointments (Redbook, Sec. 3.3.1; Sec. 4.1.1). Term appointments, if there is a demonstrated need, may be renewed at the convenience of the University, on recommendation of the Department Chair and the Dean.

1.3. Annual and Periodic Career Review. Term faculty are subject to annual and periodic career reviews and may apply for promotion in rank according to Redbook and SPHIS criteria. Procedures for promotion will be the same as for probationary or tenured faculty. Criteria will be used to evaluate only those areas included in the work plan. Excellence is required in the area of greatest effort.

1.4. Transfer to Tenurable (Probationary) Appointment. A faculty member with a term appointment is eligible to request an appointment to a tenurable or probationary position following a positive recommendation by a majority of the department faculty, Department Chair, Promotion, Appointment and Tenure (PAT) Committee, and Dean; and if they were not previously on a probationary appointment at UofL (Sec. 4.1.1.A.2.d). Time in rank will not be counted toward the probationary period unless negotiated at the time of transfer, recommended by the Dean, and approved by the University Provost in consultation with the EVPHA. Once a faculty member has transferred from a term appointment to a tenure-track (probationary) appointment, transfers back to non-tenurable appointment status are prohibited.

c. Tenure-Track (Probationary) Full-Time Appointment (Redbook, Sec. 4.1.1.B)

1.1. Definition and Time Limit. Probationary appointments refer to appointments of full-time faculty members without tenure. No probationary appointment to the University will extend beyond the period when tenure would normally be granted (Redbook, Sec. 4.1.1.B.1 and Sec. 4.2.2).

1.2. Appointment to the Rank of Instructor. Persons appointed to the rank of Instructor on the tenure-track must be able to demonstrate professional experience relevant to the area of the teaching assignment and show promise of proficiency in teaching. Appointments will be for terms of one year each. Individuals appointed as Instructors without a terminal degree are required to complete their doctoral degree within a one-year period in order to be eligible for a contract to be renewed.

1.3. Appointment to the Rank of Assistant and Associate Professors. Probationary appointments to the rank of Assistant or Associate Professor are not to exceed two years on the initial contract or three years for continuation contracts. The duration of the initial contract must be specified in the letter of appointment.

1.4. Appointment to the Rank of Professor. Professors will be awarded tenure if employed subsequent to the initial probationary appointment.

1.5. Transfer to Non-tenurable Appointment. Transfers from an initial probationary appointment (tenure-track) to a non-tenurable appointment are permitted, but must be completed prior to the fifth year of service. Once a faculty member has transferred from a probationary appointment to a term appointment, transfer back to probationary status is prohibited.

d. Tenured Appointment (Redbook, Sec. 4.1.1.C)

1.1. Definition. 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 Redbook procedures established in Sec. 4.2.2.H.

1.2. Administrative Personnel and Tenure. Administrative personnel who have acquired tenure are subject to the regulations of tenure and the provisions of Section 4.5.3 of the Redbook governing termination of university employment only in their capacities as faculty members.

1.3. Recommendation of Tenure. Recommendations concerning the award or denial of tenure originate with the faculty of the department in the SPHIS in which tenure is to be granted.

1.4. Tenure Date. For probationary appointments, the date of mandatory tenure and the number of years of previous full-time service to be counted toward acquisition of tenure will be recommended by the Dean, and stipulated by the University Provost in consultation with the EVPHA, and agreed to in writing by the candidate before the appointment is made by the UofL Board of Trustees.

B. Part-Time Faculty Appointment (Redbook, Sec. 4.1.2)

1. Contract and Renewal. Part-time faculty members are appointed by contract to teach specified courses or to engage in specified instruction, research or service activities less than full-time for a designated period. The requirements for appointment to a part-time faculty position will be the same as those for full-time appointments; it is recognized that the responsibilities of part-time faculty may differ from those of full-time faculty. The Department Chair with approval of the Dean and a majority vote of approval by department faculty may appoint or reappoint part-time faculty for each academic term at the convenience of the University on standard contract terms approved by the University Provost. Part-time faculty appointments are not eligible for tenure and time in such an appointment may not count toward time for acquisition of tenure.

2. Rank. Part-time faculty members hold rank according to education and experience. Part-time faculty members are reviewed in writing annually following the process and criteria described in Appendix A and will be the basis for reappointment and contract renewal. Department documents may stipulate additional requirements for appointment and reappointment and include criteria associated with areas noted in the annual work plan. Part-time faculty members are not eligible for sabbaticals or other academic leave.

3. Benefits. Part-time faculty may qualify for certain benefits as authorized by University policy.

4. Committee Participation. Part-time faculty may be elected to the Faculty Senate and may be appointed or elected to University or unit committees as specified by contract, University or unit personnel documents. Such service will be accounted for and recognized.

C. Emeritus Faculty Appointment (Redbook, Sec. 4.1.3)

The honorary title of Emeritus may be conferred upon retired faculty if requested by the department and Dean. The University Provost will make a recommendation in consultation with the EVPHA to the University President and Board of Trustees.

D. Adjunct Faculty Appointment

Adjunct appointments are non-tenurable positions at one of four levels in a Department: Adjunct Instructor, Adjunct Assistant Professor, Adjunct Associate Professor, and Adjunct Professor (Redbook 4.1.4, Appendix B). They are offered to individuals who demonstrate a commitment to work with full-time faculty or students in the teaching, research, or service mission of the SPHIS (Appendix B). The term of initial appointment will be at the discretion of the Department Chair, but may not exceed one year for an Adjunct Instructor and three years for an Adjunct Assistant Professor, Adjunct Associate Professor and Adjunct Professor.

II. FACULTY PERSONNEL REVIEW

Personnel reviews will be based on peer evaluation of a documentary record including both quantitative and qualitative evidence of performance. In keeping with the Redbook, proficiency in teaching, research and service is required of all faculty members in all areas of the annual work assignment. In compliance with The Redbook Minimum Guidelines, all faculty members in the SPHIS are evaluated for the purpose of annual, pre-tenure, tenure, promotion (to associate professor or professor), and periodic career review. The following section provides the general guidelines for reviews. The procedures are described in Section III. See Appendix A of this document for SPHIS guidelines and Chapter 4, Article 4.2 of the Redbook for university-based guidelines.

A. Annual Review (Redbook, Sec. 4.2.1 and Minimum Guidelines Sec. I and III.)

1. Annual Work Plan and Review. (Redbook, Sec. 4.3.1.A) Annual work plans will provide the percent work effort associated with teaching, research, and service assignments, which must account for 100 percent of the faculty member's work load and state the intended outcomes of the work effort. Each Department Chair and the Dean will review annually all part-time, term, probationary, and tenured faculty in writing. The annual review will be done in conjunction with the SPHIS merit-based policy. Annual reviews assess faculty performance based on the distribution of the effort indicated in the approved annual work plan. A faculty member may not be penalized for non-performance in any area of activity for which the faculty member has no assigned responsibility. The work plans and reviews are retained as part of all employment files. All career reviews, including annual, pre-tenure, promotion, tenure and periodic, including the reappointments of term faculty, are linked to the annual work plans. Satisfactory annual reviews do not in and of themselves constitute sufficient grounds for promotion, tenure, or satisfactory periodic career reviews.

2. Summary of Annual Professional Effort. Each faculty member should provide a detailed summary of the year's professional effort along with the annual faculty work plan at the time of the annual personnel review. Annual reviews may take into account multi-year performance. The faculty member is responsible for maintaining the documentary evidence supporting the annual review through the next promotion, tenure, or periodic career review.

3. Documentation of Outside Work. As part of the documentation for annual review a report of professional work outside the University and in keeping with the Redbook policy (Sec. 4.3.3.) must be submitted by the faculty member.

4. Review Results. The Department Chair will provide the review results in writing to the faculty member and to the Dean. The faculty member may express disagreement in writing, which will be filed with the annual review. Presence of a written rebuttal does not preclude the discussion of a review or annual work assignment. The evaluations, rebuttals made by a faculty member, and appeal results, if applicable, will be made available to the SPHIS PAT Committee when the Faculty member is reviewed for promotion and tenure. Copies of the annual reviews will be maintained in the office of the Dean (Redbook, Sec. 4.2.1.B).

5. Appeal Process. In keeping with the Redbook (Sec. 4.2.1.C.), an appeal process exists for annual reviews and is separate from the grievance process (Redbook, Sec. 4.4). A faculty member's (full- or part-time) request for an appeal regarding the annual review is submitted to the PAT Committee for review through the Associate Dean for Faculty Affairs and/or Dean within ten (10) working days of receipt of the annual review being appealed. The faculty member must provide rationale and documentation for the appeal. The PAT Committee will ask the Department Chair to submit a response within five (5) working days. The result of the PAT Committee review will be forwarded to the Dean as a recommendation within ten (10) working days after receipt of the chair's response. The Dean will render the final recommendation within five (5) working days after review of faculty rationale and documentation, Department Chair's response, and PAT Committee review report.

B. Pre-Tenure Review. (Redbook, Sec. 4.2.2.G and Minimum Guidelines Sec. IV.B)

1. Timing of Pre-Tenure Review and Purpose. In addition to annual reviews, each probationary faculty member will receive a pre-tenure review, which normally occurs during the third year of the probationary period. The purpose of the pre-tenure review is to determine whether a faculty member is making satisfactory progress toward meeting the standards for tenure. The review is conducted at the same level of rigor and by the same process as in a tenure review; however, extramural evaluations are not required.

2. Pre-Tenure Review Process. The Department Chair will inform the faculty member of the pre-tenure review process. This should be documented in writing and the faculty member provided access to the SPHIS personnel policy documents. The Dean's Office will provide the appropriate materials regarding a pre-tenure review and the Department Chair will meet with the faculty member to review the process and discuss any questions or concerns. The Department Chair may select one or more other department faculty members to assist in the review. The review will not be considered complete until approved by the Dean. The results of the review will be made available to the faculty member. The pre-tenure record will become part of the evidence considered in tenure review. It will be included in the materials made available to the PAT Committee and forwarded on with the file.

3. Pre-Tenure Review Results. It is expected that a faculty member will maintain a consistent level of performance following a positive pre-tenure review in order to meet tenure criteria. If the pre-tenure review identifies significant concerns regarding teaching, research, or service, the Associate Dean for Faculty Affairs will meet with the faculty member, Department Chair, two tenured faculty members from the department or the SPHIS, and the faculty member's mentor to develop a plan to assist the probationary faculty member address the concerns during the remaining time before the initiation date for the five-year review.

C. Tenure Review and Process. (Redbook, Sec. 4.2.2.H and Minimum Guidelines Sec. IV)

1. Tenure Initiation and Termination. Evaluation for tenure, once originated, will proceed as noted below (Evaluation Process) and in accordance with the Redbook (Sec. 4.2.2) unless the faculty member under review resigns or is subject to termination by reason of the discontinuation of the department or the SPHIS, in accordance with Redbook Sec. 4.5.3.A.2).

2. Length of Probationary Period. All probationary faculty members who have had seven years of full-time service counted in a tenurable faculty position, if re-employed full-time after the seventh year, will be granted tenure.

3. Leave of Absence. One year spent on an approved leave of absence may be counted toward the seven years of full-time service necessary for tenure. Any leave granted during the probationary period must carry with it a stipulation in writing as to whether the leave counts toward tenure.

4. Extension of Probationary Period. An extension of the probationary tenure-track period is permitted if a faculty member faces extenuating circumstances, which result in a significant reduction in ability to perform normal duties, but does not require a leave of absence. The extension of the probationary period cannot be for less than six months and can be for no more than one year; a second extension may be granted for a second extenuating circumstance. An extension will not be granted more than two (2) times within the probationary period of a faculty member. Such extensions must be requested and approved before the end of the fifth year of the probationary period. They require a positive recommendation from the Department Chair and SPHIS Dean, and approval by the University Provost in consultation with the EVPHA.

5. Prior Service Counted. Previous full-time service at the rank of instructor or higher (tenurable or non-tenurable appointment) or of comparable status in institutions of higher learning may be counted toward the acquisition of tenure, following recommendation by the Dean and approval by the University Provost in consultation with the EVPHA. The letter of appointment will state whether the previous service counts and the amount of time that will be counted toward tenure.

6. Early Tenure. Normally, requests for promotion to Associate Professor and tenure will not be considered until a full probationary period of five years in faculty status has been served. Tenure may be granted at the time of initial appointment or in less than seven years when such action is warranted. A faculty member may request only one evaluation for early tenure. Requests for early action are appropriate if the faculty member's accomplishments meet the stated criteria. Evaluation for early tenure, once originated, will proceed as indicated in The Redbook (Section 4.2.2.H.) unless the faculty member under review

requests its withdrawal prior to the required submission date to the Office of the University Provost.

7. Criteria for Tenure. Criteria for tenure are based on: research; teaching; and service to the profession, to the SPHIS, to UofL, or to the community. The details of these criteria and additional criteria to be considered in making a recommendation concerning tenure are defined and specified in Appendix A.

8. Evaluation Process. Completion of the probationary period with satisfactory annual performance evaluations and pre-tenure review does not in and of itself constitute sufficient grounds for tenure.

a. Evaluation Period. A faculty member who is eligible for tenure must be evaluated within 12 months after five years of service applied to tenure. Evaluation for tenure, once originated, will proceed as indicated in The Redbook (Sec. 4.2.2.H.) and as described below unless the faculty member under review resigns from the University or is subject to termination by reason of the discontinuation of the department or the SPHIS (Sec. 4.5.3.A.2). In addition to meeting with faculty for annual review and pre-tenure review, the Department Chair should meet with the faculty candidate and the Associate Dean for Faculty Affairs at the beginning of the tenure evaluation process during the first three months of the evaluation tenure period.

b. Amendments to Criteria. Faculty members on probationary status will be affected by any amendments to or change in the criteria for tenure subsequent to their appointment. In such evaluations, appropriate consideration will be given to the amount of time remaining in the probationary period when the change becomes effective.

c. Compilation of Materials. A file of all information and documents pertinent to the tenure evaluation will be compiled with the cooperation of the faculty member. Recommendations and any other material added will become part of the file. The faculty member has the right to examine the materials in the tenure file prior to it being reviewed at any level, but every effort must be made to mask the identity of individuals who have submitted evaluation letters. The faculty member may add newly available material as evidence for reconsideration by the previous evaluators or rebuttals before the file is forwarded to the office of the University Provost.

d. Origin and Process of Tenure Evaluation. Evaluation for tenure will originate in the department in which the faculty member has their primary appointment. Department votes will be by written ballot not marked with name, rank, tenure status, or other identifying information for faculty who vote. All ballots must be retained as a permanent part of the file under review and aggregate results provided on the Ballot Summary Form. At each subsequent level of review there must be a letter of recommendation, which includes a written evaluation of all evidence regarding teaching, research and service. At each of these levels the faculty member being reviewed has the right to respond to the evaluation; all such responses become a permanent part of the dossier. After a vote of the department faculty has been conducted, the Department Chair prepares a letter of recommendation based on the evidence in the file and submits the file to the Dean's Office. The Chair's letter should include a report on the numerical vote of the department faculty using the Ballot Summary Form. If the total number of votes reported is not equal to the number of eligible voters as defined under Section III.E.1, an

explanation should be provided on the Ballot Summary Form. The Dean's Office will forward the complete dossier, with the exception of the financial documents, to the SPHIS PAT Committee. The PAT Committee will meet and review all materials for completeness and consistency with UofL, SPHIS and department criteria and policies. The PAT Committee members will vote via written or electronic ballot. The PAT Committee Chair will write a recommendation letter, which will be delivered to the Dean's office within a one-week period, when possible, following the PAT Committee vote.

e. Recommendation of the SPHIS Dean. The Dean will write a letter of recommendation to accompany the file, which is forwarded to the next review level. The Dean's recommendation is the unit recommendation. Prior to the transfer of the dossier, the Dean, Department Chair, and Associate Dean for Faculty Affairs will meet in-person with the candidate to inform them if the Dean's recommendation is negative.

f. Transfer Process of File. In the case of positive recommendations, the complete file is forwarded concurrently to the Office of the EVPHA and to the University Provost. In the case of negative recommendations, the complete file is forwarded to the Affirmative Action Office for review and, following that review, forwarded concurrently to the Office of the EVPHA and to the University Provost.

g. Negative Recommendation Regarding Tenure File and Hearing Request.

1.1. Notification of Candidate Regarding Negative Recommendations. If the recommendation of the Department Chair, the SPHIS Dean, or the University Provost is negative, the candidate must be notified by certified mail, return receipt requested, before it is forwarded to the next review level. If the negative recommendation is from the University Provost, the faculty member, Department Chair, and the Dean will have the opportunity to comment in writing prior to any recommendation to the President. The file containing all comments and recommendations are then made available to the President. If a faculty member fails to sign for a certified letter after two attempts at delivery by the U.S. Postal Services, the University will send an email to the faculty member's official University email address advising the faculty member of the attempted delivery. Five (5) working days after that email is sent, the faculty member will be deemed to have received the certified letter if the faculty member has not already signed for the letter.

1.2. Candidate Request for Grievance Hearing Associated with Tenure. If the recommendation of the University Provost or Dean is negative, the candidate may request a hearing before the University Faculty Grievance Committee. The request must be delivered to the Faculty Grievance Officer on or before the 10th working day following notification by certified mail, return receipt requested.

h. Review and Recommendation by the University President. The University Provost will prepare a recommendation for the President's review, and the President will make the final recommendation concerning tenure for any faculty member whose status is to be acted upon by the Board of Trustees or will inform the Board concerning the nonrenewal of contract for any faculty member completing the sixth year of service in a probationary appointment. The process regarding denial by the President is described in the Redbook (Sec. 4.2.2.H.8).

i. Review and Recommendation by the Board of Trustees. The Board of Trustees will take final action to grant tenure after an affirmative recommendation of the President. If the initial recommendation to deny tenure is by the President, the Board of Trustees will decide whether to grant tenure after considering the President's original recommendation, and, if review by the Faculty Grievance Committee has been timely requested by the faculty candidate, the report of the Faculty Grievance Committee, and the response of the President and of the candidate.

j. Appeal and Grievance in Relation to a Final Tenure Recommendation. If appeal or grievance procedures delay a final tenure recommendation at the time notice of nonrenewal must be given, the President may give notice of nonrenewal of the appointment, but such notice will not prejudice later award of tenure.

D. Promotion in Rank Review and Process (Redbook 4.2.3 and "Minimum Guidelines")

1. Promotion Initiation and Criteria. The Department Chair in discussion with the faculty member initiates the procedures for promotion. The criteria for evaluation will be based on those established for teaching, research and service to the SPHIS, the University or the community as specified in Appendix A.

2. Evaluation Process. The process for promotion in rank follows the procedures described in Section II.C.8. (Subsections a-f) of this document and in the Redbook (Sec. 4.2.2.H, subsections 1-6). Following these procedures and recommendations, a recommendation is made by the President and acted upon by the Board of Trustees.

3. Promotion to Associate Professor. The criteria for promotion to Associate Professor for term and tenure-track faculty are described below. Candidates for promotion to Associate Professor must demonstrate broad proficiency in the assigned work areas (Redbook, Minimum Guidelines, Sec. IV.E).

a. Term. Evidence must be provided for proficiency in the assigned work area or areas and for excellence in the area of greatest assignment on the annual work plan for promotion to Associate Professor (Appendix A). There should be evidence that the faculty member's accomplishments provide promise of continuing proficiency.

b. Tenure-Track. The faculty member must demonstrate continuing proficiency in two areas and excellence in the area associated with the highest work assignment percentage for promotion to Associate Professor. If the candidate also is being reviewed for tenure, evidence for scholarship is required. It is recommended that requests for evaluation of promotion and tenure be submitted jointly (Appendix A).

c. Service Counted and Timeline. Normally, requests for promotion to Associate Professor will not be considered until a period of five years in faculty status has been served. Accomplishments made prior to employment at UofL can be considered in these deliberations.

d. External Review. Extramural review of research is required for promotion to the rank of associate professor (see Section III.D of Reviewer Evaluations).

e. Compilation of Promotion File and Process. The file composition and processing of materials is the same as that described above for tenure (see Section II.C.8.b through g).

f. Candidates for New Appointments. Candidates for new appointments at the rank of Associate Professor must satisfy the same criteria as described above, depending on whether the appointment as Associate Professor is term, tenure-track, or tenured.

4. Promotion to Professor. The criteria for promotion to Professor for term and tenure-track are noted below. Candidates for promotion to professor must be evaluated in the work assignment areas and by the distribution of effort specified in their approved annual work plans for the period under review (Redbook, Minimum Guidelines, Sec. IV.F).

a. Term. Promotion to Professor should be awarded to those who show promise of continuing proficiency in the activities included in the annual work assignment and defined in Appendix A. A recommendation for granting the rank of Professor will be made in recognition of accomplishments already attained. Evidence also must be provided for excellence in the assigned work area or areas of greatest assignment on the annual work plan. There must be documented sustained excellence as well as demonstrated extra-university influential leadership (Appendix A).

b. Tenure-Track or Tenured. The faculty member on tenure-track or already tenured must demonstrate sustained proficiency in two areas and sustained excellence in the area associated with the highest work assignment percentage for promotion to Professor. A recommendation for granting the rank of Professor will be made in recognition of accomplishments already attained. There must be documented sustained excellence as well as demonstrated extra-university influential leadership (Appendix A). If the candidate also is being reviewed for tenure, evidence for scholarship is required (Appendix A).

c. Service Counted and Timeline. Normally, requests for promotion to Professor are not considered until a period of five years as Associate Professor has been served. A department is not obligated to make a recommendation after the fifth year. Time in rank as an Associate Professor may be considered, but does not entitle one to promotion to Professor. Accomplishments made as a Professor prior to employment at UofL can be considered in these deliberations.

d. External Review. Extramural review of research is required for promotion to the rank of professor (see Section III.D, External Evaluations).

e. Compilation of Promotion File and Process. The file composition and the processing of materials is the same as that described above for tenure (see Section II.C.8.a through j) and promotion (see Section II.C.8.b through f).

f. Candidates for New Appointments. Candidates for new appointments at the rank of Professor must satisfy the same criteria as described above, depending on whether the appointment as Professor is term, tenure-track, or tenured.

5. Promotion of Part-Time Faculty. Part-time faculty members are held to the criteria specified for full-time non-tenurable faculty, but with consideration for their assigned work plan percentages.

E. Periodic Career Review (Redbook, Sec. 4.2.4 and Minimum Guidelines for Faculty Personnel Reviews, Sec. V: Periodic Career Reviews)

1. Periodic Career Review Process. A periodic career review will follow the same process as detailed for promotion and tenure; however, evaluations are restricted to the SPHIS and

personnel files do not proceed through University-wide offices. Faculty members are evaluated as either "satisfactory: meeting SPHIS criteria", or "unsatisfactory: not meeting SPHIS criteria" in teaching, research and service with due regard for their annual work plans during the period under review. The criteria for a satisfactory rating in periodic review require proficiency in all areas assigned on the annual work plan for the associated time period. The review process does not extend beyond the office of the SPHIS Dean but review results will be reported annually to the EVPHA and the University Provost. Candidates undergoing periodic career review may examine any substantive and procedural material in the personnel file at any time.

2. Faculty with Tenure Appointments. Faculty members with tenure will undergo a periodic career review after every fifth year of service. When the review period ends in a sabbatical (or other leave), the periodic career review will be deferred until the next academic year. A promotion replaces a periodic career review for the period in which the promotion occurs.

a. Satisfactory Review. Tenured faculty members with a satisfactory review begin the next review cycle in the following academic year.

b. Unsatisfactory Review. Within thirty calendar days of a periodic career review that indicates unsatisfactory performance, a faculty member, in consultation with the Chair and Associate Dean for Faculty Affairs, will prepare a career development plan, acceptable to the Dean, to remedy the deficiency in one year unless the Dean approves a longer period. The plan will include specific requirements to be met within that first year. If the faculty member does not prepare a career development plan acceptable to the Dean, the Dean may set the requirements to be met so long as the requirements are consistent with the obligations and responsibilities expected of all faculty at the same rank as the faculty member under review. If the faculty member completes the agreed upon professional development plan, the faculty member will have one additional year to demonstrate satisfactory performance. The Chair will then institute another career review. A faculty member whose performance is judged unsatisfactory in the second review will be subject to appropriate disciplinary action, which may include proceedings for termination (Redbook, Sec. 4.2.4.B and Sec. 4.5.3).

3. Faculty with Administrative Appointments. The Administrative Officers of the school, the Dean, Associate Deans, and Department Chairs, are, with respect to their administrative responsibilities, appointed by and serve at the pleasure of the Board of Trustees (Redbook Sec. 3.2.3; 3.3.5). The Dean is reviewed annually by the EVPHA and the University Provost, and every five years by a broad-based committee consisting of an even number majority of faculty. The Associate Deans and Chairs are reviewed annually by the Dean, and every five years by a broad-based committee established with the concurrence of the departmental faculty. Sections 3.2.3 and 3.3.5.D of the Redbook provide guidelines for the process of review and resolution of disputed reviews. Deans may conduct special reviews of administrative subordinates at any time as may be necessary to assure effective leadership and may recommend their removal at any time for any reason that is not illegal or arbitrary.

4. Faculty with Probationary Appointments. The scheduled pre-tenure and tenure reviews are the required career reviews for faculty with probationary appointments. If a decision is made not to renew a probationary appointment at an interim point between these

reviews, the process of termination of the appointment will follow the rules and procedures outlined in Redbook Sec 4.5.2.

5. Faculty with non-Tenurable (Term) Appointments. Consideration for reappointment serves as the periodic career review for faculty with term and part-time appointments. Faculty members with non-tenurable (term) appointments may be reappointed for the benefit of the university after a career review. They are to be reviewed in the last semester of their current contract under the evaluation criteria appropriate to the faculty member's current rank with due regard for his/her work plan during the period under review. The Chair will conduct the review and will provide a report and recommendation to the Dean. A satisfactory review requires documented proficiency in all areas of the annual work assignment. Those who are evaluated as satisfactory may be offered additional contracts for reappointment, provided there is still a need in the primary area. No term faculty member will be reappointed if the evaluation is unsatisfactory. Term appointments that exceed three continuous years must undergo a school-based review to be conducted by the Chair, PAT Committee, and Dean to determine if they have the profile of a term rather than a tenure-track appointment, and if the position is needed.

III. PROCEDURES FOR FACULTY PERSONNEL REVIEWS

The following procedures apply for all of the faculty personnel reviews.

A. Documentation

- 1. New Appointment.** Materials and documents required for consideration of appointment include current curriculum vitae, external letters of recommendation, copies of selected manuscripts, if any, a personal statement, and other materials as required by University policy.
- 2. Periodic Career Review.** Materials and documents required for consideration of a periodic career review include a current curriculum vitae, letters of recommendation, teaching evaluations, annual work assignments and evaluations, and other materials as required by University policy.
- 3. Pre-Tenure Review.** Materials and documents required for consideration of the pre-tenure review include a current curriculum vitae, teaching evaluations, annual work assignments and evaluations, reprints of articles, other pertinent documentation as noted in Appendix A, and other materials as required by University policy.
- 4. Promotion and/or Tenure.** Materials and documents required for consideration of promotion and/or tenure include a current curriculum vitae, annual work assignments and evaluations, external letters of recommendation, teaching evaluations, reprints of articles, other pertinent documentation as noted in Appendix A, and other materials as required by University policy. Copies of requests for letters of evaluation, recommendation letters, email or memo notifications for delivery of ballots, scheduled meetings when requested, and emails or memos requesting materials from a candidate also form part of the documentation and should be maintained by the Department Chair's Office.

B. Notification of Faculty Candidate Regarding Materials for Promotion and/or Tenure and Periodic Career Review

The Department Chair in conjunction with the Associate Dean for Faculty Affairs will notify the faculty candidate what materials should be assembled and by what date the materials should be submitted. Every effort will be made to provide the faculty member with at least 90 working days to assemble the required materials. The notification will indicate that the faculty candidate for promotion or tenure may add information or documents for reconsideration by previous levels of evaluation before the file is forwarded to the University Provost. The faculty member may examine any substantive and procedural material in the file at any time prior to receipt in the office of the University Provost. However, the faculty candidate will not be informed of the identity of the evaluators.

C. Evaluation Criteria for Promotion and/or Tenure and Periodic Career Review.

The Department Chair in conjunction with the Associate Dean for Faculty Affairs will provide the criteria by which candidates are to be evaluated to all faculty members of the department and to the external and internal reviewers.

D. Reviewer Evaluations for Promotion and/or Tenure and Periodic Career Review

(Redbook, Minimum Guidelines Section IV.D.5)

1. Number of Reviewers for promotion and/or tenure. Three external reviewer evaluations are required for each promotion and/or tenure review. The faculty candidate will be given the opportunity to suggest names of reviewers and to discuss these with the Department Chair. The candidate will provide the Department Chair a list of at least eight potential reviewers outside of the University. All reviewers should have a doctoral level degree (MD, PhD, EdD, DDS, JD or equivalent terminal degree) and an academic appointment at or above the rank to which the candidate is being promoted, or be in an equivalent non-academic position. The relationship of the reviewers to the candidate and the University must be clearly indicated in the list. The Department Chair will review the evaluators and may strike names of those considered to be inappropriate, and may identify alternatives. All materials related to such changes must be included in the promotion file. The Dean or Dean's designee will resolve any disputes associated with the external evaluator selection process.

2. Number of Reviewers for Periodic Career Review. Because evaluations during periodic career review are restricted to the SPHIS and personnel files do not proceed through University-wide offices, external evaluations are not required in the personnel file; internal letters may take their place. A total of three letters are required.

3. Selection of External Reviewers. The primary purpose of the extramural review is to provide an unbiased, professional expert and objective evaluation of the candidate's published research and service activities. Thus, the reviewers must be sufficiently well established in the candidate's field of expertise to allow an informed assessment of the quality of the candidate's contributions. Former mentors (graduate or post-graduate supervisors), recent co-authors or current collaborators are not acceptable extramural evaluators. However, it is permissible to provide supplementary letters from mentors, so long as they are clearly indicated as such. Once the Department Chair and candidate have agreed on the list of potential extramural reviewers or any dispute about the list has been resolved by the Dean or the Dean's designee, the list will be forwarded to the Dean's office. The Dean, or Associate Dean for Faculty Affairs will select three evaluators. The

Department Chair or the Associate Dean for Faculty Affairs will contact the evaluators to request letters of evaluation. The professional qualifications, eligibility and objectivity of the reviewers must be certified in the department Chair's evaluation letter (Minimum Guidelines Sec. IV.D.5.a). The candidate should not contact potential reviewers and should not be informed of the identity of the selected reviewers.

4. Request for Reviewer Letters. The letters of request to the selected reviewers must provide the candidate's average annual work assignment for the time period under review for the areas on the work plan (teaching, research, service). If the annual work assignment has varied greatly over part of the period of review, this should be clearly indicated. The letter must summarize the performance criteria defined in Appendix A, any supplementary departmental criteria, and direct reviewers to evaluate whether criteria for proficiency have been attained in all areas of the work assignment and if excellence has been demonstrated in the area of greatest assignment. In the case of tenure reviews, and promotion to professor of tenured faculty, reviewers should be asked to additionally evaluate the quality of the candidate's scholarship. Recommendations on the advisability of award of promotion and/or tenure should not be solicited because extramural evaluators are not generally familiar with the entire record of the candidate; if such recommendations are returned, they will be disregarded. Accompanying documents provided by the faculty member must include: (1) a copy of the 'Policy for Promotion, Appointment and Tenure and for Periodic Career Review' and Appendix A; (2) the candidate's CV; (3) selected reprints of peer-reviewed publications; (4) summative teaching evaluations; (5) a research/teaching summary report by year showing work assignment percentages for research, teaching, and service, number of publications, external grant and contract funding percents, name and number of courses taught and number of students; and (6) a service summary report by year showing service percent time, service organization interactions, and nature of the interaction.

5. Receipt of External Reviews. The evaluative letters of the extramural reviewers must be returned to the Dean's Office. The faculty candidate, upon request, may view a redacted copy that does not provide any identifying information on the reviewer. The faculty candidate may respond in writing to any substantive points in the reviewer's evaluations if they choose, and this response may be included in the review binder. The faculty candidate, however, may not remove letters of review from the binder.

E. Procedures for Department Review for Appointment, Promotion and/or Tenure and Periodic Career Review.

The following provides general guidelines for the eligibility of faculty who may vote on appointment, promotion, tenure and periodic career reviews, and the required department review procedures.

1. Eligibility of Faculty Voting. Tenured faculty members are eligible to review and vote on all faculty members for appointment, promotion and tenure at or below their rank. Probationary faculty members and term faculty members are eligible to review and vote on the appointment and promotion of faculty to the same or lower rank. If there are fewer than three eligible departmental faculty members, exclusive of the chair, the department will recommend a list of up to six eligible university extra-departmental faculty members from which the Dean or Dean's designee will select up to three. Faculty who are on university leave do not vote unless they inform the Office of the Dean in writing that they wish to vote during their leave.

2. Department Voting Process and Records. Voting for promotion and tenure are conducted separately and recorded on separate ballots. The ballots will not be marked with name, rank, tenure status, or any other information that could identify a faculty member to ensure that votes remain anonymous. Any identifying information associated with a faculty member will be removed and the anonymous ballots submitted to the Dean's Office. A staff assistant will collect and log the returned ballot envelopes. If the total number of ballots returned is less than the number sent, a reminder will be sent to the voting faculty providing a final deadline for return of ballots. Ballots that are not returned will be excluded from the total count. The voting records will be maintained by the Dean's Office and include the list of faculty eligible to vote, the number and names of faculty sent a ballot, the number and names of faculty who return a ballot, and the aggregate result of the vote summarized on the Department Ballot Summary. The decision of the anonymous vote will constitute the departmental recommendation. All confidential records regarding faculty reviews should be protected to maintain the privacy of the reviewers and faculty member under review. The results of the department vote will be summarized on the Department Ballot Summary and included in the candidate's promotion and tenure dossier.

3. Evaluation by the Department Chair. The Department Chair will prepare a separate letter of evaluation and recommendation, which constitutes the Chair's vote. This letter must describe the candidate's work assignment over the period of review and evaluate the performance according to the SPHIS criteria provided in Appendix A, and any department criteria. The letter also must summarize the evaluations by the external reviewers and make note of their relationship to the University and to the candidate.

4. Compilation of the Personnel File. All documentary materials employed in the evaluation of the candidate including a copy of the criteria used for evaluation, plus the recommendations and votes of the eligible department faculty and the Chair, will be placed in the candidate's personnel file and in the dossier for promotion and/or tenure. Annual work assignments and evaluations covering the entire review period for the candidate must also be present. The contents of the personnel file are the basis for evaluation at all succeeding levels of review. Materials are considered confidential.

5. Personnel Decision Voting. Individual faculty members vote on personnel decisions only once.

F. Procedures for PAT Committee Review

All recommendations for appointment or promotion to Associate Professor or Professor, for tenure, and periodic career review are forwarded to the SPHIS PAT Committee for review and recommendation prior to the Dean's evaluation. The file should include copies of all materials noted above and required documentation as noted in Appendix A. The body of work presented in the file will be evaluated in relation to the percent of effort as recorded for the work plan assignment. The PAT Committee will examine each recommendation for consistency with current SPHIS personnel policy. The decision of the anonymous vote, when applicable, will be included in the PAT Committee letter, which must reference the Annual Work Plan and assigned percentages for the review period. Additionally, the letter should reference the SPHIS criteria and must provide a written analysis of the validity and significance of the evaluations received.

G. Termination of a Review for Promotion or Early Award of Tenure

Once formally initiated, the process of review for promotion or early award of tenure will proceed through the levels described unless the candidate requests in writing that the proceedings be halted.

IV. CONDITIONS OF FACULTY APPOINTMENT

A. Annual Work Plan (Redbook Sec. 4.3.1.A)

An annual faculty work plan is to be determined by the Department Chair in response to departmental needs and in collaboration with each faculty member, subject to approval by the Dean. While signature by both indicating their agreement is preferred, it is not essential. The annual work plan must specify percentage effort to be spent in teaching, research and service. Service may be further specified as Community Service (defined as service to the Department, School, University, Commonwealth, region, nation, or profession that primarily involves public health and/or health information sciences expertise). The annual work plan will specify the requirements for a faculty member's presence at the University or University-affiliated facilities and describe the specific goals and objectives to be achieved by the faculty member during the period covered. When circumstances require changes in the work plan, the faculty member and Department Chair will file an amended plan (including an explanation of the necessary changes) for the Dean's approval.

- 1. Non-Tenured Faculty.** The faculty work plan will be specific to the assigned areas and duties specific to the contract period for non-tenurable faculty.
- 2. Probationary Faculty.** For probationary faculty (defined in Section I.A.c of this document) the faculty work plan will reflect the need to demonstrate broad proficiency in the three areas of teaching, research and service and scholarship in one area in order to satisfy the requirements for the award of tenure.
- 3. Tenured Faculty.** For tenured faculty, the faculty work plan will respect both the faculty member's need to shape his or her career and the missions of the department, SPHIS, and University. In order to accomplish this, the annual work plan will permit individual faculty members to concentrate, at various times in their careers, on one or more of the areas of teaching, research and service. However, the work plan also must allow for achieving the mission, goals, and objectives of the department.

B. Presence at the University (Redbook Sec. 4.3.1.B)

- 1. Minimum Requirements.** Although professional activities may require a faculty member's absence on occasion, faculty members normally are expected to be routinely available on campus and at the SPHIS to meet with their colleagues, attend department meetings and to teach and meet with students.
- 2. Office Hours.** Faculty are required to make themselves available to students by observing posted office hours and by allowing students to arrange appointments at other mutually convenient times.
- 3. Faculty Governance and Duties.** Participation in departmental meetings and school assemblies is assumed. Under normal circumstances, faculty members are expected to serve on department, school and university committees.

4. Meeting Classes. Each faculty member is responsible for the conduct of assigned courses and is required to meet such classes and make such assignments as will fulfill the learning objectives of the course. In the event a faculty member must miss a scheduled class, notice must be given to the Department Chair specifying the reason for the missed class and the plan for making up the work.

C. Work Outside The University (Redbook Sec. 4.3.3)

Work outside the University that is not specified in the annual work plan must be approved in advanced by the Department Chair and Dean and must not conflict or interfere with the faculty member's responsibilities at UofL. As part of the documentation for annual review, full-time faculty will submit a report of this professional work outside of UofL.

D. Other Conditions Of Employment

Other conditions of faculty employment, including compensation, paid tutoring, sabbatical leave, leave of absence without pay, leave of absence with pay, and retirement are covered more fully in Article 4.3 of The Redbook.

V. RESOLUTION OF DISAGREEMENTS

Article 4.4 in The Redbook covers the informal and formal procedures associated with the resolution of disagreements.

VI. TERMINATION OF SERVICE

Article 4.5 in The Redbook covers the termination of service by a faculty member and termination of a probationary academic appointment or of an academic appointment before the end of a specified term or for faculty with tenure.

VII. CHANGES TO THIS DOCUMENT

The process of reviewing and implementing changes to this document and appendices originates in the school and in collaboration with the SPHIS Dean, the PAT Committee, the Department Chairs and the Faculty. The proposed amendment(s) will be considered by the appropriate committees as noted in the SPHIS Bylaws and forwarded via mail or email to all faculty members eligible to vote. The proposed amendment(s) is passed if approved by 60 percent of SPHIS faculty eligible to vote. The Dean will forward this document concurrently to the office of the EVPHA and the office of the University Provost. The University Provost will make a recommendation in consultation with the EVPHA, after which, it will be considered for recommendation by the President and approval by the Board of Trustees.

APPENDIX A
School of Public Health & Information Sciences
University of Louisville

**Achievement (Proficiency and Excellence) in
Teaching, Research, & Service for Promotion,
& Scholarship for Tenure**

Faculty promotion is based on faculty achievement. In the School of Public Health and Information Sciences (SPHIS), faculty achievement is evaluated in the areas of teaching, research and service for proficiency and excellence, with consideration of the percent effort assigned to each area. Work assignments for tenure-track and tenured faculty members cover all three areas; work assignments for term faculty members may be limited to fewer than the three areas, depending on the work assignment. Work assignments and other institutional obligations and activities that require a faculty member's presence on campus are determined by the Department Chair in response to departmental needs, and in collaboration with each faculty member, subject to approval by the Dean (Redbook, Chapter 4, Sec. 4.3.1.).

Proficiency requires evidence for competency in each of the assigned areas, and is expected for satisfactory career review or contract renewal. Excellence must be demonstrated in the area of greatest work effort during the period of review. The area in which excellence is expected should be indicated in the annual work assignment letter. Demonstrated capacity for leadership or entrepreneurship is important for a rating of excellence. Scholarship for the award of tenure is necessary in one of the three areas of teaching, research or service. Tenured faculty must demonstrate sustained scholarship in the area of greatest work effort, defined by the average percent effort across annual work assignments for five-year periodic reviews.

Leadership is the process by which a person influences and enlists the support of others in the accomplishment of a common task. Entrepreneurship is valued primarily in association with research and teaching. An entrepreneur is considered to be someone who assumes the risk for developing and introducing new ideas or technologies into society. Scholarship involves the creation, integration, and dissemination of knowledge that advances a field of study and influences the profession and community as evidenced in peer-review and acceptance. An important measure of scholarship is the number and quality of peer-reviewed publications. Examples of proficiency, excellence, leadership, entrepreneurship and scholarship in teaching, research and service are provided below.

Although there may be variation across departments in the evaluation of faculty achievement there should not be marked disparities. Each department may develop and apply more explicit evaluation measures that are suitable to their discipline (Redbook Sec. 4.6.4), but these may not be less stringent than those defined in the Redbook (Sec. 4.2: Faculty Personnel Reviews) or in this policy.

I. TEACHING

A variety of methods may be used to evaluate teaching. The SPHIS requires teaching evaluations to be conducted, at minimum, by the faculty member's Department Chair and at least two faculty at the same or higher rank based on materials assembled in a teaching portfolio that includes documentation for formal classroom teaching, as reflected in: amount of individual,

team, and interdisciplinary teaching; curriculum development; mentoring of students and faculty; and community-based, practice-based, and service-based instruction. The teaching portfolio should also include syllabi for courses taught; student and peer course evaluations that consider teaching style and strategies; and other evidence of accomplishment of learning objectives, innovation, and overall teaching effectiveness. Although the department or the SPHIS compiles much of this information, it is ultimately the responsibility of the faculty member to assemble a complete teaching portfolio. Documentation of activity in the design and development of new courses, restructuring of courses, teaching awards, training grant awards, teaching-related publications, and any other teaching-related activities including, but not limited to workshops, symposia, special lectures, or tutoring, should be included when available. The amount and quality of mentoring also may be documented by letters of support from a graduate student's thesis or dissertation committee members, or from post-doctoral trainees, fellows, or junior faculty members. Lastly, the faculty member must include a self-assessment of teaching performance when this accounts for a percentage of work assignment. All documents are to be collected in accordance with the SPHIS suggested teaching portfolio contents (see SPHIS Teaching Portfolio Guide). Teaching evaluations must consider the average percent effort and any details related to the teaching assignment specified in the work assignments covering the period of review. The evaluation of the teaching portfolio will result in an overall qualitative rating of proficiency or excellence for promotion as well as scholarship for tenure as defined below.

A. Proficiency in Teaching for Promotion

Proficiency in teaching requires evidence based on the Summative Teaching Evaluations for competence in all areas of teaching in which a faculty member is engaged. Proficient teaching requires faculty members to apply their expertise toward advancing the understanding of a topic by students and mentees and encouraging critical and creative thinking. Summative supervisory, peer, student, and mentee reviews should show evidence for satisfactory performance commensurate with the time-averaged teaching work assignment. Examples of evidence for proficiency in teaching may include, but are not limited to: all course syllabi were thorough, properly distributed, and up to date; learning objectives were consistently met; active participation in mentoring including practica, theses, dissertation and independent studies; positive peer and student teaching reviews and teaching awards; peer reviewed publications, presentations at national scientific meetings and grant applications that include the student or mentee.

B. Excellence in Teaching for Promotion

Evidence of excellence in teaching is required for promotion for those with the highest assigned percent effort in teaching. Excellence in teaching requires faculty to display leadership in actively challenging and engaging students in the learning process, influencing them to continue as critical and creative thinkers upon completion of their formal program. Additionally, faculty may display entrepreneurship in teaching by developing, copyrighting, patenting, licensing and disseminating new teaching methods and materials, curricular models, educational software or technologies.

1. Promotion to Associate Professor (term and tenure-track)

Promotion to associate professor requires evidence of excellence in teaching when this is the primary area of greatest effort or the only area of effort. The expectation is that there will be strong evidence to demonstrate a substantial teaching assignment with a major

responsibility for (i.e., leadership role in) a teaching program that is clearly documented, and an average of at least one peer-reviewed publication each year. Additional evidence may include substantial activity in team and interdisciplinary teaching, community-based or practice-based instruction, mentoring of doctoral and masters-level students, leadership of workshops, symposia, invited lectures, teaching-related publications, presentations on teaching methods, widespread use of developed teaching materials, or receipt of training grants. Supervisory, peer, and student reviews of the teaching effort must be obtained and should support the rating of excellence.

Excellence in teaching may also be demonstrated through entrepreneurship which may include patented technologies (e.g., computer programs, Videos, Web-based applications, textbooks) that are widely accepted, development and licensing of curricula or curricular models, new evaluation methodologies, well-subscribed faculty continuing education programs, and copyrighted workbooks and study guides adopted by other institutions.

2. Promotion to Professor (term and tenure-track)

In addition to the criteria specified above under Section 1, promotion to professor requires evidence for sustained excellence as well as demonstrated extra-university influential leadership or entrepreneurship in teaching. Examples of sustained leadership may include, but are not limited to: demonstrated participation in extramural educational initiatives, leadership of national forums, election to national committees involved with education, invitations as a visiting professor for a teaching activity, and invitation to be an accreditation site visitor at other institutions.

C. Scholarship in Teaching for Tenure

Tenure is awarded to tenure-track faculty members who have demonstrated scholarship through superior achievement and recognition in teaching. Peer acceptance of disseminated scholarship related to teaching may be demonstrated in a number of ways, however it is expected that the majority of the documentation will be through traditional peer-reviewed publications with at least an average of one each year. The expectation is that these publications will include peer-reviewed manuscripts in journals, review articles, textbooks, book chapters, and other publications on pedagogic issues, educational outcomes studies, or the development of new teaching protocols; quality and quantity are important measures. The content of the publications may be in teaching, research, or service. First or senior authorship is preferred, but all publications may be considered. Additionally, it is expected that at least two of the following criteria will be met for evidence of scholarship in teaching, and that all three will be considered in evaluating the strengths of the candidate:

1. Funding

Extramural funding that supports training grants, teaching initiatives, service teaching, or teaching-related extramural contracts. Sources of funding may include, but are not limited to federal grants, national peer-reviewed grants and contracts.

2. Methods Application

Development of new methodologies or the application of existing methodologies in a novel manner, which have been disseminated and accepted by peers, as evidenced in peer-reviewed publications, extramural letters, presentations at national forums, or other similar media.

3. Recognition

Emerging regional, national, or international recognition in a focused area of instructional innovation, which should include relevant peer-reviewed journal or book-length publications. Additional examples of evidence may include, but are not limited to: demonstrated leadership roles on training grants or on national forums, consultation by other universities, as an editor or reviewer of peer-reviewed publications, or exceptional entrepreneurship through continued development and dissemination of new educational technologies. Evidence for this recognition will include confidential and anonymous extramural letters of evaluation.

II. RESEARCH

Each faculty member maintains a research portfolio that includes clearly defined research goals, documented effort, and results that can be used to evaluate the quantity and quality of research productivity (see SPHIS Research Portfolio Guide). Research is defined as work leading to new knowledge, a better theoretical or applied understanding of an area of knowledge, or the development of new methodologies and their application. Collaborative, interdisciplinary team, community and practice-based research efforts within and outside of the SPHIS and University of Louisville are important and recognized. Principal investigators on multiple-investigator grants are acknowledged and rewarded, although it is recognized that some investigators on such grants will be required to have more extensive involvement and time commitment than others. Evaluation is based on documented evidence for duration, extent of involvement, innovation, effectiveness, impact and output of research activities documented in the research portfolio. Documentation may include notice of grant or contract awards, abstracts of funded grants and contracts, submitted research grants and contracts, research awards, and any other research-related activities, including, but not limited to peer-reviewed publications, peer-reviewed presentations at national scientific meetings, research workshops, symposia, and special lectures, and other examples of peer recognition of research accomplishments. It is the responsibility of the faculty member to provide documentation of his/her performance in the research portfolio, and to provide a self-assessment of research performance when this accounts for a percentage of work assignment. Research evaluations must consider the average percent effort and any details related to the research assignment specified in the work assignments covering the period of review. All documents are to be collected in accordance with the SPHIS Policy and evaluated to show an overall qualitative rating of proficiency or excellence as well as scholarship for tenure as defined below.

A. Proficiency in Research for Promotion

Primary evidence of proficiency in research is based on a consistent and regular dissemination of research findings, the majority of which are expected to be through traditional peer-reviewed publications. Proficiency in research may include evidence of research activity in grant or contract submissions as either a principal investigator or co-investigator. Additional examples of proficiency in research include, but are not limited to, reviews by collaborators, peers and external reviewers, and research awards.

B. Excellence in Research for Promotion

Evidence of excellence in research is required for promotion for those with the highest assigned percent effort in research. Excellence in research requires faculty to display leadership,

which is best demonstrated by success in obtaining extramural funding and garnering peer recognition as a principal investigator or having a significant role as a co-investigator. Additionally, faculty may demonstrate entrepreneurship in research on small business innovation or technology transfer research grants or contracts that are linked to the school and of demonstrable value to the University with total support equivalent to the research assignment.

1. Promotion to Associate Professor (term and tenure-track)

Promotion to associate professor requires excellence in research when this is the primary area of greatest effort or the only area of effort. The expectation is that there will be strong evidence to demonstrate a major responsibility for an independent research program that has extramural federal or nationally peer-reviewed funding or a leadership role in a collaborative or multicenter research effort that is clearly documented, and an average of at least one peer-reviewed publication each year. Additional evidence may include peer-reviewed abstracts for accepted oral or poster presentations, especially oral presentations, at competitive national scientific meetings, substantial contributions to collaborative and interdisciplinary research, community-based or practice-based research, leadership of research oriented workshops, symposia, invited lectures, media-based publications, serving as a manuscript reviewer on a local or regional grant peer review study section. Supervisory and external peer reviews of the research effort must be obtained and should support the rating of excellence.

Excellence in research may also be demonstrated through entrepreneurship, which is highly valued and evidenced by the translation of research findings to new, patentable methods or technologies that are widely accepted, licensed applications of existing methods, and acquisition of small business initiative research grants or contracts through government or business partnerships.

2. Promotion to Professor (term and tenure-track)

In addition to the criteria specified above under Section 1, promotion to professor requires evidence for sustained excellence as well as demonstrated extra-university influence through leadership or entrepreneurship in an area of research. Examples of evidence may include, but are not limited to: sustained, renewed, federal or national peer-reviewed funding as a principal or major investigator; annual publications in peer-reviewed journals; invitation to be a visiting professor at a nationally recognized research institution; invitation to serve as a manuscript reviewer on a journal editorial board; supervision of doctoral level research trainees who show successful progress; or development and translation of new, patented or licensed methods or technologies. Publication is expected as a senior author on high impact publications of original research or a significant role on publications of high impact collaborative research.

C. Scholarship in Research for Tenure

Tenure is awarded to tenure-track faculty members who have demonstrated scholarship through superior achievement and recognition in research. Peer acceptance of disseminated scholarship in research and innovations in research (discovery of new findings or application of existing findings in a new fashion) are expected. It is expected that the majority of the documentation for peer acceptance of scholarship will be through traditional peer-reviewed publications with an average of one each year and presentations of research findings at national forums. The expectation is that these publications will include peer-reviewed manuscripts in journals, review articles, books, and book chapters, and other publications on research-related

areas, including methodology and editorials; quantity and quality are important measures. The content of the publications may be in research, teaching or service. First or senior authorship is preferred, but all publications may be considered. Additionally, it is expected that at least two of the following criteria will be met for evidence of scholarship in research, and that all three will be considered in evaluating the strengths of the candidate:

1. Funding

Extramural funding that supports independent or collaborative research from grants or contracts. Sources of funding may include, but are not limited to federal grants, national peer-reviewed grants and contracts.

2. Methods Application

Development of new methodologies or the application of existing methodologies in a novel manner, which have been disseminated and accepted by peers, as evidenced in peer-reviewed publications, extramural letters, presentations at national forums, or other similar media.

3. Recognition

Emerging regional, national, or international recognition in a focused area of research expertise, which should include relevant peer-reviewed journal or book-length publications. Additional examples of evidence may include, but are not limited to: demonstrated leadership roles on individual or collaborative research grants or contracts, membership on national forums or on a national grant peer review study section, as an editor or reviewer of peer-reviewed publications, or as an invited lecturer or speaker. Evidence for this recognition will include confidential and anonymous extramural letters of evaluation.

III. SERVICE

Service is defined as activities that support the collective missions of the Department, SPHIS, and the University in conjunction with the community (city, county, state, region, or nation) or profession. Community work that does not draw upon a faculty member's professional expertise is not included. The SPHIS requires faculty, regardless of rank and percent time, to be involved in service to the university. Participation in department meetings and school assemblies is assumed. Faculty members are expected to serve on department, SPHIS, and university committees. It is recognized that service on some committees requires more extensive involvement and time commitment than others. Evaluation of service is made by the faculty member's supervisor, and is based on documented evidence for frequency, duration, extent of involvement, and output of service activities that is compiled and summarized in a service portfolio (see SPHIS Service Portfolio Guide). Because of the value of public health practice, community engagement is particularly recognized that includes public contracts, committee memberships, economic development and outreach partnerships, training, practice-based and research service, and other forms of community and civic engagement that benefit the health of communities. The service portfolio also includes peer evaluations of service accomplishments, their innovation, effectiveness, and impact, and a faculty self-assessment. It is the responsibility of the faculty member to document progress towards meeting their service goals, and to provide a self-assessment of service performance when this accounts for a percentage of work assignment. Documentation of service-related activities, as well as service awards should be included when available. The Service Portfolio Guide provides information on the type of

documents to include for review. An evaluation will be made to show an overall qualitative rating of proficiency or excellence as well as scholarship for tenure as defined below.

A. Proficiency in Service for Promotion

Proficiency in service requires satisfactory supervisory and peer reviews, and includes, but is not limited to, letters of recognition addressing the impact of a faculty member's service. Reviews by the recipients of the service or colleagues with knowledge of the service, external reviewers, and service awards are used to document proficiency. Examples of evidence for proficiency in service may include, but are not limited to service as: a manuscript reviewer; reviewer on a grant peer-review study section; editor for a peer-reviewed publication; organizer of symposia, meetings, and community forums; or as an invited presenter.

B. Excellence in Service for Promotion

Excellence in service is required for promotion for those with the highest assigned percent effort in service. Excellence associated with service requires faculty to display leadership, which is best demonstrated through exceptional community engagement and extramurally funded activities.

1. Promotion to Associate Professor (term and tenure-track)

Promotion to associate professor requires evidence of excellence in service when this is the primary area of greatest effort or the only area of effort. The expectation is that there will be strong evidence to demonstrate a clearly documented, major responsibility for (i.e., leadership role in) a service program associated with extramural funding, and an average of one peer-reviewed publication each year. Reviews by supervisors, recipients of the service, and external peer reviews must be obtained and should support the rating of excellence. Recipients of service may include colleagues, health departments, government and community organizations, and other acceptable entities. Collective reviews based on public satisfaction inventories may be included. Additional evidence may include awards for service.

2. Promotion to Professor (term and tenure-track)

In addition to the criteria specified above under Section 1, promotion to professor requires demonstrated extra-university influence and leadership in service. Examples of evidence may include, but are not limited to: novel and sustained partnerships and interventions that impact the public health of the community, establishment of strong ties with the community-based health organizations at the local, state, regional and national level and with state and federal agencies, demonstrated participation in extramural service initiatives including research service, community programs to educate and promote public health changes that have potential to impact community members' health, curriculum development for community and government agencies, service related to elimination of community health disparities, election to national committees involved with service activities, invitations as a visiting professor or a university representative for a service activity or assistance with implementation of community-based programs.

C. Scholarship in Service for Tenure

Tenure is awarded to tenure-track faculty members who have demonstrated scholarship through superior achievement and recognition with the development of new service protocols or programs or the expansion of existing service programs that are specifically associated with community engagement and partnership. It is expected that the majority of the documentation

for peer acceptance of disseminated scholarship will be through peer-reviewed reports and publications, and presentation of findings at national forums. The expectation is that these publications will include peer-reviewed manuscripts in journals, review articles, books, and book chapters, and other publications that report on community engaged work; quantity and quality are important measures. The content of the publications may be in service, teaching or research. First or senior authorship is preferred, but all publications may be considered. Additionally, it is expected that at least two of the following criteria will be met for evidence of scholarship in service, and that all three will be considered in evaluating the strengths of the candidate:

1. Funding

Extramural funding that supports community engagement programs. Sources of funding may include, but are not limited to federal grants, national peer-reviewed service grants and contracts. Service as a key supporting or technical collaborator in multiple grants, contracts or protocols is recognized also. This includes, but is not limited to, substantial service as a management, statistical, technical or policy consultant.

2. Methods Application

Development of new methodologies or the application of existing methodologies in a novel manner, which have been disseminated and accepted by peers, as evidenced in peer-reviewed publications, extramural letters, presentations at national forums, or other similar media.

3. Recognition

Emerging regional, national, or international recognition in community engagement or in a focused or innovative area of service delivery, which should include relevant peer-reviewed journal or book-length publications. Additional examples of evidence may include, but are not limited to: demonstrated leadership roles on individual or collaborative service-related grants or contracts; membership on national forums related to community engagement; service on regional, national, or international grants and contracts; committee member on scientific peer-review panels or study sections; organizer of symposia, meetings, and community forums; service as an editor or reviewer of peer-reviewed publications; or consultant to other universities or agencies affiliated with service. Evidence for this recognition will include confidential and anonymous extramural letters of evaluation.

APPENDIX B
School of Public Health & Information Sciences
University of Louisville

**Appointment, Promotion, Retention and
Recognition of Adjunct Faculty**

An individual interested in participating in the University of Louisville (UofL) School of Public Health and Information Sciences (SPHIS) as an Adjunct Faculty member must be qualified and able to demonstrate a commitment to actively work with full-time faculty or students in the teaching, research, or service mission of the school, and must maintain a professional profile. All adjunct faculty members must adhere to the standards set forth in statements issued by the SPHIS, and any documents related to ethics, research integrity, IRB requirements, and appropriate statements issued by the UofL.

A. Appointment

Adjunct faculty appointments are non-tenurable and may be at one of four levels in a Department: Adjunct Instructor, Adjunct Assistant Professor, Adjunct Associate Professor, and Adjunct Professor. The following outlines the process for appointment as an adjunct faculty member.

1. Materials Required for Application

A request for an Adjunct faculty appointment is initiated by the Department Chair through a letter of support indicating how the faculty member will contribute to the teaching, research or service missions of the SPHIS, accompanied by the individual's CV. Other pertinent materials that provide documentation for previous experience in teaching, research or service from previous academic or other appointments may be included.

The application for appointment, letter of reference from the Department Chair and any other supporting documents will be reviewed by the Dean of the SPHIS for recommendation and then transmitted to the EVPHA for review and recommendation, after which, a roster of adjunct faculty is reported to the University Provost.

2. Criteria Required for Appointment

Adjunct faculty, usually, are expected to have the same academic qualifications as members of the regular faculty. They may be employed by a school or university other than UofL, by another school or college at UofL, as either a part-time or full-time faculty member, or by another organization. They are not normally compensated as adjunct faculty, but may be compensated by contract for specific part-time services. An individual applying for Adjunct Faculty status must demonstrate a capacity for and commitment to actively work with full-time faculty or students to further the teaching, research, or service missions of the school. Specifically, the applicant must show documentation for: previous experience in teaching, research or service from previous academic or other appointments. Examples of such materials may include: mentoring of students, presenting didactic lectures, involvement in departmental instructional or service activities, or participating in research collaborations with one or more full-time SPHIS faculty members for joint presentations, publications, or grant submissions.

3. Level of Appointment

The level of appointment should be commensurate with the level of experience of the applicant. For example, an applicant who received a doctoral degree within the last three years or who has accumulated little experience in academia should be considered for an appointment at the level of Adjunct Assistant Professor. If the prospective Adjunct Faculty member has served as full-time faculty or Adjunct Faculty of higher rank at this or another university, the prospective faculty member may apply for a position of higher rank. Application for a higher rank requires documentation of associated activities at the prior institution that would warrant a higher rank position. Exceptions may be granted for applicants with long documented experience in a special area directly relevant to the mission of the department or SPHIS. They are not normally compensated as adjunct faculty, but may be compensated by contract for specified part-time services in accordance with UofL policy.

4. Term of Appointment

The term of initial appointments will be at the discretion of the Department Chair, but may not exceed one year for an Adjunct Instructor and three years for Adjunct Assistant Professor, Adjunct Associate Professor, and Adjunct Professor.

B. Reappointment

1. Materials Required for Reappointment Application

The term of appointment to Adjunct Faculty is time-limited. A Department will make reasonable efforts to send notification to the faculty member approximately one year prior to the expiration date of the current appointment; however, it is the responsibility of the Adjunct Faculty member to apply for reappointment six months prior to the expiration date of the current appointment in order to ensure continuity of appointment, assuming there is a continuing need for the Adjunct Faculty member's services. The process of reappointment is at the sole discretion of the Department Chair and SPHIS Dean and will follow the same process as that for initial appointment.

Applications for reappointment will be reviewed by the Dean of the SPHIS for recommendation and will follow the same process conducted for initial appointment.

2. Criteria Required for Reappointment

See criteria required for initial appointment (A.2.). Applicants submitting for reappointment must document successful contributions made to the teaching, research or service missions of SPHIS during the previous appointment period.

3. Term of Reappointment

Reappointment will be made to the Adjunct Faculty for the same maximum terms delineated above for initial appointments.

C. Promotion

1. Materials Required for Promotion Application

Application for promotion must be made by the Adjunct Faculty member six months prior to the time the current appointment is to be reviewed. The faculty member should return the completed application with a letter requesting consideration for promotion accompanied by a support letter from the Department Chair.

2. Level of Appointment for Promotion

Promotion to the various levels in the Adjunct Faculty track will be sequential and will be determined by the continuing demonstration of a commitment to the criteria for Adjunct Faculty Appointment listed above and duration of involvement outlined below.

3. Term of Appointment and Timing for Promotion

There is a standard minimum time the Adjunct Faculty member must serve at the appointed level prior to applying for promotion. Five years minimum time is required for promotion from Adjunct Instructor and Adjunct Assistant Professor (combined) to Adjunct Associate Professor, and five years is required for promotion from Adjunct Associate Professor to Adjunct Professor. Promotion from Adjunct Instructor to Adjunct Assistant Professor may be done at any time. Promotion to Adjunct Professor will require an exceptional effort on the part of the Adjunct Faculty applicant. At the time of retirement, the Adjunct Faculty member who has achieved advanced rank (Adjunct Associate Professor or Adjunct Professor) may be given an Emeritus Adjunct Faculty position at the highest rank attained. Early promotion based on exceptional contributions is possible.

D. Termination of Appointment

Recommendation of termination prior to the end of the appointed term should be forwarded to the Dean for review and recommendation. Justification must include refusal to comply with the requirements and criteria set forth in this document or inactivity when asked to comply or any of the bases upon which probationary or term faculty may be terminated. Non-renewal at the end of the appointed term is at the discretion of the Department Chair and may be done without cause. Recommendation of termination and non-renewal will follow the same process conducted for initial appointment.

Recommended by SPHIS Faculty Forum August/02

Recommended by the SPHIS Executive Faculty August/02

Recommended by the SPHIS Faculty Forum August/02

Approved by the SPHIS Executive Faculty August/02

Confirmed by the Faculty Senate, September 4, 2002

Approved by the Board of Trustees, September 13, 2002

Revision 1 (Includes Appendices A & B)

Recommended by SPHIS PAT Committee: August 13, 2014

Recommended by SPHIS Rules Policies and Credentials Committee: September 12, 2014

Recommended by SPHIS Faculty Forum: September 23, 2014

Approved by SPHIS Faculty: October 28, 2014

Approved by Faculty Senate: September 21, 2016

Approved by Board of Trustees: October 13, 2016