




UNIVERSITY OF KENTUCKY

July 30, 2003

Office of the Provost  
106 Gillis Building  
Lexington, KY 40506-0033  
(859) 257-2911  
Fax: (859) 257-1333  
Email: [provost@email.uky.edu](mailto:provost@email.uky.edu)  
[www.uky.edu](http://www.uky.edu)

**MEMORANDUM**

TO: Deans, Chairs, School Directors, Division Chiefs,  
Division Directors, and Graduate Program Center Directors

FROM: Michael T. Nietzel  
Provost 

RE: Procedures for Faculty Appointment, Promotion and Tenure

The effectiveness of the University of Kentucky depends upon the quality of its faculty. We continually strive to hire, retain, promote, and tenure the best possible faculty, and you play the most important role in recruiting, evaluating, and retaining these faculty. The evaluation process, particularly as it relates to promotion and tenure, is a crucial event in the life of a faculty member and in the life of the University. It is important that each faculty member be fully informed about the promotion and tenure process.

I will ask that you take the following actions:

- Please share this memorandum with each faculty member who is a candidate for appointment, promotion, and/or tenure.
- Please send it to each faculty member who is scheduled for a promotion and/or tenure review in the next fiscal year. You may also wish to share it with those who are a year or two away from such a review, recognizing that certain changes could occur along the way.
- Please also post this memorandum in the college office and in departments.
- Please ensure that you, as the unit administrator, explain the process to each faculty member. The more we can demystify this process the better the University will be in providing an environment for faculty to assume their individual responsibilities to meet the institution's standards and expectations. An excellent university rigorously applies its standards for teaching, research, and service to its faculty candidates.

We will provide a workshop for you that will be focused upon appointment, promotion and tenure process and issues. This will provide an opportunity for all parties involved in these important reviews to consider the same material and discuss issues together. The workshop is scheduled as follows; I strongly encourage you to attend:

**Date: Wednesday, October 1**

**Time: 3-5 p.m.**

**Place: W. T. Young Library Auditorium**

The following requirements, guidelines and procedures regarding dossiers, review processes for appointments, promotion and tenure, and relevant schedules for reviews and notifications will be in effect for AY 2003-04.

#### **A. SUBMISSION OF DOSSIERS**

A dossier for a faculty member must be submitted in support of [1] an initial, full-time appointment in all title series; [2] a promotion to the rank of associate or full professor with or without tenure; or [3] the granting of tenure if separate from a simultaneous promotion process. These cases, except joint appointments, appointments of voluntary faculty, or appointments at the level of Instructor or Assistant Professor require the advice of the appropriate academic area advisory committee.

Dossiers are assembled within the academic unit and submitted to the dean of the faculty member's college. The dean may approve or disapprove proposals relative to instructors, assistant professors, post-retirements, appointments on a fee schedule basis, and part-time faculty appointments. The Provost's approval is needed for an appointment as lecturer or any appointment in the Visiting Title Series.

Board of Trustees approval is required for an initial faculty appointment at an annual salary or annual anticipated remuneration (AAR) exceeding \$60,000.

Dossiers must be forwarded to the following individuals for the colleges and graduate program centers listed below. The division of these colleges among these two staff was done in order to equalize workloads and has no other implications. The process for handling and evaluating these proposals will be identical regardless of which office handles the processing.

It would be advisable for colleges to retain a duplicate copy of a dossier.

Margaret Leach, Room 4, Gillis Building

Arts and Sciences

Agriculture

Business and Economics

Communications and Information Studies

Design

Education  
Engineering  
Fine Arts  
Law  
Lexington Community College  
Libraries  
Social Work

Cathy Owen, Room 311F, Health Sciences Building

Biomedical Engineering  
Dentistry  
Gerontology  
Health Sciences  
Martin School of Public Administration  
Medicine  
Nursing  
Nutrition  
Patterson School of Diplomacy  
Pharmacy  
Toxicology

## **B. JOINT APPOINTMENTS**

When a faculty member holds an appointment within two or more units, one of the areas is designated as the primary appointment. Tenure may be awarded only in the area of primary appointment, typically a department or a graduate program center. Appointment, promotion, and tenure procedures for secondary, joint appointments are the same as those for the primary appointment. Each joint appointment must be evaluated and processed separately, but such appointments do not require review by an academic area committee. A dean's recommendation on joint appointments to the Provost must include: [1] the candidate's up-to-date curriculum vitae; [2] letters from at least the tenured faculty of the department or graduate program center where the candidate will have a proposed secondary appointment, and the full-time, tenure-track faculty who have been appointed in the academic unit for two years; [3] letters from the chairs or directors of the primary and proposed secondary departments or graduate program centers; and [4] letters from the deans where the faculty member holds primary and secondary appointments, if the appointment bridges two colleges and/or centers.

## **C. SCHEDULE FOR SUBMISSION OF DOSSIERS**

Faculty promotion and tenure dossiers should be submitted by the deans to one of the above offices as early as possible. **All promotion dossiers must be delivered by January 12.** Preparation of dossiers and solicitation of outside letters must therefore take place in the fall semester. Any deviation from this schedule will require approval from the Provost or Associate Provost for Academic Affairs.

#### **D. NOTIFICATION OF FACULTY**

An untenured faculty member in the first year of service must be notified of non-renewal of appointment by March 1 for appointments ending June 30 or three months in advance if the appointment ends at some other point during the academic year. The corresponding deadline in the second year of service is December 15 for appointments ending June 30 or six months in advance if the appointment ends at some other point during the academic year. After two years of service, twelve-months notice must be given (AR II-1.01, Section IV.B).

If a dean decides not to recommend the award of tenure to an assistant or associate professor in the next-to-last year of probation, the dean shall notify the faculty member of this decision in writing before the end of the sixth or next-to-last year of the individual's probationary period. A full professor in a one-year probationary period must be notified in writing of the dean's decision not to recommend tenure no later than March 1 if the individual's probationary period expires at the end of the academic or fiscal year or three months in advance if the probationary period terminates during the year (AR II-1.0-1, Sections III.G and III.H).

#### **E. RULES AND GUIDELINES**

In addition to the foregoing, the following rules and guidelines should be observed. Further details may be found in Administrative Regulation AR II-1.0-1. Separate sections of this Regulation are devoted to the Regular Title Series, the Extension Title Series, the Special Title Series, the Research Title Series, the Clinical Title Series, the Librarian Series, and the Adjunct Title Series.

##### **[1] SIX-YEAR RULE**

Tenured assistant or associate professors whose credentials have not been considered for promotion by an area committee for six years are entitled to such review. The faculty member should request this consideration in writing by October 1 of the seventh or subsequent year. If the faculty member makes such a request, the chair must forward a recommendation to the dean. The dean must make a recommendation to the Provost by January 11 (AR II-1.0-1, Section III.G). It is important that faculty members eligible for such consideration be made aware of this opportunity.

##### **[2] PREPARATION OF DOSSIER**

It is imperative that the dossier make a convincing case for promotion and/or tenure. The area committee members and others who review these files may not know the faculty under consideration, and the recommendation or decision will be made on the basis of the written materials provided. A worthy candidate should not fall victim to a poorly prepared file. The general requirements of a dossier are described in AR II-1.0-1, Section III.D. The dossier should contain a description of the procedures used at the department level in the appointment, promotion and/or tenure process.



Reappointments do not require a dossier but a description of the department-level reappointment process should be on file in the department.

The following sections of this document may assist you in constructing the documentation necessary to make persuasive cases for promotion or tenure.

### [3] OUTSIDE LETTERS

The regulations state that outside letters shall be obtained by the department chair in part from and in part independent of suggestions of the individual being considered (AR II-1.0-1, Section III.D). Although no specific number of outside letters are stipulated in the Administrative Regulations, we recommend a minimum of six outside letters of which four should be from individuals not suggested by the candidate. In cases involving the appointment of a faculty member already holding tenure at the rank of Professor at a research-oriented university, three letters solicited by the chair will be sufficient. The file should indicate which were suggested by the candidate and which were selected independently. Letters from a candidate's major professor, research advisor, former students or postdoctoral fellows, or close friends carry less weight than those written by independent reviewers. Letters from independent scholars at research-oriented universities are given most serious consideration. It is the chair's or director's responsibility to solicit the outside letters. The candidate's only participation is to supply the chair or director with suggestions of names and addresses. **It is imperative that the chair or director send samples of the candidate's work to the outside evaluators. The dossier should indicate what work was sent. The chair or director should consult with the candidate about which samples of work to send.** The outside letters should address the quality of the candidate's work and provide an objective analysis of its merits and its contributions to the field. The qualifications of external reviews should also be noted by the department chair.

### [4] CONFIDENTIALITY

Within the parameters of federal and state laws, we make every effort to maintain confidentiality on behalf of the individual candidate for appointment, promotion and/or tenure. Each department/school, college and central office as well as each area committee member must be diligent in maintaining confidentiality with respect to the materials under review and the deliberations between involved parties.

Kentucky's Open Records Law makes clear that outside letters and internal letters are not protected by claims of confidentiality. In addition, all letters of evaluation are placed in the candidate's Standard Personnel File (AR II-1.0-1, Section II.G).

External reviewers should be informed that their letters will not be confidential, but that our request is that they make an honest, professional opinion of the value and significance of the candidate's performance.

The courts have made clear that professional judgment that is professionally rendered, given without personal bias, will be protected. A university must be one institution in society where professional judgment of a colleague's work is offered without malice and without fear of retribution.

#### **[5] CONSULTATION WITH FACULTY**

The University's Governing Regulations (Part VII.B.5, page VII-11) require consultation with certain faculty on faculty appointments, reappointments, terminal reappointments, promotions, and the awarding of tenure. At a minimum, consultation shall be with [1] all tenured members of the department or graduate program center; [2] directors of any multidisciplinary research centers or institutes with whom the faculty under consideration is associated; and [3] all full-time, non-tenured faculty members with the actual or equivalent rank of assistant professor or higher who have been members of the department for at least two years (except for cases of tenure or promotion to a rank that would be higher than that of the consulted faculty member). Faculty members who are appointed in the Research Title Series or Clinical Title Series or who hold Visiting Scholar appointments are excluded from the third category. Each consulted faculty member, with exceptions only as listed in the Regulations, is expected to provide a written judgment on each such case. This is a complex matter, and it is essential that you consult the Governing Regulation referenced above and the exceptions contained therein.

The provision of these written evaluations is both a right and a responsibility of the faculty. Faculty members are entitled to have and to state opinions, and inserting in the letters phrases such as "in my opinion" will help to differentiate these from statements of fact that may require proof. The letters should be as informative as possible. It is not acceptable for these letters to consist simply of votes for or against a proposed promotion or granting of tenure. In order to achieve both fairness to the candidate and protection of program standards, the letters should be objective and analytical, written for the purpose of providing guidance to those who will make subsequent evaluations.

Letters should not be personal. They should be professional judgments about the professional performance of the candidate, offered not as statements of fact but as expressions of opinion of the evaluator.

#### **[6] DOCUMENTATION OF TEACHING**

Teaching performance is taken seriously in the promotion and tenure process, and failure to address it properly may jeopardize an otherwise meritorious case. Teaching performance should be documented thoroughly and should include the Teaching Portfolio. AR II-1.0-5 (Faculty Performance Review) states in section A, part 2:

"The extent and character of each faculty member's teaching and advising should be documented by a body of supporting materials regularly maintained and updated by the faculty member. For the University System, such documentation shall include a teaching portfolio as outlined in Appendix I."

That Appendix, as copied from the AR, is attached to this memo. The portfolio applies not only to promotion and tenure, but also to faculty performance review. Parts of the Portfolio requirement are voluntary and parts involuntary. No one will be penalized for supplying the bare minimum, but the more information available, the better the chance the candidate has to demonstrate teaching and advising abilities.

#### **[7] SPECIAL TITLE SERIES**

Complete information should be supplied on individuals in a Special Title Series or with other exceptional appointments that differ from regular faculty positions. Dossiers for Special Title Series faculty must contain full descriptions of the positions and of the criteria for promotion that have been approved.

#### **[8] SPECIAL MATERIALS**

Materials such as slides, audiotapes, videotapes, and movies may present a dilemma to the area committees. The dossier should explain what these materials are and should indicate how important it is that they be viewed or heard. The committee will appreciate direction on where to find the necessary technology to view or hear these materials. Colleges should make reasonable efforts to provide necessary technology in the committee's dossier-reading area.

#### **[9] MULTIDISCIPLINARY RESEARCH**

Care should be given to evaluate multidisciplinary research carefully and in consultation with groups outside the candidate's primary unit. We need to recognize that some disciplines are entering an era of multidisciplinary/multiinvestigator research requiring team of investigators rather than the traditional model of single-investigator research.

#### **[10] APPROPRIATE AREA COMMITTEE**

In most cases, it is obvious which area committee should review a file. Sometimes, however, the choice of committee is not apparent from the academic department (e.g., an Anthropology case might go to the Biological Sciences committee or to the Social Sciences committee). Even where these options are not explicitly listed in AR II-1.0-1, Section XII.E, the details of a candidate's work may make an area committee other than the usual one for the department most appropriate. In any case, where a non-routine choice of an area committee is desired, it is necessary to obtain the written agreement of the candidate to send his or her file to that committee and to inform the Provost or Associate Provost for Academic Affairs of this choice when you submit the dossier.

#### **[11] COLLEGE ADVISORY COMMITTEE**

A dean may seek the advice of a college advisory committee on any appointment, promotion, and tenure case where assistance will be helpful. It is mandatory to seek

advice when considering for tenure an untenured assistant or associate professor in the next-to-last year of a probationary period or an untenured full professor in the first semester of a one-year probation (AR II-1.0-1, Section III.E). It is recommended that advice be sought from a committee when the dean is contemplating denying a department's recommendation for reappointment. In cases where the advice of the committee is sought, the recommendation should be in writing, and a separate letter should be obtained for each case. These letters will become part of the official correspondence to which faculty members have access in their Standard Personnel File.

#### [12] REPORTING PROCEDURES IN THE DOSSIER

It is a matter of fairness that faculty considered for (re)appointment, promotion, and tenure know what procedures are being used to reach that decision. **Each department chair and each dean should include in the dossier a description of the procedural steps used at each level that led to the recommendations included in the dossier.** (Similarly, procedural steps used in annual/biennial reappointment of untenured faculty should be on file at the department level). Consequently, this item was added to the Checklist referred to below, along with the requirement of an explanation of how the faculty member was informed of these procedures. The purpose, once again, is to demystify the process. A good university, rendering tough-minded, qualitative judgments, has no need to cloak its procedures for arriving at those judgments.

#### [13] CHECKLIST

Attached is a checklist to use in compiling dossiers to ensure that no essential components are omitted.

attachments:      Checklist  
                         2003-04 P&T Calendar  
                         Teaching Portfolio Description

cc:      Members of the Academic Area Advisory Committees  
         President Lee T. Todd, Jr.  
         Senate Council Chair Jeffrey Dembo



**CHECKLIST FOR DOSSIERS**  
(refer to AR II-1.0-1, Section I)

1. Recommendation of college dean. \_\_\_\_\_
2. Recommendation of college advisory committee. \_\_\_\_\_
3. Recommendation of department chair. \_\_\_\_\_
4. Recommendations of directors of centers, institutes or other departments with which the candidate may be associated. \_\_\_\_\_
5. Up-to-date curriculum vitae or resume. \_\_\_\_\_
6.
  - a. List names and ranks of faculty members in the educational unit \_\_\_\_\_
  - b. Written opinion of each faculty member required to be consulted within educational unit. \_\_\_\_\_
7. Written opinions of other faculty members consulted. \_\_\_\_\_
8. Letters providing evaluation of individual's abilities in teaching, research, or other areas:
  - a. obtained by chair from persons outside the University not suggested by the individual; \_\_\_\_\_
  - b. obtained by chair from persons outside the University suggested by the individual. \_\_\_\_\_
9. Brief biographical information on persons outside the University from whom chairman obtained letters and indication of which were suggested by candidate. \_\_\_\_\_
10. Results of faculty performance reviews for three previous years \_\_\_\_\_
11. Description of the procedural steps used within the department and the college, and explanation of how these steps were communicated to the faculty member. \_\_\_\_\_
12. The Teaching Portfolio. \_\_\_\_\_
13. Letters from students, undergraduate and/or graduate, pertaining to candidate's instruction. \_\_\_\_\_
14. List of, and representative samples from research articles, books, patents, writings, or other creative productivity. \_\_\_\_\_
15. List of proposals submitted and grant or contract awards received. \_\_\_\_\_
16. Information or materials relating to professional status and activity, including copies of awards received for teaching or scholarship. \_\_\_\_\_
17. Information or materials relating to University and public service. \_\_\_\_\_
18. Distribution of Effort agreements since last promotion or appointment. \_\_\_\_\_
19. Description and criteria of special title series position or other assignment that differs from regular faculty position. \_\_\_\_\_
20. If the choice is not obvious, specification of which Area Committee should review the file and the candidate's written consent to be considered by this committee. \_\_\_\_\_
21. Official Transcript from institution from which highest degree was earned (For Appointment of New Faculty Only) \_\_\_\_\_