May 24, 1990

To: Charles T. Hethington, Jr.
    Interim President
    University of Kentucky

From: Robert L. Lester
    Professor, Department of Biochemistry


The committee met a total of seven times to consider 8 files transmitted by Chancellor Bosomworth and 10 from Chancellor Hemenway. Twelve recommendations for approval were forwarded. The chancellors agreed with the committee's recommendations in 16/18 instances. All members were quite conscientious and attended very well prepared but there were a number of recurring issues that deserve comment:

- Lack of documentation of student evaluation of teaching.
- Incomplete information about who recommended the outside evaluators
- Many perfunctory faculty letters, deficient in evaluation of scholarship
- The exact appointment dates were often absent from the dossiers
- Publications should be categorized and documented with care; "refereed" listed separately, "in press" with acceptance letter, and "submitted" with photocopy.

Aspects of our review process were successful and perhaps worthy of consideration by other committees:
- For a given file the chairman designated a lead reviewer who presented a detailed written evaluation at the committee meeting. A written evaluation is often more thorough, thoughtful, and responsible, serving to focus the discussion at the meeting, and helpful in drafting the letter to the chancellor. A draft of this letter was circulated for comment.

The review process could be shortened by about 10 days if copies of the file were available for each committee member rather than circulating a single copy of the file.

Chancellor Hemenway met with the committee in mid April to go over some of the stickier cases. The committee thoroughly endorses this approach. Chancellor Bosomworth has indicated that he would welcome meeting with the committee several times a year as warranted.

Copies: Bosomworth, Hemenway, Area Committee members
MEMORANDUM

TO: Charles T. Wethington, Jr.
President
University of Kentucky

FROM: Kenneth V. Yeargan
Professor, Department of Entomology

DATE: 17 May 1991

SUBJECT: REPORT OF THE 1990-91 ACADEMIC AREA ADVISORY COMMITTEE FOR THE BIOLOGICAL SCIENCES

To date, the Committee has met a total of 13 times to consider 31 dossiers (20 from Chancellor Hemenway's office, 10 from Chancellor Bosomworth's office, and 1 from Acting Vice President Peters' office). Twenty-five recommendations for approval were forwarded. Also, the Committee reviewed a Special Title position description at Chancellor Bosomworth's request. All members of the Committee were very conscientious and attendance at the 13 meetings averaged 88%.

Chancellor Hemenway met with the Committee on 22 April to discuss a few of the more difficult cases and to request our observations about the process. The Committee endorses this approach.

Many of the dossiers were well prepared, but we feel that some recurring problems deserve comment.

1. In cases of new appointments, "outside" letters frequently consisted of only the original letters of recommendation solicited by the candidate when he/she applied; we feel that updated, independent letters of evaluation should be included.

2. In a related matter, "outside" letters in promotion cases sometimes are solicited from the candidate's former mentors and/or collaborators; thoughtful letters from independent experts in the candidate's field are the most helpful.

3. It would be helpful if chairs and/or deans commented on the accuracy of DOE's; for example, DOE's for candidates from the College of Agriculture often show zero percent assignment for service, even though most candidates clearly contributed in this area.

4. A candidate's efforts as major professor for graduate students are assigned to teaching in some colleges at the University of Kentucky and to research in others; it would be helpful if deans clarified this matter in their letters.

5. Concise documentation of student evaluations of teaching is sometimes a problem, especially in cases where much of the candidate's teaching has been done as a member of a team; pooled evaluations of the team/course are of little value when evaluating a particular individual's performance.

cc: Chancellors Bosomworth and Hemenway