

SIS Guidelines for Tenure and Promotion from Assistant to Associate Professor¹

Faculty are evaluated on three areas: scholarly productivity, teaching and service. Guidelines for each area are included in this document.

Scholarly Productivity for Regular-Title Faculty

Introduction

Assessment of faculty scholarly productivity is based upon informed judgment. Such judgment should include an assessment of the totality of work to date; the following will serve as guidelines for making such judgments. These guidelines reflect the consensus of the School regarding the general research expectations of regular title faculty seeking tenure and promotion. The attempt to articulate the quantity and quality of academic achievement as outlined here is to serve as a general guide. The School recognizes and affirms that the unique characteristics of an individual's research agenda and discipline may necessitate a different and equally appropriate pattern of publication. It is incumbent upon the candidate to make a compelling case for the strength of the research and publication record in all cases, but particularly in those that deviate from the standards outlined in this document. This case should be made in the candidate's research statement. It should be noted that while these guidelines describe the baseline level of accomplishment, the simple attainment of this level of productivity does not guarantee award of tenure or promotion.

Research component (Scholarship of Discovery/Integration)

- High-quality, original scholarship is what distinguishes a research university from others;
- Research is essential for research universities to answer the call for creating new knowledge;
- Original research informs and advances the faculty member's knowledge of an area and should, directly or indirectly, contribute to the faculty's ability to instruct in the classroom;
- A sub-standard research record cannot be overcome by outstanding teaching. As ARII.2:201 puts it, "Excellence in teaching, advising and other instructional activities, research or other creative activity, and in professional, University and public service is expected."

Development of research program

- Defined as a series of research projects centered around a core of research questions (that are considered to be socially, methodologically, or theoretically significant and problem-driven);
- Demonstrated by a series of publications that are linked in terms of theme and purpose; while more than a single research theme may be appropriate, a research program should be coherent and focused.

¹ Approved Spring 2018

- Demonstrated by a sustained record of publication over time to allow for that researcher to develop a national and/or international reputation and to enhance his or her impact in an area of research

Quantity of research publications

Past successful tenure cases in the College that have included 11 or more peer-reviewed research articles, including those in press by the end of probation period, are indicative of the college's expectations for research productivity. Quantity of publications may vary by discipline and by methodological approach. In other words, this number is presented to indicate what has been successful in past cases, but it is not a mandatory threshold, nor does it signify that achieving this number of publications, in itself, will ensure promotion.

Quality of research publications

Quality judgments are partially dependent upon the (a) venue of publication, (b) authorial contribution, and (c) impact of the research. For example, conference proceedings are often perceived as less rigorous than journal articles, for a variety of reasons (e.g., journals typically have a longer history of publication, a more stable editorial board, and more comparative data for ranking); however, this perception varies by discipline.

Articles

Publications in peer-reviewed outlets that apply a revise-and-resubmit process (e.g., journals, conference proceedings) are highly valued and help to build a national reputation; the following can serve as a general guideline for indicators of quality. There will always be an element of judgment in evaluating research; allowing for differences among various subject areas, methodological approach, and interdisciplinarity, an ordinal scale (not to be followed rigidly) would be as follows:

- Single-authored, first authored, and equally authored (when publicly acknowledged) articles in top tier, peer-reviewed journals;
- Single-authored, first authored, and equally authored (when publicly acknowledged) top tier conference proceedings that follow a revise-and-resubmit process;
- Secondary author of a multi-authored work in top tier, peer-reviewed journals or conference proceedings that follow a rigorous revise-and-resubmit process.
- Single-authored or first (primary or equally) authored articles in lower-ranked peer-reviewed journals that follow a revise-and-resubmit process;
- Secondary author of a multiple-authored work in lower ranked, peer-reviewed journals that follow a revise-and-resubmit process;
- Single-authored or first (primary or equally) authored papers in refereed conference proceedings.

Chapters

- Single-authored, first authored, and equally authored (when publicly acknowledged) chapter in an edited book published by a quality press that follows a review process;
- Second or third author of a chapter in an edited book published by a quality press that follows a review process.
- Single-authored, first authored, and equally authored (when publicly acknowledge) chapter in an edited textbook or professional book.
- Second or third author of a a chapter in an edited textbook or professional book.

Books and Monographs

Books and monographs are valuable but not required for tenure and promotion from assistant to associate professor. This is often more valuable for promotion to full professor. Peer-reviewed, scholarly books are highly valued in certain disciplines. However, since books usually take much longer to press than articles, books should be judged (in comparison to articles, conference papers, and book chapters) commensurate to their scope, size, and contribution of original scholarly work. One scholarly book may be equivalent to multiple articles. As with all scholarly endeavors, it is incumbent upon the candidate to make the case in the research statement for the venue, authorial contribution, quality, and impact of the book(s) in the research. That said, the following ranking applies to books:

- Single-authored, first authored, and equally authored (when publicly acknowledged) scholarly monographs published by a quality press (e.g., university, scholarly-scientific, or major commercial) that have undergone one or more rounds of peer-review and a revision process;
- Secondary author of a multiple-authored scholarly monograph published in a quality press that have undergone one or more rounds of peer-review and a revision process;
- First (primary) editor of an edited book published by a quality press.
- Second or third editor of an edited book published by a quality press.

- First (primary) author of a textbook or professional book.
- Second or third author of a textbook or professional book.

Grants and Contracts

- Track record of grant awards are valuable but not required for tenure and promotion from assistant to associate professor. Often more valuable for promotion to full professor.

Other

- Conference presentations and posters may be either contributions to service, or products of research; as the latter they are best viewed as way-stations to publications, which are the main evidence considered in the tenure review.

NOTE: the relative importance of single-versus multiple-authorship varies among disciplines.

Indicators of research quality might include:

- Venue of publication
- Rigor of the publishing outlet
- Authorship (see above; based on order and/or level of contribution)
- Collaborative nature
- Impact (e.g., evidence based on awards, reviews, citations, expert evaluations, dissemination to, and adoption by, appropriate practitioners, etc.)

These indicators of quality and impact are guidelines. In each individual case the evaluation is based upon the contents of the dossier in total and how well the case for promotion and/or tenure is made in the candidate's research statement.

Instruction

Faculty in the School of Information Science are tasked with teaching and with creating a learning environment that transmits, transforms, and extends knowledge (AR 2:2-1). All tenure track faculty members are therefore expected to demonstrate instructional competency in the topics of the courses they teach, and the ability to guide students through the process of learning the appropriate content. Instruction includes formal classroom instruction, advising, practicum/internship supervision, and mentoring. Evaluation will be proportional to a faculty's distribution of effort.

Documentation

Teaching effectiveness and demonstrating competence and growth are the responsibility of the faculty. Per the Administrative Regulation 3:10, Appendix I, faculty should create a teaching portfolio that includes evidence for reviewing, evaluating, and improving teaching and advising. Evidence for these may be documented through the faculty's teaching statement or statement of teaching philosophy, quantitative and qualitative student evaluations, list of courses taught for each semester under review, and course syllabi. Additional student evaluations of teaching quality and value of teaching may be collected and documentation may also include evidence of pedagogical innovations, evidence of academic rigor of courses, procedures admired or adopted through peer reviewed literature on teaching and instruction, special teaching awards and recognition, peer review, contributions to course development, and professional development activities. Other noteworthy contributions include teaching beyond regular duties, collaborative efforts, interdisciplinary instructional activities, teaching via distance learning or online format, and assisting in student advising.

Faculty may submit additional evidence that supports their ability to teach and to create a learning environment. See Administrative Regulation 3:10, Appendix I, for a list of items that may serve as additional evidence.

Development and quality of teaching program

- Evidence that students perceive the course to be of value as indicated by scores that meet or exceed 3.0 (on a 5.0 point scale) on course evaluations;
- Evidence that students perceive the course to be of quality as indicated by scores that meet or exceed 3.0 (on a 5.0 point scale) on course evaluations;
- Development or application of pedagogical methods and materials that demonstrate an impact on learning outcomes;
- Evidence that the faculty's own research informs his/her teaching;
- Engagement in opportunities to further course curriculum and course assessment.

Development and quality of advising program

- Evidence that the faculty member has demonstrated professional standards of advising.
- Additional contributions to teaching program:
- Evidence of participation in professional development in the areas of teaching and/or advising;
- Awards and other forms of official recognition that acknowledge the teaching and/or advising;
- Contributions to major curriculum changes, course development, and other instructional programs.

Service

Faculty service is considered those professional activities in which the faculty member exercises academic leadership that contribute to the discipline, the life of the school, the college, the university and the local community.

Service activities may be limited during the probationary period in order for the faculty member to meet teaching and research obligations, and as such, should be evaluated with the assigned distribution of effort for service in mind.

Service activities may include:

- University service: Membership and leadership on official committees at the departmental, school, college or university levels.
- Service to the profession: Membership and participation in local, state, national, and/or international professional organizations or other appropriate professional associations of relevance to the faculty member's field of study. Participation denotes performing editorial, peer review, organizational, and committee responsibilities.
- Public service: Consistent with the CCI Strategic Plan, faculty may participate in outreach, engagement, and public service aimed at improving the quality of life of Kentuckians. Public service activities may include community efforts in schools or other educationally relevant organizations.

Documentation

The service statement shall address the outcomes and impact of the faculty's service activities and its relation to the his/hers/their academic expertise.

School of Information Science
**Statement of Evidence: Research or Other Creative Activity for Appointment,
Reappointment, or Promotion to Full Professor for Regular-Title Faculty²**

Introduction

Assessment of faculty scholarly productivity is based upon informed judgment. Such judgment should include an assessment of the totality of work to date; the following will serve as guidelines for making such judgments. These guidelines reflect the consensus of the School of Information Science regarding the general research expectations for appointment, reappointment, or promotion to full professor. It should be noted that these guidelines build upon those for promotion from Assistant to Associate, and that the expectations for appointment, reappointment, or promotion from Associate to Full exceed those for promotion from Assistant to Associate.

The attempt to articulate the quantity and quality of academic achievement as outlined here is to serve as a general guide. The School recognizes and affirms that the unique characteristics of an individual's research agenda and discipline may necessitate a different and equally appropriate pattern of publication. It is incumbent upon the candidate to make a compelling case for the strength of the research and publication record in all cases, but particularly in those that deviate from the standards outlined in this document. This case should be made in the candidate's research statement. It should be noted that while these guidelines describe the baseline level of accomplishment, the simple attainment of this level of productivity does not guarantee promotion.

Research component (Scholarship of Discovery and Integration)

- High-quality, original scholarship is what distinguishes a research university from others;
- Scholarship of Discovery and Integration is essential for research universities to answer the call for creating new knowledge;
- Original research informs and advances the faculty member's knowledge of an area within the discipline and should, directly or indirectly, contribute to the faculty's ability to instruct in the classroom;
- A sub-standard research record cannot be overcome by outstanding teaching. As ARII.2:201 puts it, "Excellence in teaching, advising and other instructional activities, research or other creative activity, and in professional, University and public service is expected."
- In accordance with AR II-1.0-1, appointment, reappointment, or promotion to full professor implies that, in the opinion of colleagues, the candidate's scholarship is excellent and has earned a high level of professional recognition. Where appropriate, this recognition should be on a national or international level in the field of assignment. It is further emphasized that this rank is in recognition of attainment rather than length of service.

² Adopted Spring 2019, approved by the Associate Provost for Faculty Advancement on behalf of the Provost, May 17, 2019

Established research program

A candidate seeking appointment, reappointment, or promotion to full professor is expected to demonstrate a sustained record of scholarship and a national or international reputation in one or more research areas that are socially, methodologically, or theoretically significant and problem-driven.

Quantity of research publications

A general expectation for appointment, reappointment, or promotion to full professor is evidence of a sustained, substantial, and significant research record that has led to national and/or international recognition. Quantity of publications may vary by discipline, by methodological approach, and data collection cycles, but the general expectation for candidates seeking appointment, reappointment, or promotion to full professor is an average of two high quality research publications per year. This number is presented as a general guideline, but it is not a mandatory threshold, nor does it signify that achieving this number of publications, in itself, will ensure appointment, reappointment, or promotion.

Quality of research publications

Quality judgments are partially dependent upon the (a) venue of publication, (b) authorial contribution, and (c) impact of the research. For example, conference proceedings are often perceived as less rigorous than journal articles, for a variety of reasons (e.g., journals typically have a longer history of publication, a more stable editorial board, and more comparative data for ranking); however, this perception varies by discipline and by individual venue.

The relative importance of single- versus multiple-authorship varies among disciplines. In a mentoring role, experienced scholars sometimes grant first or second author position to junior faculty and/or graduate students; however, candidates seeking appointment, reappointment, or promotion to full professor are also expected to demonstrate lead roles in an established program of research. Within the research statement, the candidate should provide a compelling case for authorship choices made.

Indicators of research quality might include:

- Venue of publication
- Rigor of the publishing outlet
- Authorship (see above; based on order and/or level of contribution)
- Collaborative nature
- Impact (e.g., evidence based on awards, reviews, citations, expert evaluations, dissemination to, and adoption by, appropriate practitioners, etc.)

These indicators of quality and impact are guidelines. In each individual case the evaluation is based upon the contents of the dossier in total and how well the case for promotion and/or tenure is made in the candidate's research statement.

Publications in peer-reviewed outlets that apply a revise-and-resubmit process (e.g., journals, select conference proceedings) are highly valued and help to build and maintain a national and/or international reputation. The following can serve as a general guideline for indicators of quality. There will always be an element of judgment in evaluating research; allowing for differences among various subject areas, methodological approaches, and interdisciplinarity. An ordinal

scale (not to be followed rigidly) would be as follows for each of the following types of publication:

Articles

- Single-authored, first authored, and equally authored (when publicly acknowledged) articles in top tier, peer-reviewed journals;
- Single-authored, first authored, and equally authored (when publicly acknowledged) top tier conference proceedings that follow a revise-and-resubmit process;
- Secondary author of a multi-authored work in top tier, peer-reviewed journals or conference proceedings that follow a rigorous revise-and-resubmit process.
- Single-authored, first authored, and equally authored articles in lower-ranked peer-reviewed journals that follow a revise-and-resubmit process;
- Secondary author of a multi-authored work in lower ranked, peer-reviewed journals that follow a revise-and-resubmit process;
- Single-authored or first (primary or equally) authored papers in refereed conference proceedings.

Chapters

- Single-authored, first authored, and equally authored (when publicly acknowledged) chapter in an edited book published by a quality press that follows a review process;
- Second or third author of a chapter in an edited book published by a quality press that follows a review process.
- Single-authored, first authored, and equally authored (when publicly acknowledge) chapter in an edited textbook or professional book.
- Second or third author of a chapter in an edited textbook or professional book.

Books and Monographs

Books and monographs are valuable but not required for appointment, reappointment, or promotion from Associate to Full Professor. Peer-reviewed, scholarly books are highly valued in certain disciplines. However, since books usually take much longer to press than articles, books should be judged (in comparison to articles, conference papers, and book chapters) commensurate to their scope, size, and contribution of original scholarly work. One scholarly book may be equivalent to multiple articles. As with all scholarly endeavors, it is incumbent upon the candidate to make the case in the research statement for the venue, authorial contribution, quality, and impact of the book(s) in the research. That said, the following ranking is a guide for books:

- Single-authored, first authored, and equally authored (when publicly acknowledged) scholarly monographs published by a quality press (e.g., university, scholarly-scientific, or major commercial) that have undergone one or more rounds of peer-review and a revision process;
- Secondary author of a multiple-authored scholarly monograph published in a quality press that have undergone one or more rounds of peer-review and a revision process;
- First (primary) editor of an edited book published by a quality press.
- Second or third editor of an edited book published by a quality press.
- First (primary) author of a textbook or professional book.

- Second or third author of a textbook or professional book.

Other

- Conference presentations and posters may be either contributions to service, or products of research; as the latter they are best viewed as way-stations to publications, which are the main evidence considered in the review.
- Due consideration will be given for preparation of “white papers” and reports that disseminate findings from international, national, and state-level research studies
- Due consideration will be given for the use of electronic media (e.g., websites and blogs) for enhancing dissemination of research-based, professional knowledge and improving policy and practice.

Grants and Contracts

While grant awards are not required for appointment, reappointment, or promotion to full professor, submissions of applications, and especially awarded applications, for external funding serve as evidence of a socially, methodologically, or theoretically significant and problem-driven research program that is coherent and focused.

School of Information Science
**Statement of Evidence: Instruction and Student Relations for Appointment,
Reappointment, or Promotion to Full Professor for Regular-Title Faculty³**

Instruction and Student Relations

Faculty in the School of Information Science are tasked with teaching and with creating a learning environment that transmits, transforms, and extends knowledge (AR 2:2-1). All faculty members seeking appointment, reappointment, or promotion to full professor are therefore expected to demonstrate instructional competency in the topics of the courses they teach and the ability to guide students through the process of learning the appropriate content. Included within instruction and student relations are formal classroom instruction, advising, practicum/internship supervision, and mentoring. Evaluation of Instruction and Student Relations will be proportional to a faculty's distribution of effort.

Documentation

Teaching effectiveness and demonstrating competence and growth are the responsibility of the faculty. Per the Administrative Regulation 3:10, Appendix I, faculty should create a teaching portfolio that includes evidence for reviewing, evaluating, and improving teaching and advising. Evidence for these may be documented through the faculty's teaching statement or statement of teaching philosophy, quantitative and qualitative student evaluations, list of courses taught for each semester under review, and course syllabi. Additional student evaluations of teaching quality and value of teaching may be collected, and documentation may also include evidence of pedagogical innovations, evidence of academic rigor of courses, procedures admired or adopted through peer reviewed literature on teaching and instruction, special teaching awards and recognition, peer review, contributions to course development, and professional development activities. Other noteworthy contributions include teaching beyond regular duties, collaborative efforts, interdisciplinary instructional activities, and assisting in student advising.

Faculty may submit additional evidence that supports their ability to teach and to create a learning environment. See Administrative Regulation 3:10, Appendix I, for a list of items that may serve as additional evidence.

Development and quality of teaching program

- Evidence that students perceive courses developed or co-developed by the faculty member to be quality courses as indicated by scores that meet or exceed 3.0 (on a 5.0-point scale) on course evaluations;
- Evidence that students perceive the instructor provided quality teaching as indicated by scores that meet or exceed 3.0 (on a 5.0-point scale) on course evaluations;
- Development or application of pedagogical methods and materials that demonstrate an impact on learning outcomes;
- Evidence that the faculty's own research informs his/her teaching;
- Engagement in opportunities to further course curriculum and course assessment.

³ Adopted Spring 2019, approved by the Associate Provost for Faculty Advancement on behalf of the Provost, May 17, 2019

Development and quality of advising program

- Evidence that the faculty member has demonstrated professional standards of advising.

Additional contributions to the teaching program

- Evidence of participation in professional development in the areas of teaching and/or advising;
- Awards and other forms of official recognition that acknowledge the teaching and/or advising;
- Contributions to major curriculum changes, course development, and other instructional programs.

School of Information Science

Statement of Evidence: Professional Activity and University and Public Service for Appointment, Reappointment, or Promotion to Full Professor for Regular-Title Faculty⁴

Service

Faculty service is considered those professional activities in which the faculty member exercises academic leadership that contributes to the discipline, the life of the School, the College, the University and the local community. Senior faculty are expected to carry a heavier service workload than junior faculty and are expected to demonstrate leadership within those service roles. Service activities should be evaluated with the assigned distribution of effort for service in mind.

Service activities may include:

- University service: Membership and leadership on official committees at the Program, School, College and/or University levels. This includes mentorship of junior faculty.
- Service to the profession: Membership and participation in local, state, national, and/or international professional organizations or other appropriate professional associations of relevance to the faculty member's field of study. Participation denotes performing editorial, peer review, organizational, and committee responsibilities.
- Public service: Consistent with the College of Communication and Information Strategic Plan, faculty may participate in outreach, engagement, and public service aimed at improving the quality of life of Kentuckians. Public service activities may include community efforts in schools or other educationally relevant organizations.

Documentation

The service statement shall address the outcomes and impact of the faculty's service activities and its relation to that faculty member's expertise.

⁴ Adopted Spring 2019, approved by the Associate Provost for Faculty Advancement on behalf of the Provost, May 17, 2019