

<p>[ED faculty member]</p>	<p>The provost has offered a number of recommendations to change the tenure and promotion procedures (see attached file). The senate will be considering them in the near future. YOU should look at them carefully, since they may influence your status in the future.</p> <p>I believe these should be discussed, probably at all levels of faculty involvement.</p> <p>Note, I find some inconsistencies (most notably the statement that the process stops at the [college] Dean level. I believe the document indicates the involvement of the Dean of the Graduate School.)</p> <p>Although I tend to agree with many of the suggestions, I think the review responsibility (and subsequent influence) should NOT reside with the Provost's Office. I find this a threat to the separation of Faculty and Administrative prerogatives. If a change is made, I would suggest that the responsibility be changed and to reside more with the Dean of the Graduate School, with the Area Review Committee and the Provost being vehicles for appeals of various types.</p> <p>Given all with which we have to contend on a day to day basis, I personally believe that the lower level (grass roots) inputs have a more complete understanding of the demands on faculty and can best consider the factors contributing to the Tenure and Promotion decisions. The appeals and balances are still there up the line, but the departmental faculty have more of the raw data, and the needed perspective, than those at any other level.</p>
<p>[AG faculty member]</p>	<p>1-4: I emphatically agree with Dean Smith on these points.</p> <p>5. I strongly disagree with recommendation number 5. I think that the Area Committee can only make a well considered judgment based on experience with the larger body of dossiers, qualified and unqualified, that come up for consideration. Having the Area Committee only review those deemed at college level to be unqualified will badly distort their perspective. I appreciate that there is a heavy workload associated with the Area Committee, but emphatically feel this is the wrong way to reduce it. What might work better and have the desired effect is for the Area Committees to be instructed that they need not feel obligated to review the entire dossier comprehensively where indications are that the college was favorable. I don't know how it is with other Area Committees, but I think that the feeling in the Life Sciences cmt is that all members are obligated to look through all dossiers as thoroughly as possible. This might require simply a cultural change brought on by conversation between the Provost and the Area Committees.</p> <p>6. I think that Dean Smith has some excellent points raised as concerns about this recommendation. Furthermore, I think it is both undesirable and unworkable to rely on specific regulations to prevent faculty from making untoward or even actionable statements. Instead, I would suggest that the chair be afforded the opportunity to review those letters and make suggestions of changes where there might be such concerns, prior to their placement in the dossier. This is probably the case for many departments already.</p> <p>7. I don't think the recommendation addresses the problem. Even if the number of such letters is increased, there can be a preponderance of unhelpful letters. I have see dossiers with plenty of letters, all unhelpful, mostly because they come from reviewers elsewhere who are too inexperienced in their own careers or too far removed from a university setting. The standing of those submitting the letters should, along with the content of those letters, be considered as evidence pertinent to the candidate's reputation. If so, then 3 and 3 should be sufficient.</p> <p>Some institutions exclude former advisors and advisees from submitting such letters. This is not always a good idea, but I would suggest that letters from former advisors and advisees should not count toward the required minimum number of letters.</p>

	<p>8. I don't favor eliminating a second year review. Although it may be too early for some faculty, a third year review may be too late for others. If an area of research requires a long set-up time (as do an increasing number in the life/biological sciences), a second year review can be extremely helpful in assessing whether the candidate is making appropriate decisions (e.g., How are lab members being recruited; What grant agencies are being solicited for funding?). And, a second year review of teaching and service should be as helpful now as it ever was. The Provost's point is well taken that a third year review may sometimes be more beneficial. Therefore, I suggest that the process involve comprehensive reviews in the second, third and fourth year.</p> <p>Overall comment and other recommendations: I appreciate the strong desire to reduce the time burden on faculty and committees. I have been aware of some of ideas like these being raised in that context. But being fair takes time. I think that focus should be on reducing the workload by reducing inefficiencies in the process. Two of the suggestions I have heard that make sense in that regard are: (1) moving to an online submission and review process, and (2) compelling those who assemble dossiers to do so correctly. The first of these would eliminate the considerable faculty and staff time devoted to moving the hard copy dossiers around, and tracking them down when needed. It would make it much easier for committee members to look them over at night and on weekends, at home, with few other distractions (except, maybe, ESPN). The second point has been a sore point for as long as I recall. Improperly assembled dossiers make it very difficult and time consuming for committee members to hunt down key information. In general, the college and area cmts that I have been on have felt obligated (per instructions from Dean and Provost) to make the judgment as fairly as possible despite deficiencies in the dossier format. Nevertheless, those deficiencies are so common that they have consumed a very significant amount of the discussion on many candidates. This problem can be addressed to some significant degree with an expertly assembled online dossier submission system. Funding such an effort will, IMHO, ultimately pay off several fold in faculty time saved and reduced stress on cmt members and all others involved.</p>
[B&E faculty member]	<p>With regard to the Senate Council Chair's request for feedback on suggested changes to procedural/process issues concerning faculty classification and tenure at UK, I offer the following:-</p> <p>(a) on the "Top 20 faculty Policies ..." document:-</p> <p>Items 5, 6, 7, and 8:- I think every one of these suggestions is well thought out and worthy of strong consideration by faculty.</p> <p>(b) on the "Aligning Faculty Classification ..." document:-</p> <p>I concur with bullets 3 and 4 at the top of page 3, bullet 5 on page 4, and bullet 7 on page 6.</p> <p>My lack of feedback on any other aspects of either document ought not to be interpreted as disagreement or tacit agreement. Rather, I wish to explicitly voice my support for strong consideration of the particular suggestions/recommendations/concerns referenced above. All in all, I do believe that such an exercise is long overdue and am glad that we are re-examining traditional practices in light of the current times.</p>
[ENG faculty member]	<p>I strongly agree with items 1, 2, 3, 4</p> <p>I think I agree with 6, but I have not had an opportunity to participate in that process yet. Things I have been told about how it works though makes me tend to agree with 6.</p>

	<p>I agree with the intent of 7, but think that it might make it difficult. My understanding is that it is already tough to get the outside letters on time, and to get people to agree to do it. Can we lower the value to somewhere in between 3 and 6?</p> <p>I am not sure about 8. The *best* information I ever received on tenure was at the President's Commission on Women (I think that was it) session on Promotion and Tenure (when I was getting ready to turn in my portfolio, so it really came too late). They should present it once a term and make it mandatory for asst. profs.</p>
AG Fac Council	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Tenure review There is general agreement that all promotion reviews, positive or negative, should proceed through the entire process. This has already been the operating policy in the College of Agriculture, and has been working well. 2. Reconsideration of a negative decision <ol style="list-style-type: none"> A. The option of a seventh year review should remain for certain circumstances B. There is some concern about college by college criteria for a seventh year review. Perhaps there should be more standard university criteria. C. There is concern that a specific policy would be restrictive and not in the best interest of individual faculty or departments. D. Instead of specific criteria, outlining a step-by-step procedural process would give more guidance for how to proceed. 3. Criteria for granting tenure <ol style="list-style-type: none"> A. There is a great deal of interdisciplinary work throughout the College of Agriculture. Recognition of such work should not be restricted to criteria from a single discipline. B. Even within departments, criteria can vary for various faculty based on their specific appointments. Evidence of this sort would best be determined at the time of faculty hiring. C. Interdisciplinary work should be equally assessed to disciplinary. 4. Eliminate review by the Dean of the Graduate School Most agree with this recommendation. 5. Positive cases bypassing the area committee There are mixed opinions of this proposal. On the one hand, where there is positive reaction at all levels through the college, there is little need to add an additional review step. However, if the area committee only sees cases that received a negative review at some level, the area committee has a more limited basis to compare them to positive cases. It was also noted that this would remove one point of faculty input in the process. Several faculty members that have served on a variety of area committees indicated that the time saved would be minimal in reviewing positive cases. 6. Individual faculty letters While in many departments it is difficult for all faculty to make meaningful comments about faculty in another area of the discipline, most feel that faculty letters are still very valuable. Letters are especially used by the chair in summarizing the case from

	<p>the department. If just a yes-no vote of faculty is used, reasons why will be lost. In a sense the faculty almost serves an advisory role to the chair just like the college committee and the area committee.</p> <p>7. Outside letters Most feel the current guidelines about outside letters are preferable to setting a larger minimum number of letters. The main reason is that in some disciplines, it would be difficult to get more letters. If a certain case calls for more outside review, more letters could always be solicited. Faculty indicated that it is getting more difficult to find outside people willing to take the time and/or professional responsibility to write letters, especially given the legal climate.</p> <p>8. Performance evaluation Most feel that more reviews are preferable to fewer reviews, especially if used in conjunction with the annual performance review.</p> <p>Title series designations The Agriculture Faculty Council also received many comments about the proposal to use a single title series for all promotions since the College of Agriculture has a large number of faculty with other designations, especially the extension title series. One main point of this proposal is that each promotion case would be determined based on the individual position requirements and DOE; that is generally supported. At the same time, most faculty are concerned that this system would lead to a more standardized set of expectations regardless of the faculty position mission. If this standardization occurred, faculty would be largely judged by a primarily research standard that is not necessarily a part of all faculty position expectations. Scholarly work can take many forms beyond pure research. The proposal does not mention those programs whose faculty have primarily teaching appointments, either. Care must be taken to be sure that all of the missions of the university, including research, teaching, and outreach/extension are considered equally important in the quest for the Top 20. There is also some concern that if this research standardization occurs other types of faculty positions will be changed over time to one of the non-tenure type positions, thereby weakening the standing of some segments of an inclusive higher educational institution.</p>
COMed	<p>The UK College of Medicine (COM) Faculty Council has carefully examined and considered the Provost's goal of improving the standards and stature of the University of Kentucky through re-examining the faculty titles series along with the promotion and tenure process. Our Council and faculty-at-large, however, recognize that the proposed changes represent only a part of the process necessary to move UK to top 20 status and have concerns about potentially detrimental effects of some of the proposed changes.</p> <p>There is concern amongst the COM faculty that emulating other institutions' administrative structures may compromise UK's ability to be competitive in the faculty marketplace. While some of the points identified by the Provost are valid and may benefit the University as a whole, there are several specific points of concern - brought to the attention of Faculty Council by our general membership, outlined as follows:</p> <p>1) In terms of recasting of the tenurable faculty title series: A. While many COM faculty support creation of a single tenure track title series, all agree that better administrative assurances on faculty distributions of efforts (DOE) would be essential to the success of such a system. There are, however, a significant number of COM faculty who support the retention of multiple faculty titles series and believe that eliminating them due to past abuse does not</p>

	<p>recognize their valid and important uses. For example, our clinical faculty members are unique in that their primary responsibility is not teaching and/or research, but instead is patient care. While the medical center is dependent on faculty who care for patients, this in no way absolves these faculty from pursuing scholarly activity or teaching; clinical care does, in fact, take up the majority of their time. If the clinical faculty members who we recruit spend the majority of their time doing NIH research, the significant clinical contribution to moving our medical center to top 20 status will deteriorate.</p> <p>B. A recurring concern from our clinical faculty is whether short term changes in clinical work load which significantly impact their distribution of effort (DOE) would qualify them for an extension in the probationary period.</p> <p>2) In terms of policies and practices pertaining to tenure review:</p> <p>A. COM Faculty Council strongly believes that all tenure-track faculty members should be entitled to a full and comprehensive promotion and tenure review at all levels. The existing review system allows identification of “weak” and “strong” departmental environments. For example, trends of putting forth dossiers of young faculty with heavy clinical demands despite inadequate support of their academic development can be identified. At higher levels of review, there is an “equilibration” advantage to having the area committee review all dossiers, discussing both “weak” and “strong” dossiers. We do not support diminishing the contribution of faculty to this important evaluation process.</p> <p>At higher levels of review, there is an “equilibration” advantage to having the area committee review all dossiers, discussing both “weak” and “strong” dossiers. We do not support diminishing the contribution of faculty to this important evaluation process. We are concerned about any changes that diminish the role of the faculty in the tenure and promotion process.</p> <p>B. COM Faculty Council has concerns regarding the proposed changes in criteria for promotion to the rank of Full Professor. Two sets of standards will exist for promotion to Professor. The combined use of length of employment and service to institution as criteria for promotion, without consideration of scholarship, is highly problematic.</p> <p>C. The guaranteed 12 month salary should remain the default. Both clinical and basic science COM faculty have significant responsibilities throughout 12 months of the year, including but not limited to clinical work, teaching activities (doctoral and postdoctoral, medical and resident), and funded research. Our broadly defined faculty responsibilities are not amenable to the traditionally defined 9-month academic calendar.</p> <p>D. Removing incentives needs to be carefully considered. Recent budget issues indicate that we cannot rely solely on securing competitive salaries from the state. Competitive compensation is essential to recruit and retain quality faculty. The larger impact on departmental infrastructure needs to be carefully considered before changes in reimbursement structure are adopted.</p>
CoHS	<p>The College of Health Sciences Faculty Council recently met with College faculty for discussion of the issues proposed in the “Aligning Faculty Classification and Tenure Policies with Top 20 Goals: A Framework for Discussion” whitepaper and the “Top 20 Faculty Policies Suggested Changes to Procedural/Process Issues” summary document.</p> <p>Our faculty generally support the Provost’s recommendations for streamlining the promotion process, including eliminating Area Committee review of dossiers that are supported by the college dean and initiating a secondary Area Committee review of all dossiers</p>

	<p>not supported for promotion and/or tenure by the college dean. Some concern was raised about the composition of the Area Committee and the membership's ability to understand the unique natures and aspects of colleges. The current system of Area Committees is felt to work reasonably well, in general, and the benefits of continuing with this model should be carefully considered.</p> <p>Regarding establishment of written statements on disciplinary-based evidences that constitute excellence in areas of faculty activity, there was some concern about our ability to adequately and fairly describe in a concise, appropriate way productivity expectations for promotion and tenure. This may be particularly problematic if it is required that such statements, of what constitutes disciplinary-based evidence, be agreed upon at all levels of review at the time of hiring of the faculty member. Faculty supported eliminating required review of all dossiers by the Dean of the Graduate School.</p> <p>A recommendation is made to require that promotion or tenure dossiers include a minimum of six letters of evaluation from qualified persons outside the University. In part owing to the diversity of disciplines within our College we regularly experience difficulty in procuring a sufficient number of meaningful outside letters, particularly from evaluators not directly suggested by the applicant. While faculty generally agreed that outside evaluators serve an important role in standardizing productivity expectations, we suggest that an absolute number of outside letters not be required for dossier completion, leaving the final number to the discretion of the college dean.</p> <p>Finally, we discussed the pros and cons of maintaining the current system of pre-tenure review (2-year and 4-year reviews) vs the proposed single 3-year review. Consensus within our College supported continuing the current system. We feel that receiving broad-based summary feedback was critical for developing faculty toward meeting expectations for tenure and promotion. Furthermore, we felt that this need was magnified by the proposal to make the results of the first tenure and promotion review final, i.e., eliminate the possibility of re-submitting a tenure and promotion dossier should it be turned down on initial review.</p> <p>Thank you for the opportunity to offer feedback on these important matters.</p>
SoA	<p>This memo is intended to convey comments made by the Von Allmen School of Accountancy (SOA) faculty in regards to two documents:</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">Aligning Faculty Classification and Tenure Policies with Top 20 Goals: A Framework for Discussion, by Kumble R. Subbaswamy, Provost, December 2007. Top 20 Faculty Policies Suggested Changes to Procedural/Process Issues (for Discussion Purposes)</p> <p>These documents were forwarded to the SOA faculty by the department Chairman and the faculty was asked to forward any comments to the Dean or the Associate Dean. We invited the SOA faculty to a meeting on 2/29 to discuss these documents. The comments from this meeting and any additional comments received by e-mail are included in this document. This process does not preclude individual faculty members in the SOA communicating their comments directly to the Dean or Associate Dean.</p> <p><u>Overall:</u> The attitude of the faculty toward these two documents was overwhelmingly positive. The faculty would like to thank Provost Subbaswamy for taking the initiative and making the effort to address both procedural and conceptual issues in the promotion and tenure process that have been contentious and possibly dysfunctional for some time.</p>

	<p><u>Specific Comments:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • “Great ideas! Lets move on them.” <p>Top 20 Faculty Policies Suggested Changes to Procedural / Process Issues</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Point #3 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Can we see examples of “written statements of disciplinary-based evidences”? Are these “evidences” operational (i.e. specific) or conceptual? If they are specific, shouldn’t they be allowed to change if the faculty member and the Dean agree? • Points #4 and #5. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ These are very positive changes. They streamline the process and take out unnecessary and non-value added steps. • Point #5 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Does the word “agree” mean a majority or unanimity? And are these at each level or at all levels? • Point #7 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The proposal is to require a minimum of six outside letters, of which at least four shall come from reviewers selected by the chair independent of the P&T candidate. However, the current wording permits a situation where all of the letters are selected by the chair independent of the candidate and no letter writers are selected by the candidate. This should only be allowed if the candidate agrees. Otherwise, there should be a provision giving the faculty the option of selecting a certain percentage of the outside letter writers. <p>Aligning Faculty Classification and Tenure Policies with Top 20 Goals: A Framework for Discussion</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Point #2 under the guiding principles states: <p>“Any policy changes will have no impact on those who are already on the faculty at the time the changes are adopted. All those already in the ranks will be subject to the rules and regulations under which they were hired.”</p> <p>Why would the existing faculty be required to continue to operate under a policy that is recognized to be flawed and not in line with current university principles? Would it not make sense to allow the existing faculty members to operate under either the rules enforced when they were hired, or the new rules if they chose, and if their Dean agrees?</p> • In the “Review of Policies, Practices, and Processes...” section of this document, point #7 received considerable support and agreement.
Dept of Econ	<p>Comments from the Department of Economics, Gatton College of Business and Economics</p> <p>I’ve read through these documents, have circulated them to the faculty and have received several comments back. Let me relay my comments and the sense of the faculty comments.</p> <p>I’ll go through summary points 1 through 8 in the document “Aligning Faculty . . .”</p> <p>Point 1. I and other faculty agree that each tenure-track faculty member should be entitled to a full review.</p> <p>Point 2. Seems fine.</p> <p>Point 3. This is okay as long as it is not expected to be really specific, e.g., n publications in journal set X.</p> <p>Point 4. Agreed.</p> <p>Points 5 and 6. I and other faculty disagree with these. The Area Committee should see all the cases. Area Committee is, in part, there</p>

	<p>to make sure good processes are being followed and units are not simply pushing everyone through. Point 7. This is fine, but one to be careful with it. One doesn't want nearly automatic promotion for people after 12 years, especially if research has shut down. Point 8. Related to bench sciences.</p> <p>Other comments. Regarding the number of outside letters. Agreed that 3 is not enough; 5 to 6 is the right amount.</p> <p>There is strong sentiment in the economics faculty that we should dispose of our process of having each person write a letter. It would be better to follow a process like the one described in the proposal.</p> <p>There is some disagreement about whether the initial, major review of new faculty should be in the 2nd or 3rd year. Some argue that the 3rd year is too late to redirect anything if needed.</p> <p>Regarding Special Title Series. We are happy in economics the way our STS has worked out. Of course, it is important to have clear expectations for the duties and tenure requirements.</p> <p>Lecturers. Sounds like a good idea to having rolling 3-year and 5-year contracts for these positions.</p>
<p>[B&E faculty member]</p>	<p>(a) on the "Top 20 faculty Policies ..." document:- Items 5, 6, 7, and 8:- I think every one of these suggestions is well thought out and worthy of strong consideration by faculty.</p> <p>(b) on the "Aligning Faculty Classification ..." document:- I concur with bullets 3 and 4 at the top of page 3, bullet 5 on page 4, and bullet 7 on page 6.</p> <p>My lack of feedback on any other aspects of either document ought not to interpreted as disagreement or tacit agreement. Rather, I wish to explicitly voice my support for strong consideration the particular suggestions/recommendations/concerns referenced above. All in all, I do believe that such an exercise is long overdue and am glad that we are re-examining traditional practices in light of the current times.</p>
<p>CoDes</p>	<p>College of Design responses to your request regarding: Aligning Faculty Classification and Tenure Policies with Top 20 Goals: A White Paper</p> <p>Regarding "faculty classifications", I don't believe our present system is broken, and am therefore reluctant to fix it. However, if the Provost wants to make changes, I have only one objection. It concerns #2 on page 4 and #4 on page 5: We, in Design, should be able to appoint distinguished practitioners to our faculty, with tenure and appropriate rank. Ideally, they would teach design and practice courses while continuing to practice part-time. They would not be expected to conduct "research" as we generally understand it. At the same time they should not be regarded as second class citizens. In the past we have used "Special Title" series appointments for these individuals. There is also the problem of some faculty members whose DOEs call primarily for teaching. They, too, should not be second class citizens, denied opportunity to achieve tenure. We have used the "Special Title" series appointments for them, also. The Provost appears to want to limit Lecturers to teaching at only the lower division level. That would limit our use of these valuable</p>

	<p>individuals.</p> <p>Regarding "faculty policies", pages 2 and 3, there may be "wisdom in the crowd", but there are also mob or herd behaviors inimical to individual reasoned judgment. One has only to think of "silver tongued orators", or demagogues, able to sway large crowds of otherwise sensible people to regrettable votes or actions. Required individual letters from appropriate faculty members, on which the chair can comment, will prevent this. There should still be faculty discussions and a vote, but the letters are also needed.</p> <p>In the proposal it is not clear to me who would write the letter on behalf of the faculty, nor which faculty members would be permitted or required to participate in the discussions and vote. A meeting may, or may not, achieve consensus. Would a minority letter be accepted in addition to a majority report? What about individual dissents? Would all go forward? In a small, collegial group such as ours, one letter can summarize the various points made in the discussion. In a large department a meeting can become quite contentious and summarizing all the points very difficult if not impossible. Leaks are inevitable, feelings can be hurt and enmities established. Is that good?</p> <p>College of Design responses to your request regarding: Aligning Faculty Classification and Tenure Policies with Top 20 Goals: A White Paper</p> <p>I have a problem with no.3 of faculty policies.</p> <p>Criteria for evaluating performance vary from person to person and also change over time. Flexibility here has encouraged good work; fixed standards limit it. The best way to ensure this quality is to rely on faculty expertise to support decisions about performance by situating the work (including the effort required to produce it) within the evaluation of each candidate rather than fixing standards beforehand. By definition, we understand our fields and know to whom we should turn when other expertise is required so we should be able to provide a well-argued evaluation every time.</p> <p>Flexibility is particularly crucial in the design disciplines (and not only here), which always and everywhere seem to have a difficult time situating their research within the university structure. A major obstacle here, I think, is the emphasis on fixing standards for productivity. (I was just in a meeting in Stockholm about this.) Fixed standards would only lead to the conclusion that design work does not belong in a university because the standards would only apply to a very few if any faculty members. I also think that fixed standards are likely to compromise the content of our research. Flexible standards would allow the university to support contributions to design and very likely foster new ways of conceiving them.</p>
Libraries	<p>The Library Faculty Council submits this response to the Provost's discussion paper on Top 20 Faculty Policies. The Council conferred at length and received input from the library faculty in preparing the response. We have provided specific comments regarding each numbered recommendation following the text of the recommendation. We also have some general comments and questions regarding the discussion paper as a whole, as follows.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Although the Provost provided some context for his recommendations in the original Dec. 2007 document that combined procedural/process issues with discussion of changes to the faculty series, we feel it would be helpful to have more information about why he is proposing these specific changes at this time. • Some terms and phrases are ambiguous in the discussion document and need clarification. In several cases some of us read one meaning into a statement while others saw it quite differently. We point out some of those ambiguities in specific commentary

below.

- Some recommendations specifically mention “tenure” but not “promotion” even though they could be applied to both. We are unclear as to whether both tenure and promotion should be implied in these cases.
- The distinction is not always clear as to what the Provost would be required to do and what he may do at his discretion.

Top 20 Faculty Policies Suggested Changes to
Procedural/Process Issues (for Discussion Purposes)

1. Current regulations, under which a faculty member’s tenure review ends without provost level review if the dean denies tenure, should be changed. Every tenure-track faculty member should be entitled to one full and comprehensive review at all levels for consideration for appointment with tenure. Current policy stops a tenure case at the college level, save for appeal on the grounds of an alleged procedural irregularity, when a dean renders a negative decision. Why should a negative decision by the dean receive more deference than a positive decision? We should change this such that all tenure cases, irrespective of the judgments at the college level, would be sent forward to the Provost’s Office for further consideration and final action. Considerable deference would be shown by the Provost to the judgments emanating from the college, especially in cases where those college-level judgments (departmental faculty, chair, college advisory committee and dean) are near unanimous, either for or against the granting of tenure. A comprehensive tenure review would not abridge a faculty person’s right to appeal a tenure decision on procedural grounds as codified in the Governing and Administrative Regulations.

Libraries response to #1:

Although the Library Faculty Council concurs with the generally perceived spirit of this recommendation, the following questions arose in our examination of this issue:

- Would the area committee have any role in this situation and, related to this, what constitutes a “comprehensive review”?
- Would this change in the regulation relate to those going up for early review?
- Tenure review is specified in the wording; would the regulation also apply to promotion to full professor?
- Could the Provost unilaterally reverse a dean’s decision?

2. Reconsideration of a negative decision on tenure should be permitted only as the remedy in a successful appeal (i.e., recommended by the Senate Advisory Committee on Privilege and Tenure and approved by the President as the remedy after a successful appeal on procedural grounds) of the initial tenure review process. In instances where no procedural errors exist, reconsideration might only occur at the discretion of the Provost, upon recommendation by the dean. The Governing and Administrative Regulations are agnostic on the matter of reconsideration of a negative tenure decision in the terminal year of reappointment, and we should codify the university’s position. I suggest that each college adopt, with the approval of the Provost, criteria under which a terminal year reconsideration might be appropriate.

Libraries response to #2:

The ambiguity of this statement also raises a question concerning those who choose to go up early for promotion/tenure: would they receive a terminal contract if they are not promoted? Also, we would like more clarity on what types of “criteria” beyond procedural grounds the Provost is envisioning.

3. The Governing and Administrative Regulations establishes the criterion for the granting of tenure as excellence in all areas of activity. Departments should be required to establish written statements on disciplinary-based evidences that constitute excellence in areas of activity assigned to department faculty, in consultation with the dean, and then submitted for approval by the provost. In other words, these statements of what constitutes disciplinary-based evidences should be agreed upon at all levels of review at the time of hiring of the faculty member. Where the scholarly activity of a newly hired faculty person is deemed to be highly interdisciplinary, the chair, in consultation with the unit faculty, should prepare a statement on procedures for soliciting the opinions of scholars external to the department and beyond the disciplinary boundaries typically applied by department. This process should be articulated in the candidate's appointment letter, with approval at the Provost's level.

Libraries response to #3:

We concur with this recommendation. The Libraries, as a college of the whole without departments, have established profession-based evidences and are currently considering whether we need to expand those evidences and provide more specificity. The expectations and process for promotion and tenure considerations are outlined in appointment letters, and we can include a paragraph about our process.

4. Current regulations require review of dossier and recommendation on tenure for all cases by the Dean of the Graduate School. I suggest we eliminate this requirement. The provost will be free to seek the advice of the Dean of the Graduate School as deemed necessary and appropriate.

Libraries response to #4:

We concur with this recommendation.

5. Tenure and promotion cases where all lower level reviewers (external, department faculty, college committee, dean) agree on a positive outcome should go directly to the provost for final review, circumventing area committees. The overwhelming majority of tenure and promotion are sent forward unchallenged by all levels of review within a college. Area Committees should review all cases with a negative recommendation, and those positive cases where there is disagreement among the summary judgments of lower-level reviewers.

Libraries response to #5:

We agree generally with this approach but have the following questions:

- What triggers a review by the Area Committee?
- What determines a "positive outcome," i.e., must the decision be unanimous to be considered positive?
- What is the weight of possible disagreements in the assessments from external reviewers?

6. UK is the only institution among our benchmarks that continues the practice of requiring individual unit faculty to submit letters of evaluation in tenure and promotion cases. Unit faculty opinion is an irreducible element of any promotion or tenure review. The faculty must engage in a formal deliberative process that results in an unambiguous statement of their opinions and be unconditionally reassured that those opinions, duly recorded, shall guide the judgments of all line evaluators in the review process. Too often, however,

individual letters do not convey unambiguous statements for or against the granting of tenure or promotion; present cryptic or biased assessments of strengths and weaknesses; and not infrequently contain language (or prejudicial information) that borders on (or falls into) the category of actionable statement. Those letters neither offer assistance to line evaluators nor solace to a candidate who expects from his or her colleagues consummate and proper deliberative conduct. There is “wisdom in the crowd,” and a collective process of unit faculty deliberation has been enshrined among our benchmarks as the fairest means to ascertain the will of a unit faculty.

Our peer and benchmark institutions have moved successfully to a collective review by the unit faculty, one that foregoes the writing of individual faculty letters and instead is characterized by the following procedural steps and practices:

- The appropriate unit faculty persons are required to engage in substantive discussion of each tenure and promotion case at a meeting (or series of meetings). Typically, a faculty person closest to the scholarly area of the candidate, but not the department chair, facilitates the discussion.
- After each case has been discussed to the satisfaction of the appropriate unit faculty, a detailed assessment is prepared of the candidate’s accomplishments in teaching, scholarship, and service, regarding both strengths and weaknesses. The summary in draft form is circulated among the faculty who participated in the discussion for their review and approval.
- A formal numeric vote of the appropriate faculty is taken and reported (in the aggregate) in the assessment document (see bullet above).
- The unit faculty assessment should be included in the review dossier. The chair makes an independent recommendation, with justification, in a letter that will be a part of the dossier. The chair must report to the appropriate unit faculty her/his judgment in each case under consideration and should be required to provide an explanation at formal meeting of the appropriate faculty if her/his recommendation is counter to the majority vote.

There is “wisdom in the crowd,” and a collective process of unit faculty deliberation has been enshrined among our benchmarks as the fairest means to ascertain the will of a unit faculty.

Libraries response to #6:

We do not concur with this recommendation.

As a college without departmental segmentation, we approach the process as a whole. In a faculty meeting with 50-60 in attendance, complete and open discussions are difficult. Individual peer letters permit detailed examination of candidates’ accomplishments and allow for a clear statement in regard to support.

7. The Governing and Administrative Regulations currently require a chair to obtain at least three (3) outside letters for each tenure or promotion case. I am proposing that we increase that minimum number and the preponderance of outside letters that come from reviewers selected by the chair, in consultation with the faculty but independent of the candidate for promotion or tenure. My revised language reads as follows:

A promotion or tenure dossier shall include a minimum of six (6) letters of evaluation from qualified persons outside the University. At least four (4) of the outside letters shall come from reviewers selected by the chair independent of the candidate for promotion or tenure.

	<p>Three outside letters offer no margin in those instances where one of the three letters is judged to be unhelpful, or misleading, for whatever reason; limit to a maximum of two reviewers the opinions of letter writers selected by the chair independent of the candidate for promotion or tenure; and by their numbers cannot ensure that the complexities and nuances of a case have been identified and thoughtfully discussed. Some might argue that even six is too few.</p> <p>Libraries response to #7: We concur on increasing the number of outside letters. We feel it would be valuable to specify what constitutes an appropriate relationship between reviewer and candidate for outside letters, e.g., should colleagues or department chairs who worked with a candidate at UK and then went on to other institutions review files? What about reviewers from businesses or other non-academic institutions?</p> <p>8. Meaningful mentoring of untenured faculty is one of the most important investments a department can make. Mentoring done well helps ensure that the considerable funds we invest in new faculty will result in the launch of a successful career, punctuated by a celebratory tenure review. Thoughtful, constructive feedback should be given annually to all untenured faculty members. Moreover, UK's Administrative Regulations stipulate that untenured faculty persons undergo formal progress reviews in their second and fourth years of their probationary period. However, a second-year progress review comes too early in the probationary period to provide meaningful feedback. Instead, UK should replace the second-year progress review with a substantive third-year review. This review would constitute a major assessment of the faculty member's record of achievement. It will provide for a mid-cycle evaluation that gives chairs a greater period of faculty performance on which to judge achievement and untenured faculty enough time before the sixth-year review to address areas of deficiency.</p> <p>The third year is also an appropriate time for a departmental faculty and chair, faced with the record of a seriously underperforming faculty person, to convey an unambiguous statement about their expectations for progress over the subsequent year. In this context, the fourth-year progress review can then be used to identify and acknowledge progress in addressing areas of deficiency or, in the absence of significant progress, solidify opinions on a decision to extend a terminal reappointment for a final year.</p> <p>Libraries response to #8: Library practice would not be affected by this recommendation. Because untenured library faculty members have one year contracts, the contract renewal process provides an opportunity for tenured faculty to evaluate their progress on an annual basis. Additional intensive review occurs in conjunction with consideration for promotion to Librarian III (assistant professor) in the third year.</p>
Dentistry	<p>The UK College of Dentistry Faculty Council's comments on the discussion paper regarding changes in promotion and tenure policies (discussion text in red, comments in black):</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Current regulations, under which a faculty member's tenure review ends without provost level review if the dean denies tenure,

should be changed. Every tenure track faculty member should be entitled to one full and comprehensive review at all levels for consideration for appointment with tenure. Current policy stops a tenure case at the college level, save for appeal on the grounds of an alleged procedural irregularity, when a dean renders a negative decision. Why should a negative decision by the dean receive more deference than a positive decision? We should change this such that all tenure cases, irrespective of the judgments at the college level, would be sent forward to the Provost's Office for further consideration and final action. Considerable deference would be shown by the Provost to the judgments emanating from the college, especially in cases where those college-level judgments (departmental faculty, chair, college advisory committee and dean) are near unanimous, either for or against the granting of tenure. A comprehensive tenure review would not abridge a faculty person's right to appeal a tenure decision on procedural grounds as codified in the Governing and Administrative Regulations.

Faculty Council Comments: The council is supportive of this change in procedure. However we would like to be sure that as this change is made, that procedures are clearly written.

2. Reconsideration of a negative decision on tenure should be permitted only as the remedy in a successful appeal (i.e., recommended by the Senate Advisory Committee on Privilege and Tenure and approved by the President as the remedy after a successful appeal on procedural grounds) of the initial tenure review process. In instances where no procedural errors exist, reconsideration might only occur at the discretion of the Provost, upon recommendation by the dean. The Governing and Administrative Regulations are agnostic on the matter of reconsideration of a negative tenure decision in the terminal year of reappointment, and we should codify the university's position. I suggest that each college adopt, with the approval of the Provost, criteria under which a terminal year reconsideration might be appropriate.

Faculty Council Comments: Interesting wording. On the one hand the statement is made that reconsideration should only occur to remedy as successful appeal (on procedural grounds). The next sentence then states that the dean or provost can initiate reconsideration apparently on any grounds. FC felt that essentially means that anything can be reconsidered and why make the first statement at all?? Currently the governing regulations permit a faculty to be put up for promotion and tenure during his terminal year (after failure to achieve tenure in the 6th year). Is the provost attempting to change this? If so, FC does not believe that each college should write criteria for this, but rather should be added to the ARs. If each college decided who could or could not be put up in his 7th year, could the university as a whole be setting itself up for litigation?

3. The Governing and Administrative Regulations establishes the criterion for the granting of tenure as excellence in all areas of activity. Departments should be required to establish written statements on disciplinary-based evidences that constitute excellence in areas of activity assigned to department faculty, in consultation with the dean, and then submitted for approval by the provost. In other words, these statements of what constitutes disciplinary-based evidences should be agreed upon at all levels of review at the time of hiring of the faculty member. Where the scholarly activity of a newly hired faculty person is deemed to be highly interdisciplinary, the chair, in consultation with the unit faculty, should prepare a statement on procedures for soliciting the opinions of scholars external to the department and beyond the disciplinary boundaries typically applied by the department. This process should be articulated in the candidate's appointment letter, with approval at the Provost's level.

Faculty Council Comments: The FC already believes that the College of Dentistry already has written criteria for promotion and tenure in our college's official "Promotion and Tenure Document". We disagree that individual departments should be writing their own promotion and tenure criteria (as opposed to a college). The final sentences in the section regarding placement of how/who will be solicited for external evaluators in a new hires appointment letter, the FC disagrees with. We believe that this wording can be put into the ARs and also into each college's PT document in a more general way. Often when a person is hired, their collaborative research efforts go in a variety of directions and locking the review in to a particular area may be a mistake. We believe that the ARs can simply read that when interdisciplinary research is being done that a variety of outside reviewers may be used...

4. Current regulations require review of dossier and recommendation on tenure for all cases by the Dean of the Graduate School. I suggest we eliminate this requirement. The provost will be free to seek the advice of the Dean of the Graduate School as deemed necessary and appropriate.

Faculty Council Comments: The FC agrees with this change in policy.

5. Tenure and promotion cases where all lower level reviewers (external, department faculty, college committee, dean) agree on a positive outcome should go directly to the provost for final review, circumventing area committees. The overwhelming majority of tenure and promotion are sent forward unchallenged by all levels of review within a college. Area Committees should review all cases with a negative recommendation, and those positive cases where there is disagreement among the summary judgments of lower-level reviewers.

Faculty Council Comments: The FC agrees with this change in policy however would like to clarify what exactly constitutes "all lower level reviewers agree...". The discussion paper refers to external, department faculty, college committee, dean. We thought it should read where there is unanimous agreement among the entities, ie summary judgment of the external reviewers, summary judgment of the department faculty, APT committee, chair, and dean. Also in our overall faculty meeting where this was discussed, there was some concern that the area committee would only see these "marginal" cases where there was lack of agreement. Without the area committee seeing those dossiers where there was unanimous agreement, the area committee may not have a good reference point to which to judge those cases? Some members of our faculty still felt for this and other reasons, that all dossiers should be reviewed by the area committee.

6. UK is the only institution among our benchmarks that continues the practice of requiring individual unit faculty to submit letters of evaluation in tenure and promotion cases. Unit faculty opinion is an irreducible element of any promotion or tenure review. The faculty must engage in a formal deliberative process that results in an unambiguous statement of their opinions and be unconditionally reassured that those opinions, duly recorded, shall guide the judgments of all line evaluators in the review process. Too often, however, individual letters do not convey unambiguous statements for or against the granting of tenure or promotion; present cryptic or biased assessments of strengths and weaknesses; and not infrequently contain language (or prejudicial information) that borders on (or falls into) the category of actionable statement. Those letters neither offer assistance to line evaluators nor solace to a candidate who expects from his or her colleagues consummate and proper deliberative conduct. There is "wisdom in the crowd," and a collective process of unit faculty deliberation has been enshrined among our benchmarks as the fairest means to ascertain the will of a unit faculty. Our peer

and benchmark institutions have moved successfully to a collective review by the unit faculty, one that foregoes the writing of individual faculty letters and instead is characterized by the following procedural steps and practices:

- The appropriate unit faculty persons are required to engage in substantive discussion of each tenure and promotion case at a meeting (or series of meetings). Typically, a faculty person closest to the scholarly area of the candidate, but not the department chair, facilitates the discussion.
- After each case has been discussed to the satisfaction of the appropriate unit faculty, a detailed assessment is prepared of the candidate's accomplishments in teaching, scholarship, and service, regarding both strengths and weaknesses. The summary in draft form is circulated among the faculty who participated in the discussion for their review and approval.
- A formal numeric vote of the appropriate faculty is taken and reported (in the aggregate) in the assessment document (see bullet above).
- The unit faculty assessment should be included in the review dossier. The chair makes an independent recommendation, with justification, in a letter which will be a part of the dossier. The chair must report to the appropriate unit faculty her/his judgment in each case under consideration and should be required to provide an explanation at formal meeting of the appropriate faculty if her/his recommendation is counter to the majority vote.

There is “wisdom in the crowd,” and a collective process of unit faculty deliberation has been enshrined among our benchmarks as the fairest means to ascertain the will of a unit faculty.

Faculty Council Comments: The FC was generally in agreement with this change with the exception that we felt there were a lot of details that needed to be carefully drawn out. For example regs on who would chair such a committee and how dissenting opinions might be aired.

7. The Governing and Administrative Regulations currently require a chair to obtain at least three (3) outside letters for each tenure or promotion case. I am proposing that we increase that minimum number and the preponderance of outside letters that come from reviewers selected by the chair, in consultation with the faculty but independent of the candidate for promotion or tenure. My revised language reads as follows:

A promotion or tenure dossier shall include a minimum of six (6) letters of evaluation from qualified persons outside the University. At least four (4) of the outside letters shall come from reviewers selected by the chair independent of the candidate for promotion or tenure.

Three outside letters offer no margin in those instances where one of the three letters is judged to be unhelpful, or misleading, for whatever reason; limit to a maximum of two reviewers the opinions of letter writers selected by the chair independent of the candidate for promotion or tenure; and by their numbers cannot ensure that the complexities and nuances of a case have been identified and thoughtfully discussed. Some might argue that even six is too few.

Faculty Council Comments: The FC noted that currently the regulation is that there be a minimum of 3 external letters. The College of Dentistry has traditionally included at least 6-7 external letters for the exact reasons the Provost cites, the FC would only hope that in a

	<p>few cases where external letters are slow to be returned that this additional number does not unduly hold up dossiers from moving forward.</p> <p>8. Meaningful mentoring of untenured faculty is one of the most important investments a department can make. Mentoring done well helps ensure that the considerable funds we invest in new faculty will result in the launch of a successful career, punctuated by a celebratory tenure review. Thoughtful, constructive feedback should be given annually to all untenured faculty members. Moreover, UK’s Administrative Regulations stipulate that untenured faculty persons undergo formal progress reviews in their second and fourth years of their probationary period. However, a second-year progress review comes too early in the probationary period to provide meaningful feedback. Instead, UK should replace the second-year progress review with a substantive third-year review. This review would constitute a major assessment of the faculty member’s record of achievement. It will provide for a mid-cycle evaluation that gives chairs a greater period of faculty performance on which to judge achievement and untenured faculty enough time before the sixth-year review to address areas of deficiency.</p> <p>The third year is also an appropriate time for a departmental faculty and chair, faced with the record of a seriously underperforming faculty person, to convey an unambiguous statement about their expectations for progress over the subsequent year. In this context, the fourth-year progress review can then be used to identify and acknowledge progress in addressing areas of deficiency or, in the absence of significant progress, solidify opinions on a decision to extend a terminal reappointment for a final year.</p> <p><u>Faculty Council Comments:</u> The FC felt that the 2 year review was indeed enough time to consider a new faculty member’s scholarship. While there may not be a lot of publications, it is still clear at 2 years what the faculty is pursuing in his scholarly efforts. The FC felt that waiting until 3 years to do this review, could potentially let new faculty go too far off track and make the ultimate goal of tenure harder to achieve. Some also noted the difficulty in getting the reviews completed and that initiating it at 3 years, could delay the receipt of that feedback until 3.5 to 4 years into the tenure process – again FC considers this too late. We disagree with this change in promotion and tenure procedure.</p>
[A&S faculty member]	I've reviewed the proposed changes and think that they are quite good. I would support changing procedures along those lines.
CoPharm	<p>Top 20 Faculty Policies Suggested Changes to Procedural/Process Issues (for Discussion Purposes)</p> <p>The proposed changes provoked a good deal of commentary from College of Pharmacy faculty and administrators. The primary concern is that moving toward a single Tenure-able Title Series will decrease the chance that Clinical Scholars will be able to gain promotion and tenure; this will decrease our ability to recruit and retain the best faculty. The “generic” nature of the “Tenure-able Title Series” vernacular also does not accurately reflect the day to day contributions of faculty that have responsibilities as health care</p>

providers.

Under each heading below, I have pasted the most salient comments from the UKCOP Deans and Chairs meeting last week, and from a College-wide faculty meeting. At the end of this document, I have also pasted all comments from individual faculty. If you have any questions or concerns about these comments

1. Current regulations, under which a faculty member's tenure review ends without provost level review if the dean denies tenure, should be changed. Every tenure track faculty member should be entitled to one full and comprehensive review at all levels for consideration for appointment with tenure. Current policy stops a tenure case at the college level, save for appeal on the grounds of an alleged procedural irregularity, when a dean renders a negative decision. Why should a negative decision by the dean receive more deference than a positive decision? We should change this such that all tenure cases, irrespective of the judgments at the college level, would be sent forward to the Provost's Office for further consideration and final action. Considerable deference would be shown by the Provost to the judgments emanating from the college, especially in cases where those college-level judgments (departmental faculty, chair, college advisory committee and dean) are near unanimous, either for or against the granting of tenure. A comprehensive tenure review would not abridge a faculty person's right to appeal a tenure decision on procedural grounds as codified in the Governing and Administrative Regulations.

Pharmacy Comments and Concerns

A) The special title series was initially designed to permit clinical scientists with obligations in patient care to explore scholarship through clinical research trials and publications expanding the knowledge base for improving patient care outcomes. Direct patient contact is a pre-requisite for this type of scholarship.

B) When reviewing the UK AR's II-1.01 V-2 – a change in the definition of University and Public Service took place. The service definition 9/20/89 included the following statement: "In the colleges of the Medical Center, patient care is recognized as a special competence in an assigned field and is an integral part of the service component". This statement is not included in the present AR's.

C) The national need for clinician scientists capable of conducting and designing clinical and translational research programs mandates a system for recognizing clinical scholars. If a single title series is employed, the design must encompass the demand of balance in effort for outstanding patient care that extends scholarship in clinical pharmacy/medicine/nursing/dentistry or other allied health professionals. The special title series previously recognized the role of patient care as a service of the University thereby addressing teaching/service/research responsibilities. A tenurable title is needed for clinical scholars.

D) Presently, the assignment of clinicians to non-tenure positions undermines the significant contributions of these professionals in advancing the professional and graduate training programs in clinical disciplines. Future collaborative clinical and translational graduate and certificate programs will benefit significantly from leadership provided by these clinical scholars. For their participation, an academic title reflecting their scholarly contributions is needed. The assignment of "adjunct" or "clinical" title series does not adequately distinguish those clinician scholars capable of applying their clinical expertise to advancing patient care and therapeutic outcomes. These faculty can conduct clinical and translational investigations and serve as principal investigators on nationally funded programs. They also publish and are frequently recognized as scholarly leaders in their professional discipline.

E) The regular title series will only capture the full contributions of the clinician scholar if the job description clearly outlines the expected scholarship, definitively and accepts clinical service and teaching as the contributing elements toward tenure. A philosophical decision to recognize University based clinicians as scholars with distinctly different demands than traditional faculty lines.

F) We do not believe the Clinical Title series or Adjunct Title series adequately captures the contributions of clinical scholars in pharmacy. Redefinition of the special title series to reflect the specific element of patient care responsibilities, as originally designed, would eliminate confusion related to qualifications for this assignment. Indeed, patient care experience is an essential component for educators training professional students. In order to bring relevant and contemporary content into the classroom, it is imperative that faculty teaching clinical application be clinician-scientists.

G) We do not agree with the sentiment that Clinical Faculty “generally teach professional practicum”. See above comments. Additionally, the current regulations recognize the inherent challenges of large faculty numbers in this title series within departments. By placing all clinical scholars into this category it debases the tenure track faculty numbers and introduces imbalance in governance for clinical units. We continue to argue a special title series or a tenurable series be available for clinical scholars. The suggestion that these faculty teach professional practicum only is incorrect for our College. They are an integral part of our classroom courses, both required and elective. We presently are challenged in the development of Masters and Graduate Programs for clinical and translational research because the clinician scholars are presently restricted to non-tenure appointments with the hold on STS future appointments. This is a significant obstacle for our department when attempting to align our professional programs with the Top 20 goals. Our clinical scholar faculty presently are assigned adjunct appointments yet they teach, publish and partner in research at the level many of our earlier STS faculty did. They cannot hold graduate faculty appointments. In the past, STS faculty were rewarded with tenure for outstanding contributions in teaching and research programs accomplished through integration of their patient care into each of these aspects. It is highly unlikely these clinical scholars will accept a regular title series appointment and insisting they relinquish patient care severely compromises the advancement of developing graduate students capable of bench to bedside research advancing therapeutic outcomes.

2. Reconsideration of a negative decision on tenure should be permitted only as the remedy in a successful appeal (i.e., recommended by the Senate Advisory Committee on Privilege and Tenure and approved by the President as the remedy after a successful appeal on procedural grounds) of the initial tenure review process. In instances where no procedural errors exist, reconsideration might only occur at the discretion of the Provost, upon recommendation by the dean. The Governing and Administrative Regulations are agnostic on the matter of

reconsideration of a negative tenure decision in the terminal year of reappointment, and we should codify the university’s position. I suggest that each college adopt, with the approval of the Provost, criteria under which a terminal year reconsideration might be appropriate.

This prolongs the inevitable- if the decision on tenure is negative and there is no procedural error it should be final – additional criteria will only generate confusion and prolong the matter, increasing the likelihood of legal recrimination. Sometimes less is more when making judgment on suitability of a subjective component inherent in tenure decisions beyond the objective criteria easily quantified.

3. The Governing and Administrative Regulations establishes the criterion for the granting of tenure as excellence in all areas of activity. Departments should be required to establish written statements on disciplinary-based evidences that constitute excellence in areas of activity assigned to department faculty, in consultation with the dean, and then submitted for approval by the provost. In other words, these statements of what constitutes disciplinary-based evidences should be agreed upon at all levels of review at the time of hiring of the faculty member. Where the scholarly activity of a newly hired faculty person is deemed to be highly interdisciplinary, the chair, in consultation with the unit faculty, should prepare a statement on procedures for soliciting the opinions of scholars external to the department and beyond the disciplinary boundaries typically applied by the department. This process should be articulated in the candidate's appointment letter, with approval at the Provost's level.

This has been an ongoing problem in our Department. With the departure of faculty and the extent of teaching responsibility, it is inevitable that teaching effort may change over a six year time course. Upon initial appointment, our RTS and STS faculty have lower teaching obligations as they establish their research or patient care programs. The effort assigned to research and scholarship also will fluctuate based on successful funding during the year. It is unclear how to meet item 4 expectations.

Please clarify whether Pharmacy Practice and Science would be included as a "clinical" department for concept or increasing the probationary period to 8 or more years.

We support further investigations regarding appointments to Centers, and the impact on the tenure process. The advent of collaborative research teams and integrated educational programs in response to national initiatives requires assessment of how faculty contributions and graduate programs are recognized for University metrics. This issue extends beyond the Research Title Series and investigation of the role of assignment to Centers should explore this aspect also.

Mixed opinions on this – the local administrator would have knowledge of internal and professional matters to a larger extent than the Provost. While the Provost can certainly ascertain the contribution of the faculty member to University Goals and Metrics, presumably that would be easily ascertained by the local APT within the College. Faculty dynamics and programs require some degree of autonomy for selection of those meeting program requirements, particularly as it relates to professional program faculty.

4. Current regulations require review of dossier and recommendation on tenure for all cases by the Dean of the Graduate School. I suggest we eliminate this requirement. The provost will be free to seek the advice of the Dean of the Graduate School as deemed necessary and appropriate. 5. Tenure and promotion cases where all lower level reviewers (external, department faculty, college committee, dean) agree on a positive outcome should go directly to the provost for final review, circumventing area committees. The overwhelming majority of tenure and promotion are sent forward unchallenged by all levels of review within a college. Area Committees should review all cases with a negative recommendation, and those positive cases where there is disagreement among the summary judgments of lower-level reviewers.

Should we be in the position of offering tenure to faculty incapable of training graduate students? This seems to be inconsistent with Top 20 goals. Even with multiple title series for tenure, the NIH re-engineering of clinical research teams, call for community practice based research teams and translational research scientists, each demand faculty capable of training future scientists and educators in

each area.

How will the Area Committee comments on negative decisions be addressed at the Provost level? When will the College and Dean be notified of the findings? A clear process for this needed so the faculty understand exactly what can happen during this review, how the final decision will be made, what role each group plays in the final decision and how this impacts timelines for budget decisions and position postings.

6. UK is the only institution among our benchmarks that continues the practice of requiring individual unit faculty to submit letters of evaluation in tenure and promotion cases. Unit faculty opinion is an irreducible element of any promotion or tenure review. The faculty must engage in a formal deliberative process that results in an unambiguous statement of their opinions and be unconditionally reassured that those opinions, duly recorded, shall guide the judgments of all line evaluators in the review process. Too often, however, individual letters do not convey unambiguous statements for or against the granting of tenure or promotion; present cryptic or biased assessments of strengths and weaknesses; and not infrequently contain language (or prejudicial information) that borders on (or falls into) the category of actionable statement. Those letters neither offer assistance to line evaluators nor solace to a candidate who expects from his or her colleagues consummate and proper deliberative conduct. There is “wisdom in the crowd,” and a collective process of unit faculty deliberation has been enshrined among our benchmarks as the fairest means to ascertain the will of a unit faculty. Our peer and benchmark institutions have moved successfully to a collective review by the unit faculty, one that foregoes the writing of individual faculty letters and instead is characterized by the following procedural steps and practices:

- The appropriate unit faculty persons are required to engage in substantive discussion of each tenure and promotion case at a meeting (or series of meetings). Typically, a faculty person closest to the scholarly area of the candidate, but not the department chair, facilitates the discussion.
- After each case has been discussed to the satisfaction of the appropriate unit faculty, a detailed assessment is prepared of the candidate's accomplishments in teaching, scholarship, and service, regarding both strengths and weaknesses. The summary in draft form is circulated among the faculty who participated in the discussion for their review and approval.
- A formal numeric vote of the appropriate faculty is taken and reported (in the aggregate) in the assessment document (see bullet above).
- The unit faculty assessment should be included in the review dossier. The chair makes an independent recommendation, with justification, in a letter which will be a part of the dossier. The chair must report to the appropriate unit faculty her/his judgment in each case under consideration and should be required to provide an explanation at formal meeting of the appropriate faculty if her/his recommendation is counter to the majority vote. There is “wisdom in the crowd,” and a collective process of unit faculty deliberation has been enshrined among our benchmarks as the fairest means to ascertain the will of a unit faculty.

These are improvements we support

7. The Governing and Administrative Regulations currently require a chair to obtain at least three (3) outside letters for each tenure or promotion case. I am proposing that we increase that minimum number and the preponderance of outside letters that come from reviewers selected by the chair, in consultation with the faculty but independent of the candidate for promotion or tenure. My revised language reads as follows: A promotion or tenure dossier shall include a minimum of six (6) letters of evaluation from qualified persons outside the University. At least four (4) of the outside letters shall come from reviewers selected by the chair independent of the candidate for promotion or tenure. Three outside letters offer no margin in those instances where one of the three letters is judged to be unhelpful, or misleading, for whatever reason; limit to a maximum of two reviewers the opinions of letter writers selected by the chair independent of the candidate for promotion or tenure; and by their numbers cannot ensure that the complexities and nuances of a case have been identified and thoughtfully discussed. Some might argue that even six is too few.

8. Meaningful mentoring of untenured faculty is one of the most important investments a department can make. Mentoring done well helps ensure that the considerable funds we invest in new faculty will result in the launch of a successful career, punctuated by a celebratory tenure review. Thoughtful, constructive feedback should be given annually to all untenured faculty members. Moreover, UK's Administrative Regulations stipulate that untenured faculty persons undergo formal progress reviews in their second and fourth years of their probationary period. However, a second-year progress review comes too early in the probationary period to provide meaningful feedback. Instead, UK should replace the second-year progress review with a substantive third-year review. This review would constitute a major assessment of the faculty member's record of achievement. It will provide for a mid-cycle evaluation that gives chairs a greater period of faculty performance on which to judge achievement and untenured faculty enough time before the sixth-year review to address areas of deficiency. The third year is also an appropriate time for a departmental faculty and chair, faced with the record of a seriously underperforming faculty person, to convey an unambiguous statement about their expectations for progress over the subsequent year. In this context, the fourth-year progress review can then be used to identify and acknowledge progress in addressing areas of deficiency or, in the absence of significant progress, solidify opinions on a decision to extend a terminal reappointment for a final year.

Other Comments From Pharmacy Faculty

I have reviewed both documents ... and these are my semi-random thoughts:

Regarding the "Procedural Changes" document ... I have no issues/concerns with this document ... it seems like all the proposed changes in this document would accomplish the goal of promulgating the tenure process.

With regards to re-casting the faculty line system as is potentially proposed in the "Aligning Faculty" document, it seems as though the repeated premise/basis for change or suggested change found here is two-fold ... (1) either that the current structure is ill-defined and misinterpreted/applied or (2) that our peers do not use similar faculty line paradigms (e.g., STS). I am concerned that neither of these constitute a strong argument for imposing change ...

With regards to confusion in application and interpretation of the current title paradigms ... having joint appointments it is obvious that there are different "yardsticks" used across the medical center ... but if this is the crux of the issue then re-education and correct

application of the system we have should be explored first.

In terms of comparisons with our peer institutions ... I do not see a need to be a mirror image of each of our benchmark institutions ... perhaps some of our differences in actuality are our strengths? I find it hard to accept the argument that we should simply be like everyone else without any objective data.

My opinions are based on a strong feeling that part of the success of that this COP has garnered over the years was in large part a product of faculty members in the STS title series. Would those people still be here or would they have been here without this title series? Additionally, the majority of the tenured faculty in PPS have significant (and critical) clinical responsibilities that would likely preclude a traditional "tenure-able" line. This would in turn effect the Dept and its governance. That is, our Dept missions and the people with voting/tenure privileges would be in a way "out of synch."

in general I find the Provost's comments and proposals enlightening and helpful. Given his sentiments I can agree that there is not a need for special title series. In an ideal world he is exactly correct. I think the key is in the details and execution of the policy. The only significant hold back I have is that it is hard at times to get to where he wants us to be when the "old guard" are used to doing things their own way. I think it is important that the criteria for advancement be better documented at time of appointment and that the criteria not actually be something else in the end. What this does is make it harder on the chairs and deans up front to be more thoughtful about the job description and DOE and so that they can be held accountable for what the faculty performance is relative to mentoring and feedback. Too often I see a bait and switch in which the really important criteria are not espoused until late in the process – which makes this inherently unfair. It also can address when chairs dump on faculty to do new things when not in the DOE. I am not opposed to rigorous criteria, or rigorous job description and DOE, and evidence from faculty that they in fact have performed. I just dislike the political and ethereal elements of our current process. So in general I am supportive of the proposed changes and so that the mutual expectations have equipoise.

Many of the issues discussed by the Provost seem reasonable to me, but with little experience I don't feel that I have much to comment on. However, I would like to contribute 2 things:

1. Restructuring to one title series, but still varying the expectations based on DOE sounds logical to me. I don't see where that would change much in terms of expectations and evaluation. So, the overall thrust of this makes sense in my opinion.
2. I totally agree with the comment concerning how over 40% of other peer institutions have 8 or more years for the process for clinical faculty, and that this could be a good thing. I think that this is best shown by the overriding discussion that took place at the Keystone Symposium I attended last year. The meeting focus was Immunologic Interventions for the Treatment of Human Disease. This was a big group of basic immunologists that recently had evolved over to get involved in clinical trials—many of them for the first time. The overriding discussion was how LONG it takes to get a clinical trial planned, implemented, and completed. Because of this, the compatibility of conducting clinical studies with the tenure process really doesn't fit because there just isn't enough time. With the migration of research over to more collaborative, more clinically-focused projects, this could impact tenure decision making over the next several years. A longer probation period would alleviate some of this problem.

Stated Problem:

- I. “The lexicon of tenurable title series designations (Regular, Special, Librarian and Extension Title Series) is unique among our peer institutions.” “...we should certainly ask why we need a separate category called “Special Title Series.”
- II. “Faculty members appointed to the Special Title Series have often been relegated to second-class citizenship.”
- III. “Within the medical center, the practice of hiring physicians or surgeons into Special Title Series has often led to the unwelcome and involuntary departure of many an outstanding clinician-educator. There is considerable confusion at levels concerning the expectations from STS faculty.”

Proposed solution:

1. Only have 1 tenure title series.
2. Revise regulations governing tenure process to make it reasonable for clinical scholars to achieve tenure. Primarily clarify expectations and extend the clock.

Outcome of proposal:

- I. We will look like our peers (followers not leaders)
- II. I don't believe STS faculty are seen as second-class citizens. Respect is derived at a personal level not based on title series.
- III. I disagree that hiring people in a STS, where tenure is based on DOE and job description leads to early departure. I do not think that a single title series with variable time to go up for promotion and tenure based on DOE and job description will alleviate confusion created by having a STS. I believe that telling clinical scholars that they will not be eligible for tenure or promotion for 8 years because of their job description would be detrimental.

Major concern

A big metric for promotion and tenure is research funding. Historically, industry dollars are considered differently than NIH dollars. Regular title series faculty in the COP have an unwritten funding standard of being a PI on an RO1. While clinical research in pharmacy is predominately funded by industry. Holding clinical scholars to the historical funding expectations will prevent successful promotion and tenure (despite prolonging the clock).

Summary:

I believe the future success of UK relies on attracting and retaining clinical scholars, which align us with the NIH roadmap. Although the proposal of eliminating the STS would make us look like our peers, I don't believe it resolves the two other stated problems and in fact could result in a negative outcome.

As background, I have served as the chair of the Biological Sciences and the Medical Center Area Advisory Committees on several occasions. So with that experience I make these comments.

1. A single Tenurable Title series will require quite a bit of discussion.
2. I agree that tenure and promotion cases that have positive outcomes at the external, department, college and dean levels should go directly to the Provost. No need for an Area Committee to approve. The Area committees should see only those cases in which there was a negative review at the external, department, college and dean levels.
3. Unit faculty reviews are important. I would caution about reducing this. The collective review has merit.
4. The Mentoring aspect of untenured faculty is important and should be stressed.
5. I believe the 2 and 4 year reviews are valuable. I question changing to a 3 year review. What I would suggest is the 2 and 4 year reviews be maintained and that if the 2 year review is not positive, then a three year review be included.

1. Good idea
2. Good idea
3. This assumes more homogeneity in a department than we have in the CoP. It may work in an A&S dept but I suspect it won't work for us.
4. Good idea
5. Good idea
6. Good idea but at bullet #2 who will prepare the "detailed assessment"? That is unspecified.
7. I'm ambivalent about this one
8. Good idea

I like the recommendations of the Provost with regards to the process for tenure and promotion. The proposed system is nearly identical to the system that I lived under at the University of Michigan. I think that the proposed changes will require some cultural shifts at UK (and thus may create some uneasiness in the short run) but will be good for our faculty.

I do not support changing 12 month appts to academic year appts. My primary objection is the message this sends to graduate students. Graduate training and research are not a 9 month activity. We should expect our graduate students to be pursuing completion of their degree requirement full time, not taking off 3+ months in the summer for vacation. If properly mentoring graduate students, faculty advisors should be available throughout the year for their graduate students. Secondly, even though a faculty might know s/he is being paid for the academic year with the expectation of some service throughout the 12 months, it is my observation that most people will not perform with as much dedication during the summer than the rest of the year. A great example is MLK day. It is a University

holiday, so hardly one works. I think the same would happen if we were put on 9 month contract; most would not work during the summer. This is not conducive to becoming a top-20 university, which is the underlying goal of this entire discussion.

I have a question about "Reconsideration of a negative decision on tenure ... that seems to be only permitted on procedural grounds." If I interpret this correctly, if a faculty member comes up for tenure, and it is denied, unless there is an appeal on procedural grounds, that person cannot re-apply. If so, I believe this would greatly limit consideration of early promotion & tenure. Presently, a "star" might apply for an early decision, and if denied, apply at the "regular" time. Unless a "star" was very confident in a positive early decision, I suspect no one would take that chance.

RE: Special title series. It would help me to understand this if I knew what faculty in the COP are in this track, and why they are compared to a different track (regular or clinical).

I think 6 or more outside letters for promotion and tenure cases places too much burden on people to write letters. Why not keep at 3, and if they do not reflect uniformity of opinion, solicit further letters.

If performance review is conducted after the 3rd & 4th years and the person is not doing well, the Provost suggests a terminal reappointment for a final year. Is that possible? I thought tenure track faculty had 6 years to submit application for promotion and tenure. If given a terminal 1 year appointment after 4 years who would accept that without the formal promotion and tenure review process?

I know I am untenured and probably should not have an opinion, but this seems pretty open to even us little people. My comments in regular font to the points where I have a strong opinion....

1. Current regulations, under which a faculty member's tenure review ends without provost level review if the dean denies tenure, should be changed. Every tenure track faculty member should be entitled to one full and comprehensive review at all levels for consideration for appointment with tenure. [Why should a negative decision by the dean receive more deference than a positive decision?] I really believe that the department faculty vote should carry the heaviest of weight here and am concerned that this would allow a provost or area committee to overturn a negative decision by the departmental faculty. And though logically I understand the point about the negative versus positive point, the bottom line really should lie in the "wisdom in the crowd." I could see if there were conflicting votes by Dean and Faculty that it might jump to the next level, but if both are negative, it should be done and over (minus appeal options). I can think of an example at the University of Texas where this might have applied. Certain faculty member got a no vote by faculty despite her renewed R01 and other grants. If a dean, area committee or provost happened to like her and her grant money, those folks might be inclined to overturn a faculty decision. And then the department is stuck with a faculty member that no one believes should be a part of the department. That is lose lose for everyone.

4. Current regulations require review of dossier and recommendation on tenure for all cases by the Dean of the Graduate School. I suggest we eliminate this requirement. Thumbs up, reduces unnecessary workload, as this sounds like they just rubber stamp anyway.

5. Tenure and promotion cases where all lower level reviewers (external, department faculty, college committee, dean) agree on a positive outcome should go directly to the provost for final review, circumventing area committees. As an untenured faculty that

FEARS that area committee, YEA! However, how many of us have given a YES to tenure because we knew the decision would be struck down in Area committee? I am thinking of our most recent tenure failure. The common sense of the area committee has helped the department say NO to tenure when it really was not appropriate. Would the department have the strength to vote down a well liked but clearly not tenurable member? As much as I fear that Area committee, I think they have kept our department and college up to the appropriate standards of a med center environment. So it is easy to say YEA no more area committee because I think that means it will be easier for us to get tenure. However, being easier to get tenure is NOT good for Top 20 standards. It also puts a lot of power in the hands of the provost.....

6. Area Committees should review all cases with a negative recommendation and those positive cases where there is any disagreement among lower level reviewers. I do think this sounds appropriate. But see previous comments.

8. Our current practice of guaranteeing 12-month salary for basic science faculty in some of the colleges should be reexamined with an eye toward our benchmark institutions. In a similar vein, most benchmarks use academic year salary buy-out savings for reinvestment in research rather than as bonus pay. Should we aim to ensure our faculty salaries are at market levels rather than rely on a bonus system?

I think it would be foolish to drop the 12 month salary. That is a huge recruiting tool. And how many professors would disappear in the summer when we went to 9 month appointments. Seriously, it happens. You can bet the productivity is going to drop significantly. And if UK really wants to be taken seriously it should ensure that faculty salaries are at market levels AND rely on the bonus system. Nothing attracts and keeps faculty like money. It all works out the same way for buy out versus bonus. The only exception is that faculty may end up having to choose as to whether they want to employ another technician or even a student (good for the economy, good for the state) or pump up their buy out (good for their job, probably better for UK to keep the \$). I think the current system is a good balance. But perhaps threatening to go to the buy out system would wake up the state. How many new jobs or current jobs would be lost if faculty are forced into buying out? Less technical support and fewer grad students hurt productivity on science, hurt the educational mission and hurt the economy.

EC comments are included.

Tenable Title Series

- Move toward one tenurable series (eliminate Special Title series)
- All faculty have similar DOE and DOE unchanged during probationary period
- Probationary period default remains 7 years however, some Colleges could adopt 5-8 year timeframe

No significant concerns raised by the EC members.

Nontenable Series

- Research Title – time limit in RT status, need to set promotion standards and establish bridge funding policy.
- Lecturers – Generally reserved for specialized instructors, proposed multi-year contracts with reasonable compensation and loads

No significant concerns raised by the EC members.

Faculty Appointment Policies and Procedures

- All tenure review processes include Provost review (currently a tenure denial could end at the Dean level)
Several EC members stressed the importance of maintaining the right to appeal should the tenure/promotion process end at the Dean's level due to negative reviews. This appeal process includes petitioning the Provost and forwarding the dossier to the Area Committee for further review.
- Department should establish written statements on disciplinary-based evidence that constitute excellence.
Dr. Anderson noted the importance of establishing clear guidelines for "excellence" which would prove beneficial in the appointment and promotion process.
- Review step by Graduate Dean to be eliminated
The EC members felt that this was a superfluous step and should be eliminated.
- Tenure/promotion cases where all lower level reviewers agree (positive) should go directly to the Provost (no Area Committee review)
The PS EC committee feels strongly that the Area Committee should remain involved in this process, even when lower level reviews are positive. This additional step helps to ensure quality decisions from highly qualified scientists and is an important component in the tenure/promotion process.
- Area Committee should review all negative (or less than positive cases)
The EC members felt strongly that this step remain in place.
- Proposed to move from a 12-month to nine months salary for basic science faculty
The EC committee strongly re-affirmed the importance of remaining on a 12-month salary. Among other reasons, this is a good recruiting tool.

PS EC Minutes (12/18/07)

Provost Faculty Proposals

In an attempt to align faculty classification and tenure policies with the Top-20 goals, the Provost has proposed issued two documents for discussion by the faculty. Previous EC meeting discussed the "Aligning Faculty Classification and Tenure Policies with Top-20 Goals" document which basically proposed the following:

- Move toward one tenurable series (eliminate Special Title series)
- All faculty have similar DOE / DOE unchanged during probationary period
- Probationary Period (Default remains seven years)

Previous EC meeting discussed the "Top 20 Faculty Policies, Suggested Changes to Procedural and Process Issues" document; however there were changes in this document which were discussed briefly.

- Department should establish written statements on disciplinary-based evidence that constitute excellence
- Eliminate individual faculty letters
- Faculty discussion of tenure/promotion decisions ("wisdom of the crowd") [end of 5th year?]
- Unit faculty engage in discussion at a meeting with one faculty member (not Chair) leading discussion
- Summary of accomplishments/comments is prepared, circulated to faculty

- Formal numerical vote of faculty is taken and submitted with summary statements
- Chair writes separate letter; must report to faculty if counter to majority
- Outside letters: minimum of 6 (four from Chair's reviewers)
- Formal review process
- Replace 2yr with 3yr; keep 4yr

These changes need to be discussed at an upcoming faculty meeting (CoP and PS).

I wanted to send you some feedback & a note of thanks regarding the current issues with faculty lines & definition. I think the position stated by Dr. and yourself, both at the specialist meeting & the faculty meeting, reflects my opinion on the matter. Personally, I don't care much about the title (clinical vs adjunct) unless it limits what we are able to do, which at this point, since it is due to funding more than anything, it doesn't appear to affect anything that we are able to do as non-tenurable faculty. Clinical sounds better, I guess.

The primary issue is the ability for us to recruit for or move into clinical faculty tenurable positions. Certainly we aren't able to recruit clinical scholars at a high level without a reasonable tenure position that reflects what a clinician scientist with an active practice would be expected to do. Current specialists would likewise not be able to move into such a position either. As the provost's statement is written, it seems as though if the COP can justify the role of clinical service in the job description & have some consideration for time spent in this area when evaluating a dossier for tenure & promotion, then many current specialists would be capable of being successful in such a position (interest may be another story, but the availability would be a great victory & a foundation upon which we can grow). That being said, as you mentioned, we would need some assurance that the other non-medical members of the area committees are cognizant of this as well. Both factors may be able to be accomplished by combining forces with the medical school, etc.

If there is a precedent from within the medical faculty, that might be a nice model, even if it is 25 years old. I am not certain if part of the rationale is aimed at retention of faculty, but most assuredly the dynamics are different now for pharmacy specialists—the pharmaceutical industry has drained many specialist groups in comparable institutions over the past 10 years & a relative lack of 'incentive' (for lack of a better term) to keep skilled specialists in the academic environment may contribute to this phenomenon. That would be an undesirable situation which we should try to avert if at all possible.

What I think would be optimal is for the COP/hospital to hire clinicians with some skill and/or desire to engage in research & education within the professional program, and perhaps more significantly, the residency & graduate program. To have a tenurable position with a significant component devoted to clinical service (~40-50%?) with the expectation of commensurate, related publications in other emphasis areas (innovative education/assessment, clinical/translational research, etc.) would be ideal.

#2 For the non-tenure peons (or even tenure i guess), adjunct or clin title series - you get stuck at the associate level b/c there is no clear details for promotion. After 16.5 years, a small pile of publications in my area of expertise, many formal lectures COP, COM, allied health, and hospital, precepting 20-24 COP prof. students yearly on rotation!, mentoring and precepting residents, participating in some clinical research, coordinating a clinical service and providing patient care EVERY DAY - what else can I do for promotion. write more - hello, exactly how many more. I give up at the promotion thing, its really a courtesy thing if you are in the non-tenure track and I am STUCK as the document stated. I think I am now only 9% COP, pretty sad since I started @ 20-25% and was consistently diluted to add other clinical faculty.

	<p>After reviewing the document I agree with the points that you make. These are just a couple of my thoughts. Please feel free to use my direct comments or wordsmith them to make them sound better.</p> <p>Regarding the Adjunct vs. Clinical title. I have always felt the title adjunct was not much different than voluntary. I think that at UK we practice at a different level than the voluntary faculty that we have out in the state. Also along those lines, with the positions that we hold, becoming faculty is the expectation not the rule. I actually do have an appointment at Sullivan and it is clinical assistant professor. I think that it is a shame that I can be considered “clinical” at that program but “adjunct” at our own. At this point in my career I would not want to be in a tenurable series or at least in the way the regulations are currently (or proposed for that matter). Even once those would be defined, I still don’t know that I would pursue that option. But clearly there are those in our group who would definitely fit in this model.</p> <p>Another area that I would also like to see addressed is the promotion within our adjunct series. Currently it seems that we can only advance to an associate level. I think that we should truly be able to advance to a full adjunct professor. (Of course I would love for the name to be changed to clinical.) I know that Bob encouraged Barb to go for the full professor promotion. But that was struck down in its early stages, before even going anywhere. Once we get to associate, do we really have any place left to go?</p>
[FA faculty member]	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Current regulations, under which a faculty member’s tenure review ends without provost level review if the dean denies tenure, should be changed. Every tenure track faculty member should be entitled to one full and comprehensive review at all levels for consideration for appointment with tenure. Current policy stops a tenure case at the college level, save for appeal on the grounds of an alleged procedural irregularity, when a dean renders a negative decision. Why should a negative decision by the dean receive more deference than a positive decision? We should change this such that all tenure cases, irrespective of the judgments at the college level, would be sent forward to the Provost’s Office for further consideration and final action. Considerable deference would be shown by the Provost to the judgments emanating from the college, especially in cases where those college-level judgments (departmental faculty, chair, college advisory committee and dean) are near unanimous, either for or against the granting of tenure. A comprehensive tenure review would not abridge a faculty person’s right to appeal a tenure decision on procedural grounds as codified in the Governing and Administrative Regulations. 2. Reconsideration of a negative decision on tenure should be permitted only as the remedy in a successful appeal (i.e., recommended by the Senate Advisory Committee on Privilege and Tenure and approved by the President as the remedy after a successful appeal on procedural grounds) of the initial tenure review process. In instances where no procedural errors exist, reconsideration might only occur at the discretion of the Provost, upon recommendation by the dean. The Governing and Administrative Regulations are agnostic on the matter of reconsideration of a negative tenure decision in the terminal year of reappointment, and we should codify the university’s position. I suggest that each college adopt, with the approval of the Provost, criteria under which a terminal year reconsideration might be appropriate.

Re: #1 & 3. All final tenure and promotion recommendations should be made at the college level by a committee of peers chosen by the Dean and validated in some way by the executive committee or council that helps guide governance in the college. This recommendation, positive or negative, is then sent directly to the Provost for a final review and decision. An appeal to a negative ruling at the college level and sustained by the Provost is made to an appeals committee appointed by the Provost. Consequently, this effectively eliminates the need for "area committees" and the appeals committee is formed in a timely discipline specific manner only when an appeal is presented to the Dean who refers it to the Provost for further action.

3. The Governing and Administrative Regulations establishes the criterion for the granting of tenure as excellence in all areas of activity. Departments should be required to establish written statements on disciplinary-based evidences that constitute excellence in areas of activity assigned to department faculty, in consultation with the dean, and then submitted for approval by the provost. In other words, these statements of what constitutes disciplinary-based evidences should be agreed upon at all levels of review at the time of hiring of the faculty member. Where the scholarly activity of a newly hired faculty person is deemed to be highly interdisciplinary, the chair, in consultation with the unit faculty, should prepare a statement on procedures for soliciting the opinions of scholars external to the department and beyond the disciplinary boundaries typically applied by the department. This process should be articulated in the candidate's appointment letter, with approval at the Provost's level.

4. Current regulations require review of dossier and recommendation on tenure for all cases by the Dean of the Graduate School. I suggest we eliminate this requirement. The provost will be free to seek the advice of the Dean of the Graduate School as deemed necessary and appropriate.

Re: #4 An appropriate revision.

5. Tenure and promotion cases where all lower level reviewers (external, department faculty, college committee, dean) agree on a positive outcome should go directly to the provost for final review, circumventing area committees. The overwhelming majority of tenure and promotion are sent forward unchallenged by all levels of review within a college. Area Committees should review all cases with a negative recommendation, and those positive cases where there is disagreement among the summary judgments of lower-level reviewers.

Re: #5. See above.

6. UK is the only institution among our benchmarks that continues the practice of requiring individual unit faculty to submit letters of evaluation in tenure and promotion cases. Unit faculty opinion is an irreducible element of any promotion or tenure review. The faculty must engage in a formal deliberative process that results in an unambiguous statement of their opinions and be unconditionally reassured that those opinions, duly recorded, shall guide the judgments of all line evaluators in the review process. Too often, however, individual letters do not convey unambiguous statements for or against the granting of tenure or promotion; present cryptic or biased assessments of strengths and weaknesses; and not infrequently contain language (or prejudicial information) that borders on (or falls into) the category of actionable statement. Those letters neither offer assistance to line evaluators nor solace to a candidate who expects from his or her colleagues consummate and proper deliberative conduct. There is "wisdom in the crowd," and a collective process of unit faculty deliberation has been enshrined among our benchmarks as the fairest means to ascertain the will of a unit faculty. Our peer and benchmark institutions have moved successfully to a collective review by the unit faculty, one that foregoes the writing of

individual faculty letters and instead is characterized by the following procedural steps and practices:

- The appropriate unit faculty persons are required to engage in substantive discussion of each tenure and promotion case at a meeting (or series of meetings). Typically, a faculty person closest to the scholarly area of the candidate, but not the department chair, facilitates the discussion.
- After each case has been discussed to the satisfaction of the appropriate unit faculty, a detailed assessment is prepared of the candidate's accomplishments in teaching, scholarship, and service, regarding both strengths and weaknesses. The summary in draft form is circulated among the faculty who participated in the discussion for their review and approval.
- A formal numeric vote of the appropriate faculty is taken and reported (in the aggregate) in the assessment document (see bullet above).
- The unit faculty assessment should be included in the review dossier. The chair makes an independent recommendation, with justification, in a letter which will be a part of the dossier. The chair must report to the appropriate unit faculty her/his judgment in each case under consideration and should be required to provide an explanation at formal meeting of the appropriate faculty if her/his recommendation is counter to the majority vote. There is "wisdom in the crowd," and a collective process of unit faculty deliberation has been enshrined among our benchmarks as the fairest means to ascertain the will of a unit faculty.

Re: #6. A ballot that approves or disapproves of the promotion/tenure as well as letters from each tenured faculty member in the department/school in which the candidate's responsibilities reside that justifies the ballot decision should be required. As long as the final recommendation to the Provost is made at the college level by peers whose work is relative to that of the candidate, letters can be read more subjectively with a fairness and understanding that is considerably more difficult than in the current area committee process. Letters regarding a candidates qualifications for promotion/tenure from faculty provide a college level promotion and tenure committee with a greater perspective than an up or down faculty vote and strengthens the committee's ability to judge fairly but can still be objective relative to the "facts" as presented in the candidates promotion portfolio, including outside letters.

7. The Governing and Administrative Regulations currently require a chair to obtain at least three (3) outside letters for each tenure or promotion case. I am proposing that we increase that minimum number and the preponderance of outside letters that come from reviewers selected by the chair, in consultation with the faculty but independent of the candidate for promotion or tenure. My revised language reads as follows:

A promotion or tenure dossier shall include a minimum of six (6) letters of evaluation from qualified persons outside the University. At least four (4) of the outside letters shall come from reviewers selected by the chair independent of the candidate for promotion or tenure. Three outside letters offer no margin in those instances where one of the three letters is judged to be unhelpful, or misleading, for whatever reason; limit to a maximum of two reviewers the opinions of letter writers selected by the chair independent of the candidate for promotion or tenure; and by their numbers cannot ensure that the complexities and nuances of a case have been identified and thoughtfully discussed. Some might argue that even six is too few.

Re: #7. In the School of Music, six outside letters have been the practice since 1989, including three of each type. I agree that the ratio could be 4-2, but only as long as there is a proven method of choosing evaluators not recommended by the candidate whose expertise matches closely the field and specialty of the candidate. In many cases, given the wide variety of areas of specialty in some field (including music), it is difficult for the department chair/school director to identify appropriate evaluators who are willing to write.

8. Meaningful mentoring of untenured faculty is one of the most important investments a department can make. Mentoring done well

	<p>helps ensure that the considerable funds we invest in new faculty will result in the launch of a successful career, punctuated by a celebratory tenure review. Thoughtful, constructive feedback should be given annually to all untenured faculty members. Moreover, UK's Administrative Regulations stipulate that untenured faculty persons undergo formal progress reviews in their second and fourth years of their probationary period. However, a second-year progress review comes too early in the probationary period to provide meaningful feedback. Instead, UK should replace the second-year progress review with a substantive third-year review. This review would constitute a major assessment of the faculty member's record of achievement. It will provide for a mid-cycle evaluation that gives chairs a greater period of faculty performance on which to judge achievement and untenured faculty enough time before the sixth-year review to address areas of deficiency.</p> <p>The third year is also an appropriate time for a departmental faculty and chair, faced with the record of a seriously underperforming faculty person, to convey an unambiguous statement about their expectations for progress over the subsequent year. In this context, the fourth-year progress review can then be used to identify and acknowledge progress in addressing areas of deficiency or, in the absence of significant progress, solidify opinions on a decision to extend a terminal reappointment for a final year.</p> <p>I feel strongly that waiting until the 3rd year to undertake a formal progress review of new untenured faculty is too late. At the onset of my tenure as school director, we began a process of evaluation and discussion every year of all untenured faculty members with a written report to the faculty member in question of the general tenor of the faculty discussion and recommendations for strengthening the candidate's credentials as appropriate. Each new faculty member was assigned a mentor to see them through the first two years (or more) of their appointment. This relates closely to an annual faculty review. To do less is not a responsible position for the careful mentoring of new faculty, particularly faculty in their first collegiate position.</p>
<p>[B&E faculty member]</p>	<p>I have spoken with a number of my colleagues here in the business school (primarily in economics). In general there is a great deal of support for these changes as outlined in the Provosts documents. Indeed, many of my colleagues expressed that these changes were long overdue and we are happy that they are finally being considered. A few specific comments are offered below (the numbers correspond to the numbers in the document "Top 20 Faculty Policies: Suggested Changes to Procedural Issues (a discussion paper)").</p> <p>(1) There is strong support that each faculty member should have the right to a complete review.</p> <p>(2) The current policy of reconsideration does appear to be quite vague. In general we support the ideas in the proposal, although the specific details will be important. I personally might suggest that rather than having different policies for reconsideration across different colleges, the provosts office might propose a general policy for reconsideration.</p> <p>(3) Providing new faculty members (and senior faculty members as well) with guidelines for promotion qualifications is an important and positive step. Concern arises, though, that very specific guidelines might be difficult to achieve, and may be overly restrictive. Clearly this is a case where "the devil is in the details." In general, though, there is support for this idea. It might be helpful for the provost to provide some guidelines as to the form this might take. It would also be helpful if the provost would caution against a rigid set of guidelines and encourage the use of professional judgment and the insights of external letter writers. We have concern that these types of guidelines may become simple "numbers" exercises and fail to account for the richness of some research programs.</p> <p>(4) We agree completely.</p>

(5) We understand that in many cases a full review by the area committee is unwarranted. The area committee does serve an important role, however, in that they ensure that the colleges are following appropriate procedures with all cases. Especially in conjunction with (1) above, we believe that the area committees can do a better job of ensuring appropriate procedures are followed if they have some review role in all cases. We might suggest that cases which have universal support at the department and college level may follow an expedited review process which allows the area committee to view the file although does not require a complete review.

(6) This element has perhaps the strongest support among my colleagues. The procedure outlined by the provost is much more aligned with national professional practices in our discipline and others of which we are aware. This is the more sensible approach and we strongly recommend that this be adopted.

(7) Our department has typically obtained as many as six outside letters for candidates. We agree that three letters is far too few in many cases, but might caution against requiring too many (ten would clearly be too many). We would suggest that the regulation require five as a minimum. We might also suggest that the guidelines promote these as an integral part of the dossier.

(8) There are mixed views on when formal review of non-tenured faculty takes place. Clearly the general profession has adopted a standard “third year” review. There are many good reasons for this, and a large number of faculty have expressed support for adopting this approach. Other faculty argue that the second and fourth year review process may provide certain benefits. The second year review occurs early enough that senior faculty can provide path altering advice to the candidate, which may increase the probability of ultimate success. The fourth year review occurs at a time where a serious indication of the likely outcome can be conveyed. This provides candidates who are on track some security, which allows them to continue to focus on their research agenda, while providing candidates who are unlikely to be tenured opportunities to begin a sound exit strategy. It is not clear which approach is ideal. It is my sense that this is not a highly contentious issue and that few would strongly object to either approach.

Additional comments (generally regarding the document “Aligning Faculty Classification and Tenure Policies with Top 20 Goals).

Faculty Title Series: The economics department has two tenured Special Teaching Series faculty. We are quite pleased with how these faculty members have contributed to the goals of our unit. Indeed, they are valuable colleagues whose specialization in pedagogy has added important dimensions to our program. They have supervised our graduate teaching assistants and provided important development to these students. Indeed, many of our students’ placements are in Liberal Arts Colleges, where the teaching development is quite important.

Our experience has demonstrated that an important aspect of this type of position is to have clearly stated responsibilities and tenure requirements (this is not really different than issues discussed in 1 above). It is clear, however, that if we are to keep STS appointments significant reform and unification of expectation must occur.

We agree that lecturer and other non-tenure positions should be placed into three and five year contracts.

Promotion to Full: Point 7 in “Aligning Faculty Classification...” considers promotion to Full Professor. We agree that there may be some problems with our current criteria and that this may lead to otherwise productive faculty who become discouraged and disengage. We support the idea that faculty who are steadily active and productive should ultimately be promoted to full professor. Some of the

	<p>language in that section may be viewed as an entitlement to promotion after twelve years. While we do not think this was the intent, it would be important to be very clear in this section.</p> <p>Overall we again are thrilled that this reform is taking place. The vast majority of faculty are quite supportive of these policies. The comments above are not meant, in any way, to stall or slow this process down. Indeed, many faculty would rather see these procedures adopted at this point, and then work on fixing problems with those procedures than to continue with the clearly poor system we currently have in place.</p>
[A&S faculty member]	Kaveh, I didn't spot anything that would require immediate attention. I am looking forward to the discussion this afternoon...
Steve Wyatt, CoPbH dean	I checked with the chair of the CPH Faculty Council and at this point they have no formal comments. They have an upcoming meeting where it is possible they could generate some comments. They realize it will be past the deadline you established.
B&E, Management	<p><u>Top 20 Faculty Policies - Feedback from Faculty in the School of Management, Gatton College of Business & Economics</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. I think the current policy of stopping negative decisions at the Dean's level is fine. Most universities stop the process at the department level, or the college level if the decision is negative. I'm in favor of decentralizing these decisions, not centralizing them. No need for the university committee and provost to get involved in negative decisions unless there is a procedural irregularity (which is now allowed). I would vote no on this. 2. OK but probably not necessary. 3. Sounds like more bureaucratic procedures for what we do already. OK 4. Yes, eliminate the Dean of the graduate school. 5. Yes, this sounds like it would speed up the process - go directly to provost. 6. Yes, this is the best idea in the report - no reason to write all those individual letters. Units should meet and write a consensus letter to be forwarded to the college committee and the Dean. 7. We usually get more than 3 external letters, but I don't like changing the minimum to six - that's too many in case we run into problems getting people to get them in on time. Let's keep it three, or increase it to four. My own opinion is that these letters are not that helpful anyway - almost no one writes a negative letter given the confidentiality laws. Requiring six is just making unnecessary work for us. 8. As I read this, we're replacing the two-year review with a three-year review, but continuing to do a four-year review. Yes, I'm in favor of that. However, I do not want to do away with the four-year review

	<p>-----</p> <p>. Regarding point #2 on p4, there is a suggestion that DOE for research should “normally” be 40-60%. It is unclear what “normally” means. The specified percentages appear to discourage/constrain heavy-duty work with doctoral students and discourage heavy-duty work in external service, unless there are reductions in classroom teaching loads for faculty members who do these things. For instance, if a professor is required to do 4 sections per year, this is considered to consume 40% effort to do a good job. In my experience, competently chairing a doctoral dissertation at the proposal development and execution stages consumes at least as much as teaching a section of a course (usually considerably more). So, chairing a couple of these at a time takes at least another 20% of the DOE. Then, there is some variable requirement for internal service – as a glue that holds things together. On top of this, there can be a major external service effort – such as bringing stature to the university via time-consuming editorial or professional organization service – that can easily add another 20% or more. Thus, having a research DOE of 40-60% is just plain infeasible for faculty members who attempt to help the top-20 push via some prominent editorial work and diligent dissertation guidance. The only way to make it feasible is a) refusal to mentor doctoral students and/or achieve major editorial stature, or b) reduce the 40% classroom teaching requirement. There is a related issue about DOE percents: % of <u>what</u> seems never to be defined and is probably not applied uniformly???? For instance, 30% of 80 hours is more than 50% of 40 hours. So when the provost speaks of 40-60% research, do we really know what that means and do we realize that other (perhaps more important?) avenues toward top-20 become impossible if we adhere to this range.</p> <p>-----</p> <p>The idea that all files should be seen by the Provost, i.e. every faculty file should get one full review is a good idea. Hence, even those files that obtained a negative decision at the college level should be reviewed at the Provost level.</p> <p>The idea of having departments develop disciplinary based evidence of excellence for each activity is important. It is also important that these criteria for promotion and tenure be closely tied to the colleges’ merit evaluation system.</p>
Social Work	<p>Hi, Kaveh--I asked for comments from the College of Social Work faculty. Most of them indicated that they find both papers to contain many ideas worth pursuing and generally had a favorable response to the proposed changes. A couple of the faculty members said that they found that the item referring to appealing a negative review outcome seems confusing as written and that it was not clear where the appeal process began or what the process would entail. That's all I have for now.</p>
[A&S faculty member]	<p>I did not realize that individual comments were being sought. The letter below says that the opinions of Faculty Councils are being sought, not those of individuals.</p> <p>However, since you asked, I think most of these changes are wonderful. Many, many problems in our department could have been avoided if the proposed procedures (such as ending the absolute veto power of a dean over a tenure package) had already been in place. And any changes that streamline the bureaucracy at this place (such as not reviewing unanimous tenure cases at the Area Committee level) are, in my opinion, very worthwhile.</p> <p>Even those changes that I would not describe as “wonderful”, such as consolidating all the tenure-track titles into a single one, I have no objection to them in principle.</p>
Steven Hoch A&S dean	<p>Over the course of three meetings (January 28, February 4, and February 25), the College of Arts and Sciences Executive Committee reviewed the Provost’s paper, Top 20 Faculty Policies: A Discussion Paper. The following letter offers the committee’s feedback on</p>

	<p>points raised.</p> <p>(1) The committee concurs with the White Paper that all tenure cases should be sent forward to the Provost's Office, regardless of college-level judgments.</p> <p>(2) With regards to the issue of reconsidering negative decisions on tenure, the committee believes that if the Senate Advisory Committee on Privilege and Tenure renders no procedural error, then the case should be terminated. The committee agrees that the college should adopt criteria and procedures under which a terminal-year reconsideration is appropriate. The committee believes that such reconsiderations should only be for extraordinary cases.</p> <p>(3) The committee concurs with the recommendation that all academic departments should establish written criteria for tenure and promotion. All A&S departments already have done so. With regard to hiring highly interdisciplinary faculty, the committee feels that it has insufficient information to offer comment. The committee feels that determining written tenure and promotion criteria for highly interdisciplinary faculty is important, but also problematic. The way in which the issue is raised in the White Paper further muddles the issue. For example, what happens if a faculty member in his or her third year begins to develop an interdisciplinary research agenda? The committee asks for a more concrete proposal before rendering an opinion.</p> <p>(4) The committee concurs with the recommendation that the Dean of the Graduate School should not be required to review tenure and promotion cases.</p> <p>(5) Although the committee found merit in the Provost's proposal to curb the work required by his Area Committees, the committee did not come to a consensus on whether the Area Committees should only review cases when there is a disagreement among lower-level reviewers. As a part of the discussion the committee questioned the need for reviews by both the Provost's Area Committee and the College's Advisory Committee. The committee was concerned about duplicative work on the part of A&S faculty. The committee however finds value in having some inter-collegiate committee review tenure and promotion cases.</p> <p>(6) The committee had reservations about foregoing individual, internal faculty letters. Concerns include: more emphasis would be placed on the external letters; the chair's letter would carry too much weight; faculty would be more inclined to abdicate their responsibilities as they would not be required to write an individual letter; faculty would be inclined to agree with the majority opinion even if they have concerns about the case given the discussion would be public.</p> <p>(7) The committee concurs with the recommendation to require a minimum of six external letters, four of which should come from reviewers selected independent of the candidate.</p> <p>(8) The committee agrees with the recommendation to replace the second-year review by a formal third-year review. The committee also believes that FMER ratings should not be mandatory for probationary faculty in their first year as there usually has not been sufficient time to give thoughtful ratings. The committee feels that it would be better to have the option of rating or not rating faculty in their first year.</p>
Nursing	<p>In response to the Provost's 'Aligning Faculty Classification and Tenure Policies with Top 20 Goals: A Framework for Discussion' document, Dean Kirschling, the College of Nursing's Promotion, Appointment and Tenure Advisory Committee and the Faculty Council reviewed and commented on the document. Subsequent to that, two faculty forums were held on February 13 and 15, 2008.</p>

Responses from faculty for the Provost's plan to streamline into one tenure-track title series are summarized below:

1. Overall, the College of Nursing did not see an issue with having a single tenure track as long as Colleges could approach tenure-track positions with flexibility as defined in specific job descriptions. Moving to a single tenure track would require: (a) that the College of Nursing be diligent about aligning the job description with DOEs and faculty evaluation and (b) that the area committee be fully informed about College of Nursing criteria (i.e., they could not hold faculty accountable to the current regular title series criteria unless this was explicit in the job description). As the conversations move forward it might be helpful to think of the new title series as more aligned with special title series (job descriptions) vs. regular title series. Will require a new way of viewing all faculty in tenure track positions.
2. The College of Nursing recommends that the Area Committee continue to review all cases, even when there is 100% agreement within the academic unit. The Area Committee serves as a "benchmark" as well as safe guard for individual faculty.
3. Moving to a single tenure-track will require the University and/or College of Nursing have a clear picture of what engagement means within the framework of research/creative activity (current terminology). It was noted that other research institutions have struggled with implementing Boyer's model of scholarship.
4. The College of Nursing needs to value collaborative arrangements and contributions made within the University but outside the College of Nursing. There needs to be recognition of how these currently fit with our criteria for promotion, tenure, high merit, etc.
5. Discussed whether the College of Nursing should reevaluate the membership and role of PATA in promotion and tenure decisions, as well as high merit. In general there was support to address this issue in 2008-2009.