

# **PERSONNEL POLICY AND PROCEDURES**

**J.B. Speed School of Engineering**

## Table of Contents

<b>ARTICLE 1</b>	<b>FACULTY APPOINTMENTS .....</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>Section 1.1</b>	<b>Types of Appointments.....</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>Section 1.2</b>	<b>Non-Tenurable Appointments .....</b>	<b>1</b>
Part 1.2.1	Full-Time Appointments .....	1
Part 1.2.2	Part-Time Appointments .....	2
<b>Section 1.3</b>	<b>Probationary (Tenure-track) Appointments.....</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>Section 1.4</b>	<b>Tenure Appointments.....</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>Section 1.5</b>	<b>Graduate Faculty Membership .....</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>ARTICLE 2</b>	<b>FACULTY PERSONNEL REVIEWS.....</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>Section 2.1</b>	<b>General Criteria .....</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>Section 2.2</b>	<b>Departmental Criteria.....</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>Section 2.3</b>	<b>Responsibilities and Authority .....</b>	<b>4</b>
Part 2.3.1	Departmental Faculty Affairs Committee (DFAC).....	4
Part 2.3.2	JB Speed School Faculty Affairs Committee (FAC).....	5
<b>Section 2.4</b>	<b>Annual Reviews .....</b>	<b>6</b>
Part 2.4.1	Overview .....	6
Part 2.4.2	Schedule .....	6
Part 2.4.3	Process .....	6
Part 2.4.4	Appeal Procedure .....	7
<b>Section 2.5</b>	<b>Periodic Career Review .....</b>	<b>8</b>
Part 2.5.1	Overview .....	8
Part 2.5.2	Schedule .....	8
Part 2.5.3	Process .....	8
Part 2.5.4	Consequences.....	10
Part 2.5.5	Appeal Procedure .....	10
<b>Section 2.6</b>	<b>Pre-tenure reviews .....</b>	<b>10</b>
Part 2.6.1	Overview .....	10
Part 2.6.2	Schedule .....	10
Part 2.6.3	Process .....	10
Part 2.6.4	Consequences.....	11
Part 2.6.5	Appeal Procedure .....	11

<b>Section 2.7</b>	<b>Promotion and Tenure.....</b>	<b>11</b>
Part 2.7.1	Overview .....	11
Part 2.7.2	Schedule for Tenure .....	12
Part 2.7.3	Schedule for Promotion in Rank.....	12
Part 2.7.4	Criteria for Tenure .....	12
Part 2.7.5	Criteria for Promotion in Rank .....	13
Part 2.7.6	Materials for Promotion and Tenure.....	13
Part 2.7.7	Process for Promotion and Tenure .....	14
Part 2.7.8	Appeal Procedure .....	15
<b>ARTICLE 3</b>	<b>CONDITIONS OF FACULTY EMPLOYMENT .....</b>	<b>16</b>
<b>Section 3.1</b>	<b>Annual Work Plan .....</b>	<b>16</b>
<b>Section 3.2</b>	<b>Code of Conduct .....</b>	<b>17</b>
Part 3.2.1	General Criteria .....	17
Part 3.2.2	Process .....	17
Part 3.2.3	Consequences.....	18
Part 3.2.4	Appeal Procedure .....	19
<b>Section 3.3</b>	<b>Compensation .....</b>	<b>19</b>
<b>ARTICLE 4</b>	<b>AMENDMENTS.....</b>	<b>20</b>
<b>APPENDIX 1</b>	<b>SCOPE AND DEFINITIONS .....</b>	<b>21</b>
<b>Section App-1.1</b>	<b>Purpose .....</b>	<b>21</b>
<b>Section App-1.2</b>	<b>Scope.....</b>	<b>21</b>
<b>Section App-1.3</b>	<b>Definitions.....</b>	<b>21</b>
Part App-1.3.1	Teaching.....	21
Part App-1.3.2	Research and Creative Activity .....	21
Part App-1.3.3	Service.....	22
Part App-1.3.4	Tenure.....	22
Part App-1.3.5	Proficiency .....	22
<b>APPENDIX 2</b>	<b>PROMOTION AND TENURE REVIEW SCHEDULES.....</b>	<b>23</b>
<b>Section App-2.1</b>	<b>Purpose .....</b>	<b>23</b>
<b>Section App-2.2</b>	<b>Standard Schedule for Promotion and Tenure Reviews .....</b>	<b>24</b>
<b>Section App-2.3</b>	<b>Alternate Schedule for Tenure Reviews (with Promotion).....</b>	<b>25</b>

APPENDIX 3	PERIODIC CAREER REVIEW SCHEDULE.....	26
APPENDIX 4	ANNUAL WORK PLAN AND REVIEW SCHEDULE .....	27
APPENDIX 5	GUIDELINES FOR REVIEW AND EVALUATION LETTERS.....	28
Section App-5.1	Purpose .....	28
Section App-5.2	Extramural Review Letters.....	28
Section App-5.3	DFAC Evaluation Letter .....	29
Section App-5.4	Department Chair (DC) Evaluation Letter .....	29
Section App-5.5	FAC Evaluation Letter .....	30
APPENDIX 6	GUIDELINES FOR PROMOTION AND TENURE MATERIALS .....	31
Section App-6.1	Purpose .....	31
Section App-6.2	Evidence for Proficiency in Teaching.....	31
Section App-6.3	Evidence for Proficiency in Research and Creative Activity.....	32
Section App-6.4	Evidence for Proficiency in Service .....	32
APPENDIX 7	GUIDELINES FOR CODE OF CONDUCT .....	34
Section App-7.1	Purpose .....	34
Section App-7.2	Responsibilities to Teaching and Students.....	34
Section App-7.3	Responsibilities to Research, Scholarship, and/or Creative Activities .....	34
Section App-7.4	Responsibilities to the University .....	34
Section App-7.5	Responsibilities to the Colleagues .....	35
Section App-7.6	Responsibilities to the Community .....	35
Section App-7.7	Scope and Jurisdiction .....	35
Section App-7.8	Inappropriate Conduct .....	36

# Article 1 Faculty Appointments

## Section 1.1 Types of Appointments

Faculty appointments are "Full-time", "Part-time", "Emeritus", or "Other Appointments", as described in The Redbook, Article 4.1.

## Section 1.2 Non-Tenurable Appointments

### Part 1.2.1 Full-Time Appointments

Non-tenurable, full-time appointments with the university may be for lengths of time in accordance with The Redbook policies. Generally, temporary appointments are for short-term appointments commonly associated with visiting professors.

#### 1. Temporary Appointments

Temporary appointments to the various academic ranks (Instructor, Assistant Professor, Associate Professor, Professor) may be made for specifically limited time periods less than one year or for special purposes. In no case shall a temporary appointment or a renewal thereof result in the acquisition of tenure. (See The Redbook 4.1.1.A.1)

#### 2. Term Appointments: Teaching-Track, Research-Track, and Instructor

- a. Teaching-track and Research-track appointments at the various ranks (Assistant Professor, Associate Professor, Professor) and Instructors are subject to policies for Term Appointments in The Redbook 4.1.1.A.2. The Track designation should be specified in the contract based on the primary responsibility of the faculty member (teaching or research). The greatest workload percentages for Teaching-track and Research-track appointments will be in teaching or research, respectively.
- b. Teaching-track and Research-track faculty shall meet the same criteria for appointment at a designated rank as specified in Section 1.3 (for Probationary appointments), although specific variation in assignments may be designated in the contract and specified in the Annual Work Plan. In normal circumstances, persons appointed as Instructor shall hold a Masters or PhD in their field of specialization, or shall present evidence of having completed a body of research, scholarship or other creative activity equivalent in scope and quality to the similar component of such degree.
- c. Teaching-Track, Research-Track, and Instructor appointments are subject to annual review as described in Section 2.4.
- d. Teaching-track and Research-track faculty may apply for promotion in rank according to the criteria of the J.B. Speed School of Engineering defined in Section 2.7. Promotion in rank may be considered after the faculty member has served five consecutive years in rank. Procedures for the promotion of teaching and research track faculty shall be the same as for probationary or tenured faculty. Criteria shall include proficiency in teaching, research and creative activity, and service, but only the areas included in the

contract or in the Annual Work Plan. Proficiency in teaching or proficiency in research will not be required if it is not specified in the contract or Annual Work Plan.

- e. Teaching-track, Research-track, and Instructor faculty appointments may be renewed by recommendation by the Dean to the President or President's designee, upon initiation of the department chair and recommendation by the department faculty or faculty committee, subject to satisfactory annual and career reviews.
- f. Contract duration for initial appointments for Instructors, Teaching-track and Research-track faculty may be for 1 - 3 years. Follow-on appointments may be 1 to 3 years for Instructors, Assistant and Associate Professors and 3 years minimum for Full Professors. For faculty at the rank of Associate Professor and Professor, rolling contracts will be available after five years of service at the University of Louisville. Rolling contracts are renewable every year for a duration up to 3 years for Associate Professor and up to the maximum duration allowed by The Redbook for Full Professor. Appointment and duration of such contracts are at the discretion of the Chair and must be approved by the Dean. Renewal of multi-year contracts should generally be considered one full year prior to the end date of the contract.

#### Part 1.2.2 Part-Time Appointments

Part-time faculty shall be appointed by contract to teach specified courses or to engage in specified instruction, research or service less than full time for a designated period. No such appointment, continuation, or renewal thereof shall result in acquisition of tenure or implied renewal for subsequent periods as specified in The Redbook, Section 4.1.2. Requirements for appointment at the various ranks for part-time faculty shall be the same as those for full-time faculty. The Dean or Dean's designee may appoint or reappoint part-time faculty for each academic term at the convenience of the University on standard contract terms approved by the Executive Vice President and University Provost.

### **Section 1.3 Probationary (Tenure-track) Appointments**

Probationary appointments shall be appointments of full-time faculty members without tenure other than those described in Section 1.2, provided that such appointment shall not extend beyond the period when tenure is normally granted. Probationary appointments are subject to policies defined in The Redbook Section 4.1.1.B.

#### 1. Assistant Professor

Probationary appointments to the rank of Assistant Professor shall be for stipulated terms up to two years on the initial appointment, and up to three years for appointments made thereafter, provided that they do not extend beyond the period when tenure would normally be granted (The Redbook 4.1.1.B.1). In normal circumstances, persons appointed as Assistant Professors shall hold the recognized terminal degree in their field of specialization, or shall present evidence of having completed a body of research, scholarship or other creative activity equivalent in scope and quality to the similar component of such degree. They shall, in any event, give promise of proficiency in all areas of activity listed in Article 2.

2. Associate Professor

Probationary appointments to the rank of Associate Professor shall be for stipulated terms up to two years on the initial appointment, and up to three years for appointments made thereafter. In normal circumstances, persons appointed as Associate Professors shall hold the recognized terminal degree in their field of specialization, or shall present evidence of having completed a body of research or other creative activity equivalent in scope and quality to the similar component of such degree. Additional criteria for appointment (or promotion) to Associate Professor can be found in Section 2.7.

3. Professor

Probationary appointments initially at the rank of Professor shall be for stipulated terms up to two years. Professors shall be awarded tenure if employed subsequent to an initial probationary appointment. In normal circumstances, persons appointed or promoted to the rank of Professor shall hold the recognized terminal degree in their field of specialization, or shall present evidence of having demonstrated a level of research and/or service equivalent in scope and quality to the similar component of such degree. Additional criteria for appointment (or promotion) to Professor can be found in Section 2.7.

#### **Section 1.4 Tenure Appointments**

Personnel who have acquired tenure are subject to the regulations in The Redbook (Section 4.1.1.C) and in this document (Section 2.7) and the provisions governing termination of faculty members (The Redbook Section 4.5.3).

#### **Section 1.5 Graduate Faculty Membership**

The Graduate Faculty of the J.B. Speed School of Engineering will be responsible for the teaching, training, and mentoring of graduate students and postdoctoral students within the Speed School. Further description of the responsibilities, qualifications, *ad hoc* appointments and review of Graduate faculty are defined in the [Minimum Guidelines for Graduate Education in the J.B. Speed School of Engineering](#) that are part of the Guidelines for Graduate study at the University of Louisville.

Graduate Faculty Membership will be granted to any tenured or probationary (tenure-track) faculty in the J.B. Speed School of Engineering at initial appointment. Teaching-track and Research-track faculty are eligible for *ad hoc* Graduate Faculty Membership.

## **Article 2 Faculty Personnel Reviews**

### **Section 2.1 General Criteria**

The Redbook requires unit documents to classify faculty activities into the areas of teaching, research or creative activity, and service to the profession, the unit, the University or the community. Performance in each of these 3 areas (teaching, research, and service) is the basis for annual reviews, tenure and promotion reviews, and periodic career reviews.

Guidelines regarding J.B. Speed School of Engineering criteria for promotion and tenure reviews are provided in Appendices 5 and 6. Departmental criteria for performance reviews are developed by individual departments as described in Section 2.2.

### **Section 2.2 Departmental Criteria**

Each department will develop a statement of expectations that describes proficient faculty performance. This statement will serve as the department's criteria for promotion, tenure and periodic career reviews, consistent with The Redbook 4.2.2.H.2. Statements should be reviewed annually by department faculty and maintained by the department chair. At least once a year, the department chair shall provide a copy of its approved statement of expectations to each faculty member (commonly during the annual review).

Revisions to a department's statement of expectations must be approved by a majority of its eligible voting faculty. Statements will also be reviewed and approved by the Dean to ensure consistency with the mission of the Speed School.

### **Section 2.3 Responsibilities and Authority**

One of the objectives of shared-governance is to review, recommend, and mitigate issues at levels closely associated with the individual faculty. As such, the Departmental Faculty Affairs Committee (DFAC) and the Faculty Affairs Committee (FAC) have been created within these documents and by-laws. The DFAC is composed of faculty members from within a department and thus can provide counsel and guidance specific to a discipline. The FAC is composed of faculty members from various departments within the JB Speed School of Engineering. In this manner, the FAC can provide counsel and guidance relative to the school as a whole.

#### **Part 2.3.1 Departmental Faculty Affairs Committee (DFAC)**

The DFAC shall serve as the representative of departmental faculty body on all matters pertaining to promotion, tenure, and career reviews. When appropriate, the DFAC will advise the chair, Dean and the faculty and recommend courses of action. The DFAC will function in an advisory capacity and none of its recommendations for promotion, tenure, or career review will be considered binding on the Dean.

Departmental faculties may develop individual procedures for selection of DFAC and for processing promotion, tenure, and career review materials within their departments. If they do not, the general procedure in this section will be used.

In tenure review cases, the DFAC will consist of those voting faculty in the department who have tenure. In promotion review cases, the DFAC will consist of the voting faculty in the department of higher rank than the individual under consideration. In career reviews, the DFAC will consist of voting faculty in the department with the same and higher rank as the individual under consideration (excluding the individual under review). For dispute resolution regarding annual reviews and workplans, the DFAC will be composed of members of equal or higher rank than the faculty member under consideration (excluding the faculty member of concern).

When a faculty member holds a position on the DFAC and FAC, the conventions of shared governance are such that individual faculty members should vote on personnel decisions only once. A member of the FAC shall vote in the DFAC consideration of a candidate. In the FAC's vote tally, the FAC member's recorded vote shall be consistent with the DFAC recommendation.

#### Part 2.3.2 JB Speed School Faculty Affairs Committee (FAC)

The FAC shall serve as the representative faculty body on all matters pertaining to promotion, tenure, and, when necessary, career reviews. The charge, composition, and selection of the FAC are defined in the Speed School Bylaws. When appropriate, it will advise the Dean and the faculty and prepare courses of action. The FAC will function in an advisory capacity and none of its recommendations for promotion, tenure, or career review will be considered binding on the Dean. The committee members have the right to bring and discuss any matter relating to promotion, tenure, and career review before the FAC. The committee has the right to obtain information as complete as possible on any matter brought before it. The committee shall endeavor to obtain all relevant information required by The Redbook about a candidate for promotion, tenure, or career review.

The FAC shall base its recommendations on a comparison of the record of accomplishment in the evaluation file to the criteria which appear in The Redbook, this document, and their addenda. Members should not act as advocates for any person or constituency, but rather as judges of the meeting of criteria.

The FAC meetings shall be held strictly confidential and the committee's recommendations will be given only to the Dean, the individual affected by the recommendation, and the individual's department chair. The recommendation will also become a part of the promotion, tenure, and career review file.

The FAC shall act on any claim for promotion, tenure, or career review brought before it by a faculty member, DFAC or department chair. Self-initiation of the claim shall not work to the detriment of the candidate. However, the FAC will not act upon a request for promotion, tenure, or a career review evaluation without prior referral to the appropriate departmental faculty committee and department chair for recommendations. Such recommendations must be made in a timely manner (see Appendix 2).

As per the Speed School Bylaws, whenever a promotion, tenure, or career review evaluation must be made for a member of the FAC, that member shall recuse from the committee discussion of the case.

The relevant academic department will provide a substitute selected by vote of the eligible department faculty to provide representation only for this case.

When a faculty member holds a position on the DFAC and FAC, the conventions of shared governance are such that individual faculty members should vote on personnel decisions only once. A member of the FAC shall vote in the DFAC consideration of a candidate. In the FAC vote tally, the FAC member's recorded vote shall be concurrent with the DFAC recommendation. The FAC member may fully participate in the FAC discussions regarding the candidate.

Candidates for promotion and tenure may challenge the participation of no more than two members of the FAC committee. If a majority of the remaining FAC members agree that the challenged members are prejudiced against the candidate, the challenged members shall not participate in the recommendation. In this case, the relevant academic department will provide a substitute selected by vote of the eligible department faculty to provide representation only for this case.

## **Section 2.4 Annual Reviews**

### **Part 2.4.1 Overview**

All full-time faculty (tenured and non-tenured) will develop an annual work plan, annual faculty activity report, and be provided with an annual review by their supervisor. The purpose of the annual review is to provide feedback to the faculty regarding the prior year's work performance. The purpose of the annual work plan is to define specific activities that will mutually benefit the faculty member, department, and school.

Work plan and review are normally considered in tandem. The annual reviews shall become part of the record for tenure and promotion files as well as periodic career reviews.

### **Part 2.4.2 Schedule**

The specific dates associated with milestones throughout the development of the annual work plan and the annual review process are identified in Appendix 4.

### **Part 2.4.3 Process**

Faculty members will complete and submit their annual work plan and faculty activity report to the department chair according to the schedule in Appendix 4. The form of the work plan and activity report will be as directed by Dean of the J. B. Speed School of Engineering along with any additional guidance adopted by departments for these submissions.

After receiving the faculty activity reports, the department chair shall evaluate each faculty member's performance for the period. This evaluation will be based on the annual faculty activity report, merit, and contributions to the missions of the department, the J.B. Speed School of Engineering, the University, the profession and the community. The department chair will make every effort to ensure uniform, objective and professional standards in assessing the submitted documentation.

The chair will evaluate the faculty member's performance in a range of effort categories based on a 0 to 6 rating scale system that defines performance as "none (rating of 0)", "not proficient (rating of 1 or 2)", "proficient (rating of 3 or 4)", or "exceptional (rating of 5 or 6)". The overall annual performance score is calculated as the sum of the percentage weight in each effort category multiplied by the performance score within the associated effort category. The overall annual performance review will be rated based on the weighted score as "not proficient" (a rating of less than 2.5), "proficient" (a rating of 2.5 to less than 4.5) and "exceptional" (a rating of 4.5 or greater).

Performance ratings of "not proficient" or "exceptional" must be explained. Performance ratings of "proficient" require no justification. When the annual review identifies weaknesses and/or deficiencies, the department chair's summary should include specific recommendations for improvement or for possible adjustments in workload concentration.

Each faculty member will meet with the department chair to review the evaluation and proposed annual work plan. It is anticipated that the chair will discuss the evaluation process and work with the faculty member to define a mutually agreeable annual work plan. These meetings will be held by the date specified in Appendix 4.

Once the faculty reviews are complete, the chair will forward the following information for each faculty member to the Dean 1) the department chair's evaluation 2) the annual faculty work plan, 3) relevant letters or supporting materials. Each faculty member will also receive a copy of their own evaluation and annual work plan. This information may be transmitted electronically using the format adopted by the J. B. Speed School of Engineering for these submissions.

The performance of department chairs will be evaluated as described above, but with the following differences:

- The Dean will play the role of the department chair.
- Department chairs' workloads and evaluations for a given year will center on the accomplishments of their administrative unit's mission and goals for the year. An annual review of the department chair using faculty member metrics shall be used as part of the evaluation.
- Disagreements between the Dean and a department chair regarding the department chair's workload or evaluation will be resolved by the University Provost, if necessary.

#### Part 2.4.4 Appeal Procedure

In the event a faculty member disagrees with either the evaluation or the annual work plan, the faculty member may 1) provide a letter of rebuttal to the chair, and/or 2) involve the DFAC. If the faculty member chooses to provide a letter of rebuttal, the chair will provide a copy to the Dean. The letter will be maintained within the faculty member's personnel file and provided as a supplemental document for periodic career reviews.

A faculty member may also request the involvement of the DFAC in the evaluation process. At the faculty member's request, the department chair will forward all departmental faculty evaluations, activity reports, annual work plans, relevant letters, and other requested supplemental information to the DFAC. This committee will look for serious disparities in evaluations, workloads and examine any

letters of rebuttal. The DFAC will discuss its findings with the department chair within two weeks of receipt of the materials. If concerns remain after this discussion, the committee and department chair will write separate letters to the Dean, who shall assist in resolving the committee's concerns before receiving the evaluations. Whatever the committee's concerns and whatever their state of resolution when presented, the Dean has disposition authority for the matters under discussion. The committee will then notify the faculty member and the department chair of the final disposition.

## **Section 2.5 Periodic Career Review**

### **Part 2.5.1 Overview**

All tenured faculty shall undergo a periodic career review (PCR) to evaluate their contribution to the department, the J.B. Speed School of Engineering, the University, the profession and the community. Teaching-track and Research-track faculty shall also undergo PCR (The Redbook Minimum Guidelines Section V.D).

The J.B. Speed School of Engineering assumes that faculty will ordinarily discharge their professional responsibilities by proficient performance in all areas of scholarship as specified in General Criteria (Section 2.1) and in accordance with their annual work plans. Such holistic judgments should be made in the context of departmental mission. In those unusual cases where this assumption is shown to be mistaken, the review process provides a mechanism to support the faculty member by returning performance to or above the level of proficiency specified in the departmental guidelines as required by the J.B. Speed School of Engineering.

### **Part 2.5.2 Schedule**

All tenured faculty shall undergo a periodic career review in every fifth year of service, in accordance with The Redbook 4.2.4. Teaching-track and research track faculty should also undergo a PCR after every 5 years of continuous service.

When the review period ends in a sabbatical or other leave, the career review shall be deferred until the next academic year. A promotion shall replace a career review for the period in which the promotion occurs. The specific dates associated with milestones throughout the periodic review process are identified in Appendix 3.

### **Part 2.5.3 Process**

The PCR begins with an initial review of faculty performance. The objective of this review is to identify faculty who are or are not performing at a "satisfactory" level. If the initial review determines that faculty are performing at a "satisfactory" level, the PCR evaluation is complete. If the initial review determines that faculty are performing at an "unsatisfactory: not meeting department criteria" level, then remediation plan is developed.

Copies of all evaluations, including any forms used, and all letters written by department chairs, committees, individual faculty, or the Dean as described in this document shall be maintained by the Office of the Dean of the J.B. Speed School of Engineering.

*A. Periodic Career Review:*

Both the chair and the DFAC will provide independent assessments of the faculty member. These assessments will be based on annual reviews and the documentation supporting them (including a current curriculum vita, faculty activity reports and annual workplans for the 5-year period). The DFAC and the chair will render opinions regarding whether the faculty member's performance over the 5-year period is satisfactory or unsatisfactory. Per The Redbook (Minimum Guidelines Section V.A), each evaluation report shall characterize the member's contribution as "satisfactory: meeting unit criteria" or "unsatisfactory: not meeting unit criteria" in teaching, research and service with due regard for the faculty member's annual work plans during the period under review.

Under ordinary circumstances, proficient performance in teaching, research and scholarly activity, and service, in areas specified in the annual work plans, will be deemed satisfactory. However, a satisfactory rating does not necessarily require proficient performance in all areas in each year of the review period. Some variation in satisfactory performance may be acceptable, arising from new teaching assignments, administrative assignments, the initial development and preliminary stages of research, projects, unusual service obligations, or other relevant and documented situations.

The DFAC will forward their recommendation and evaluation summary to the department chair. The department chair will then send the chair's report and DFAC report to the Dean of the J.B. Speed School of Engineering; copies will also be provided to the reviewed faculty member.

If both the department chair's evaluation and the DFAC's evaluation are positive, the review will be complete, and the next five-year cycle will begin.

If either the chair's or the DFAC's evaluation is unsatisfactory, the faculty member may write a letter of rebuttal and provide additional documentation to the Dean. The Dean will then review the chair and DFAC evaluations and letters provided by the faculty member and make the final determination whether evaluation is satisfactory or unsatisfactory. If the Dean determines that the faculty member's performance to be satisfactory, the PCR will be considered complete. If the Dean agrees with either the DFAC or Chair that the faculty member's performance is unsatisfactory, the Dean will write a letter to the chair indicating that the faculty member will need to complete a remediation plan to address the unsatisfactory evaluation. A copy will be sent to the faculty member under review and the DFAC chair.

*B. Periodic Career Review: remediation plan*

In general, the purpose of the remediation plan is to provide useful feedback and appropriate intervention and assistance to those faculty members whose periodic career review was unsatisfactory.

The chair will work with the faculty member to develop a specific, written plan to overcome the identified deficiencies. This plan will identify the specific weaknesses, define specific expected outcomes, outline the activities that will be taken to correct deficiencies, set timelines for accomplishing this work, and specify how the new activities will be monitored and assessed. The remediation plan must not conflict with The Redbook (Section 4.2.4.B); that section also states that the plan is for one year unless the Dean approves a longer period.

The chair will forward the written plan to the DFAC for review. The DFAC will then provide a recommendation to the chair that the plan be accepted, modified, or rejected. The chair may modify the plan based on the DFAC recommendations and in consultation with the faculty member, and will forward the written plan to the Dean.

The Dean will give final approval to the plan by responding to the faculty member and department chair in writing. Once the Dean approves the plan, the timeline associated with the corrective actions is deemed to have started.

#### Part 2.5.4 Consequences

The faculty member's plan will be monitored as part of the annual review. If the faculty member has not achieved the stated goals of the plan within one year (or other timeline specified), and is again evaluated as "unsatisfactory: not meeting unit criteria," the documentation will be sent to the Dean for further action.

#### Part 2.5.5 Appeal Procedure

A faculty member can appeal the results of a PCR, if and only if the disagreement meets at least one of the causes stated in The Redbook (Section 4.4).

### **Section 2.6 Pre-tenure reviews**

#### Part 2.6.1 Overview

Pre-tenure review, described in Section 4.2.2.G of The Redbook, is a procedure whose purpose is to determine whether or not a faculty member is making satisfactory progress toward achieving tenure. A positive pre-tenure review is not a promise of eventually granting tenure.

#### Part 2.6.2 Schedule

The pre-tenure review will take place prior to the end of the third year of service counted towards tenure. No later than two months following completion of the 2<sup>nd</sup> year of service counted towards tenure, the department chair shall inform the faculty member, in writing, that the pre-tenure review is to take place. In the event that an individual's career pattern does not fit the normal progression that case shall be treated on its own merits. For example, in the case of an individual coming to the University with three or more years of credit toward tenure), a pre-tenure review may not be necessary.

#### Part 2.6.3 Process

The department chair is responsible for the review. All such correspondence shall become a part of the faculty member's documentation.

The standard for a positive pre-tenure review shall be a determination that continuation of activity, as documented, is expected to fulfill the stated tenure criteria as presumed by the department chair and DFAC. In the event that the departmental evaluation is negative, the written evaluation must include recommendations to the faculty member for changing the situation documented in the course of the review. In accordance with The Redbook, Section 4.2.2.G, the pre-tenure review is not final until approved by the Dean of the J.B. Speed School of Engineering.

Pre-tenure review shall involve an evaluation of activity in the areas outlined in General Criteria (Section 2.1). Standards of judgment for the areas of activity shall be the same as those outlined in Section 2.6, and in departmental statements of criteria for tenure. For the purpose of pre-tenure review, extramural review is optional. This option may be exercised by either the faculty member or the departmental faculty activity committee. If pursued, the department chair shall specify the number of external reviewers and the manner of their solicitation; the procedures specified in Appendix 5 may be used but are not required. The record compiled for pre-tenure review shall be maintained intact as part of the evidence to be considered in tenure review.

#### Part 2.6.4 Consequences

Pre-tenure review is a procedure whose purpose is to determine whether or not a faculty member is making satisfactory progress toward achieving tenure. Thus, the pre-tenure review is informative only and not binding on any aspect of the subsequent tenure evaluation.

#### Part 2.6.5 Appeal Procedure

A faculty member can appeal the results of the pre-tenure review, if and only if the disagreement meets at least one of the causes stated in The Redbook (Section 4.4).

### **Section 2.7 Promotion and Tenure**

#### Part 2.7.1 Overview

The process for assessing promotion and for assessing tenure are very similar and thus are presented together within this section.

Faculty who have joint appointments in more than one department shall be evaluated by each department.

The general process for promotion and/or tenure is that an evaluation file representing the candidate's body of work will be assembled. The evaluation file will be forwarded to the DFAC for review, and the DFAC will provide a written recommendation to be included in the evaluation file. After the DFAC have made their recommendation, the chair will review the evaluation file and also provide a written recommendation for the evaluation file. The FAC will then review the evaluation file and also provide a written recommendation. The evaluation file, which includes the DFAC, Chair, and FAC recommendations, will be forwarded to the Office of the Dean. The Dean of the J.B. Speed School of

Engineering will compile the unit recommendation and will forward the file to the Executive Vice President and University Provost. The Provost will recommend appropriate action on the promotion and/or tenure to the University President. The Board of Trustees (BOT) shall take final action to grant promotion and/or tenure after an affirmative recommendation of the President.

Specific guidance information regarding promotion and tenure will be provided by the Provost and Dean each year.

### Part 2.7.2 Schedule for Tenure

Each faculty member eligible for tenure must be evaluated within twelve months after five years of service applied to tenure. This process is described in Section 4.2.2.H of The Redbook. The five years of service may extend longer than five calendar years in cases where extensions were granted as specified in Section 4.2.2.C of The Redbook.

Completion of the probationary period with proficient annual performance evaluations and pre-tenure review shall not, in and of itself, constitute sufficient grounds for tenure. Faculty members on probationary status shall be affected by any amendments to or changes in the criteria for tenure subsequent to their appointment. In such evaluations, appropriate consideration will be given to the amount of time remaining in their probationary period when the change becomes effective.

Tenure may be recommended for persons whose initial appointment with the JB Speed School of Engineering is at the rank of Associate Professor or Professor.

### Part 2.7.3 Schedule for Promotion in Rank

For faculty members eligible for tenure, promotion to the rank of Associate Professor normally occurs concurrently with the award of tenure, although these may take effect in different years. For Associate Professor's, promotion to Full Professor can occur at any time when performance objectives have been met.

For other faculty not eligible for tenure, promotion (if applicable) to subsequent rank can occur when performance objectives have been met.

### Part 2.7.4 Criteria for Tenure

Criteria for tenure in the J.B. Speed School of Engineering are based on the following areas (The Redbook, 4.2.3.A and 4.2.2.F, respectively):

- Teaching
- Research or creative activity
- Service to the department, the J.B. Speed School of Engineering, the University, the profession and the community.

For the award of tenure, materials representative of the faculty's work must be deemed proficient in each category. Appendices V and VI provide guidance information regarding letters and materials. The Dean may provide additional guidance information. If the Dean provides additional guidance information, this information must be provided to the candidates within 14 days of the initiation date of the promotion and tenure review as identified in Appendix 2. The Dean's guideline information shall be made available to all JB Speed School of Engineering faculty.

#### Part 2.7.5 Criteria for Promotion in Rank

The General Criteria (Section 2.1) and the following specific criteria represent the minimum levels of achievement for promotion to the following ranks:

Associate Professor - In order to be promoted to the rank of Associate Professor, the candidate shall have shown evidence of having attained proficiency in teaching, research, and service, as defined in their workplan. The evidence of proficiency must include extramural evaluation as specified in the The Redbook Minimum Guidelines (Section IV.D.5).

Professor - In order to be promoted to the rank of Professor, the candidate shall have shown evidence of (a) having maintained proficiency in teaching, research, and service, as defined in their workplan; (b) superior achievement in at least one of the three areas, consisting of teaching, research, and service; and (c) having achieved professional recognition. The evidence of achievement in research, teaching, service, and the evidence of professional recognition, must include extramural evaluation as specified in the Minimum Guidelines (Section IV.D.5).

The level of performance above that specified in the Minimum Guidelines must be considered as well as the general criteria listed above. Candidates should be considered individually and not in competition with others. Seniority (normally six years in rank) is a consideration for all promotions, but lack of seniority alone shall not be grounds for a negative recommendation.

Teaching-track or Research-track faculty may apply for promotion in rank according to the criteria of the J.B. Speed School of Engineering. The resulting promotion reviews will be based upon the same documentation, standards, and schedule used for probationary or tenured faculty at the same rank. Promotion assessment will be based upon work effort and performance in the areas (i.e., teaching, research/creative activity, and/or service) established in their annual work plans in effect during the review period.

#### Part 2.7.6 Materials for Promotion and Tenure

The Chair is responsible for initiating the promotion and tenure review process. However, the DFAC or faculty member may also initiate the process. The entity who initiated the review for promotion or tenure (faculty member, department chair, or DFAC) shall be responsible for compiling the evaluation file.

It is the responsibility of the individual under review to provide review materials that will create a compelling promotion or tenure case. At a minimum, the tenure and promotion evaluation files should

contain relevant information in a format as requested by the Provost and Dean. Individuals under review may include any material they wish in their file. The department chair and other reviewers may also include other materials as long as they are made available to the individual and previous reviewers within the J.B. Speed School of Engineering so that prior recommendations may be reconsidered.

Tenure and promotion files must be compiled with the cooperation of the faculty member under review. A faculty member must be permitted to see, copy, and respond to the material in his or her promotion and/or tenure file with the names and affiliations of the evaluators masked. Additionally, the faculty member may add newly available material evidence for reconsideration by the previous evaluators or rebuttals at any time before the file is advanced to the Executive Vice President and University Provost (The Redbook 4.2.2.H.4).

### Part 2.7.7 Process for Promotion and Tenure

Steps in the promotion and tenure evaluation procedure are described below. The schedule of dates for the Promotion and Tenure process are provided in Appendix 2; these dates should normally be followed unless otherwise agreed upon by the Dean and faculty member. Each year, after the Executive Vice President and Provost has notified the Dean of the final date for receiving the files of nominees from J.B. Speed School of Engineering, a schedule (consistent with Appendix 2) will be set for the remaining evaluation steps. The Dean shall formulate the schedule, and it shall be disseminated in a timely manner.

Promotion cases and early reviews for tenure may not be stopped except with the permission of the faculty member involved per The Redbook 4.2.2.E.3.

Promotion and/or tenure review cases are generally initiated by department chairs. The department chair will send memoranda to the DFAC chair, Dean, and the FAC chair indicating the names of departmental faculty members who are under consideration for promotion and/or tenure review. A copy will also be sent to each faculty member under consideration. The department chair will compile the evaluation file (dossier) in cooperation with the faculty member. Guidelines for evaluation letters and solicitation of extramural review letters are in Appendix 5. The evaluation file will be sent to the DFAC for review.

Alternatively, the faculty member may work with the DFAC or the FAC to initiate a review, subject to The Redbook Section 4.2.2.H.3. In this case, memoranda should be sent to the department chair, DFAC chair, Dean, and the FAC chair indicating that the review has been initiated. The faculty member may compile the evaluation file in cooperation with the DFAC or FAC (i.e., to solicit extramural review letters). The evaluation file should then be submitted to the DFAC for review.

If the DFAC has not received a complete evaluation file prior to the cutoff date, the committee will transmit a memorandum to that effect to the appropriate department chair, to the Dean, and to the individual faculty member concerned. The faculty member will have 7 days to provide the missing materials or provide a written response to be included in the evaluation file.

The DFAC will review the evaluation file and write a recommendation letter (Appendix 5) to be included in the evaluation file. The DFAC will send the evaluation file to the department chair. The chair will review the materials and also write a letter of recommendation to be included in the evaluation file.

The department chair will then forward the evaluation file to the FAC. A separate confidential copy of both the recommendations of the DFAC, and of the chair will be forwarded to the individual faculty member. The Dean will not be informed of either the DFAC's or chair's recommendations at this juncture but shall receive a copy of the letter of transmittal.

The FAC will review the evaluation file and make its recommendations for promotion and/or tenure. The FAC will include its recommendation in the evaluation file and then forward the file to the Dean. A confidential copy of their recommendation will be forwarded to the faculty member under consideration and to the appropriate department chair.

The Dean will review the evaluation file and make a recommendation for promotion and/or tenure. The FAC will be advised of the Dean's recommendations on all promotion and tenure cases, and will be given an opportunity to provide written responses to be included in the evaluation files before they are sent to the Executive Vice President and University Provost.

Each individual being considered for promotion or tenure will receive a confidential copy of the Dean's recommendation to the Executive Vice President and University Provost, and if applicable, a copy of the FAC's response. The department chair will also receive copies.

The Dean will forward all evaluation files for promotion and tenure candidates to the Executive Vice President and University Provost. Evaluation documents should be either paper or electronic as specified by university or unit guidelines.

#### Part 2.7.8 Appeal Procedure

A faculty member can appeal the results of this process according to procedures stated in The Redbook (Section 4.4).

## **Article 3      Conditions of Faculty Employment**

The performance of each faculty member shall be evaluated in accordance with the annual review (see Section 2.4). The goals of these reviews are to reward performance in the short term, to reinforce desirable patterns of career advancement, and to foster the development of excellence in J.B. Speed School of Engineering. Performance evaluations shall be based on merit, including contributions to the missions of the department, J.B. Speed School of Engineering, and the University.

Evaluations of performance will be based on the annual work plans.

### **Section 3.1      Annual Work Plan**

During the spring semester of each calendar year, each full-time faculty member shall develop an annual work plan that describes the distribution of effort planned for the calendar year. The steps to be used in the annual work plan development are described below; the dates for each step are specified in Appendix 4. The department chair will provide his or her faculty with a list of proposed instruction and other duties for the upcoming calendar year. Each faculty member then drafts an annual work plan agreement and submits it to the department chair. This plan shall define faculty activity based on teaching, research, and service.

Each faculty member in full-time status for the year must account for 100% of a full work load by allocation of effort. Justification for allocations of effort shall take the form of listing the activities (e.g., courses to be taught, committee assignments, etc.).

Annual work plans shall be initiated in the department where the faculty member holds primary appointment. For faculty appointed to administrative positions, annual work plans will be negotiated with the Dean or his/her representative and the individual.

The department chair shall evaluate the annual work plans and meet with each faculty member to negotiate a mutually agreeable plan. The plan should describe the faculty member's role in carrying out the mission and goals of the department while seeking to accommodate the individual's professional goals. If the department chair and faculty member cannot agree on an annual work plan, each shall submit a proposed plan and explanation to the DFAC for review. The DFAC may request copies of other approved departmental work plans in order to evaluate consistency and fairness. The DFAC will make a recommendation regarding a suitable faculty work plan and forward their recommendation to the chair. If the chair and faculty member still disagree, the proposed plans and explanations from the chair, faculty member, and DFAC will be forwarded to the Dean. The Dean will approve or modify the faculty member's workplan and distribute it to the chair and faculty member for implementation.

Annual work plans should be revised if a significant change in a faculty member's situation occurs. Annual work plans may be revised during the year only by mutual agreement.

In every personnel action, the accomplishments of the faculty member shall be reviewed against the background of the distribution of effort identified in the annual work plan for the period under review. Accomplishments in proportion to the allocation of effort to each area of activity shall be required.

All approved annual work plans shall respect both the individual faculty member's need to shape his or her own career and the School's various needs. Annual work also must respect the limitations imposed by budgets, specific department needs, and may require the faculty member to perform various functions at different stages in his or her career.

## **Section 3.2 Code of Conduct**

### **Part 3.2.1 General Criteria**

As per the Board of Trustees policy regarding governance of the university, every employee, in conducting the affairs of the University of Louisville, is expected to comply with applicable federal, state, and local laws as well as the policies and procedures of the University of Louisville.

The standards of conduct at the University of Louisville are identified in the University's Code of Conduct and supported through policies, procedures, and workplace rules. Additional guidelines for Speed faculty are described in Appendix 7. These documents provide guidance for making decisions and memorialize the institution's commitment to responsible behavior.

Additionally, all faculty are expected to be guided by and comply with all principles and canons of their particular professions and disciplines, and to adhere to their professional code of conduct and ethics. As such, all J.B. Speed School of Engineering faculty are expected to act and behave appropriately, and in a professional manner as they perform their university functions both on and off campus.

### **Part 3.2.2 Process**

Failure to act in a professional, acceptable, or appropriate manner may embody many forms and adversely affect the individual, department, school and/or university with varying levels of severity. The purpose of this section is not only to provide a guide to resolve inappropriate conduct, but also to allow adaptability for each unique situation.

#### *File a complaint*

Any J.B. Speed School of Engineering faculty, department chair, or Dean may initiate a code of conduct complaint against any other faculty, department chair, or Dean within the school. (Grievances involving staff and students must follow associated Redbook procedures.) Code of conduct complaints must be submitted to the Dean in writing, signed, and dated. The complaints must identify the individuals involved and the alleged inappropriate conduct, along with any evidence to support the claim and any history of actions previously taken to attempt to resolve the misconduct.

Once the Dean receives a code of conduct complaint, the Dean must work to resolve the issue through an informal or formal resolution process. The Dean is expected to work to resolve the code of conduct complaint expeditiously. However, once a code of conduct complaint is filed with the Dean, the time for resolution will depend on the specific details concerning each case.

If the Dean is the individual identified in the code of conduct complaint as having committed the alleged inappropriate conduct, the complaint should be delivered to the Provost.

### *Informal resolution*

If reasonable and possible, the Dean will work to resolve any code of conduct complaint through informal means. This may involve discussions or facilitated dialogue between affected parties, or other actions deemed appropriate. Any informal resolution to a code of conduct complaint must be documented by the Dean, distributed to all affected parties, and maintained in records kept by the Dean's office.

### *Formal resolution*

If an informal resolution to a code of conduct complaint cannot be achieved, the Dean will work to resolve the issue through a more formal means. A formal resolution process is generally appropriate for more complex, or severe cases. The Dean may implement procedures and resources as necessary to render a judgement and resolve the case. To formally conclude the code of conduct complaint, the Dean must prepare a letter that addresses the following:

- Summarize the case including events, conduct and/or actions under review
- Summarize the resources utilized to assemble information relevant to the case (committees formed, who was interviewed, etc.)
- Summarize the key information relating to the case (what are the critical components that must be addressed)
- Identify metrics used to assess faculty behavior (whose code of conduct, which ethical standard or canon).
- Render a clear opinion on whether the case violated the identified code(s) of conduct or other metric.
- Identify sanctions, consequences or other remedial actions to be imposed

The Dean's letter resolving the code of conduct complaint must be provided to the complainant, all affected parties, and maintained in records kept by the Dean's office.

### Part 3.2.3 Consequences

Faculty who fail to adhere to the code of conduct may be subject to the following:

- Complete education or training.
- Receive a reprimand from the Dean into their personnel file.
- Liability for loss, damage or injury to the University or University property. This may take the form of appropriate service and/or monetary or material replacement.
- Separation from the University for a definite period of time, after which the offending faculty member is eligible to return. Conditions for return should be clearly specified by the Dean. Suspension may be with or without salary (full or partial). Suspension without pay is subject to approval of the Executive Vice President and University Provost as well as the President.
- Referral to the President of the university to consider/initiate dismissal for cause as specified in Section 4.5.3 of The Redbook.

#### Part 3.2.4 Appeal Procedure

The Dean's decision may be appealed to the University-wide grievance committee as specified in Article 4.4 of The Redbook.

### **Section 3.3 Compensation**

If there are funds for merit-based salary increments in a given year, increments for all faculty shall be subject to the following guidelines and in accordance with The Redbook Minimum Guidelines Sec III.B.

After distribution of salary increment funds to departments, the department chair will determine how to allocate salary increments appropriate to faculty member performance and the size of the salary pool. The chair will send a description and explanation of the policy for salary increments to the Dean for approval. Only faculty whose overall performance is proficient are eligible for a salary increment. No departmental policy shall be implemented until approved by the Dean.

The Dean will inform each faculty member in writing of his or her salary increment. In the event a faculty member is dissatisfied with his/her salary increment, the faculty member may submit a letter of appeal to the chair who must forward this to the Dean. The Dean has dispositional authority.

Per The Redbook Minimum Guidelines Sec. III.B.4.G, the dean shall report annually to the faculty and to the Executive Vice President and University Provost the frequency distribution of the percentage salary increases received by all faculty members in the unit and a description of the evaluation system used to arrive at such salary increases.

## **Article 4    Amendments**

Amendments to this document must be approved by the J.B. Speed School of Engineering faculty. The vote will be made by electronic ballot after discussion at a faculty meeting. Approval requires two- thirds of those voting but no less than a simple majority of all the faculty. Amendments receiving sufficiently many votes will be forwarded, as necessary, through appropriate channels to the Board of Trustees for approval.

Speed Scientific School Guidelines for Promotion, Tenure and Merit Evaluation

Approved by the Board of Trustees, February 25, 1985.

Revised, approved by Speed School Faculty, September 15, 1985.

Approved by the Board of Trustees, October 26, 1987.

Revised, approved by Speed School Faculty, October 11, 1996.

Approved by the Board of Trustees, October 28, 1996.

School name changed to J.B. Speed School of Engineering

Approved by the President, October 16, 2003.

Revised, revisions approved by Faculty Senate, April 6, 2005.

Approved by the Board of Trustees, June 6, 2006.

Revised, approved by Speed School Faculty, October 26, 2010.

Approved by Faculty Senate, December 1, 2010.

Approved by the Board of Trustees, February 8, 2011.

Revised, approved by Speed School Faculty, August 28, 2019.

Approved by Faculty Senate, January 8, 2020.

Approved by the Board of Trustees, April 23, 2020

## Appendix 1 Scope and Definitions

### Section App-1.1 Purpose

The Redbook requires units to adopt policy and procedure documents on faculty appointment, promotion, tenure, as consistent with its Minimum Guidelines for Faculty Personnel Reviews (Addenda to Chapter 4 of The Redbook). This document and the appendices are intended to fulfill the requirements.

### Section App-1.2 Scope

The criteria and procedures in this document apply on a school-wide basis, except that established departments may adopt procedures compatible with this document for processing their evaluations and recommendations. When, and if, such departmental procedures are developed, they should be made an addition to this document.

### Section App-1.3 Definitions

#### Part App-1.3.1 Teaching

Teaching includes all work that involves the use of the faculty's expertise to communicate subject matter and research expertise to students. Typically, teaching takes place in the classroom or through mentoring individual or small groups of students. Good teaching involves the ability to interact effectively with students. When teaching both undergraduate and graduate classes, pedagogical procedures must be carefully planned, continuously examined, and directly related to the subject taught. Good teachers stimulate active, not passive, learning, and encourage students to be critical, creative thinkers with the capacity to go on learning after their college days are over.

As a scholarly enterprise, teaching begins with what the teacher knows. Those who teach must be, above all, well informed, and steeped in the knowledge of their instructional and research fields. Hard work and serious study underpin good teaching. Good teaching means that faculty, as scholars, are also learners.

#### Part App-1.3.2 Research and Creative Activity

For most faculty, research, basic or applied, is delving into some question in that faculty member's field and seeking to add to the reservoir of knowledge. Such endeavors not only result in the creation of knowledge, but also invigorate student-faculty relationships inside the classroom and out. Research includes the act of knowledge creation through the publication or dissemination of original or innovative

theoretical, empirical, or creative work. The intellectual excitement and progress that are generated by research are vital to a university such as ours.

Research also means making connections across the disciplines, placing the specialties in a larger context, illuminating data in a revealing way, and/or educating non-specialists. There is a need for scholars who give meaning to isolated facts by putting them in perspective. Research is also serious, disciplined work that seeks to draw together, interpret, and bring insight to bear on new developments.

Research also occurs when one applies information, interpretation, or techniques characteristic of one's discipline to consequential problems in the real world. The key to defining application is that the activity must be tied directly to one's special field of knowledge and relate to one's professional activity.

Research and creative activities aimed at teaching involve not only transmitting knowledge, but transforming and extending it as well. This is an important area of research that can lead to better pedagogical practices.

### Part App-1.3.3 Service

Service is the application of general academic expertise that results from experience as a university educator, as when one participates in faculty governance within the university or when service activities outside the university are linked to one's general academic expertise. Service is distinguished from research in that service does not require that the activity be related to one's area of professional expertise. Additionally, service does not include activities that one might engage in as a citizen of a civic community, but is restricted to those activities required by the students, department, college, university or profession.

### Part App-1.3.4 Tenure

Tenure is the right of certain full-time faculty personnel who hold academic rank to continuous full-time employment without reduction in academic rank until retirement or termination as provided in Section 4.5.3 of The Redbook. Tenure is granted in an academic unit in accordance with the procedures established in Section 4.2.2.8 of The Redbook.

### Part App-1.3.5 Proficiency

Whenever used in this document, the word "proficient" shall be understood to mean "to satisfy capably all the special demands or requirements of a particular situation, craft, or profession."

## **Appendix 2 Promotion and Tenure Review Schedules**

### **Section App-2.1 Purpose**

The following schedules describe the review process for promotion and tenure cases. Should any date fall on a holiday or weekend, the associated correspondence is due on the previous business day. Reviews initiated by the department chair (DC) are referred to as standard reviews. Reviews initiated by the faculty member (FM) or the department faculty activity committee (DFAC) are referred to as self-initiated reviews and DFAC-initiated reviews, respectively. The DFAC in this usage is to be interpreted as the subset of members comprising either the department tenure committee or department promotion committee depending on the type of review (see Article 2). The Speed School Faculty Affairs Committee is referred to below as the FAC.

## Section App-2.2 Standard Schedule for Promotion and Tenure Reviews

This schedule applies for all promotion cases of faculty, and for tenure/promotion and tenure cases for faculty with tenure dates falling between May 1 and November 30. For tenure cases that are not early, the process timing is such that the dossier is delivered to the Provost on January 15<sup>th</sup> at least 1 year, but not more than 2 years, prior to the tenure date.

Date*	Correspondence Due
<b>Sep 1</b>	Entity initiating review sends memo to DC, DFAC chair and FM indicating name of FM to be reviewed. Copy sent to FAC chair and Dean.
<b>Oct 25</b>	DC recommendation letter, DFAC letter, and complete evaluation file sent from DC to FAC. Copy of DFAC letter and DC recommendation letter sent to FM. <u>For tenure cases only</u> : If DC recommendation letter is negative, copy to FM must be sent to home address by certified mail.
<b>Nov 15</b>	FAC recommendation letter and evaluation file sent from FAC to Dean. Copy of FAC recommendation letter sent to FM and DC.
<b>Dec 15</b>	Dean notifies FAC regarding each promotion and tenure case recommendation. FAC has opportunity to draft response letter and add it to the evaluation file prior to delivery of dossier to the Provost. Copy of Dean's recommendation letter sent to FM and DC. <u>For tenure cases only</u> : If the Dean's recommendation letter is negative, a copy must be sent to the FM's home address by certified mail.
<b>Jan 15</b>	Dossier sent from Dean to Office of the University Provost.

\* If a date falls on a holiday or weekend, correspondence is due on the previous business day.

### **Section App-2.3      Alternate Schedule for Tenure Reviews (with Promotion)**

This schedule applies for tenure/promotion and tenure cases for faculty with tenure dates falling between December 1 and April 30. For tenure cases that are not early, the process timing is such that the triptych is delivered to the Provost on September 1<sup>st</sup> at least 1 year, but not more than 2 years, prior to the tenure date.

<b>Date *</b>	<b>Correspondence Due</b>
<b>Feb 15</b>	Entity initiating review sends memo to DC, DFAC chair, and FM indicating name of FM to be reviewed. Copy sent FAC chair and Dean.
<b>Apr 10</b>	DC recommendation letter, DFAC letter, and complete evaluation file sent from DC to FAC. Copy of DFAC letter and DC recommendation letter sent to FM. If DC recommendation letter is negative, copy to FM must be sent to home address by certified mail.
<b>May 1</b>	FAC recommendation letter and evaluation file sent from FAC to Dean. Copy of FAC recommendation letter sent to FM and DC.
<b>Jun 1</b>	Dean notifies FAC regarding each promotion and tenure case recommendation. FAC has opportunity to draft response letter and add it to the evaluation file prior to delivery of dossier to the Provost. Copy of Dean's recommendation letter sent to FM and DC. If the Dean's recommendation letter is negative, a copy must be sent to the FMs home address by certified mail.
<b>Sep 1</b>	Dossier sent from Dean to Office of the University Provost.

\* If a date falls on a holiday or weekend, correspondence is due on the previous business day.

### Appendix 3 Periodic Career Review Schedule

The following describes the periodic career review (PCR) schedule. PCRs are conducted on a five-year cycle for all tenured faculty and Teaching-track/Research-track faculty during the Spring semester. This schedule is designed to: 1) allow enough time for chairs to complete the most recent annual faculty evaluations by March 15 so that they can be included in the PCR review process; and 2) to be completed prior to the end of the spring semester. For more information of the PCR process, see Section 2.5 of this document or Section 4.2.4 of The Redbook.

<b>Date *</b>	<b>Correspondence Due</b>
<b>Feb 15</b>	Dean's Office notifies faculty member (FM) scheduled for PCR review as well as the associated department chair (DC).
<b>Mar 1</b>	FM sends updated Curriculum Vitae (CV) to DC.
<b>Mar 15</b>	DC sends CV and copies of previous five FM annual performance reviews, workplans, and faculty activity reports (including most recent year) to department faculty activity committee (DFAC).
<b>Apr 1</b>	DFAC sends the recommendation letter (including a summary of annual performance reviews) to DC.
<b>April 15</b>	The DC sends the recommendation letter and the DFAC recommendation to the Dean (copy to FM).
<b>May 1</b>	If applicable, Dean makes a decision whether a remediation plan is necessary.
<b>June 1</b>	If applicable, chair sends remediation plan to the Dean for approval.

\* If a date falls on a holiday or weekend, correspondence is due on the previous business day.

## Appendix 4 Annual Work Plan and Review Schedule

The following describes the schedule for annual work plans and review. Annual work plans and annual reviews are conducted each year for all faculty. This schedule is designed to allow enough time for chairs to complete the most recent annual faculty evaluations by March 15 for incorporation into the PCR review process (if applicable).

Date*	Correspondence Due
<b>Dec 20</b>	Department chair (DC) communicates with department faculty with list of proposed instruction and other duties for the upcoming calendar year.
<b>Jan 20</b>	Annual work plan submitted by faculty member (FM). Any digital faculty effort reporting system in use by Speed School is updated by the FM.
<b>Feb 15</b>	DC approves annual work plan that is mutually agreeable to DC and FM.
<b>Feb 28</b>	FM submits activity report for previous academic year.
<b>Mar 15</b>	DC completes annual review of FM.
<b>Apr 1</b>	Meeting between DC and FM to discuss annual review of FM is completed.

\* If a date falls on a holiday or weekend, correspondence is due on the previous business day.

## Appendix 5 Guidelines for Review and Evaluation Letters

### Section App-5.1 Purpose

The following describes the procedures for solicitation of extramural review letters and guidelines for evaluation letters by the department chair (DC), and department faculty activity committee (DFAC), and Faculty Affairs Committee (FAC) in promotion and tenure cases.

### Section App-5.2 Extramural Review Letters

The faculty member (FM), DC, and DFAC chair each have a role in completing this process. This appendix does not provide a schedule but the steps below should be undertaken after careful consideration of the dates outlined in Appendix 2 (Promotion and Tenure Review Schedules).

This procedure satisfies Section IV.D.5(a) of the Minimum Guidelines for Faculty Personnel Reviews (Addenda to Chapter 4 of The Redbook, henceforth referred to as the Minimum Guidelines), which states: "Each unit document must specify the process by which extramural evaluators shall be solicited. This process shall be designed to certify the professional expertise and objectivity of the evaluators, whose comments regarding the quality of the work under review shall be solicited along with justification of those comments." The promotion and tenure process determines what constitutes objectivity; however, it is stipulated that close colleagues, close collaborators, former mentors, co-authors, and so on, are not generally considered objective evaluators. The FM and DC statements regarding the suitability of potential reviewers may be used by the Speed School Faculty Affairs Committee (FAC) to satisfy Section IV.D.5(c) of the Minimum Guidelines which states, in part, that "The unit personnel committee shall provide a written analysis of the validity and significance of the evaluations received." The FAC may choose, at its discretion, to create its own written analysis of the extramural evaluators in place of the FM and DC suitability statements.

The steps for the extramural review letters are listed below. However, it is understood that individual circumstances may require alteration of these steps; in such cases, the Department Chair (DC) should discuss the matter with the Faculty Member (FM) and the DFAC chair, outline the proposed changes in writing, and forward to the Dean for approval (with a copy to the FM, DFAC chair and FAC chair). If possible, preference should be given to reviewers who are tenured (in tenure review cases), full professors, and familiar with the candidate's research (if applicable).

- FM shall provide to the Department Chair (DC) a list of 4-6 potential reviewers, along with a brief statement for each one as to why they are suitable to serve as extramural reviewers.
- DC shall provide to the FM a list of 4-6 potential reviewers, different from those suggested by the FM, along with a brief statement for each one as to why they are suitable to serve as extramural reviewers.
- DC and FM will review the combined lists and come to consensus regarding a list of 8-12 potential reviewers, eliminating and/or adding additional potential reviewers if necessary.
- DC requests about 6 extramural letters, selecting from the candidate's list and from the chair's list in a manner of his/her choosing. The DC should prepare a list of names and affiliations of all reviewers and a brief statement regarding their suitability and objectivity to be included in the dossier. Solicitation letter(s) sent to reviewers should also be included in the dossier.

- If a potential reviewer declines, an additional review request should be sent, with the chair selecting from the remaining potential reviewers by alternating between the FM and DC lists.
- The dossier must contain a minimum of 4 extramural review letters. The department chair and the DFAC chair will determine when the period to receive extramural review letters has closed. All letters received by this date will be included in the dossier, while any received after this date may be discarded without consideration.
- The DFAC chair is responsible for adding the extramural review letters to the dossier; the associated statement written about the reviewer's suitability also becomes part of the record. If the candidate wishes to review the dossier at any point, the names and affiliations of the reviewers must be redacted from the candidate to ensure the confidentiality of the reviewers.
- Once the letter receipt period has closed, the DFAC chair will provide the candidate with a redacted document containing the external review letters. This will include a cover letter indicating that the FM has 7 days to respond, in writing, to the extramural review letters. If desired; the DFAC chair has the discretion to grant additional time if requested by the candidate. The FM's written response to the extramural letters received in the allowed timeframe must be added to the dossier prior to consideration by the DFAC. The FM has the right to add a response at a later time but this will not alter any discussions or decisions that have preceded it.
- Upon conclusion of the 7 day (or longer if agreed) extramural reviewer letter response period, the DFAC chair calls a meeting of the DFAC to consider the FM candidate further.

### **Section App-5.3      DFAC Evaluation Letter**

After the DFAC meets to discuss the FM candidate, the DFAC chair writes a letter to be included in the evaluation file. The letter should include:

- Names of committee members
- Committee recommendation regarding promotion and/or tenure along with vote count.
- Summary of discussion and justification of committee vote regarding FM member performance in departmental criteria for teaching, research or creative activity, and service (Section 2.2). If any votes are negative, the letter should clearly state why the committee member(s) felt the candidate did not sufficiently meet criteria. Dissenting members may write a separate letter if desired to be included in evaluation file.
- Comment on the suitability and objectivity of extramural reviewers

### **Section App-5.4      Department Chair (DC) Evaluation Letter**

The Department Chair must also provide a letter that evaluates the candidates promotion and/or tenure materials. The chair's letter should include:

- Provide a summary regarding suitability of external reviewers
- Provide a summary discussion of the external reviewer's evaluations

- Overall recommendation of candidate for promotion or tenure
- Discussion of research activities (as appropriate) including focus area, suitability for continued development, discussion of publications and suitability of journals, discussion of proposal and funding efforts, and other significant factors
- Discussion of teaching activities (as appropriate) including teaching loads, effort, improvement, quality of instruction, and other significant factors
- Discussion of service activities (as appropriate) including university, school, department activities, and other significant factors
- Discuss any other relevant strengths and weaknesses of the candidate as appropriate

### **Section App-5.5      FAC Evaluation Letter**

After the FAC meets to discuss the FM candidate, the FAC chair writes a letter to be included in the evaluation file. The letter should include:

- Names of committee members
- Committee recommendation regarding promotion and/or tenure along with vote count
- Summary of discussion and justification of committee vote. If any votes are negative, the letter should clearly state why the committee member(s) felt the candidate did not sufficiently meet criteria. Dissenting members may write a separate letter if desired to be included in evaluation file.
- Comment on fairness and objectivity of reviews by extramural evaluators, DFAC, and DC.

## Appendix 6 Guidelines for Promotion and Tenure Materials

### Section App-6.1 Purpose

The criteria for tenure reviews and reviews for promotion in rank are specified in The Redbook Section 4.2.2.F and Section 4.2.3.A, respectively, as Teaching, Research or Creative Activity, and Service to the department, the J.B. Speed School of Engineering, the University, the profession and the community. The Minimum Guidelines for Faculty Personnel Reviews which is an addendum within Chapter 4 of The Redbook provides standards for the evaluation and review of the criteria.

In addition to the university criteria, The J.B. Speed School of Engineering may also consider

- Registration / licensure as a Professional Engineer or other forms of certification where appropriate
- Overall professional development, including education and experience prior to University employment, and subsequent efforts to maintain and advance professional competency
- University leadership capability and experience
- Administrative assignments

Ultimately, however, it is the responsibility of the individual faculty member to organize and present the most compelling evidence of their proficiency in each of the criteria. The following information is meant to provide additional guidance in this regard.

### Section App-6.2 Evidence for Proficiency in Teaching

Providing evidence for proficiency in teaching should begin with student evaluations in each course taught. This should include both detailed evaluations as well as a summary of the evaluations. The size for each course should also be given as part of this section. Student evaluations should not provide the sole criterion for evaluation of teaching. Other forms of evidence can include, but are not limited to,

- Publications in peer reviewed journals, monographs, textbooks, conference proceedings, etc., on teaching pedagogy;
- Evaluation of teaching based upon student questionnaires or mid-semester reviews, letters from current or former students, classroom visitations by chairs, colleagues, or other forms of peer review, or comments spontaneously received by the chair;
- Syllabi and course material;
- The submission of proposals and success in obtaining funding of research directed toward improved teaching methods and/or the acquisition of equipment and instrumentation to enhance teaching effectiveness.
- Curriculum development,
- Participation in faculty learning communities and other professional development opportunities,

- Thesis and dissertation supervision, as well as mentoring students, part-time faculty, and junior faculty.

### **Section App-6.3 Evidence for Proficiency in Research and Creative Activity**

A significant source of evidence for proficiency in research and creative activity should come in the form of publications in peer reviewed journals, monographs, edited books, textbooks, conference proceedings, and technical reports. Discussion of papers should begin with a description of authorship ordering that is utilized in the faculty member's field. It should also include a discussion of the key journals within the field of interest and a general range of impact factors for those journals. The letter from the DFAC or the Department Chair should corroborate these statements. A brief description and a highlight of each of the faculty member's students in the author list should accompany each paper. Papers under review at the time should also be listed.

Another significant source of evidence for proficiency in research is the submission of proposals and success in obtaining funding of research directed toward the discovery of new knowledge. Both single investigator and multi-investigator efforts can be used as evidence of these activities, especially in multi-disciplinary efforts where principal investigators on multiple-principal-investigator grants should be rewarded commensurately to those on single-principal-investigator grants. Discussion of proposals and grants should include the faculty member's role and the percentage of the project ascribed to the individual.

Proficiency in research also may be evidenced by any forum that demonstrates effectiveness in linking knowledge across fields of specialization. These would include but are not limited to presentations; computer courseware; public speeches, and television and radio presentations.

Proficiency in research or creative activity may also be evidenced by: publications in peer reviewed journals, monographs, textbooks, conference proceedings, etc., on teaching methodology; and the submission of proposals and success in obtaining funding of research directed toward improved teaching methods and/or the acquisition of equipment and instrumentation to enhance teaching effectiveness.

Additionally, proficiency in research or creative activity can be demonstrated through entrepreneurial activities directed at the discovery and commercialization of new knowledge. These activities can be demonstrated through technology disclosures and patents, licensing agreements, and the formation of start-up companies.

### **Section App-6.4 Evidence for Proficiency in Service**

Evaluations of service should be done in a manner similar to that for teaching and research to the extent possible. Most commonly, service does not automatically produce documentary results. Thus, written statements by witnesses, the people or organizations benefiting from the service, or colleagues evaluating such service may be obtained. Also included would be any products resulting from service

activities along with evidence regarding the nature of the candidate's contribution. Minor activities, such as committee work of short duration, should have a less formal, aggregate evaluation.

Evaluation of service should also incorporate work that the university or unit has asked faculty to perform but that is not necessarily rewarded within individual unit cultures; specific examples may include, but are not limited to, work on the University's and the unit's strategic goals, work on signature partnerships and other forms of community engagement.

## **Appendix 7 Guidelines for Code of Conduct**

### **Section App-7.1 Purpose**

The ethical principles and responsibilities of J.B. Speed School of Engineering faculty are organized around an individual faculty member's relation to teaching and students, scholarship, professional responsibilities, university, colleagues, and community.

### **Section App-7.2 Responsibilities to Teaching and Students**

- To encourage the free pursuit of learning in students.
- To hold before students the best scholarly standards of the disciplines.
- To demonstrate respect for students as individuals, and to adhere to one's proper role as intellectual guide and counselor.
- To make every reasonable effort to foster honest academic conduct and to assure that evaluation of students reflects their true merits.
- To avoid any exploitation of students for private advantage and acknowledge significant assistance from them.
- To protect student academic freedom.

### **Section App-7.3 Responsibilities to Research, Scholarship, and/or Creative Activities**

- To recognize the special responsibility for the advancement of knowledge.
- To seek the truth and to state the truth as one sees it.
- To improve scholarly competence.
- To exercise critical self-discipline and judgment in using, extending, and transmitting knowledge.
- To practice intellectual honesty.
- To prevent intrusion of subsidiary interests in the freedom of inquiry

### **Section App-7.4 Responsibilities to the University**

- To be effective in teaching, research, scholarship and/or creative activities, and service.
- To adhere to university policies and regulations.
- To monitor the amount and character of any work outside the university, with due regard to responsibilities within it.

- To give due notice to the university of pending interruption or termination of service.
- To alert appropriate university offices about alarming or threatening behavior of colleagues and students.

### **Section App-7.5 Responsibilities to the Colleagues**

- To respect and defend free inquiry by associates, where in compliance with university regulations.
- To show professional courtesy and respect for others in exchange of criticism.
- To strive to be objective during the professional judgment of colleagues.
- To accept a fair share of the responsibilities for the governance of the university.
- To actively assist in the professional development of colleagues.

### **Section App-7.6 Responsibilities to the Community**

- To strive to conduct oneself as a responsible, productive member of the community, aware of and sensitive to the responsibilities and obligations placed on all citizens by a free society.
- To make it clear in public statements that one's personal opinions are one's own and not those of the university.
- To conduct one's public and private lives so as to avoid bringing dishonor to oneself and the university.

### **Section App-7.7 Scope and Jurisdiction**

The J.B. Speed School of Engineering Code of Conduct applies to all Faculty Members, as defined in The Redbook. This Code of Conduct is in addition to and does not limit other processes and procedures for addressing conduct and employment issues as they relate to the University of Louisville at large. Enforcement of the Code of Conduct is bound by The Redbook, including termination policies in The Redbook Section 4.5.

Jurisdiction of the J.B. Speed School of Engineering generally shall be limited to conduct which occurs on the University of Louisville premises or at University of Louisville sponsored or supervised functions. However, J.B. Speed School of Engineering may take appropriate action, including, but not limited to, the imposition of sanctions under J.B. Speed School of Engineering codes of conduct against Faculty Members for conduct occurring in other settings, including off-campus, under the following circumstances:

- If the faculty conduct threatens the physical safety of students, employees, visitors or any other members of the University of Louisville community,

- If the faculty conduct interferes with or limit any person's ability to participate in or benefit from the university's educational programs, activities or employment,
- If the faculty conduct hinders the Faculty Member's ability to perform in the professional capacity of teacher or researcher
- If the faculty conduct occurs when the Faculty member is serving in the role of a University employee at large.

### **Section App-7.8      Inappropriate Conduct**

Violation of the University of Louisville Code of Conduct is considered inappropriate conduct. Generally, the following will also be construed as inappropriate conduct:

- Violation of Professional Ethics and professional guidelines that apply to the field of the Faculty member.
- Any conduct that endangers the health or safety of any person
- Any unreasonably interference with another person's ability to perform University duties including teaching, research, administration, or other University activities, including public service functions on or off campus.
- Refusing or neglecting to perform reasonable assigned teaching duties, or quitting duties without due notice in accordance with the university rules and regulations.
- Intentional and habitual neglect of duty in the performance of academic responsibilities.