

University of Louisville School of Dentistry

ULSD Faculty Personnel Document

An Appendix to ULSD Faculty Governance Document and Bylaws

Approved by the ULSD Faculty Assembly: 4/25/18

Approved by the University of Louisville Board of Trustees: 4/18/19

ULSD FACULTY PERSONNEL DOCUMENT

Table of Contents

Introduction	3
Article 1: Faculty Appointments and Tenure	
Section 1: Classification of Faculty Appointments	4
A. Full-Time Academic Appointments	4
1. Definition	4
2. Contract	4
3. Term (Non-tenurable) Appointments	5
4. Probationary Appointments	6
5. Tenure Appointments	6
B. Part-Time Academic Appointment	6
C. Temporary (Non-tenurable, Lecturer) Appointments	7
D. Joint and Associate Appointments	7
E. Emeritus Appointments	8
F. Gratis Appointments	8
Section 2: Initial Faculty Appointments	9
A. General Considerations	9
B. Criteria for Initial Faculty Appointment	9
Article 2: Conditions of Faculty Employment	10
Section 1: Annual Work Plan	10
Section 2: Compensation	11
Section 3: Work Outside the University	11
Section 4: Other Conditions of Faculty Employment	12
Article 3: Faculty Personnel Reviews	12
Section 1: Annual Performance Reviews	12
Section 2: Promotion in Rank	12
Section 3: Supplementary Procedures for the Review of Probationary (tenure-track) Faculty for Promotion	15
Section 4: Periodic Career Reviews	15
Appendix A: Definitions and Examples of Proficiency and Excellence in Teaching, Scholarship and Service	
Introduction	16
Section I: Teaching	
A. Definition of Teaching	16
B. Examples of Teaching	16
C. Evaluation of Teaching	17
D. Proficiency in Teaching	17
E. Excellence in Teaching	17
Section II: Scholarship (Research and Creative Activity)	
A. Definition of Scholarship	18
B. Examples of Scholarship	19
C. Evaluation of Scholarship	19
D. Proficiency in Scholarship	20

E. Excellence in Scholarship	20
Section III: Service	
A. Definition of Service	21
B. Evaluation of Service	22
C. Proficiency in Service	22
D. Excellence in Service	23
Appendix B: ULSD Faculty Personnel Procedures and Policies	
Introduction	24
Section I: Annual Work Plans	
A. Guidelines for Annual Work Plans	24
B. Expectations for Faculty Assignments in Annual Work Plans	25
C. Process for Developing Annual Work Plans	26
D. Changes to the Annual Work Plan	26
E. Appeal Process	26
Section II: Annual Performance Reviews	
A. Process	27
B. Appeal Process	27
C. Outcomes of the Annual Performance Review	28
D. Use in Performance-Based Salary Increases	28
Section III: Promotion in Rank Reviews	
A. Development of the Documents in Support of Promotion	29
B. The Departmental Evaluation	30
C. The Dental School Faculty Personnel Committee Evaluation	32
D. The Dean's Evaluation	32
E. The University's Evaluation	32
Section IV: Supplementary Procedures for the Review of Probationary (tenure-track) Faculty for Promotion	
A. Preparation for the Tenure Review	32
B. The Tenure Review	34
C. Criteria for the Tenure Review	34
Section V: Periodic Career Reviews	
A. Procedure for Periodic Career Reviews	35
B. Outcome of the Periodic Career Review	35

INTRODUCTION

The purpose of this document is to delineate the policies, procedures and criteria utilized by University of Louisville School of Dentistry (the Unit) for the evaluation of promotion, tenure, periodic career reviews and the appointment of faculty. Departments within the Unit may stipulate criteria and/or standards for teaching, research or creative activity, and service that are more rigorous than those defined in this document only if approved by a majority of the Unit's Faculty Assembly as an amendment to the *University of Louisville School of Dentistry (ULSD) Faculty Governance Document*. The contents of this Unit document apply to all faculty (executive faculty and general faculty) as defined in the *School of Dentistry Bylaws*.

These standards and criteria are consistent with the general policies described in the University of Louisville *Redbook* and the University Faculty Senate's *Minimum Guidelines* document. The faculty of the School of Dentistry intends these guidelines to clarify and further define the material in the *Redbook*. In case of conflict between this document and the *Redbook*, the *Redbook* is the higher authority.

All faculty appointments, promotion, tenure, and periodic career review actions concerning the University of Louisville, School of Dentistry faculty will be based on the standards, criteria and procedures set forth in this document and the University *Redbook*.

All School of Dentistry faculty members shall have access to this document and, if one exists, a copy of their departmental guidelines for promotion, appointment, tenure, and periodic career review.

Changes to this Faculty Personnel Document (not including its appendices) must be presented and approved by the School of Dentistry's Faculty Personnel Committee and Faculty Assembly, the University Faculty Senate, Provost, President, and Board of Trustees.

To assign and properly evaluate faculty members for appointment, promotion, tenure or periodic career reviews, in the context of University, Unit and Department missions and goals, the following Unit documents must be maintained:

1. School of Dentistry Mission and Goals Statement: The Faculty Assembly of the School of Dentistry will develop, in concert with the Dean, a Mission and Goals Statement for the Unit. The Faculty Assembly will review this Mission and Goals Statement annually to assure its relevance. The Dean and the faculty are responsible for assuring that the School achieves its mission and goals.
2. Department Mission and Goals Statements: Each Department of the Unit will develop a Mission and Goals Statement that will define how the Department will systematically contribute to the accomplishment of the Unit's mission and goals. The Chair and faculty of each Department will review its Mission and Goals Statement annually to assure its relevance. The Department Chair will be responsible for assuring that the Department achieves its mission, goals and objectives.
3. Annual Work Plans (AWPs) and Annual Performance Reviews (APRs): The Dean, Department Chairs and Faculty Personnel Committee will contribute to development of forms (templates) for faculty AWP and APRs. The AWP will specify the individual faculty member's expected work outcomes (productivity) and their percent allocation of effort in teaching, research/creative activity, service, administration, intramural (faculty) practice and/or approved work outside the University (as applicable to the individual faculty member). The APR will evaluate the individual faculty member's performance in accomplishing the expectations and outcomes specified in that year's AWP.

Article 1: FACULTY APPOINTMENTS

Section 1: Classification of Faculty Appointments

A. Full-Time Academic Appointments

1. Definition:
Full-time faculty appointments are those with a 1.0 full-time equivalent (FTE) time commitment (i.e., 5 days per week) to the University.*
* Such definition shall not limit the application of the University of Louisville's definition of full-time status for purposes of benefits, and is intended only to define faculty status for purposes of appointment and the associated rights and obligations
2. The appointee shall sign a contract, approved by the Board of Trustees, stipulating that the appointment is made subject to the regulations, policies, and provisions of employment at the University of Louisville (and participation in the School of Dentistry Faculty Dental Practice) if the applicant is qualified to do so).
3. Term (Non-tenurable) Faculty Appointments
 - a. Definition:
All non-tenurable full-time faculty who are not "temporary" are "term". Term faculty are full-time faculty appointments without tenure for a stipulated contract period not to exceed three years. Such appointments are not probationary appointments as described in Section 4.1 of the *Redbook*, and no such appointments, continuation or renewal thereof shall result in acquisition of tenure or implied renewal for subsequent terms.
 - b. General Expectations:
 - i. Term faculty members must meet the standards and criteria described in this document for appointment to the titled rank, followed by the designation "Term".
 - ii. Term faculty will complete Annual Work Plans, receive Annual Performance Reviews, and are eligible for performance-based salary increase determinations based on achievement of their Annual Work Plans subject to University policy.
 - iii. Term faculty may apply for promotion in rank according to the criteria in this document.
 - iv. The Department Chair may assign workloads to term faculty that are not consistent with the general policy regarding probationary faculty workloads at the School of Dentistry described in this document. Specifically, term faculty workloads (i.e., Annual Work Plans) may be primarily or entirely for classroom teaching, clinical or pre-clinical supervision and teaching, research or service activities.
 - c. Before offering a term faculty appointment, the Department Chair and the Faculty Personnel Committee will review the credentials of each faculty candidate being considered for appointment and provide their written recommendations to the Dean concerning appropriate rank and any credit (when being reviewed for promotion) given for previous work and outcomes (i.e., teaching, scholarship, service) accomplished at this or other institutions prior to their appointment at the School of Dentistry.
 - d. The School of Dentistry establishes all term appointments through a contract. The contract sets forth the purpose of employment, duration of the contract, and the amount and method of compensation. Upon appointment, the Department Chair negotiates an Annual Work Plan (AWP), including specific duties and responsibilities, with the candidate before making a recommendation for appointment, subject to the Dean's approval. The Department Chair retains a copy of each contract in the Department and provides a copy to the Dean's office and to the faculty member.
 - e. The term appointment ends at the expiration of the contract. There is explicitly no guarantee of either continued employment or reappointment at the end of the period of

appointment. However, if it is mutually agreeable by both the faculty member and the School of Dentistry, the School may appoint an individual to a new term appointment.

- f. **Transfer to a Probationary (Tenure Track) Appointment:**
Faculty on term appointments shall be eligible to transfer to probationary (tenure track) appointments if they were not previously on a probationary appointment. The criteria for probationary appointments (and promotion to Associate Professor with tenure) are different from those of a term appointment. Therefore, work and outcomes accomplished during a term appointment do not automatically transfer to the new probationary appointment. The Provost's letter of appointment to probationary status states whether and to what extent time served in a term appointment applies as prior service counted toward the probationary period. A request for a transfer out of the probationary appointment and back into a non-tenurable status may be submitted by a probationary faculty member to their Department Chair at any time prior to the start of the tenure review process, and is subject to final approval by the Dean of the School of Dentistry. Transfer back to probationary status after that point is prohibited.

4. Probationary Appointments

a. Definition:

Probationary (tenure-track) appointments are appointments of full-time faculty members without tenure, but who will be eligible for tenure. Each probationary faculty member must be evaluated for tenure within twelve months after five years of service applied to tenure in accordance with the standards and criteria described in this document and Section 4.2.2.H of the *Redbook*.

- i. Before offering a probationary faculty appointment, the Departmental (Faculty Appointment) Review Committee, Department Chair and the Faculty Personnel Committee will review the credentials of each faculty candidate being considered for appointment and provide their written recommendations to the Dean concerning appropriate rank and any credit (when being reviewed for promotion and tenure) given for previous work and outcomes (i.e., teaching, scholarship, service) accomplished at this or other institutions prior to their appointment at the School of Dentistry.
- ii. At the time of initial probationary appointment, the Department Chair develops a Pre-Tenure Development Plan with the probationary faculty member as described in Appendix B, Section IV.A.1 of this document. This plan ensures adequate time to demonstrate proficiency in the three areas of teaching, scholarship and service.
- iii. No probationary appointment to the University shall extend beyond the period when tenure would normally be granted unless the probationary faculty member has been granted a leave of absence or an extension of the probationary period as described in Sections 4.2.2.B and 4.2.2.C of the *Redbook* and Appendix B, Section IV.B.4 of this document.
- iv. A request to transfer out of the probationary appointment into a non-tenurable status (e.g., a term appointment) may be submitted by a probationary faculty member to their Department Chair at any time prior to the start of the tenure review process and is subject to final approval by the Dean of the School of Dentistry. Transfer back to probationary status after that point is prohibited.

5. Tenure Appointments

a. Definition:

Tenure is the right of certain full-time faculty who hold academic rank to continuous full-time employment without reduction in academic rank until retirement or dismissal as provided in Section 4.5.3 of the *Redbook*. Tenure is granted in an academic unit (Section 3.1.1 of the *Redbook*) in accordance with the procedures established in Section 4.2.2.H. of the *Redbook*.

- i. **General Expectations:**

Tenured faculty members must continue their professional growth and maturation. Tenured faculty members should continue to contribute to the teaching, scholarship and service components of the University, as defined by the individual's Annual Work Plans.

- ii. Tenured Administrators:
Administrative personnel who have acquired tenure are subject to the regulations herein on tenure and the provisions governing termination only in their capacities as faculty members in their departments.
- b. Immediate Tenure on Appointment:
 - i. It is generally recommended that tenure not be granted as a condition of appointment; however, it is understood that for certain persons of exceptional merit who already have tenure at other universities, it is impractical to expect them to accept a faculty position at the University of Louisville without assurance of tenure. The *Redbook* gives the University the right to grant tenure at any stage: "Tenure may be granted at the time of initial appointment or in less than seven years when such action is warranted." (*Redbook*, Section 4.2.2.E.1).
 - ii. The Departmental (Faculty Appointment) Review Committee, Department Chair and the Faculty Personnel Committee must review the credentials of each faculty candidate being considered for immediate tenure on appointment, and will provide their written recommendations to the Dean concerning the appropriate rank for the appointment (i.e., Associate Professor or Professor), as well as a summary of the faculty candidate's qualifications in demonstrating the standards and criteria described in this document for the award of tenure.

B. Part-Time Academic Appointments

1. Definition:

Part-time appointments are those appointments which consist of less than a 1.0 FTE commitment to the University.*

* Such definition shall not limit the application of the University of Louisville's definition of part-time status for purposes of benefits, and is intended only to define faculty status for purposes of appointment and the associated rights and obligations

Part-time faculty members may hold academic rank commensurate with their education and experience, depending upon their time commitment to the University. Part-time faculty may 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.*

a. General Expectations:

- i. Part-time faculty members must meet the standards and criteria described in this document for appointment to the titled rank, prefaced by the designation "Clinical".
- ii. Part-time faculty will perform duties and meet expectations as specified in Annual Work Plans, receive Annual Performance Reviews, and are eligible for performance-based salary increase determinations based on accomplishment of the goals and expectations of their Annual Work Plans subject to University policy.
- iii. Expectations guiding Annual Performance Reviews of part-time faculty must be commensurate with the candidate's FTE percentage.
- iv. Part-time faculty may apply for promotion in rank according to the criteria in this document.
- v. The Department Chair may assign workloads to part-time faculty that are not consistent with the general policy regarding probationary faculty workloads at the School of Dentistry described in this document. Specifically, part-time faculty workloads (i.e., Annual Work Plans) may be primarily or entirely for classroom teaching, clinical or pre-clinical supervision and teaching, research or service activities.

- vi. Part-time faculty members should be available for departmental activities such as orientation or calibration sessions, and faculty meetings that occur at times other than their normally scheduled time at the University.
- b. The academic qualifications for appointment to a part-time faculty position in the School of Dentistry shall be the same as those for full-time academic appointments. No such appointment, continuation, or renewal thereof shall result in acquisition of tenure or implied renewal for subsequent periods
- c. The School of Dentistry establishes all part-time appointments through a contract. This contract sets forth the purpose of employment, duration of the contract and amount and method of compensation. Before recommendation of appointment, the Department Chair negotiates specific duties and responsibilities with the candidate for inclusion in the contract. The Chair recommends all part-time faculty contracts for approval by the Dean and in compliance with the *Redbook*. The Chair retains a copy of each contract in the Department and provides a copy to the faculty member.
- d. Part-time faculty members may qualify for certain benefits as authorized by the University. They may schedule time for continuing education and other professional activities contingent upon approval by the Departmental Chair. They negotiate time off (paid or unpaid) with the Chair in the Annual Work Plan, subject to University policy.
- e. The School of Dentistry may renew a part-time faculty member's appointment if the Dean determines that the Unit needs the services of the incumbent for the renewal period, and if the part-time faculty member agrees to the conditions of employment for the anticipated contract. Satisfactory outcomes in the areas of the Annual Work Plan, as documented in the faculty member's Annual Performance Review, must be used as the basis for reappointment and/or contract renewal.

C. Temporary (Non-tenurable, Lecturer) Appointments

1. Definition:
Temporary appointments at the rank of Lecturer are those made for a specifically limited time period of one year or less for visiting faculty or special purposes.
2. General Expectations:
The Lecturer must possess academic and/or professional qualifications commensurate with their work assignment at the School of Dentistry.
3. The School of Dentistry establishes all temporary faculty appointments through a contract. This contract sets forth the purpose of employment, duration of the contract and amount and method of compensation. The Department Chair negotiates specific duties and responsibilities with the candidate before recommendation of appointment. The Chair recommends all temporary faculty contracts for approval by the Dean. The Chair retains a copy of each contract in the Department and provides a copy to the faculty member.
4. In no case shall temporary appointments or renewals as a Lecturer result in the acquisition of tenure or eligibility for promotion in rank.
5. Lecturers must meet with their Department Chair for orientation before beginning their assigned work activities at the School of Dentistry. This orientation may include guidance for syllabus preparation, examination schedules, and clinical procedures and policies.

D. Joint and Associate Appointments

1. Definition:
Faculty may have additional appointments outside their primary department (their primary appointment) or in other units of the University.

- a. Joint appointments require that faculty member's Annual Work Plan include a percent effort in the joint (secondary) department and this percent effort must have equivalent associated salary originating from the secondary department. Annual Performance Reviews and other career reviews (mid-tenure, tenure, promotion, and periodic), as applicable for the faculty member are performed in the primary and secondary departments (or units).
- b. Associate appointments do not entail salary commitments. Criteria for appointment as an associate in a department shall be stipulated by the department. Examples of criteria for associate membership include contributions by associate faculty in teaching, mentoring of students, and research collaborations.
- c. Any faculty member from another unit applying for a joint appointment in the School of Dentistry must submit credentials (e.g., *curriculum vitae*) to the School of Dentistry Faculty Personnel Committee for their review and recommendation to the Dean. The faculty member negotiates duties and responsibilities within the School of Dentistry with the Chair of the department where they hold the joint appointment.

E. Emeritus Appointments

1. Definition:
The Emeritus appointment recognizes a history of outstanding teaching, service, or scholarship by a member of the faculty who has retired from the University. To qualify for Emeritus appointment, a faculty member must have held the rank of (term or tenured) Associate Professor or above for a minimum of five years and had a minimum of 15 years of full-time experience in higher education (or 20 years of experience for part-time faculty members).
2. Another full-time member of the department faculty or the Chair of the department where the emeritus faculty candidate last served may submit a recommendation for an emeritus faculty appointment along with supporting documents (e.g., the nominee's *curriculum vitae*) to the Faculty Personnel Committee for their review, who then forward their recommendation to the Dean for his/her review, and then subsequently to the Provost, President, and Board of Trustees for their approval.

F. Gratis Appointments

1. Definition:
Gratis appointments are unpaid faculty positions that support the teaching, service or research missions and goals of the School of Dentistry.
2. General Expectations:
Candidates for Gratis appointments must actively show a commitment to the educational, research or service missions of the Unit, maintain a professional license in good standing with appropriate regulatory Boards (if applicable), and must maintain a personal profile that positively reflects the School of Dentistry.
3. Gratis faculty appointments can be held at the ranks of Instructor, Assistant Professor, Associate Professor and Professor, and are prefaced by the designation "Adjunct".
4. Gratis faculty appointments must be based in departments and are non-tenurable.
5. Gratis appointments and promotions are approved by the Dean (or their designee) and do not require review by the Faculty Personnel Committee.

6. The term of the initial gratis appointment is at the discretion of the department Chair, but must not exceed three years for the rank of Instructor and five years for all other ranks. Reappointments may be made at the same maximum terms as initial appointments.
7. A gratis faculty appointment may be discontinued at any time for any reason that is not arbitrary or capricious. The gratis faculty member may appeal the decision through the University grievance process (*Redbook*, Article 4.4, "Resolution of Faculty Disputes").

Section 2: Initial Faculty Appointments

A. General Considerations

1. Initial appointments for all term, probationary or tenured faculty must be reviewed by the School of Dentistry Faculty Personnel Committee for their recommendation of appropriate rank and any credit (when being reviewed for promotion) given for previous work and outcomes (i.e., teaching, scholarship, service) accomplished at this or other institutions prior to their appointment at the School of Dentistry), as applicable, before recommendation for appointment by the Dean.
2. The fundamental criteria for the various ranks for initial faculty appointments must be equivalent to the criteria for the corresponding promotion in rank for current School of Dentistry faculty.
3. Part-time faculty titles are prefaced by the designation "Clinical" before the rank. Term faculty titles are followed by the designation "Term" before the rank. Gratis faculty titles are prefaced are prefaced by the designation "Adjunct" before their rank.

B: Criteria for the Initial Appointment of Faculty

1. **Instructor:**
The candidate must possess a terminal degree in their field appropriate to their proposed academic responsibilities. Appointment at the rank of Instructor at the School of Dentistry is typically reserved for Gratis (Adjunct) faculty only.
2. **Term or Part-time Assistant Professor:**
The candidate must possess a terminal degree in their field appropriate to their proposed academic responsibilities. In addition, the candidate will have (typically at least one year) experience in teaching, scholarship or service; or have advanced professional training (degrees or post-graduate certificates) or equivalent professional (clinical practice) experience.
3. **Probationary (Tenure Track) Assistant Professor:**
All the criteria for the Term or Part-Time Assistant Professor's appointment apply. In addition, the candidate will have adequate professional and/or academic training, experience and qualifications so as to facilitate and enable their successful promotion to Associate Professor and tenure. At the time of their review for promotion to Associate Professor and tenure, the candidate will be expected to demonstrate excellence in the area of their major allocation effort (i.e., teaching, scholarship or service) of their proposed academic responsibilities, and proficiency in the two remaining areas as described Article 3, Section 2.B.2.
4. **Term or Part-time Associate Professor:**
The candidate must possess a terminal degree in their field appropriate to their proposed academic responsibilities. In addition, the candidate will usually have at least five years full-time experience (or its part-time equivalent) as an Assistant Professor or Associate Professor (or its equivalent). The candidate will have clear documentation of work and outcomes that

demonstrate excellence (as defined in this document) in the area of their major allocation of effort (i.e., teaching, scholarship or service), and proficiency in any other area(s) where they have had a significant allocation of effort.

5. Associate Professor with Tenure:

The candidate must possess a terminal degree in their field appropriate to their proposed academic responsibilities. In addition, the candidate will usually have at least five years full-time experience as an Assistant Professor or Associate Professor (or its equivalent). Having been awarded tenure at a previous university is highly indicative of the requisite level of academic achievement a tenured faculty appointment at the School of Dentistry, but is not sufficient grounds alone for granting a tenured faculty appointment. Therefore, the candidate will have clear documentation of work and outcomes that demonstrate excellence (as defined in this document) in the area of their major allocation of effort (i.e., teaching, scholarship or service) of their proposed academic responsibilities, and proficiency in the two remaining areas. The candidate should also exhibit the potential for attaining extra-university recognition of excellence in their primary area of allocation of effort.

6. Term or Part-Time Professor:

The candidate must possess a terminal degree in their field appropriate to their proposed academic responsibilities. In addition, the candidate will usually have at least five years full-time experience as an Associate Professor or Professor (or its equivalent). The candidate will have a record of work and outcomes that demonstrate sustained excellence (as defined in this document) in his/her field of professional expertise (i.e., their primary area of allocation of effort in teaching, scholarship or service), and proficiency in any other area(s) where they have had a significant allocation of effort. They will show extra-university recognition of excellence by peers for their work in teaching, scholarship or service. The candidate must exhibit the promise of continued professional excellence to the fulfillment of the School's and the Department's mission.

7. Professor with Tenure:

The candidate must possess a terminal degree in their field appropriate to their proposed academic responsibilities. In addition, the candidate will usually have at least five years full-time experience as an Associate Professor or Professor (or its equivalent). The candidate will have a tenured faculty appointment if they are currently serving at a University that grants tenure. The candidate will have a record of work and outcomes that demonstrate continuing, sustained excellence (as defined in this document) in primarily teaching and/or scholarship (research/creative activity), and proficiency in other areas. They will show extra-university recognition of excellence by peers for their work in teaching and/or scholarship. The candidate must exhibit the promise of continued professional excellence to the fulfillment of the School's and the Department's mission.

ARTICLE 2: CONDITIONS OF FACULTY EMPLOYMENT

Section 1: Annual Work Plans

All full-time (term, probationary, tenured) and part-time faculty members must have an approved Annual Work Plan (AWP). The AWP must be in concurrence with the Department and Unit missions and goals. The Dean, upon the recommendation of the appropriate Department Chair, approves AWP's for each calendar year. The Department Chair works with individual faculty members to develop AWP's to meet the Departmental mission and to encourage faculty members' individual professional development. The Dean makes the final decisions for the approval of all faculty AWP's. The AWP contains a list of the planned activities, expected time commitments (i.e., percentage of effort), and expected outcomes of the individual

faculty member for the upcoming year. The Chair retains the AWP in the Departmental files, and provides a copy of the AWP to the faculty member and the Dean's office.

The Department Chair is responsible for specific Annual Work Plan negotiations, Annual Performance Reviews, periodic career reviews, and reviews for promotion in rank. The Chair assigns and evaluates teaching, scholarship, service and other activities. If a faculty member elects to spend a significant portion of time working in an officially (University) designated Center, then the Chair may work with the Center Director in negotiating an AWP for the portion of the faculty member's time committed to the Center. In these circumstances, the faculty member negotiates with the Departmental Chair how much time they will devote to each participating Center. The Center Director negotiates specific duties and expected outcomes with the Departmental Chair within the general time assigned and evaluates the outcomes of the faculty member's efforts for that time. The Center Director must then send those evaluations to the appropriate Departmental Chairs in time for the faculty member's review. The faculty member's AWP must state the allocation of time devoted to work at the Center and method of evaluation to be used by the Center Director.

The procedures, policies and guidelines for Annual Work Plans are described in Appendix B, Section I of this document.

Section 2: Compensation (Performance-Based Salary Increases)

- A. The salary increase pool includes the monies that are available for distribution to all faculty members who are subject to the provisions of this document. This includes probationary, tenured, term and part-time faculty members. Faculty members are rewarded with salary increases based upon accomplishment. Therefore, the documentation developed for the Annual Performance Review (APR) is the basis for performance-based salary increases. This compensation plan is subject to University guidelines for each fiscal year.
- B. Only faculty members whose overall performance is judged to be satisfactory or above (based on their Annual Performance Review) will receive a salary increase (provided the University has allocated funds for salary increases that year). The amount of increase will be appropriate to the performance and size of the pool for salary increases for a given year.
- C. A recommendation by the Dean for a zero salary increase for a faculty member must be submitted for approval of the Executive Vice President and University Provost. This recommendation shall include the reasons for the zero salary increase and specific suggestions for improving any performance considered to be unsatisfactory. Simultaneously, a copy of the recommendation shall be given to the faculty member involved (*Redbook*, "Minimum Guidelines for Faculty Personnel Reviews", Section III.B.2). The process for a faculty member to appeal an unsatisfactory Annual Performance Review (and corresponding recommendation by the Dean for a zero salary increase) is described in Appendix B, Section II.B of this document.

Section 3: Work Outside the University

- A. Full-time faculty members may conduct compensated or non-compensated professional activities up to the equivalent of one day per week of assigned time, averaged throughout the number of weeks of their employment in a given year (*Redbook*, Section 4.3.3, "Work Outside the University"). This work must be approved by the Dean as appropriate to the faculty member's expertise and the mission of the University, and cannot conflict or interfere with the faculty member's schedule of assignments and responsibilities at the University. This excludes the practice of dentistry, which must be conducted in School of Dentistry's affiliated clinics (e.g., University of Louisville Dental Associates).

- B. The amount of time a faculty member may devote to the practice of dentistry within the School of Dentistry's clinics will be determined each year in consultation with, and approval by, their Department Chair, and specified in the faculty member's Annual Work Plan. The Annual Performance Review must report and outline any approved work outside the University (including the practice of dentistry within the School of Dentistry's clinics) that time has been allocated for in the corresponding Annual Work Plan.

Section 4: Other Conditions of Faculty Employment

The *Redbook* describes other conditions of employment in Article 4.3.

ARTICLE 3: FACULTY PERSONNEL REVIEWS

Section 1: Annual Performance Reviews

All full-time and part-time faculty members must complete an Annual Work Plan (AWP) and meet with their Department Chair for an Annual Performance Review (APR) in order to assess their accomplishment of the AWP. A faculty member is evaluated on their performance as reflected in the activities that were accomplished over the year, as compared to the activities planned in the AWP. These APRs are the basis for all other personnel decisions, including performance-based salary increases, promotion, tenure and periodic career reviews. (The Dean's office [with consultation of the Faculty Personnel Committee] develops and maintains standard forms for the Annual Work Plan and Annual Performance Review which all departments in the Unit use.)

The procedures, policies, and guidelines for performing Annual Performance Reviews are described in Appendix B, Section II of this document.

Section 2: Promotion in Rank

B. Criteria for Promotion

Length of time in rank by itself does not make a faculty member eligible for promotion. Acceptable Annual Performance Reviews alone are not sufficient evidence for promotion, although they are clearly indicative and supportive. The faculty member must meet the criteria for promotion for the rank sought.

1. Promotion to Associate Professor for (non-tenurable) Term or Part-Time Faculty:
The candidate will have clear documentation of work and outcomes that demonstrates excellence in the area of the highest percent (major) allocation of effort in their Annual Work Plans (i.e., teaching, scholarship or service), and proficiency in any other area(s) where they have had a significant (typically defined as 10% or more) allocation of effort. (*Criteria for excellence and proficiency in each area is defined in Appendix A*). The candidate should also exhibit the potential for attaining extra-university recognition of excellence in the area of their major allocation of effort. A full five years of service as an Assistant Professor is normally the minimum time needed to adequately demonstrate the criteria required for promotion to the rank of Term or Clinical (part-time) Associate Professor.
2. Promotion to Associate Professor with Tenure:
The candidate will have clear documentation of work and outcomes that demonstrates excellence in the area of the highest percent (major) allocation of effort in their Annual Work Plans (i.e., teaching, scholarship or service), and proficiency in the two remaining areas.

- *For example, a candidate with a major allocation of effort in teaching must demonstrate excellence in teaching, and proficiency in both scholarship and service. (Criteria for excellence and proficiency in each area are defined in Appendix A).* The candidate should also exhibit the potential for attaining extra-university recognition of excellence in their primary area of allocation of effort.

Probationary faculty must be evaluated for promotion and tenure by the School of Dentistry Faculty Personnel Committee before the end of twelve months after five years of service applied to tenure. Probationary faculty have the option to apply once for early promotion and tenure as described in Appendix B, Section IV.B.3 of this document.

3. Promotion to Professor for (non-tenurable) Term or Part-time Faculty:
Promotion to Term or Clinical (part-time) Professor should be awarded with care and only to those who demonstrate further (additional) evidence of excellence (*beyond that required for promotion to associate professor*) in the area of the highest percent (major) allocation of effort in their Annual Work Plans and proficiency in any other area(s) where they have had a significant (typically defined as 10% or more) allocation of effort. (*Criteria for excellence and proficiency in each area is defined in Appendix A*). Specifically, evidence of extra-university recognition by peers for their work in their field of expertise is required for promotion to Term or Clinical (part-time) Professor. The candidate also must exhibit the promise of continued professional excellence in the fulfillment of the School's and the Department's mission. A full five years of service as an Associate Professor is normally the minimum time needed to adequately demonstrate the criteria required for promotion to the rank of Term or Clinical (part-time) Professor.
4. Promotion to (Tenured) Professor:
Promotion to professor should be awarded with care and only to those who demonstrate further (additional) evidence of excellence (*beyond that required for promotion to associate professor*) in the area of the highest percent (major) allocation of effort in their Annual Work Plans, and proficiency in all other area(s) of their work plan where they have had a significant (typically defined as 10% or more) allocation of effort. (*Criteria for excellence and proficiency in each area is defined in Appendix A*). Specifically, evidence of extra-university recognition by peers for their work in their field of expertise is required for promotion to Professor. In addition, evidence of scholarship must be demonstrated at the time of promotion review. The candidate must also exhibit the promise of continued professional excellence in the fulfillment of the School's and the Department's mission. A full five years of service as an Associate Professor with tenure is normally the minimum time needed to adequately demonstrate the criteria required for promotion to the rank of (tenured) Professor.
5. Tenure (for tenurable appointments):
Tenure decisions almost always (though not necessarily) coincide with promotion to the rank of Associate Professor for probationary faculty. The criteria for the award of tenure are essentially the same as those previously described for "Promotion to Associate Professor with Tenure" in Article 3, Section 2.B.2.
6. Promotion of Gratis Faculty:
Promotion of gratis faculty is initiated at the Departmental level and does not require review by the School of Dentistry Faculty Personnel Committee. These promotions are reviewed by the Dean (or their designee). Since gratis faculty are not required to have Annual Work Plans or Annual Performance Reviews the criteria for promotion of gratis faculty are analogous to those described in this document for the initial appointment of non-tenurable faculty in rank. A full five years of service in rank is normally the minimum time needed to demonstrate the criteria required for promotion in rank for gratis faculty.

B. Responsibilities in the Promotion in Rank Process

An essential requirement of the promotion in rank process is the principle of one vote per person involved in the promotion review/evaluation for a faculty member, (e.g., if a member of the Internal Review Committee or the Department Chair of a candidate for promotion is also a voting member of the Faculty Personnel Committee, they are prohibited from voting on the promotion recommendation for the candidate made by the Faculty Personnel Committee).

The Dean's office, Department Chair and the Faculty member (promotion candidate) have specific responsibilities in the process for promotion in rank.

1. Administration's Responsibility

- a. The School of Dentistry Dean's office must inform all faculty members of the criteria for appointment, promotion, tenure and periodic career reviews at the time of their initial appointment to the School of Dentistry faculty.
- b. The School of Dentistry Dean's office must inform all faculty no later than January 31 of each year of the deadline for a faculty member to submit a letter of intent to apply for promotion to their Department Chair, as well as the deadline for all promotion and/or tenure review documents to be submitted to the School of Dentistry Dean's office.
- c. The successful candidate for promotion will receive the customary University salary increase for promotion in rank in addition to any performance-based salary increase earned for the year.

2. Department Chair's Responsibility

- a. The Department Chair has the obligation to guide and assist faculty members in their professional development and progress toward promotion (and, if applicable, tenure, and periodic career review). The Department Chair must ensure that faculty members are allocated adequate time and opportunities in their Annual Work Plans to accomplish the outcomes and requirements for successful promotion, and advise each faculty member of their progress toward promotion during the Annual Performance Review.
- b. The Department Chair must inform all departmental faculty no later than February 28 of each year of the deadline for them to submit their documents in support of promotion and/or tenure (herein referred to as the "P/T file") to the Chair's office.
- c. The Department Chair is responsible for initiating the promotion and tenure review for all probationary (tenure track) faculty in their department in a timely manner in accordance with the University's schedule for the submission of the P/T file. Each faculty member eligible for tenure must be evaluated within twelve months after five years of service applied to tenure (*Redbook*, Section 4.2.2.H.1.), or earlier, as specified in the Provost's letter of their appointment to probationary status.

3. Faculty Member's Responsibility

With the exception of probationary faculty, it is the individual faculty member's responsibility to initiate a request for a review for promotion in rank. The faculty member is responsible for preparing and compiling information that supports their petition for promotion (i.e. the P/T file).

The procedure for Promotion in Rank Reviews is described in Appendix B, Section III of this document.

Section 3: Supplementary Procedures for the Review of Probationary (tenure-track) Faculty for Promotion

The evaluation of a probationary faculty member for tenure is essentially identical to, and corresponds with, the evaluation for promotion to the rank of Associate Professor in the vast majority of circumstances. The additional procedures for the review for probationary faculty for promotion with the award of tenure include the requirements for a Pre-Tenure Development Plan and a Mid-Tenure Review.

Supplementary procedures for the review of probationary (tenure-track) faculty for promotion are described in Appendix B, Section IV of this document.

Section 4: Periodic Career Reviews

A. Tenured Faculty Members

All tenured faculty members undergo a periodic (five-year) review of their performance. This review consists of an evaluation of the faculty member's contribution to the missions of the University, School of Dentistry, and their Department over the last five years. When the Periodic Career Review cycle ends in a sabbatical (or other leave) year, the Periodic Career Review shall be deferred until the next academic year. Periodic Career Reviews are separate from reviews for promotion in rank, except that a review for promotion in rank replaces a Periodic Career Review for the period in which the promotion occurs. Periodic Career Reviews must take into account, and be commensurate with, the faculty member's allocation of effort as indicated in their Annual Work Plans and Annual Performance Reviews. While satisfactory Annual Performance Reviews alone are not sufficient grounds for attainment of a satisfactory Periodic Career Review, they are strongly supportive. The Periodic Career Review process shall not extend beyond the Office of the Dean of the School of Dentistry, but the results of such reviews shall be reported annually to the Office of the Vice President for Health Affairs for transmission to the University Provost.

The procedure for performing Periodic Career Reviews is described in Appendix B, Section V of this document.

B. Term and Part-Time Faculty Members

For faculty members with term or part-time appointments, the Annual Performance Review of their Annual Work Plan serves as their Periodic Career Review. A "satisfactory" Annual Performance Review of their Annual Work Plan with renewal of their contract (if applicable) demonstrates a "satisfactory" Periodic Career Review.

C. Administrative Faculty

All Department Chairs, as well as Assistant and Associate Deans that are tenured undergo Periodic (five-year) Career Reviews in a manner consistent with other tenured faculty as described in this document. However, the Unit Dean serves the role of the Department Chair for the Periodic Career Reviews of tenured Department Chairs.

Appendix A to the ULSD Faculty Personnel Document

Definitions and Examples of Proficiency and Excellence in Teaching, Scholarship and Service

INTRODUCTION

The contents of this Appendix cannot be changed without a positive, majority vote of the School of Dentistry's Faculty Personnel Committee and Faculty Assembly of the School of Dentistry.

For this purposes of this document, "Proficiency" is defined as demonstrating competence. The proficient faculty member is adept at performing the functions and applying specific skills required for competence in a given area. Proficiency does not necessarily imply expertise, but rather the ability to complete the given tasks independently at a satisfactory level of performance as determined by one's peers.

For this purposes of this document, "Excellence" is defined as superiority in skill and achievement. To demonstrate excellence, the faculty member must clearly surpass the baseline of proficiency in a given area, in quantity and quality. They must document the ability to work independently and to produce significant work and outcomes that (intramural and extramural) peers recognize for being exemplary in the field.

Below are the definitions of, and criteria for, proficiency and excellence in the areas of teaching, scholarship (including research and creative activity) and service. Excellence and proficiency in these areas include community-engaged scholarship, a form of scholarship that encompasses activities in teaching, research, and service for the mutual benefit of external audiences and the University. Examples of community-engaged scholarship include community-based research, service-learning, development of educational enrichment programs for the public, youth services, public health outreach, and health education.

I. Teaching

A. Definition of Teaching

Teaching in dentistry is defined as a form of active communication that fosters learning and critical thinking skills, including direct teaching and the creation of instructional materials to be used in one's own teaching.

The teacher must possess, maintain and display an accurate and current knowledge of the subject area. Maintenance of currency of knowledge is dependent on continuous review of relevant information sources, continuing independent activity in the specific discipline(s), and by scholarly pursuit in the area. Continuous development and assessment of educational materials and systems are necessary to develop and maintain efficient and effective courses for dental education. Effective teaching transforms and extends dental knowledge, makes learning interesting and relevant, generates respect for the discipline, and the larger profession of dentistry, and motivates the student to lifelong learning.

B. Examples of Teaching

Examples of teaching include classroom lectures, workshops, small group facilitation, demonstration of procedural skills, role modeling in any setting (such as clinical supervision and instruction), advising, mentoring, or providing formative feedback to students, development of new courses and teaching methods (such as distance or on-line learning and instructional technology

improvements), and off-site service-learning initiatives, course work development and participation.

C. Evaluation of Teaching

In order to perform an accurate, valid evaluation of teaching effectiveness the faculty member must have had an adequate amount of course responsibility and/or student contact. All reviews of teaching effectiveness should include a summary of the faculty member's teaching assignments (course directorships, and participation, clinical teaching assignments, and so forth, as indicated in their Annual Work Plans and Annual Performance Evaluations). Teaching load alone, however, will not be the primary factor for evaluation of teaching effectiveness.

Teaching effectiveness is best evaluated by a combination of outcomes assessment, collegial (peer) assessment, self-evaluation, and student opinion of teaching effectiveness. Specific outcomes used in the evaluation of teaching may include, but are not limited to:

1. Student performance on national, regional or specialty board examinations.
2. Faculty (peer) evaluations of the currency, appropriateness and effectiveness of educational materials, assessments, methods and innovation.
3. Faculty (peer) evaluations of instruction (e.g., lecture presentations; clinical teaching, demonstrations, instruction, or supervision; etc.).
4. Student course and teaching evaluations.
5. Evidence of stimulation of critical thinking skills among students.
6. Inclusion of evidence-based decision-making and/or evidence-based clinical practice models in teaching.
7. Coordination of interdisciplinary and/or interprofessional knowledge (interdisciplinary / interprofessional teaching and program development within and across units of the University).
8. Documentation of mentoring graduate, research or postdoctoral students.
9. Documentation of academic advising and counseling students.
10. Development of curricula or curricular models.
11. Development and/or evaluation of new educational assessment methodologies.
12. Incorporation of new teaching technology or an evidence-based educational module into a curriculum.
13. Development of service-learning initiatives (i.e., a teaching and learning strategy that integrates meaningful community service with instruction and reflection to enrich the learning experience, teach civic responsibility, and strengthen communities).
14. Development of programs or materials for public health education, outreach and awareness.

D. Proficiency in Teaching

Proficiency in teaching is best demonstrated by a documented didactic, pre-clinical and/or clinical teaching assignment and satisfactory supervisory (i.e., Department Chair, Discipline Coordinator, and/or Team Leader), faculty (peer), and learner (e.g., student, resident) evaluations of the teaching assignment. This evidence should include the number of evaluations collected and should summarize the results, including recipient comments when available.

Additional evidence of proficiency in other areas of teaching/educator activity may be considered, for example, engaging in structured mentoring or advising activities, developing new instructional or curricular materials, evidence of learning and participation in interdisciplinary teaching efforts.

E. Excellence in Teaching

1. Demonstration of Excellence in Teaching for Promotion to (Tenured, Term, or Part-time [Clinical]) Associate Professor

Excellence in teaching is demonstrated by a documented substantial teaching assignment with a major responsibility for (i.e., leadership role in) a teaching program combined with

outstanding supervisory (i.e., Department Chair, Discipline Coordinator, and/or Team Leader), faculty (peer), and learner (e.g., student, resident) evaluations of the teaching assignments. Description of the faculty member's major responsibility for a teaching program should include concise descriptions of the frequency and duration of the responsibility, outcomes, and evaluations of those outcomes. Evidence of exemplary educational outcome measures (e.g., national dental board exam [NDBE] scores, alumni surveys, and so forth) and a record of outstanding, superior accomplishments (as described in Section I.C of this Appendix) in assigned teaching activities are also highly supportive in demonstrating excellence in teaching.

Additional evidence of excellence in other areas of educator/teaching activity may be considered. For example, receiving an award for teaching, engaging in structured mentoring or advising activities, developing new instructional or curricular materials, evidence of learning and critical thinking skills and participation in interdisciplinary teaching efforts may all be considered. Descriptions of the quantity and quality of these educator activities should demonstrate excellence.

2. Demonstration of Excellence in Teaching for Promotion to (Tenured, Term, or Part-time [Clinical]) Professor:

In addition to the requirements listed above for the demonstration of excellence in teaching, extra-university recognition of excellence in teaching is also required and must be evidenced by (but not limited to) extramural recommendation letters.

Additional examples of indicators of extra-university (national) recognition of excellence in teaching may include:

1. Evidence of the use (adoption) of teaching methods, assessments and/or materials (developed by the faculty member) by other educational institutions.
2. Election or appointment to regional or national accrediting teams or participation in dental (specialty) board review or test development committees (e.g., NDBE).
3. Election or appointment to a leadership position in a related national teaching organization (e.g., ADEA).
4. Evidence of extramural curriculum development, advising or mentoring.
5. Convening/chairing a national or regional conference focused on education
6. Invitation to critically appraise or evaluate an educational activity at another institution.
7. Invited presentation on dental education, teaching, assessment, outcomes or curriculum at a national meeting.
8. Receiving a teaching award from a related regional or national organization.
9. Leadership role in a regional or national conference or in a multidisciplinary intramural conference on education or clinical care.
10. Active service on a regional or national committee or a board related to clinical care or dental education.

II. Scholarship (Research and Creative Activity)

A. Definition of Scholarship (Research and Creative Activity)

Scholarship and creative activity is the generation, documentation and dissemination of ideas and new knowledge. Inquiry into the science and practice of dentistry may include scholarly activity in the biological, physical, behavioral and clinical sciences. It may include the discovery of new knowledge (research) in the laboratory, in the classroom, or community, or may involve the investigation of new patient treatment methods or materials. The faculty member may also demonstrate scholarship through the dissemination of knowledge, methods or techniques to the profession through peer-reviewed publications, texts, monographs, or reports. The individual's pursuit of advanced training, certification or credentials shows continuing scholarship of the individual.

B. Examples of Scholarship (Research and Creative Activity)

Evidence of scholarship, research or creative activity can be presented in several ways. The faculty member is encouraged to submit material subjected to peer review, such as peer-reviewed journal publications and extramural grants.

Primary Scholarly Outcomes are major works that represent significant evidence of scholarly activity and consist of:

1. Publications in nationally recognized (e.g., included in PubMed) peer-reviewed journals. (This includes original research findings, systematic literature reviews, technical reports, case reports or any other publications relevant to dentistry or dental education).
2. Primary or co-investigator for an extramurally funded grant or contract obtained through peer-reviewed mechanisms (e.g., NIH-NIDCR, NSF).
3. Published books or texts (or chapters in texts) in the faculty member's field of expertise.
4. Patents.

Secondary Scholarly Outcomes are less indicative than primary outcomes as evidence of scholarly work. Nevertheless, they contribute to the demonstration of scholarly activity. Examples may include, (but are not limited to):

1. Serving as an extramural grant reviewer or study section member.
2. Peer-reviewed and non-peer-reviewed media publications, including, but not limited to, text, web-based (e.g., MedEdPORTAL) and CD-ROM.
3. Publications in professional, non-peer-reviewed journals.
4. Publications in the proceedings of a scientific meeting or professional organization.
5. Editorship or serving on the editorial board of a nationally recognized (e.g., included in PubMed) peer-reviewed journal.
6. Primary or co-investigator for an intramurally funded grant or gifts-in-kind.
7. Invited presentations at local, national and international meetings and symposia (including posters, oral presentations and continuing education courses).
8. Invited presentations of clinical cases.
9. Consultantships and invited expert opinions.
10. Completing graduate degrees, receiving postdoctoral training (certificates), or board certification.
11. Adoption of original educational materials or assessments (developed by the faculty member) by other educational institutions.
12. Receiving an award or other recognition for excellence in research from a national organization.
13. Other entrepreneurial activities as outlined in the Annual Work Plan.
14. Leadership or substantial role in a quality improvement project that documents effectiveness or leads to improved processes, clinical care, or outcomes.
15. Leadership role in the development or revision of evidence-based clinical practice procedures, guidelines, or treatment algorithms.
16. Evidence-based consultation to public officials at community, regional, state, or national venues.
17. Substantial contribution to a local or national clinical trial (i.e., patient recruitments, data collection, other documentable contributions that are important but do not result in authorship).
18. Evidence-based development or revision of organizational policy.

C. Evaluation of Scholarship (Research and Creative Activity)

Collaborative research activities are considered appropriate and desirable in the academic setting and are to be considered an integral part of the record of scholarly outcomes by the faculty

member. The faculty bases this philosophy, in part, on the belief that multiple interested individuals working in cooperation can, through shared insight and pooled effort, render effective and thorough attention to scholastic endeavors. Furthermore, we see the encouragement of joint scholastic projects as advancing the spirit of academic cooperation and interchange of ideas between individuals of different backgrounds, disciplines, units and areas of expertise. Therefore, the order of authorship (or other alleged ranking of effort) is not the sole determining factor in the evaluation of the quality or quantity of publications in promotion or tenure review decisions, but being listed as a primary (senior) author is preferable since it more clearly indicates an individual's actual contribution to a publication. Similarly, principal investigators on multiple-principal-investigator grants will be rewarded commensurately to those on single-principal-investigator grants.

The quality of the journal and the impact of the publication on the field should be given greater consideration than order of authorship in the evaluation of the quality and quantity of scholarly activity. For example, an exception to the expected amount of productivity in peer-reviewed publications (as specified in the Annual Work Plans) can be made if the publications during the review period are in exceptionally high ranking journals of international acclaim. Intramural reviewers of scholarly activity should also weigh them as to their importance in contributing to the School of Dentistry's mission, the completion of the faculty member's Annual Work Plans, and the promise of future scholarly contributions by the faculty member to the University.

D. Proficiency in Scholarship (Research and Creative Activity)

1. The expected quantity of outcomes of scholarship is commensurate with the allocation of effort assigned to these activities in the faculty member's Annual Work Plans. The faculty member is expected to achieve an annual average of one Primary Scholarly Outcome per day per week devoted to scholarly activities. For example, a probationary (full-time, tenure-track) faculty member with a 20% allocation of effort for scholarship would be expected to have an average of at least one peer-reviewed publication in nationally recognized (e.g., included in PubMed) journals per year. As described in Section II.C of this Appendix, quality of publications should be considered in addition to their quantity. Also, it is recommended (but not required) that the faculty member be the primary author on the majority of these publications to the degree possible. While Secondary Scholarly Outcomes augment the demonstration of proficiency in scholarly activity, they cannot be used as a substitute for the expectations for productivity of Primary Scholarly Outcomes for individuals with greater than or equal to 20% allocation of effort for scholarship in their Annual Work Plans.
2. Reviews by collaborators, peers and external reviewers must also be obtained and should indicate satisfactory performance compared to others at the same stage of their career.

E. Excellence in Scholarship (Research and Creative Activity)

1. Demonstration of Excellence in Scholarship (Research and Creative Activity) for Promotion to (Tenured, Term, or Part-time [Clinical]) Associate Professor:

The expected quantity of outcomes of scholarship is commensurate with the allocation of effort assigned to these activities in the faculty member's Annual Work Plans. The faculty member is expected to achieve an annual average of one Primary Scholarly Outcome per day per week devoted to scholarly activities. A leadership role on federally funded entrepreneurial peer-reviewed grants or contracts for technology development linked to the University, and of demonstrable value to the mission and goals of the University, can be considered as contributing to excellence in research, but is not, alone, sufficient to meet these criteria. Additionally, in order to demonstrate excellence the individual must have:

- a. A major responsibility for an independent research program:
This includes current extramural funding, with federal funding as principal investigator, including principal investigator on a multi-principal investigator grant, preferred.

Alternatively, nationally peer-reviewed funding via multi-year significant grants as principal investigator may be acceptable.

- i. For promotion to Associate Professor, an exception to the requirement for current extramural funding as principal investigator can be made if there is documentation of such funding within the past two years of review, and there is evidence (as assessed and presented by the Department Chair) of the likelihood of future funding. This assessment should include, but is not limited to, reviews of recently submitted grant applications.
- b. Regular dissemination of original research findings:
At least one of the individual's (expected productivity for) publications per year should report original research findings in a traditional, peer-reviewed, nationally recognized (e.g., listed in PubMed) journal (as either primary or co-author). As described in Section II.C of this Appendix, quality of publications should be considered in addition to their quantity. Published review articles, opinions or perspectives can augment, but not replace this obligation for at least one peer-reviewed publication of original research findings annually in this context.

2. Demonstration of Excellence in Scholarship (Research and Creative Activity) for Promotion to (Tenured, Term, or Part-time [Clinical]) Professor:

In addition to the requirements listed above for the demonstration of excellence in scholarship (research and creative activity), the following is also required for promotion to the rank of Professor:

- a. Both current and sustained extramural funding meeting the above criteria (in Section II.E.1.a).
- b. Extra-university recognition of excellence in a focused area of scholarship is required and should be evidenced by leadership roles in national forums, consultations such as being an editor or reviewer, or invitations to speak, as well as by extramural review letters.

III. Service

A. Definition of Service

Service consists of the use of professional knowledge to meet the needs of the University and/or community. Service can be categorized as follows:

1. Governance Service is service in faculty matters to the Department, Unit or University. This involves actively serving on standing or ad hoc committees, and/or performing leadership and administrative duties within the institution. The time allocated for participation in these service activities should usually increase with academic rank.
2. Professional Service (to one's Academic Discipline) involves using one's expertise in serving and improving the profession. This involves serving through the various professional organizations, professional education and consultation, and giving time and skill as a member of the profession.
3. Community-Engaged Service is service to the public that engage students and faculty with the community in a mutually beneficial manner that results in both student learning and community action outcomes. This involves developing partnerships between the University and outside agencies that enhance the teaching or research functions of the University, Unit or Department and improve the lives of affected citizens. Community access to professional knowledge and skills is central to the School of Dentistry's mission of service to the public.

4. Patient-Centered Service is serving people through using professional skills and expertise in professional practice and patient care. Patient-Centered can take the form of direct provision of dental care through the school's outreach clinics, faculty practice clinics, dental service missions (e.g., RAM, Smile Kentucky) and other activities.
5. Administrative Service is the organization, supervision and management of the affairs and operation of the Department, Unit or University.

B. Evaluation of Service

Every member of the faculty has an obligation to participate in service for the University and profession. All full-time faculty members are expected to perform service as part of their Annual Work Plans. Probationary faculty members should not devote excessive time to service obligations at the expense of teaching and scholarly activities.

Evaluators will judge the service component of a faculty member's efforts to the extent the service contributes to the advancement of the Department, School or University's mission. Different types of service require different types of demonstration of effectiveness.

1. Governance Service: Active participation on Department, Unit or University committees or demonstrated leadership or administration in Department, Unit or University activities is the best indicator of this type of service. Reviews by colleagues with knowledge of the service activity will aid the documentation and evaluation of Governance Service.
2. Professional Service: Participation in professional organizations, their committees, learned professional societies and service activities show the faculty member's involvement in professional service activities. Leadership roles in professional organizations and societies, consulting and competency programs help to prove effectiveness in this area.
3. Community-Engaged Service: The faculty member shows their effectiveness in this area through the application of professional and scholarly skills in outreach programs. This may be through developing collaborations with outside agencies, serving as director of outside boards or committees that partner with the university, or coordinating efforts of university, community and civic partners. They may engage other faculty and students in the dissemination of knowledge and skills to the public and profession, and advocacy of oral health in the public policy and governmental forums.
4. Patient Service: Professional practice activities are a service to the public in which many faculty members engage, as subject to the provisions of Article 2, Section 3A. Evaluation will take the form of demonstrating satisfactory clinical practice activities and patient care outcomes.
5. Administrative Service: Administrative activities in the Unit should be considered in the area to which they apply. For example:
 - Administrative responsibility for a didactic or clinical educational activity (e.g., residency program director, Team Leader, Clinic Director, clinical discipline coordinator, course director, Director of Quality Assurance, Director of Continuing Education) should be considered a teaching activity and evaluated accordingly.
 - Administrative responsibility for a research activity (e.g., Associate Dean for Research, research Center Director, grant administrator) should be considered a scholarship (research) activity and evaluated accordingly.
 - Administrative activities that cannot be classified as teaching or scholarship activities (e.g., Department Chairs, Director of University of Louisville Dental Associates) will be considered a service activity, and may be classified and evaluated as Governance, Professional, Community Engagement or Patient Care service as applicable.

C. Proficiency in Service

Proficiency in service is best demonstrated through a documented service assignment in one or more areas of defined service, and by satisfactory peer and supervisory (e.g., committee Chairs) reviews of the service. Reviews by the recipients of the service or colleagues with knowledge of the service must also be obtained to document proficiency.

D. Excellence in Service

1. Demonstration of Excellence in Service for Promotion (Tenured, Term, or Part-time [Clinical]) Associate Professor:

Excellence in service is best demonstrated through the outcome of a sustained, documented assignment with major responsibility (i.e., a leadership role) in service programs. These programs generally require the faculty member to be the principal investigator of external funding for sustained service activity, through grants, contracts, significantly increased revenues, and so forth. This may include extramural funding for student or faculty participation in community and/or public health outreach, health education programs, or patient care/treatment activities. Additionally, peer, supervisory and extramural reviews of the individual's service activities must be obtained and should support the rating of excellence. Governance and patient service by themselves are inadequate to prove excellence in service.

2. Demonstration of Excellence in Service for Promotion to (Tenured, Term, or Part-time [Clinical]) Professor:

In addition to the requirements listed above for the demonstration of excellence in service, extra-university recognition of excellence in service is also required and must be evidenced by (but not limited to) extramural recommendation letters. Leadership of national organizations or committees, leadership in national societies, or national awards for service program development and administration are all clear evidence that supports demonstration of excellence in service required for promotion to professor.

Appendix B to the ULSD Faculty Personnel Document

ULSD Faculty Personnel Procedures and Policies

INTRODUCTION

The contents of this Appendix cannot be changed without a positive, majority vote of the School of Dentistry's Faculty Personnel Committee and Faculty Assembly of the School of Dentistry.

This Appendix describes procedures and policies pertaining to:

- I. Annual Work Plans**
- II. Annual Performance Reviews**
- III. Promotion in Rank Reviews**
- IV. Supplementary Procedures for the Review of Probationary (tenure-track) Faculty for Promotion**
- V. Periodic Career Reviews**

I. Annual Work Plans

A. Guidelines for Annual Work Plans (AWPs)

1. AWP delineate faculty workloads and may include assignments in teaching; scholarship (i.e., research and creative activity); program administration; supervision of field work; professional practice or related activities; Unit, University, professional or community engaged service, and so forth. The AWP must specify the percentage of effort allocated to each applicable major area of work assignment (i.e., teaching, scholarship, service, administration, and faculty practice or approved work outside the University). There is no required minimum percentage of effort for areas that are assigned in the faculty member's AWP, except for probationary faculty (as stated in Section I.2.b of this Appendix), but percentages must total 100%. An approved AWP for a faculty member contains assignments consistent with their amount of professional engagement (i.e., their full-time equivalent) to the University.
2. The Department Chair must ensure that faculty members who have the goal of applying for promotion in rank are allocated adequate time and opportunities in their AWP to accomplish the outcomes and requirements for successful promotion as described in this document.
 - a. For faculty in non-tenurable positions, the AWP shall be specific to the duties particular to their contract periods and shall reflect the need to demonstrate evidence of excellence in their primary (greatest) area of allocation of effort, and demonstrate (at least) proficiency in other areas of their AWP where they have a significant (typically defined as 10% or more) allocation of effort. Faculty in non-tenurable positions are not required to have assignments in all of the areas of research, teaching, and service.
 - b. For probationary (tenure-track) faculty, the AWP shall reflect the need demonstrate excellence in the area of the highest percent (major) allocation of effort in their Annual Work Plans (i.e., teaching, scholarship or service), and proficiency in the two remaining areas. In addition, for probationary faculty, a minimum assignment of 20% allocation of

effort for scholarship/research and the corresponding time away from service and/or teaching obligations is required.

- c. For Associate Professors, the AWP shall reflect the need to demonstrate an extra-university (nationally) recognized level of excellence in their primary (greatest) area of allocation of effort in their AWP, and proficiency areas of their AWP where they have a significant (typically defined as 10% or more) allocation of effort. Associate Professors are not required to have assignments in all of the areas of research, teaching, and service. However, the AWP of (tenured) Associate Professors should reflect the need to demonstrate evidence of scholarship at the time of their promotion review to (tenured) Professor.
- d. While not eligible for promotion, tenured Professors are still subject to periodic (five-year) career reviews. Therefore, their AWP shall respect both the faculty member's need to shape his/her career and the missions of the Department, Unit, and University. In order to accomplish this, the AWP shall permit individual faculty members to concentrate, at various times in their careers, on one or more of the areas of teaching, research and service. Tenured Professors are not required to have assignments in all of the areas of research, teaching, and service.

3. All Department Chairs submit their Annual Work Plan to the Unit Dean for approval.
4. The Dean and Department Chairs ensure that the approved AWP, taken together, enable the Unit or Department to meet its annual goals and objectives. The Dean and Department Chairs work with faculty members to make appropriate changes in the AWP if Unit or Departmental needs change during the year, subject to the Dean's approval.

B. Expectations for Faculty Assignments in Annual Work Plans

The following expectations apply to individual faculty members and Department Chairs when developing and negotiating Annual Work Plans.

1. All full-time and part-time faculty members are accountable for the time (amount of professional engagement) that their University contract stipulates.
2. Each AWP will be specific for the duties the Department Chair assigns the faculty member for the upcoming year and will detail how the individual's efforts will contribute to the achievement of the Department's mission, goals and objectives.
3. Faculty members who have didactic (including pre-clinical) teaching activities outlined in their AWP are to be allotted specific additional amounts of time (typically three hours of out-of-class time for each hour of didactic or pre-clinical course directorship) to accomplish these assignments, and to ensure and enhance the quality and scholarship of instruction at the School of Dentistry. This additional time allotment should allow for out-of-class preparation, grading and evaluation of student assessments and assignments, student advising and mentoring, and other requirements of teaching, including the scholarly activity related to teaching necessary to remain current in one's curricular subject areas and educational methodology.
4. The Chair should allot time for faculty members who have clinical course administration responsibilities and/or significant pre-clinical (laboratory) course project grading responsibilities.
5. The Chair should allot time for faculty members who have significant recurring service activities outlined in the AWP.

6. The Chair should allot time for faculty members who have significant scholarship activities outlined in the AWP.
7. The Chair should allot time for professional development in the individual's major area(s) of effort or expertise.

C. Process for Developing Annual Work Plans

1. Departmental Goals and Work Plans
The Chair and the Dean negotiate and complete the Departmental goals (or Departmental "Work Plan"). This defines expectations of the Department's contribution to the Unit's mission.
2. Individual Goals and Annual Work Plans
After the Dean and Department Chair establish Departmental goals, faculty members develop proposed AWP's for the next year that contribute to the attainment of Departmental goals. The AWP's focus on explicit efforts devoted to the following activities:
 - a. Teaching.
 - b. Scholarship (research and creative activities).
 - c. Service to the profession, the Unit, the University and the community.
 The goals of individual faculty members must be congruent with Departmental goals. The Department Chair is encouraged to adapt to the strengths and preferences of individual faculty members in establishing yearly goals. It is the responsibility of the faculty member to work with the Department Chair in determining individual goals that also meet Departmental goals.

D. Changes to the Annual Work Plan

The AWP developed for a calendar year may or may not reflect the actual activities of a faculty member during that year. Unanticipated needs may arise during the year that require a faculty member to perform work or conduct activities that were not included in the individual's AWP. Therefore, substantial departures from the AWP may occur. If the Department Chair asks a faculty member to perform work or conduct activities that are significantly different from those described in their AWP, then they should amend the AWP at their earliest opportunity to reflect those changed assignments and expectations subject to the approval of the Dean.

E. Appeal Process

If a faculty member believes that the Department Chair has required an unreasonable Annual Work Plan, the faculty member may appeal the decision to the School of Dentistry Faculty Personnel Committee. The appeal must be in a written letter that describes in sufficient detail the unreasonable aspects of the Annual Work Plan. The Department Chair submits a similar letter describing why the Annual Work Plan is appropriate. The Faculty Personnel Committee reviews the letters and issues their recommendation regarding the disagreement to the Dean. The Faculty Personnel Committee may, at their own discretion, call for additional evidence or discussions with the two parties to aid their deliberations. The appeal must be submitted to the Chair of the Faculty Personnel Committee within ten (10) working days after the conclusion of the meeting between the faculty member and Department Chair to negotiate the Annual Work Plan. The Faculty Personnel Committee will issue its recommended decision within twenty (20) working days of receipt the response from the Department Chair. The Dean's decision on the matter is final within the Unit. The faculty member may appeal the decision through the University grievance process (*Redbook*, Article 4.4, "Resolution of Faculty Disputes").

II. Annual Performance Reviews

A. Process

1. The Department Chair or Dean will announce each year when the documents for the Annual Performance Review should be submitted, giving the faculty at least thirty (30) days to prepare the material.
2. The Department Chair meets with each faculty member for the Annual Performance Review related to the activities specified in the Annual Work Plan for the concluding calendar year, as well as any amendments to the AWP that were approved by the Department Chair and the Dean. Specifically, the Department Chair reviews the percentage of time allocated to each major category listed in the AWP (i.e., teaching, scholarship, service, administration, and faculty practice or approved work outside the University), and the outcomes and accomplishments in each of those categories. The APR is an overall, summative evaluation of the faculty member's performance for the year, and must specifically annotate any areas of deficient or unsatisfactory performance as well as any areas where the faculty member has exceeded expectations.
3. The faculty member receives a copy of the Annual Performance Review which includes the Department Chair's written evaluation and (if necessary) any recommendations for improvement for their review and signature. Each faculty member may submit a written response (rebuttal) to their Department Chair regarding the Chair's evaluation of their APR so the Department Chair can consider the rebuttal and make any modification to the APR they believe is indicated in a timely manner before the APR is forwarded to the Dean for his/her evaluation. If, after the Department Chair's consideration and response to the faculty member's rebuttal of the Chair's evaluation of their performance, the faculty member still disagrees with the Chair's evaluation, the faculty member may appeal the Chair's decision as described in Section II.B of this Appendix.
4. The Department Chair and Dean's office will maintain records of the completed and signed (approved) Annual Performance Reviews and corresponding Annual Work Plans for each faculty member, as well as all documents related to the modification of an AWP, the rebuttal and/or appeal of an APR, and related salary recommendations. The faculty member will be provided with copies of all aforementioned documents.
5. Individual faculty members are responsible for maintaining their own documentary evidence of their Annual Work Plans and Annual Performance Reviews through the next tenure, promotion or periodic career review.
6. All Department Chairs will have an Annual Performance Review conducted by the Unit Dean, using the same criteria used for full-time faculty.

B. Appeal Process for Annual Performance Reviews and Performance-Based Salary Increases

If a faculty member disagrees with the outcome of their Annual Performance Review conducted by their Department Chair (including any recommendation pertaining to a performance-based salary increase), the faculty member may appeal the decision to the School of Dentistry Faculty Personnel Committee. The appeal must be in a written letter that describes in sufficient detail the alleged problems or unfair aspects of the Annual Performance Review. The Department Chair submits a similar letter describing why the Annual Performance Review was appropriate. The Faculty Personnel Committee reviews the letters and issues their recommendation regarding the disagreement to the Dean. The Faculty Personnel Committee may, at their own discretion, call for additional evidence or discussions with the two parties to aid their deliberations. The appeal must

be submitted to the Chair of the Faculty Personnel Committee within ten (10) working days after the conclusion of the Annual Performance Review meeting between the faculty member and their Department Chair. The Faculty Personnel Committee will issue its recommended decision within twenty (20) working days of receipt of the response from the Department Chair. The Dean's decision on the matter is final within the Unit. The faculty member may appeal the decision through the University grievance process (*Redbook*, Article 4.4, "Resolution of Faculty Disputes").

C. Outcomes of the Annual Performance Review

In the context of eligibility for performance-based salary increases, the overall, summative result of the Annual Performance Review must have one of two possible outcomes:

1. Satisfactory: The faculty member met (or exceeded) the expectations as outlined in the Annual Work Plan and is eligible for a performance-based salary increase (as consistent with University policy). In this case, the faculty member and Department Chair negotiate an Annual Work Plan for the upcoming year.
2. Unsatisfactory: The faculty member did not meet the expectations as outlined in the Annual Work Plan (and is not eligible for a performance-based salary increase that year). In this case, the Department Chair notes specific areas of deficiency where the faculty member did not meet the Annual Work Plan. Specific strategies and development activities must be recommended by the Department Chair to assist the faculty member in eliminating deficiencies in the future and they are included in the Annual Work Plan for the upcoming year.
 - a. Any tenured faculty member that receives an unsatisfactory Annual Performance Review for two consecutive years will undergo a Periodic Career Review (as described in Section V of this Appendix) regardless of the date of their last Periodic Career Review.

D. Annual Performance Reviews Use in Performance-Based Salary Increases

The following are additional criteria and procedures by which Annual Performance Reviews are related to salary decisions in accordance with the *Redbook*, "Minimum Guidelines for Faculty Personnel Reviews", Section III.B.4).

1. Each faculty member is guaranteed the opportunity to present documentation of their performance and effort relative to their his or her Annual Work Plan during the Annual Performance Review process described in the this document.
2. Based upon the outcome of the Annual Performance Review, the Department Chair will make recommendations to the Dean for performance-based salary increases for faculty within the department, subject to University guidelines for each fiscal year.
3. The period of performance to be covered in the Annual Performance Review for salary increases is the preceding year.
4. Faculty members must be informed in writing by the Department Chair and/or the Dean of the outcome of their Annual Performance Review, any recommendations for improvement (if necessary), and any recommendations related to performance-based salary increases. If a faculty member wants to appeal the salary recommendation made by the Department Chair based on their Annual Performance Review, they are to follow the appeal process described in Section II.B of this Appendix.

5. 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.

III. Promotion in Rank Reviews

A. Development of the Documents in Support of Promotion by the Faculty Member

1. The faculty member (candidate) develops and compiles the documents in support of their petition for promotion (i.e., P/T file) with the cooperation of their Department Chair and the Office of the Dean. The "*Instructions for Promotion and/or Tenure Files*" document, developed by the Faculty Personnel Committee, provides detailed information and guidance as to the contents and organization of the P/T file. Once the candidate has completed compiling their P/T file, they deliver it to their Department Chair.
2. The faculty member's (candidate's) promotion documents (P/T file) must include a Personal Statement letter to their Department Chair that describes in detail why they believe they merit a promotion. The Personal Statement letter should include the candidate's self-assessment of how they specifically met the criteria for promotion to the rank sought. It should review their assignments in the Annual Work Plans and evaluations in their Annual Performance Reviews. The Personal Statement letter should specifically delineate how the candidate fulfilled the requirements for proficiency or excellence in teaching, scholarship and service (as applicable) for the percent allocation of effort assigned to these area in their Annual Work Plans, documenting the candidate's accomplishments and outcomes during the period of time under review for promotion.
3. The faculty member (candidate) must have at least three letters of recommendation in support of their promotion. (These letters of recommendation for promotion are separate [distinct] from any external reviews for research and creative activity as described in Section III.B.1 of this Appendix.) Letters of recommendation for promotion may be obtained in either of two ways:
 - a. The candidate may supply their Department Chair with contact information for persons from whom they would like the Chair to request letters of recommendation in support of their promotion, and/or;
 - b. the candidate may request their own letters of recommendation in support of their promotion from individuals and stipulate that the letters of recommendation must be mailed directly to their Department Chair.

All letters of recommendation in support of promotion should be from persons who are familiar with the candidate's work and can verify the quality and/or quantity of their teaching, scholarship or service. Any faculty member or administrator who makes a formal evaluation of the candidate's qualifications for promotion and/or tenure any time during the process (e.g., the Unit's Dean, the candidate's Department Chair, a member of the candidate's Internal Review Committee or Faculty Personnel Committee) must not submit a letter of recommendation in support of the candidate, other than their formal evaluation. Any such letter of recommendation must be removed from the candidate's P/T file.
4. The faculty member (candidate) has the right to inspect their P/T file anytime during the promotion evaluation process. The candidate may view all substantive materials, reviews, recommendations and evaluations in accordance with applicable law.
 - a. Once the faculty member's (candidate's) P/T file has been submitted to their Internal Review Committee, the candidate is prohibited from removing any material from the P/T file.

- b. The candidate may add newly available material to the P/T file (including rebuttals to promotion evaluations) until the time their P/T file is forwarded to the Executive Vice President and University Provost. A description of, and the date, each item was added to the P/T file must be documented on an "Amendments" sheet to be included as the first page of the P/T file.

B. Departmental Evaluation of the P/T File

The Departmental evaluation process of a P/T file consists of separate evaluations by the Internal Review Committee and the Department Chair.

1. External (Extramural) Reviews for Promotion

No less than three external (extramural), objective reviews for scholarship (research or creative activity) are required in promotion and/or tenure reviews for faculty that have significant (typically defined in this context as at least 10%) time allocated for scholarship. External, objective reviews for teaching or service activities are required only when it is possible for an extramural reviewer to perform a valid, meaningful evaluation of the quality of the candidate's original materials or outcomes for these activities. External reviewers must be able to impartially and objectively evaluate the quality of the candidate's work. Therefore, external reviewers should not be former mentors or dissertation directors, collaborators, co-authors, and so forth. The procedure for obtaining external (extramural), objective reviews is as follows.

- a. The candidate for promotion completes the "Informed Disclosure" form (developed by the Faculty Personnel Committee). This form identifies individuals the candidate believes are qualified to serve as external reviewers and describes the specific qualifications and expertise of each potential reviewer. It also discloses any previous or present working or personal relationship the candidate has with the reviewer. In this way, the various internal evaluators may judge the objectivity and expertise of the external reviewers.
- b. The candidate submits the completed "Informed Disclosure" form to their Department Chair along with copies of all documents (e.g., journal publications, abstracts, book chapters, grant cover sheets, and so forth) the candidate wishes to be evaluated by the external reviewers.
- c. The Department Chair selects the external reviewers they believe are best qualified and able to impartially and objectively review the candidate's work that they have submitted for consideration. The Chair then contacts the external reviewers and requests letters of evaluation from them. (The Faculty Personnel Committee has developed a template that Chairs may use for the letters to external reviewers to request evaluations). Requests for extramural review should indicate the area(s) (e.g., research and creative activity) and material (e.g., journal publications, abstracts, book chapters) to be evaluated in regards to the quality of the candidate's work and its impact and contribution to the body of knowledge in their field of endeavor.
- d. The Department Chair must review the evaluation letters they receive from the external reviewers and disregard and remove (redact) any comments or recommendations concerning the suitability of the candidate for promotion and/or tenure. Extramural evaluators are familiar with neither the total performance of the candidate nor the School of Dentistry's criteria for promotion.
- e. The faculty member must be given the opportunity to review and, if they elect to do so, respond in writing to extramural evaluations. This response is added to the promotion P/T file before it is evaluated by any reviewing person or committee.

2. The Internal Review Committee's Evaluation
 - a. When the Department Chair receives the candidate's P/T file for consideration for promotion and/or tenure, the Chair is responsible for forming an Internal Review Committee to evaluate the application for promotion (P/T file). The Internal Review Committee is composed of three full-time faculty members of the School of Dentistry. The Internal Review Committee will consist of faculty members of who hold an academic rank at or above the rank sought by the candidate, and, to the degree possible, consists of individuals who have had a close working relationship with the candidate, and who possess expertise in fields pertinent to a fair review of the candidate. The candidate selects one member of their Internal Review Committee and the Department elects two members of the Committee. The Internal Review Committee elects a Chair from among its membership.
 - b. A faculty member serving on the School of Dentistry Faculty Personnel Committee may not serve on the Internal Review Committee or provide information to the Internal Review Committee, such as letters of recommendation
 - c. The Internal Review Committee evaluates the candidate's qualifications for promotion (and/or tenure) and writes a letter of recommendation to the Department Chair. The letter must:
 - i. Refer to the School of Dentistry's criteria for promotion and/or tenure (described in this document) and specify how the candidate's performance specifically meets or does not meet the criteria for promotion to the rank sought.
 - ii. Include a statement indicating the Internal Review Committee has verified the professional expertise and objectivity of the candidate's external (extramural) reviewers (if applicable).
 - iii. Conform to the additional requirements described in Section III.B.4 of this Appendix.
 - iv. Report the Internal Review Committee's vote regarding the candidate's qualifications for promotion (i.e., the number of members voting in support of, and for denial of the candidate's promotion).
 - d. In instances where the Internal Review Committee is evaluating a Department Chair for promotion, the recommendation of the Internal Review Committee is the official Departmental recommendation.
3. The Department Chair's Evaluation
 - a. The Department Chair evaluates the candidate's qualifications for promotion based on the evidence in the P/T file and also considers the Internal Review Committee's recommendation. The Department Chair writes a letter of recommendation to the Chair of the School of Dentistry Faculty Personnel Committee. The letter must refer to the School of Dentistry's criteria for promotion and/or tenure (described in this document) and specify how the candidate's performance specifically meets or does not meet the criteria for promotion to the rank sought. Also, the letter must conform to the additional requirements described in Section III.B.4 of this Appendix.
 - b. The Department Chair's evaluation (recommendation) for promotion is considered the Departmental recommendation candidate's promotion. The Department Chair forwards the P/T file containing both his/her letter of recommendation for the candidate's promotion, and that of the Departmental Review Committee, to the Chair of the School of Dentistry Faculty Personnel Committee through the Office of the Dean.
4. Additional Requirements for the Internal Review Committee's and Department Chair's Promotion Recommendations

The letter of recommendation from the Internal Review Committee and Department Chair regarding the candidate's qualifications for promotion must specifically delineate how the candidate fulfilled the requirements for proficiency or excellence in teaching, scholarship and

service (as applicable) based on the percent allocation of effort assigned to these area in their Annual Work Plans, as documented in the candidate's Annual Performance Reviews. Furthermore, (as applicable) the letter should provide qualitative as well as quantitative assessments about the work and outcomes included in the P/T file. For example, when evaluating scholarly activity that involves peer-reviewed publications, the "quality" or "impact" of journals where work has been published should be referenced, and while extramural evaluators often do this, the letters from the Internal Review Committee and Department Chair should speak to the quality of the publications and the quality of the journals in which they are published (and they may include comments from those external [extramural] reviewers as support).

C. The Dental School Faculty Personnel Committee (FPC) Evaluation

The Faculty Personnel Committee evaluates the candidate's qualifications for promotion based on the evidence in the P/T file and also considers the Department Chair's and Internal Review Committee's recommendations. The Chair of the Faculty Personnel Committee writes a letter of recommendation to the Dean on behalf of the Committee. This letter must refer to the School of Dentistry's criteria for promotion and/or tenure (described in this document) and specify how the candidate's performance specifically meets or does not meet the criteria for promotion to the rank sought. Furthermore, the letter must specifically delineate how the candidate fulfilled the requirements for proficiency or excellence in teaching, scholarship and service (as applicable) for the percent allocation of effort assigned to these area in their Annual Work Plans, as documented in the candidate's Annual Performance Reviews. Finally, the letter must report the Faculty Personnel Committee's vote regarding the candidate's qualifications for promotion (i.e., the number of members voting in support of, and for denial of the candidate's promotion). The Chair of the Faculty Personnel Committee forwards the P/T file containing the Faculty Personnel Committee's recommendation for the candidate's promotion to the Dean.

D. The Dean's Evaluation

The Dean of the School of Dentistry will review the P/T file and all related information pertinent to the application for promotion according to the criteria in this document. He or she may solicit opinions from their administrative staff, faculty members and others in developing their recommendation. The Dean places their written recommendation in the P/T file and forwards it to the Executive Vice-President and University Provost. The recommendation of the Dean is the Unit (Dental School) recommendation for promotion.

E. The University's Evaluation

The Executive Vice President and University Provost will review the promotion P/T file and prepare a recommendation for the President's review, and the President shall make the final recommendation concerning promotion and/or tenure for any faculty member whose promotion recommendation is to be acted upon by the Board of Trustees or shall inform the Board concerning the nonrenewal of contract for any faculty member completing the sixth year of service in a probationary appointment.

IV. Supplementary Procedures for the Review of Probationary (tenure-track) Faculty for Promotion

A. Preparation for the Tenure Review

1. Pre-Tenure Development Plan

When a probationary faculty member is first employed, their Department Chair (and/or faculty mentor) is responsible for working with the faculty member to develop a Pre-Tenure Development Plan to help orient and guide them toward successfully achieving the outcomes and criteria required for promotion and tenure (i.e., demonstrating excellence in the area of the major allocation of effort in their Annual Work Plans [i.e., teaching, scholarship or service], and proficiency in the two remaining areas, as well as exhibit the potential for attaining extra-university recognition of excellence in the area of their major allocation of effort). The Pre-Tenure Development Plan should reflect the mission statement and the goals of the Unit and the Department and the objectives of the individual. (The Faculty Personnel Committee has developed a template and sample Pre-Tenure Development Plan). The Pre-Tenure Development Plan should serve as a timeline and “road map” to successful promotion and tenure, and should specify the expectations for allocation of effort, outcomes and productivity in teaching, scholarship and service for the faculty member over the (typically 5 year) probationary appointment period. In circumstances where a faculty member has time allocated to a Research Center, the Pre-Tenure Development Plan must clearly state the expectations of both Department Chair and Center Director for the faculty member’s professional progress. The Department Chair is required to send a copy of the faculty member’s Pre-Tenure Development Plan to the Faculty Personnel Committee for their review and comment within three months of the start date of the faculty member’s employment at the School of Dentistry. The Chair gives a copy of the final, approved Pre-Tenure Development Plan to the faculty member.

2. Annual Performance Reviews

During the Annual Performance Review for a probationary faculty member, the Department Chair includes, as a part of the evaluation, their assessment of the candidate’s progress toward achieving successful promotion and tenure. While this is not a binding endorsement by the Chair, it gives the faculty member an annual appraisal of their progress toward achieving promotion and tenure.

3. Pre-tenure Review

- a. All probationary faculty members undergo a comprehensive Pre-tenure Review at the midpoint of their probationary appointment, typically at the end of their third year of service at the School of Dentistry. The Pre-tenure Review provides direction and advice to the probationary faculty member regarding their progress toward meeting the requirements for promotion and tenure. It is advisory only and not, in itself, sufficient justification for the award or denial of tenure.
- b. The Department Chair of the probationary faculty member initiates the Pre-tenure Review process. The faculty member submits a report in sufficient detail to allow the Chair and the Faculty Personnel Committee to assess the faculty member’s progress to date in meeting the criteria for promotion and tenure. The report includes an updated curriculum vita, a copy of their Pre-Tenure Development Plan, copies of their Annual Work Plans and Annual Performance Reviews, evidence of scholarship (e.g., publications), service and teaching (including student and peer evaluations of teaching). The Department Chair writes a letter to the Chair of the Faculty Personnel Committee, summarizing their assessment of the faculty member’s progress towards promotion and tenure in each of the three areas (teaching, scholarship and service), including any recommendations and plan for improvement of the faculty member’s activities in (a) deficient area(s). The Department Chair includes his/her evaluation letter with the supporting documents for the Pre-tenure Review, which is then forwarded to the Chair of the Faculty Personnel Committee (through the Office of the Dean). The Faculty Personnel Committee performs its own review of the faculty member’s progress towards promotion and tenure and forwards its evaluation along with those of the Department Chair to the Dean for his/her evaluation and approval.

The Dean informs the faculty member and the Department Chair of the outcome and any recommendations of Pre-tenure Review in writing.

- c. A copy of the Pre-tenure Review must be included in the P/T file.

B. The Tenure Review

1. Time of the Tenure Review

Each faculty member eligible for tenure must be evaluated within twelve months after five years of service applied to tenure (*Redbook*, Section 4.2.2.H.1.), or earlier, as specified in the Provost's letter of their appointment to probationary status.

2. Prior Service

The Provost's letter of appointment to probationary status states whether and to what extent credit for previous work and outcomes (i.e., teaching, scholarship, service) accomplished at this or other institutions is counted toward the probationary period.

3. Early Tenure

A faculty member in a probationary appointment may apply for early tenure once. They must meet all the criteria for the award of tenure, not prorated for years of service. The review for early tenure will follow the same procedure as described in Sections III and IV of this Appendix.

4. Extension of Probationary Period

A faculty member who faces extenuating circumstances that do not require a leave of absence but result in a significant reduction in ability to perform normal duties (such as personal illness, the birth or adoption of a child, or care of an ill family member) may request an extension of the probationary period for no less than six months and no more than one year. A second extension may be granted for a second extenuating circumstance. An extension shall not be granted more than two (2) times within the probationary period of a faculty member. Such extensions must be requested by the faculty member and approved by their Department Chair and the Dean of the School of Dentistry before the end of the fifth year of the probationary period and must have documentation satisfactory to the Executive Vice President and University Provost.

5. Procedure for the Tenure Review

- a. The procedures for evaluation for tenure are the same as for promotion in rank (Section III of this Appendix). The Internal Review Committee must be composed of tenured faculty members who are at or above the rank sought by the individual.
- b. If the recommendation for tenure from the Department Chair, Dean, or Executive Vice President and Provost is negative, the candidate must be notified by certified mail before their P/T file is forwarded to the next level of review (*Redbook*, Section 4.2.2.H.7a)
- c. If the recommendation for tenure from the Department Chair, Dean, or Executive Vice President and Provost is negative, the candidate may request a hearing before the University Faculty Grievance Committee. This request must be delivered to the Faculty Grievance Officer on or before the tenth working day following notification by certified mail.

C: Criteria for the Tenure Review

Satisfactory Annual Performance Reviews alone are not sufficient evidence for the award of tenure although they are clearly indicative and supportive. The candidate will have clear documentation

of work and outcomes that demonstrates excellence in the area of the highest percent (major) allocation of effort in their Annual Work Plans (i.e., teaching, scholarship or service), and proficiency in the two remaining areas.

- *For example, a candidate with a major allocation of effort in teaching must demonstrate excellence in teaching, and proficiency in both scholarship and service as defined in this document.*

The candidate should also exhibit the potential for attaining extra-university recognition of excellence in their primary area of allocation of effort.

V. Periodic Career Reviews

A. Procedure for Periodic Career Reviews

The Dean (or their designee) is responsible for initiating the Periodic Career Review process for all tenured faculty due for review that year. The Dean (or their designee) will inform each tenured faculty member (candidate) undergoing a Periodic Career Review of the deadline to submit to their Department Chair a compilation of their past five years' work. This includes:

- Copies of their Annual Work Plans and Annual Performance Reviews from the past five years;
- a letter from the candidate to the Department Chair describing how they have accomplished the elements of their Annual Work Plans and why they should receive a satisfactory Periodic Career Review evaluation;

and, as applicable;

- copies of any publications, grants, patents or other scholarly activity;
- copies of course manuals and/or other original educational materials developed by the faculty member, student course evaluations and/or student and peer evaluations of teaching, educational outcomes or other measures of teaching effectiveness;
- copies of other materials that support the attainment of the various elements of the Annual Work Plans.

B. Outcome of the Periodic Career Review

The outcome of the Department Chair's evaluation of the Periodic Career Review for a tenured faculty member (candidate) is either "satisfactory" performance or "unsatisfactory" performance.

1. If the Department Chair's evaluation of the candidate's Periodic Career Review affirms "satisfactory" performance, then the Department Chair writes a letter in support of the candidate's positive periodic career review. The Department Chair then forwards the candidate's Periodic Career Review documents to the Chair, School of Dentistry Faculty Personnel Committee (through the Office of the Dean) for their (procedural) review and affirmation of the process, who then forwards it to the Dean of the School of Dentistry for his/her final evaluation. The Dean informs the candidate in writing of the outcome of their Periodic Career Review. Tenured faculty members evaluated as "satisfactory" shall begin the next Periodic Career Review cycle in the following academic year.
2. If the Department Chair's evaluation of the candidate's Periodic Career Review designates "unsatisfactory" performance, then the Department Chair writes a letter of denial of support for the candidate's Periodic Career Review, detailing the reasons for the unsatisfactory performance. The candidate must be immediately informed in writing by their Department Chair of the "unsatisfactory" performance evaluation for their Periodic Career Review. The candidate may then respond in writing (within ten [10] working days) rebutting the reasons for the negative review. The candidate's letter of rebuttal is added to the Periodic Career Review materials sent forward to the next step of the process.

3. The Department Chair sends the candidate's Periodic Career Review documents to the Chair of the School of Dentistry Faculty Personnel Committee (through the Office of the Dean) for both a procedural review and an independent evaluation of the candidate's Periodic Career Review. If the Faculty Personnel Committee concurs with the Department Chair's "unsatisfactory" performance evaluation of the candidate's Periodic Career Review, then the Chair of the Faculty Personnel Committee must immediately inform the candidate of the negative outcome. The candidate may then respond in writing (within ten [10] working days) rebutting the reasons for the Faculty Personnel Committee's negative evaluation. The candidate's letter of rebuttal is added to the Periodic Career Review materials sent forward to the next step of the process.
4. The Chair of the Faculty Personnel Committee forwards the candidate's Periodic Career Review documents to the Dean of the School of Dentistry for his/her final evaluation. The Dean informs the candidate in writing of the outcome of their Periodic Career Review.
5. The candidate has thirty (30) days from final notification by the Dean of the "unsatisfactory" Periodic Career Review to develop a Career Development Plan. The Career Development Plan shall include specific requirements and outcomes to be met within a two-year period in order to correct the deficiencies identified in the Periodic Career Review. The Department Chair assists the faculty member in the development of the Career Development Plan and then approves the plan. The Department Chair then forwards the Career Development Plan to (the Chair of) the Faculty Personnel Committee for their review and approval. The Career Development Plan is then forwarded to the Dean of the School of Dentistry for his/her review and approval. The faculty member receives a copy of the approved Career Development Plan.
 - a. Appeal Process for the Career Development Plan
 If the faculty member and Department Chair cannot agree on the specific activities and outcomes described in the Career Development Plan, the faculty member may submit a written appeal to the Chair of the Faculty Personnel Committee. The appeal must be in a written letter that describes in sufficient detail the alleged problems or unfair aspects of the Career Development Plan. The Department Chair submits a similar letter describing why the Career Development Plan is appropriate. The Faculty Personnel Committee reviews the letters and issues their recommendation regarding the disagreement to the Dean. The Faculty Personnel Committee may, at their own discretion, call for additional evidence or discussions with the two parties to aid their deliberations. The appeal must be submitted to the Chair of the Faculty Personnel Committee within ten (10) working days after the conclusion of the meeting between the faculty member and Department Chair to negotiate the Career Development Plan. The Faculty Personnel Committee will issue its decision to the Dean of the School of Dentistry within twenty (20) working days of receipt the response from the Department Chair. The Dean's decision on the matter is final within the Unit. The faculty member may appeal the decision through the University grievance process (*Redbook*, Article 4.4, "Resolution of Faculty Disputes").
6. Immediately following the two-year period, the faculty member will undergo a Special Periodic Career Review (using the same process for Periodic Career Review specified in this document). If the faculty member is again evaluated as "unsatisfactory" by their Department Chair and the Faculty Personnel Committee in the Special Periodic Career Review, the career record of underperformance shall be forwarded to the Dean of the School of Dentistry for appropriate disciplinary action that may include proceedings for termination (described in Section 4.2.4.A.2 of the *Redbook*). However, if the faculty member is evaluated as "satisfactory" at the time of the two-year Special Periodic Career Review, the next five-year Periodic Career Review cycle begins with the following year.

Revised by the ULSD Faculty Assembly: August 27, 1984
Approved by the Board of Trustees: April 22, 1985
Approved by the ULSD Faculty Assembly: August 14, 1995
Approved by Faculty Senate: December 6, 1995
Approved by the Board of Trustees: February 26, 1996
Revised, Approved by the Board of Trustees: April 22, 2002
Revised, Approved by the Board of Trustees: May 8, 2008
Approved by the ULSD Faculty Assembly: April 7, 2010
Approved by the Board of Trustees: October 14, 2010
Approved by the ULSD Faculty Assembly: April 25, 2018
Approved by Faculty Senate: October 3, 2018
Approved by the Board of Trustees: April 18, 2019