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Introduction

The purpose of this document is to describe the requirements and procedures for appointment, promotion, tenure, and periodic career review used within the University of Louisville School of Dentistry (the Unit). The document specifies minimum acceptable levels of quality and quantity of teaching, research and creative activity, service and (if appropriate) clinical work. Departments within the Unit may stipulate criteria that are more rigorous than those defined in this document only if approved by the Unit’s faculty as an amendment to the ULSD Faculty Governance document.

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

To assign and properly evaluate faculty members for appointment, promotion, tenure or periodic career reviews, in light of School, University of Louisville, and Department or missions, several documents must have been completed. These include the following:

1. The faculty of the School of Dentistry will develop, in concert with the Dean, a mission statement and general goals for the Unit. The faculty will review this mission statement annually to assure its currency. The Dean and the faculty are responsible for assuring that the School achieves its mission and goals.

2. Each Department will develop, and annually maintain as current, a mission statement and specific goals and objectives for the Department. This mission and goals will define how the Department will systematically contribute to the accomplishment of the School’s mission. The Department Chair will be responsible for assuring that the Department achieves its mission, goals and objectives.

3. Each faculty member will negotiate annually an individual work plan (Annual Work Plan, AWP) that describes the individual faculty member’s time commitments and expected work outcomes. Each AWP will be specific for the duties the Chair assigns the individual 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.

Article 1: Faculty Appointments

Section 1. Types of Faculty Appointments

A. Term (Non-tenurable Full-Time Appointments)

1. Definition
   Term faculty appointments are full time faculty appointments without tenure for a contract period not to exceed three years. Such appointments are not probationary appointments.

2. General Expectations
   a. Term faculty members meet the standards for appointment to the designated rank with consideration for the areas assigned in the Annual Work Plan and are subject to annual reviews for the faculty of the unit. Faculty members with term appointments complete
Annual Work Plans and are eligible to receive annual performance evaluations and performance-based salary increase determinations similarly to probationary and tenure appointment faculty members. The Chair may assign duties that are not according to the general policy regarding probationary and tenure faculty workloads at ULSD. Term faculty appointments may be primarily or wholly for classroom teaching, clinical supervision and teaching, research or service activities.

b. Faculty members on term appointments are eligible to apply for any available Probationary appointment, if they were not previously on a Probationary appointment and if the position advertisement allows. If a person is selected for the probationary appointment, they may negotiate credit for up to three year’s work accomplished here or at other Universities at the time of appointment. We do not count time in rank toward the probationary period unless the individual faculty member specifically negotiates this at the time of track transfer. Since the criteria for a probationary or tenured appointment are different from those of a term appointment, the term rank does 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 non-tenurable status applies as prior service.

c. Before offering a term faculty appointment, the departmental Internal Review Committee and the School of Dentistry Faculty Personnel Committee (FPC) review the credentials of each faculty member candidate being considered for appointment and provides written recommendations to the Dean concerning appropriate rank and credit for previous service at this or other institutions.

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. The Department Chair negotiates an Annual Work Plan (AWP), including specific duties and responsibilities, with the candidate before recommendation for appointment. The Chair or supervisor recommends all term faculty contracts to the Dean before his or her recommendation to the President for appointment. The Chair retains each contract in the Department and provides a copy to the Dean’s office and to the employee.

e. The School may recommend renewal of term faculty appointments for the convenience of the University if the Dean determines that the unit needs the services of the incumbent for the renewal period and if the term faculty member agrees to the Annual Work Plan and conditions of employment for the anticipated contract. The term faculty member and Chair must renegotiate each term contract and establish an Annual Work Plan before they renew the contract. If the faculty member has satisfactorily met the performance criteria for their status, they should be rehired at the same status as the most recent contract.

f. The term appointment ends at the completion 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 reappoint an individual to a new term appointment.

g. Rolling three year contracts recognize the accomplishments of term faculty members. These contracts are at the discretion of the Chair of the department and the Dean.

h. Term faculty members may apply for promotion in rank under the criteria and procedures for the appropriate rank.

B. Probationary (Full Time, Tenure Track) Appointments
1. Definition
Probationary appointments are appointments of full-time faculty members without tenure, but who will be eligible for tenure according to the criteria described in this document and the Redbook.

2. General Expectations
a. At the time of initial appointment, the Department Chair develops a Pre-Tenure Development Plan with the Probationary faculty member. This plan ensures time to show proficiency in the three areas of Scholarship, Service and Teaching.

b. Before offering a probationary faculty appointment, the departmental Internal Review Committee and the School of Dentistry Personnel Committee review the credentials of each faculty candidate being considered for appointment and provides written recommendations to the Dean concerning appropriate rank and credit for previous service at this or other institutions.

C. Tenured (Full Time) Appointments

1. Definition
Tenure is the right of certain full-time faculty members who hold academic rank to continuous full-time employment without reduction in academic rank until retirement or dismissal as described in the Redbook.

2. General Expectations
a. 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 Plan.

b. Before offering a tenured faculty appointment, the departmental Internal Review Committee and the School of Dentistry Personnel Committee review the credentials of each faculty candidate being considered for appointment and provide written recommendations to the Dean concerning appropriate rank and credit for previous service at this or other institutions.

D. Part-time Appointments

1. Definition
Part-time appointments are those appointments which consist of less than 5 day per week time commitment annually to the School of Dentistry. No such appointment, continuation, or renewal will result in acquisition of tenure or implied renewal for subsequent periods. Part-time faculty members may hold academic rank commensurate with their education and experience, depending upon their time commitment to the University.

2. General Expectations
a. A contract establishes all part-time faculty appointments. 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 or supervisor recommends all part-time faculty contracts before approval by the Dean. The Chair retains a copy of each contract in the Department and provides a copy to the employee.

b. Part-time faculty members develop standard faculty Annual Work Plans. Their Chair evaluates their performance similarly to full-time faculty members, with consideration given
to the allocation of effort specified in the AWP. They are eligible for salary increases based on achievement of the AWP. Any service expectations will be accounted for in the AWP.

c. Part-time faculty members may apply for promotion in rank similarly to probationary and tenure appointments. They must meet the same criteria for appointment at the given rank, proportioned to time allotted in the AWP. Ranks for part-time faculty members are:
   - Clinical Lecturer
   - Clinical Instructor
   - Clinical Assistant Professor
   - Clinical Associate Professor
   - Clinical Professor

d. Part-time faculty members should be available for departmental activities such as orientation or calibration sessions, and faculty meetings that at times other than their normally scheduled time at the University.

e. The School may renew 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.

f. 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.

g. The School of Dentistry will provide notice of part-time teaching opportunities and make the hiring process as open as possible.

h. The University contract process governs terms for employment.

E. Temporary Appointments (Lecturer)

1. Definition
   All faculty members whose contract is for less than one year are considered temporary.

2. General Expectations
   a. The lecturer must hold qualifications and show preparation to teach their assignment. They must present accurate representations in their vita, resume or credentials.
   b. Lecturers must meet with the Departmental Chair of assignment for orientation before beginning their university activities. This orientation may include guidance for syllabus preparation, examination schedules, clinical orientation, procedures and policies.
   c. The University contract process governs terms for employment.

F. Gratis Appointments

1. Definition
   Gratis appointments are unpaid positions that support the educational, service or research missions of the school.
2. General Expectations
   The University appoints Gratis Faculty members for a specific time for a specific function with
   the School of Dentistry.

G Emeritus Appointments

1. Definition
   The Emeritus appointment recognizes a history of outstanding teaching, service, or
   scholarship. The candidate must have retired from the University.

2. General Expectations
   The Faculty Personnel Committee reviews the credentials of a faculty member nominated for
   an emeritus appointment and sends their recommendation to the Dean.

H. Joint Appointments

Faculty members may hold joint appointments in other units of the University. Any Faculty member
applying for joint appointments in this unit must submit credentials (triptych) to the unit’s FPC for
recommendation to the Dean. The faculty member negotiates duties and responsibilities within this
unit with the Chair of the department where they hold the joint appointment.

Section 2 Criteria for Appointment or Promotion to Faculty Ranks

A. General Considerations

1. All faculty appointments (part-time, term, probationary or tenured) must meet the same
   requirements for appointment or promotion to the various levels in areas specified in their
   AWP’s. The Annual Work Plan (AWP) guides these faculty efforts. The Chair evaluates all
   faculty members in the areas specified in the Annual Work Plans. The Chair must insure that
   faculty members who have long range plans involving promotion are allocated time to
   accomplish the requirements of the various levels.

2. Part time faculty titles include the phrase “Clinical” before the rank. Term faculty titles include
   the phrase “Term” after the rank. (For example, a Clinical Associate Professor is a part time
   faculty member. A Professor (Term) is a full time (Term) faculty member.)

3. Initial appointments for term, probationary or tenured appointments must be reviewed by the
   School of Dentistry Faculty Personnel Committee for recommendation for rank (and tenure, if
   appropriate) before appointment by the Dean.

4. Appointments for all Lecturer appointments are made through the School of Dentistry. All
   Gratis, Part-Time, Term, Probationary, Tenured and Emeritus appointments are made through
   the University Board of Trustees.

5. Only members of the administration (including persons acting in the capacity of Chair) who
   have themselves completed the requirements of academic tenure may issue recommendations
   concerning the qualifications of faculty members in academic tenure or promotion decisions.

B. Requirements

The following are the requirements for faculty appointments at the various levels.
1. **Gratis**
Candidates for Gratis Appointment must actively show a commitment to the educational, research or service missions of the school, maintain a clinical license in good standing (if applicable) with appropriate regulatory Boards, and must maintain a personal profile that positively reflects the University of Louisville School of Dentistry.

2. **Lecturer**
Candidates for Lecturer must have an earned terminal degree in their field of work. The Lecturer’s appointment is for one calendar year.

3. **Instructor**
The candidate must possess a terminal degree in the field. Appointment at the rank of Instructor is for those faculty members whose long-term plans do not include qualifying through the ranks of faculty appointment, or those who are new to academe and do not yet qualify for appointment at the rank of Assistant Professor.

4. **Assistant Professor**
All the criteria for the Instructor’s appointment apply. In addition, the candidate will have shown experience (typically one year) in teaching, service or scholarship or advanced training. The promise of proficiency in scholarship, teaching and service is critical in assessing a candidate’s suitability for appointment or promotion.

5. **Associate Professor**
All the criteria for the Assistant Professor’s appointment apply. In addition, the candidate will have clear documentation of demonstrated proficiency in each of the three areas: scholarship, teaching, and service as described in this document. The candidate must show the promise of continued proficiency and development of excellence in the area of greatest concentration on the Annual Work Plans. A total of five years as an Instructor/Assistant Professor is the usual time of service before consideration for promotion to the rank of Associate Professor.

6. **Professor**
All the criteria for Associate Professor’s appointment apply. In addition, the candidate will have proved excellence in his/her field of professional expertise (scholarship, service, or teaching) and proficiency in the other areas outlined in the Annual Work Plans. They will show national recognition by peers for their work in their field of expertise. The individual should exhibit promise of continued professional excellence to the fulfillment of the School’s and the Department’s mission. A period of five years as Associate Professor is the usual minimum time of service needed to prove continuing, sustained proficiency and excellence.

7. **Tenure (for tenurable appointments)**
The successful candidate must prove proficiency in each area of Teaching, Service and Scholarship. Tenure decisions often (though not necessarily) coincide with promotion to the rank of Associate Professor.

8. **Emeritus**
The Emeritus appointment recognizes a history of outstanding teaching, service, or scholarship. The candidate must have retired from the University. They must have held the rank of Associate Professor or above for a minimum of five years and had fifteen years minimum in full-time higher education or part-time equivalent (twenty years of service for part-time faculty members). The Faculty Personnel Committee will review the credentials of a faculty member nominated for an emeritus appointment and forward their recommendation to the Dean.
ARTICLE 2: FACULTY PERSONNEL REVIEWS

Section 1: Annual Reviews

All faculty members complete an Annual Work Plan (AWP) and have an Annual Review session to assess completion of the AWP. A faculty member is judged on his or her performance as reflected in the activities that occurred over the year, as compared to the activities planned in the AWP. These reviews are the basis for all other personnel decisions, including compensation awards, promotion, tenure and periodic career reviews. (The School’s Faculty Personnel Committee develops and maintains a standard form for this purpose which all departments in the School use.)

A. Process

1. The Chair meets with each faculty member during December for a performance review related to the activities specified in the Annual Work Plan for the concluding calendar year and any amendments approved by the Chair. Specifically, the Chair reviews the percentage of time devoted to each category listed in the AWP, and the accomplishments in each of those categories. The evaluation is an all-inclusive, overall evaluation of the faculty member’s outcomes for the year, noting areas of under performance and areas where the faculty member has exceeded expectations.

2. The Chair prepares a written summary of the review that is part of the permanent personnel record for each faculty member. The faculty member receives a copy of the Annual Review. The written summary contains, besides the result of the Annual Review, recommendations for improvement, if necessary, and recommendations for salary increases. Each faculty member may respond in writing to these recommendations and performance evaluations so that they can make timely adjustments before the Dean’s final decision. The Chair and Dean’s office will maintain records of the signed Annual Work Plans for any faculty performance review.

3. The Chair compiles all Annual Work Plans, assignments, and evaluations for inclusion in the faculty member’s personnel file. The Chair retains the original in Departmental files and sends a copy of both AWP and Annual Reviews to the individual faculty member and the Dean’s office. The Chair must give the faculty member a copy of any other material they enter into the personnel file.

B. Results of the Annual Review

The results of the Annual Review are one of two outcomes:

1. Satisfactory: The faculty member met the expectations as outlined in the AWP. In this case, the faculty member and Chair negotiate an Annual Work Plan for the upcoming year.

2. Unsatisfactory: The faculty member did not meet the expectations as outlined in the AWP. In this case, the Chair notes specific areas where the faculty member did not meet the AWP, and specific strategies and development activities recommended to eliminate deficiencies in the future.

C. Appeal Process for Annual Reviews and Salary Adjustment Decisions

If a faculty member believes that the Chair unfairly administered the Annual Review or disagrees with the outcome, the faculty member may appeal the decision to the School’s Faculty Personnel Committee. The appeal is to be in a written letter that describes in sufficient detail the alleged problems or unfair aspects of the Annual Review. The Chair submits a similar letter describing why the review is appropriate. The Faculty Personnel Committee reviews the letters and issues a recommendation on the disagreement. The Committee may, at their own discretion, call for
additional evidence or discussions with the two parties to aid their deliberations. The appeal must be initiated within 10 working days of notification of the Annual Review. The Committee issues its decision within 20 working days of receipt of the appeal. The Dean's decision on the matter is final within the school. The individual may appeal the decision through the University grievance process.

D. Dean's Report
The Dean reports annually to the faculty and the Provost the frequency distribution and the percentage of salary increases received by all faculty members in the unit and a description of the evaluation system used to arrive at such salary increases.

Section 2: Promotion in Rank Review

A. Responsibility for Preparation for Promotional Reviews
Each party to these reviews has specific responsibilities for the proper conduct of the review.

1. Administration's Responsibility:
The School of Dentistry's administration 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.

The successful candidate for promotion receives the customary university salary increase for promotion in rank beyond any merit pay earned for the year.

2. Faculty Member's Responsibility
It is the individual faculty member's responsibility to initiate a request for consideration for a promotional review. The faculty member is responsible for preparing and compiling information that supports their petition for promotion.

The faculty member should describe in detail why they believe they should be promoted. A cover letter to the Chair requesting the promotion should include the candidate's self assessment of how they met the criteria for level to which they aspire. It should review the assignments in the Annual Work Plans and the resulting Annual Reviews. The letter should specifically state how the candidate fulfilled the requirement of proficiency or excellence in each of the three categories (if applicable), documenting the candidate's accomplishments and outcomes.

The faculty member should gain letters of recommendation to support their promotion. The Chair solicits these letters at the faculty member's request. These should be from reviewers who are familiar with the candidate's work and can verify the quality or quantity of their service, teaching or scholarly outcomes. 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 may not submit letters of recommendation speaking for the candidate, other than their formal evaluation. They should remove any such letters from the candidate's triptych.

The faculty member has the right to inspect his/her triptych anytime in the evaluation process. He or she may view all substantive materials, reviews, recommendations and evaluations, although the identity of evaluators will be hidden. They may add newly available material for reconsideration by previous evaluators, or offer written rebuttals to evaluations before the Dean reviews the file.

3. Departmental Chair's Responsibility
The Departmental Chair has the obligation to guide and aid faculty members in their professional development and progress toward promotion, tenure, and periodic career review.
The Chair advises each faculty member who is subject to these guidelines of their progress toward promotion and tenure during the Annual Review. The Chair aids the faculty member in development of appropriate Annual Work Plans and conducts annual performance appraisals that result from those plans.

B. Procedures for Promotional Reviews

1. The Dean’s office will publish the dates for submission of material for consideration of promotion or tenure decisions by July 1 of the academic year.

2. Development of Triptych
   The candidate develops their triptych with the cooperation of the Office of the Dean. They then deliver the triptych to his/her Departmental Chair according to the timetable as outlined by the office of the Dean.

3. Departmental Review of Application
   The Departmental review consists of two discrete steps:
   a. Internal Committee Review
      When the Departmental Chair receives the candidate’s application for consideration for promotion and/or tenure, he or she helps establish an Internal Review Committee to consider the application. The Internal Review Committee is composed of three full-time dental school faculty members. To the degree possible, the Internal Review Committee consists of individuals who have had a close working relationship with the candidate, who hold an academic rank at or above the rank sought by the candidate, and who possess expertise in fields pertinent to a fair review of the candidate. The candidate selects one member and the Department elects two members of the Committee. The Committee elects a Chair from among its membership.
      A faculty member serving on the dental school Faculty Personnel Committee may not serve on the Internal Review Committee or provide information to the Internal Review Committee, such as letters of recommendation.
      The committee provides its written recommendations to the Departmental Chair. In instances where the committee is reviewing a Department Chair for promotion or tenure, the recommendation of the Internal Review Committee is the official Departmental recommendation.
   b. Department Chair’s Review
      The Chair of the Department considers the Internal Review Committee’s recommendation and evidence in the triptych, and writes a recommendation that is added to the triptych. The recommendation of the Chair is the Departmental recommendation unless the Chair himself/herself is under review. The Department Chair forwards the triptych containing the Departmental recommendation to the Chair of the School of Dentistry Faculty Personnel Committee through the Office of the Dean.

4. Dental School’s Faculty Personnel Committee (FPC) Review
   The Faculty Personnel Committee reviews and evaluates the application according to the criteria in this document. It then prepares its written recommendation for inclusion in the triptych. They then send the application to the Dean.

5. Dean’s Review
   The Dean of the School of Dentistry will review the triptych and all related information pertinent to the application according to the criteria in this document. He or she may solicit opinions from their professional staff, faculty members and others in developing the recommendation. The Dean places their written recommendation in the triptych and sends it to the Executive
Vice-President and Provost. The recommendation of the Dean is the unit (Dental School) recommendation.

6. University Review
The Provost's recommendation is incorporated in the President's recommendation. The President makes the final recommendation concerning tenure to the Board of Trustees.

C. External Reviews
The faculty requires three external reviews for research and creative activity in tenure and promotion reviews. The faculty uses external reviews in teaching and service activities only where an external evaluator can make a meaningful evaluation of the candidate's outcomes or material. Reviewing bodies use The Faculty Personnel Committee's "Informed Disclosure" form to solicit external reviews. This form, which the candidate completes, describes the 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 reviewers.

The candidate develops a list of possible external reviewers for each area of review, as applicable to the candidate's review. The Departmental Chair selects the reviewers that he or she believes are best able to review the candidate's work in the area accurately and impartially. To the degree possible, the Chair solicits reviews that cover the entire range of the candidate's work. The Chair then solicits the letters of external evaluation. (All Chairs use the School of Dentistry Faculty Personnel Committee's standard form for soliciting these external reviews.) The faculty member being review has the opportunity to respond in writing to extramural evaluations. This response is added to the review materials before the consideration of the evaluation by any reviewing person or body.

Requests for extramural evaluation specify the area(s) to be reviewed. The Chair will solicit comments regarding the quality of the candidate's work in the area under review. If the external reviewer includes comments concerning recommendations regarding the advisability of awarding promotion and/or tenure, they will be stricken from the review letter and disregarded. Extramural evaluators are familiar with neither the total performance of the candidate nor the School of Dentistry's criteria for promotion.

The Faculty Personnel Committee requires a written statement from the appropriate Internal Review Committee saying that it has analyzed the evaluations and has determined their validity. The candidate then may respond in writing to the evaluation(s). This response is added to the review materials before consideration of the evaluation by any reviewing body, including the Internal Review Committee.

D. Criteria for Promotion
Acceptable Annual Reviews alone are not sufficient evidence for promotion, although they are strongly indicative. The faculty member must meet the criteria for the rank sought. Article 1, Section 2 of this document describes specific criteria for various ranks.

Section 3: Tenure Review

A. Preparation for the Tenure Review
   1. Pre-Tenure Development Plan
      When a faculty member who is subject to these guidelines is first employed, the person and his/her departmental Chair create a pre-tenure development plan to help orient the faculty member and guide him/her toward developing credentials acceptable for promotion and tenure. This plan should reflect the mission statement and the goals of the school and the
department and the objectives of the individual. It should define the amount of student contact and the requirement for scholarship, service and patient care. In cases 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 Chair sends this pre-tenure development plan to the Faculty Personnel Committee for review and comment. The Chair gives a copy of the plan and the review of the plan to the faculty member.

2. Annual Reviews
During the Annual Review for a faculty member on a probationary appointment, the department Chair includes as a part of the evaluation their assessment of the candidate’s progress toward achieving the goal of tenure. While this is not a binding endorsement by the Chair, it gives the faculty member regular opinion concerning their progress toward achieving tenure.

3. Pre-tenure Review
All probationary faculty members undergo a comprehensive pre-tenure review at the midpoint of their probationary period at the University, generally at the end of three years of service to the School of Dentistry. The Chair of the department of primary appointment of the faculty member under consideration 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 in meeting the criteria for promotion and tenure. The report includes an updated curriculum vita, evidence of scholarship, student and other teaching reviews, reviews of service and the Annual Reviews by his/her Chair. The Chair submits the findings of the review to the Faculty Personnel Committee, which performs its own review and forwards its findings along with those of the Chair to the Dean for final approval. The Dean informs the faculty member and the Chair of the findings of the review in writing.

The pre-tenure review gives direction and advice to the faculty member regarding their progress toward meeting the requirements of tenure. It is advisory only and not, in itself, sufficient justification for the award or denial of tenure. The individual includes the pre-tenure review in the tenure triptych.

B. Process of the Tenure Review
1. Time of the Review
   a. The normal time for tenure review is during the sixth year of service in the probationary appointment. The tenure review is generally conducted in concert with a review for promotion in rank.

   b. 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.

2. Procedure
   The procedures for application for tenure are the same as for application for promotion in rank, with certain differences:

   a. The Internal Review Committee must be composed of tenured faculty members who hold at least the rank sought by the individual. They may be from a department different from the candidate’s.

C. Criteria for the Tenure Review
Satisfactory Annual Reviews alone are not sufficient evidence for the award of tenure. The faculty member must show broad proficiency in each of the three areas listed (teaching, service, and
Section 4: Periodic Career Reviews

A. Tenured Faculty Members
All tenured faculty members undergo a five-year review of performance. This review consists of the faculty member’s previous five Annual Reviews, and any other supporting evidence of effectiveness as a faculty member and scholarly proficiency during that period. These reviews are separate from reviews for promotion in rank, except that a promotional review replaces a periodic career review for the period in which the promotion occurs. These reviews must take into account the faculty member’s primary focus of activity and Annual Work Plans. While satisfactory annual evaluations alone are not sufficient grounds for attainment of a satisfactory periodic career review, they are strongly indicative.

1. Procedure
Each faculty member undergoing a periodic career review submits to the Departmental Chair a compilation of the past five years’ work. This includes:
   a. Copies of the Annual Work Plans and Annual Reviews from the past five years.
   b. Copies of articles, grants or other scholarly endeavors.
   c. Copies of course manuals, student or peer evaluations, educational outcomes or other measures of teaching effectiveness.
   d. Copies of other materials that support the attainment of the various elements of the Annual Work Plans.
   e. A letter from the candidate to the Chair describing how they have accomplished the elements of the work plans and why they should receive a positive evaluation.

2. Outcome of the Review
The outcome of the Chair’s review is either “satisfactory” performance or “unsatisfactory” performance.
   a. If the review outcome is “satisfactory” performance, then the Departmental Chair writes a letter of support for the candidate’s application for positive periodic career review. The Chair then sends the candidate’s file to the School FPC for review of the process, then to the Dean for final evaluation. The faculty member completes Annual Work Plans and the review process repeats five years following the initial periodic career review.

   b. If the review outcome is “unsatisfactory” performance, the Departmental Chair writes a letter of denial of support for the candidate’s application for positive periodic career review, detailing the reasons for denial of support. The Chair then sends the candidate’s file to the School FPC for review of the process and content of decision, then to the Dean for final evaluation. If any review during the process is “unsatisfactory,” then the reviewer must notify the candidate immediately in writing the reasons for the negative 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 materials sent forward to the next step of the review process.

A faculty member who has been judged to be “unsatisfactory” on a periodic career review establishes a written agreement (Career Development Plan) for remediation of the identified deficiencies with the Departmental Chair. The faculty member has thirty (30) days from final notification of the “unsatisfactory” review to develop the plan. If they cannot agree concerning the specific tasks to be accomplished, the Dean determines appropriate remedial tasks. If the individual faculty member and the Dean cannot agree on specific remediation, the individual faculty member may challenge the content of the
written agreement through the Faculty Personnel Committee, whose determination is advisory to the Dean. The faculty member may appeal through the University’s faculty grievance process. The faculty member generally has one year (unless the Dean approves a longer period) from the time of the review to complete the development plan. They then have another year to show satisfactory performance. The faculty member then undergoes a second career review at the end of this period. If this review is “satisfactory,” then the faculty member repeats the review process in five years according to a normal cycle. If this review is again “unsatisfactory,” then the faculty member will be subject to appropriate disciplinary action, including possible termination of employment.

B. Term and Part-Time Faculty Members
For faculty members with a term or part-time appointments, the Annual Review of the AWP serves as their periodic career review. A “satisfactory” Annual Review of their AWP with renewal of their contract (if applicable) shows a “satisfactory” periodic career review.

C. Administrative Faculty
After every five years of service, each tenured faculty member who holds an administrative appointment undergoes a career review similarly to other tenured faculty of the Unit, applying the same criteria as other faculty of the Unit. The Dean replaces the functions of the Chair in this review process.

Section 5: Promotion of Faculty with Non-tenurable Appointments

A. Full Time (Term) Faculty
Criteria for promotion of faculty members with non-tenurable appointments include only those areas assigned in the Annual Work Plan. Claims of promotion are evaluated based on the Annual Work Plan’s proportional allocation of effort over the period under review. Evaluators expect faculty members with non tenurable appointments to meet the proficiency or excellence requirements for the faculty rank to which they aspire. All other criteria apply to promotion in these cases.

B. Part-Time Faculty
Part-time faculty members must meet the criteria specified for full-time, non tenurable faculty members with consideration given for their percentage effort and work assignment. In a promotion consideration, the candidate should show tangible evidence that their contributions are significant to the Unit’s mission. Length of time in rank by itself does not make a person eligible for promotion.

ARTICLE 3: CONDITIONS OF FACULTY EMPLOYMENT

Section 1: Annual Work Plan

All faculty members must have an approved Annual Work Plan. The plan must be in concurrence with the Departmental and School missions and goals. The Dean upon the recommendation of the appropriate Department Chair approves such plans each calendar year. The Department Chair works with individual faculty members to develop work plans to meet the Department mission and to encourage faculty members’ individual development. The Dean makes the final decisions about all faculty work assignments. The plan contains a listing of the planned activities, expected time commitments, 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 Departmental Chair is responsible for specific Annual Work Plan negotiations, annual, career and promotional reviews. 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 cases, 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 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 Candidate’s review. The AWP must state the allocation of time and method of evaluation.

A. Guidelines for Annual Work Plans
1. Work plans specify workloads that include the proportion of effort the faculty member devotes to various accepted faculty functions. These may include assignments in teaching, scholarship and other creative activity, program administration, university and professional or community engaged service. An approved work plan for a faculty member contains assignments consistent with their amount of professional engagement for the University.

2. A faculty member and her or his Department Chair have flexibility in agreeing upon the distribution of effort, including research, clinical work, supervision of field work, and activity subject to professional practice activities. In addition, Deans and Department Chairs may establish flexible one or two year faculty work plans for tenured faculty members. These may concentrate teaching assignments in certain parts of the one or two year period, reserving other times for concentrated work in other appropriate work categories.

3. Department Chairs, after proper consultation with the individuals involved, prepare a work plan for each probationary faculty member that provides opportunities for him or her to achieve proficiency or excellence in each area required for the tenure decision (scholarship, teaching and service).

4. Deans and Department Chairs ensure that the approved work plans, 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 Annual Work Plans if unit or departmental needs change during the year. The Guidelines for Faculty Workload provide fundamental policy guidance in the accomplishment of the Annual Work Plans, and Departmental and School missions.

B. Guidelines for Faculty Assignments
The following guidelines apply to individual faculty members when determining their workload:

1. All full time and part time faculty members are accountable for the time that their contract stipulates.

2. Faculty members who have didactic teaching activities outlined in the AWP are to be allotted specific additional amounts of time (e.g., three hours of out-of-class time for each hour of course directorship) to accomplish tasks so that the quality and scholarship of instruction at the School of Dentistry will improve. This time allotment should include in-class presentations, out-of-class preparations, student conferences and advising, grading and evaluation of student assignments, and other requirements of teaching, including the scholarly activity related to teaching necessary to remain current in one’s field.

3. The Chair should allot time for faculty members who have clinical course administration responsibilities.
4. The Chair should allot time for faculty members who have significant recurring service activities outlined in the AWP.

5. The Chair should allot time for faculty members who have significant scholarship activities outlined in the AWP.

6. The Chair should allot time for an individual's area of primary concentration.

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 School's mission.

   2. Individual Goals and Work Plans
      After the Dean and Chair establish Departmental goals, faculty members develop work plans for the next year that contribute to the attainment of Departmental goals. The work plans focus on explicit efforts devoted to the following activities:
      a. Teaching
      b. Scholarship, including 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 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 Chair in determining individual goals that also meet Departmental goals.

D. Changes to the Annual Work Plan
   The AWP developed at the beginning of the calendar year may or may not reflect the actual activities of a faculty member. Unanticipated needs may arise during the year that require a faculty member to take part in activities not included in the individual work plan. Therefore, substantial departures from the work plan occur. If the Chair asks a faculty member to conduct activities that are different from those described in the Annual Work Plan, then they should amend the AWP to show those changed expectations.

E. Appeal Process
   If a faculty member believes that the 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 is to be in a written letter that describes in sufficient detail the alleged problems or unfair aspects of the Annual Work Plan. The Chair submits a similar letter describing why the plan is appropriate. The Faculty Personnel Committee reviews the letters and issue a recommendation on the disagreement. The Committee may, at their own discretion, call for additional evidence or discussions with the two parties to aid their deliberations. The appeal must be initiated within 10 working days of notification of the Annual Work Plan. The Committee issues its decision within 20 working days of receipt of the appeal. The Dean's decision on the matter is final within the school. The individual may appeal the decision through the University grievance process.

Section 2: Compensation

The salary increase pool includes the moneys that are available for distribution to all faculty members who are subject to the provisions of this document. This includes probationary, tenured, part-time and term faculty members. Faculty members are rewarded based upon accomplishment. Therefore, the documentation developed for the annual review process is the basis for salary determinations. This compensation plan is subject to University guidelines for each fiscal year.
Only faculty members whose overall performance is judged to be satisfactory or above (based on the Annual Review) will receive a salary increase. The amount of increase will be appropriate to the performance and size of the pool for salary increases for a given year. A recommendation by the dean for a zero salary increase 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.

The following are criteria and procedures by which Annual Reviews are related to salary decisions.

1. Each faculty member will present documentation of performance and effort relative to his or her work plan.
2. The Dean will announce each year when the material should be submitted, giving the faculty at least thirty days to prepare the material.
3. The departmental chair will recommend, based upon the results of the Annual Review, salary increases within the department.
4. The period of performance to be covered in the review for salary increases is the preceding year.
5. Faculty members must be informed in writing by the chair and/or the dean of the performance evaluations, recommendations for improvement if necessary, and recommendations, if any, for salary increases; each faculty member shall be given opportunity to respond to these recommendations and his or her performance evaluation so that timely adjustments may be made before the dean’s final recommendation;
6. If a faculty member wants to appeal the salary decision of the Chair, they are to follow the appeal process for reconsideration of the performance evaluation (3.1.E of this document).
7. 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.
8. The unit must preserve the Annual Reviews. Individual faculty members shall be responsible for maintaining the documentary evidence supporting each Annual Review through the next tenure, promotion or periodic career review.

Section 3: Work Outside the University
Full time faculty members may conduct professional activities up to the equivalent of one day per week of assigned time, as allowed in the RedBook (Sec. 4.3.3 "Work Outside the University"). This work may be compensated or non-compensated. (Nothing in this section is intended to prevent non-dentist faculty members from using up to one day per week of time that is professionally related to their educational responsibilities.) This excludes the practice of dentistry, which must be conducted in School affiliated clinics. The amount of time devoted to practice of dentistry within the school’s clinics will be determined each year in consultation with the Department Chair, and as specified in the faculty member’s Annual Work Plan. The faculty member is required to report their activities during time allocated for these professional activities. This will take place during the Annual Review.

Section 4: Other Conditions of Faculty Employment
The Redbook describes other conditions of employment.
Appendix A to the ULSD Faculty Personnel Document

Definitions and Examples of Proficiency and Excellence in Teaching, Service, and Scholarly Work

Teaching
Definition of Teaching
Teaching in dentistry is a form of active communication that is based upon several critical elements. The teacher must possess, maintain and display an accurate and current knowledge of the topic. 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 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.

Teaching consists of classroom performance, clinical supervision, advising, monitoring and mentoring students, development of new courses and teaching methods (such as distance learning and instructional technology improvements), and off site service-learning initiatives, course work development and participation.

Evaluation of Teaching
A teacher must have had enough course responsibility and student contact for a realistic evaluation. (Reviews should give a detailed accounting of the faculty member’s participation in all courses, where they have had responsibility.) Teaching load alone, however, will not be the primary factor for evaluation of teaching effectiveness. Teaching effectiveness is measured by a combination of outcomes assessment, self-evaluation, collegial assessment and student opinion of teaching effectiveness.

The teacher’s effectiveness will be examined by considering the following:
1. Student performance on national, regional, or specialty board examinations
2. Faculty (peer) evaluations of currency and appropriateness of material
3. Student evaluations of presentation.
4. Chair evaluation of educational material and innovation.
5. Development of critical thinking skills among students.
6. Adoption of material and techniques by other educational programs.
7. Coordination of interdisciplinary knowledge (interdisciplinary teaching and program development within and across units).
8. Mentoring graduate, research or postdoctoral students
9. Advising and counseling students
10. Development of curricula or curricular models.
11. Development and testing of new educational evaluation methodologies.

Faculty review is generally most reliable when restricted to academic peers, and therefore will often be found in the Departmental review statements submitted by the Chair. They will ask only those who have had an educational relationship with a faculty member (e.g., student-teacher, co-instructor, mentor) for evaluations. Self-evaluation of the faculty member under review will be considered.
Service
Definition of Service
Service consists of the use of professional knowledge to meet the needs of the community. We recognize several types of service, as outlined below:

1. Governance Service is service in faculty matters to the Department, School or University. This involves actively serving on standing or ad hoc committees, and performing leadership and administrative tasks within the institution. Participation in these service activities should increase with rank. Probationary faculty members should not devote excessive time to service obligations at the expense of teaching and scholarly activities.

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 Engagement is service to the public through teaching, learning, research and patient care opportunities that engage students and faculty with the community in a mutually beneficial manner. This involves developing partnerships between the University and outside agencies that enhance the teaching or research functions of the school and improve the lives of affected citizens. Community access to professional knowledge and skills is central to the School's mission of service to the public.

4. Patient Centered Service is serving people through using professional skill care and expertise in professional practice. Service can take the form of direct provision of dental care through the school’s outreach clinics, faculty practice clinics, and other activities.

Evaluation of Service
All full time faculty members are expected to perform service as part of their AWP. 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
   Every member of the faculty has an obligation to participate in service for the university and profession. Active participation on faculty or university committees or demonstrated leadership in University activities is the best measure of this type of service. Reviews by colleagues with knowledge of the service activity will aid the documentation 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. Professional continuing education presentations, leadership roles in societies, consulting and competency programs help to prove effectiveness in this area.

3. Community Engagement 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 may choose to engage. Evaluation will take the form of acceptable clinical practice activities.
Research, Scholarship and Other Creative Activity

Definition of Research, Scholarship and Other Creative Activity

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

Collaborative research activities are considered appropriate and desirable in the academic setting and are to be considered an integral part of the publication record of the candidate. 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 a criterion for consideration in promotion or tenure review decisions. Principal investigators on multiple-principal-investigator grants will be rewarded commensurately to those on single-principal-investigator grants.

Evaluation of Research, Scholarship and Other Creative Activity

Evidence of research or creative activity can be presented in several ways. The candidate is encouraged to submit material subjected to peer review, such as peer-reviewed journal publications and extramural grants. Besides the quality of the scholarship, the evaluator will review the candidate’s efforts with particular attention to the promise of future contributions to the University of Louisville.

Primary Scholarly Activities are major works that are evidence of scholarly activity. They include:

1. Published research, technical reports, or case reports. (This includes studies in laboratory-based, clinical, diagnostic, epidemiology/survey, business and practice management, health care delivery methods/organization, data management and communications, professional history, related anthropology, law, jurisprudence, ethics or environmental studies.)
2. Extramural and intramural funding
   (This includes grants, contracts, and the dollar value of in-kind gifts.
3. Published books or texts (or chapters in texts) in the faculty member’s field of expertise.
4. Patents

Supportive Scholarly Activities are less important than primary activities as evidence of scholarly work. However, they contribute to the demonstration of scholarly activity. Reviewers will weigh them as to their importance in contributing to the School’s mission and the individual’s completion of the AWP. Examples include:

1. Extramural grant reviewer / study section member
2. Non peer-reviewed products such as manuscripts
3. Publication in peer-reviewed media (including but not limited to text, web-based, CD-ROM)
4. Publication in professional, non-peer-reviewed journals
5. Proceedings of scientific meetings
6. Editorship of a peer-reviewed publication (journal)
7. Investigators on grants
8. Invited lectures and presentations, continuing education presentations
9. CD-ROM, web, or computer based instructional materials
10. Consultantships and invited Expert Opinions
11. Manuscripts or research in progress
12. Other entrepreneurial activities as outlined in the AWP.
13. Completing graduate degrees and certificates, receiving postdoctoral training, or board certification.
Definitions of Proficiency
For this document, “Proficiency” means displaying competence. The proficient person is adept at performing the functions and applying the specific skills given in each category. Proficiency does not necessarily imply expertise, but rather an ability to complete the given tasks independently at a level of basic competence. Faculty members must show proficiency in all areas assigned by the Annual Work Plan. The award of tenure requires proficiency in each of the three areas (teaching, service, and scholarship).

Proficiency in Teaching
The individual documents proficiency in teaching through teaching assignment and satisfactory reviews of the teaching effort by students (or residents), peers, and the Chair. Development of new courses and course materials are additional evidence of teaching proficiency. When they distribute those materials for use in other schools or venues, the material may be considered “Scholarship and Creative Activity.”

Proficiency in Service
The individual documents proficiency in service through service assignment to one or more areas of defined service. An active, ongoing service commitment shows proficiency in this area. Reviews by colleagues or collaborators of the Service effort enhance the documentation of Proficiency.

Proficiency in Scholarship and Research
The individual documents proficiency in scholarship and research through the resulting products. These results may be as dissemination of research findings, by gaining funding for research efforts, development of new methodologies, models, tools or programs. The quantity expected varies with the time devoted to these activities in the Annual Work Plan. To prove proficiency, the faculty expects the individual to achieve an annual average of one primary scholarly activity (or its equivalent) per day per week devoted to scholarly activities.

Proficiency in Administration
Administrative activities are considered in the area to which they apply. For example, clinical administrative activities (such as Clinic Director or Group Leader) should be part of the clinical teaching activity. Administrative responsibility for research activities (such as administration of a grant, or Associate Dean for Research) should be part of the research effort and evaluation. Administrative activities that do not fall into the teaching or creative activities will be in the Service area. They may be Governance, Professional, Community Engagement or Patient Care service.
**Definitions of Excellence**

For this document, “Excellence” means superiority in skill and achievement. It is proved by the long-term sustainable outcome in the area of evaluation. To prove excellence, the faculty member must surpass the baseline of proficiency in the area, in quantity and quality. They must document the ability work independently and to produce significant work that peers recognize for being exemplary work in the field. The faculty requires national recognition for outcomes in their area of expertise to show excellence.

**Excellence in Teaching**

The individual documents excellence in teaching through the outcome of a sustained, documented assignment with a major responsibility (i.e., a leadership role) in a teaching program. Outcomes of the teaching result (e.g., board scores, alumni evaluations, accreditation reviews, etc.) must support the excellence of the teaching effort. Use of developed teaching methods and materials by other dental education institutions shows an external review process that shows excellence in the teaching area. National recognition of teaching efforts and methods (e.g., serving leadership positions in related national organizations, serving on national or regional accrediting teams, participation in specialty board review or test development committees, etc.) help to prove excellence in teaching.

**Excellence in Service**

The individual documents excellence in community service through the outcome of a sustained, documented assignment with major responsibility (i.e., a leadership role) in community service programs. These programs generally require the candidate to be the principal investigator of external funding for sustained activity, through grants, contracts or significantly increased revenues etc. These may be student participation in community and outreach activities, or may be public health, service or patient treatment activities. Leadership of national organizations or committees, leadership in national societies, or national awards for service program development and administration shows national recognition in this area. Governance and patient service by themselves are inadequate to prove excellence in the service area.

**Excellence in Scholarship and Research**

The individual documents excellence in scholarship through a sustained, documented assignment with a major responsibility (i.e., a leadership role) in a research area. Generally, they must be the principal investigator for an independent research program (which requires external funding). They must be nationally recognized for their scholarly work in the field.