Addendum to May 11, 2010 CAC Agenda

The College of Liberal Arts & Sciences
Statement on Promotion and Tenure

This statement serves as the official policy on matters related to promotion and tenure for faculty members in the College of Liberal Arts & Sciences. University rules officially govern policies related to promotion and tenure. Nothing contained herein is intended to substitute for University policies and procedures that may be found in Article VI of the Faculty Senate Rules and Regulations (FSRR) concerning promotion and tenure. The College of Liberal Arts & Sciences Statement on Promotion and Tenure has been adopted by a vote of the College Academic Committee (CAC).

The intent of the College’s statement on promotion and tenure is to ensure that procedures are articulated clearly, resulting in an impartial application of standards and procedures, and that recommendations are made carefully, based on a thorough examination of the complete record of a candidate. This statement sets certain common practices that the College and its units shall follow in the nomination and review of candidates for promotion and/or tenure.

The review of candidates for promotion and or tenure at the intermediate review level resides with the College Committee on Appointments, Promotion, and Tenure (CCAPT). Members are elected to the CCAPT in accordance with the Bylaws of the College Assembly in the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences.

The award of tenure and/or promotion in rank are among the most important and far-reaching decisions made by the University because an excellent faculty is an essential component of any outstanding institution of higher learning. Promotion and tenure decisions also have a profound effect on the lives and careers of faculty. Recommendations concerning promotion and tenure must be made carefully, based upon a thorough examination of the candidate’s record and the impartial application of clearly articulated standards pursuant to prescribed procedures.

The purpose of these procedures is to promote the rigorous and fair evaluation of faculty performance during the promotion and tenure process by (a) Establishing College-wide standards and procedures for the evaluation of teaching (or professional performance), scholarship, and service; (b) Creating a mechanism for the approval of written criteria and procedures by the department; (c) Preserving and enhancing the participatory rights of candidates, including the basic right to be informed about critical stages of the process and to have an opportunity to respond to negative evaluations; and, (d) Clarifying the responsibilities, roles, and relationships of the participants in the promotion and tenure review process so as to promote more effective interaction among them.

Academic Freedom and Tenure Policy. The University of Kansas subscribes to the 1940 American Association of University Professors (AAUP) statement on Academic Freedom and Tenure and/or any amendments or revisions to that statement adopted by the Kansa Board of Regents. Pursuant to the policies and statement, all faculty members, regardless of rank, are entitled to academic freedom in relation to teaching and scholarship, and the right as citizens to speak on matters of public concern. Likewise, all faculty members, regardless of rank, bear the obligation to exercise their academic freedom responsibly and in accordance with the accepted standards of their academic disciplines. Tenured faculty members may be dismissed only for adequate cause, in cases of program discontinuance, or under extraordinary circumstances caused by financial exigency.
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Although procedures governing promotion are very nearly identical to those governing tenure, the two are not the same thing. As a general rule, promotion to the rank of Associate Professor should carry a simultaneous recommendation for tenure.

**Time in Rank.** Pursuant to Board of Regents policy, the probationary period for tenure-track faculty members may not exceed seven years. Under this policy, if a faculty member does not receive tenure, the seventh year becomes the terminal year. Consideration of tenure must therefore occur no later than the sixth year, which constitutes the "mandatory review year."

Prior to the beginning of the spring semester of the academic year before a mandatory tenure review, the College Dean's Office will secure from the Provost's Office a list of all the candidates whose mandatory review year falls in the next academic year. The College Dean's Office will forward those names to the relevant chairs of these units along with procedures for obtaining external letters of evaluation (see item 2 that follows). The chair/director shall notify the candidate that the next academic year represents the mandatory review year and shall discuss and review with the faculty member the unit, College, and University procedures governing promotion and tenure.

Candidates who apply for promotion and tenure prior to their mandatory review year are held to the same standards of achievement as those who have completed the full probationary period. Promotion in academic rank is not given for the completion of a particular number of years of service.

Promotion to full professor is based on substantial additional achievement since the award of tenure and/or promotion to associate professor. Faculty members with tenure are expected to continue to engage in substantial productive activity in the areas of scholarship, teaching (or professional performance), and service. Although there may be some variation, continuing productivity should prepare most faculty members for promotion to full professor within six years of their promotion to the rank of associate professor.

**Preparation of Unit Recommendations.** It is the responsibility of the candidate to complete the appropriate portions of the promotion and tenure form and to provide necessary documents and information in accordance with the Provost's guidelines, with assistance from the unit conducting the initial review. The committee responsible for the initial review at the unit level shall receive the form and accompanying materials from the candidate and finish compiling the entire record of the candidate's research, teaching, and service contributions in accordance with the Provost's guidelines. The committee shall follow the approved written procedures for initial review. Consideration and evaluation of a faculty member's entire record is a confidential personnel matter. The record compiled for purposes of evaluation and all recommendations made pursuant to the process should be treated accordingly.

Each level of review, including the initial review, the intermediate review, and the university level review, conducts an independent evaluation of a candidate’s record of performance and makes independent recommendations to the Chancellor. Later stages of review neither affirm nor reverse earlier recommendations, which remain part of the record for consideration by the Chancellor. It is the responsibility of each person involved in the review process to exercise his/her own judgment to evaluate a faculty member’s teaching (or professional performance), scholarship, and service based upon the entirety of the data and information in the record. No single source of information, such as peer review letters, shall be considered a conclusive indicator of quality.

A recommendation for promotion and tenure should be based upon the most careful scrutiny and rigorous and fair evaluation of the candidate's entire record of scholarship, teaching, and service. Equally important is the preparation and organization of the promotion recommendation and supporting documentation. It is...
crucial that a candidate's consideration for promotion and tenure not be compromised by the poor preparation or organization of the promotion recommendation "packet" that is forwarded to the College by the unit.

Accordingly, in addition to Article VI of the FSRR, units shall conform to the following College guidelines:

1. **Statement of Unit Expectations and Standards.** Each unit should submit to the College Dean's Office a concise statement (as approved in the unit's bylaws) that specifies the expectations and standards with respect to academic performance that would be sufficient for a recommendation for tenure and promotion applicable to a probationary faculty member in the academic area. This statement should be submitted to the Dean for endorsement. The statement should be endorsed by the unit's faculty members prior to submission to the Dean. In some fields, scholarly activity cannot be measured in terms of books or articles published, grants received, etc. In such cases, it would be beneficial for the unit to provide background information on normal expectations at peer institutions.

Unit criteria and procedures for promotion and tenure shall be incorporated into unit bylaws and distributed to all faculty members. Faculty members should also receive a copy of the College's guidelines along with the unit's statement.

2. **Process for Obtaining External Letters of Evaluation.** The timetable for tenure and promotion review calls for the process to begin in the spring with the solicitation of external letters of support. In the review process, evaluators attach considerable weight to external letters from faculty peers. These should represent searching assessments from distinguished scholars in the candidate's field. Emphasis should be placed on selecting reviewers who hold academic rank or a professional position equal to or greater than the rank for which the candidate is being considered. Comments and reviews by six (6) external scholars and professionals in the same discipline or performance area shall be provided as part of the material forwarded to the CCAPT. The outside evaluators must not include dissertation advisors, postdoctoral supervisors, former professors, graduate school colleagues, co-authors, KU faculty, personal friends, and one's own former students, etc. Candidates whose specialized research requires drawing on such persons must make a special case to the appropriate department or College committee; those reasons should be transmitted to the CCAPT and will be forwarded to the University Committee on Promotion and Tenure (UCPT).

a. At the outset of the review process, the unit chair/director shall ask the candidate to provide six (6) names of potential external evaluators. This prioritized list should include brief explanations of why the individuals were named. The candidate may also supply the names of no more than two (2) individuals who should not be used as referees; no explanation is required.

The unit is responsible for using its judgment in the creation of its list of external evaluators. The unit should compile a primary list of six (6) prioritized referees generated by the unit and six (6) prioritized referees generated by the candidate. In the case of a candidate on a joint appointment, three (3) external evaluators will be provided by the primary unit and three (3) from the secondary unit. Only one set of external evaluations should be solicited for candidates who hold joint appointments. Accordingly, the two units should consult on the selection of external evaluators. The primary unit is responsible for initiating the consultation, soliciting the evaluations, and sharing the evaluations with the other unit. In some cases, the two units may determine that they wish to jointly solicit the evaluations, with both chairs/directors signing the letters to the evaluators. The list of 12 external evaluators (from the unit and the candidate) shall be provided to the Dean for review and approval. In the case of joint appointments, the College will share the respective lists of reviewers with the units involved for comments. The list of
external referees from the unit(s) and the candidate, including brief explanations of the selection
criteria (e.g., identification of reviewer's discipline area, institutional affiliation, and testament to
stature in the field), shall be provided to the Dean prior to the time the solicitations are made,
and no later than May 15th of the given year. External reviewers may be contacted only after
approval from the Dean has been received.

Candidates must not themselves solicit recommendations, nor must they provide
recommendations or evaluations for themselves. The criteria and process for selection of
external evaluators must be communicated to the candidate; however, the candidate is not to be
informed of the final selection for referees nor should they see the letters that are obtained on
behalf of the candidate.

b. Following approval of the list of evaluators, the unit will contact the six referees selected. If
any of the selected referees declines, the next approved external evaluator may be contacted as
needed. There should be no more than six requests active at any one time. However, units may
proceed to the next name on the approved list if a reviewer fails to respond positively within
seven (7) days. The unit will be expected to supply copies of all mail and/or e-mail solicitation
communications with external evaluators.

c. External evaluators should be sent an appropriately representative body of the candidate's
work to review. The candidate should have input into the selection of work to be sent.
Evaluators should be requested to review and evaluate the quality of the candidate's work,
including published materials and any work submitted for publication or completed and ready
for submission.

All letters to external evaluators must contain the following: College confidentiality statement, a
request for a short form of the individual's CV, and identification of the following evaluation
areas which must be addressed by the evaluator at a minimum:

- The length and capacity of his/her association with the candidate;
- The quality of the candidate's work as reflected in the candidate’s CV and works
  sent for the evaluator’s review;
- The significance of the candidate's work to the discipline/profession;
- The pattern of productivity reflected in the candidate's record compared to discipline
  characteristics;
- The extent to which the candidate’s record reflects a sustainable program of
  scholarly activity;
- The level of state, regional, national and/or international stature of the candidate as a
  result of this work; and,
- Any special distinction achieved by the candidate.

d. The following materials should be submitted as part of the candidate's file:
- Original signed letters on official letterhead of all responses (including declinations
  or explanations of non-response) to requests for external evaluators;
- A copy of the letter sent to evaluators;
- A list of materials sent to the evaluators;
- A brief biographical statement concerning the qualifications of the evaluators
  indicating stature in the field and identification of the relationship to the nominee, if
  any; and,
- The evaluator's vita.
e. The College's confidentiality policy regarding soliciting external reviewers for the promotion and tenure review process, is as follows:

“As a part of the promotion and/or tenure review process, we are soliciting assessments of Professor ____’s research contributions from academic colleagues and distinguished professionals. These letters will become part of the candidate's promotion and tenure dossier and are treated as confidential by the University to the extent we are permitted to do so by law.”

3. **Joint Appointments.** Once a candidacy for promotion or tenure is initiated, each academic unit and each school in which the individual serves must act upon the candidacy before it is forwarded to the College Committee on Appointments, Promotion, and Tenure (CCAPT) or to the University Committee on Promotion and Tenure (UCPT).

The primary unit is responsible for all administrative protocols pertinent to the process. The review for tenure/promotion is conducted in consultation with the secondary unit in compliance with relevant College and University policies.

Candidates who hold joint appointments prepare only one set of promotion and tenure materials for review by both units in which they hold appointments. The materials should present their records of teaching, research, service, and, if applicable, professional performance.

The promotion and tenure materials should be submitted to the primary unit as designated at the time of appointment. For candidates in joint tenured/tenure-track faculty and unclassified staff positions, this is the academic department. For individuals with appointments that are evenly split among or between academic departments (e.g., 50-50 between two departments), the primary department is usually identified at the time of appointment.

The initial review units (i.e., departments, centers, etc.) shall consult with each other on their evaluations and the evaluation process, but each initial review unit must provide a separate evaluation of the candidate’s performance in the unit. Therefore the primary unit shall provide a date for receipt of these documents that will allow a minimum of two weeks for the primary unit to consider the assessment from the secondary unit in their review of the candidate’s dossier.

The primary department/unit is responsible for collecting the evaluation materials from the secondary unit(s) for inclusion in the candidate’s dossier along with the materials from the primary unit’s review.

Following the initial review, the primary department/unit is responsible for forwarding the candidate’s dossier to each of the appropriate intermediate level review committee(s). If the appointments cross schools or are in an academic and a research unit, each intermediate level review committee and Dean or Vice Provost must complete an evaluation of the candidate.

For more information on the Guidelines on Review Procedures for Faculty Holding Joint Appointments please see the Provost’s Office policy at [http://www.provost.ku.edu/areas/faculty/docs/general/jointApptGuidelines.pdf](http://www.provost.ku.edu/areas/faculty/docs/general/jointApptGuidelines.pdf).

4. **Withdrawal from the Non-Mandatory Promotion Process.** In the event that a candidate withdraws from the non-mandatory promotion process, the following guidelines shall be followed regarding the disposition of external letters of support:
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• If the candidate desires that these letters be used in the following year, then the unit committee on promotion and tenure should write to the external referees, inform them of the situation, and request permission to retain the letters for use the following year. Under this option, all letters received must be retained for subsequent review and used no later than the following year after receipt of such letters. Only if an external referee is not agreeable to future use may a letter be discarded.

• The rule of confidentiality applies to all letters, including those not used, at all stages of the review process.

• If the candidate desires new letters, whether from previously or newly selected external referees, the letters should be solicited according to the guidelines of the CCAPT. "Old letters" shall be destroyed or returned to the external referee.

5. **Expectations for Research, Teaching, and Service Responsibilities.** The award of tenure and/or promotion in rank acknowledges meritorious performance in the areas of scholarship, teaching, and service. The standards set forth in Section 2 - Promotion and Tenure Standards of Article VI of the Faculty Senate Rules and Regulations (FSRR) and written criteria adopted pursuant to it shall be the controlling standards and criteria for evaluating candidates for promotion and tenure.

The University strives for a consistent standard of quality against which the performance of all faculty members is measured. Nonetheless, the nature of faculty activities varies across the University and a faculty member’s record must be evaluated in light of his/her particular responsibilities and the expectation of the discipline. Teaching and scholarship should normally be given primary consideration, but the particular weight to be accorded each component of a faculty member’s activities depends upon the responsibilities of the faculty member.

**Research.** The award of tenure and/or promotion in rank must be based on a record of accomplishment reflecting a sustainable program of scholarly activity. Evaluation of scholarship must be undertaken in light of the expectations of the discipline. As used throughout these guidelines and the promotion and tenure process, the concept of "scholarship" encompasses not only traditional academic research and publication, but also the creation of artistic works or performances and any other products or activities accepted by the academic discipline as reflecting scholarly effort and achievement for purposes of promotion and tenure. While the nature of scholarship varies among disciplines, the College and the University adhere to a consistently high standard of quality in its scholarly activities to which all faculty members, regardless of discipline, are held.

For the award of tenure and/or promotion to the rank of associate professor, the record must demonstrate a successfully developing scholarly career, as reflected in such factors as the quality and quantity of publications or creative activities; external reviews of the candidate's work by respected scholars or practitioners in the field; the candidate's regional, national, or international reputation; and other evidence of an active and productive scholarly agenda. The record must demonstrate clear evidence of developing a research program that goes well beyond research completed for the Ph.D. or terminal degree, that has already resulted in products of high quality (as demonstrated in part by publication in sources of high quality that use critical standards for review) or creative activities, and that exhibits promise of continuing productivity. When a candidate has participated primarily or exclusively in group research projects, the unit shall document, to the best of its ability, the candidate's unique contribution to these projects. It should also be noted that research includes appropriate forms of creative activity and artistic production.
For promotion to the rank of professor, the record must demonstrate an established scholarly career, as reflected in such factors as a substantial and ongoing pattern of publication or creative activity, external reviews of the candidate's work by eminent scholars or practitioners in the field, the candidate's national or international reputation, and other evidence of an active and productive scholarly career. The record must show clear evidence of a well-established research program that has already demonstrated its quality, which promises continuing productivity, that has established the faculty member's national contributions and reputation in the field, and that is confirmed as such by distinguished, independent, external reviewers.

Teaching. The evaluation procedures also place considerable weight on the documented evaluation of teaching, including student evaluation data and peer review of teaching, consideration of syllabi, course materials, a candidate's own statement of teaching philosophy and goals, public representations of teaching, and other accepted methods of evaluation. Supervising student research and clinical activities, mentoring and student advising, and other teaching-related activities outside of the classroom shall be regarded as part of teaching responsibilities. In addition to the sort of data acquired by routine student evaluations, units are urged to secure letters from its alumni over the past three to five years. Such letters shall not be sent to the candidate but to the unit chair/director, and all responses should be included in the tenure and promotion materials. Units shall devise an appropriate procedure for a constructive peer review of teaching, and the results of such reviews shall be included in the tenure and promotion materials sent to the College.

For the award of tenure and/or promotion to associate professor, the record must demonstrate effective teaching, as reflected in such factors as command of the subject matter, the ability to communicate effectively in the classroom, a demonstrated commitment to student learning, and involvement in providing advice and support for students outside the classroom.

For promotion to the rank of professor, the record must demonstrate continued effectiveness and growth as a teacher, as reflected in such factors as mastery of the subject matter, strong classroom teaching skills, an ongoing commitment to student learning, and active involvement in providing advice and support for students outside the classroom.

In the case of non-teaching faculty and unclassified academic staff, professional performance, as defined by the unit and the expectations of the discipline, may be evaluated instead of teaching. The weight given to professional performance shall be determined by the particular responsibilities of the candidate. Each administrative unit with non-teaching faculty shall establish standards of professional performance, commensurate with the standards for teaching established in these regulations, to evaluate non-teaching faculty for promotion to equivalent ranks. Throughout these guidelines, references to teaching and its evaluation should be understood to include professional performance and its evaluation as appropriate to the positions and responsibilities of non-teaching faculty and unclassified academic staff.

Service. Service is also an important responsibility of all faculty members that contributes to the University's performance of its larger mission. Although the nature of service activities will depend on a candidate's particular interests and abilities, service contributions are an essential part of being a good citizen of the University.

The form of accepted and valued service varies greatly among the disciplines represented in the College, and may include scholarly service to the discipline or profession, service within the university, and public service at the local, state, national, or international level. As a consequence of the varied nature of service, it is the responsibility of each unit in the College to articulate clearly how it values various types of service.
For the award of tenure and/or promotion to associate professor, the record must demonstrate a pattern of service to the University at one or more levels, to the discipline or profession, and/or to the local, state, national, or international communities.

For promotion to the rank of professor, the record must demonstrate an ongoing pattern of service reflecting substantial contributions to the University at one or more levels, to the discipline or profession, and/or to the local, state, national, or international communities. The CCAPT assumes that what constitutes very good performance for a candidate for promotion to professor is beyond the expectations of what is required for a candidate being considered for tenure and promotion to the rank of associate professor. Units shall advise their candidates of this distinction well in advance.

6. Preparation of Materials. The Provost's guidelines and standardized form for the promotion and/or tenure process can be found on the Provost's Office website: [http://www.provost.ku.edu/policy/faculty/evaluation.shtml](http://www.provost.ku.edu/policy/faculty/evaluation.shtml). Units shall prepare promotion and tenure materials so that the relevant information is available to the CCAPT in a clear and concise form. Upon completion of the record, the committee conducting the initial review shall evaluate the candidate's record of scholarship, teaching, and service in light of the applicable standards and criteria and make recommendations concerning the award of tenure and/or promotion in rank.

7. Criteria for Review. Each unit in the College shall adopt written criteria, consistent with the University promotion and tenure standards set forth in Section 2 of Article XI of the FSRR, for evaluating a faculty member's research, teaching, and service. Units that include non-teaching faculty shall include criteria for the evaluation of professional performance. Each unit shall articulate the criteria of disciplinary expectations for meeting university promotion and tenure standards for scholarship, teaching (or professional performance), and service, including their relative weights.

The criteria shall provide for the evaluation of scholarship, teaching (or professional performance), and service as "excellent," "very good," "good," "marginal," or "poor" defined as follows:

a. "Excellent" means that the candidate substantially exceeds disciplinary and unit expectations for tenure and/or promotion to this rank.

b. "Very Good" means the candidate exceeds disciplinary and unit expectations for tenure and/or promotion to this rank.

c. "Good" means the candidate meets disciplinary and unit expectations for tenure and/or promotion to this rank.

d. "Marginal" means the candidate falls below disciplinary and unit expectations for tenure and/or promotion to this rank.

e. "Poor" means the candidate falls significantly below disciplinary and unit expectations for tenure and/or promotion to this rank.

Absent exceptional circumstances, successful candidates for promotion and tenure will meet disciplinary expectations in all categories, and strong candidates are likely to exceed normal expectations in one or more categories.

8. Conduct of Review. Recommendations concerning the award of tenure and/or promotion in rank shall be based upon the record of a candidate's scholarship, teaching (or professional performance), and service, which shall be compiled and evaluated pursuant to the criteria, procedures, and guidelines set forth in Article VI of the FSRR and adopted pursuant to its provisions. Responsibility for the initial review, intermediate review, and University level review lies with the unit, the College Committee on Appointments, Promotion, and Tenure (CCAPT), and the University Committee on Promotion and
Tenure (UCPT) respectively. The Bylaws of the College charge the CCAPT with the responsibility to evaluate candidates for the award of tenure or promotion in rank.

The Provost’s guidelines on promotion and tenure shall provide for a summary evaluation section to be prepared by the committee at each level (initial, intermediate, and University level reviews) and shared with the candidate upon completion of the initial review and intermediate review. As outlined in Article VI, Section 6.3.4.2 of the FSRR, the evaluation section shall include:

- the recommendation of the committee (at each level), its rating of the candidate in the areas of scholarship, teaching (or professional performance), and service, and a statement of the reasons for the evaluation and recommendation;
- if the initial or intermediate procedures provide for the faculty holding the necessary rank to vote as a committee of the whole, whether the committee of the whole concurred in the recommendations; and,
- the concurrence or nonconcurrence of the unit director and the Dean of the College in the recommendation.

**Initial Review Level:** The head of the administrative unit shall indicate separately in writing whether he or she concurs in or disagrees with the recommendations of the committee and/or faculty at the initial review level. The unit head shall communicate the recommendations of initial review to the candidate and provide the candidate with a copy of the corresponding unit evaluation summary section of the promotion and tenure form. Negative recommendations shall be communicated in writing and, if the review will not be forwarded automatically, shall inform the candidate that he/she may request that the record be forwarded for further review. Favorable recommendations, together with the record of the initial review, shall be forwarded to the committee conducting the intermediate review (CCAPT). Negative recommendations resulting from an initial review shall go forward for intermediate or UCPT review only if it is the candidate's mandatory review year or if the candidate requests it.

The candidate may submit a written response to a negative recommendation at the initial review level, or to a final rating of research, teaching, or service below the level of "good" included in the evaluation summary section of the recommendation. This written response should be submitted to the CCAPT within one week of the due date of the dossier at the College.

**Intermediate Review Level:** The intermediate review by the CCAPT shall be initiated upon receipt of a recommendation and record from the initial review unit. The CCAPT shall evaluate the candidate's research, teaching (or professional performance), and service on the basis of the entire record compiled during the initial review and in light of the applicable standards and criteria and shall make recommendations concerning the award of tenure and/or promotion in rank. No new material may be submitted as part of the record except as follows:

If the CCAPT determines that additional information would assist it in the evaluation of a candidate's record, the CCAPT may request additional information from the unit. The candidate and the unit may provide additional information or materials in response to a request for information from the CCAPT. If a preliminary vote of the CCAPT reflects a negative recommendation or a recommendation that differs from the recommendation of the unit review level, a request for information is required. A request for information shall:

- specify the information sought and the reasons for the request. If the request is based upon a negative preliminary vote, it shall so state and describe the reasons for the negative recommendation.
be sent to the head of the unit, who shall immediately provide a copy to the candidate and inform
the initial review committee. The unit head and/or committee shall prepare the unit's response in
accordance with the initial review procedures.

- the candidate shall be afforded an opportunity to participate in the preparation of the unit's
response and/or to submit his or her own documentation or comments to the CCAPT.

In conducting an intermediate review, the CCAPT undertakes an independent review of a candidate's
record and makes its own recommendations concerning the award of tenure or promotion in rank.
The intermediate review of CCAPT neither affirms nor reverses the recommendations of the initial
review, which remain part of the record that will be forwarded to the Chancellor for final decision.
The Dean of the College makes an independent review of the candidate's record and indicates
separately in writing whether he/she concurs in or disagrees with the recommendations of the
CCAPT. Furthermore, upon completion of the intermediate review, the Dean of the College
communicates the recommendations of the intermediate review of CCAPT to the candidate and
provides the candidate with a copy of the corresponding evaluation summary section of the
promotion and tenure form. The evaluation summary section shall include: the recommendation of
the CCAPT, its rating of the candidate in the areas of teaching (or professional performance),
scholarship, and service, and a statement of the reasons for those ratings; and, if applicable, whether
the committee of the whole concurred in the recommendation. A negative recommendation shall be
communicated in writing and, if the review will not be forwarded automatically, the Dean shall
inform the candidate that he or she may request that the record be forwarded for further review.

Favorable recommendations, together with the record of initial and intermediate review, shall be
forwarded to the Provost for consideration by the University Committee on Promotion and Tenure
(UCPT). Negative recommendations resulting from an intermediate review shall go forward for
UCPT review only if it is the candidate's mandatory review year or if the candidate requests it.

University Level Review: For detailed information about the Review by the University
Committee on Promotion and Tenure, see Section 7 of Article VI of the FSRR. The University
Committee on Promotion and Tenure (UCPT) shall evaluate a candidate's teaching, scholarship, and
service on the basis of the record compiled during the initial and intermediate reviews, in light of the
applicable standards and criteria, and will make recommendations concerning the award of tenure or
promotion in rank. No new material may be submitted as part of the record except as follows:

- The candidate may submit a written response to a negative recommendation resulting from the
intermediate review or to a final rating of research, teaching, or service below the level of "good"
included in the evaluation summary section.

- The candidate and the unit may provide additional information or materials in response to a
request for information from the UCPT.

If the UCPT determines that additional information would assist it in the evaluation of a candidate's
record, the UCPT may request additional information from the initial or intermediate review levels.
If a preliminary vote of UCPT reflects a negative recommendation or a recommendation that differs
from the recommendation of the intermediate review, a request for information is required.

A request for information shall be sent to the Dean of the College, who shall immediately provide a
copy to the candidate and inform the initial and intermediate review committees. The dean shall
prepare the response in accordance with the applicable procedures. The unit conducting the initial
review shall be given an opportunity to participate in the preparation of the response, including the preparation of a separate response if the intermediate review recommendation differs from the recommendation on initial review. The candidate shall be afforded an opportunity to participate in the preparation of the response and/or to submit his/her own documentation or comments to UCPT.

According to Article XI of the FSRR, the Provost indicates separately in writing whether he/she concurs in or disagrees with the recommendations of UCPT. The Provost communicates the recommendations of the University level review to the candidate in writing. If UCPT or the Provost makes a negative recommendation, the written notification shall state the reasons for the recommendation and notify the candidate of his/her right to respond or appeal pursuant to Section 6.7.5 of Article VI of the FSRR. Notification of a negative recommendation from either the UCDP or the Provost shall be communicated to the candidate by the first Friday in March of the academic year in which the candidate is being considered for award of tenure and/or promotion in rank.

A candidate may appeal a negative recommendation of the UCPT to the Faculty Rights Board. The College in conducting its intermediate reviews, has no specific responsibilities relating to appeals. Since appeals are to relate to errors that undermine the evaluation process, not to the merits of promotion and tenure recommendation, units should exercise due diligence to avoid such errors. Appeals of a negative decision to the FRB must occur within ten (10) days of UCPT’s notification of a negative recommendation. Recommendations from the FRB shall be forwarded to the Chancellor by April 15th. If the committee cannot agree on a recommendation by that date, they will so inform the Chancellor and forward all materials of the appeal for his/her consideration.

If the UCPT and Provost recommend the candidate favorably for promotion and/or tenure, the entire record of review, including the recommendation of the initial, intermediate and university level reviews, and either a candidate's response or Faculty Rights Board recommendation, shall be forwarded to the Chancellor for decision. The Provost shall officially notify the faculty member in writing of the Chancellor's decision. Under State law and Board of Regents policy, final authority to make decisions concerning promotion, tenure, and non-reappointment rests with the Chancellor and no further administrative review is permitted within the University or to the Board of Regents. The Chancellor's decision is the final agency action of the University of Kansas.

Notification of the denial of tenure during the mandatory review year constitutes a notice of nonreappointment for purposes of section 6.4.3.2 of the Faculty Senate Rules and Regulations.

All Levels of Review - Reminders: A process whereby required written feedback to each candidate as well as an opportunity for each candidate to respond to a negative recommendation, must be accommodated at each level of review. Specifically:

- Written feedback to all candidates on the vote, ratings, and rationale for rating at each level of review (initial, intermediate, and University) is required.

- Opportunity for the candidate to respond to a negative recommendation at each level. The candidate's response will be included with the dossier forwarded to the committee at the next level or, if the negative recommendation was from UCPT and the Provost, to the Chancellor.

9. **Conflicts of Interest.** No person shall participate in any aspect of the promotion and tenure process concerning a candidate when participation would create a clear conflict of interest or compromise the impartiality of an evaluation or recommendation.
• Members of the faculty who are themselves candidates for promotion and/or tenure shall not serve on departmental or College promotion committees during the year of their candidacy.

• A faculty member who is a spouse or partner of an individual being considered for tenure and/or promotion shall not serve on a departmental committee, CCAPT, or UCPT during that year.

• No students or untenured faculty members, except unclassified academic staff with the rank equivalent to or higher than associate professor, shall serve on departmental or College promotion and tenure committees or vote on any recommendation concerning promotion and tenure.

• Specifically, membership on the College Committee on Appointments, Promotion, and Tenure will be restricted to associate and full professors.

• Members of the College Committee on Appointments, Promotion, and Tenure shall recuse themselves from any deliberations or voting when the candidate for promotion and/or tenure is from the CCAPT member's unit.

• No person shall serve simultaneously on more than one committee (department, College, or University) considering promotion and tenure, except when all faculty holding the necessary rank serve as a committee of the whole for the department, College, or other administrative unit.

• Department Chairpersons/Program Directors having an independent responsibility to evaluate a candidate shall not serve as members of the CCAPT or of the UCPT.

• If a candidate believes that there is a conflict of interest, the candidate may petition to have that person recuse him/herself. Procedures at the unit and CCAPT levels shall establish a means whereby, if a committee member does not recuse him/herself, a decision about whether that person has a conflict of interest shall be made by a majority of the other committee members.