NOTE TO CAC: The KU Medical Center (KU Med) is in the process of renewing their NIH grant for designation as a Cancer Center. KU Med has been informed that the grant renewal only would be considered if they along with the College and several other professional schools on the Lawrence Campus provided a statement that acknowledges the value of collaborative and interdisciplinary scholarship in promotion and tenure reviews (P&T).

While being a good partner is important, we would not bring something forward for the College if it was inconsistent with our mission and values or if it would somehow undermine P&T. In fact, many of our faculty are participating meaningfully in high impact collaborative and interdisciplinary work and these efforts are an important part of our College. Thus, a strong argument can be made for indicating the value of this work explicitly stated for P&T, regardless of the request presented now. In no way is the statement forcing this type of scholarship or suggesting it as a necessity for P&T—it’s simply indicating it has value.

The proposed additions in yellow highlights provides language that recognizes the value of collaborative and interdisciplinary research and provides some guidance regarding the importance of identifying one’s substantive contribution in that work. Red text indicates deletion to the original text (which was done solely to ensure reference to this issue appears once and in the clearest manner possible). We have shared the language with a small number of CAC members and have made edits based on the feedback received. We now bring it forward to the full group and look forward to your comments.

Statement on Promotion and Tenure for the College of Liberal Arts & Sciences

Purpose: To serve as the official policy on matters related to promotion and tenure for faculty members in the College of Liberal Arts & Sciences.

Applies to: Tenure-track faculty within the College of Liberal Arts & Sciences

I. Introduction:

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.

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/advising (or professional performance), scholarship, and service; (b) Creating a mechanism for the approval of written criteria and procedures by the unit(s); (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.

A. 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 Kansas 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.

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.

B. 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.” In cases of mandatory reviews resulting in the denial of tenure, no further reviews for tenure shall occur.

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 teaching/advising (or professional performance), scholarship, 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.

In some unusual situations, the personal circumstances may qualify the faculty member for certain types of leave or reduction in appointment that extend the tenure clock. The types of leave and circumstances that provide a basis for an application and approval of an extension of the probationary period for one year include: (1) family medical leave under the Family and Medical Leave Act (FMLA) and/or (2) birth, foster placement, or adoption of a child. Other circumstances include (3) non-scholarly leave without pay, (4) a part-time appointment, and (5) other unexpected special and extenuating circumstances that justify an extension of the tenure clock for a maximum of one year. [http://policy.ku.edu/provost/interruption-of-tenure-clock](http://policy.ku.edu/provost/interruption-of-tenure-clock).

Prior to the beginning of the spring semester, the Provost shall notify all faculty whose mandatory review year will be the following academic year, with copies provided to department chairs, deans, and/or heads of their administrative units. Upon receipt of this notice or if a faculty member requests it prior to the mandatory review year, the unit shall initiate procedures for evaluating the candidate for the award of tenure.

As part of the annual faculty evaluation process, each department school (if there is no departmental structure), or other administrative unit shall consider the qualifications of all tenured faculty members below the rank of full professor, with a view toward possible promotion in rank during the following academic year. After considering a faculty member’s qualifications, if the department, school, or administrative unit determines that those qualifications may warrant promotion in rank, it shall initiate procedures for reviewing the faculty member for promotion.

After seven years in the rank of associate professor, a faculty member who believes he/she has the qualifications for promotion, despite the failure of his or her unit to initiate the review process for promotion to full professor, may initiate the promotion review process himself/herself. In such cases the unit will treat the candidate in the same way that it treats other candidates for promotion to the rank of full professor.

II. Initial Review Committee.

The unit is responsible for designating a committee for the initial review and where possible, unit level procedures shall be followed concerning the formation of the initial review committee. In units without sufficient faculty members at the appropriate rank to form an initial review committee, the unit administrator shall consult with the Contact Associate Dean or Dean to determine appropriate actions including, but not limited to, appointing faculty members from outside the unit to serve on the committee. Additionally, in cases where the unit administrator is a candidate for promotion, the divisional associate dean serves the role of chairperson or director for concurrence or non-concurrence with the recommendation of the unit’s initial review committee.

III. 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 teaching/advising, research, 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 next review level. 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/advising (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 teaching/advising, scholarship, 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:

A. 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 posted through the Policy Library and distributed to all faculty members. Faculty members should also receive a copy of the College's guidelines along with the unit's statement.


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).

1. 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 committee shall provide for the solicitation of respected and established outside reviewers to assist in the evaluation of a faculty member’s scholarship. The committee shall give the candidate the opportunity to suggest individuals to be included or excluded from the list of reviewers. The committee, however, is responsible for using its judgment in the final selection of reviewers. Emphasis should be placed on selecting independent reviewers in the same or related discipline or performance area of the candidate who hold academic rank or professional position equal to or greater than the rank for which the candidate is being considered. When soliciting external reviews of a candidate’s scholarship, the committee shall inform prospective reviewers of the extent to which the candidate will have access to the review.

The committee 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 evaluators 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.

2. Following approval of the list of evaluators, the committee 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 maintain copies of all mail and/or e-mail solicitation communications with external evaluators, and the evaluator’s vita.

3. 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.

4. The following materials shall be submitted as part of the candidate's file:

- A list of materials sent to the evaluators and,
- 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.

5. 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."

C. 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 an appointment. The materials should present their records of teaching/advising, 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 academic 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 primary unit will be responsible for sharing the candidates’ materials with the secondary unit(s) during the evaluation process, as well as for initiating consultation with the other unit(s) with respect to the evaluation process. 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. Candidates will be asked to review and endorse a position description by each unit in which they hold an appointment. They will also receive a report of the initial review committee’s evaluation and recommendation from each unit after the initial review.

The primary 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 unit is responsible for forwarding the candidate’s dossier to the College Committee on Appointments, Promotions, and Tenure. If the appointment crosses schools, or is 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 https://policy.drupal.ku.edu/provost/joint-appts-guidelines.

D. Withdrawal from the Non-Mandatory Promotion Process.

In the event that a candidate withdraws from the non-mandatory promotion process, the following guidelines will be followed regarding the disposition of external letters of support:

- 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.

E. Expectations for Teaching/Advising, Research, and Service Responsibilities.

The award of tenure and/or promotion in rank acknowledges meritorious performance in the areas of teaching/advising, scholarship, 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/advising and scholarship should normally be given primary consideration, but the particular weight to be accorded to each component of a faculty member’s activities depends upon the responsibilities of the faculty member.

1. **Teaching.** Teaching is a primary function of the University, which strives to provide an outstanding education for its students. The evaluation of teaching should be developed using multiple sources of information and evidence about the intellectual aspects of teaching and student learning. The evaluation of teaching includes consideration of syllabi, course materials, and other information related to a faculty member’s courses; peer and student evaluations; a candidate’s own statement of teaching philosophy and goals; and other accepted methods of evaluation, which may include external evaluations.

High quality teaching is serious intellectual work grounded in a deep knowledge and understanding of the field and includes the ability to convey that understanding in clear and engaging ways. The conduct of classes is the central feature of teaching responsibilities at KU, but teaching also includes supervising student research and clinical activities, mentoring and advising students, and other teaching-related activities outside of the classroom.

In addition to the sort of data acquired by routine student evaluations, units may consider securing 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.

2. **Research.** Scholarship is an essential component of the University’s mission as a center of learning, and 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. Individual scholarship as well as collaborative and/or interdisciplinary scholarship are valued at every rank. In the case of co-authorship, the substantive contribution must be clearly documented and considered within the context of the discipline(s) the work resides in. 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.

3. 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.

4. Professional Performance. In the case of unclassified academic staff, professional performance, as defined by the unit and the expectations of the discipline, may be evaluated instead of or in addition to teaching, research, and/or service. The weight given to each area of responsibility shall be determined by the particular responsibilities of the candidate and his/her job description defined at the time of initial hire. Each administrative unit with unclassified academic staff shall establish standards of performance, commensurate with the standards established in these regulations, to
evaluate unclassified academic staff for promotion in rank. Throughout these guidelines, references to areas of performance should be understood to include professional performance and its evaluation as appropriate to the positions and responsibilities of unclassified academic staff.

F. 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://facultydevelopment.ku.edu/promotion-tenure). 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 teaching/advising, scholarship, and service in light of the applicable standards and criteria and make recommendations concerning the award of tenure and/or promotion in rank.

G. 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, teaching/advising, research/scholarship, 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 teaching/advising (or professional performance), scholarship, and service, including their relative weights.

The criteria shall provide for the evaluation of teaching/advising (or professional performance), scholarship, 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.

H. Conduct of Review.

Recommendations concerning the award of tenure and/or promotion in rank shall be based upon the record of a candidate's teaching/advising, (or professional performance), scholarship, 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 Assembly 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, teaching/advising (or professional performance), scholarship, 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 chairperson/director and the Dean of the College in the recommendation.

1. Initial Review Level: The head of the administrative unit shall indicate separately in writing whether he/she concurs in or disagrees with the recommendations of the committee and/or faculty at the initial review level. The head of the unit shall provide in writing the recommendations of the initial review to the candidate. If a chair, dean or head of administrative unit does not concur with the unit’s positive recommendation or concurs with a negative recommendation, that individual shall include a written rationale based on unit criteria that will be included with the written recommendations provided to candidates. If a negative review will not be forwarded automatically to the next level of review, the chair, dean, or head of administrative unit 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 the initial review, shall be forwarded to the committee conducting the intermediate review, if one is to be conducted, or to the Provost for University Committee on Promotion and Tenure (UCPT) review, if not. 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 and the department or other administrative unit may provide additional information or materials in response to a request for information from the intermediate review committee. Specifically, the candidate may submit a written response to a negative recommendation at the initial review level, or to a final rating of teaching/advising, research 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.

2. 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 intermediate review committee shall evaluate the candidate’s teaching/advising (or professional
performance), scholarship, and service in light of the applicable standards and criteria and make
recommendations concerning the award of tenure and/or promotion in rank. If the intermediate
review procedures so provide, the committee recommendation shall be forwarded for consideration
to a committee of the whole consisting of all faculty holding the appropriate academic rank.

The Dean of the College indicates separately in writing whether he or she concurs in or disagrees
with the recommendations of the intermediate review committee and/or faculty.

The Dean of the College shall provide in writing the recommendations of the committee. If the dean
or head of administrative unit does not concur with the unit’s positive recommendation or concurs
with a negative recommendation, that individual shall include a written rationale based on unit
criteria that will be included with the written recommendations provided to candidates. If a negative
review will not be forwarded automatically to the next level of review, 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.

3. 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/advising,
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 teaching/advising, research, 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. 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, the request for information shall notify the candidate of this fact and specify the reasons for the negative recommendation.

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 6.7.4.4 and 6.7.4.5 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 UCPT 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 file either a written response to be included in the record or may appeal a negative recommendation of the UCPT to the Faculty Rights Board (FRB). The College in conducting its intermediate review 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 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. 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. If the candidate has received a negative recommendation from either UCPT or the Provost, UCPT shall retain the record of review until whichever of the following occurs first: (1) the candidate files either a timely response to a negative recommendation at the university level or an appeal; (2) the time for filing either a response to a negative recommendation at the university level or appeal has expired; or (3) April 15 of the year in which the candidate received a negative recommendation. If an appeal is filed, the recommendations and record of review will be forwarded to the Faculty Rights Board. If no appeal is filed, the recommendations
and record of review, including the response, if any, 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.

The award of tenure and/or promotion in rank becomes effective with the faculty member’s next regular appointment (i.e. academic or fiscal year).

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.

4. 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 recommendation of the review committee, 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.

I. 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. In cases were an Associate Professor serving as unit administrator is being considered for promotion, the administrative unit will work in consultation with the Dean to determine a replacement including, but not limited to, another faculty member holding the appropriate rank or the contact Associate Dean to fulfill the administrator’s responsibilities at the unit level.

- 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.

• In cases were a faculty member has collaborated with the chairperson/director of the unit in the production of scholarly work, the administrative unit will work in consultation with the Dean to determine a chairperson replacement. Since the chairperson/director has an independent responsibility to evaluate a candidate, they should not serve in the evaluative role as chair/director of the unit. Another faculty member holding the appropriate rank in the unit or the contact Associate Dean will serve to fulfill the administrator’s responsibilities at the unit level.

• 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.
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11/__/2016: To update language to acknowledge the value of multi- and transdisciplinary multi-investigator projects in promotion and tenure reviews as a requirement for the KUMC Cancer Center renewal grant.

02/05/2016: The following bullet was added to the Section I: Conflict of Interest:

*In cases where a faculty member has collaborated with the chairperson/director of the unit in the production of scholarly work, the administrative unit will work in consultation with the Dean to determine a chairperson replacement. Since the chairperson/director has an independent responsibility to evaluate a candidate, they should not serve in the evaluative role as chair/director of the unit. Another faculty member holding the appropriate rank in the unit or the contact Associate Dean will serve to fulfill the administrator’s responsibilities at the unit level.*

09/28/2015: Guidelines modified to incorporate changes to the Faculty Senate Rules and Regulations in regard to materials to be submitted and feedback at all levels of review.

09/11/2012: College Academic Council revised the lingo regarding the formation of Initial Review Committees.

05/11/2010: Guidelines modified to incorporate changes to Faculty Senate Rules and Regulations (FSRR), Article VI on promotion and tenure criteria and procedures. Review by the Standards and Procedures on Promotion and Tenure (SPPT) Committee (April 5, 2010) and final approval by the College Academic Council on May 11, 2010.

10/31/2008: Approved by Erin Spiridigliozzi