

**University of Kansas
School of Social Welfare
Promotion, Retention, and Tenure (PRT) Committee**

Policies and Procedures for Faculty Promotion

**Revisions Adopted May 10, 2013
Technical Revisions Adopted 12-13-13***

I. University Rules Governing Promotion

The policies of the School of Social Welfare are in line with University of Kansas rules governing promotion and Faculty Senate Rules and Regulations, Article VI.

II. School of Social Welfare Committee on Promotion, Retention and Tenure (PRT)

A. Committee Membership

The PRT committee consists of five elected tenured faculty members, including at least one full professor. A sixth tenured faculty person will be elected to PRT to serve as an alternate. Alternate PRT member will serve actively when a regular member of the PRT committee is also a mentor for candidate. Members and alternate members serve three years. No students or untenured faculty members shall serve on the PRT committee or vote on any recommendation concerning promotion and tenure.

B. Committee Roles and Duties

The committee advises faculty candidates of promotion, tenure, and sabbatical, Keeler Intra-University Professorship application guidelines, reviews their application materials, and makes recommendations to the Dean. The committee conducts annual and third year reviews of untenured tenure-track faculty, advises them with regard to PRT standards, and gives a written report to the Dean and the faculty member with observations on faculty progress and suggestions about preparation for tenure application.

The Committee has two roles to perform in carrying out its decision-making function. It acts as a consultant on the review process to applicants while they are preparing their materials and it acts as an evaluator once the materials have been submitted.

In its consultative role, the Committee attempts to clarify University rules and expectations and provide an explicit statement of its own procedures and its bases for evaluation. In this role, the applicant may consult with the Committee as a whole or with individual members while materials are being prepared and receive information

about the application process. The purpose of this consultation is to enhance the likelihood that a well-organized and accurate application is submitted.

The committee is bound to conform to the rules and regulations established by the University. The committee shall likewise be guided by the ethos of the School itself with specific regard to the atmosphere of collegiality and the importance of collaborative work, and the overall contribution to the mission of the School.

Once the required materials have been submitted, the Committee assumes an evaluative role. In this capacity, it judges the applicant's materials according to the University's and the School's own pre-established criteria. On the basis of this evaluation, it makes a decision about whether the application will be recommended to the Dean for consideration. The Dean forwards this material with his / her recommendation to the University Committee on Promotion and Tenure (UCPT).

C. Conflict of Interest and Confidentiality of Review

In cases of conflict of interest (as defined by the university) that occur for a member of the PRT committee, that member will be recused and replaced with an alternate member selected by vote of the faculty. If a candidate believes that there is a conflict of interest, the candidate may petition to have that person recuse himself or herself. If a committee member does not recuse himself or herself, a decision about whether that person has a conflict of interest will be made by a majority of the other committee members.

In the event that the person recused is the only Full Professor serving on the Committee and the candidate is applying for promotion to Full Professor, then the alternate committee member must also be a Full Professor.

Consideration and evaluation of a faculty member's record is a confidential personnel matter. Only those persons eligible to vote on promotion and tenure may participate in or observe deliberations or have access to the personnel file (except that clerical staff may assist in the preparation of documents under conditions that assure confidentiality).

III. Review of Promotion with Tenure Applications

A. University Criteria

The criteria for promotion with tenure have been and continue to be teaching, research, and service. Both teaching and research should normally be given primary consideration. Service is also expected of every individual, and its nature and extent may vary widely. It should be the aim of evaluators at every level to ensure that the total contributions of the faculty member to the University are properly recognized.

Promotion with tenure must be based principally upon evidence of achievement since the initial appointment to the faculty. The awarding of tenure must take into account any prior service credited but will be based largely on the evidence of achievement since joining the University of Kansas. Part-time service, however, does not count toward tenure." See "Faculty Responsibilities" Article IV of the Faculty Code of Conduct for more detailed information.

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

B. Applying University Criteria

1. Teaching

The applicant must provide clear evidence of the ability to engage competently in the teaching/learning process. Excellence in teaching involves the ability to engage students fully in the teaching and learning process in classrooms of varying types; evidence of full knowledge of the curriculum area, including the most recent theory and inquiry; the ability to integrate and synthesize related areas of knowledge; the ability to translate theory/concept/research findings into practice; the ability to demonstrate the links between this curriculum and other areas of the curriculum of the School; the ability to promote independent learning in students; the ability to motivate students to learn more; and evidence of the application of the curriculum themes of the School in classes taught; evidence of efforts to improve teaching skills over time, and involvement in providing advice and support for students outside the classroom.

For purposes of evaluating a faculty member's activity, both student evaluations and peer reviews will be used to assess the quality of the teaching performance.

- a. Student evaluation of quality of teaching will be determined by reviewing student evaluation scores and the accompanying student comments, and teaching awards.
- b. Peer review of quality of teaching and educational activity will be conducted by at least two tenured faculty members chosen by the PRT committee from a list of 3 nominees chosen by the candidate. Peer review shall include the following:
 - Teaching materials – syllabi, readings or other evidence of innovative techniques, and classroom observations.
 - Student voice or evidence of learning – student feedback forms or assignments that demonstrate understanding of key goals.

- Teaching narrative – statement describing the development of teaching practice over time with a focus on reflection, course goals, and student learning.

The peer reviewer's responsibility includes interacting with the faculty member, observing student instruction, and documenting the teaching practices.

- c. Committee evaluation of quality of teaching and educational activity will be based on multiple sources of input, including but not limited to the following:

- Applicant's statement of teaching philosophy.
- Student Evaluations.
- Peer review of teaching.
- Assessment of course outlines, assignments, and exams.
- Assessment of contributions to curriculum development through activity of curriculum committees, and new course development and teaching innovations.
- Letters commenting on teaching skills.

- d. The PRT Committee will assess the quality of the candidate's teaching by reviewing syllabi, readings or other evidence of innovative techniques, and classroom observations. Based on the review of these sources, the Committee will characterize the teaching performance for each course as required by the University. Student evaluation scores and the accompanying student comments will be examined to determine if there is a general trend of competence in teaching over time. Student evaluations of teaching will also be compared to School-wide averages.

2. **Scholarship/Research**

Faculty members are entitled to academic freedom and have an obligation to exercise that freedom responsibly.

Scholarship and inquiry in a mission-oriented profession such as social work involves a variety of paths. The root idea of scholarship is to make new and distinctive contributions to a particular field of interest. The publication of scholarly work makes open and visible the individual's capacity to think, to formulate, and to communicate. Examples of approaches to scholarship may include the following:

- Quantitative research
- Qualitative research
- Mixed methods research
- Historical/archival studies

- Critiques, revisions, and enhancements of theoretical, conceptual, or methodological orientations
- Critical reviews of existing knowledge
- Well-documented case studies
- Interdisciplinary research/scholarship using a variety of methodologies

The quality of scholarship must be demonstrated and documented in the faculty member's statement of scholarly interests, in letters of evaluation of scholarly work from outside reviewers, and in the corpus of the applicant's scholarly work. The candidate must demonstrate independent scholarship that goes beyond the scholarly work completed for the terminal degree.

Scholarship includes the following products: books, monographs, peer reviewed and invited articles, peer reviewed and invited book chapters, grants, research and technical reports, peer reviewed conference papers, unpublished papers, non-peer reviewed conference papers, book reviews, and oral presentations. University of Kansas policy requires a statement defining "the criteria upon which a work is classified as a major or minor work in this field." The definition for major and minor works is provided below in Section III.B.2.d and III.B.2.e.

Minimum expectations of scholarship for tenure and criteria for evaluation of scholarship are as follows:

- a. Applicants are expected to have produced publications or in-press publications that clearly demonstrate the applicant's scholarly trajectory, commensurate with the guidelines outlined above. It would be difficult to make a case for tenure without at least 10 publications. The majority of these publications must be in peer reviewed journals. **Note that ten or more publications do not** guarantee satisfaction of scholarship expectations, because the quality might be considered inadequate by the PRT Committee, the external reviewers, or the Dean. **Fewer than ten** publications could be sufficient to meet scholarship expectations only if the PRT Committee, the external reviewers, and the Dean agree that they are of exceptional quality and significance to the profession. Applicants for tenure are encouraged to excel both in quantity and quality of publications. Excellent applicants ordinarily significantly exceed this minimum quantity expectation and also have outstanding quality. See Section III.B.2.d for more information on determination of quality. The greatest weight is placed on major publications, as defined in Sections III.B.2.d.
- b. Greater weight will be given to works that have relevance to the social work knowledge base, social work practice and social policy.

- c. Greater weight will be given to works where the applicant has made significant contributions, as indicated by the order of authorship or an assessment of the candidate's overall contribution to each scholarly endeavor.
- d. Major publications are defined as publications in any print or electronic medium subject to peer review as a prior condition for acceptance. This could include journal articles, books, and chapters. In specific instances where uncertainty may exist as to whether a product meets the definition of "major" the candidate can seek prior written approval from the PRT Committee.
- e. Minor publications are defined as i) non-peer reviewed publications (e.g., books, monographs, invited chapters, invited articles); ii) papers included in peer reviewed conference proceedings; iii) book reviews; iiiii) teaching resources, such as modules or videos.
- f. Major presentations are defined as presentations at national or international conferences or meetings.
- g. Minor presentations are defined as presentations at state and local conferences or meetings.
- h. Peer review means that reviews are done by peer reviewers, without knowledge of the author's identity, and that the reviews can end up in rejection. The candidate should be able to document whether the article, book, or book chapter was peer reviewed.
- i. While not included in minimum expectations for tenure, research and scholarship which is supported through external funding is encouraged and recognized in evaluating the candidate's body of scholarship and research. Major grant activity is defined as awards and grants from agencies and foundations of national standing where the candidate is PI or co-PI and the award includes a rigorous review process, anonymous or not. Minor grant activity includes all other funding.
- j. The quality of individual publications as well as the candidate's body of scholarship will be assessed by the PRT Committee as well as by external evaluators who are at associate or full professor rank. The quality of the body of work must be reflected in the outside evaluators' letters. External evaluators must not include dissertation advisors, former professors, graduate school colleagues, co-authors, KU faculty, or one's own former students. External evaluators are informed that their evaluation letter will become part of the candidate's promotion with tenure dossier and will be treated as confidential by the University to the extent we are permitted to do so by law. External evaluators will be asked to address the following:

- 1) The quality of each of the candidate's publications. Such an assessment might cover their judgment about the theoretical, logical and/or methodological rigor as well as the contribution that the publication has made to the profession.
 - 2) The quality of the candidate's corpus of scholarly work. Such an assessment might cover their judgment about the extent to which the body of work demonstrates an increasing or continuous level of excellence and productivity, and the degree to which the corpus is cohesive in that there are some central questions/issues that drive the research as a whole.
 - 3) Their assessment of the candidate's reputation as it pertains to relevant regional, national, and/or international scholarly research and knowledge building activities, as well as the candidate's ability to independently conceptualize, execute and disseminate scholarly research.
- k. The quality of the scholarship is also assessed through unsolicited letters from peers, colleagues, and others familiar with the applicant's work.

3. Service

Service will be considered within the following classification:

- School service,
- University service, and
- Professionally related service outside the University, including local community, state and region, national and/or international.

We do not value any one type of service over another since this varies as a function of scholarly work pursued. We favorably evaluate service at various levels, and look for evidence of regional, national, and international service as academic careers evolve.

Paid practice of any kind, be it direct service, consultation, teaching, speaking (except for a token honorarium) cannot be counted as service since, although it makes a professional contribution, it is already being rewarded through payment whereas the concept of service here includes personal donation or contribution.

Judgments about the quality of service will take into account:

- Honors and awards
- Letters from others who are in a position to judge the quality and extent of participation
- Written documents produced in connection with service rendered

IV. Review of Applications for Promotion to Full Professor

As stated in Article VI of the Rules and regulations of the Faculty senate (6.1.5.2), promotion to full professor is based on substantial additional achievement since the award of tenure and/or promotion to associate professor, and faculty members with tenure are expected to continue to engage in substantial productive activity in the areas of teaching (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.

Faculty may apply for promotion to full professor at any time after receiving tenure and promotion to associate professor. However, a recommendation for promotion to full professor earlier than customary must include evidence of truly exceptional merit.

The same basic criteria for scholarship, teaching, and service for tenure and promotion apply to work principally completed after application for tenure. In addition, the applicant must clearly have earned a national and/or international reputation, and show evidence of significant career development in one or more fields of interest and scholarly endeavor germane to the profession of social work. Likewise, the applicant shall have demonstrated leadership in the profession. The applicant will have produced a significant body of knowledge reflecting leadership in the thinking pertaining to areas of scholarly/pedagogic/professional activity.

Evidence of this comes from the same sources as in promotion with tenure evaluative criteria (see Section III. above). In addition, the distinguished panel of external reviewers must be composed of people who hold a position at least of Full Professor, or have comparable professional standing in a non-academic setting and possess credentials that will document they have expertise in evaluating the candidate's work within the context of the discipline or profession.

The process of the PRT committee in evaluating the work of candidates for promotion to full professor is essentially the same as the process described above for evaluating the work of candidates for promotion with tenure. The PRT Committee will use all submitted materials to evaluate teaching, scholarship, and service as “excellent,” “very good,” “good,” “marginal,” or “poor.”

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

V. PRT Committee Promotion and Tenure Procedures

- A. An applicant for promotion and tenure must submit his or her application and all required supporting documentation on or before deadline announced by the PRT Committee.

B. Documentation to Collect for Promotion with Tenure Application

1. A copy of the candidate's up-to-date CV

2. Teaching

- ◆ all student evaluations including scores and accompanying student comments
- ◆ all course outlines
- ◆ all class rosters
- ◆ the number of students regularly advised as defined by the University
- ◆ lists of liaison students
- ◆ letters / notes commenting on teaching skills
- ◆ letters from professional community re: workshops, seminars, etc.
- ◆ at least two letters from peers who have reviewed the candidate's teaching

3. Scholarship

- ◆ copies of all published articles, in-press manuscripts, and manuscripts under review
- ◆ a description of the review process for each book, refereed book chapter, conference presentation, grant, or article appearing in a special issue of a refereed journal.
- ◆ letters commending / recognizing published and presented works
- ◆ copies of all technical reports and funded grant proposals
- ◆ copies of letters to editor, book reviews, or anything else that includes evaluative comments about published or presented works

4. Service

- ◆ complete listing of every service activity: International, National, State, Local, School, University, Profession (note dates, role, time commitment, work products that demonstrate one's contribution)
- ◆ letters from others recognizing / commending service activities
- ◆ program brochures listing presentations made
- ◆ copies of legislative testimony
- ◆ letters of invitation to participate in community events

C. The candidate will arrange all materials according to instructions set forth by the University, consulting with the PRT committee chairperson as needed to determine how to package materials for external reviewers of scholarship and for the PRT and UCPT committees.

D. The PRT committee will ask candidate to provide names of up to six (6) people who meet the following criteria:

1. Hold a position at a level at least equal to the level to which the candidate is seeking promotion or have comparable professional standing in a non-academic setting and possess credentials that will document their expertise in evaluating the candidate's work.
 2. External evaluators must not include individuals who have a close academic or personal connection with the candidate (e.g., dissertation advisors, former professors, graduate school colleagues, co-authors, KU faculty, former faculty colleagues, personal friends, or one's own former students).
 3. Candidates may identify up to 2 individuals who they prefer not be reviewers.
 4. Candidate will have input into the selection of work to be sent to external reviewers.
- E. The PRT committee selects no more than three suggested external reviewers from the candidate's list, and three at least three additional potential external reviewers, along with alternates. PRT members then contact the potential external reviewers to secure a commitment to evaluate the candidate's CV and a selection of the candidate's scholarly work. When external reviewers agree to evaluate materials, the PRT committee offers electronic versions of all materials unless the reviewer prefers to receive hard copies. If hard copies are required, the PRT committee will ask the candidate to make copies of his or her CV and scholarly products.
- F. The PRT committee will review external evaluations and all other materials, make a decision as to its recommendation (most typically by consensus, but otherwise by majority vote) complete the Initial Review Evaluation Summary for the Candidate (see Provost's website), and submit a summary evaluation to the Dean. This summary evaluation will include: the recommendation of the PRT committee; its ratings of the candidate in the areas of teaching, scholarship, and service; statements of the reasons for those ratings.

VI. Policies and Procedures Following the PRT Committee Review

- A. After independently reviewing all materials, the Dean will concur or not with the PRT committee's recommendations in writing, share the PRT summary evaluation with the candidate, make his / her own recommendation to the UCPT, and provide the candidate with a copy of the corresponding evaluation section of the promotion form.
- B. In the event of a negative recommendation or a final rating of teaching, scholarship, or service below the level of "good" by the PRT committee, the Dean will ask the candidate to submit a written response to him / her for consideration during the Dean's independent review of promotion tenure applications.

- C. In the event of a negative recommendation that will not be automatically forwarded by the Dean to the UCPT, the Dean will inform the candidate that he / she may request that the record be forwarded for further review.
- D. If the UCPT sends a request for additional information while conducting its review, the Dean will immediately provide a copy of the request to the candidate and the Chair of the PRT committee. The candidate will have the opportunity to participate in the preparation for the response to the request for information and/or submit his or her own response.

*Document history:

- Adopted November 3, 2000
- Revisions Adopted September 5, 2003
- Revisions Adopted February 20, 2009
- Revisions Adopted May 8, 2009
- Revisions Adopted November 5, 2009
- Revisions Adopted December 11, 2009
- Revisions Adopted September 2, 2011
- Revisions Adopted May 4, 2012
- Revisions Adopted May 10, 2013
- Technical Revisions Adopted December 13, 2013