

University of Kansas
School of Business Promotion and Tenure Committee
White Paper on Promotion and Tenure
Evaluation Guidelines: 2010-2011

Table of Contents

- A. Introduction
- B. Membership Criteria and Election Procedures
- C. Probationary Period Reviews
 - 1. Annual Review
 - i. Nature of the review
 - ii. Possible outcomes
 - 2. Progress Towards Tenure Review
 - i. Nature of the review
 - ii. Possible outcomes
- D. Tenure and Promotion Review
 - 1. Preparation of Nomination Dossiers
 - 2. Overall Promotion and Tenure Standards
 - 3. Evaluation of Teaching
 - i. Peer Teaching Evaluation Team (PTET)
 - 4. Evaluation of Research
 - i. Additional Considerations
 - ii. Peer Research Evaluation Team (PRET)
 - iii. External Evaluation of Research
 - 5. Evaluation of Service
 - 6. Confidentiality and Communication with Candidate
 - 7. Tenure/Rank Review for External Candidate Offer

Appendix A: Request templates for external and internal reviews
Committee Blue Form templates: K:POLICIES/P&T

University of Kansas
School of Business Promotion and Tenure Committee
White Paper on Promotion and Tenure
Evaluation Guidelines, 2010-2011

A. INTRODUCTION

The mission of the University of Kansas School of Business is to prepare students for careers in the practice and study of business and management by maintaining a leading School of Business that fosters the creation and dissemination of knowledge in a changing global environment.

This document explains the evaluation procedures of the School of Business Promotion and Tenure Committee (SBPTC). The promotion/tenure evaluation procedures reflect University imposed guidelines, directives passed in previous years by School of Business faculties and assemblies, previous SBPTC policies, and the judgments and beliefs of the members of this year's SBPTC.

This document, past White Papers, and other relevant, non-confidential documents are maintained at K:/POLICIES/P&T.

B. MEMBERSHIP CRITERIA AND ELECTION PROCEDURES

In accordance with Faculty Senate Rules and Regulations (FSRR) Article VI, Section 6.1.4, and with policies adopted by the faculty of the School, SBPTC membership will be guided by the following criteria:

1. No person may serve on both the School and University P&T Committee at the same time.
2. With the exceptions noted below, any tenured member of the faculty of the academic rank of Associate Professor or above is eligible for election to the SBPTC.
3. The Dean, Associate Dean and Area Directors shall not serve as members of the SBPTC.
4. A faculty member who is a spouse or partner of an individual being considered for tenure and/or promotion shall not serve on SBPTC during that year.
5. The committee will consist of 7 (seven) members. Each administrative area be represented by at least one faculty member.

Each year, the number of departing committee members and any areas left unrepresented will be determined. Nominations will be solicited by ballot. If an area requires new representation, at least one candidate from that area will win a place on the ballot for the final election. At the final election, at least one candidate from an unrepresented area will be voted to the committee, along with any new at-large members.

C. PROBATIONARY PERIOD REVIEWS

The SBPTC conducts annual reviews for all untenured Assistant Professors, except during the first year of service. The School is required to conduct a "progress toward tenure review" (PTTR) approximately midway between a faculty member's appointment and mandatory review year. Normally this is required

during the third year of service. During other probationary years, prior to tenure application, the committee conducts a briefer annual review. Both annual and PTTR reviews are typically conducted early in the spring. Each fall, the SBPTC will hold an open informational meeting. All faculty are invited. Assistant professors are strongly encouraged to attend.

The SBPTC communicates with the Area Directors and Dean's office to ensure that all faculty members scheduled for reviews have been identified.

C. 1. Annual Reviews

Faculty Senate Rules and Regulations (FSRR 6.4.1) require that the School have a plan for mentoring faculty prior to tenure. The plan should provide information and guidance to assist faculty members in the development of successful careers. FSRR requires that the School, working with the faculty member, shall on an ongoing basis, generate and compile documentation necessary to evaluate performance. Therefore, all untenured faculty members who are not in their first year of employment in the School, and not scheduled for an in-depth progress towards tenure review will undergo a brief annual review.

C.1.i. Nature of the review

The purpose of the review is to provide faculty with an evaluation of their performance in three fundamental areas: teaching, research, and service. The SBPTC views teaching and research to be approximately equally important in evaluating performance. While service is a relevant factor in the evaluation process, it is not recommended that probationary tenure eligible faculty undertake heavy service responsibilities. Assistant professors scheduled for annual reviews must provide current vitas, copies of all teaching evaluations (numerical summaries and individual student comment sheets) and any other materials requested by the committee; they are also responsible for keeping the committee apprised of significant changes in their record. The SBPTC will seek input from the School Area Directors regarding their respective area faculty members under review.

C.1.ii. Possible outcomes of an annual review

The first possible outcome is that the faculty member's performance is determined to be satisfactory for reappointment. The SBPTC may provide suggestions for building a stronger record if it identifies areas for potential improvement. It should be noted that a recommendation of reappointment in an earlier year does not imply that the SBPTC will necessarily recommend an award of tenure in the final probationary year.

A second possible outcome is that the SBPTC may suggest the candidate consider applying for promotion and tenure during the next school year. This situation would occur only in cases of outstanding performance meriting the award of tenure or promotion earlier than normal University guidelines. Such an application would follow the procedure for the evaluation of faculty in their mandatory tenure-review year.

The third possible outcome is that the SBPTC decides that the faculty member's performance is unsatisfactory, and recommends non-reappointment (as provided in FSRR 6.4.3). Such a recommendation can be due to unsatisfactory performance in teaching or research or both, extending over a sufficient period of time such that the faculty member's record at the end of the probationary period is unlikely to

support a recommendation for tenure. It is possible, but unlikely, that an annual review conducted prior to the third-year PTTR would lead to a recommendation for non-reappointment.

Evidence of unsatisfactory performance in teaching would include consistently low student evaluations, absent evidence to the contrary. Unsatisfactory performance in research would be evidenced by lack of significant and/or refereed publications occurring at a rate commensurate with School of Business expectations for faculty in that particular academic area.

Should a recommendation for non-reappointment be warranted, the committee will communicate its judgment to the faculty member. The faculty member may provide any significant new information to the SBPTC for its consideration. The final judgment of the SBPTC will be communicated to the individual.

Should the committee ultimately recommend non-reappointment, the recommendation will be forwarded to the Dean of the School of Business. The Dean will provide notice of his decision to the faculty member and forward the recommendation to the Provost, indicating whether or not the Dean concurs with the recommendation. The SBPTC will provide the Dean with the materials relied upon in the evaluation process and a written statement supporting its recommendation.

C.2. Progress Toward Tenure Reviews

FSRR 6.4.2 requires the School to conduct a “progress toward tenure review” (PTTR) approximately midway between a faculty member’s appointment and mandatory review year. Normally this will occur during the spring of the third year of service.¹ In that year, this review takes the place of the briefer annual review of assistant/untentured professors.

C.2.i. Nature of the review

The purpose of the review is to give faculty members a meaningful appraisal of their progress to date toward earning tenure, and to orient the tenure-track faculty member to elements of the formal tenure review process. The review assesses the faculty member’s cumulative accomplishments and pattern of progress in teaching, research and service at the University of Kansas. The reference point for this assessment is the academic unit’s and University’s criteria for promotion and tenure and departmental and University goals. Assistant professors scheduled for such reviews must provide completed *Progress Toward Tenure Review* forms and associated materials to the committee. The PTTR forms and instructions are available at the KU Provost’s web site.² Assistant professors are encouraged to consult with faculty mentors in preparing materials to be submitted to the SBPTC. The SBPTC will also seek input from the School Area Directors regarding their respective area faculty members under review.

PTTRs include written reports by a peer research evaluator (PRE) and a peer teaching evaluator (PTE). The PTE will include a class visit as part of their assessment.

The SBPTC will evaluate all three dimensions (teaching, research and service) relative to the following categories:

1. Exceptions to the standard third-year timing of the PTTR and procedures for applying for additional time before this review is conducted are subject to University policies and procedures and do not involve the SBPTC.

2. See: Office of the Provost / Policies & Resources / Resources for Faculty / Faculty Evaluation / Progress Toward Tenure Review / Candidate Documents. Part A, Section III is not necessary for School of Business Faculty.

- () Demonstrates progress toward tenure
- () Improvement required for continued progress toward tenure
- () Record not sufficient for progress toward tenure

At the time of the PTTR, the committee typically expects to observe research progress towards tenure reflected in publications and/or papers under later-round review as well as initial submissions, working papers, work in progress and conference presentations. Publications at journals with notoriously stringent standards are the clearest indication of satisfactory progress. While the committee recognizes that such publications are not always realized early in the probationary period, meaningful progress toward such publications is expected for continued reappointment. When assessing studies published in other referred journals or submissions in later round reviews, journal quality will be a primary indicator of progress. The committee will also consider whether the faculty member is beginning to develop a stream of research likely to develop into a national reputation.

The committee expects to see teaching progress reflected in satisfactory or improving student evaluations, pedagogical materials and classroom conduct. These will be assessed in the context of the number and nature of courses taught. Much of this information will be obtained from the PTE and the Area Director's report.

The committee expects to see limited, but some, service activity, typically at the Area or School level. Professional service such as conference participation and reviewing activity is good, but does not replace KU service.

C.2.ii. Possible outcomes

The SBPTC will make an overall evaluation that will reflect the individual's record of teaching, research and service in relation to progress toward meeting the University's criteria for promotion and/or tenure. In this process, the SBPTC will be mindful of the School's promotion and tenure standard that requires that a successful tenure candidate should have at least one area of conspicuous strength beyond the "good" standard. For Assistant Professors this area of strength should be research or teaching, not service.

The three evaluation categories from the PTTR form are:

- () Evidence sufficient for continuing tenure track appointment at this time
- () Evidence requires a subsequent formal probationary review within one academic year
- () Evidence supports a recommendation for non-reappointment.

Typically, faculty members will need to be assessed as making progress toward tenure on all three evaluative dimensions to avoid a recommendation of probation or non-reappointment. If the faculty member is placed on probation, the following annual review will determine whether the probationary conditions have been met, and if tenure track appointment can continue.

If the committee determines that evidence supports a recommendation of non-reappointment, the SBPTC will communicate its judgment to the faculty member. The faculty member may provide any significant new information to the SBPTC for its consideration. The final judgment of the SBPTC will be communicated to the individual.

Should the committee ultimately recommend non-reappointment; the recommendation will be forwarded to the Dean of the School of Business. The Dean will provide notice of his decision to the faculty member and forward the recommendation to the Provost, indicating whether the Dean concurs with the recommendation. The SBPTC will provide the Dean with the materials relied upon in the evaluation process and a written statement supporting its recommendation.

D. TENURE AND PROMOTION REVIEW

Pursuant to Board of Regents policy, consideration of tenure typically occurs during the sixth year.³ Each spring, the SBPTC communicates with the Area Directors and Dean's office to identify faculty members scheduled for tenure review. These reviews take place during the fall, and involve rigorous deadlines.

Non-tenured faculty requesting an early tenure application should inform the committee during spring semester. Candidates applying for promotion in the fifth year are held to the same standards of achievement as those who have completed the full probationary period

Tenured faculty applying for promotion to Full Professor should also inform the committee during spring semester. The SBPTC typically commences the review process prior to the start of fall semester.

Given that the School does not have department-level P&T structures, the School conducts only an initial review (as provided for in FSRR 6.5.1.1). There is no intermediate review. The remainder of this document provides guidelines for initial reviews.

D.1. Preparation of Nomination Dossiers

The candidate is responsible for completing the Promotion and Tenure - Candidate Documents (Blue Form) found at the Provost's web page.⁴ The SBPTC secures outside letters of evaluation and other evaluative material. The SBPTC also requests a letter from the candidate's Area Director assessing the candidate's qualifications for promotion.

SBPTC templates for the committee's portion of the Promotion and Tenure Forms, are maintained at K:POLICIES/P&T and available for reference.⁵

D.2. Overall Promotion and Tenure Standards

FSRR 6.3.2.2 requires the evaluation of teaching, scholarship, and service using the following five point scale. The evaluation adjectives are:

Excellent, Very Good, Good, Marginal, and Poor

³ Exceptions to this rule and procedures for applying for additional probationary time are subject to University policies and procedures and do not involve the SBPTC.

⁴ See: Office of the Provost/Policies and Resources/Resources for Faculty/Faculty Evaluation/Promotion and Tenure/ Candidate Documents. Folder C, Sec 1 is not required for School of Business faculty.

⁵ These consist of Folders A, B, D, E and F. Folder C is not applicable to the School.

Each of the three major activities (teaching, research, and service) will be rated into one of these categories, and an overall adjective will be assigned. We will employ these evaluative adjectives in the following way:

"Excellent" means that the candidate substantially exceeds disciplinary expectations for tenure and/or promotion to this rank. This adjective will be reserved for performance that so greatly exceeds minimum standards for promotion and tenure that few School of Business faculty members achieve this high level. Excellent performance is profound and unambiguously accomplished.

"Very good" means that the candidate's performance exceeds disciplinary expectations for tenure and/or promotion to this rank. The individual is consistently highly effective and productive.

"Good" means that the candidate's performance meets disciplinary expectations for tenure and/or promotion to this rank. The individual is regularly effective and productive.

"Marginal" means that the candidate falls below disciplinary expectations for tenure and/or promotion to this rank. There are minor areas of deficiency or ineffectiveness in the candidate's performance, and therefore the school's minimum standards for promotion and tenure are only partially fulfilled.

"Poor" means that the candidate falls significantly below disciplinary expectations for tenure and/or promotion to this rank. A considerable deficiency or lack of effectiveness is observed.

Once a faculty member's performance is evaluated in all three activity areas, a "recommend/not recommend" decision is made regarding promotion/tenure. It is not possible to put into a formula a specification of the minimum evaluations necessary to secure a positive recommendation. However, these are some guidelines the SBPTC uses in performing its task.

1. If a candidate receives a rating of "poor" in service activities, it will be difficult to receive a positive tenure recommendation.
2. If a candidate receives a rating of "poor" in either the teaching or research activity, it will be virtually impossible to receive a positive tenure recommendation.
3. If a candidate receives a rating of "good" in all three activities, it will be difficult to receive a positive tenure recommendation. The rationale for this approach is that the SBPTC believes that a successful tenure candidate should have at least one area rated "very good" or higher.
4. The SBPTC believes there are some differences between the criteria for tenure and for promotion to full professor. Generally, the tenure decision is more critical for the School and for the candidate. Service activities play a lesser role in tenure decisions than in decisions to promote to full professor. Nonetheless, some service activity is expected for tenure and School and University-level service is expected for promotion to full professor. As stated in the Faculty Handbook, "Intramural service is expected of every faculty member. It is part of being a good citizen and a participating member of the academic community."

D.3. Evaluation of Teaching

In the realm of teaching, the mission of the University of Kansas School of Business is to maintain a leading School of Business that fosters the creation and dissemination of knowledge and thereby promotes student development. Our teaching standards for promotion to Associate or Full Professor are consistent with this mission of developing well-rounded business graduates that enhances our standing as a leading School of Business.

FSRR 6.2.2.2 states:

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.

FSRR 6.2.2.3 states:

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.

Multiple sources of input form the basis for the evaluation of teaching. Matters for review and evaluation include, among other things, course syllabi, course objective statements, exams, assignments, original instructional materials, student evaluations, grade distribution data, and teaching awards. These are considered in the context of the number and nature of courses taught. The committee also relies on input from colleagues, including peer classroom observations and administrative reports.

To evaluate a candidate's teaching, the SBPTC requires quantitative results of the School of Business Curriculum and Instruction Survey form, and all comment sheets ("comment sheets" refers to open-ended responses solicited from students in class along with the C & I Survey).

The SBPTC may also consider, among other things, letters and comments from colleagues with first-hand evidence of a candidate's teaching effectiveness, letters from students and alumni, successful executive education teaching and education-based research and textbooks.

D.3.i. Peer teaching evaluation team (PTET)

To help in assessing teaching performance, a two person peer teaching evaluation team (PTET) will be formed for each tenure/promotion decision. Members of the PTET should be mutually agreeable to the SBPTC and the candidate.

The charge to each PTET member is to engage in a thorough analysis of the candidate's teaching program and to provide the SBPTC with a written report. This should include evaluation and comment regarding the C&I evaluations and student comment sheets for the candidate, but should also focus heavily on other evidence relevant to the candidate's teaching. The PTET will familiarize itself with the candidate's Blue Form statement regarding teaching, and may wish to discuss with the candidate his/her teaching practices,

style, etc. The PTET should evaluate whether course content is current, rigorous, innovative, and appropriate for the level of enrolled students. A useful standard might be how the content of the candidate's teaching program would be judged at our peer institutions.

The PTET should evaluate specific teaching skills (e.g., presentation skills, interpersonal communication skill, organization and planning skills, and the ability to motivate students) and the degree to which the individual is appropriately addressing teaching responsibilities outside the classroom (e.g., regularly holding office hours, and being accessible to students with special learning needs). The PTET will examine course syllabi, course objective statements, exams, assignments, original instructional materials, and course enrollment and grade distribution data. The PTET will also engage in classroom visitations.

The member of the PTET also should investigate other important teaching activities the candidate may be involved in, such as Ph.D. and M.S. thesis and examination work both inside and outside the School, student independent studies activities, and work with non-traditional students.

Each member of the PTET will provide a written report. To encourage candor, confidentiality of the PTET report will be maintained by, for example, possibly forgoing opportunities for diagnostic counsel. Candidates will not have access to the original critique, or to the summary included on the Blue Form.

D.4. Evaluation of Research

In the realm of research, the mission of the School of Business is to foster the creation and dissemination of basic and applied research. Our research standards for promotion to Associate or Full Professor are consistent with this mission of producing high quality research that enhances our standing as a leading School of Business.

FSRR 6.2.3.2 states:

For the award of tenure and/or promotion to 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.

FSRR 6.2.3.3 states:

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.

Considering these contexts, the awarding of tenure and promotion to Associate Professor requires a research record demonstrating the candidate is achieving national, and preferably, international stature. Accordingly, the SBPTC expects candidates to demonstrate that their research endeavors have influenced business scholarship, practice, or regulation. For Assistant Professors, publications in the most prestigious academic journals, with notoriously stringent acceptance standards, will normally be accepted as such evidence.

In some cases, well-cited articles published in well-respected, but not the most prestigious, journals might be judged to be influential. Other evidence that an article has meaningfully affected scholarship, policy or practice, such as awards or citations by policy-makers, may also be considered. It is the candidate's responsibility to provide the SBPTC with evidence of the impact of their research.

Awarding tenure is a long-term commitment by the University, so the SBPTC also will carefully assess whether the candidate is likely to continue as a productive researcher. At the time of review, evidence of future activity primarily consists of research in progress and working papers under review at well-respected journals.

Assessment of a candidate's research record is based on standards existing at the time the candidate is reviewed for promotion, as applied by the SBPTC extant in that year. Each SBPTC will assess every candidate's research record in the context of past promotion and tenure decisions at the University of Kansas School of Business, as well as standards at other leading Schools of Business, with the intent to advance the mission of the School. Documents providing contextual information are provided at K:POLICIES/P&T.

Promotion to full professor will require a continuing record of research that includes publications that have influenced business scholarship, practice or regulation. Again, publishing in top-tier journals is considered the best indication of such research. Additionally, the extent to which others have cited the candidate's work in prestigious journals can serve as evidence whether the candidate for full professor has established a national or international reputation as an expert. A qualified candidate for full professor should have received some such citations.

D.4.i. Additional considerations

The SBPTC will evaluate the relevance, importance, and impact of the candidate's scholarly contributions, including whether the candidate has pursued successfully a program of research. By program of research we mean a related series of research efforts directed toward a common topic or body of knowledge. The underlying premise of this approach is that scholarly contribution is closely related to programmatic research.

The SBPTC will consider both the quantity and the quality of output in evaluating the research dimension. Research performance will be based on cumulative research results, with more weight placed on performance in the current rank. We expect to be especially mindful of differences across outlets. High quality refereed journals with notoriously stringent acceptance standards will be identified as "top-line" journals in the various disciplines within the School.

Most faculty in the School work in one or more established business disciplines (e.g., finance, marketing, accounting) in which there are a few top journals, along with a slightly larger number of second-tier journals, all having stringent refereeing and low acceptance rates. However, a short note may not be considered a top-tier publication even if it appears in a very prestigious outlet. Contributions to government reports, handbooks, annuals, and other edited volumes are weighted by considering the prestige of the publication and the quality of the contribution. Publications in proceedings, practitioner journals, non-refereed journals, paper presentations, workshops, working papers, and work in progress, will be considered as a reflection of scholarly involvement, but they play a minor role as evidence of research accomplishment. Textbooks are typically not considered to be research.

The Progress Towards Tenure Review and the Promotion and Tenure forms require publications and presentations to be designated as major or minor works. Typically, major works are publications in academic, refereed journals and conferences with competitive acceptances. Publications in practitioner or non-referred journals, conference proceedings, book chapters and workshop presentations are likely minor works. Minor works have little impact on the overall assessment of research productivity.

In assessing the candidate's contribution to collaborative research efforts and coauthored publications, the SBPTC considers the number and variety of coauthors, and evidence of the candidate's individual contributions. Sole-authorship is not a requirement.

Faculty members are encouraged to seek both external and internal financial support for their research. Receipt of such support cannot be imposed as an expectation in view of the limited external research funding available to business faculty, but such support is considered positive evidence of the quality of a faculty member's research.

D.4.ii. Peer research evaluation team (PRET)

To help in assessing research performance of faculty in the School of Business, a two person PRET will be formed for each tenure/promotion candidate within the School who is receiving an in-depth review. Typically, a PRET will consist of two members of the faculty from the School knowledgeable of the candidate's research area and mutually agreeable to the candidate and the SBPTC. Members outside the School would only be considered if sufficient expertise is not believed to exist within the School.

The charge to each PRET will be to engage in a thorough analysis of the candidate's research program and to provide the SBPTC with a written report. Generally, a written report to the SBPTC will be expected from *each* member of the PRET. The report should assess (1) the impact of the research, (2) the quality of journals in which this research has been published, and (3) the overall nature and quality of the candidate's program of research. The SBPTC will direct the PRET to keep in mind, while making these judgments, the guidelines provided in the section above, titled "Evaluation of Research." The PRET will familiarize itself with the candidate's Blue Form statement regarding research and may wish to discuss with the candidate his/her research interests, objectives, methods, etc. The candidate shall provide the PRET with (1) objective (independent) information about journal quality ; (2) a dis-aggregation of his/her published works into major and minor subsets; and (3) evidence about citations (for candidates for full professor). The PRET shall evaluate (1) the candidate's information about journal quality; (2) the candidate's classification of works as major and minor; and (3) the evidence about the impact of his/her research (if provided). In accomplishing these tasks, the PRET should read at least the candidate's major published works. In the case of a candidate for full professor, the PRET should read at least the candidate's major publications since the prior promotion to associate professor.

D.4.iii. External evaluation of research

To help in assessing research performance the SBPTC will solicit external research evaluations for each tenure or promotion candidate who (1) is being recommended by the SBPTC for promotion with tenure to the rank of Associate Professor prior to their sixth year of service, or (2) is being recommended for promotion to the rank of Professor, or (3) is in the final tenure review service year, or (4) requests the collection of external reviews to supplement the existing performance record. External evaluations will be

used to assist the SBPTC in the preparation of supporting materials to be forwarded to the UCPT. Candidates not in their final tenure review year may request that external evaluations not be collected and thereby remove themselves from tenure consideration for that review year. Detailed guidelines for external evaluation are provided in the current "University of Kansas Guidelines for Promotion and Tenure Recommendations" (i.e. Blue Form guidelines).

The SBPTC will contact the reviewers by letter (see Appendix A) and will, with the help of the candidate, provide the reviewers with representative reprints, pre-prints, other relevant materials, a current vitae, and a statement describing the candidate's research orientation, ongoing work, and future research plans. Reviewers will be provided with a representative sample of the candidate's research (about 4-6 papers). The papers are to be chosen by the candidate, subject to the committee's approval. The external reviewers will be asked to address the following:

- 1) Length and nature of your association with the candidate;
- 2) The quality and quantity of the candidate's work as reflected in the candidate's CV and works sent for the evaluator's review;
- 3) The significance of the candidate's work to the discipline/profession;
- 4) The extent to which the candidate's record reflects an active and productive scholarly agenda compared to discipline characteristics;
- 5) The extent to which the candidate's record reflects a sustainable program of scholarly activity;
- 6) The level of state, regional, national and/or international stature of the candidate as a result of this work;
- 7) Any special distinction achieved by the candidate.

D.5. Evaluation of Service

FSRR 6.2.4.2 states:

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.

FSRR 6.2.4.3 states:

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.

Professional service includes activities such as chairing sessions or being a discussant at conferences, holding office in professional associations, serving as reviewers, editors or associate editors for journals and serving as committee members of professional associations.

The service requirements for assistant professors are modest. However, some service at the area or School level is desirable for promotion and tenure. This would include, for example, serving as a member of School committee or a faculty mentor for a School student organization. It is also expected that all tenure candidates will seek out opportunities to provide service to the profession, such as by serving as a journal reviewer or as a reviewer or discussant for papers presented at annual conferences for academic

associations in their field. Serving on a University-wide committee, leading a School Committee, or serving in a significant role for a professional group is beyond the normal expectation for an assistant professor.

Candidates for promotion to full professor normally would be expected to participate at a satisfactory level in both School and University service activities and demonstrate a willingness to serve on the School of Business Faculty Advisory Committee, the SBPTC, and on University Committees. For example, a candidate for full professor who has habitually removed his or her name from consideration for the School's Faculty Advisory Committee and the SBPTC, who has failed to volunteer for University service, or who has never served on a University committee would likely be rated poor in service.

D.6. Candidate's Procedural Rights and Communication with the Candidate

FSRR 6.1.4 states "no person should 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." If a candidate believes a member of the SBPTC has a conflict of interest, the candidate may petition the SBPTC to have that member recuse himself or herself. In the event that the member does not recuse himself or herself a decision will be made by a majority vote of the other SBPTC members. In the event of a tie vote the member will recuse himself or herself.

The record compiled for purposes of evaluation and all recommendations made will be treated as a confidential personnel matter.

Only members of the SBPTC will have access to University Committee on Promotions and Tenure's (UCPT) "Blue Forms," PTTR forms, and annual review letters completed in previous years. Under NO circumstances will the SBPTC provide candidates with access to the confidential parts of any of these documents. Candidates may have access to non-confidential parts of previous "Blue Forms." These materials can be useful guides for preparation of dossiers.

Candidates will have an opportunity to verify and correct the factual sections of their own Blue Forms, and the SBPTC will later add evaluative material, following University practice. While we recognize that diagnostic opportunities are lost when evaluators' comments are kept in complete confidence, we judge the importance of anonymity to be paramount.

The SBPTC shall provide the candidate with a written summary evaluation of their records. The summary evaluation shared with the candidate shall include (FSRR 6.3.4.2):

- (a) the recommendation of the committee, its majority rating in the areas of teaching, research and service, and a statement of the reasons for those ratings;
- (b) the concurrence or nonconcurrence of the dean of the School.

The chair of the SBPTC shall communicate the recommendation of that committee to the candidate and provide the candidate with a copy of the evaluation section of the promotion and tenure form. In the event of a negative recommendation, that recommendation shall be communicated in writing to the candidate. In the mandatory review year, the recommendation will automatically be forwarded to the next level. In

cases where the review occurs prior to the mandatory review year, the candidate will be informed that he or she may request that their record be forwarded to the UPTC for further review.

The candidate may submit a written response to a negative recommendation or to a final rating of teaching, research, or service below the level of “good” included in the evaluation section of the recommendation by the SBPTC that will be forwarded to the UPTC.

The candidate will be informed of any request for information from the UPTC and the candidate shall be afforded an opportunity to participate in the preparation of the response of the SBPTC or to submit his or her own response to the request for information.

D.7. Tenure/Rank Review In Connection with an Offer of Employment to an External Candidate

When the School is considering extending an offer of employment with tenure or employment at a position above the rank of Assistant Professor to an external candidate, the SBPTC will conduct a review of the candidate's record of teaching, research, and service. The SBPTC should be provided with materials similar to those that would be part of the Blue Form dossier. The grant of tenure to a person who has not previously been granted tenure by a research university and has not been evaluated through the standard University P&T process would be an unusual event that would require an extraordinarily strong record.

Appendix A: Request templates for external and internal reviews

Letter Requesting External Evaluation for Tenure & Associate Professor

Date:

Professor

Address 1

.....

Dear Professor:

The School of Business Promotion and Tenure Committee at the University of Kansas is conducting an in depth review of Professor X's teaching, research, and service record for the purpose of evaluation for tenure and promotion to the rank of Associate Professor. As a part of the promotion and tenure review process, we are soliciting assessments of Professor X'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.

The purpose of this letter is to seek your assistance. We would greatly appreciate your help in evaluating the relevance, importance, and impact of the candidate's scholarly contributions. Given your own research accomplishments and contribution to the profession, your confidential opinion will be given great weight. As mentioned above, in no case are reports from external referees shared with the candidate.

To make your task easier, the Committee has enclosed a copy of the candidate's curriculum vitae, a statement describing the candidate's research agenda, ongoing work, and future research plans. A representative sample of the candidate's scholarly works is also enclosed.

In broad terms, the research standard that candidates must satisfy is articulated in the University of Kansas *Faculty Senate Rules and Regulations*:

For the award of tenure and/or promotion to 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.

In this context, the awarding of tenure and promotion to Associate Professor in the University of Kansas School of Business requires a research record demonstrating the candidate is achieving national, and preferably international stature. Accordingly, the SBPTC expects candidates to demonstrate that their research endeavors have influenced business scholarship, practice, or regulation. For Assistant Professors, publications in the most prestigious academic journals, with notoriously stringent acceptance standards, will normally be accepted as such evidence. In some cases, well-cited articles published in well-respected, but not the most prestigious, journals might be judged to be influential. Other evidence that an article has meaningfully affected scholarship, policy or practice, such as awards or citations by policy-makers, may also be considered.

The Committee requests that you address the following areas in your evaluation:

- 1) Length and nature of your association with the candidate;
- 2) The quality and quantity of the candidate's work as reflected in the candidate's CV and works sent for the evaluator's review;
- 3) The significance of the candidate's work to the discipline/profession;
- 4) The extent to which the candidate's record reflects an active and productive scholarly agenda compared to discipline characteristics;
- 5) The extent to which the candidate's record reflects a sustainable program of scholarly activity;
- 6) The level of state, regional, national and/or international stature of the candidate as a result of this work;
- 7) Any special distinction achieved by the candidate.

To aid us in the evaluation of the candidate's research record and scholarly contribution to the profession, please provide us with your comments in the form of a letter. In the interest of full disclosure, also please indicate any prior knowledge, association, and/or relationship with the candidate. In addition, we need to furnish to the University your curriculum vitae, summarizing your own research accomplishments. So we would appreciate it if you would enclose a copy with your evaluation. Like your letter, this information will be shared with the University Promotion and Tenure Committee as a means for characterizing the breadth and depth of the candidate's recognition in the field. And finally, in the interest of a timely review process, please let us receive your evaluation no later than _____ [e.g. **Wednesday, October 31.**]

The Committee thanks you in advance for your generous and timely assistance.

Sincerely,

.....
Chair, School of Business Promotion
and Tenure Committee

Example Letter Requesting External Evaluation for full Professor

Date

Professor

Dear Professor ...:

The School of Business Promotion and Tenure Committee at the University of Kansas is conducting an in depth review of Professor Y's teaching, research, and service record for the purpose of evaluation for promotion to the rank of Professor. As a part of the promotion review process, we are soliciting assessments of Professor Y'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.

The purpose of this letter is to seek your assistance. We would greatly appreciate your help in evaluating the relevance, importance, and impact of the candidate's scholarly contributions. Given your own research accomplishments and contribution to the profession, your confidential opinion will be given great weight. As mentioned above, in no case are reports from external referees shared with the candidate.

To make your task easier, the Committee has enclosed a copy of the candidate's curriculum vitae, a statement describing the candidate's research agenda, ongoing work, and future research plans. A representative sample of the candidate's scholarly works is also enclosed.

In broad terms, the research standard that candidates must satisfy is articulated in the University of Kansas *Faculty Senate Rules and Regulations*:

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.

In this context, the awarding of promotion to Full Professor in the University of Kansas School of Business requires a research record demonstrating the candidate has successfully achieved national, and preferably, international stature. Accordingly, the SBPTC expects candidates to demonstrate that their research endeavors have influenced business scholarship, practice, or regulation. Publications in the most prestigious academic journals, with notoriously stringent acceptance standards, will normally be accepted as such evidence. In some cases, well-cited articles published in well-respected, but not the most prestigious, journals might be judged to be influential. Other evidence that an article has meaningfully affected scholarship, policy or practice, such as awards or citations by policy-makers, may also be considered.

The Committee requests that you address the following areas in your evaluation:

- 1) Length and nature of your association with the candidate;
- 2) The quality and quantity of the candidate's work as reflected in the candidate's CV and works sent for the evaluator's review;
- 3) The significance of the candidate's work to the discipline/profession;

- 4) The extent to which the candidate's record reflects an active and productive scholarly agenda compared to discipline characteristics;
- 5) The extent to which the candidate's record reflects a sustainable program of scholarly activity;
- 6) The level of state, regional, national and/or international stature of the candidate as a result of this work;
- 7) Any special distinction achieved by the candidate.

To aid us in the evaluation of the candidate's research record and scholarly contribution to the profession, please provide us with your comments in the form of a letter. Also, in the interest of full disclosure, please indicate any prior knowledge, association, and/or relationship with the candidate. In addition, we need to furnish to the University your curriculum vitae, summarizing your own research accomplishments. So we would appreciate it if you would enclose a copy with your evaluation. Like your letter, this information will be shared with the University Promotion and Tenure Committee as a means for characterizing the breadth and depth of the candidate's recognition in the field. And finally, in the interest of a timely review process, please let us receive your evaluation no later than _____ [e.g. **Wednesday, October 31.**]

The Committee thanks you in advance for your generous and timely assistance.

Sincerely,

.....
Chair, School of Business Promotion
and Tenure Committee

Example Letter to PRET Members

DATE

Professor
School of Business
Kansas University
Lawrence, Kansas 66045

Dear:

Thank you for agreeing to help the School's Promotion and Tenure Committee by serving with Professor YY on Professor XX's peer research evaluation team (PRET). Please read the sections titled "Evaluation of Research" and "Peer Research Evaluation Team" on pages 9-12 of the current SBPTC White Paper (*available on the K drive under Policies/P&T*). It is imperative that you are familiar with these sections, since they detail your specific responsibilities. When writing your report, please provide a summary evaluation of Professor XX's research performance using one of the adjectives listed and explained on page 5 of the White Paper (excellent, very good, good, marginal, or poor).

Our primary objective is to gain insight from you regarding the quality of Professor XX's scholarly work, although your assessment of the quantity of output might also prove useful.

Your report will become part of the information base used by the School of Business Promotion and Tenure Committee. If this Committee decides to recommend promotion your report becomes part of the nomination document forwarded to the University Committee. However, in no case are reports shared with the candidate.

I encourage you and Professor YY to discuss Professor XX's scholarly work with each other and with other members of the School of Business who may be knowledgeable about it. However, the SBPTC requires that separate reports be submitted given that PRET members are often most familiar with different parts of the candidate's work, and/or because they have different perspectives on it.

Please give me your report or reports, together with the file of materials Professor XX gave you for your work, by _____ [e.g. September 10] or earlier if possible. If you have any questions, please contact me.

Thank you for your help.

Cordially,

Chair, School of Business Promotion and Tenure Committee

Example Letter to PTET Members

DATE

Professor
School of Business
Kansas University
Lawrence, Kansas 66045

Dear:

Thank you for agreeing to help the School's Promotion and Tenure Committee by serving with Professor YY on Professor XX's peer teaching evaluation team (PTET). Please read the sections titled "Evaluation of Teaching" and "Peer Teaching Evaluation Team" on pages 8-9 of the current SBPTC White Paper (*available on the K drive under Policies/P&T*). It is imperative that you are familiar with these sections, since they detail your specific responsibilities. When writing your report, please provide a summary evaluation of Professor XX's teaching performance using one of the adjectives listed and explained on page 5 of the White Paper (excellent, very good, good, marginal, or poor).

The PTET should provide the P&T committee with a thorough analysis of Professor XX's teaching program. This analysis should include evaluation and comment regarding the C&I evaluations and student comment sheets for the candidate, but should also focus heavily on other evidence relevant to the candidate's teaching. You will familiarize yourself with the candidate's statement of teaching philosophy, and may wish to discuss with the candidate his/her teaching practices, style, etc. You should evaluate whether course content is current, rigorous, innovative, and appropriate for the level of enrolled students. A useful standard might be how the content of the candidate's teaching program would be judged at our peer institutions. You should evaluate specific teaching skills (e.g., presentation skills, interpersonal communication skill, organization and planning skills, and the ability to motivate students) and the degree to which the individual is appropriately addressing teaching responsibilities outside the classroom (e.g., regularly holding office hours, and being accessible to students with special learning needs). You will examine course syllabi, course objective statements, exams, assignments, original instructional materials, and course enrollment and grade distribution data. You will also engage in classroom visitations. You also should investigate other important teaching activities the candidate may be involved in, such as Ph.D. and M.S. thesis and examination work both inside and outside the School, student independent studies activities, and work with non-traditional students.

Your evaluation will become part of the information base used by the School of Business Promotion and Tenure Committee. If this Committee decides to recommend promotion, your report becomes part of the nomination document forwarded to the University Committee. However, in no case are reports shared with the candidate.

Please give me your report or reports, together with the file of materials Professor XX gave you for your work, by _____ [e.g. September 10] or earlier if possible.

If you have any questions, please contact me.

Thank you for your help.
Chair, School of Business Promotion and Tenure Committee