

**POLICIES AND PROCEDURES FOR PROMOTION, AND
TENURE MID-TENURE REVIEW
DEPARTMENT OF PHARMACOLOGY AND TOXICOLOGY**

Revised 2017 (Approved by SPPT 2017)

Recommendations concerning promotion and tenure shall be made solely in accordance with the standards and procedures in **Article VI. Promotion & Tenure** of the Faculty Senate Rules and Regulations. The procedures outlined below are used in developing a recommendation for promotion, tenure or mid-tenure reviews for a faculty member of the Department of Pharmacology and Toxicology. Consideration and evaluation of a candidate's record is a confidential personnel matter and will not be discussed by staff or faculty on the promotion and tenure committee outside of the meeting. These procedures and criteria have been adopted by a vote of eligible faculty.

1. The process of considering a faculty member for promotion, tenure, or mid-tenure review is usually initiated by the department chairperson in consultation with the individual faculty member. However, any faculty member of the School of Pharmacy including the candidate for review may make a recommendation for consideration of a faculty member in Pharmacology and Toxicology for promotion or tenure. The timing of the mid-tenure review is set and based on the faculty members start date. The Provost's office can initiate a mandatory review.

Supporting documentation of "meritorious achievement" and an evaluation of the candidate's ability and potential are provided by the faculty member under consideration in accordance with the Provost's guidelines, and additional materials are gathered by the departmental chairman, with the assistance of the departmental promotion and tenure committee, (or by the Dean of the School of Pharmacy in cases where the Chairman cannot participate in the deliberations) in accordance with the Provost's guidelines.

Outside letters of recommendation are not required for mid-tenure review, but are necessary to the level described by University regulations for tenure review and promotion. Outside reviewers are solicited and selected according the Provost's guidelines. The reviewers must hold academic rank or professional position equal to or greater than the rank for which the candidate is being considered. The candidate is asked to prepare a fully-updated CV we can send to selected external evaluators with our letter requesting their assessment of the candidate's research and scholarship. All external evaluators should be experts in research that is generally focused on biological questions similar to those being pursued by the candidate. The candidate is asked to provide names for potential external evaluators, with the proviso that she/he neither trained with nor collaborates with any individual listed. The candidate is also allowed to request that two individuals not be asked for evaluations, and this request will be honored. After receiving the list, three external reviewers suggested by the candidate are chosen. The names of several other scientists with expertise in closely related areas are also selected by the department chair or member of the review committee with research expertise similar to the candidate. Formal letters of request and the updated CV are sent to each of the external reviewers. The letter specifically asks that each evaluator address the issues outlined in the Provost's guidelines on External Evaluations.

2. Criteria for “meritorious achievement” in the context of a candidate’s suitability for tenure and/or promotion include the following:

a) A distinguished record in research. For consideration of promotion to Associate Professor with tenure, the candidate should demonstrate excellence in research which is evident from the record of the faculty member. This includes developing an independent research program, receiving external and intramural research support for investigations in this area, and publishing high quality publications in refereed journals. Collaborative and interdisciplinary or trans-disciplinary research as well as individual scholarship is valued. When the scholarly contributions are the result of collaborative interdisciplinary or trans-disciplinary efforts, the record should document the unique contribution of the candidate and its significance. Additional supporting evidence is provided by invited presentations to speak at regional, national or international Universities or professional societies. Candidates for Associate Professor should show a clear indication of developing a national presence within their field of expertise and an emerging international presence.

For promotion to Full Professor, the expectation is that the candidate continues to enhance his/her research productivity, provide a record of continuous extramural research support or credible attempts to secure such support and have clear evidence that the candidate has established a national and international reputation or recognition in their field. Collaborative and interdisciplinary or trans-disciplinary research as well as individual scholarship is valued. When the scholarly contributions are the result of collaborative interdisciplinary or trans-disciplinary efforts, the record should document the unique contribution of the candidate and its significance.

b) A meritorious record of teaching. At all levels, this should be documented as consisting of substantial effort in both undergraduate and graduate teaching and having received high quality evaluations from both peers and students. Developing novel teaching methodologies and/or participating in curricular development for the department is also appropriate. Additionally, participation in undergraduate advising is a required component of the teaching effort but metrics are not in place for formal assessment. The record for promotion to the rank of **professor** must demonstrate continued effectiveness and growth as a teacher.

c) Exemplary service to the University, the community, the profession, the State of Kansas and/or the nation. Service is defined as active participation in organizations, committees and other activities which enhance the goals of the University or render expert advice to professional review committees or learned societies.

Following the gathering of all supporting documentation by the faculty member, the departmental committee on promotions and tenure and the chairperson, the committee reviews the materials and makes a recommendation to the Chairman. All members of the department faculty holding the proposed rank or higher meet to consider and evaluate recommendations for promotion, tenure and mid-tenure review and thereby compose the promotion and tenure committee for any given consideration of promotion, tenure or mid-tenure review. The full committee evaluates the candidate and votes on recommendations. No students or untenured faculty members, except unclassified academic staff with rank equivalent to or higher than associate professor, shall serve,

participate, or observe any promotion and tenure committee or vote on any recommendation concerning promotion and tenure. Any persons with a clear conflict of interest will not serve on the committee. A candidate can petition for the recusal of a committee member and if a committee member does not recuse himself/herself, a decision about whether that person has a conflict of interest shall be made by a majority of the other committee members.

1. The Chairman of the Department directly communicates the decision and recommendation made by the committee to the nominee. If the review is not mandatory at that time, the nominated faculty member is then asked whether he or she wishes to allow the process to advance to the next step of the review procedure after being apprised of the major recommendations of the committee. Thus, if an initial review and faculty vote result in a negative recommendation that will not automatically be forwarded to the next level of review (the School of Pharmacy Executive Committee). Based on these considerations, the results of departmental deliberations and all supporting documentation on the candidate may be forwarded by the department Chairman to the Chairman of the School of Pharmacy Executive Committee. The Department Chair may submit a written statement of agreement or disagreement with the recommendation of the evaluation committee. Candidates will be informed that he/she may submit to the next level of review (the School of Pharmacy Executive Committee) a written response to a negative recommendation at the departmental level, or to a final rating of teaching, research, or service below the level of “good”.
2. If a “request for information” comes from a higher-level review committee (after the initial review procedures), the chair will immediately provide a copy of this “request for information” to the candidate and will inform the initial review committee. A candidate will provide information to the department in response to a “request for information” and may submit his or her own documentation or comments to the higher-level committee.