

University of Kansas
School of Business Promotion and Tenure Committee
White Paper on Promotion and Tenure
Evaluation Guidelines: 2018-2019
Approved by Assembly May 2018

TABLE OF CONTENTS

A. Introduction	2
B. Membership Criteria and Election Procedures	2
C. Probationary Period Reviews.....	3
C. 1. Annual Reviews.....	3
C.1.i. Nature of the review	3
C.1.ii. Possible outcomes of an annual review.....	3
C.2. Progress Toward Tenure Reviews.....	4
C.2.i. Nature of the review	4
C.2.ii. Possible outcomes	5
D. Tenure and Promotion Review	6
D.1. Preparation of Nomination Dossiers	6
D.2. Overall Promotion and Tenure Standards	7
D.3. Evaluation of Teaching	8
D.3.i. Peer teaching evaluation team (PTET).....	9
D.4. Evaluation of Research.....	9
D.4.i .Additional considerations.....	10
D.4.ii. Peer research evaluation team (PRET)	11
D.4.iii. External evaluation of research.....	12
D.5. Evaluation of Service	12
D.6. Candidate’s Procedural Rights and Communication with the Candidate	13
D.7. Tenure/Rank Review In Connection with an Offer of Employment to an External Candidate.....	14
Appendix A: Request templates for external and internal reviews for tenure and promotion Reviews	15
Appendix B: Request templates for progress toward tenure reviews and annual reviews.....	21

University of Kansas
School of Business Promotion and Tenure Committee
White Paper on Promotion and Tenure
Evaluation Guidelines, 2016-2017

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. [Recommendations concerning promotion and tenure shall be made solely in accordance with the standards and procedures in Faculty Senate Rules and Regulations Article VI.](#) As the elected faculty body responsible for updating this White Paper, the SBPTC annually brings these guidelines to the attention of the faculty prior to their implementation, to permit discussion by all parties concerned. Proposed changes will be discussed and voted upon by the tenure-track faculty members prior to implementation.

This document, past White Papers, and other relevant, non-confidential documents are maintained at BSchool_Shares>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 five or seven members. The committee will assess the workload each year and recommend to the FAC before February 1 what the size should be. Each of the four administrative areas will be represented by at least one faculty member, while the remaining members shall be "at large."

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. Then, at the final election, at least one candidate from the unrepresented area will be voted to the committee, along with an at-large member.

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 an in-depth “progress toward tenure review” (PTTR) approximately midway between a faculty member’s appointment and mandatory review year. Normally this PTTR is required during the third year of service. During other probationary years, prior to tenure application, the committee conducts a more brief annual review. Both the 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 (PTTR) 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 SBPTC will evaluate all three dimensions (teaching, research and service) relative to the following categories:

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

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, but before the mandatory year for the tenure decision. This situation would occur only in cases of outstanding performance meriting the award of tenure or promotion earlier than the normal time frame specified in the University guidelines. Such an early application would follow the same procedure that applies 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 an in-depth "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 more brief annual review of assistant/untentured professors.

C.2.i. Nature of the review

The purpose of the PTTR 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 PTTR 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

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.

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.

The PTTR includes written reports by a peer research evaluator (PRE) and a peer teaching evaluator (PTE). The PRE and PTE should be mutually agreeable to the SBPTC and the candidate. The PTE will include a class visit as part of the assessment.

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

- () 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 that is 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 refereeing 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 which 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:

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.

- () 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 the 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 or her decision to the faculty member and forward the SBPTC 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 **mandatory** tenure review **during the following academic year**. 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 found at the Provost's web page.⁴ The SBPTC secures outside letters of evaluation and other evaluative material.

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: <http://facultydevelopment.ku.edu/promotion-tenure>

The SBPTC also requests a letter from the candidate's Area Director assessing the candidate's qualifications for promotion.

To facilitate appropriate, timely, complete, and accurate flow of documents, the SPBTC committee requires that all documents requested of candidates and evaluators be submitted to a designated support entity in the School of Business. This support entity, in turn, will forward documents under guidance from the committee.

The SBPTC templates for the committee's portion of the Promotion and Tenure Forms, are maintained at BSchool_Shares>POLICIES>P&T, and are available for reference.

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

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 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 recommendation.
3. If a candidate receives a rating of "good" in all three activities, it will be difficult to receive a positive recommendation. The rationale for this approach is that the SBPTC believes that a successful 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 from the School of Business Student Survey of Teaching form, along with all comment sheets ("comment sheets" refers to open-ended responses solicited from students in class along with the Student Survey of Teaching).

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 numerical student evaluations and student comment sheets for the candidate, but it should also focus heavily on other evidence relevant to the candidate's teaching. The PTET will familiarize itself with the candidate's 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 members 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 in the written report.

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 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.

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 that 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. As evidence of such influence, for Assistant Professors, the SBPTC will normally expect publications in the most prestigious academic journals with notoriously stringent acceptance standards. In the absence of prestigious publications, it is very unlikely that the SBPTC would support a tenure decision.

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. Thus, the SBPTC will also 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 [BSchool_Shares>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. In addition, the extent to which others have cited the candidate's work in prestigious journals can serve as evidence regarding 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. Illustrative lists of high quality refereed journals with notoriously stringent acceptance standards may be provided to the SBPTC by the various disciplines within the School.

The SBPTC encourages tenure-track faculty members to focus on publications in the top-tier journals because such publications tend to make much greater contributions to their fields, have significantly wider academic readership and do most to further the School's research reputation. However, it tends to take much more time and effort to publish in the top-tier journals. Devoting one's effort in trying to publish papers in these journals may result in a smaller number of publications than otherwise, and the SBPTC recognizes this trade-off in its evaluation of the candidate.

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 standards and low acceptance rates. 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.

The forms for Promotion and Tenure and the forms for a candidate's third-year PTTR require publications and presentations to be designated as major or minor works. Typically, major publications include those published in academic, refereed journals, while major presentations are those presented at conferences with competitive acceptance standards. In contrast, minor publications include short notes, conference proceedings, book chapters, and publications in practitioner-oriented journals, trade journals, or non-refereed journals. In addition, evidence of work in progress, including working papers and presentations at less competitive conferences and workshops, are also likely to be judged as minor works. Designations of major and minor are made by the candidate. The SBPTC may suggest redesignations based on its assessment of School standards. If the candidate's ultimate assignments are at variance with the SBPTC's assessment, the Committee reserves the right to point to any discrepancies in the listed designations.

While the SBPTC does not require sole-authored publications, the committee recognizes their merit. In assessing the candidate's contribution to collaborative research efforts, the SBPTC may consider the number, variety, and ordering of co-authors as well as other evidence of the candidate's role.

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. 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 will only be considered if sufficient expertise does not 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 the 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 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 candidate for tenure or promotion who (1) is being considered by the SBPTC for promotion with tenure to the rank of Associate Professor prior to their sixth year of service, or (2) is being considered 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. 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.

External evaluations will be used to assist the SBPTC in the preparation of supporting materials to be forwarded to the UCPT. [External reviewers shall not have close personal or professional relationships with the candidate and hold academic rank or professional position equal to or greater than the rank for which the candidate is being considered.](#) Detailed guidelines for external evaluation are provided in the current "University of Kansas Guidelines for Promotion and Tenure Recommendations."

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 Promotion and Tenure (UCPT) P&T 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 P&T 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 P&T 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 to be 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 non-concurrence of the dean of the School.

The dean of the school shall provide, in writing, the recommendations of the initial review to the candidate. If the dean does not concur with the SBPTC's positive recommendation or concurs with a negative recommendation, the dean shall include a written rationale that will be included with the written recommendations provided 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 UCPT for further review.

In compliance with FSRR 6.6.2, the SBPTC will request that the candidate 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. In the event that such a written response is provided, the SBPTC will forward it to the UCPT.

The candidate will be informed of any request for information from the UCPT, 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 candidate dossier. The granting of tenure to a person who has not previously been granted tenure by a research university, and who 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 FOR TENURE AND PROMOTION 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.

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.

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" of the current SBPTC White Paper (available on the BSchool_Shares>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 (each PRET should right their own review), 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 BSchool_Shares>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 (each PTET should right their own review), 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

APPENDIX B: REQUEST TEMPLATES FOR PROGRESS TOWARD TENURE REVIEWS AND ANNUAL REVIEWS

Example Letter to Area Directors and Candidates

Date: *

TO: *Area Directors and *All Assistant Professors

FR: *, Chair of School of Business Promotion & Tenure Committee

RE: Progress Toward Tenure Review (PTTR) - Notification to Faculty Members Due for 3rd Year Review and Annual Reviews

Purpose & Resources

The purpose of this memo is to (a) provide an initial notification to Area Directors and faculty members who are due for their 3rd year PTTR review or their annual reviews and (b) provide directions to University and School policies and procedures related to the promotion and tenure process.

- The School of Business policies and procedures are described in the White Paper for on Promotion & Tenure, which can be accessed at the following link (BSchool_Shares>POLICIES>P&T).
- The University of Kansas policies and procedures can be accessed at the following link: <http://facultydevelopment.ku.edu/pttr>.

This memo is just an initial overview. **In the fall**, the P&T Committee will communicate with Area Directors and faculty members due for review with more **specific instructions for the process**.

Traditionally the SBPTC *does not* undertake this review for 1st Year newly hired Assistant Professors who have *less than two semesters* of service in the School.

3rd Year PTTR Review

The following faculty members are listed as being due for 3rd Year PTTR Review:

*

Assistant Professors in their third year of service in the School will receive the more extensive third year review. According to the University, “The third year progress toward tenure review is a formal review conducted approximately midway through the probationary period for tenure-track faculty. The purpose of the review is to give faculty members a meaningful appraisal of their progress to date toward earning tenure. 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*. A secondary purpose is to orient the tenure-track faculty member to elements of the formal tenure review process.”

Annual Review

The following faculty members are listed as being due for annual review>

Except in the first year, Assistant Professors will receive a brief review as described in the School of Business White Paper on Promotion and Tenure. 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.

Example Letter to Candidates

Date: *

TO: Faculty Members in 3rd Year PTTR Review and in 2nd/4th Year Annual Review

FR: Promotion & Tenure Committee

RE: PTTR/Annual Reviews Submittals and Deadline

The P&T Committee asked me to email you regarding the PTTR 3rd Year Review and the Annual Review process. For reference, the School of Business White Paper on Promotion & Tenure is available at link (BSchool_Shares>POLICIES>P&T).(please see the Section C. on Probationary Period Reviews). Please see the section below that pertains to you for what to do. Please email the submittals to me, so that I can compile the materials for the P&T Committee. The **deadline** for submission of materials is ***Nov 30**.

3rd YEAR PTTR REVIEW (*list last names of 3rd yr candidates)

A. Attached Document. Please see the attached file named **insert name**. Please submit the following:

- *Initial Evaluation Position Description* - It contains the standard Assistant Professor position description and 40%-40%-20% time allocation. Please review it, and if everything is correct, sign and date it electronically or physically. If electronically, please leave in Word doc form so that we may easily add the Dean's electronic signature. If in paper form, please print document in color and sign in blue ink, and convert to pdf file. Please save file as *

B. Source Documents. Please see at

<http://www.provost.ku.edu/areas/faculty/evaluation/pttr.shtml>. Please submit the following:

- *Candidate CV* – this document includes the promotion and tenure CV. Please save file as (Lname, Finitia CV)
- *Candidate PTTR Statement* – this document includes the candidate's statements on teaching and research. Please save file as *(Lname, Finitia Candidate Statement)
- *Candidate PTTR Verification and List of Supplemental Materials* – this document includes the candidate's verification of forms and list of supplemental materials. Please save file as (Lname, Finitia Verification)
- *Supplemental Materials* –
 1. Research papers / working papers / awards. Please save file as (Lname, Finitia Paper #/ WP #/ award name)
 2. C&I Summary Sheets. Please save file as (Lname, Finitia C&I Summaries)
 3. C&I Evaluation packets with comments. Please save file as (Lname, Finitia Course #-Semester)

ANNUAL REVIEW (*list last names of candidates)

A. Candidate Documents to Submit:

- *Candidate CV* – this document includes the promotion and tenure CV. Please save file as (Lname, Finitia CV)

- *Supplemental Materials* –
 1. Research papers / working papers / awards. Please save file as (Lname, final Paper #/ WP #/ award name)
 2. C&I Summary Sheets. Please save file as (Lname, Finitial C&I Summaries)
 4. 3. C&I Evaluation packets with comments. Please save file as (Lname, Finitial Course#--Semester)

Example Memo to Area Directors, PRE, and PTE

Date: *

TO: *AD's / PRE / PTE

FR: Promotion & Tenure Committee

RE: Progress Toward Tenure Review (PTTR) - Deadline for 3rd Year & Annual Reviews

Deadline

If you are an Area Director (AD) or a faculty member who has agreed to serve as a Peer Research Evaluator (PRE) or Peer Teaching Evaluator (PTE), thank you and please begin conducting the 3rd Year PTTR Review and/or the Annual Review. The review process is explained below along with the names of the faculty members who are being reviewed. Please email your reviews to me, so that I can compile them for the P&T Committee. The **deadline** for submission of reviews is ***Jan 25, *Jan 30, * Feb 5.**

Reference Resources

- *Link* - The School of Business *White Paper* on Promotion & Tenure is available at link (BSchool_Shares>POLICIES>P&T)(please see the Section C. on Probationary Period Reviews).
- *Link* – Please see the relevant *materials submitted* by 3rd Year PTTR Candidates and/or Annual Review Candidates at replaced the missing link for the White Paper.
- *Attachments* –
 - a. AD's please use the *attached template file* (named *) to complete a narrative evaluation of *teaching, research, and service* and to complete an *evaluation chart* at the bottom of the memo for each 3rd year candidate. For other annual reviews, your evaluation can be submitted to the SBPTC. PRE's and PTE's please use the *attached template files* (named PRE* or named PTE*) to complete a narrative evaluation of their *research or teaching* and to complete an *evaluation chart* at the bottom of the memo for each 3rd year candidate if you are reviewing.

Reviews to Submit for 3rd Year Review Candidates (*list last names)

- AD – submit Review Memo (use attached template)
- PRE – submit Review Memo (use attached template)
- PTE – submit Review Memo (use attached template)
**Include if applicable Asst Prof * did NOT teach a course this past fall, so please attend a spring class by JAN 30 so that you may include your observations in your review memo.*

Reviews to Submit for Annual Review Candidates (*list last names)

- AD – submit Review Memo (use attached template)

Example Memo to SBPTC members

Date: *

TO: *P&T Cmte Members

FR: P&T Staff Assistant

RE: PTTR/ Annual Review Process – Initial Evaluation Submittals

As requested by the P&T Chair, this is a courtesy reminder that the deadline for the P&T Cmte to submit PTTR materials to the Dean is ***Feb 28**. Please email the submittals to me, so that I may file them electronically for the P&T Cmte and for later submittal to the Dean.

3rd YEAR PTTR REVIEW

Candidate & Reviewer Documents

- 3rd Year Candidate documents, Area Director reviews, and PRE/PTE reviews are available for each candidate at BSchool_Shares>POLICIES>P&T).

P&T Committee Review Documents to Submit

- The Initial Review Evaluation Documents file is available at <http://www.provost.ku.edu/areas/faculty/evaluation/pttr.shtml>.
 1. The first part of the form is the candidate Position Description. It was previously completed and signed. It will be included with the second and third parts of the form after they have been completed.
 2. The second part of the form is the Initial Review Evaluation, which should be completed by the P&T Cmte and signed by the P&T Cmte Chair.
 3. The third part of the form is the Initial Review Composite Evaluation and Recommendation, which should be completed by the P&T Cmte and signed and dated by the P&T Cmte Chair and the Dean.

ANNUAL REVIEW

Candidate & Review Documents

- Candidate documents and Area Director reviews are available for each candidate at (BSchool_Shares>POLICIES>P&T).

P&T Committee Review Documents to Submit

- A template file is available at (BSchool_Shares>POLICIES>P&T). It should be used to create and save a review memo file for each candidate. The P&T Cmte should complete a review memo for each Assistant Professor after the second year.

Example Memo from PRE to SBPTC



Date: *

TO: Promotion & Tenure Committee

FR: *Name of PRE for *

RE: Progress Toward Tenure Review for Assistant Professor *

This memo regards the Progress Toward Tenure Review (PTTR) for Assistant Professor *. Based on my comprehensive assessment, Assistant Professor * is making * progress toward promotion and tenure. My review of *his *her research is summarized below along with a completed evaluation chart.

Research

*

Evaluation Chart

An "X" has been entered in "Research" next to item "a.", "b.", or "c."

Faculty Name: *	Research
a. Demonstrates progress toward tenure.	
b. Improvement required for continued progress toward tenure.	
c. Record not sufficient for progress toward tenure.	

Example Memo from PTE to SBPTC



Date: *

TO: Promotion & Tenure Committee

FR: *Name of PTE for *

RE: Progress Toward Tenure Review for Assistant Professor *

This memo regards the Progress Toward Tenure Review (PTTR) for Assistant Professor *. Based on my comprehensive assessment, Assistant Professor * is making * progress toward promotion and tenure. My review of *his *her research, teaching, and service is summarized below along with a completed evaluation chart.

Teaching

*

Evaluation Chart

An "X" has been entered in "Teaching" next to item "a.", "b.", or "c.".

Faculty Name: *	Teaching
a. Demonstrates progress toward tenure.	
b. Improvement required for continued progress toward tenure.	
c. Record not sufficient for progress toward tenure.	

Example Memo from Area Directors to SBPTC



Date: *

TO: Promotion & Tenure Committee

FR: *Area Director for *

RE: Progress Toward Tenure Review/ Annual Review for Assistant Professor *

This memo regards the Progress Toward Tenure Review (PTTR) or Annual Review for Assistant Professor *. Based on my comprehensive assessment, Assistant Professor * is making * progress toward promotion and tenure. My review of *his *her research, teaching, and service is summarized below along with a completed evaluation chart.

Research

*

Teaching

*

Service

*

Evaluation Chart

One "X" or "NA" has been entered in "Research", "Teaching", and "Service" next to item "a.", "b.", or "c".

	Research	Teaching	Service
a. Demonstrates progress toward tenure.			
b. Improvement required for continued progress toward tenure.			
c. Record not sufficient for progress toward tenure.			

Example Memo from Dean's Office to Candidates



Date: *

TO: Assistant Professor *

FR: _____, Dean

RE: Progress Toward Tenure Review

Thank you for your diligent efforts in preparing the submittal materials requested for your Progress Toward Tenure Review. The materials were of great assistance to your Area Director, your Peer Research Evaluator and Peer Teaching Evaluator, and the Promotion & Tenure Committee.

I have requested that the School of Business Promotion & Tenure Committee (SBPTC) provide you with the relevant feedback on your progress toward promotion and tenure as it relates to your performance so far in research, teaching, and service along with a summary statement. Please find that memo attached. I concur with the conclusions of the SBPTC.

Recommendation

Based on this review, the School of Business will report the following recommendation to the Office of the Provost.

An "X" has been entered to the right of 1., 2., or 3.

Faculty Name: *	
1. Evidence sufficient for continuing tenure track appointment at this time	
2. Evidence requires a subsequent formal probationary review within one academic year	
3. Evidence supports a recommendation for non-reappointment*	

Again, thank you for your contributions to the KU School of Business. We look forward to your continued development as a faculty member.

Example Memo from Dean's Office to Candidates



Date: *

TO: Assistant Professor *
FR: _____, Dean
RE: Annual Reviews

Thank you for your diligent efforts in preparing the submittal materials requested for your Annual Review. The materials were of great assistance to your Area Director and the Promotion & Tenure Committee.

I have requested that the School of Business Promotion & Tenure Committee (SBPTC) provide you with the relevant feedback on your annual review as it relates to your performance so far in research, teaching, and service along with a summary statement. Please find that memo attached. I concur with the conclusions of the SBPTC.

Recommendation

Based on this review, the School of Business will report the following recommendation to the Office of the Provost.

An "X" has been entered to the right of 1., 2., or 3.

Faculty Name: *	
1. <u>Outstanding</u> - Reappointment recommended. Faculty member may consider applying for promotion & tenure before mandatory review year.	
2. <u>Satisfactory</u> - Reappointment recommended. Performance is satisfactory and SBPTC may identify areas for potential improvement.	
3. <u>Unsatisfactory</u> - Non-reappointment recommended. Performance in research and/or teaching insufficient over time and record at end of probationary period unlikely to support recommendation for tenure.	

Again, thank you for your contributions to the KU School of Business. We look forward to your continued development as a faculty member.

Example Memo from Dean to Provost for Non-Reappointment



Date: *

TO: _____, Provost

FR: _____, Dean

RE: Recommendation of Non-Reappointment for Assistant Professor *

Please accept this memo regarding the recommendation of non-reappointment for Assistant Professor *. The faculty member submitted a curriculum vitae, research and teaching statements, a candidate verification and list of supplemental materials, research publications, student evaluations, and student evaluation summaries as part of their 3rd Year Progress Toward Tenure Review.

These materials were reviewed by the faculty member's Area Director, a Peer Research Evaluator and Peer Teaching Evaluator, the Promotion & Tenure Committee, and me. Please find below the rationale for recommendation of non-reappointment as it relates to the faculty member's performance in research, teaching, and service.

Research

*

Teaching

*

Service

*

Recommendation

Based on the reviews of Professor *'s research, teaching, and service, the School of Business concluded that the evidence supports recommendation of non-reappointment.

Example P&T Committee Feedback Memo for PTTR or Annual Review

Date: *March 5, 2014

To: Assistant Professor*

From: The School of Business Promotion and Tenure Committee - *names of committee

Re: Progress Toward Tenure Review OR Annual Review

Cc: Associate Dean*, Area Director *

I. Purpose

In accordance with School of Business guidelines consistent with Article VI, Section 3 of the Rules and Regulations of the Faculty Senate, the School of Business Promotion & Tenure Committee provides its annual review of your teaching, research and service. The purpose of this letter is to provide an assessment of your record to date. It is the understanding of the Committee that you are scheduled to be reviewed for promotion and tenure during the *2016-2017 academic year, which means your review will take place during the * semester of *.

At that time, you will be evaluated through the process set out in the School's Promotion and Tenure White paper. A committee of your colleagues elected through the process specified in the White Paper, different than the current committee, will conduct that evaluation. The current assessment will not be part of that evaluation. The committee reviewing your record for promotion and tenure will consider all of your teaching, research and service contributions, and will make a far more in-depth evaluation of your contributions than is possible at this time.

Tenure at the University of Kansas requires a rating of at least good performance in teaching, research and service. However, at least one rating should exceed good for a successful tenure candidate. As stated in the School's Promotion & Tenure White Paper, this higher rating should be research or teaching, not service.

II. Teaching

*In depth feedback of teaching

Overall evaluation:*

III. Research

*In depth feedback of research

Overall evaluation: *

IV. Service

The service requirements for assistant professors are modest. 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." Some service at the department or School level is desirable for promotion and tenure, as well as service to the profession, such as serving as a journal reviewer or as a reviewer or discussant for papers presented at annual conferences for the leading academic associations in your field.

*In depth feedback of research

Overall evaluation: *

[Office of the Dean](#)

[Capitol Federal Hall / 1654 Naismith Drive / Lawrence, KS 66045-7601 / 785-864-8027 / Fax 785-864-5369 / \[www.business.ku.edu\]\(http://www.business.ku.edu\)](#)

V. SUMMARY

*Summary of reviews for research, teaching, and service.