

Promotion and Tenure Procedures, Child Language Doctoral Program

Purpose: To articulate the standards and procedures for promotion and/or tenure for the Child Language Doctoral Program

Applies to: Faculty within the Child Language Doctoral Program

General Provisions

Scope and Purpose. The award of tenure and/or promotion in rank are among the most important and far-reaching decisions made by the program because an excellent faculty is an essential component of any outstanding institution of higher learning. Promotion and tenure decisions also have a profound effect on the lives and careers of faculty. Recommendations concerning promotion and tenure must be made carefully, based upon a thorough examination of the candidate's record and the impartial application of these criteria and procedures, established in compliance with the Faculty Senate Rules and Regulations (FSRR) Article VI.

It is the purpose of this document to promote the rigorous and fair evaluation of faculty performance during the promotion and tenure process by (a) establishing criteria that express the program's expectations for meeting University standards in terms of disciplinary practices; (b) providing procedures for the initial evaluation of teaching, scholarship, service, and (in the case of unclassified academic staff) professional performance; (c) preserving and enhancing the participatory rights of candidates, including the basic right to be informed about critical stages of the process and to have an opportunity to respond to negative evaluations; and (d) clarifying the responsibilities, roles, and relationships of the participants in the promotion and tenure review process.

Each level of review, including the initial review, the intermediate review, and the University level review, conducts an independent evaluation of a candidate's record of performance and makes independent recommendations to the next review level. Later stages of review neither affirm nor reverse earlier recommendations, which remain part of the record for consideration by the Chancellor. It is the responsibility of each person involved in the review process to exercise his/her own judgment to evaluate a faculty member's teaching, scholarship, and service based upon the entirety of the data and information in the record. No single source of information, such as peer review letters, shall be considered a conclusive indicator of quality.

Academic Freedom. All faculty members, regardless of rank, are entitled to academic freedom in relation to teaching and scholarship, and the right as citizens to speak on matters of public concern. Likewise, all faculty members, regardless of rank, bear the obligation to exercise their academic freedom responsibly and in accordance with the accepted standards of their academic disciplines.

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

No person shall participate in any aspect of the promotion and tenure process concerning a candidate when participation would create a clear conflict of interest or compromise the impartiality of an evaluation or recommendation.

If a candidate believes that there is a conflict of interest, the candidate may petition to have that person recuse him/herself. If a committee member does not recuse him/herself, a decision about whether that person has a conflict of interest shall be made by a majority of the other committee members.

Promotion and Tenure Standards

General Principles. The University strives for a consistent standard of quality against which the performance of all faculty members is measured. Nonetheless, the nature of faculty activities varies across the University and a faculty member's record must be evaluated in light of his/her particular responsibilities and the expectations of the discipline. These criteria state the program's expectations of performance in the areas of teaching, scholarship, and service necessary to satisfy University standards for the award of tenure and/or promotion to associate professor and for promotion to full professor, or equivalent ranks.

Teaching and scholarship should normally be given primary consideration, but the particular weight to be accorded to each component of a faculty member's activities depends upon the responsibilities of the faculty member. The College has traditionally recognized the 40-40-20 formula for weighting research, teaching, and service, except when weight is differentiated for unclassified academic staff members pursuant to their job description.

Teaching. Teaching is a primary function of the University, which strives to provide an outstanding education for its students. The evaluation of teaching includes consideration of syllabi, course materials, and other information related to a faculty member's courses; peer and student evaluations; teaching awards, a candidate's own statement of teaching philosophy and goals; public representations of teaching; and other accepted methods of evaluation, which may include external evaluations. The evaluation of student mentoring includes consideration of the number of students mentored, description or examples of mentored student projects, outcomes for mentored students (e.g., awards earned by the student), mentoring awards, pursuit/receipt of federal/private funding for mentoring activities (e.g., training grants, sponsorship of a student's grant), a candidate's own statement of mentoring philosophy, and other accepted methods of evaluation. Mentoring may include out of class projects and service on student committees.

High quality teaching is serious intellectual work grounded in a deep knowledge and understanding of the field and includes the ability to convey that understanding in clear and engaging ways.

The conduct of classes is the central feature of teaching responsibilities at KU, but teaching also includes supervising student research, mentoring and advising students, and other teaching-related activities outside of the classroom.

Under the University standards 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.

In the CLDP, the following teaching expectations to meet University standards apply for the award of tenure and/or promotion to the rank of associate professor:

- A pattern of growth in student and/or peer evaluations that culminates in effective teaching of three courses per academic year, with the exceptions for approved leaves or reduced teaching loads;
- Reflective approach to teaching that is responsive to student and/or peer feedback; and
- Involvement in advising and mentoring graduate students.

Under the University standards 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.

In the program, the following teaching expectations to meet University standards apply for the promotion to the rank of professor:

- Established record of effective teaching of the assigned course load, with the exceptions for approved leaves or reduced teaching loads;
- Evidence of continued commitment to teaching as demonstrated by innovative approaches to teaching, development of new courses, and/or contributing locally or nationally to the scholarship of teaching and learning (e.g., course portfolios, presentations, publications); and
- Established record of active advising and mentoring of graduate students.

Scholarship. The concept of “scholarship” encompasses not only traditional academic research and publication, but also the creation of artistic works or performances and any other products or activities accepted by the academic discipline as reflecting scholarly effort and achievement for purposes of promotion and tenure. While the nature of scholarship varies among disciplines, the University adheres to a consistently high standard of quality in its scholarly activities to which all faculty members, regardless of discipline, are held. In the Child Language Doctoral Program, scholarship is defined as the participation in an independent and programmatic line of research. Since Child Language is an inherently interdisciplinary research area, it is recognized that the research and its resulting publications may be jointly conducted and authored. Evidence supporting scholarship includes publication of original research in peer-refereed journals, publication of books, monographs, or chapters, refereed/invited presentations at local, state, national or international conferences, pursuit/receipt of federal or private research funding, the quality of dissemination and funding outlets, the role of the candidate in disseminating and funding the research, the impact of the research on the scholarly field (as indexed by awards, citation counts, comments by external evaluators, recognition from professional societies and other methods of evaluation), and the impact of research on the larger community (as indexed by invited lectures, press coverage, consulting in areas of research expertise and other methods of evaluation).

Whereas the mentoring of student research is considered as a teaching responsibility, presentations and publications resulting from this mentorship are included in faculty scholarship. In most cases (especially those involving Master theses or dissertations), the student will serve as the first author and the faculty member may be listed as a secondary author. In these instances, it is recognized that secondary authorship may involve considerably more responsibility than when a faculty colleague serves as the first author.

The University standard for the award of tenure and/or promotion to the rank of associate professor is an emerging national reputation in the applicant’s area of expertise. In the University, the candidate must demonstrate a successfully developing scholarly career, as reflected in such factors as the quality and quantity of publications or creative activities (e.g., inventions, patents), 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 the program, the following benchmarks reflect the scholarship expectations of the candidate for the award of tenure and/or promotion to the rank of associate professor:

- Development of an independent programmatic line of research;
- Seek external funding for research and support of students;
- Record of publication in peer-reviewed journals including those with high impact in the field;
- Record of invited and refereed presentations at state, national and/or international conferences.

The University standard for the award of the rank of full professor is an established national and/or international reputation in the applicant’s area of expertise. In the University, the candidate 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 the program, the following benchmarks reflect the scholarly expectations of the candidate for promotion to the rank of professor:

- Ongoing programmatic line of research;
- Record of external grant funding;
- Sustained record of publication in peer-reviewed journals including those with high impact in the field; and
- Sustained record of invited and refereed presentations at national and/or international conferences.

Service. Service is an important responsibility of all faculty members that contributes to the University's performance of its larger mission. Although the nature of service activities will depend on a candidate's particular interests and abilities, service contributions are an essential part of being a good citizen of the University. The program accepts and values scholarly service to the discipline or profession, service within the University, and public service at the local, state, national, or international level.

Under the University standards 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.

In the program, the following service expectations to meet University standards apply for the award of tenure and/or promotion to the rank of associate professor:

- Regular service to the program through attendance and participation in program meetings and committees and/or service to the University through membership on committees in the College or University; and
- Service to the profession and/or community as demonstrated by participation on local, state or national committees, editorial boards, and/or conference planning or review committees.

University standards 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.

In the program, the following service expectations to meet University standards apply for the promotion to the rank of professor:

- Regular service to the program through attendance and participation in program meetings and leadership of program committees and/or service to the University through membership on committees in the College or University;
- Service to the profession and/or community as evidenced by membership on local and/or national committees and editorial boards, scientific review or advisory panels for federal funding agencies, and/or consultant-ships with other universities or scientific colleagues; and
- Participation in a leadership role in academic or professional committees.

Rating for Performance. Using the criteria described above, the candidate's performance in the areas of teaching, scholarship, and service will be rated using the terms "excellent," "very good," "good," "marginal," or "poor," defined as follows:

- (a) "Excellent" means that the candidate substantially exceeds expectations for tenure and/or promotion to this rank.
- (b) "Very Good" means the candidate exceeds expectations for tenure and/or promotion to this rank.
- (c) "Good" means the candidate meets expectations for tenure and/or promotion to this rank.
- (d) "Marginal" means the candidate falls below expectations for tenure and/or promotion to this rank.
- (e) "Poor" means the candidate falls significantly below expectations for tenure and/or promotion to this rank.

Absent exceptional circumstances, no candidate may be recommended for promotion or tenure without meeting standards in all applicable areas of performance.

Promotion and Tenure Procedures

The program conducts the initial review of the candidate pursuant to the procedures and requirements of [section 5 of Article VI of the FSRR](#) in connection with the candidate's responsibility in the program.

Promotion and Tenure Committee. The Program Review Committee shall evaluate the candidate's teaching/training/advising, research, and service. The Program Review Committee is composed of the Program Director and three to five tenured faculty members at the same or higher rank than that under consideration. The Program Director will appoint this committee with preference given to faculty members who have their primary appointment within the program who have relevant areas of expertise. The Program Director may also appoint faculty with relevant expertise from outside the Program. The Program Director is a non-voting member of each promotion and tenure committee.

No students or untenured faculty members, except unclassified academic staff with the rank equivalent to or higher than associate professor, shall serve on the Program Review Committee or vote on any recommendation concerning promotion and/or tenure.

Initiation of Review. Prior to the beginning of the spring semester, the Provost shall notify all faculty whose mandatory review year will be the following academic year, with copies provided to unit administrators and the dean. Upon receipt of this notice or if a faculty member requests it prior to the mandatory review year, the unit shall initiate procedures for evaluating the candidate for the award of tenure or tenure and promotion in rank.

At or before the beginning of the spring semester, the unit shall consider the qualifications of all faculty members below the rank of full professor, with a view toward possible promotion in rank during the following academic year. After considering a faculty member's qualifications, if the unit determines that those qualifications may warrant promotion in rank, or if the faculty member requests it, the unit shall initiate procedures for reviewing the faculty member for promotion to full professor.

Preparation of the Promotion and/or Tenure File. NOTE: Candidates who hold joint appointments prepare only one set of promotion and tenure materials for review by both units in which they hold an appointment. The initial review units (i.e., departments, centers, etc.) shall consult with each other on their evaluations and the evaluation process, but each initial review unit must provide a separate evaluation of the candidate's performance in the unit. Please refer to the [College's Promotion and Tenure Statement](#) for detailed instructions.

It is the responsibility of the candidate to complete the appropriate portions of the form and provide necessary documents and information in accordance with the Provost's guidelines, with assistance from the program

The Program Review Committee shall receive the form and accompanying materials from the candidate and finish compiling the record of the candidate's teaching, scholarship, and service in accordance with the Provost's guidelines.

The Program Review Committee shall provide for the solicitation of outside reviewers to assist in the evaluation of a faculty member's scholarship and in accordance with College procedures. Emphasis shall be placed on selecting independent reviewers in the same or related discipline who hold academic rank or a professional position equal to or greater than the rank for which the candidate is being considered. The committee shall give the candidate the opportunity to suggest individuals to be included or excluded from the list of reviewers. The committee, however, is responsible for using its judgment in the final selection of

reviewers. For College specific requirements and guidelines, please refer to “[Section B. Process for Obtaining Evaluation Letters from External Reviewers](#)” within the College’s posted policy for promotion and tenure.

When soliciting external reviews of a candidate’s scholarship, the Program Review Committee shall inform prospective reviewers of the extent to which the candidate will have access to the review. The College's confidentiality policy regarding soliciting external reviewers for the promotion and tenure review process is as follows:

"As a part of the promotion and/or tenure review process, we are soliciting assessments of Professor _____’s research contributions from academic colleagues and distinguished professionals. These letters will become part of the candidate's promotion and tenure dossier and are treated as confidential by the University to the extent we are permitted to do so by law."

Recommendations. Upon completion of the record, the Program Review Committee evaluates the candidate’s record of teaching/training/advising, scholarship, and service in light of the applicable standards and criteria and makes recommendations in accordance with the voting procedures detailed below.

In the Program, voting procedures are as follows: The Program Review Committee discusses the candidate’s performance in each of the categories. Members of the committee then vote on each of the categories as “excellent,” “very good,” “good,” “marginal,” or “poor” as defined by University standards. The number of votes in each category is listed on the summary form. The votes are counted and the final rating is determined by the majority of the votes. Members of the committee also vote on the final recommendation (i.e., recommend or not recommend promotion; grant or deny tenure). Votes are tabulated and the final recommendation is based on the majority of the votes.

The Program Review Committee shall prepare the evaluation and summary evaluation sections of the promotion and/or tenure forms. The forms and recommendations shall be forwarded to the Program Director, who shall independently evaluate the candidate and indicate separately, in writing, whether he or she concurs or disagrees with the recommendations of the review committee. The Program Director shall communicate the recommendations of the initial review, and his or her concurrence or disagreement with the recommendation, to the candidate and provide the candidate with a copy of the summary evaluation section of the promotion and tenure form. Negative recommendations shall be communicated in writing and, if the review will not be forwarded automatically, the Program Director shall inform the candidate that he or she may request that the record be forwarded for further review.

Favorable recommendations, together with the record of the initial review, shall be forwarded to the College Committee on Appointments Promotion, and Tenure conducting the intermediate review. Negative recommendations resulting from an initial review shall go forward for intermediate review only if it is the candidate’s mandatory review year or if the candidate requests it.

Intermediate Review.

The candidate may submit a written response to a negative recommendation by the program, or to a final rating of teaching, research, or service below the level of “good” included in the evaluation section of the recommendation. The written response is sent separately by the candidate to CCAPT.

A request for information by CCAPT and/or UCPT shall be sent to the Program Director who shall immediately provide a copy to the candidate and inform the Program Review Committee. The Program Director and/or committee shall prepare the program’s response in accordance with the initial review procedures.

The candidate shall be afforded an opportunity to participate in the preparation of the program's response and/or to submit his/her own documentation or comment to the CCAPT and/or UCPT as applicable.

* The Child Language Doctoral Program is comprised of faculty appointed to the CLDP and faculty with related interests from the affiliated units of Applied Behavioral Science, Child Clinical Psychology, Linguistics, Psychology, and Speech, Language, Hearing. Faculty with related interests in genetics and possible causal pathways for language impairments, including molecular biology, may be affiliated as well.

Approved by:

Child Language Doctoral Program Executive Committee*/ The Faculty Senate Committee on Standards and Procedures for Promotion and Tenure

Approved on:

November 13, 2015

Effective on:

November 13, 2015

Review Cycle:

Annual (As Needed)

Related Policies:

[Faculty Senate Rules and Regulations Article VI: Promotion and Tenure](#)

Related Procedures:

[Statement On Promotion and Tenure for the College of Liberal Arts & Sciences](#)

Related Forms:

[Guidelines and Documents for Promotion and Tenure](#)

Review, Approval & Change History:

06/12/2017: Dean of CLAS Approved adding the following language to Unit PT statements:

For College specific requirements and guidelines, please refer to "[Section B. Process for Obtaining Evaluation Letters from External Reviewers](#)" within the College's posted policy for promotion and tenure.

03/01/2017: SPPT Review and approval of CLAS P&T policy changes.

02/14/2017: CAC review and approval on revision to Section B. on the *Process for Obtaining Evaluation Letters from External Reviewers*. to ensure procedural clarity.

06/12/2017: Updated FSRR 6.5.1

04/13/2017: Amendments to the Faculty Senate Rules and Regulations (FSRR) 6.5.1 were approved by the Faculty Senate:

Prior to the beginning of the spring semester, the Provost shall notify all faculty whose mandatory review year will be the following academic year, with copies provided to unit administrators and the dean. Upon receipt of this notice or if a faculty member requests it prior to the mandatory review year, the unit shall initiate procedures for evaluating the candidate for the award of tenure or tenure and promotion in rank.

At or before the beginning of the spring semester, the unit shall consider the qualifications of all faculty members below the rank of full professor, with a view toward possible promotion in rank during the following academic year. After considering a faculty member's qualifications, if the unit determines that those qualifications may warrant promotion in rank, or if the faculty member requests it, the unit shall initiate procedures for reviewing the faculty member for promotion to full professor. ~~After seven years in the rank of associate professor, a faculty member who believes he or she has the qualifications for promotion, despite the failure of his or her unit to initiate the~~

~~review process for promotion to full professor, may initiate the promotion review process himself or herself. In such cases the unit will treat the candidate in the same way that it treats other candidates for promotion to the rank of full professor.~~

11/13/2015: Approved by the Faculty Senate Committee on Standards and Procedures for Promotion and Tenure

10/23/2015: Approved by the Child Language Doctoral Program Executive Committee