Promotion and Tenure Procedures, Molecular Biosciences
Department

Purpose: To articulate the standards and procedures for promotion and/or tenure for the Department of Molecular Biosciences

Applies to: Faculty within the Department of Molecular Biosciences

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 department 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 department’s expectations for meeting University standards in terms of disciplinary practices; (b) providing procedures for the initial evaluation of teaching, scholarship, and service; (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 department’s expectations of performance in the areas of teaching, scholarship, and service necessary to satisfy the University standards for promotion 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 and Advising.

1. Teaching and Advising Expectations:

   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; 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.

   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 and clinical activities, mentoring and advising students, and other teaching-related activities outside of the classroom. Faculty members in Molecular Biosciences are expected to train and mentor undergraduate students, graduate students, and/or postdoctoral research fellows who are carrying out research in the faculty member’s lab. Such training requires time and effort equivalent to teaching a standard 3-credit hour lecture course. Faculty members are also expected to advise graduate students through service on thesis and dissertation committees, and to advise undergraduate students regarding educational matters and career choices.

   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 department, the following teaching expectations to meet University standards apply for the award of tenure and/or promotion to the rank of associate professor: Newly hired faculty members in Molecular Biosciences are generally given a research-intensive semester and are released from teaching duties to set up their research labs. In subsequent years, they are expected to achieve a teaching load on par with other pre-tenure members of the department. In cases where teaching effectiveness is uncertain, it is important that the faculty member has actively sought and applied advice from students, peers, and/or the Center for Teaching Excellence and has demonstrated improvement. Faculty members should also have trained and mentored undergraduate students, graduate students, and/or postdoctoral research fellows in their research labs, served on thesis and dissertation committees, and advised undergraduate 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 department, the following teaching expectations to meet University standards apply for the promotion to the rank of professor: The quality and quantity of classroom teaching should be on par with tenured faculty members in our department with the same teaching percentage. Faculty members should also have trained and mentored undergraduate students, graduate students, and/or postdoctoral research fellows in their research labs, served on thesis and dissertation committees, and advised undergraduate students.

2. Teaching and Advising Evaluation:

Classroom teaching is evaluated using a variety of measures including: 1) the total credit hours taught; 2) the size and level (introductory, intermediate, advanced) of the classes taught; 3) the percentage of the class for which the faculty member has responsibility; 4) student evaluations of the faculty member’s teaching and the course; and, 5) peer evaluations of the faculty member’s teaching. The procedures for procuring the student and peer evaluations are as follows:

Student evaluations: Faculty in Molecular Biosciences value comments by students in their courses and use the feedback to improve their courses. Students are asked to complete evaluation forms at the end of each course. Currently, the evaluations include the University-recommended “Student Survey of Teaching” form and a short, department-approved questionnaire that solicits written responses to questions such as “List one or more aspects of the course and/or instructor that you like”. Comparable evaluation tools may be adopted by the department in the future. Students are asked to complete evaluation forms for each professor who participated in the course. A student or assistant collects the completed forms and returns them in sealed envelopes to the office of KU Undergraduate Biology (KUUB). The “Student Survey of Teaching” forms are subsequently sent to the Testing Service, which tabulates the responses and forwards the results to the Office of Institutional Research and Planning (OIRP), who in turn forward the results to the Director of KUUB, the Chair of Molecular Biosciences, and the instructor who was evaluated. The other form (the short questionnaire) is copied by KUUB and forwarded to the Chair of Molecular Biosciences, and the instructor of record. Faculty members do not have access to the results of the evaluations until after final grades have been submitted for the course. OIRP and KUUB keep comprehensive records of all faculty evaluations such that mean scores can be generated on a number of different criteria including, specific course name, number of students in the course, and course level (e.g., introductory-level undergraduate versus upper-level undergraduate and graduate).

Peer evaluations: Similar to student evaluations, faculty members also improve their teaching based on suggestions from their peers. Each faculty member’s lectures are regularly peer-reviewed, about once every other year for pre-tenure faculty members. The peer reviews are submitted to the chairperson of the Department and placed into the faculty member’s personnel file. In making their reviews, faculty peers follow the guide prepared by the University Task Force on the Assessment of Teaching and Learning. The guide urges peers to use multiple sources of information when evaluating teaching. These include: 1) a review of course materials (e.g., syllabi, sample examinations, student assignments, handouts, and Blackboard notes), and 2) observations of lectures. The guide also calls for comments on the faculty member’s weaknesses and strengths.

Undergraduate and graduate advising and mentoring effectiveness are assessed based on a number of factors including: 1) The overall number of undergraduates, graduates, and postdoctoral research fellows mentored; 2) the number of thesis and dissertation committees on which the faculty member has served;
and 3) the number of masters and Ph.D. degrees awarded to students who’ve carried out research in the faculty member’s lab.

Research and Scholarship.

1. Research and Scholarship Expectations:

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 department of Molecular Biosciences, scholarship is defined as the publication of original works in peer-reviewed scientific journals and presentations at scientific meetings and/or at other research-oriented venues. Scholarship is also reflected in invitations to review journal articles and grant applications, and participation on scientific advisory and/or editorial boards. Faculty members are expected to procure external financial support for their research programs.

Under the University standards 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.

In the department, the following scholarship expectations to meet University standards apply for the award of tenure and/or promotion to the rank of associate professor: Publications, which are the foremost indicator of successful scholarship, must include original work in peer-reviewed journals. The quality and quantity of the published work needs to be sufficiently high to establish the faculty member as an important contributor to his/her field. The level of funding should be appropriate to the research needs of the discipline. When the majority of a faculty member’s research support comes from multi-investigator grants, it is important that the intellectual and research contributions of the faculty member are unique and essential to the grant’s success.

Under the University standards 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 the department, the following scholarship expectations to meet University standards also apply for the promotion to the rank of professor: Publications, which are the foremost indicator of successful scholarship, must include original work in peer-reviewed journals. The faculty member must also have demonstrated repeated success at obtaining sufficient extramural funding to support his/her research program and provided evidence that they are likely to maintain a productive research program of
high scholarship for the foreseeable future. When the majority of a faculty member’s research support comes from multi-investigator grants, it is important that the intellectual and research contributions of the faculty member are unique and essential to the grant’s success.

2. Research and Scholarship Evaluation:

Scholarship is assessed by the examination of published works, and external funding, as well as the record of research presentations, as described below. In addition, candidates are required to present a public seminar of their research findings to the department. This provides them the opportunity to present the big-picture of their research program, and provides members of the department with a glimpse of their presentation and teaching style.

Major Published Works: Individual major published scholarly works, including original research articles and invited reviews, are the primary indicator of successful scholarship. These are rated according to several criteria, including: 1) The length of the paper and whether it is solely the product of the faculty member’s lab, or the product of a collaborative effort with multiple labs; 2) The authorship position of the faculty member. (In the molecular biosciences, the faculty head of a laboratory is generally involved in every aspect of the publication—from setting up the lab infrastructure and the intellectual problem, to experimental design, advising, experimental execution, data interpretation, and writing the manuscript—and most often is listed as the senior (last) author on the publication. The first author on such papers is typically the graduate student or postdoctoral researcher who carried out the majority of the experiments. In rare cases, the faculty member him/herself might carry out the majority of the experiments and be listed as the first author. Most faculty members also list themselves last on review articles, even if they carried out most of the research and wrote the bulk of the paper); 3) The reputation of the journal in which the work is published. This reputation is measured by “impact factors” published by Thomson ISI, which takes into account the size of the readership of the journal and how frequently typical articles in that journal are cited in others’ subsequent research; and 4) The assessment of the paper by the external reviewers.

Minor Published Works: Minor scholarly works in the area of molecular biosciences are typically abstracts of work that are presented at meetings in the form of oral or poster presentations. We evaluate these works based on whether the meeting was a regional, national or international conference. We also consider whether the presentation was invited, the result of a competitive review, or required only the submission of an abstract.

Research Presentations: Scholarly presentations are rated according to whether they are local, regional, national, or international. For oral presentations at scientific meetings, we also consider the length of the talk, the size of the meeting, and whether the talk was a keynote address or otherwise featured. For oral presentations at other universities, we consider the stature of the host institution.

External Funding and Ability to Sustain Productivity: Faculty members in Molecular Biosciences must seek funding in order to maintain quality research programs. Research grants of larger dollar amounts and awarded through national competitions are highly rated, as they provide the best indication of the faculty member’s national stature and ability to obtain the funding needed to support his/her research program in the long-term. For multi-investigator grants, we assess the contribution of the faculty member to the grant’s success based on the faculty member’s role (Principle Investigator or other), and the percent of the funding under the faculty member’s control.

Service.

1. Service Expectations:
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 department 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 department, the following service expectations to meet University standards apply for the award of tenure and/or promotion to the rank of associate professor: The award of tenure and/or promotion to the rank of associate professor requires membership on Departmental and/or College level committees of at least medium workload. Examples include faculty search, seminar, or graduate admissions committees. It is considered excellent service if the faculty member chairs one or more of these committees and/or provides service at the regional, national or international level. It is essential that the faculty member takes service seriously, shows a willingness to help and displays good departmental and university citizenship.

Under the 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 department, the following service expectations to meet University standards apply for the promotion to the rank of professor: Promotion to the rank of professor requires an ongoing pattern of service including membership on departmental, College, University and/or national level committees of medium to high workload. Examples include: the graduate admissions committee, promotion and tenure review committees, national or international grant review panels, and journal editorial boards. It is expected that the faculty member has chaired at least one such committee, or has otherwise taken a leadership role. It is essential that the faculty member takes service seriously, shows a willingness to help and displays good citizenship.

2. Service Evaluation:

Service is evaluated by a number of different criteria including: 1) the number of committees that the faculty member has served on, as well as the workload of each committee; 2) the number of committees in which the faculty member has taken a leadership role (e.g., chair); and 3) the breadth of the faculty member’s committee work in terms of the level of service (e.g., departmental, College, University, state, national, etc.), the type of service (e.g., faculty search, graduate admissions, university governance, etc.), and the term of the service on each committee.

**Ratings 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.

*Department Standards:*

Promotion to the rank of associate professor or to the rank of professor requires ratings of “very good” or better in two out of the three categories (teaching, research, and service) and no ratings below a “good” in any category.

A rating of “very good” in teaching requires demonstrated effectiveness in classroom teaching at both the undergraduate and graduate level. “Very good” also requires evidence of effective mentoring of graduate students and/or postdocs. For promotion to the rank of associate professor, it is expected that the faculty member will have mentored, or currently be mentoring, at least one graduate student and/or postdoctoral research fellow, and that he or she has served on dissertation and thesis committees. For promotion to the rank of professor, it is expected that the faculty member will have mentored Ph.D. students and served on a number of dissertation and thesis committees.

A rating of “very good” in research requires publication of original work in peer-reviewed journals. The quality and quantity of the published work needs to be sufficiently high to establish the faculty member as an important contributor to his/her field. It is also normally expected that the faculty member has demonstrated success at obtaining funding to support his/her research program, including extramural funding, and that there is a reasonable level of assurance that they will maintain a productive research program of high scholarship for the foreseeable future. The level of funding should be appropriate to the research needs of the discipline. For promotion to associate professor, the published work should provide a record of growing independence from past advisors. For promotion to the rank of professor, the quality and quantity of the published work and invited speaking engagements must be sufficient to establish the faculty member as an important contributor to his/her field with an international level of recognition. The faculty member must also have demonstrated repeated success at obtaining extramural funding to support his/her research program.

A rating of “very good” in service for promotion to the rank of associate professor requires membership on departmental and/or College level committees of at least medium workload. Examples include: faculty search, seminar, or graduate admissions committees. It is considered excellent service if the faculty member chairs one or more of these committees and/or provides service at the regional, national or international level. It is essential that the faculty member takes service seriously, shows a willingness to help and displays good citizenship. For promotion to the rank of professor, a “very good” requires an ongoing pattern of service including membership on several departmental, College, University and/or national level committees of medium to high workload. Examples include: the graduate admissions committee, promotion and tenure review committees, national or international grant review panels, and journal editorial boards. It is expected that that the faculty member has chaired at least one such committee, or has otherwise taken a leadership role. It is essential that the faculty member takes service seriously, shows a willingness to help, and displays good citizenship.

*Promotion and Tenure Procedures*

The department 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 department.

*Promotion and Tenure Committee.* The department review committee shall evaluate the candidate’s teaching, research, and service. In the Department of Molecular Biosciences the initial review committee (Promotion and Tenure Committee) consists of a standing committee plus *ad hoc* members. The standing committee is comprised of the Associate Chair of the department (committee Chair) and three elected, tenured, faculty
members each of whom serves a three-year term. Following a call for nominations, new members are elected by a simple majority vote by all tenured faculty. In addition, each faculty candidate selects two *ad hoc* members for their committee. In the case of promotion to professor, all members of the committee must be at the rank of professor. In the event that one or more members of the standing committee does not hold the professor rank, former professor members of the committee will bring the total committee membership (standing plus *ad hoc* members) up to at least five members.

The recommendation of the departmental Promotion and Tenure Committee shall be forwarded for consideration to a committee of the whole consisting of all faculty members holding the appropriate academic rank in the department.

No students or untenured faculty members, except unclassified academic staff with the rank equivalent to or higher than associate professor, shall serve on the Promotion and Tenure Committee or vote on any recommendation concerning promotion and/or tenure. In the case of promotion to associate professor the committee of the whole consists of all the tenured associate and full professors in the department eligible to vote. In the case of promotion to full professor, the committee of the whole consists of all the tenured full professors in the department eligible to vote.

**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 department. In the Department of Molecular Biosciences, this is normally done during the summer and early fall. Candidates for promotion and/or tenure are also required to give a departmental seminar prior to being considered for promotion.

The Promotion and Tenure 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 department 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.
When soliciting external reviews of a candidate’s scholarship, the Promotion and Tenure 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 committee conducting the initial review shall evaluate the candidate’s record of teaching, scholarship, and service in light of the applicable standards and criteria and make recommendations in accordance with the voting procedures detailed below. The committee recommendation shall be forwarded for consideration to a committee of the whole consisting of all faculty members holding the appropriate academic rank.

In the department, voting procedures are as follows: Members of the Promotion and Tenure Committee write evaluations of the candidate’s teaching/advising, research, and service. The committee also rates the candidate in the categories of teaching/advising, research and service and makes an overall assessment of whether the candidate exceeds, meets, or does not meet the required criteria. The committee members vote by secret ballot. The ratings and overall assessments are recorded in the promotion and tenure dossier and made available for review at least one week prior to a meeting of the committee of the whole. At the meeting of the committee of the whole, the Promotion and Tenure Committee formally presents their ratings and overall assessment. After thorough discussion, members of the committee of the whole (excluding the Departmental Chair) vote by secret ballot on the overall assessment of the candidate including a vote to recommend or not recommend a candidate for promotion and/or tenure. A vote to recommend a candidate for promotion and/or tenure requires a two-thirds majority vote of the committee of the whole. This vote is recorded on the promotion and tenure form along with the recommendations of the Departmental Chair. The Departmental Chair and the Promotion and Tenure Committee each write letters of evaluation that become a part of the promotion dossier that is forwarded to CCAPT for further review at the intermediate level.

The 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 chair, who shall indicate separately, in writing, whether he or she concurs or disagrees with the recommendations of the review committee and committee of the whole. The department chair 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 chair 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 department, 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 department chair who shall immediately provide a copy to the candidate and inform the Promotion and Tenure Committee. The chair and/or committee shall prepare the department’s response in accordance with the initial review procedures.

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

09/02/2015: Made updates to boiler plate text:
1) Under General Provisions, paragraph three, “Chancellor” has been changed to “next review level;”
2) Under Initiation of Review, the following was added, “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.”
3) The following was added under to paragraph concerning outside reviewers, “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.

04/25/2012: Approved by the Department of Molecular Biosciences
03/27/2012: Approved by The Faculty Senate Committee on Standards and Procedures for Promotion and
Tenure