

The University of Kansas
Requirements for Promotion and Tenure Recommendations
(2007-2008 Academic Year)

The criteria followed by the University Committee on Promotion and Tenure (UCPT) are found in Section C.2.c. (Promotion and Tenure) and in Section C.2.e (Faculty Code of Rights, Responsibilities and Conduct) in the Handbook for Faculty and Other Unclassified Staff <http://www2.ku.edu/%7Eunigov/fachand1998.html>

While there are no firm rules with regard to the time to be spent in one grade before promotion to the next higher rank, the normal expectations in most fields are:

- from first appointment as assistant professor to advancement to the rank of associate professor and the tenure decision, five to six years;
 - from first appointment as associate professor to advancement to the rank of (full) professor, five to six years.
- (The same time intervals apply to equivalent ranks among librarians and unclassified academic staff.)

Promotions at the end of the above time periods will be determined in accordance with the published guidelines and criteria. The mandatory tenure review must occur no later than the date established by the Office of the Provost. Candidates who apply for promotion and tenure prior to their mandatory review year are held to the same standards of achievement as those who have completed the full probationary period. Issuance of a notice of terminal appointment by the Chancellor following the promotion and tenure process represents a final judgment by the University.

**GENERAL INSTRUCTIONS AND GUIDELINES FOR PROMOTION/TENURE
DOSSIERS**

Recommendations must be submitted on the current "Blue Form" (Form AA-5 Promotion and Tenure Recommendations) and printed on blue paper. Recommendations for librarians and unclassified academic staff should also include the "Green Form" for the current year, printed on green paper. The Green Form should be used by librarians and unclassified academic staff without teaching responsibilities to replace pages 3-10 of the Blue Form (See pp. ix-x of these instructions. The date 5/07 should appear in the lower right corner of both the Blue and Green Forms. Please read all instructions for completing each section of the form since some instructions have been modified for this year.

Electronic Version of the Form: The current versions of the Blue Form and the Green Form (Addendum for Librarians and Unclassified Academic Staff without teaching responsibilities) may be downloaded from the Provost Office website at <http://www.provost.ku.edu/policy/faculty/evaluation.shtml>. Please note: the forms are available only in Word 2000 and can be downloaded for both PC and MAC platforms. Disclaimers: Word 2003 documents are compatible with Word 97 (PC) and Word 98 (MAC), as well as with later versions of Word. Due to the form's complexity, it may not convert from Word to other software packages in the correct format.

PLEASE NOTE:

****Inclusion of Student Comments from Teaching Evaluations:** Under Regents' and university policy, quantitative evaluations of teaching effectiveness are required for faculty evaluation, but written comments from students are not. Comments are considered information that faculty can use individually to help improve their teaching. Candidates may choose to include student comments in their dossiers, **but they are not required to do so**. If candidates choose to include the student comment pages from teaching evaluations in their dossiers, they must include all comment pages from all classes.

Rating scale calibration (pp. 5, 10, 13-15, 22, 25 of the blue form; pp. 3d, 3e of the green form): The scale for the summary evaluations for teaching, professional performance, research/creative activity, and service are calibrated as follows:

Exceptional

Very Good

*Good **

Marginal

Poor

* This midpoint rating assumes that the quality and quantity of documented performance are satisfactory for the expected criteria. Should individual departments and Schools have a higher baseline standard, this expectation should be explicit in their promotion and tenure documents.

These ratings are qualitative judgments of the overall record in each section reflecting peer judgments that the documented performance meets the expected performance in that area supporting promotion and/or tenure. The rating should be supported by the dossier's documentation and the justification provided by the initial evaluation committee.

Identification of External Reviewers: although there is no policy or procedure change, UCPT has asked that the following sections of the guidelines be reinforced. Please review page xvi of the guidelines.

Electronic Submission of External Letters: Original or faxed letters on official letterhead and signed are required for all external evaluations. Thus, any e-mail letter included in the file instead of the required signed hard copy must be accompanied by a departmental e-mail requesting submission of a hard copy with signature and the hard copy letter.

Preparation of Materials

The Blue Form is the basic document the UNIVERSITY COMMITTEE ON PROMOTION AND TENURE uses in evaluating the candidate. All sections appropriate to the candidate's appointment must be completed and each promotion/tenure packet should contain the material specified on the form and in this document. The promotion and tenure packet should be complete prior to being forwarded from the department level. No new materials can be added after the review at the department level, except during a check back procedure.

Materials should be prepared so that relevant information is included in a clear and concise form. The supporting documentation should be well organized.

All necessary information should be listed on the form. If there is not enough room on any one sheet of the form, add additional sheets. Place them in the correct sequence with suitable identification (e.g., 2, 2a). In general, each item of information will appear only once. All lists should begin with the most recent information.

Font size: No smaller than 11 point.

Candidate Responsibility: The candidate is responsible for assembling the materials, completing a rough draft of the blue form, and reviewing the final copy and supporting materials before the form and materials go to the initial review committee. When the candidate supplied information has been completed on the blue form and the supporting materials assembled, the candidate is responsible for inspecting the final copy of the form and materials to determine that the dossier is accurate and complete. Once this copy has been submitted to the initial review committee, no other changes are made to the candidate sections. Adherence to established deadlines should ensure that the final dossier is complete at the time of initial committee review.

Department/College/School Committee Responsibility: All required information and signatures should be complete at the time of submission to the next level of review.

Materials Packet:

The completed blue form (Form AA-5) must be printed on blue paper and should be placed in letter-size three-cut file folders, appropriately labeled A-F as noted below. The 6 separate file folders (A-F) should be placed in a letter-size expanding file pocket (with no top flap or internal dividers) * in the following order. Placement of Pages 3a-3e of the green form (on green paper) is included below.

Folder A: Cover sheet (page 1 of blue form), Composite Summary and Recommendations and Action sheet (page 28 of blue form), a current curriculum vita for the candidate, and Dossier Checklist.

Evaluative cover letters addressing the three areas of teaching, research and service from the department and School/College Promotion and Tenure Committees and letters from the department chairperson and dean should be placed in Folder A as the dossier progresses through the review process.

* Pocket specifications: <http://www.provost.ku.edu/policy/faculty/evaluation.shtml>.

Folder B: Description of Present Position Within the University (page 2 of blue form)

Folder C: Record and Evaluation of Teaching (pages 3-10 of blue form) **OR** Record of Professional Performance (pages 3a-3e of the green form for librarians and unclassified academic staff)

Folder D: Record and Evaluation of Research, Scholarship, Creative or Artistic Professional Performance (pages 11-22 of blue form)

Folder E: Record and Evaluation of Service (pages 23-25 of blue form)

Folder F: Summary of Supporting Materials and Candidate Verification (page 26 of blue form) and

Promotion and Tenure Record Retention Waiver (page 27 of blue form). No other material should go into this accordion file folder.

Folder G & Others: Supporting data (e.g., student evaluations, letters, feedback or similar sheets and one copy of each publication or score, slides or tapes of musical compositions or performances referred to in the Recommendation Form AA-5) should be submitted in a separate folder or folders.

Solicited Letters of Support (all solicited letters of support **except** the external reviewer letters required in Folder D): folders containing solicited letters should be clearly labeled and a copy of the solicitation letter, which must include the School/College confidentiality policy, should be placed in the folder.

All files and file folders submitted should be able to accommodate 8-1/2" x 11" sheets. Do not use legal size or other large folders or envelopes. Materials may be placed in binders to facilitate handling. Such materials should be clearly labeled.

Although the promotion package forwarded to UCPT should be complete, it should not contain extraneous material (e.g., annual faculty reports, departmental or school personnel folders on the candidate, works in which the candidate's name is merely mentioned, etc.).

Candidate Verification Prior to the Addition of Confidential Material and Committee Review:

At the time the dossier is to be submitted to the department review committee, it is the candidate's responsibility to inspect the form and supporting materials to determine accuracy and completeness. Whether or not the candidate fills in the candidate provided information on the final copy of the recommendation form, he or she, should inspect the form and supporting material prior to submitting the file to the review committee and before confidential material is added to the form or the folder. After this inspection, the candidate is asked to verify that he or she has reviewed the candidate provided information and considers the dossier a complete, fair, and accurate presentation of his or her records in teaching, research and service by signing on page 26.

Dossier Checklist: A completed copy must be included in Folder A of the dossier packet. The Schools and the College are required to verify that the dossier is complete prior to sending the UCPT for review. **The checklist is a separate Adobe Acrobat printable file on the Provost's website, <http://www.provost.ku.edu/policy/faculty/evaluation.shtml>**

Confidentiality of the File/Dossier: The form and supporting materials become a confidential file after the candidate has reviewed and forwarded the dossier to the department committee or designated individual for inclusion of evaluative information. If confidential or other material is added to the dossier at the department level or as a part of a request for information (formerly checkback) procedure, the candidate must be informed of the type of subject matter, approximate date, and category of source of the material. This information must be entered as addenda to the file.

Unit Evaluations: In each section of the form, Form AA-5, a designated space is provided for the candidate's response, and a separated section is provided for evaluation statements or ratings and identification of the individual or group who has rated the candidate in that particular aspect of his or her work. This identification should be done by title (e.g., departmental chairperson, school committee) rather than by name.

Where there is more than one level of review before UCPT, evaluations should be made at the first level. The first evaluator should provide the basis for all ratings. It is particularly important for the evaluator to provide the specific grounds upon which a rating of "exceptional" or "poor" has been made.

Joint Appointments: If the candidate is carried on more than one budget, or makes substantial contributions to more than one unit, the initiating unit shall secure evaluations from any other unit involved. Joint appointment agreements specify the responsible department and the specific procedures to be followed during the tenure review.

Once a recommendation for promotion and tenure is initiated, each academic department and each school in which the individual serves must act upon the recommendation before it is forwarded to the University Committee on Promotion and Tenure. The University Committee will not consider cases for promotion/tenure unless a full description and assessment of the faculty member's contributions in all departments or programs in which the candidate serves is included in the dossier.

Adjunct and Courtesy Appointments: All recommendations for promotion in academic rank, including adjunct and courtesy appointments, must be submitted through the appropriate academic department(s) and school or College to UCPT.

Unclassified Academic Staff Appointments: Unclassified academic staff promotion files must be reviewed at the appropriate initiating unit level and the next appropriate administrative unit (i.e., the School/College or Vice Chancellor for Research and Public Service levels) prior to submission to UCPT.

INSTRUCTIONS FOR THE CONTENT AND EVALUATION OF PROMOTION AND TENURE RECOMMENDATIONS (FORM AA-5)

Those sections designated with an asterisk () are to be completed by the department chairperson, dean or chair of a designated committee (in those units where by-laws provide for evaluation by such a committee). The candidate provides all other information.*

PAGE 1 Section I. Educational and Professional Career Data

- A. Degrees, with date and source. List all academic degrees the candidate has earned starting with the most recent. Indicate the year conferred and institution.
- B. Chronological list of academic appointments held. List every academic appointment the candidate has held, beginning with the present appointment. Indicate rank and department (or school). Note for each appointment whether it was full or part time.

Be sure to provide the appointment data requested in the right hand column.

NOTE: The term "*tenure alert date*" refers to the date by which the mandatory tenure review must be completed (e.g., MM/YYYY). This date was established by the Provost's Office at the time of initial hire; adjustments may have occurred in accordance with the policy on interruption of the tenure clock.

- C. Other experience relevant to candidate's professional career. List all other experience that is

relevant to the candidate's professional career, beginning with the most recent.

PAGE 2 Section II. Description of Present Position Within the University

***Position description*:** State the general expectations of the position the candidate currently occupies. *A statement from each unit should be submitted for individuals with joint appointments.* The description of the position should address the following elements of the position's expectations, as appropriate (*similar detail is expected for unclassified academic staff and librarian positions*):

- ◆ Level of courses taught (undergraduate and/or graduate)/expected teaching load
- ◆ Responsibility for graduate advisement, including supervision of thesis or dissertation projects and research training
- ◆ Establishment of a research program appropriate to the discipline and position
- ◆ Internal and/or external funding for research and/or scholarly activities (including the purpose of such funding to support independent research and/or provide graduate student support, submission as a basis for later funding, evidence of funding beyond initial awards)
- ◆ Research program productivity and quality indicators
- ◆ Campus, professional and external service (including the level of type of service expected)

Unusual circumstances If unusual circumstances are a part of the position responsibilities and/or the candidate was hired with special stipulations or exceptions with regard to the criteria for promotion and tenure, such conditions should be explicitly stated in this section.

Candidate's Response: The candidate indicates whether he or she concurs or differs with the description.

PAGES 3-10 Section III. Record and Evaluation of Teaching

NOTE: *Librarians and non-teaching members of the academic staff do not complete Sections III A and B (pages 3-10) of the blue form. Instead, those candidates should complete the alternative green form (Pages 3a-3e) for this section of Form AA-5.*

A. Record of Teaching

- 1. (Form Pages 3-4)Teaching Narrative, 1.a. Candidate's Statement:** The candidate should describe the topics s/he teaches and give one or two examples of intellectual goals for students. How does the candidate help students achieve course goals? How does the candidate know that students are achieving these goals? How have the candidate's teaching experiences shaped her/his ongoing goals and practices as a teacher?
- *2. (Form Page 4)Unusual Circumstances*:** List any unusual circumstances connected with the candidate's teaching assignments, including any special circumstances in which the individual's teaching responsibilities differ from the department norm.
- 3. (Form Page 5) Courses taught.**
 - 3.a. (Form Page 5) List the course numbers and titles** for all courses taught for promotion to associate professor; for promotion to full professor list all courses taught during the last five years. Indicate the following for each course:

Course Code: Indicate the type of course using the following codes. All codes that apply to a course should be listed: *R* = required; *Svy* = survey course; *C* = clinical/supervision; *S* = service course; *E* = elective; *ITV* = instructional television; *T* = Team taught

Semester/year Taught: Semester and year the course was taught, e.g., SPR 06, FA 06

Enrollment: Number of students enrolled

Student Evaluation Numerical Data: Mean numerical ratings from student evaluations must be provided for each course that has 5 or more students enrolled. Two means should be provided: the overall mean for the course and the overall mean for the instructor.

Note: *Additional formatted pages are contained in the Appendix to the Blue Form if the list of courses does not fit on Page 5 of the Blue Form. The page is numbered to match the form and should be placed after page 5 in the dossier.*

3.b. (Form Page 5) Context for Numerical Student Evaluation Data Provide an explanation of the numerical scale used in determining the mean ratings for course and instructor.

Example: The C & I survey uses the following scale: 1 = unsatisfactory, 2 = below average, 3 = average, 4 = above average, and 5 = excellent .

Indicate the department or school mean, if available, and/or departmental expectations or standards for teaching.

3.c. (Form Page 5) Evaluation of Each Course In the first column of the course table, the evaluator shall characterize the teaching performance for each course using the following symbols: *E* = *Exceptional*; *VG*=*Very Good*; *G* = *Good*; *M* = *Marginal*; *P* = *Poor*
Multiple sources of input should form the basis for the evaluations of teaching performance made in column one. Sources may include review of class material, such as syllabi, exams, course objective statements provided by the instructor, examples and analysis of student performance, student evaluations, alumni evaluations and classroom observations. **See Guidelines in Appendix A of these instructions.**

Accompanying Documentation (In Folder G, for example): Student evaluation of the candidate's teaching is required. In addition to the numerical scores and evaluator's ratings, documentation includes all original student rating sheets and summary forms for courses listed in this section of the form. The absence of student evaluations for specific courses must be justified.

Special Note on Inclusion of Student Comments from Teaching Evaluations: Under Regents' and university policy, quantitative evaluations of teaching effectiveness are required for faculty evaluation, but written comments from students are not. Comments are considered information that faculty can use individually to help improve their teaching. Candidates may choose to include student comments in their dossiers, **but they are not required to do so.** If candidates choose to include the student comment pages from teaching evaluations in their dossiers, they must include all comment pages from all classes.

3d. (Form Page 6) Documentation of the Evaluation Process Describe the procedures used to determine the ratings listed in column one. Describe the process used to examine 1) teaching goals, 2) instructional methods, 3) evidence of student learning, 4) development as a teacher, and 5) student evaluations of teaching. Indicate what evidence has been reviewed to determine the ratings. **See Guidelines in Appendix A of these instructions.**

***4. (Form Page 7) Graduate Advisement Expectations *** Provide a statement of the

department's expectations (including load) for chairing graduate level committees (PhD and Masters) and graduate committee service for faculty members at the candidate's rank.

- 4.a. **(Form Page 7)** List the names of doctoral students whose committee the candidate has chaired (include the date the degree was completed) or is currently chairing. List the students in chronological order based on the year of degree completion, ending with current doctoral advisees.
- 4.b. **(Form Page 7)** List the names of masters students whose committee the candidate has chaired (include the date the degree was completed) or is currently chairing. List the students in chronological order based on the year of degree completion, ending with current masters advisees.
- 4.c. **(Form Page 8)** Give the total number of doctoral and masters committees on which the candidate has served or is currently serving as a committee member. List the names of those students (include the date of degree completion or identify as current).
5. **(Form Page 8) Candidate's Statement of Advising Activities:** The candidate should indicate the number of students regularly advised broken down by freshmen-sophomores, undergraduate majors, graduate students, or other breakdowns appropriate to the unit. Any special circumstances regarding advisement should be indicated.
6. **(Form Page 9) Recognition and Awards (including certain types of internal and external funding)** List honors, prizes, awards and recognition received for teaching (e.g., Center for Teaching Excellence Teacher Appreciation Recognition). Grants supporting training or teaching effectiveness/innovation would be included in this section. For example, Hall Center Fellowships on Teaching Improvement, Quest for the Best awards, and internal or external funding (e.g., training grants) whose *primary* purpose is support of graduate students would be included in this section. Note: If the funded awards are related to your program of research and contain a research component, they should be listed in the research section of the dossier.

Additional Documentation in Folder G, etc.: The candidate may wish to provide additional documentation of his or her teaching which may be a part of a comprehensive teaching portfolio, such as course syllabi, reflective journals, sample assignments that demonstrate innovations, efforts to improve teaching through reflective journals or course design changes to enhance student learning, descriptions of how his or her publications or research activities relate to teaching.

B. Summative Evaluation of Teaching

- *1. **(Form Page 9) Student Evaluations*** Provide a summary of student evaluations including comparison with departmental expectations or standards for teaching.
- *2. **(Form Page 10) Peer Evaluations*** The format for and summary of peer evaluations should be described in this section. These evaluations should be based on a review of the candidate's teaching portfolio and also include in-class observation. Information that is most helpful to review committees is (1) based on multiple sources of information about the instructor and student performance collected over time, including variations in class size and level and (2) addresses both strengths and areas for improvement. The individual peer evaluations that form the basis for the summary in this section should describe the context for the

consideration of evidence (e.g., type and level of class – large lecture service course with a range of abilities, small honors seminar in the major, along with an account of the various forms of evidence that were reviewed.) and should be placed in Folder C. **Additional guidelines to aid the peer evaluators can be found in Appendix A of these instructions.**

- *3. (Form Page 10) Overall Rating of Teaching *** Mark the appropriate qualitative category. The full range of the scale should be considered when judging the candidate's performance. The final judgment should reflect the evaluations included in this section and the accompanying documentation. Provide comments describing the basis for this rating.

E = Exceptional; VG=Very Good; G = Good; M = Marginal; P = Poor

If there is a vote on individual ratings, please show the distribution of votes for each rating. Provide the rationale for the rating under comments.

The following instructions refer to the special pages completed by Librarians and non-teaching members of the Unclassified Academic Staff – Section III. Record and Evaluation of Professional Performance (Pages 3a-3e). If these are not applicable, go to page xi of the instructions.

GREEN FORM PAGES 3a-3e III. Record and Evaluation of Professional Performance

NOTE: Librarians and non-teaching members of the academic staff insert these pages in Form AA-5 in lieu of Sections III A and B (pages 3-10).

C. Record of Professional Performance

- 1. (Green Form Page 3a) Professional interests and philosophy, Candidate's Statement:** In the space provided, the candidate should provide his or her statement of major professional interests, professional philosophy, and approaches to the exercise of the profession.
- 2a. (Green Form Page 3b) Professional responsibilities:** The candidate should provide a detailed description of his or her professional responsibilities.
- 2b. (Green Form Page 3b) Unusual Circumstances:** The candidate should provide a statement regarding any unusual circumstances connected with his or her professional responsibilities, if any.
- 3. (Green Form Page 3c) Honors and awards:** List honors, prizes and awards received for professional performance.
- *4. (Green Form Page 3c) Supervisor's Comments*:** The immediate supervisor of the candidate should provide any appropriate comments about sections 1- 3.

D. Summative Evaluation of Professional Performance

- *1. (Green Form Page 3d) Supervisor Evaluation*** The immediate supervisor of the candidate should provide a descriptive evaluation of the candidate's professional performance in regard to

responsibilities described in Section III.C.2.

***2. (Green Form Page 3d) Overall evaluation of performance.** The immediate supervisor should provide an evaluation of the candidate's professional performance marking the appropriate qualitative category below. The supervisor should also provide comments describing the basis for this rating.

E = Exceptional; VG=Very Good; G = Good; M = Marginal; P = Poor

*** 3. (Green Form Page 3e) Summary of Other Evaluations *** The evaluation committee should provide a summary of the evaluation of the candidates professional performance based on data from multiple sources (e.g. recipients of services, etc.) in addition to the immediate supervisor's evaluation.

*** 4. (Green Form Page 3e) Summary of Peer Evaluations*** The evaluation committee should describe the format for and criteria used for peer evaluations, and also present a summary of peer the peer evaluations received by the candidate.

Accompanying documentation in Folder G, etc.: Include documentation as supporting data and indicate whether it was spontaneously offered, solicited, etc., and whether the documents included are selective, representative, or include all available for the period being considered.

*** 5. (Green Form Page 3e) Overall Evaluation of Professional Performance*:** The evaluation committee should mark the appropriate category that represents their judgment of the candidate's professional performance. The full range of the scale below should be used. The final judgment should reflect the evaluations included in this section and the accompanying documentation. Provide the rationale for the rating under comments. If there is a vote on ratings, please show the distribution of votes for each rating.

E = Exceptional; VG=Very Good; G = Good; M = Marginal; P = Poor

End of instructions for the Green Form Pages 3a-3e. The remainder of the instructions regarding reports of research and service apply to all candidates for promotion and/or tenure.

PAGES 11-22 IV. Record and Evaluation of Research, Scholarship, Creative or Artistic Professional Performance

A. Record of Research, Scholarship, Creative or Artistic Professional Performance

1. (Form Page 11) Major research/scholarship/creative interests: The candidate should describe his or her program of research and major research/scholarship/creative interests. The description should include the major focus of the candidate's program, accomplishments/contributions to date, future directions for the program, and the relationship of this program to the broader discipline. If the candidate engages in collaborative research, this statement should also clearly describe the candidate's specific role and contribution to collaborative research and the relationship of the collaborations to the candidate's overall research agenda and the discipline. In all cases, candidates are encouraged to describe their scholarly/creative activities so that their goals and significance are clear to individuals from other disciplines.

*** 2. (Form Page 12) Discipline Characteristics/Expectations*** The evaluator should describe the expectations regarding research/scholarship/creative interests in the candidate's discipline. In addition, this statement should describe appropriate venues for dissemination of work including the major venues and the specific expectations and role of external funding in the candidate's discipline. This statement should outline the criteria for classifying a work as major or minor in this field that were used to classify the works reported by the candidate in Section IV. A. 4a and 4b on pages 13 and 14 of the blue form. For example, in some disciplines publication in a "first tier" refereed journal indicates that the paper is a major work; articles that appear in "second tier" journals or articles and chapters that are not refereed may be considered minor works. In artistic fields, a national show or performance may be considered major whereas a regional or local one may be classified as a minor work. Note that these are merely examples. *Each department (or school) should refer to its approved criteria for evaluation and promotion in completing this section.*

Points to address could include the accepted modes of dissemination (e.g., journals, technical reports, electronic media), the refereeing process used, the typical number of co-authors or collaborators in that discipline, the role of collaborative research in the discipline and/or the candidate's area of specialization, the typical acceptance rate for journals in that field, a listing of the major scholarly journals (including identification of journal stature such as first tier, second tier, etc.) or appropriate presentation venues in the discipline, as well as opportunities, expectations and the role of external financial support of research/creative work in the candidate's field.

*** 3. (Form Page 12) Documentation of the Evaluation Process*** Describe the procedures used to determine the evaluation ratings for individual work listed in the IV.A. Sections 4 (a) Major Publications (page 13), 4 (b) Minor Works (page 14), and 5. Works Submitted or Ready to be Submitted (page 15).

4. Published/Creative Work (Form Pages 13-14)

Pre KU Work/Pre-tenure-track: Include scholarly or creative work associated with academic appointments since the terminal degree and prior to the initial tenure-track appointment at KU that is a part of the candidate's overall research/creative activity agenda and record. Draw a line to

separate these entries from work completed after the initial tenure-track appointment at KU.

Previous Promotion: Draw a line separating those items submitted in support of a previous promotion (include all publications accepted or in press at that time in the section of items supporting the previous promotion), and those produced since the promotion.

4.a. (Form Page 13) Major Works. List in chronological order those works that are considered major works according to the criteria of the candidate's discipline (as described in #2 on page 12).

Note: *Additional formatted pages are contained in the Appendix to the Blue Form if the list of major works does not fit on Page 13 of the Blue Form. The page is numbered to match the form and should be placed after page 13 in the dossier.*

4.b. (Form Page 13) Minor Works. List in chronological order those works that are considered minor works according to the criteria of the candidate's discipline (as described in #2 on page 12).

Note: *Additional formatted pages are contained in the Appendix to the Blue Form if the list of minor works does not fit on Page 14 of the Blue Form. The page is numbered to match the form and should be placed after page 14 in the dossier.*

Format Specifications: For both 4a. and 4b. above, give complete information for all publications, including all authors in the order in which they were listed; the year and page numbers of articles; the publisher, year and number of pages of books and monographs. Provide comparable information for creative performances and exhibits (e.g., title of the performance, single or group performance or exhibit, sponsoring agency, location, dates, etc.).

In Press: In press refers to work that has been written, accepted with no substantial revisions pending (include the letter from the editor indicating acceptance of the work).

Multiple authors: For multiple-authored works, indicate the principal author and the percentage participation of the candidate in the writing/research of each multi-authored work. These percentage contributions should be assigned so that the sum of the contributions for all authors is 100%. Occasionally, and in some disciplines, it may not be possible to assign meaningful numbers to the "Percentage Participation" column. In such cases, a brief description of the dynamics of research in that discipline should be provided by the evaluator, as well as an assessment of the candidate's overall contribution or place in each scholarly endeavor listed.

5. (Form Page 15) Work Submitted or Ready for Submission List any work submitted for publication or completed and ready for submission. Specify the status of work (i.e., submitted, ready for submission, book under contract and in preparation, etc.). If the work is submitted, specify the journal or publishing house as appropriate.

Note: *Additional formatted pages are contained in the Appendix to the Blue Form if the list of work submitted or ready for submission does not fit on Page 15 of the Blue Form. The page is numbered to match the form and should be placed after page 15 in the dossier.*

6. Scholarly Presentations (Form Pages 16-17)

Pre KU Work/Pre-tenure-track: Draw a line to separate Pre-KU and/or Pre-tenure track presentations from work completed after the initial tenure-track appointment at KU.

Previous Promotions: Draw a line separating presentations submitted in support of a previous promotion and those produced since that time.

6.a. (Form Page 16) Scholarly Presentations. List all *major* scholarly presentations in chronological order, beginning with the most recent. Such presentations would include scholarly public lectures, colloquia, keynote addresses, peer reviewed or juried presentations at regional, national, or international conferences, etc. **Subsequent Publication:** Indicate with an asterisk (*) whether each presentation that was subsequently published in any proceedings or in some other form and by referring to the corresponding entry in Section IV.A.4 (a) or 4(b) of the blue form (page 13 or 14).

Note: *Additional formatted pages are contained in the Appendix to the Blue Form if the list of major scholarly presentations does not fit on Page 16 of the Blue Form. The page is numbered to match the form and should be placed after page 16 in the dossier.*

6.a. (Form Page 17) Other Presentations. List all other presentations in chronological order, beginning with the most recent. Include in this section those presentations based on scholarly/creative activity that do not reflect the same venue recognition and review as those listed in 6a. or are not more appropriately categorized as professional or public service. **Subsequent Publication:** Indicate with an asterisk (*) whether each presentation that was subsequently published in any proceedings or in some other form and by referring to the corresponding entry in Section IV.A.4 (a) or 4(b) of the blue form (page 13 or 14).

Note: *Additional formatted pages are contained in the Appendix to the Blue Form if the list of minor scholarly presentations does not fit on Page 17 of the Blue Form. The page is numbered to match the form and should be placed after page 17 in the dossier.*

7. Grant Activity (Form Pages 18-19)

7.a. (Form Page 18) External Funding: List all proposals for funding of research or creative activities since appointment at KU or since the previous promotion. For each, report on its disposition, the name of the funding agency/organization, the amount of funding requested/received, and the dates for funding if received. For each, also indicate the candidate's role, e.g. PI, Co-investigator, etc., and the names of all co-recipients. Indicate whether the basis of the award was an externally refereed/competitive process or an invited sole source contract. Proposals should be listed in chronological order, beginning with the most recent.

Note: *Additional formatted pages are contained in the Appendix to the Blue Form if the list of externally funded awards does not fit on Page 18 of the Blue Form. The page is numbered to match the form and should be placed after page 18 in the dossier.*

7.b. (Form Page 19) Internal (KU) Proposals: List all proposals for internal funding of research or creative activities since appointment at KU or since the previous promotion. For each, report on its disposition, the name of the funding unit, the amount of funding requested/received, and the dates for funding if received. For each, also indicate the candidate's role, e.g. PI, Co-investigator, etc., and the names of all co-recipients. Indicate whether the basis of the award was an internally refereed/competitive process or an invited opportunity. Proposals should be listed in chronological order, beginning with the most recent. **Indicate with an asterisk (*)** those internal awards that led to external awards listed in Section 7.a. on Page 18 and by referring to the corresponding external award.

Note: *Additional formatted pages are contained in the Appendix to the Blue Form if the*

list of internally funded awards does not fit on Page 19 of the Blue Form. The page is numbered to match the form and should be placed after page 19 in the dossier.

8. (Form Page 19) Honors and Awards: List honors, prizes, and awards received for research or creative activity.

Accompanying Documentation for Section IV in Folders G, etc. Submit one copy of all published or completed work since last promotion or since KU appointment (as appropriate) as part of the primary evidence. If pre-KU works are considered by outside reviewers, one copy of each of those works should also be included. Submit photocopies of articles, chapters in books, and book reviews rather than the whole publication, but provide full bibliographic information for each. Do not submit works in which the candidate's scholarship or creative activity is merely cited. Large portfolios of artwork and music scores may be submitted where necessary, though slides or tapes of such work are preferred. When submitting slides, each slide should be clearly identified and labeled.

B. Evaluation of Research, Scholarship, Creative or Artistic Performance (Form Pages 20-22)

***1. (Form Page 20) External Evaluation of Research, Scholarship, Creative or Artistic Performance ***

Guidelines for External Evaluations: The purpose of external peer evaluations is to provide an independent, unbiased evaluation of the candidate's scholarly attainment in the discipline. Comments and reviews by outside scholars and professionals in the same discipline or performance area shall be provided as part of the material forwarded to UCPT. All files are expected to contain 6 external evaluations. In exceptional cases, the number may be less than 6, but never fewer than 4 evaluations. *The department must provide a justification for files with less than 6 evaluations.*

NOTE: The solicitation process for external evaluations should begin in sufficient time to confirm and receive six evaluations providing thorough appraisals of the candidate's work. **All** evaluations solicited and received *must* be included in the file.

Identification of Reviewers: The school or department is responsible for making every effort to obtain qualified evaluators who can provide fair and objective assessments of the candidate's work.

Qualifications of Evaluators: It is expected that outside evaluators will hold a rank at least equal to the rank to which the candidate is seeking promotion at an institution comparable to KU or have comparable professional standing in a non-academic setting. Evaluators should possess credentials that will document their expertise in evaluating the candidate's work within the context of the discipline or profession.

Objectivity: One criterion in determining the degree of objectivity of external evaluators is the nature of the relationships with the candidate. Therefore, external evaluators must not include individuals who have a close academic or personal connection with the candidate (for example, dissertation advisors, former professors, graduate school colleagues, co-authors, KU faculty, personal friends, one's own former students, etc.). In rare cases, the candidate's specialized research or very narrow, specialized field of expertise requires drawing from individuals with close professional connections. In these instances, the unit is responsible for explaining and justifying an exception to this requirement. This justification should be transmitted to the UCPT.

While the University does not have a standardized university-wide selection procedure, all department/School processes must meet the following guidelines:

- The department is responsible for using its judgment in the final selection of external evaluators. Candidates must not themselves solicit recommendations, nor must they provide recommendations or evaluations for themselves.
- The candidate should be asked to provide up to 4 names of potential external evaluators; and may identify up to 2 individuals who they prefer to not be reviewers.
- The criteria and process for selection of external evaluators must be communicated to the candidate.

Confidentiality of External Reviews: Policies governing the confidentiality of external evaluations are established by the schools and the College. The decision concerning confidentiality will not be delegated below the College or School administrative level. UCPT should be apprised of the School and College policy at the annual meeting with the Academic Deans. All letters to external evaluators must disclose the College or School policy.

Required Statements:

Confidential

“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.”

Not confidential

“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. “

Evaluation Focus: Evaluators should be sent an appropriately representative body of the candidate’s work to review. The candidate should have input into the selection of work to be sent. Evaluators should be requested to review and evaluate the quality of the candidate’s work, including published materials and any work submitted for publication or completed and ready for submission.

All letters to external evaluators must contain the following: School/College confidentiality statement, a request for a short form of the individual’s CV, and identification of the following evaluation areas which must be addressed by the evaluator at a minimum:

- 1) Length and capacity of his/her association with the candidate;
- 2) The quality of the candidate’s work;
- 3) The significance of the candidate’s work to the discipline/profession;
- 4) The pattern of productivity reflected in the candidate’s record compared to discipline characteristics;
- 5) The level of state, regional, national and/or international stature of the candidate as a result of this work;
- 6) Any special distinction achieved by the candidate

Accompanying Documentation in Folder D: The following materials must be enclosed with this section of the form:

- One copy of the letter requesting evaluations from outside scholars or professionals;
- Copies of all responses to requests (including declines and explanations of non-responses); original or faxed letters on official letterhead and signed are required for all external evaluations. **Electronic Submission of External Letters:** Any e-mail letter included in the file instead of the required signed hard copy must be accompanied by a departmental e-mail requesting submission of a hard copy with signature.
- A brief biographical statement establishing the scholarly reputation of each external evaluator and identification of the relationship of the evaluator to the candidate;
- List of materials sent to each evaluator; and
- Evaluators' vita (short form)

The biographical statement and accompanying vita should indicate to UCPT the individual's status/stature in the discipline or profession, why this individual has the credentials to assess the candidate's research, scholarship, or creative activity, why they were selected as reviewers, and if they have a personal or academic connection with the candidate.

***1.a. (Form Page 20) Evaluator Selection Process*:** A statement of the school or department's procedure for identifying and selecting evaluators must be provided. The procedures for replacing reviewers who withdraw after agreeing to participate and for transmitting the criteria and selection procedure to the candidate are also to be addressed in this section.

***1.b. (Form Page 20) Justification for fewer than 6 letters:** If fewer than six evaluation letters are included in the file, a justification must be provided in this section.

***1.c. (Form Page 21)** List in chronological order all individuals contacted to be external reviewers. Indicate their position/title, the date the request was made, whether they agreed to provide an evaluation, and the date the evaluation was received. Indicate with an asterisk (*) evaluators recommended by the candidate.

Location of Materials in Dossier

Required Evaluations: All letters solicited and received from external reviewers identified in 1.b. must be placed in the separate file folder (Folder D) labeled "Record and Evaluation of Research/Creative Activity." Copies of all letters requesting the evaluations are to be placed in this folder. While six evaluations are expected, in no case should fewer than four letters be submitted in the file.

The vita and brief biographical statement for each reviewer should precede the response of each evaluator. **ONLY** evaluations requested by the unit for the purpose designated in this section of the form should be included in Folder D of the dossier.

NOTE: These evaluations remain a part of the permanent promotion and tenure dossier.

Other Support Letters: All other letters of evaluation or support and other relevant data, etc., should be clearly labeled as such and placed in folders (Folders G, . . .). Folders containing

solicited letters should be clearly labeled and a copy of the solicitation letter, which must include the School/College confidentiality policy, should be placed in the folder. A clear distinction should be made between the content of this solicitation letter and the external reviewer letter in Folder D of the dossier.

2. Evaluation of Research, Scholarship, Creative and Artistic Performance

***Qualitative Evaluation of Major Works, Minor Works, Works Submitted** *Evaluate each item (since the last promotion if appropriate) listed under Major Works, Minor Works, and Works Submitted or Ready to be Submitted on Pages 13-15 using the procedures and criteria outlined on Page 12, in Sections IV.A.3 (a) and (b). Use the following rating scale:

E = Exceptional; VG=Very Good; G = Good; M = Marginal; P = Poor

Place the rating in the designated column on Pages 13-15.

*** 2. (Form Page 21) Qualitative Evaluation:** In this section of the form, separate comments may be provided regarding significant presentations, external and internal funding awards, etc.

*** 3. (Form Page 22) Expectations in Field and Overall Quality*** Evaluate the research/scholarship/creative work of the candidate and its quality in relation to school or departmental expectations and those of the discipline. The evaluation should include any statements that will assist the UCPT in its evaluation of the contribution of the candidate to the particular field of study or discipline. Special information deemed necessary to establish the quality of the candidate's research, scholarship, creative or artistic performance may be provided through outside letters or statements. Such statements may include such matters as standards of the discipline, level of involvement of the candidate in a project, the expectations for and role of collaborative research, descriptions of specialized evaluation strategies, such as special peer review panels of specific work. Letters or statements solicited in support of the evaluation process must be labeled as such and placed in Folder G.

***4. (Form Page 22) Overall Research, Scholarship, Creative, or Artistic Performance*:** Mark the appropriate category reflecting an overall rating of the research, scholarship or creative artistic performance of the candidate. The full range of the scale should be considered when judging the candidate's performance.

E = Exceptional; VG=Very Good; G = Good; M = Marginal; P = Poor

The final judgment should reflect the evaluations included in this section and the accompanying documentation. This rating should reflect a critical assessment of the content, significance, quality and quantity of the candidate's research, scholarly or creative activity and the extent to which the work has earned the candidate regional or national recognition, as appropriate. Provide comments describing the basis for this rating.

If there is a vote on individual ratings, please show the distribution of votes for each rating. Provide the rationale for the rating under comments. For recommendations for promotion to full professor, national and/or international stature of the candidate should be indicated, where applicable, and the basis for this assessment should be included.

V. Record and Evaluation of Service (Pages 23-25)

A. Record of Professional Service.

On the form, list only service since the last promotion or appointment at KU as appropriate. The candidate should include a list of all relevant service on the vitae submitted with this application.

1. **(Form Page 23) Service to the University.** List service under the categories: department (if applicable), school, and university. Indicate membership (with dates) and leadership roles on task forces, councils, committees at each level. For each activity, use the following symbols to indicate time and/or effort it required: *H = Heavy; M = Medium; L = Light*. Add additional pages if necessary.
2. **(Form Page 24) Professionally Related Service Outside the University.** List the candidate's professional service within the community, state, region, nation, or world (include service as a journal referee or editor, offices held in professional organizations, etc.).
3. **(Form Page 24) Honors or Awards for Professional Service.** List the candidate's honors or awards received for professional service.

*B. Evaluation of Professional Service (Form Page 25)

- * 1. **(Form Page 25) Evaluation of Service*:** To place the candidate's service in perspective, provide an overall descriptive evaluation of the quantity and quality of professionally related service. Both quality and time and/or effort associated with the service should be considered. Evaluation of service should be based on information from those who actually are acquainted with the candidate's work.
- * 2. **(Form Page 25) Overall Rating of Service*:** Mark the appropriate category reflecting an overall rating of the candidate's professionally related service. The full range of the scale should be considered when judging the candidate's performance. The final judgment should reflect the evaluations included in this section and the accompanying documentation. Both quality of and effort involved in service should be considered. Provide the rationale for the rating under comments.

E = Exceptional; VG=Very Good; G = Good; M = Marginal; P = Poor

If there is a vote on individual ratings, please show the distribution of votes for each rating.

VI. List of Supporting Materials (Form Page 26) Provide a summary list of supporting materials supplied by the candidate (e.g., Student Evaluation Forms from 10 classes, Teaching Portfolio including 5 syllabi and assignments, 3 articles, 2 books, etc.). **NOTE:** Documentation of student evaluation of teaching is required. Documentation includes all original student rating sheets and summary forms for courses listed in this section of the form. The absence of student numeric evaluations for specific courses must be justified. Inclusion of student comments is not required (see page vii of these instructions).

VII. Verification of Candidate Provided Information (Form Page 26)

Candidate's Verification Signature: The candidate's acknowledgement that he or she has reviewed

the information and materials he or she provided and views the file complete and accurate. The candidate's signature should be obtained after the data provided by the candidate has been assembled on the form and the document and folders reviewed is the final copy of the form/folders to be submitted to the evaluation committee.

VIII. Additions to File (Form Page 26) Any material that was added to the candidate's file after the candidate reviewed it should be indicated here. Indicate the nature of the material (e.g., letter by the chairperson, four letters of reference, publication acceptance, letters from colleagues, etc.), when the material was added, and the date the candidate was informed that material had been added. Attach copies of the notification to the candidate that material had been added.

IX. Retention of Files (Form Page 27)

Record Retention Waiver: In accordance with Section 7.3.3 of the Faculty Senate Rules and Regulations, the Promotion and Tenure application, including check back materials and department, school, and external reviewer evaluations, is retained for a period of seven years. At that time, the materials will be destroyed, unless the faculty member and the Office of the Provost agree that the material will be retained for a further specified period of time.

***Composite Evaluation and Record of Recommendations and Action (Form Page 28):** The appropriate evaluator or committee chairperson should complete each section.

- **The evaluator or chairperson's name should be typed under the signature in each section.**
- **Signatures must be provided.**

If there is other information that should be submitted or other comments that are appropriate, or if there are special circumstances (either positive or negative) regarding this recommendation that should be brought to the attention of the members of the UCPT, please use a separate sheet of paper placed in sequence after Section X, page 28.

X. (Form Page 28) Composite Evaluation Statement Evaluation in this section is to be completed by the department Promotion and Tenure Committee (or the School committee in units without a department structure). This evaluation should reflect the composite evaluation of the individual's records of teaching, research and service in relation to the unit's and University's criteria for promotion and/or tenure. A judgment is to be made whether the candidate meets the criteria for promotion in rank and/or the award of tenure. The judgment is indicated by selecting the appropriate category below:

Exceeds criteria; Meets criteria; Does not meet Criteria

***XI. (Form Page 28) Recommendations and Action**

Recommendation for: Mark all appropriate boxes. (e.g., promotion, promotion and consideration for tenure, promotion in courtesy, adjunct or research rank only)

Committee Actions:

Decision: One of the following decisions must be made by each review committee and identified on the form: recommended or not recommended.

Vote Distribution: The vote distribution must be indicated on this page of the form even if it is unanimous or stated in an accompanying letter.

Rankings: Rankings must be provided.

Committee, Department and Dean Summary Letters: It is essential that these letters specify how the candidate fulfills the unit's **and** the University's criteria for promotion and/or tenure in the areas of teaching research and service.

Each committee is to provide an evaluative cover letter supporting the committee's recommendation. This letter must address evaluative information in each of the following areas: teaching, research and service. This letter should be placed in Folder A.

Summary letters from the department chair and dean should follow the same format as the letters expected from the evaluation committees and be placed in Folder A as the dossier progresses through the review process.

Appendix A

Guidelines for Departmental and Peer Evaluations of Teaching

The following guide is not a required list of activities for conducting or reporting on peer evaluation of teaching. Rather it is designed to prompt peers to think about the possible components of the evaluation process and the reporting of outcomes.

1. Quality of intellectual content

The instructor can provide an annotated syllabus for a course, highlighting the decisions made in including material and choosing which particular aspects of the field will be included, excluded, or emphasized.

The evaluator should consider:

- Is the material in this course appropriate for the topic, appropriate for the curriculum and institution?
- Is the content related to current issues and developments in the field?
- Is there intellectual coherence to the course content?
- Are the intellectual goals for students well articulated and congruent with the course content and mission?

2. Quality of teaching practices

The instructor can provide a brief account of an overall plan for use of the students' time both in and outside of class. Some of this is found in the syllabus and some would be in the annotations to the syllabus.

The evaluator should consider:

- Is the contact time with students well organized and planned, and if so, are the plans carried out?
- How much of the time are students actively engaged in the material?
- Are there opportunities [in or out of class] for students to practice the skills embedded in the course goals?
- Are there any particularly creative or effective uses of contact time that could improve student understanding?
- Are there any course structures or procedures that contribute especially to the likely achievement of understanding by students?

3. Quality of student understanding

The instructor provides samples of assignments the students use to demonstrate their understanding of some of the key goals articulated in the first part of the review. For each assignment chosen for review, there would also be graded student work, complete with the feedback provided (if any). A recommendation is to provide two A papers (or equivalent category of judgment), two B papers, and two C papers, along with the distribution of performance for the entire class.

The evaluator should consider:

- Is the performance asked of students appropriate for the course goals, for the level of course, and for the institution?

- Does the performance requested include challenging levels of conceptual understanding and critical evaluation of the material appropriate to the level of the course and of the students?
- Are students being asked to demonstrate competence in the stated course goals? If not, is it possible to identify why?
- Are there obvious changes in the course that could improve performance?
- Are the forms of evaluation and assessment appropriate to the stated goals of the course?
- Are they particularly creative or do they provide students with opportunities to demonstrate their understanding using intellectual skills typical of the field?
- Is the weighting of course assignments in grade calculation coordinated with the relative importance of the course goals?

4. Summarizing the evidence of reflective consideration and development

The evaluator should consider:

- Has this faculty member made a sincere effort to insure that students achieve the goals for the course?
- Has the faculty member identified any meaningful relationship between what (s)he teaches and how students perform?
- Is there evidence that the faculty member has changed teaching practices based on past teaching experiences?
- Is there evidence of insightful analysis of teaching practice that resulted from consideration of student performance?