## Promotion and Tenure Initial Review Evaluation Summary for Candidates

***Instructions for Completing the Summary for Candidate Form***

### Part 1: Evaluation Ratings

Select the rating category that represents the unit’s average evaluation of the candidate’s performance in each area. The goal should be to give the candidate as clear an idea as possible of the overall evaluation. Therefore, if the voting faculty is evenly divided between two adjacent rating categories, you may mark those two categories rather than only one category.

### Part 2: Initial Review Recommendation

Select the appropriate option to indicate the unit’s recommendation on promotion and/or tenure. The chair of the unit’s promotions and tenure committee should sign the form where indicated.

### Part 3: Statement of Reasons for Evaluation Ratings and Recommendations

Committees arrive at their evaluation of candidates’ records after reviewing all documents in the dossier (teaching evaluations, publications, outside review letters, supporting materials, etc.). The statement of the reasons for the evaluation should be a summary of the unit’s assessment of the candidate’s record **in relation to unit criteria** for promotion and tenure. It should include at a minimum a paragraph about the basis for the evaluation of the candidate’s record in each of the areas of responsibility: teaching, professional performance, research, and service.

When candidates receive either (1) a marginal or poor rating in any area or (2) a negative recommendation, the paragraphs should provide detailed information that enables candidates to address the identified deficiencies in a response to the committee at the next level. For all candidates, the paragraphs should identify the aspects of the record that formed the basis for the evaluative ratings and the resulting recommendation/s.

***Examples provided on next page.***

**Note:** The examples listed below are not exhaustive and do not include references to criteria appropriate for all disciplines. These examples do not include specific references to the outside review letters. Such references may be included only if candidates in a school have open access to the letters.

**EXAMPLE: Positive Recommendation**

|  |
| --- |
| The committee arrived at our assessment of your work after a careful consideration of your statements, your record of teaching, research, and service, peer evaluations of your teaching, and outside reviews of your scholarship. We concluded that your record of teaching evaluations, teaching materials, and other assessments show work that exceeds UNIT standards for promotion and tenure. Specifically, you have worked on developing your teaching practices to emphasize student learning outcomes. The data on student achievement in your courses, the peer evaluations, and student feedback show substantial improvement from your initial semester. You have introduced innovation in your courses at both the undergraduate and graduate level, especially in adapting to the curricular changes in the department. We also note that you serve on a number of doctoral committees and have three current doctoral advisees, an excellent record for an assistant professor.Your publication record meets UNIT standards for promotion and tenure in terms of number and quality, as does your record of external funding. Over the past five years you have published seven peer-reviewed research articles in the top journals in the discipline, four book chapters in edited volumes by major presses, and five peer-reviewed articles in second level journals. Citations and impact factor scores support the conclusion that your research is developing national prominence. You have also been successful in garnering sufficient external funding to support your research agenda and graduate students in the future.Last, your service to the UNIT met UNIT criteria for promotion and tenure, and your service to the university and profession exceeded those criteria. Your work on the undergraduate curriculum committee and the recent faculty search committee was important to the success of those committees. You have also served on three university level committees over the past four years, representing the department well. At the national level, you have participated as an ad hoc reviewer for several journals and have served as a division officer in our national organization. For these reasons, the committee has recommended you for promotion to associate professor with tenure. |

 **EXAMPLE: Negative Recommendation**

|  |
| --- |
| The committee arrived at our assessment of your work after a careful consideration of your statements, your record of teaching, research, and service, peer evaluations of your teaching, and outside reviews of your scholarship. The committee concluded that your record of teaching does not meet unit expectations. The course materials do not conform to the curricular standards of our major, as confirmed by the peer evaluations of your teaching during the probationary period. In addition, graduate and undergraduate student feedback has consistently identified issues related to the clarity of the course objectives, availability to meet with students, and a lack of respect for students. Your record provides no evidence that you have worked to improve your teaching, an expectation for promotion.Your record of scholarship does not meet UNIT standards for promotion and tenure in terms of number and quality. You have published only two peer reviewed articles in lower tier journals in the past five years. Further, you were not the primary author on these articles. Likewise, you have not met the criterion of garnering sufficient external funding to support your research program and fund your graduate students. As a result of this publication and funding record, you have not achieved the developing national reputation and productive scholarly agenda expected for promotion to associate professor with tenure.Your record of service meets UNIT standards for promotion and tenure at the department level and school level, but not at the professional level. You performed an acceptable level of service within the department by serving on the departmental library committee and on the curriculum committee in your area. However, you have not pursued professional service at the regional or national level. Our expectation is that assistant professors will participate in one regional or annual meeting of our professional organizations each year. You have attended only one regional and no annual meetings in the last five years.  |

**Additional Paragraph in the Case of a Negative Recommendation**

|  |
| --- |
| Dossiers of those who receive a negative recommendation in their mandatory review year are automatically forwarded to the next level of review. Otherwise, candidates must request that their dossier be forwarded to the next level. Such candidates should be so informed in the evaluation summary statement. For example, the statement to an assistant professor applying prior to the mandatory review year might end with the following:  Because you have received a negative recommendation for promotion and tenure from this committee prior to your scheduled mandatory review year, your dossier will be forwarded to the next level of review only upon your request. If you would like us to forward your dossier to that committee, please notify the chair/director by \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ (set a reasonable deadline prior to the submission date of the school/college/Office of Research committee or UCPT).  ***The statement to a tenured associate professor applying for promotion to full professor might end:*** Because you have received a negative recommendation for promotion from this committee, your dossier will be forwarded to the next level of review only upon your request. If you would like us to forward your dossier to that committee, please notify the chair/director/dean by \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ (set a reasonable deadline prior to the submission date of the school/college/Office of Research committee or UCPT). |

### Part 4: Concurrence of Initial Unit Chair/Director/Dean

The chair/director/dean of the initial review unit completes this section, indicating concurrence or non-concurrence with the committee’s recommendations on promotion and/or tenure. If the chair/director/dean does not concur, a letter outlining the reasons for non-concurrence should be included with the form. If the chair/director/dean concurs with a negative recommendation, then a letter outlining the reasons for concurrence should be included with the form.

### Transmittal to Candidate

The Initial Review Summary for Candidate form and any attachments (i.e., summary letter from committee and, if applicable, letter from the chair, director, or dean providing reasons for non-concurrence with the committee recommendation OR providing reasons for concurrence with a negative recommendation) should be saved as one document in pdf format for electronic transmission to the candidate and to the committee at the next level of review. Delete these instructions and save the document with the filename: **Last Name, FirstInitial Initial Summary Candidate.pdf**

The head of the initial review unit should email this document to the candidate as an attachment with a read receipt. The read receipt, along with the document, should be included in the dossier sent to the next level review.

**NOTE:** Candidates who receive a marginal/poor evaluation in any category or a negative recommendation should also receive a copy of the appropriate candidate response form that can be submitted to the committee at the next level of review.

### Candidate

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Full Name (Last, First, Middle Initial): |  |
| Current Rank: |  |

**Recommendation For:**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|[ ]   |[ ]   |[ ]
| Promotion in Academic Rank |  | Promotion in Courtesy Rank |  | Tenure |

### Initial Review Evaluation Summary for Candidate

For each area of evaluation below, place a check mark in one rating, or two adjoining ratings, as appropriate.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| * + **Excellent**
 | Substantially exceeds expectations for promotion and/or tenure |
| * + **Very Good**
 | Exceeds expectations for promotion and/or tenure |
| * + **Good**
 | Meets expectations for promotion and/or tenure |
| * + **Marginal**
 | Falls below expectations for promotion and/or tenure |
| * + **Poor**
 | Falls significantly below expectations for promotion and/or tenure |

**Overall Teaching and Advising**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|[ ]   |[ ]   |[ ]   |[ ]   |[ ]   |[ ]
| **Excellent** |  | **Very Good** |  | **Good** |  | **Marginal** |  | **Poor** |  | **Not Applicable** |

**Overall Professional Performance**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|[ ]   |[ ]   |[ ]   |[ ]   |[ ]   |[ ]
| **Excellent** |  | **Very Good** |  | **Good** |  | **Marginal** |  | **Poor** |  | **Not Applicable** |

**Overall Research, Scholarship, Creative or Artistic Performance**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|[ ]   |[ ]   |[ ]   |[ ]   |[ ]
| **Excellent** |  | **Very Good** |  | **Good** |  | **Marginal** |  | **Poor** |

**Overall Service**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|[ ]   |[ ]   |[ ]   |[ ]   |[ ]
| **Excellent** |  | **Very Good** |  | **Good** |  | **Marginal** |  | **Poor** |

### Summary of Initial Review

###  (Departments/Centers, Libraries, and Schools without Departments)

 **Initial Review Recommendation**

 Mark the appropriate category that reflects the vote.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Promotion in Rank:** (check only one) |[ ]   |[ ]   |[ ]
|  | **Recommended** |  | **Not Recommended** |  | **Not Applicable** |
| **Tenure:** (check only one) |[ ]   |[ ]   |[ ]
|  | **Recommended** |  | **Not Recommended** |  | **Not Applicable** |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  |  |  |
| Committee Chairperson Signature(if no digital signature available, please print, sign, and scan) |  | Date: |
|  |  |
| Please Type Name |  |
|  |  |

### Statement of Reasons for Evaluation Ratings and Recommendation

|  |
| --- |
|  |

Insert statement here or attach letter to the end of this document

### Concurrence or Non-concurrence of Initial Review Unit

### Chair/Director/Dean (as appropriate)

|  |
| --- |
|[ ]  I **concur** with the committee’s positive recommendation |
|[ ]  I **concur** with the committee’s negative recommendation for the reasons stated in the attached letter |
|[ ]  I **do not concur** with the committee’s recommendation for the reasons stated in the attached letter |
|  |  |  |
| **Signature** |  | **Date** |
|  |  |  |
| **Please Type Name** |  | **Title (Chair/Director/Dean)** |

### Candidate Response Option

Candidates who receive either a

1. Negative Recommendation or
2. An Evaluation of Marginal or Poor in any category

may compose a response to the initial review unit evaluation for consideration by the committee at the next level of review: intermediate review committee (School/College/RGS) or UCPT as appropriate.

Procedures and receipt deadlines for a response are specified by each intermediate review committee as posted [in](http://www.provost.ku.edu/areas/faculty/evaluation/pt.shtml) the document **“Candidate Response to Negative Recommendation or Marginal/Poor Evaluation from Initial Review Committee for Intermediate Committee Review”** found on [the Faculty Affairs website](https://facultyaffairs.ku.edu/promotion-and-tenure).