

PROCEDURES AND STANDARDS FOR PROMOTION

**Schiefelbusch Institute for Life Span Studies
University of Kansas**

PROCEDURES

Candidates for promotion within the Schiefelbusch Institute for Life Span Studies ("LSI") undergo a rigorous process. The purpose of this document is to describe the process through which promotion is considered, and the standards against which individuals nominated for promotion are evaluated.

Aside from the candidate, there are three principal entities involved in this process: the LSI Director ("Director"), the Chair of the LSI Promotion Committee ("Chair") and the members of the LSI Promotion Committee ("Committee").

Nomination for Promotion

The promotion process is initiated by a call for nominations from the Director. This call is typically issued in April for nominees who will be considered for promotion during the following Fall semester. This nomination process applies to individuals appointed solely within the LSI, as well as individuals who hold joint appointments with LSI and one or more academic departments.

Individuals are nominated in a letter to the Director. The letter may come in the form of a self-nomination, or may come from the director of the research unit (e.g., a center director) or another supervisor of the setting in which the scientist is currently working.

Post-Nomination Preparation

Securing External Referees

Once the nomination has been made, the Director notifies the Chair to begin the selection of external referees, with the goal of obtaining six letters to include with the Candidate's dossier.

A list of the names of up no less than 6 external reviewers is assembled, although an initial list of 10 to 12 is recommended. Half of the names of potential reviewers are generated by the candidate, and half are generated by the Chair, in consultation with appropriate personnel within the LSI; typically, this will be the director of the center from which the nomination came, although other individuals may be consulted for input on this process.

Potential reviewers identified cannot be collaborators, past undergraduate, graduate, or postgraduate advisors/mentors, or coauthors. Reviewers should also be free of any apparent conflict of interest (for example, the reviewers should not be collaborators, coauthors, or students of a spouse, nor should they

be students of any of the candidate's mentor(s)). Reviewers should typically hold a senior rank or senior research appointment.

The list of potential reviewers should include the reviewer's:

- (a) name
- (b) title and position
- (c) mailing and email addresses
- (d) telephone and fax, and
- (e) a brief description of the reviewer's research area and stature within the field

The list of potential reviewers is submitted to the Office of Graduate and Research Studies for approval. From this approved final list, six referees are selected by the Chair with input from the Director and invited to submit a letter of evaluation, half from the candidate's list, and half from the Chair's list. If a referee from the Candidate's list declines the invitation to review the Candidate's dossier, a new invitee is chosen, by the Chair with input from the Director, from the Candidate's list; if a referee from the Chair's list declines, a new invitee is similarly selected from the Chair's list.

The Candidate can submit the names of up to two referees that can be recused from the process. No reason or rationale is expected or requested for such recusals from the Candidate.

Given that teaching is not the mission of the Institute, external referees will not be asked to evaluate candidate teaching.

External Letters

To ensure a candid and rigorous review, no information from the letters (including the identification of the referees) will be shared with the candidate. Referees are informed of this fact when letters are solicited.

External letters – in their entirety – will be accessible by the Chair, the Director, and members of the Committee in conducting the evaluation of the Candidate. The original letters are to be passed on as part of the Candidate's dossier, although the Committee/Chair may choose to summarize or use points from the letters in supporting or providing a rationale for their evaluation of the candidate's scholarly productivity.

Committee Membership and Voting

Membership on the LSI Promotion Committee is a dynamic process; there is no fixed committee membership or committee size. Members are recruited for

consideration of Candidates for a single year. There are no expectations about fixed rotations on or off the Committee, but service on the Committee is considered to be service to the Institute and should contribute to considerations of merit and promotion itself.

Membership is determined jointly by Director and the Chair, with an emphasis on obtaining members for the Committee who will be familiar with the standards and expectations of those candidates being considered for promotion in any particular year.

In keeping with Section 6.3.3.3 of the Faculty Senate Rules and Regulations, only individuals with the rank-equivalent of an Associate Professor or above (e.g., Senior Scientist/ Associate Scientist or Associate Research Professor/Research Professor) can serve on the Committee. The Director may not serve on the Committee, as the Director provides independent input in terms of concurrence with the Committee's decision prior to the dossier being forwarded to the Office of Research and Graduate Studies. Each member of the Committee has one vote. The Chair may also choose to vote as a member of the Committee, as necessary.

Transparency and Communication

At the end of Committee deliberations, the Candidate is informed of the Committee's decision, and of the concurrence (or lack of concurrence) of the Director. If the decision is positive, it is assumed that the Candidate's dossier will move forward to the next level of review (i.e., the Office of Research and Graduate Studies).

If the decision is negative, the Candidate may choose to continue the process or withdraw the dossier from consideration. If the Candidate chooses to continue the process and seek review at the next level, the Candidate will be informed of the basis of the negative decision, and will have the opportunity to place in the file a written response to the negative decision that will accompany the dossier when it moves to the next level.

Materials to be Submitted

Folders A through F of the Candidate's documents are submitted to the Committee for consideration for Promotion, although sections on teaching may be deemed as not applicable to, or not relevant for, investigators wholly appointed within the LSI. Candidates may submit materials that allow for the fair evaluation of their record, given that such materials are consistent with the content of their current job description. For example, the focus of some investigators within some centers of the LSI involves service provision to a

particular community or population. Products that derive from such a record may deviate significantly from those commonly considered for academic scholarship (e.g., publications).

STANDARDS

The LSI adopts standards for evaluating Candidates for promotion in keeping with Section 2 of the Faculty Senate Rules and Regulations concerning Promotion and Tenure. Owing to the fact that classroom teaching is not within the mission of the LSI, Candidates are evaluated only in terms of their scholarship and service.

For Candidates with split appointments in academic departments, the timeline for seeking promotion will be, in large part, driven by the timelines for review within the academic unit. Promotion for non-teaching research faculty appointed wholly within the LSI, however, is based substantially upon considerations of merit.

Scholarship

Scholarship is one of two critical components of evaluation for Promotion within the LSI. The award of promotion in rank is based on a record of accomplishment reflecting a sustainable program of scholarly activity. Evaluation of scholarship is undertaken in light of the expectations of the Candidate's discipline. It is acknowledged that investigators within the LSI represent a number of different disciplines (e.g., Social-Behavioral Sciences, Education, and Natural Sciences), and that there may be some variation in expectation among those disciplines. Within the LSI, promotion is also evaluated in terms of activity and success in seeking external funds to support one's research program. Within the LSI, seeking and securing external funding is a necessary indication of accomplishment reflecting a sustainable program of scholarly activity,

For the award of promotion to the rank-equivalent of Associate Professor (Associate Scientist or Associate Research Professor), the record must demonstrate a successfully developing scholarly career, as reflected by (a) the quality and quantity of publications that reflect the establishment of an independent program of research, (b) positive external reviews of the candidate's work by respected scholars or practitioners in the field, (c) the candidate's regional, national, or emerging international reputation, and (d) other evidence of an active, productive, and independent scholarly agenda. Publication quality is judged through multiple indices: the use of peer-review, the reputation or tradition of the journal, quantitative indices of journal impact, or citation counts of a particular article. In addition, it is expected that the Candidate will have been consistently engaged in seeking external funds to support their research program, and will have experienced some success in securing such funding during the course of their appointment as an Assistant Scientist or Assistant Research Professor at LSI.

For promotion to the rank-equivalent of Professor (Senior Scientist or Research Professor), the record must demonstrate an established scholarly career, as reflected in such factors as (a) a substantial and ongoing pattern of publication or creative activity since the previous promotion, (b) positive external reviews of the candidate's work by eminent scholars or practitioners in the field, (c) the candidate's national/international reputation, and (d) other evidence of an active and productive scholarly career. It is expected that the Candidate for promotion to this rank will have a record of regular and repeated success in securing such funding during the course of their appointment as an Associate Scientist or Associate Research Professor at LSI.

Service

Service an additional responsibility of faculty members within the LSI. The nature of service activities will depend on a candidate's particular interests and abilities, and it is likely that the nature of service offered by a Candidate will vary to some degree with the nature of the research program that the Candidate chooses to pursue.

Service may include scholarly service to the discipline or profession; service within the university, including the LSI and the candidate's research center; and public service at the local, state, national, or international level.

For the award of promotion to the rank-equivalent of Associate Professor (Associate Scientist or Associate Research Professor), the record should demonstrate a pattern of service to the University at one or more levels, including the LSI and the candidate's research center; to the discipline or profession; and/or to the local, state, national, or international communities.

For promotion to the rank of Professor (Senior Scientist or Research Professor), the record must demonstrate an ongoing and regular pattern of service reflecting substantial contributions to the University, including the LSI and the candidate's research center, at one or more levels; leadership within the discipline or profession; and/or to the local, state, national, or international communities.