

## Alignment with CRR and Peer Benchmarking/Validation of UMKC P&T Criteria

### Background

Periodic review and revision of department and/or school P&T criteria ensures that expectations for faculty promotion and tenure remain high and do not drift from the standards set forth in the UM System [CRR 320.035](#). Simultaneously, review and revision provide an opportunity for departments/schools to evaluate criteria in the context of changing scholarship trends (e.g., public scholarship, technology transfer and commercialization, federal requirements for publication of research data) and helps the University advance toward longer-term goals. UMKC will engage in a campus-wide P&T criteria review and revision in Winter/Spring 2023. This will occur in two inter-related steps: 1) Review of criteria to ensure alignment with the standards set forth in CRR 320.035 and 2) benchmarking of criteria with peers to ensure external validation of rigor.

### Process

Department chairs and deans will be provided with a Box folder that includes their current P&T criteria and instructions for the alignment and benchmarking exercise. In many cases criteria are already aligned with the CRR standards, and this exercise will simply confirm alignment. Similarly, in many cases the department/school criteria currently meet or exceed those of peers or higher ranked universities. In such cases this exercise will not qualitatively or quantitatively impact criteria. If, however, this exercise reveals either a lack of alignment with the CRR 320.035 standards or lack of external validation, departments/schools are expected to modify their criteria accordingly.

### **Step 1: Alignment of Department/School P&T Criteria with P&T Standards in [CRR 320.035 \(Section B\)](#).**

Departments/schools will be provided with a checklist (in Box folder) to review and document confirmation of alignment between criteria and CRR standards. In some cases, this review will identify discrepancies between the department/school criteria and the CRR standards that needs to be addressed through revision of the criteria.

- If a discrepancy is identified, departments/schools should evaluate whether it exists because the department/school does not engage in that type of activity (e.g., graduate education) or because the criteria need to be modified to reflect better the CRR standards.
- Of note, the CRR includes examples of performance expectations that demonstrate the stated standards. In some instances, the examples need to be “translated” to align with disciplinary norms for such standards. For example, if *citations* are not normatively used in a discipline to demonstrate research/scholarship/creative work favorable judgement by peers, equivalent and disciplinary-normative demonstration of such peer judgement should be included in the criteria.

### **Step 2: Peer benchmarking to provide external validation of rigor in our department/school criteria.**

#### Definitions:

*Benchmark:* a standard or point of reference against which things may be compared or assessed

*Validation:* check or prove the validity or accuracy of (something)

*Peer:* Established [UMKC Operational or Aspirational Peer](#)

- If our peer set does not include a given department/school (or if the faculty can make a strong case for why the department/school in our peer set is not an appropriate comparator), faculty can select their own peer comparison group, with the approval of the Dean. The department/school selected must have a documented strong research profile based on an external data source or ranking such as:
  - [NSF R&D Expenditures](#); Academic Analytics SRI for institution or department; other indicator that the comparator is peer or higher in research/creative productivity.
- Departments/divisions/schools at Carnegie R1 institutions can also be selected if the unit faculty believe the departments/divisions/schools are appropriate comparators for the unit's goals.

*Benchmark/Validation Process:*

- Departments/schools will identify **three** peers, approved by the dean, to validate/benchmark their criteria against and make any necessary adjustments in expectations (teaching, research, or service). Any adjustments must remain consistent with the CRR standards.
- Consistent with the recommendations of the CPTC's draft revision of Chancellor's Memorandum # 35, feedback and endorsement of the aligned and validated criteria will include the dean, CPTC, and provost.

**Additional Resource for P&T Criteria and Processes:** Faculty should consult the UMKC Faculty Senate Task Force on Promotion and Tenure Guidelines when reviewing/revising criteria.

**Full Alignment and Benchmark/Validation Timeline:**

December 1: Provost office to provide final instructions for alignment and benchmarking/validation.

April 1: Department/unit proposed criteria due to dean for review, feedback, and endorsement

May 1: Department/unit proposed criteria due to CPTC for review, feedback, and endorsement

June 1: Department/unit proposed criteria due to Provost for review, feedback, and endorsement

July 1: Final criteria documents published on Provost website

AY 23-24 New criteria resulting from alignment and benchmarking/validation go into effect

- If no or non-substantive changes are made to the criteria, faculty continue progress toward their mandatory tenure review or promotion.
- If substantive changes to criteria are made, faculty will follow the process outlined in the final, approved revision of Chancellor's Memorandum #35 (currently in development).

*Note:* Although not part of this alignment and benchmarking project we will implement standardized 3<sup>rd</sup> year review protocols across all units effective AY23-24.

- a. In the spring, we will establish core review requirements (e.g., what must be submitted and how) and the timeline
- b. There will be an option for units to add requirements (e.g., external letters)
- c. Required levels of review: standard first level review for unit, chair (if not first level review), dean.