

University of Missouri - St. Louis Procedures Concerning Tenure and Promotion.

This document specifies the procedures for reviewing candidates for tenure and/or promotion. It supplements the *Collected Rules and Regulations* of the University of Missouri including, but not limited to, Executive Order 6A, which take precedence over any campus, school or college, or department policy, should there be a conflict.

All participants in the Tenure and Promotion evaluation process are reminded of the confidential nature of all information gathered, all discussions and deliberations, and all recommendations.

Definitions

Ad Personam Committee: a committee consisting of at least three tenured regular faculty members of rank equal to or higher than that the candidate will hold if tenure or promotion is granted. This committee will normally be appointed from the Unit but occasionally it may include members from other Units or from outside the University of Missouri - St. Louis. *Ad Personam* Committee members who are from outside UM-St. Louis will normally not receive financial compensation. The candidate shall have the right to select one member. The Unit Committee or its designee will select the remaining members, after consultation with the candidate.

Candidate: a faculty member being considered for tenure and/or promotion or an individual being considered for a tenured appointment to the campus faculty.

Dean: the dean of the school or college in which the candidate has her or his primary appointment.

Dossier: Guidelines for assembling the Dossier are given in Appendix 2. When the Dossier is forwarded from one level of review to the next level of review, it must include: (1) everything in the original Dossier; (2) all material added at prior levels of review; (3) all material solicited at the current level of review; and (4) all reports, recommendations and responses generated at the current level of review. No unsolicited information shall be included in the Dossier or considered in the evaluation.

Recommendations: Deliberations by Units; Deans; and the Senate Appointments, Tenure, and Promotion Committee all result in recommendations to the Chancellor. These recommendations are formally addressed to the Chancellor although they are forwarded through the channels specified below.

Regular Faculty: a faculty member holding a tenured or tenure-track position at the rank of Assistant Professor, Associate Professor, or Professor.

Response Options: at each stage of the process when a recommendation is placed in the candidate's Dossier, the candidate shall have seven calendar days from the date of receipt to review the materials and to submit a response. The candidate may: (1) submit a written response; or (2) withdraw from consideration, in writing, thereby waiving any right to further review, reconsideration, or appeal for that cycle. By withdrawing, a candidate does not waive her or his right to file a grievance related to recommendations made prior to the withdrawal. If the Candidate selects Response Option (2), the Dossier is forwarded to Academic Affairs and retained indefinitely as required by University regulations. If the review process from which the candidate has withdrawn is a mandatory tenure review, then the candidate will be given a one-year terminal contract for the following academic year. If the review is not mandatory then the candidate may come up for review in subsequent years pursuant to III.B. of this document. At the Unit level the candidate's Dossier is not forwarded until there is a response from the candidate, or seven calendar days pass with no response. At other levels, the Dossier may be forwarded to the next level of review prior to receipt of a response from the candidate, but shall not be evaluated at the next level of review until a response has been received, or seven calendar days have elapsed. Any response should be addressed to the Chancellor, but sent to the next level of review, unless otherwise noted. The individual at the next level of review is responsible for sending copies of the candidate response to all earlier levels of review.

Unit: the faculty body that puts forward the first recommendation concerning tenure or promotion. In Arts and Sciences the Units are departments; in Education they are divisions; in Nursing, Optometry, and Business, the Unit is the school or college as a whole.

Unit Chair: in Arts and Sciences and in Fine Arts & Communication, the Chair of the Department; in Education the Chair of the Division; in Business, the Area Coordinator; in Optometry and Nursing & Health Studies, there is no Unit Chair.

Unit Committee: for tenure recommendations the Unit Committee consists of all tenured members of the unit; for promotion recommendations the Unit Committee consists of all tenured members of the unit with academic rank equal to or higher than that for which the candidate is being considered.

Unit Committee Coordinator: A member of the Unit Committee, elected (by majority vote of the Unit Committee members) to facilitate discussion of the candidate, coordinate and tally the unit vote, and write/compile the Unit Committee

report. In those cases where a Unit Chair is a member of the Unit Committee, the Unit Chair may serve as the Unit Committee Coordinator.

Unit Standards: the standards used to evaluate candidates for tenure and/or promotion are the standards in effect when the candidate achieved his or her current rank and/or tenure status at the University. Unit Standards must not be at variance with this document or with the *Collected Rules and Regulations* of the University of Missouri.

I. Unit Guidelines

Units must establish procedural guidelines and Unit Standards for the review of candidates for tenure or promotion. These must be consistent with the University of Missouri System *Collected Rules and Regulations*, and with this document, and must be approved by the Dean and by the Provost. The *Collected Rules and Regulations* (Section 320.035) provide the following guidelines:

1. General Philosophy

As one of the nation's leading teaching and research institutions, the University of Missouri maintains high standards in recruiting, promoting, and awarding tenure to faculty members. While specific criteria for judging the merits of individual faculty may vary among units, there must be no variation in standards. The University will continue to strengthen its standards in all disciplines. Satisfaction of minimum criteria at the college, school, or department levels is not sufficient to insure promotion or continuous appointment.

The University seeks faculty members who are genuinely creative scholars and inspired teachers and who are dedicated to the pursuit of knowledge and its transmission to others. These high standards are to be observed in the recruitment, promotion, and tenuring of faculty members. All persons and committees making recommendations regarding promotion and tenure will consider the candidate's demonstrated ability to meet these standards.

Outstanding intellectual qualities as reflected in teaching and scholarship are the primary criteria for recommendation for promotion and tenure. Additional criteria include professionally-oriented public service contributions and service to a faculty member's department, school, college, and the University. Because the faculty has a special role in the decisions of the University, service to the University and its numerous units is expected of every faculty member; but such service shall not substitute for teaching and scholarship in matters of promotion and tenure.

2. Special Policy Considerations

a. Sustained Contributions Essential

The essential factors in consideration of candidates for promotion and tenure will be documented merit in the traditional areas of teaching, research, and service and the degree to which contributions are comprehensively substantiated and represent sustained efforts.

Candidates for promotion and tenure should demonstrate sustained merit and contributions over an extended period of time. Recommendations for promotion and/or tenure before the sixth year should be rare and restricted to truly exceptional cases. Early recommendations for promotion and/or tenure should not be made primarily on the basis of market conditions that make it appear as if a faculty member might accept an offer elsewhere.

b. The Role of Research and Other Scholarly Contributions

Productivity in research and other scholarly activities is the most distinguishing characteristic of the faculty of the University, setting it apart from all other public institutions in the state. Research by University faculty not only generates new knowledge but also results in teaching which is up-to-date and intellectually stimulating. The University expects faculty members to be engaged in scholarly or creative activities appropriate to their disciplines. Recommendations for promotion or tenure involving cases in which such activities are not at the highest level will be approved only in very rare cases where the documented evidence for teaching (including extension) and/or service contributions is exceptionally compelling.

A recommendation for promotion and/or tenure must include supporting evidence that the individual's contributions have had an impact on the discipline; that is, the research should have made a significant contribution to knowledge that is recognized by professional colleagues. One common method of documenting such impact is through outside evaluations by authorities in the field. The most relevant letters of evaluation usually are written by disinterested experts who are recognized nationally and internationally for their own achievements. Because they may be biased, letters from former students, departmental colleagues, research collaborators, or former mentors should be used sparingly, *if at all, and under no circumstances should the number of such reviewers exceed the number of wholly independent external evaluators*; when such letters are submitted, an explanation of the personal relationship should be included.

Evidence of effective and sustained research and creativity must be presented. Quantity can be a consideration but quality must be the primary one. Evidence of favorable judgment by colleagues includes publication in journals where expert evaluation is required for acceptance; favorable review of books, appointments or awards that require evaluation of professional competence; election to office in learned societies; and receipt of fellowships. Frequent citation by other scholars also provides evidence of good research. Good researchers often are invited to serve as editors of journals, members of site visit teams or in other evaluative functions of the scholarly work of their peers. Any evidence of such contributions should be emphasized in promotion and tenure recommendations.

Research grants awarded, programs initiated, and other research in progress or research findings submitted for publication all represent activities that are expected of faculty members recommended for promotion and/or tenure.

Although faculty committees on promotion and tenure have the first responsibility for evaluating the quality of the work of a candidate for tenure or promotion, it is within the scope of the department chairpersons', deans', provost's, and chancellor's responsibilities to gather confirming evidence of scholarly competence by seeking the comments of other scholars within and outside the University.

c. The Role of Teaching, including Extension

Teaching includes, besides classroom and laboratory instruction, many activities that require professional knowledge and that directly contribute to the academic advancement of students; for example: academic advising, supervision of junior staff, creative redesign of courses, including courses offered through telecommunications and the internet; liaison with teachers outside the University, off-campus teaching, and preparation of teaching materials, including textbooks.

Teaching of all faculty members shall be evaluated annually. Among the most useful kinds of evaluative evidence are testimony of chairpersons and deans, especially when based on student interviews covering several semesters, comments of colleagues who are well acquainted with the teaching performance of the candidate, achievement of students, and the quality of teaching materials prepared by the staff member. Evaluations based on classroom visitations by departmental peers can help to document the teacher's efforts to reach or maintain a given level of quality.

A significant element in the evaluation of teaching is the overall judgment of students, and each unit, department, school, and college is responsible for obtaining such information on all staff members, particularly those recommended

University of Missouri - St. Louis
Tenure and Promotion Procedures (approved by Faculty Senate 2/15/05)

for promotion. Questionnaires developed at the college or school level in cooperation with the faculty committees on promotion and tenure may be used for this purpose, or a similar procedure can be followed which is designed to reflect comprehensive student judgment concerning teaching qualities. Data from questionnaires should be buttressed by interpretation and comparative data. Simple numerical summaries of evaluations are not sufficient to judge teaching ability. Faculty members whose records consistently reflect poor teaching will normally not be recommended for promotion.

Other indicators may be used to point out good teaching. Good teachers receive public recognition in a variety of ways. Students, both individually and through organizations, seek them out more often. Such teachers make more innovative contributions in courses, sometimes whole curricula. Their students demonstrate achievement in learning. They often serve on more student activity committees and carry heavier advising loads. They are known for their enthusiasm and involvement in the education of students. Evidence that documents such contributions is strongly encouraged.

Extension and continuing education activities represent an extension of the teaching and research functions of the institution. Faculty engaged in this mission will be evaluated by the same criteria applied to other faculty. Outstanding performance in extension leads to special recognition of faculty by groups, individuals, and organizations. These faculty members develop innovative curricula, adapt research findings to everyday needs of citizens, serve on committees and boards, and use innovative ways of enhancing learning by part-time students. They are sought out by others for advice and counsel and are known for their enthusiasm, competence and interest in helping individuals solve problems and learn.

In unusual circumstances, tenure may be recommended for demonstrated excellence in teaching, even in the absence of significant published research. Qualifications for teaching and scholarship are, however, very closely related. The faculty member who does not keep current with developing knowledge in the field or who is not constantly searching for new insights cannot be an effective classroom teacher. Graduate as well as undergraduate instruction is a responsibility of the faculty of the University; a continuing interest in, and a capacity for, creative scholarship by a faculty member is essential to effective instruction for undergraduate as well as graduate students. A faculty member who lacks the qualifications to teach advanced students ordinarily will not be recommended for promotion to senior ranks.

d. The Role of Service

Opportunities for service contributions abound and can take many forms. Service may occur within a discipline, through national, regional, and state organizations, or in the community at large; it may also occur in an administrative unit, such as the home department, school, or college, or on the campus. However, an uncritical list of such activities provides little support for the recommendations. A case should be made for the impact and quality of the individual's contributions. There should be evidence that the individual's efforts and judgment are held in high regard. Evidence of unusual service contributions, however, cannot by itself be sufficient grounds for a recommendation for promotion and/or tenure. It must be supported by significant additional evidence of contributions in teaching and research.

II. Expedited Procedures for Tenure for Persons New to the University

A document is prepared which includes: a) a current curriculum vitae; b) a brief Unit report evaluating the areas of research (including quality of publications and citations, and record of external funding), teaching, and service which focuses on the time since tenure; c) letters of endorsement obtained during the hiring process; and d) the vote of the Unit Committee.

Full Professor with Tenure

A successful candidate who already holds the rank of professor with tenure at an institution of equal or higher status (e.g., equal or higher Carnegie classification) than UM-St. Louis may be granted tenure and full professor rank at UM-St. Louis based on the recommendation of the Unit Committee, the concurrence of the hiring college's or school's promotion and tenure committee and academic dean, the recommendation of the Provost, and the approval of the Chancellor. The Dean's letter of recommendation will accompany a unit report that should outline the stature and standing of the candidate and provide an explanation of the candidate's record in the form of citations, reviews, journal quality, press quality (for books) or other data that best supports the candidate.

Associate Professor with Tenure

A successful candidate who already holds the rank of associate professor with tenure at an institution of equal or higher status (e.g., equal or higher Carnegie classification) than UM-St. Louis and who is seeking associate professor rank with tenure may be reviewed under the provisions of "expedited tenure review"

as stated above. In such cases, the Dean of the College or School shall send a letter of recommendation to the Chancellor stating the major strengths of the candidate to be shared with the Provost.

In all other cases, including those in which promotion is proposed, academic appointments for new faculty members must undergo the review process specified in the following sections.

III. Procedures for Reviewing Candidates for Tenure and/or Promotion

A. Reviews of Progress toward Tenure and/or Promotion

1. All untenured regular faculty shall be reviewed annually regarding their progress toward tenure in light of the Unit Standards. The appropriate Unit Committee will conduct this review. Faculty under review shall be given the opportunity to appear before the Unit Committee and to submit material that she or he believes should be reviewed by the Committee. A written report, prepared by the Unit Committee or the Unit Chair, shall be given to the faculty member and the Dean.
2. A comprehensive performance review of all tenure-track faculty shall be conducted at the midpoint of their probationary period at UM-St. Louis. The Unit Committee, consisting of all qualified faculty members (i.e., those holding tenure and, in cases involving promotion, rank higher than the individual under review), shall conduct this review. Faculty under review shall be given the opportunity to appear before the Unit Committee and to submit material that she or he believes should be reviewed by the Committee. Upon completion of the review, a written summary of the conclusions and recommendations reached by the committee shall be provided to the faculty member, the Unit Chair, and the Dean. The report shall include one of the following possible outcomes:
 - a. The faculty member is making satisfactory progress toward tenure and sustained progress may result in a favorable recommendation from the unit;
 - b. There are deficiencies that, if satisfactorily corrected, may lead to a favorable recommendation for tenure, or;
 - c. The faculty member has not met the stated requirements for the position in one or more areas of responsibility, and the Unit Committee recommends against further contract renewals.

3. A final comprehensive performance review is required prior to recommendations concerning tenure (see Section III.B.).
4. All tenured Assistant and Associate Professors should be reviewed annually regarding their progress toward promotion. The appropriate Unit Committee will conduct this review. Faculty under review shall be given the opportunity to appear before the Unit Committee and to submit material that she or he believes should be reviewed by the Committee. A written report, prepared by the Unit Committee or the Unit Chair, shall be given to the faculty member and the Dean.

B. Who is to have a complete tenure and/or promotion review

In the spring the Provost will establish a schedule for reviews to be conducted during the following academic year. Each year Units will determine which faculty members are to be reviewed for tenure and/or promotion during the coming academic year based on the following guidelines:

1. Untenured regular faculty who will be in their sixth year of service creditable towards tenure must, in the sixth year, go through a complete tenure and promotion review.
2. Untenured regular faculty who were appointed at the associate or full professor rank without tenure must go through a complete tenure review no later than their fourth year of service at UM-St. Louis.
3. A Unit may recommend an Associate Professor for promotion at any time. In cases when the Unit has not acted sooner, Associate Professors are entitled, at their written request, to go through the full promotion process after their fifth year in rank and at least three years after their most recent request.
4. A Unit Committee may grant the opportunity to other regular faculty to go through a complete tenure and/or promotion review in any annual cycle. Untenured regular faculty who are put forward prior to their sixth year of service creditable toward tenure and who are not awarded tenure may be considered again in their sixth year under conditions of III.B.1.

C. The Complete Review Process

Note: Once outside letters have been solicited, the complete review process, as detailed below, must be followed (unless the candidate withdraws).

1. The *Ad Personam* Committee. An *Ad Personam* Committee will be established, normally in the spring, for every Unit faculty member who is slated for a complete tenure or promotion review the following academic year. Working with the candidate, the *Ad Personam* Committee will prepare a Dossier for the candidate that includes the candidate's factual record (see Appendix 1); a thorough written summary of the candidate's research, teaching, service, and outreach activities; and letters from outside reviewers addressing the candidate's record of research and creative activity including artistic performance where applicable. The letters may also address service and teaching when the writer has particular knowledge of the candidate's activities in these areas. When requesting outside evaluations the *Ad Personam Committee* should advise reviewers that the University of Missouri - St. Louis policy is to keep the identity of outside reviewers confidential to the extent allowed by law. The Dossier will also include a copy of the letter appointing the candidate to a tenure track position (in tenure decision cases only), a copy of the current Unit Standards, and copies of every annual review of progress toward promotion and/or tenure of the candidate (in tenure decision cases only).

The *Ad Personam* Committee shall submit the candidate's Dossier in written form to the Unit Committee. The report of the *Ad Personam* Committee is intended to be a factual document. It should **not** be an advocacy document. The *Ad Personam* committee signs the report in recognition of their belief that it is a factual document.

The Unit Committee shall review the Dossier assembled by the *Ad Personam* Committee to be sure it is complete, factual, and unbiased. Dossiers that do not meet these tests will be returned to the *Ad Personam* Committee for revision. If the Unit Committee still finds the Dossier incomplete, inadequate, or biased after one revision by the *Ad Personam* Committee, the Unit Committee will correct these deficiencies in a supplement to the Dossier.

2. The Unit Committee. A recommendation on the tenure and/or promotion of the candidate shall be made on behalf of the Unit Committee by the Unit Committee Coordinator.

University of Missouri - St. Louis
Tenure and Promotion Procedures (approved by Faculty Senate 2/15/05)

- a. As required by Executive Order 6A of the Collected Rules and Regulations of the University of Missouri, prior to the deliberations of the promotion and tenure committee, all tenured members of that department or school holding the same rank as or higher rank than that of the candidate shall be given the opportunity to provide written and signed comments to the promotion and tenure committee regarding the candidate being considered.
- b. Deliberations. Upon receiving and accepting the report by the Ad Personam Committee, and any letters submitted by tenured members of the department or school holding the same rank or higher rank than that of the candidate, the candidate's Dossier will be discussed fully and appropriately.
- c. Voting. After appropriate discussion, the Unit Committee will vote whether to recommend tenure and/or promotion. The Dean may not participate or vote in meetings of the Unit Committee, but with the approval of the Unit Committee, he or she may attend Unit Committee meetings as an observer. The Unit Chair, when also a member of the Unit Committee, may participate in discussions of the committee and vote with the committee. Unit Committee members should vote at this level, and may not vote at subsequent levels of review.

Voting shall be conducted by secret ballot. Each ballot shall include a vote for, against, or abstaining, and a rationale for the vote in the case of negative or abstaining votes. Each ballot shall be placed in an envelope and the sealed envelope shall be signed by the committee member. The Unit Committee Coordinator will coordinate the counting of votes and provide a tally of the votes for, against, abstaining or invalidated because of lack of signature or rationale in the case of negative or abstaining votes. The ballots are placed in a sealed envelope in the original copy of the candidate's Dossier. Absentee votes must be accompanied by a written appraisal of the candidate's strengths and weaknesses and this appraisal must be made available to the Unit Committee before its vote.

- d. The Unit Committee Report. The Unit Committee Coordinator will prepare the Unit Committee report unless he or she is opposed to the Committee's recommendation. In this instance, the Unit Committee elects another member to prepare the report. In some cases the Unit Committee may choose to elect someone else to write the report. The report will be based on the contents of the Ad Personam Report, on the discussion that occurred before the vote and on the rationales on

the ballots cast by committee members. The Unit Committee report shall be signed by the preparer on behalf of the committee.

The unit committee report must include a section listing reasons for any negative votes or abstentions.

Within one business day of the vote, Unit Committee members may individually or collectively submit additional statements to the Unit Committee Coordinator and Unit Chair in support of, or in opposition to, tenure and/or promotion. These statements must be signed, but only copies with the signatures removed become part of the Dossier. The original signed statements must be placed in a sealed envelope in the original copy of the candidate's Dossier. Any sealed envelope shall be opened only as required by law in any future legal action.

- e. Informing the Candidate. After a vote has been taken, the candidate is to be informed, in writing, of the Unit Committee's action (the vote tally, for, against, abstaining), and given a copy of the Unit Committee's report and copies of any additional statements submitted by Unit Committee members (with signatures removed).
- f. Candidate Response Process (see definitions for Response Options). If the Candidate selects Response Option (1), the response and the Dossier are sent to the Dean. If the Candidate selects Response Option (2), the Dossier is handled as described in Response Options.

In addition to the defined Candidate Response Options, the candidate may submit a written response and ask that the Unit Committee or Unit Chair (if appropriate) reconsider the original recommendation. If the request is directed to the Unit Committee, the Unit Committee will reconvene and act upon a request for reconsideration within 10 calendar days of receiving that request. The committee will, after reviewing all newly submitted material, either confirm or revise its original recommendation. If the recommendations do not change, then the candidate is so notified and the Dossier goes forward to the Dean. If the recommendations do change, the candidate is so notified and is given the new recommendations (including the new Unit Committee vote, if there is one). The Candidate Response Options are again available to the Candidate. The actions subsequent to the exercise of one of the Candidate Response Options are the same as outlined in the preceding paragraph.

- g. Joint Appointments - If a candidate holds a joint appointment in two or more Units, and is to be considered for tenure and/or promotion, the Collected Rules and Regulations of the University of Missouri specify that each must prepare a separate recommendation which shall be combined into one file. The recommendations should be developed independently by the two unit committees, and the conclusions of one should not be shared with the other. The units involved should form a single *Ad Personam* Committee, including members from all Units in which the candidate holds appointments, to work with the candidate in preparing the Dossier. The *Ad Personam* Committee should be chaired by a member of the primary Unit. The *Ad Personam* Committee report must consider the sum total of the research, teaching, service, and outreach records of the candidate. The *Ad Personam* committee's report should include an explanation for the distribution of responsibilities between the relevant units.

The completed *Ad Personam* Committee report will be reviewed by the primary Unit Committee to be sure that it is complete, factual, and unbiased (see Section III.C.1.). The primary Unit Committee will then forward the Dossier for review by the secondary Unit Committee(s) followed by the Dean(s) of the candidate's secondary Unit(s). The secondary Unit Committee(s) and Dean(s) may add to the Dossier any vote tallies taken by the secondary Units, as well as written comments based upon their evaluation of the candidate's total record. The Dossier will be forwarded to the primary Unit Committee, which shall follow the procedures set forth in Section III.C.2. of this document to complete their review of the Dossier and prepare their recommendation.

3. The Dean of the School or College

The Dean shall review the candidate's Dossier and shall prepare a written recommendation. In preparing her or his recommendation, the Dean may consult with the Unit Committee, members of the faculty individually, form an advisory committee, and/or confer with persons at other institutions or organizations. However, any new information solicited by the Dean must be made part of the candidate's Dossier. The Dossier is forwarded with the Dean's recommendation to the Provost.

The candidate shall be given a written copy of the Dean's recommendation and may exercise the Candidate Response Options. The Unit Committee

Coordinator and Unit Chair will also receive a copy of the Dean's recommendation.

If the Candidate selects Response Option (1), the response is addressed to the Chancellor and sent to the Provost *and the ATP committee*. If the Candidate selects Response Option (2), the Dossier is handled as described in Response Options.

4. The Senate Committee on Appointments, Tenure, and Promotion

Dossiers are forwarded from the Provost to the Senate Committee on Appointments, Tenure, and Promotion (ATP). The chairperson of the Senate ATP Committee is elected from among the members. The Committee considers recommendations for tenure and/or promotion received from the Units and deans. All voting shall be conducted by secret ballot. No absentee voting shall be permitted. In cases where a candidate is from the same Unit as an ATP member, the ATP member shall vote only at the Unit level but may participate by answering questions and may be present for the discussion of the ATP Committee. The ATP Committee may invite representatives of the Unit Committee or the Dean to meet with the Committee and to provide clarification to assist in reaching a decision in difficult cases.

The candidate shall be given a written copy of the ATP Committee's recommendation which will include the vote tally (for/against/abstain) and a written summary of the committee members' appraisal of the candidate's record. The Unit Committee Coordinator, Unit Chair and Dean will also receive a copy of the ATP Committee's recommendation. The candidate may exercise the Candidate Response Options.

If the Candidate selects Response Option (1), the response is addressed to the Chancellor and sent to the *Provost and the ATP Committee*. If the Candidate selects Response Option (2), the Dossier is handled as described in Response Options.

5. Action by the Chancellor

The Senate ATP Committee forwards the Dossiers to the Chancellor. In reaching his or her decision, the Chancellor may consult with the Unit Committee, the Dean, the Senate ATP Committee, the Provost, members of the faculty individually, and/or confer with persons at other institutions or

University of Missouri - St. Louis
Tenure and Promotion Procedures (approved by Faculty Senate 2/15/05)

organizations. However, any new information solicited by the Chancellor must be made part of the candidate's Dossier. The Chancellor shall communicate her or his decision to the candidate in writing, typically within 45 days of receipt of the Dossier by the Chancellor. Copies of her or his decision should also be given to the candidate's Unit Committee Coordinator, Unit Chair, Dean, Chair of the ATP Committee, and Provost. The candidate has seven days to request that the Chancellor reconsider the decision. Only the candidate can request reconsideration by the Chancellor. The Chancellor normally will respond within 20 days, either confirming the original decision or informing the candidate of a revised decision. Final action by the Chancellor must occur before 31 July.

Appendix 1

Preparing the Factual Record Guidelines for Candidates for Tenure and/or Promotion

The candidate for tenure and/or promotion is responsible for preparing and submitting to the *Ad Personam Committee* a Factual Record as described below. A preliminary version of the Factual Record should be submitted to the candidate's *Ad Personam Committee* in the spring of the academic year preceding the year of the tenure/promotion decision. The dates for submission of initial and final versions of the Factual Record will be set forth in an annual memo from the Provost. After submission of the final version of the Factual Record, no new information may be added in promotion cases. In tenure cases, the candidate may submit new material that updates the status of items already in the Factual Record (acceptance or publication of articles or books, receipt of research grants or awards, etc.) but may not add new material to the Factual Record, remove material from the Factual Record or rewrite parts of the Factual Record. The status updates must be submitted to the Unit Committee. If the Dossier has left the unit, the Unit Committee will forward the status updates to subsequent levels of review, with or without comment on the updates. The candidate is responsible for the factual accuracy and completeness of the Factual Record.

Information should be presented in the order indicated below. The type font should be no smaller than 12 point. Information must be submitted for all relevant items. If an item is not applicable, the notation "n/a" must be inserted at that point, rather than simply omitting the item. The Candidate should consult Unit Standards for direction on the kinds of information to include. The Factual Record should be clear, concise, and to the point while recognizing that it will be read by individuals who may not be knowledgeable in the discipline. It should be limited to no more than 30 pages. The Factual Record should be organized as follows:

I. Educational, Academic and Professional Background

List in order: name, current position, educational history, professional credentials, and employment history.

II. Teaching

- A. Provide a brief statement of your philosophy of teaching.
- B. List goals and accomplishments including creative contributions to teaching. Accomplishments might include, for example, new courses developed, participation in interdisciplinary courses, and teaching that necessitates assembling and organizing a new body of information.

- C. List the courses taught at UM-St. Louis at both the undergraduate and graduate levels. Identify those courses that used distance learning (e.g., televideo and Web-based courses) or were taught at off-campus sites.
- D. List undergraduate and graduate research and independent study projects supervised, including masters theses and doctoral dissertations.
- E. List teaching done through continuing education/extension and teaching done at other institutions.
- F. Give a complete listing of publications relating directly to teaching.
- G. List materials developed relating to teaching.
- H. List all other activities relevant to teaching.

III. *Scholarly Performance*

Note: Some publications may be directed primarily to teaching or service and if so, should be cited there rather than under this category.

- A. Provide a brief statement of your research interests and an overview of your research program that can be understood by someone outside of your discipline. Explain how your publications fit into a coherent research project or projects.
- B. List all relevant publications with publication dates, publishers, volume numbers, pages, *et cetera*. Identify refereed articles (R), publications from the dissertation or parts of it (D), and invited works (I). If a submission was refereed only by an editor (either for a journal or a book), the publication should be identified by (E) rather than (R). List separately: books, articles, chapters in books, reviews, abstracts, other work.
 1. Briefly describe each item listed including number of citations to the work and a selected list of the publications citing the work. Exclude self-citations. The candidate should retain a complete list of citations that can be immediately provided to the Unit Committee, the Dean, or the ATP Committee if requested.
 2. Co-authored works should indicate the approximate percent contributed by the candidate and a brief description of the role of the co-authors.
 3. Beginning and ending page numbers should be given for all items.
 4. Journal titles should not be abbreviated.
- C. List publications in press, indicating the expected publication date. Attach a copy of the acceptance letter.
- D. List manuscripts that have been submitted for publication, indicating the number of typed double-spaced pages.
- E. List papers presented to scholarly groups or conferences, indicating dates and places of presentations. Place an asterisk before the entry for papers presented at scholarly conferences that were subsequently published.
- F. List work in progress. Work under contract but not yet completed should be included in this category.

- G. Provide a record of grants proposed/accepted/funded. Include the agency solicited, the duration and amount of grant. List internal grants separately.
- H. List elected offices held in scholarly organizations, refereeing, and/or editorships.
- I. List academic awards and honors.
- J. List other scholarly activity.

IV. *Service*

- A. Provide a brief overview of your service.
- B. Describe role in departmental/division affairs.
- C. List college, campus, and university system committee memberships and other service with dates.
- D. List any publications relevant to service. Popular book reviews, program notes, and the like, should typically be classified as service.
- E. List memberships in scholarly organizations and professional service provided for these organizations if different from that given in *III.H*.
- F. Summarize professional activities typical of a university engaged in the external community, clearly indicating both the type and degree of involvement.
- G. Summarize professional consulting.
- H. List all other activities relevant to service.

V. *Curriculum Vitae*

The Candidate must sign and date the Factual Record certifying its completeness and accuracy.

Appendix 2

The Dossier Guidelines for *Ad Personam* and Unit Committees

Please place the dossier in a binder. Follow the format presented below in preparing the candidate's Dossier. Present information in the order indicated. Do not omit any items. **All pages of the Dossier should be numbered consecutively** beginning with the Table of Contents. Type font should be no smaller than 12 point. Be clear, concise, and to the point. Be sure to review Unit Standards. Do not include items about nonprofessional characteristics of the candidate that could be the basis for allegations of discrimination and other unfair treatment.

Order of Dossier:

- I. *Table of Contents* - The page numbers of each division of the Dossier should be included. Separate each division of the Dossier with a tabbed divider.
- II. *Summary Sheet* - See attached form.
- III. *Letter of Appointment* – to a tenure track position (tenure review only).
- IV. *Unit Standards*
- V. *Annual Reviews of Progress Toward Tenure* (tenure review only).
- VI. *Candidate's Factual Statement*
The Ad Personam Committee Report (this should be limited to no more than 15 pages).
 - A. Evaluation of Teaching.
 1. What method does the Unit use to evaluate teaching? (This method should be the same for all evaluations from the Unit, and should be stated in the Unit Standards.)
 2. Evaluate the candidate's teaching record according to the norms established by the Unit. Evaluation methods might include, for example, statements from alumni, specific statements of strengths and weaknesses, summaries of student evaluations, written appraisals based on in-class observation by colleagues here and elsewhere. For student evaluations:
 - a. Provide a full explanation of the methods used to collect data
 - b. Be sure that the data include all kinds of classes that the candidate has taught (graduate and undergraduate, on and off-campus, etc.)
 - c. The evaluations should cover a long period of time, not just a recent semester.
 - d. Handwritten letters must be transcribed and typed.
 - e. Be sure the reader can interpret a numerical result.

A teaching evaluation of a candidate who received years toward tenure at UM-St. Louis from another institution may include an evaluation of teaching at that institution.

3. Estimate the future potential of the candidate's teaching at UM-St. Louis.
- B. Evaluation of Research.
1. What methods does the Unit use to evaluate research? (This method should be the same for all evaluations from the Unit, and should be stated in the Unit Standards.)
 2. Discuss the quality of the journals in which the candidate has published including rankings and acceptance rates when available.
 3. Evaluate the candidate's publications by means of reviews, commentaries, citations, and statements by outside authorities.
 - a. Generally, the Dossier should contain evaluations from at least 6 external reviewers who are recognized nationally and internationally for their own achievements. Letters from former students, departmental colleagues, research collaborators, or former mentors should not be used. Evaluators will usually be from universities of a status at least comparable to that of the University of Missouri-St. Louis. The majority of these evaluations should be from persons selected by the *Ad Personam* Committee and not by the candidate. Provide a brief statement about each outside reviewer's standing in the field and academic relationship to the candidate. Indicate which reviewers were suggested by the candidate. Be sure that outside reviewers' areas of expertise are as specific and targeted as possible. Include a list of documents sent to the outside reviewers. All reviewers should receive the same set of documents. The letter to the reviewer can suggest the reviewer limit the evaluation to those documents in her or his areas of expertise. All letters received must be included in their entirety.
 - b. When a candidate has co-authored a large portion of publications, seek the assessment of selected co-authors related to the candidate's contribution to the articles as well as to the field of study. Co-authors should not serve as primary outside reviewers.
 - c. Translate in entirety any letters that are not written in English.
 - d. Transcribe and type handwritten letters.
 4. Evaluate the citations.
 5. Evaluate the candidate's work in press, submitted work, and work in progress, and other scholarly activity.
 6. Evaluate the candidate's record in seeking and receiving grants.
 7. Estimate in detail the future potential of the candidate, indicating capacity to continue research and scholarly productivity at UM-St. Louis.
- C. Evaluation of Service.
1. What method does the Unit use to evaluate service? (This method should be the same for all evaluations from the Unit and should be stated in the Unit Standards.)

2. Evaluate the candidate's record of service. Identify all persons, including those on-campus, who have evaluated the candidate's service.

VII. *Unit Committee Report*

VIII. *Reasons cited for any negative votes or abstentions.*

IX. *Unit Chair's Recommendation (if any)*

X. *Candidate Response (if any)*

XI. *Revised Unit Committee Report and/or Unit Chair's Recommendation (if any)*

XII. *Appendices.*

- A. Supporting materials for evaluation of teaching.
 1. Include a sample of the evaluation form.
 2. DO NOT include raw data from teaching evaluations.
 3. Include original student letters on teaching (with typed transcript if the original is hand-written).
- B. Supporting materials for evaluation of research.
 1. Include a model letter sent to outside evaluators.
 2. Include original letters by evaluators.
 3. DO NOT include copies of each letter to outside evaluators.
 4. DO NOT include the curriculum vita for each evaluator.
- C. Supporting materials for evaluation of service.

This completes the Dossier from the Unit. The original Dossier will be kept on permanent file with the Provost's office and should be submitted in a **binder clip**. Fourteen copies of the Dossier should be made and placed in **three ring binders**. One copy should be retained in the Unit. The original and the remaining copies should be forwarded to the Dean. The Dean will forward the original and 12 copies to the Provost's office for distribution.

Subsequent levels of review will add the following to the Dossier:

- A. Information solicited by the Dean and the recommendation of the Dean.
- B. Response of candidate to the Dean (when applicable).
- C. Information solicited by the ATP Committee and the recommendation of the ATP Committee.
- D. Response of candidate to ATP recommendation (when applicable).
- E. Information solicited by the Chancellor and the decision of the Chancellor.

