

University of Missouri - St. Louis

Guidelines to Promotion of Non Tenure Track Faculty

(Approved by Faculty Senate – March 21, 2017)

Revised January 22, 2019

This document describes general procedures and responsibilities regarding the promotion of Non Tenure Track faculty at the University of Missouri – St. Louis. It follows and is consistent with, but is not limited to, Executive Guideline No. 35 and section 310.035 Non-Tenure Track Faculty of the *Collected Rules & Regulations* of the University of Missouri. Specific procedures and standards for promotion of NTT faculty members are the responsibility of the Colleges, Departments, and Academic Units, as prescribed by the Collected Rules. Faculty members are urged to consult Unit Guidelines and a mentor to determine paths to promotion.

All NTT faculty will be given a copy of this document and their Unit Guidelines upon their hiring with the receipt of their first contract so that they can be made aware of the processes for promotion. This document will also be made readily available through appropriate websites so that deans and department chairs can access the information easily.

Definitions

Ad Personam Committee: a committee consisting of at least three faculty members at a rank higher than the Candidate's rank. This committee will normally come from the Candidate's home Unit but by necessity may include members from other Units or from outside the University of Missouri - St. Louis. *Ad Personam Committee* members who are from outside UMSL will normally not receive financial compensation for their service. The Candidate shall have the right to select one member, while the Unit Committee or its designee will select the remaining members, after consultation with the Candidate.

The *Ad Personam Committee* is responsible for advising the Candidate on assembling the Dossier, and for soliciting, collecting, and presenting letters, reports, and other assessments from students, peers, and outside experts that evaluate the Candidate's suitability for promotion. To this end, the *Ad Personam Committee* works with the Candidate to develop the Checklist for promotion. The *Ad Personam Committee* also develops the Table of Contents, and writes and signs the *Ad Personam Committee* Report, which assesses the contents and completeness of the Dossier.

Annual Promotion Review: Unit procedure that evaluates and tracks an NTT faculty member's progress toward promotion and recommends promotion to Unit Chair. Units can form committees to perform these actions. If a committee is formed, it can be made up of NTT and TT professors at Associate Professor and Professor ranks. Associate

Professors and Professors evaluate Assistant Professors, and full Professors evaluate Associate Professors. In the case of smaller units, annual promotion review may be done by the Unit Chair or his or her designee.

Candidate: a faculty member being considered for promotion. The Candidate is responsible for preparing the Portfolio, the CV, and the appendices of sample materials, citations, and other materials that show the growth and development in the Candidate's quality, merit, and impact. Once the Candidate hands over the Dossier for evaluation by the department or Unit, the Candidate may no longer add, subtract, or modify the Dossier except in response to a vote not to promote.

Checklist or Promotion Checklist: a checklist that shows Unit standards for promotion and the section or document of the Dossier where evidence of fulfillment may be found. The *Ad Personam Committee* is responsible for compiling this Checklist with help from the Candidate.

College Committee: a committee formed, at the Unit Dean's discretion, from the Candidate's College to deliberate and vote on the Candidate's promotion.

Curriculum Vitae: an overview of professional credentials, qualifications, and experiences that shows the growth and development of a faculty member over the course of a career. The addition of the *Curriculum Vitae* to the Dossier affords readers a broad and long-term context for the narrowly focused details that appear in the Portfolio.

Dean: The Dean of the school or college in which the Candidate has her or his primary appointment. The Dean is responsible for assessing and recommending promotion or no promotion to the Provost.

Dossier: a document produced by the Candidate and Candidate's *Ad Personam Committee* that is used by the various units to review the Candidate and recommend for or against promotion. 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. Guidelines for preparing the Dossier are given in Appendix II, "Guidelines for Preparing the NTT Promotion Dossier".

Portfolio: The Portfolio is the equivalent of the Factual Record in the Tenure Track Faculty promotion process. It is the collection of documents that demonstrate the Candidate's accomplishments in the specific area of appointment and the contents may vary according to whether the faculty member holds a teaching, research, or clinical appointment. Guidelines for compiling the Portfolio are in Appendix I.

Provost: the administrative head of Academic Affairs. The Provost receives recommendations from the Unit Chair, Unit Dean, and Senate Committee Chair for or against promotion.

Rationale for Promotion: a detailed written statement that makes the case for consideration for promotion based on the expectations appropriate for each rank.

Recommendations: Deliberations by Units, Deans, and the Senate Committee all culminate in recommendations to the Provost.

Response Options: at each stage of the process when a recommendation not to promote is placed in the Candidate's Dossier, the Candidate must be notified in writing immediately and be given seven calendar days from the date of notification 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. 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 sent to the next level of review, unless otherwise noted. The individual at the next level of review is responsible for including the letter in the Dossier and sending copies of the Candidate response to all earlier levels of review.

Senate Committee: The Senate Committee on Promotion of Non Tenure Track Faculty, made up of full NTT professors and at least one TT professor elected by the Faculty Senate. The Senate Committee is responsible for assessing and recommending promotion or no promotion, and then passing on that recommendation to the Provost through the Senate Committee Chair.

Terminal Degree: the highest University degree awarded in a particular field of study. In most academic fields, the doctorate, such as the Ph.D. (Doctor of Philosophy), O.D. (Doctors of Optometry), or the Ed.D. (Doctor of Education), is considered the terminal degree. In Creative Writing, the MFA (Master of Fine Arts) is the highest degree awarded.

Unit: the faculty body that puts forward the first recommendation concerning promotion. In Arts & Sciences, Business, and Education, the Units are departments; in Nursing, Optometry, and the School of Social Work, the Unit is the college or school as a whole; in the Missouri Institute of Mental Health, the Unit is the Institute as a whole.

Unit Chair: the administrative chair or director of the Candidate's unit. In Arts & Sciences, Business, and Education, the Unit Chair is the Chair of the Department; in Nursing, Optometry, and the School of Social Work, there is no Unit Chair. In the Missouri Institute of Mental Health, the Unit Chair is the Director of the Institute.

Unit Promotion Committee: a committee formed from the Candidate's Unit to deliberate and vote on the Candidate's promotion. The Unit Committee recommends promotion or no promotion to the Dean through the Unit Chair's Letter.

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.

When unit promotion guidelines are changed, the faculty being evaluated for progress toward promotion will be given two options:

- 1) be evaluated under the new guidelines, or
- 2) continue to be evaluated under the guidelines in effect at the time of the candidate's last promotion or at the time of their initial appointment in the NTT position if the candidate has not been promoted since their initial appointment.

I. Philosophy of Promotion

UM System CRR 310.035.K. (Executive Order 35) specifies,

https://www.umsystem.edu/ums/rules/collected_rules/faculty/ch310/310.035_non-tenure_track_faculty

Evaluation of the Candidate's application for promotion should focus on the specific area of appointment – teaching, research, clinical/professional practice, extension or library – as well as service and professional activities related to that primary responsibility.

In promotion considerations, the total contribution of the faculty member to the mission of the school, college or academic unit over a sustained period of time should be taken into consideration. This includes comprehensive documentation of the position, including a letter of appointment identifying home department or unit and the initial position description, communications detailing changes in position responsibilities, and any other statements regarding expected performance.

The promotion of NTT Faculty is intended to improve the overall quality of faculty members in the NTT ranks, and to recognize the excellence they have achieved. A faculty member who strives for excellence not only benefits students and their education, but also reflects well on the University and the faculty member's field of expertise, and makes the University a better, more potent partner in the community and the state of Missouri.

Promotion is not automatic. Promotion recognizes *the growth and development* over time of the NTT faculty member's quality, merit, and impact on his or her students, department or program, college, university, field or community at departmental, local, regional, national, and/or international levels.

II. Categories of NTT Faculty and the Primary Responsibility

At UMSL, NTT Faculty members are employed in three different categories: Teaching, Clinical, and Research. At hiring and reappointment, faculty members are given a Letter of Appointment by their Unit Chairs or Deans that specifies the Primary Responsibility of their appointment, such as teaching, clinical practice, or research, and their Service. Percentages are assigned to the Primary Responsibility and Service to indicate the distribution of the faculty members' effort. Promotion Candidates are evaluated on these two areas in which they distribute their efforts: the Primary Responsibility and Service.

III. Ranks

While job requirements might change over time as the faculty member takes on new tasks and responsibilities, the expectations of growth and development in the faculty member's quality, merit, and impact throughout his or her career remain basic to earning promotion. NTT faculty work in teaching, clinical, and research positions, but across the University the following are expected.

NTT Assistant Professors have demonstrated the expertise and experience to execute their job responsibilities successfully in their specific area of appointment - teaching, research, or clinical – as well as the service and professional activities related to that primary responsibility. NTT Assistant Professors have strong records of service in the Unit, show an interest in and a potential for growth and excellence in the specific area of appointment, and demonstrate the potential for leadership among peers.

NTT Associate Professors have demonstrated excellence in their specific area of appointment beyond that justifying the rank of assistant teaching professor. They have made sustained contributions to the Unit and the University, and show consistent evidence of growth. NTT Associate Professors have strong records of leadership and service in the Unit, and beyond the Unit as well, whether in the University, community, or profession.

NTT Professors should have significant accomplishments beyond those justifying the rank of associate teaching professor. Years of service alone do not justify advancement. Rather, it is necessary to have made sustained contributions during a career to the specific area of appointment as well as service and professional activities related to that primary responsibility. A person being considered for promotion to professor should have achieved significant distinction in the specific area of appointment or related service and professional activities. NTT Professors should have strong records of leadership and service in their Units, in the University, and beyond the University as well, whether in the profession or the community.

IV. Process and Evaluation Principles

The process for promotion for full-time, non-tenure-track faculty is parallel to the process for the tenure and promotion of tenure-track or tenured faculty. The process

follows the NTT Promotion Timeline, which can be found on the UMSL Academic Affairs web site.

UM System CRR 310.35.K. states,

https://www.umsystem.edu/ums/rules/collected_rules/faculty/ch310/310.035_non-tenure_track_faculty

Specified criteria for promotion and description of the process used for promotion in rank should be spelled out by the school, college or academic unit and approved by the provost in advance. The development of specific criteria and guidelines used to determine standards of excellence for promotion purposes should be the responsibility of the department/unit, subject to approval by a Dean or director and the Provost.

Evaluation areas should be consistent with the established academic standards for each discipline. The decision to apply for promotion would be one the NTT faculty member could elect or not; annual reviews should be valuable indicators of the applicant's readiness for promotion.

NTT faculty members are evaluated according to their primary responsibility and service. To be eligible for promotion, faculty members are expected to make significant contributions in each area. The annual review for promotion is not based upon the activities of just one year, but upon the individual's cumulative record and his or her progress to promotion.

The review and recommendation for promotion is conducted by full-time department faculty of higher rank than the Candidate, and may include NTT, tenure-track, and tenured faculty. This review may be done by the Unit Chair or by a committee. If the Candidate agrees to move forward with the promotion process, the process then follows the NTT Promotion Timeline.

It is important to note that once the Candidate has decided to begin the process to promotion, only the Candidate can stop the process. Candidates are urged to seek out strong advice about their potential for success in promotion.

All participants in the Promotion process, including advisors, evaluators, and others, are reminded of the confidential nature of all information gathered, all discussions and deliberations, and all recommendations.

V. Overview of NTT Promotion Procedures

All Candidates for NTT promotion must have held the current rank for at least five years. (This does not apply to a change of title for Lecturers, which may occur sooner.) For Candidates hired at the beginning of a fall semester, the process of consideration may begin in the spring of the fifth year of employment; for Candidates hired at the beginning of a spring or summer semester, the process of consideration should begin in the spring of the sixth year.

Each spring, all full-time NTT faculty members eligible for promotion (Assistant and Associate Professors) will prepare a report on their rationale for promotion that shows credentials, years in rank, and experience that highlight growth. This will be submitted to the Unit Chair, and will be made available to the members of the Annual Promotion Review Committee.

If the Annual Promotion Review Committee so recommends, and the Candidate agrees to move forward, the Unit Chair will appoint an *Ad Personam Committee*. In the case of teaching faculty, the Committee will ask the Candidate to prepare a full Portfolio as described below; will compile student evaluation data from the previous five years; and will solicit letters from peers that evaluate the Candidate's teaching and service. In the cases of clinical and research faculty, a similar portfolio relevant to their activities should also be prepared by the Candidate. Such portfolios may include published research articles, clinical protocols, and professional presentations. Peer observations reports from faculty peers, peer researchers, and professional peers who have expertise in the Candidate's work are included when possible. The Committee assembles the Dossier and checks it for completeness, prepares the Table of Contents, and then writes the *Ad Personam Committee Report*, which objectively summarizes the Candidate's case for promotion and the evidence that is supplied in the Dossier. All Committee members must sign the Report, indicating that the Report is accurate and unbiased, and that the Dossier is complete.

The Dossier is made available to the Unit Promotion Committee (typically the same as the Annual Promotion Review Committee), whose members will discuss and vote upon the Candidate's promotion. If the vote for promotion is negative, the Candidate will have 7 days to withdraw or rebut the negative vote in writing. The rebuttal letter must be included in the Dossier. The Unit Chair (if that individual is of higher rank than the Candidate), or designee, then writes a letter to the Dean that recommends for or against promotion, offers a brief explanation of the reasoning behind the vote, and includes a vote tally. The Unit Chair's Letter is included in the Dossier.

Note: Before the Dossier goes further, the raw data concerning student evaluations should be removed from the Dossier, but all other raw data (such as letters and peer observation reports) should remain.

The Dossier then is made available to the Dean and, in colleges that employ one, the College NTT Promotion Committee, whose members discuss and vote on the Candidate's promotion. If the vote for promotion is negative, the Candidate will have 7 days to withdraw or rebut the negative vote in writing. This rebuttal letter must be included in the Dossier. The Dean then writes a letter to the Provost that recommends for or against promotion, offers a brief explanation of the reasoning behind the vote, and includes a vote tally. The Dean's Letter is included in the Dossier.

The Dossier is then made available to the Senate Committee for Promotion of NTT Faculty, whose members discuss and vote on the Candidate's promotion. If the vote for promotion is negative, the Candidate will have 7 days to withdraw or rebut the negative vote in writing. This rebuttal letter must be included in the Dossier. The Chair of the Senate Committee then writes a letter to the Provost that recommends for or against

promotion, offers a brief explanation of the reasoning behind the vote, and includes a vote tally. The Senate Committee Chair's Letter is included in the Dossier.

VI. Breakdown of Procedures, Documents, and Responsibilities

To be considered a Candidate for promotion, it is recommended that faculty members follow the procedures below.

1. **Annual Promotion Review.** Each year during the process of the Annual Review, the Unit Chair, or his or her designee or Committee, reviews NTT faculty members' progress toward promotion.
 - a. The Candidate notifies his or her Unit Chair of his or her desire to go up for promotion and submits a written rationale for promotion.
 - b. The Unit Chair evaluates the rationale and advises potential Candidate of his or her chances for success or failure.
 - c. If the Candidate chooses to move forward, the Unit Chair notifies his or her Dean, if applicable, of the potential Candidate and identifies an *Ad Personam Committee* to advise the potential Candidate.
 - d. If the Candidate chooses not to move forward, the process ends.
2. **The *Ad Personam Committee*.** The *Ad Personam Committee* advises the Candidate in preparing the Portfolio, and with the help of the Candidate, assembles a Dossier according to the Promotion Requirements (see "NTT Promotion Dossier Essentials").

The *Ad Personam Committee* is responsible for conducting and/or collecting assessments of the Candidate's work (such as student evaluations, peer observations, recommendation letters from students, peers, outside experts, etc.), as required by Promotion Requirements. For extensive raw data, such as student course evaluations, the *Ad Personam Committee* should summarize evaluation data in the Committee's Report, and store the raw data in the Candidate's Department or Unit office.

If outside evaluations or letters of recommendation are required, 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.

Using Unit, College, and University General Requirements as criteria for analysis, the *Ad Personam Committee* develops the Checklist for Promotion, which shows the requirements and the parts of the Dossier that contain evidence demonstrating fulfillment of the requirements. The Checklist should indicate clearly what is included in the Dossier and will enable the Committee to review the Candidate's Dossier to make sure it is complete, factual, and unbiased.

If analysis shows that the Candidate is not ready for promotion, or that the Dossier is incomplete, the Ad Personam Committee should advise the Candidate to wait until he or she is ready, or the Dossier is complete. However, the decision to wait or continue belongs to the Candidate alone.

If analysis shows that the Candidate is ready and the Dossier complete, the Committee then reports its findings in writing. A simple explanation helps evaluators understand if a requirement does not apply to the Candidate, or that a common piece of evidence is missing, under- or oddly-represented in the Dossier. (This is not unusual.) While the *Ad Personam Committee's* report can show the Candidate's readiness for promotion, the report should **not** be an advocacy document that recommends promotion (that is the job of the Unit Committee).

The *Ad Personam Committee* report should be signed by all committee members signifying that the Dossier is complete and accurate and then submitted with the Candidate's Dossier and the Committee's report to the Unit Chair for review by the Unit Committee.

3. **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.

A recommendation on the promotion of the Candidate shall be made on behalf of the Unit Committee by the Unit Chair.

- a. **Deliberations.** Upon receiving and accepting the report by the *Ad Personam Committee*, and any letters submitted by members of the department or school, the Candidate's Dossier will be discussed fully and appropriately.
- b. **Voting.** After appropriate discussion, the Unit Committee will vote whether to recommend 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. The Unit Committee Chair 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. A record of the vote should be included with the Chair's Letter (below). Attendance at the meeting can occur in person or by synchronous electronic means. Any Unit Committee member who participated in the deliberations by synchronous electronic means shall submit his or her vote – including the rationale for the vote in case of negative or abstaining votes – electronically to a non-voting party, designated by the Unit Committee Chair (e.g., an administrative assistant), to be included with the in-person votes.

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.

- c. **The Unit Chair's Letter.** The Unit Chair will write a letter addressed to the Provost that reviews the Dossier, the *Ad Personam Committee* Report, the Unit Committee's discussion that occurred before the vote, and the Unit Committee's decision to recommend or not recommend promotion. If he or she is opposed to the Committee's recommendation, the Unit Committee must elect another member to prepare the letter.

The Chair's Letter must include a tally of votes, and 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 Chair in support of, or in opposition to 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.

- d. **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 Chair's Letter and copies of any additional statements submitted by Unit Committee members (with signatures removed).
- e. **Candidate Response Process** (see **Definitions** above 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 request that the Unit Chair 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.

- 4. The Dean of the School or College.** The Dean shall review the Candidate's Dossier and shall prepare a written recommendation addressed to the Provost. In preparing her or his recommendation, the Dean may consult with the Unit Committee, members of the faculty individually, form an advisory College 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.

If an advisory College Committee is formed, and if it is asked to deliberate and vote on a recommendation to promote, then a record of the vote tally should be included with the Dean's recommendation. Reasons should be included for every negative vote and abstention.

- a. **The Dean's Recommendation.** The Dean's Recommendation and Candidate's Dossier are forwarded to the Provost, who will then share it with the Senate Committee on Promotion of NTT Faculty.

The Candidate shall be given a written copy of the Dean's recommendation and may exercise the Candidate Response Options. The Unit Chair will also receive a copy of the Dean's recommendation.

- b. **The Candidate's Response.** If the Candidate selects Response Option (1), the response is addressed to the Provost and sent to the *Senate Committee on the Promotion of Non Tenure Track Faculty*. If the Candidate selects Response Option (2), the Dossier is handled as described in Response Options.

5. The Senate Committee on Promotion of Non Tenure Track Faculty

Dossiers are forwarded from the Provost to the Senate Committee on Promotion of Non Tenure Track Faculty. The Committee considers recommendations for promotion received from the Units and Deans. All voting is conducted by secret ballot. No absentee voting shall be permitted. Committee members who participated in the deliberations by synchronous electronic means will submit their votes – including the

rationale for the vote in case of negative or abstaining votes – electronically to a non-voting party, designated by the Provost to be included with the in-person votes.

In cases where a Candidate is from the same Unit as a Senate Committee member, the Senate Committee member shall vote only at the Unit level but may participate by answering questions and may be present for the discussion of the Senate Committee.

The Senate 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 Senate Committee's Recommendation: The Senate Committee Chair then writes a letter addressed to the Provost that recommends to or not to promote. The letter must include the vote tally (for/against/abstain) and a written summary of the Committee members' appraisal of the Candidate's record. Reasons must be included with every negative vote and abstention.

The Candidate shall be given a written copy of the Senate Committee's recommendation. The Unit Committee Coordinator, Unit Chair and Dean may also receive a copy of the Senate Committee's recommendation.

The Candidate's Response: The Candidate may exercise the Candidate Response Options. If the Candidate selects Response Option (1), the response is addressed to the Provost and sent to the Provost and the Senate Committee. If the Candidate selects Response Option (2), the Dossier is handled as described in Response Options.

- 6. Action by the Provost:** In reaching his or her decision, the Provost may consult with the Unit Committee, the Dean, the Senate Committee, members of the faculty individually, and/or confer with persons at other institutions or organizations. However, any new information solicited by the Provost must be made part of the Candidate's Dossier. The Provost shall communicate her or his decision to the Candidate in writing. Copies of her or his decision may also be given to the Candidate's Unit Committee Coordinator, Unit Chair, Dean, and Chair of the Senate Committee. The Candidate has seven days to request that the Provost reconsider the decision. Only the Candidate can request reconsideration by the Provost. The Provost normally will respond within 20 days, either confirming the original decision or informing the Candidate of a revised decision. Final action by the Provost must occur before 31 July.

Appendix I

University of Missouri - St. Louis Guidelines for Preparing the NTT Promotion Portfolio

NOTES

Descriptive vs. Prescriptive. Because of the differences in the kinds of work NTT faculty do, no document could prescribe the Portfolio in a way that would apply fairly and equally to everyone. Therefore, this document intends to be *descriptive* by naming in the kinds of information that are typically found in the Portfolio. You should let your mentor and your Unit Guidelines help you determine what is necessary and will be useful to include in your individual case for promotion.

Time Period Covered. With the exception of details about your educational, academic, and professional qualifications (Section I below), the Portfolio should focus only on the period under evaluation and should relate clearly to promotion requirements. Typically, that means the period since your last promotion, i.e., the last five years. If you believe an item you list could be misunderstood, you may include a *brief* explanation (1-3 sentences) to show the significance of the item.

Curriculum Vitae vs. Portfolio. You might find that your *curriculum vitae* and your Portfolio share some of the same information, but they are different. Your *cv* will show your accomplishments and development over your entire career, while your Portfolio will provide a detailed view of your accomplishments and development over the past five years.

Primary Responsibility. Section II below refers to your *primary responsibility* at UMSL. In most cases, NTT faculty members are hired as teachers, researchers, or clinical practitioners. While it is possible that a teaching professor might do some research or clinical practice, or a clinical professor might do some teaching or research, *the primary responsibility of that faculty member's effort would be in one area.* Your letter of appointment should indicate your primary responsibility. If it does not, please consult your unit chair or dean. (See Collected Rules and Regulations of the University of Missouri, section 310.035.)

https://www.umsystem.edu/ums/rules/collected_rules/faculty/ch310/310.035_non-tenure_track_faculty

The NTT Promotion Portfolio

I. Educational, Academic, and Professional Background

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

II. Primary Responsibility: Teaching

If TEACHING is your primary responsibility:

- A. Provide a brief statement of your philosophy of teaching (1-2 pages typically).
- B. List goals and accomplishments (or accomplishments and goals*) including creative contributions to teaching.

*Listing goals then accomplishments can help you demonstrate that you have aimed at a particular kind of result and have been successful in achieving it. Listing accomplishments and then goals can help you show a trajectory for future growth. You should choose the approach that's best for you.

Accomplishments might include, for example, new courses developed, participation in interdisciplinary courses, and teaching that necessitates collecting and organizing a new body of information.

- C. List the courses, and the number of sections and students per course, taught at or through UM-St. Louis at both the undergraduate and graduate levels. Identify those courses that were taught online (either hybrid or completely online) or at off-campus sites. Elaborate briefly on the significance of these courses (and these students and number of students taught, if appropriate).
- D. List undergraduate and graduate research and independent study projects supervised, including master's theses and doctoral dissertations. You may also include participation in doctoral comprehensive examinations. Elaborate briefly on the topics and significance of these projects and the parts you played in them.
- E. List teaching done through continuing education/extension and teaching done at other institutions. Name the course and number of students. Include a brief explanation if necessary to show significance, such as for invited lectures or in-residence professorships.
- F. Give a complete listing of publications (include full bibliographical citation) or other output relating directly to teaching. You may list publications more indirectly related as well, but they must be explained clearly and briefly.
- G. List materials developed relating to teaching.

H. List all other activities or impacts relevant to teaching.

II. Primary Responsibility: Research

If RESEARCH is your primary responsibility:

A. Provide a brief statement of your research (1-2 pages typically). Please write so non-experts can understand.

B. List goals and accomplishments (or accomplishments and goals*) including funding (funded and unfunded funding proposals). State whether you were the Principal Investigator and indicate the percentage of your contribution, if applicable.

*Listing goals then accomplishments can help you demonstrate that you have aimed at a particular kind of result and have been successful in achieving it. Listing accomplishments and then goals can help you show a trajectory for future growth. You should choose the approach that's best for you.

Accomplishments might include publications (bibliographic details not needed here), funded projects, patents filed or issued, research student's accomplishments, invited lectures, or chairing sessions in national and international meetings/conferences, invited book chapters/reviews, editorial activities, consulting and expert witness, patents/patent filings/disclosures.

C. Give a complete listing of publications and presentations even if they are listed before. Please give full bibliographical citations and indicate the percentage of your contribution, if applicable.

D. List undergraduate and graduate research and independent study projects supervised, including master's theses and doctoral dissertations. You may also include participation in doctoral comprehensive examinations (including member of thesis evaluation/defense committee memberships, both internal and external). Elaborate briefly on the topics and significance of these projects and the parts you played in them.

E. List any teaching done, both formal and informal. Elaborate briefly on the significance of this work.

F. List any undergraduate/graduate/non-formal courses related to your field of research that you have developed or participated in developing. Please indicate the percentage of your contribution, if applicable. Identify any publications/presentations/funding that may have resulted from this activity.

G. List materials developed relating to teaching and research activities including presentations to the community or profession (E.g., high school students, non-

science groups such as Boy Scout or Girl Scout organizations, accreditation agencies, governmental agencies, political/business leaders, etc.)

H. List all other activities or impacts relevant to your research activities that you may feel appropriate and which may help in the evaluation.

II. Primary Responsibility: Clinical Practice

If CLINICAL EDUCATION & PRACTICE is your primary responsibility:

A. Provide a brief statement of your philosophy of teaching clinical and/or didactic topics (1-2 pages typically).

B. List goals and accomplishments to clinical education and practice including your most creative contributions.

Accomplishments might include delivering clinical care in specialty areas or general practice, integrating student experiences within clinical environments, integrating and facilitating transitions between clinical and didactic activities, and adapting new knowledge and technologies into teaching or the program.

C. List the courses, whether they are clinical, didactic, or laboratory, and the number of sessions and students per course. Consider your roles with the students and patients; are you coordinating courses, team teaching, supervising student clinical encounters, or directing and monitoring externships.

D. List research and independent study projects supervised, including master's theses and doctoral dissertations. Also, include extended mentoring activities. Elaborate briefly on the topics and significance of projects and the parts you played.

E. List teaching done through continuing education/extension and teaching done at other institutions. Also, report clinical practice either in a faculty practice or outside the university. Elaborate on the significances of CE teaching and clinical practice in the clinical education process.

F. Give a complete listing of publications (include full bibliographical citation), peer reviewed or otherwise, and output relating directly to teaching.

G. List materials developed relating to clinical education.

H. List all other activities including community and professional involvements including their impact on teaching.

III. Service.

A. Describe your overall role in departmental/division affairs.

B. List department, college, campus, and university system committee memberships and other service with dates. Briefly note any significant accomplishments that the reader should know, if necessary.

C. List memberships in scholarly organizations, including roles played, committee membership activities, task forces, and other professional service provided for these organizations.

D. List any publications or presentations relevant to service. Popular book reviews, program notes, invited talks, roundtables, and workshops are classified typically as service.

E. Summarize professional activities in support of the university engaged in the external community, clearly indicating both the type and degree of involvement. These activities would include community outreach.

F. Summarize professional consulting.

G. List all other activities or impact relevant to service.

Appendix II

University of Missouri - St. Louis Guidelines for Preparing the NTT Promotion Dossier

Follow the guidelines below in preparing the Candidate's Dossier. Present all the 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* - Each section and subsection should be clearly indicated in the TOC and the Dossier to make navigation easy and accurate. The Dossier should be paginated continuously.
- II. *Summary Sheet* (see attached).
- III. *Letter of Appointment* - The Letter of Appointment shows the date employment begins and the distribution of effort between the Candidate's Primary Responsibilities and Service.
- IV. *Unit Standards*.
- V. *Annual Reviews of Progress Toward Promotion*.
- VI. *Candidate's Portfolio* (see Appendix I "Guidelines for Preparing the NTT Promotion Portfolio").
- VII. *Ad Personam* Committee's Report – This report should summarize the Candidate's Dossier and qualifications and measures them against Unit Standards, as follows. The Report should also draw attention to the added responsibilities and accomplishments that make the Candidate especially unique and (therefore) promotable.
 - A. Evaluation of work related to Primary Responsibilities – Include qualitative and quantitative data and indicate how the data has been collected and evaluated. Examples of data evaluated should be in accord with Unit Standards and could include the following.

1. Courses/training sessions/professional development programs taught or supervised – Include names and type (e.g., undergraduate, graduate, professional training, community outreach) and instances offered. Include any new ones that were developed and/or existing ones that were revised, any interdisciplinary or cross-disciplinary efforts, or courses requiring the collection of a new body of data.
2. Number of individuals taught, trained, or supervised.
3. Summary of course/session/program evaluations – Indicate the significance of evaluation results by comparing results to department, unit, or national averages.
4. Number and significance of publications.
5. Number of grants funded.
6. Number of patents filed/issued.
7. User fees and other funding generated.
8. Summary of student letters, peer observations, outside peer evaluations, letters from collaborators, users, and clients, and annual reviews.
9. Other relevant evidence pertinent to the performance of Primary Responsibilities, such as scholarship, performance, and creative works.

B. Evaluation of Service – Summarize the Candidate’s record of service as required by the Unit. Indicate how the Unit evaluates service. Additional relevant service to the University and/or the profession at the organizational, community, regional, national, and/or international levels should be included as well.

VIII. *Unit Committee Report.*

IX. *Reasons Cited for Any Negative Votes or Abstentions (if any).*

X. *Unit Chair’s Recommendation (if any).*

XI. *Candidate’s Response (if any).*

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

XIII. *Appendices*

A. Supporting materials for evaluating performance of Primary Responsibility.

1. Include sample evaluation form.
 2. Do not include raw data.
 3. Include sample letter requesting peer or outside peer evaluation.
 4. Summarize credentials of outside evaluators.
 5. Include original support letters (with typed transcript if the original is hand-written).
- B. Supporting materials for evaluating service.

Non Tenure Track Promotion Review Summary Sheet
University of Missouri - St. Louis

Review Cycle: **Academic Year** _____

Name of Candidate _____ Current Rank _____

Department and/or School or College _____

Recommendation is for promotion to rank of

Assistant Professor _____

Associate Professor _____

Professor _____

Date and rank of initial appointment _____

Years credited towards tenure when appointed _____

Number of years in current rank as of September 1, 20XX _____

Summary of Recommendations and Action Taken

Unit Committee: For _____ Against _____ Abstain _____ No. of Members _____

Unit Chair, if applicable: For _____ Against _____ Abstain _____

Dean: For _____ Against _____

Senate Committee: For _____ Against _____ Abstain _____ No. of Members _____

Action of Provost: _____

Provost's signature: _____ Date _____