

Proposed Changes to the UMSL Tenure and Promotion Guidelines For submission to the Faculty Senate

These changes were approved by a vote of the Senate ATP Committee on December 3, 2013 and forwarded to UM Legal Counsel, which requested one small change and approved them in June 2014. They are now submitted by the Senate ATP Committee to the Faculty Senate for consideration.

CURRENT	PROPOSED	RATIONALE
<p>[p.2] 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.</p>	<p>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 if desired; or (2) withdraw from consideration, in writing, thereby waiving any right to further review, reconsideration, or appeal for that cycle.</p>	<p>Clarification. Some candidates interpreted the rules to mean that they must submit a written response even for a positive decision.</p>
<p>[p. 2 under Response Options] 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.</p>	<p>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 including the letter in the dossier and sending copies of the candidate response to all earlier levels of review.</p>	<p>Clarification. The instruction to address the chancellor confused the issue of who should receive the letter and include it in the dossier.</p>

<p>[p. 4 under 1.2.b.] 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.</p>	<p>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.</p> <p><u>If the candidate's dossier includes collaborative research, the Ad Personam committee may seek information on the nature and extent of the candidate's collaboration. Normally, a letter from a collaborator should address only the nature and extent of the collaboration without including an evaluation of the candidate's case for tenure and/or promotion.</u></p>	<p>The current instructions discourage the solicitation of letters from research collaborators, which conflicts with actual practice by disciplines that customarily solicit letters from research collaborators, which deal only with the nature of the collaboration. The new wording reflects actual practice.</p>
---	---	---

<p>[p. 13 under 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.</p>	<p>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. <u>When this information is considered, an explanation of how and why it was solicited should be included in the recommendation.</u> The Dossier is forwarded with the Dean's recommendation to the Provost.</p>	<p>This adds the same rigor to the Dean's collection of information that is required of the ad personam committee in its report.</p>
<p>[p. 8 under III.A.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 11 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.</p>	<p>A comprehensive performance review of all tenure-track faculty shall be conducted <u>at the midpoint</u> in the third year 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, a rank higher than the individual under review), shall conduct this review. <u>The Unit Committee may solicit outside reviews as appropriate.</u> 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.</p>	<p>Simpler wording achieves the same meaning. Legitimizes the possibility of sending out the dossier for outside review at the third-year point if departments so desire.</p>

<p>[p. 9 under III.B]</p> <p>B. Who is to have a complete tenure and/or promotion review</p> <p>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:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 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. 	<p>B. Who is to have a complete tenure and/or promotion review</p> <p>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:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 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. <u>In accordance with Section 310.035B. of the Collected Rules and Regulations of the University of Missouri, the Chancellor may grant a maximum of two one-year extensions during the probationary period.</u> 	<p>To make the written procedures consistent with practice, it seems reasonable to mention the possibility of a postponement of the tenure review.</p>
---	--	--

<p>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.</p>	<p>4. 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.</p> <p>5. 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.</p>	
--	---	--