College of Arts and Sciences
Recommendations for Conducting the Annual Review for Promotion

The purpose of the **Annual Review** is for senior faculty to evaluate the progress of other faculty members towards tenure and/or promotion to a higher rank. This review should be conducted for all full-time faculty holding tenure-track and non-tenure track ranks. Details are provided below.

**Policy on Review of Tenure-Track Faculty**

The University of Missouri-St. Louis Procedures Concerning Tenure and Promotion (for tenure-track and tenured faculty) state the following (section III.A.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.

In addition, it is stated that every tenure-track faculty member will receive a more thorough review at the midpoint of his or her probationary period (section 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 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.

At UMSL, since the standard probationary period is six years, the midpoint review will normally take place in the third year, and will therefore be called the **Third-Year Review** in this document.
Faculty who have already achieved tenure as an Assistant or Associate Professor must also be reviewed annually for their progress toward promotion to the next higher rank (section III.A.3):

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.

It is no longer the campus practice to grant tenure without promotion to an Assistant Professor; however, there may be individual faculty members who already hold the rank of tenured Assistant Professor, and these individuals should be reviewed according to the campus policy stated above.

Note: in some units, Associate Professors have been permitted to state that they do not wish to be reviewed for promotion, and such reviews have therefore not been conducted. All faculty should be aware that this practice violates the campus Procedures. Even if the faculty member does not submit an updated Factual Record for review, the Unit Committee still has an obligation to provide a report.

Policy on Review of Non-Tenure Track Faculty

Full-time NTT faculty below the rank of NTT Professor are eligible to be considered for promotion. According to the UM President’s Executive Guideline No. 35: “NTT appointees should compile a dossier of their activities, productivity, creativity and professional development to be reviewed on an annual basis. This material could also serve as the foundation for a dossier that could be used during the promotion process.”

The College of Arts and Sciences strongly advises all Departments to conduct an Annual Review of full-time NTT faculty, in the same manner as reviews are conducted of faculty in tenure-track or tenured positions. In some departments, the review is done only by the Unit Chair, but the College strongly advises all faculty of higher rank to conduct the review, as part of a Unit Committee. It is very important for the faculty who will later be called upon to vote on the NTT faculty member’s promotion to be familiar with the nature and progression of the individual’s record over time. It is also important for the review of NTT faculty to represent the opinion of a Unit Committee, and not solely the opinion of the Unit Chair.

Timetable

Annual Reviews of progress toward promotion should be conducted early in the spring semester each year. The deadline for submitting materials for the Annual Review should be several weeks before the date when the departmental recommendation for promotion is due.
to the Dean, usually in mid-March. It is important to allow sufficient time for the Unit Committee to review the materials carefully and meet for their deliberations, since the report must reflect the consensus opinion of the Unit Committee, and not solely the opinion of the committee chair, even if that person is charged with compiling the report. Please see the College’s *Recommended Calendar for Promotion Review* on the ATP Resources webpage.

Note: the Annual Review process is separate from the mandated annual faculty performance evaluation, the purpose of which is to assess the faculty member’s performance only during the preceding 12-month period. That process is typically conducted by the department chair, in some cases with the assistance of a designated faculty committee, but not with participation of all faculty of higher rank. That process is also conducted later in the semester, after faculty have submitted reports of their activities for the period of April 1 – March 31.

The comprehensive **Third-Year Review** described above is normally conducted in the spring of the third year of a tenure-track appointment, at the same time as other faculty Annual Reviews. For faculty who are hired with a shorter probationary period, the comprehensive review may take place earlier, *e.g.*, in the second year of a four-year probationary period. (For a probationary period of five years, the midpoint should be considered as the third year, in order to benefit the candidate.) If a probationary period is shorter than four years, the department chair should consult with the Dean to determine if a mid-point comprehensive review is required.

While the process of a Third-Year Review is similar to the Annual Review for promotion and tenure, it is broader in scope and has more significant consequences, i.e., potential non-renewal of contract. The faculty member should therefore be given notice in the preceding fall semester, so that he or she will have sufficient time to prepare a Factual Record and supporting materials to submit in the spring.

**Materials Reviewed**

**Tenure-Track and Tenured Faculty**

It is strongly advised that all **Annual Reviews** for promotion be based upon a Factual Record, following the University Tenure and Promotion Guidelines (Appendix 1). Since this is the mandatory format for the presentation of the candidate’s accomplishments in a dossier for tenure and/or promotion, it is logical and efficient for tenure-track faculty members to create this document in their first year of employment, adding to it over time. In this way, both the faculty member and the department unit committee are able to assess how the candidate’s record compares with the expectations of performance itemized in the Factual Record outline.

The Factual Record differs from an annual performance evaluation report in that it does not cover only the accomplishments of the preceding year, but instead should cover all relevant career accomplishments to date. This includes teaching, research, and significant professional service carried out before the individual was hired in the current position.
In addition to the Factual Record, the Third-Year Review may be based upon additional materials provided by the candidate or by departmental records. These may include, but are not limited to: copies of publications; evidence of acceptance of publications, exhibition of creative works, or papers to be presented at scholarly conferences; evaluations of external grant submissions; peer evaluations of departmental research presentations; student evaluations (to be provided by the department, not by the candidate); peer observations of teaching. Letters from external reviewers in regard to research or service are not normally included as part of this process.

Non-Tenure Track Faculty

According to the campus Guidelines to Promotion of Non-Tenure Track Faculty, faculty should prepare a Portfolio for promotion review. It is strongly advised that such a Portfolio be compiled in the first year of employment, and reviewed on an annual basis. The Portfolio has three components: 1) a detailed list of accomplishments, similar to a tenure-track Factual Record; 2) a curriculum vitae; and 3) documentation of the accomplishments in the form of abstracts of papers presented at conferences, syllabi reflecting teaching innovation, sample assignments, excerpts of handbooks prepared, etc.

Note: the campus Guidelines require the Portfolio to cover the most recent five years of accomplishment. The College recommends that the Portfolio include all accomplishments from the date of the candidate’s appointment at the current rank, plus particularly significant accomplishments that may predate that appointment.

Committee Report

The outcome of the Annual Review is “a written summary of the conclusions and recommendations reached by the committee.” It should be compiled by the Unit Committee Chair, based upon the discussions of the committee, and a draft should be circulated to all members of the committee for their approval, before the report is officially sent to the faculty member, to the Department Chair (if this person is not a member of the Unit Committee), and to the Dean.

The Annual Review report should be an objective assessment of the faculty member’s progress toward promotion and/or tenure, expressed concisely in 1-2 pages. It should acknowledge the faculty member’s specific accomplishments, using language that is descriptive and evaluative (e.g., “an article of substantial length in a top-tier journal”) but not subjective or vague (“a great contribution,” “your service is fine”). It should also avoid language that appears to predict the outcome of the future tenure decision, either positively or negatively. (An exception is a negative Third-Year Review Report, described above in the Procedures, section III.A.2.c.)

In regard to the format of the report, it should begin by identifying all members of the Unit Committee who participated in the discussion. It should then have a minimum of one
paragraph to address each category of accomplishment, i.e., teaching, research, and service. Positive accomplishments should be recognized, but the letter should also state where the record needs improvement. In the review meeting, the Committee should consult the categories listed in the outline for the Factual Record or the NTT Portfolio, as a reminder of which ones may need more attention. These outlines are provided in the campus Procedures for tenure-track faculty, Appendix II, and Guidelines for NTT faculty, Appendix II. If a noteworthy accomplishment does not fall clearly under a category listed in the outline, it should still be acknowledged, in the paragraph considered most appropriate by the Unit Committee.

In stating expectations for improvement, it is advisable to use language such as: “The case for promotion would be strengthened by … [additional refereed publications in national or international journals/contribution to service at the college or campus level/developing and teaching a new course/etc.]” This serves to inform the candidate of areas in which he or she should attempt to direct future efforts, without stating that such activity is an absolute requirement for a positive tenure or promotion recommendation, or implying that if that requirement is met, tenure or promotion will be guaranteed.

Not every candidate will have an outstanding record in every potential category of accomplishment, but no candidate should be encouraged to disregard certain categories as being unimportant. Similarly, the committee report should take seriously every category in which the faculty member has a performance expectation, and give it appropriate weight. For tenure-track faculty, this is normally 40% teaching, 40% research, 20% service; for non-tenure track faculty, it is normally 80% in the area of primary responsibility (teaching, research, or clinical), 20% service. Other distributions of expected effort may be negotiated individually at the time of the individual’s hire or subsequent appointments.

The Third-Year Review report should be more detailed than a routine Annual Review report, and must include the additional recommendation as described above in the Procedures concerning Tenure and Promotion, section III.A.2.a, b, or c.
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