

Tenure Committee Report AY 07-08

Tenure responded to the following referrals

1) Monitor Progress of P&T Process – resulted in Revision of UMR (now Missouri S&T Promotion and Tenure Procedures)

After the schools and colleges were eliminated last year, a new process had to be developed for tenure and promotion. This was the first year to use the new tenure process, and there were some issues with the appeals process, especially in appeals regarding promotions.

A revised procedure was prepared addressing the following items:

- Changed the Missouri S&T procedures Promotion and Tenure procedures to uniformly refer to Promotion and/or Tenure
- A new appeals process was designed such that the all recommendations go forward and candidates are notified by of the recommendations at each step of the process.
- The candidate will have the opportunity to add additional information and rebuttal and will be notified of each recommendation and each decision. The candidate will be able to meet with the department chair and provost to discuss their recommendations.

A motion to approve the revised Promotion and/or Tenure Procedures was passed unanimously at the June 19th Faculty Senate Meeting

2) Referral of “Best practices for creation of P&T committees”

- Some concern has been raised that the chair alone can create the procedures for creating departmental P&T committees
- All 20 departments’ rules and regulations have been circulated.
 - 16 Departments have clear instructions on the committee formation that do not include “discretion of the chair”
 - 2 Departments (Geological Sci and Eng) and Chem have a “personnel committee” or other non-specific membership
 - 2 Departments (ALP and Economics) have no description of membership of the P&T committee.
- The committee declined to make any specific rule regarding the composition of the committees but reinforced that departments should clarify the membership of their committees in their procedures.

- The committee also indicated that the Provost's web site should have all departmental procedures linked and that the dossier blank should be populated with these procedures.

3) Yearly report on membership in area subcommittees

- One request was made to correctly title English as English and Technical Communications.
- Geological Sciences and Engineering requested to split their departmental representation into engineering and science (see below).

Concerns Expressed

Department vs. Program Representation: A question has been raised several times over the last two years regarding representation by a program or by a department. Most recently, the Geological Sciences and Engineering (GSE) department is included as part of the Engineering Area committee for tenure and promotion. The department proposes that it would have representatives on both the Science and Engineering Area committees for tenure and promotion. The current tenure process requires that departments be represented on only one Area Committee, so the proposal is in violation of the tenure process. The GSE department is asking for an amendment or exception to the T&P process. The tenure committee considered this issue informally during the 07-08 year and rejected the idea as unworkable within the current scheme; concern was expressed that if representation is by program rather than by department, then the committees will become too large.

At the June 19, 2008 meeting, the Faculty Senate expressed a motion to direct the Faculty Senate Tenure Committee to consider the request for Geology and Geo Physics to be included in the Science area for Tenure and Promotion was passed unanimously. This will be re-considered by the 08-09 Tenure Committee.

Multiple Voting: Concern regarding the ability of a representative to vote multiple times on a particular candidate was expressed. For example, a representative may vote at the departmental level, the area subcommittee level, and the campus level. The Tenure committee has considered this comment during both the 06-07 and 07-08 years. Have a diverse set of voting representatives would be workable for larger departments and area subcommittees, but not feasible for smaller area subcommittees; there are simply not enough members and at some level the department would be left without representation.

The Tenure committee saw no way to address this issue and maintain a consistent approach across the campus.



Missouri University of Science and Technology
Promotion and/or Tenure Procedures

Deleted: UMR

Deleted:

I. General

- A. Guidelines for all policies and procedures affecting recommendations for promotion and/or tenure shall fall within the principles, policies, and procedures set forth in the University of Missouri Collected Rules and Regulations Sections 320.035 Policy and Procedures for Promotion and Tenure and 310.020 Regulations Governing Application of Tenure, policy Memorandum Number II-10 (dated Oct. 1, 1990), or its equivalent
- B. Any additional University and/or campus-wide guidelines not covered in I.A. shall be made available to the faculty at the beginning of each academic year.

II. Procedure

A. Department Level

- 1. Recommendations for promotion and/or tenure for persons holding rank in an academic department shall be initiated in that department.
- 2. Each department chairperson shall prepare a departmental review procedure which shall provide for faculty participation consistent with the University of Missouri Collected Rules and Regulations 320.035 Policy and Procedures for Promotion and Tenure. In the promotion and/or tenure review process, the department chairperson shall attach to each dossier a copy of the departmental faculty procedures with specific references to faculty participation. The department may establish special criteria for recommending promotion and/or tenure, providing that such special criteria conform to the general guidelines listed in Section I. The department chairperson shall make the procedures and criteria available to the faculty.
- 3. All evidence relevant to a recommendation for promotion and/or tenure shall be directed to the department chairperson.

Deleted: .

Deleted:

Deleted: T

4. The files on candidates as assembled by the department chairperson shall at all times be available to the candidate (with the exception of confidential matter) and to the appropriate review committees at the campus level. A reasonable period of time in advance of his/her action on the recommendations, the department chairperson shall advise all candidates so that the candidate may ensure the currency of information made available to the department chairperson. The promotion and/or tenure files as assembled in the department shall normally be considered complete (and closed) at the time of the chairperson's action. If, during the course of review of a promotion and/or tenure decision beyond the departmental level (during an appeal procedure, for example), any major documentation is added to the dossier, the dossier shall be returned to the department for review and recommendation.
5. The department chairperson shall then review all data submitted or received in regard to the proposed recommendation, including the recommendations of participating faculty. The department chairperson shall communicate, in writing, the recommendations of participating faculty to the candidate. In the event of a negative recommendation, the candidate shall have the option of preparing a rebuttal as described in Section III.A of this document.
6. After reaching his/her recommendations, whether favorable or unfavorable, the department chairperson shall advise in writing each candidate of the action taken with respect to their candidacy. Further the department chairperson shall offer to discuss with the candidate involved any decision regarding promotion and/or tenure. In the event of a negative recommendation, the candidate shall have the option of preparing a rebuttal as described in Section III.B of this document.
- ~~7.~~ All ~~favorable~~ recommendations by the department chairperson along with all documentation and attachments shall be forwarded to the Provost. Each dossier shall follow the general outline available from the office of the Provost. Appendices of supporting material may be submitted, but should be assembled in a separate package.

Deleted: conclusions

Deleted: should

Deleted: ¶
7. Appeals of decisions follow procedures outlined in University of Missouri Collected Rules and Regulations 310.020 Regulations Governing Application of Tenure.

Deleted: 8

Formatted: Font color: Sea Green, Double strikethrough

B. Campus Level

1. There shall be a campus review committee consisting of one faculty member from each academic department. Elected faculty members shall be elected by a vote of their department and serve for a two-year period.

Membership of the campus review committee shall consist of full-time tenured full professors. Any administrator with promotion and/or tenure decision-making authority over faculty members including, but not limited to, department chairs, provosts (as well as vice provosts), and the chancellor, shall not serve on the campus review committee.

Departments with an insufficient number of eligible full professors may substitute tenured associate professors who shall recuse themselves from voting on tenure for full professors and promotion to full professor. Departments with an insufficient number of tenured professors must find a tenured faculty member to represent the candidate as suggested by the University of Missouri Collected Rules and Regulations 320.035 Policy and Procedures for Promotion and Tenure.

The campus review committee is further organized into area subcommittees whose membership is defined in Section II.B.8 of this document.

The Provost's office will provide administrative support to the campus review committee.

2. At the start of the preceding spring semester, the Provost shall establish deadlines for the departmental recommendations, area subcommittee and campus review committee meetings, and responses to Conformance to General Guidelines as defined in II.B.4.a of this document.
3. The campus review committee shall elect its own chair and shall establish procedures for reviewing recommendations brought to it by the Provost. ~~The normal channel for these recommendations is from the individual department chairs.~~
 - a. Area subcommittees shall review the relevant dossiers and provide a report including a vote to the full campus review committee for review of recommendations.
 - b. The full campus review committee shall vote on each dossier.
4. The campus review committee shall first ascertain that all procedures and criteria used within the respective department conform to the General Guidelines listed in Section I.
 - a. If the procedures and criteria used within the respective department do not conform to the General Guidelines, the campus review committee shall inform the department chair in writing and state what specific action the department must take and shall return all

Formatted: Font color: Sea Green,
Double strikethrough

recommendations from the department without prejudice to any individual's recommendation or appeal. The campus review committee shall then allow a reasonable period of time for compliance with or appeal to its decision.

- b. When the procedures and criteria used within the respective department conform to the General Guidelines, the campus review committee shall review each recommendation and/or appeal request.

5. ~~The campus review committee shall submit its promotion and/or~~ tenure recommendations to the Provost. The Provost shall communicate, in writing, the recommendations of the area subcommittee and of the campus review committee to the candidate. In the event of a negative recommendation from either the area subcommittee or the campus review committee, the candidate shall have the option of preparing a rebuttal as described in Section III.A of this document.

Formatted: Indent: Left: 90 pt,
Hanging: 28.8 pt

Deleted: .

6. The Provost's review shall be consistent with the requirements of the University of Missouri Collected Rules and Regulations 320.035 Policy and Procedures for Promotion and Tenure. The Provost shall advise in writing each candidate of the action taken with respect to their candidacy. Further the Provost shall offer to discuss with the candidate involved any decision regarding promotion and/or tenure. In the event of a negative recommendation, the candidate shall have the option of preparing a rebuttal as described in Section III.B of this document. The Provost provides a written recommendation back to the campus committee who, in turn, has the discretion to submit a supplemental report to the chancellor. The Provost shall transmit to the Chancellor his/her promotion and/or tenure recommendations along with appropriate forms and supporting information.

7. Recommendations from the campus review committee and decisions from the Chancellor follow the procedures described in the University of Missouri Collected Rules and Regulations Sections 320.035 Policy and Procedures for Promotion and Tenure and 310.020 Regulations Governing Application of Tenure

8. Procedures for the Establishment and Maintenance of Areas

- a. Area Subcommittees shall be proposed/reviewed by the Tenure Committee and submitted to the Faculty Senate (FS)

Deleted: Academic Council

Deleted: AC

- b. The FS, makes a recommendation to the Provost based on the proposal.
- c. The Provost refers the recommendation to the Committee of Department Chairs for review.
- d. The Committee of Department Chairs (CDC), by their own procedures, finalizes area membership and reports to the Provost for inclusion in the P&T Procedures.
- e. On a yearly basis, the Tenure committee reviews the area membership and files a report with FS. On a five year cycle, the Tenure committee proposes area changes (if any) – Refer to Step 8.a
 - i. During academic years, 2007-2008 and 2008-2009, area committee membership may change each year.
 - ii. New departments/programs or merger of departments/programs shall warrant immediate area committee reconsideration.
- f. Proposed Initial Area Committees
The indicated departments shall comprise the following area committees:
 - **Social Sciences:** Business, Psychology, Economics & Finance
 - **Sciences:** Biology, Computer Science, Chemistry, Mathematics and Statistics, Physics
 - **Engineering:** Chemical and Biological, Civil, Architectural and Environmental, Geological Sciences and Engineering, Materials Science and Engineering, Mining and Nuclear and Engineering, Mechanical and Aerospace, Electrical and Computer, Interdisciplinary, Engineering Management/Systems Engineering
 - **Arts and Humanities:** Arts Languages and Philosophy, English, History & Political Science

Deleted: AC

Deleted: AC

III. Appeal Policy and Procedure

Appeals of promotion and/or tenure decisions follow procedures outlined in University of Missouri Collected Rules and Regulations 310.020 Regulations Governing Application of Tenure. Appeals of recommendations from subcommittees, committees, department chairs and the Provost follow the following procedure:

Formatted: Font: (Default) Times New Roman, 12 pt, Bold

Formatted: Font: (Default) Times New Roman, 12 pt, Bold

A. Subcommittee and Committee recommendations

A candidate who receives a negative recommendation from any committee in the procedures of Section II of this document will be informed by letter through the appropriate administrator giving the vote and the reasons for the recommendation

Formatted: Indent: Left: 36 pt

(redacted of any identifying or confidential information). The candidate will have a reasonable period of time (as indicated in the Provost's schedule as set by Section II.B.2) to write a rebuttal to this letter and include any additional documentation for the next step in the review process.

B. Department Chair and Provost recommendations

A candidate who receives a negative recommendation from any administrative officer in the procedures of Section II of this document, will be informed by letter from the appropriate administrator giving the recommendation. The candidate may request a hearing before said administrative officer making the recommendation (at a time indicated in the Provost's schedule as set by Section II.B.2). The candidate will have a reasonable period of time to write a rebuttal to this letter and include any additional documentation for the next step in the review process.

← - - - - Formatted: Indent: Left: 36 pt

Regardless of the recommendation at that step, the dossier and rebuttal will move forward to the next step unless the faculty member wishes to withdraw from the process.