

Promotion and Tenure Process Feedback
Bruce McMillin – May 5, 2008

Major Things:

- 1) The Promotion-only case procedures must be explicitly defined. An obvious way to do this is to parallel the existing tenure procedures.
- 2) The Appeals process should be explicitly defined in the S&T P&T Procedures
 - a. By CRR 320.035, each committee must notify the candidate of their recommendations.

To insure fair and timely review of all actions, committees, chairpersons, and deans shall communicate their recommendations to candidates under consideration and give each candidate a reasonable time to submit written rebuttal to the recommendation so that both recommendation and rebuttal may be forwarded to the next level of review.
 - b. We are not required to “re-hear” cases (by above). Should appeals be re-heard or just forwarded to the next level. Columbia re-hears cases at each level, by contrast. Unfortunately, the Campus review committee plays two roles in our process, so the “next level” is the same group of people going from Provost’s level to Campus level. The Provost also sees the same cases twice. Thus, a case is
 - i. Heard by the area subcommittee, then the review committee, then the provost.
 - ii. The provost communicates the rationale for the decision to the candidate.
 - iii. On appeal, the case is re-heard by the subcommittee, the review committee, and then the provost.By contrast, UM- Columbia allows a hearing to take place at the level of the negative recommendation. – **Bruce will call Columbia to see how this is done.**
 - c. We need to defined what Rebuttal, appeal, and reconsideration mean?
- 3) Specifically department chairs need to inform their faculty about their recommendations as required by S&T Procedures and 320.035. The department chair must also make the procedures and criteria available to the faculty. – **The VPAA will send a reminder of this to the department chairs.**
- 4) II.A.8 should be changed - all recommendations go forward

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. **Note the faculty may withdraw, as well.**

Medium Things

- 5) Provost's web page about Tenure is horsed up – the following documents should be listed under Promotion and Tenure (not faculty bylaws)

S&T P&T Procedures

CRR 320.035

CRR 310.020

Policy Memorandum II-10

Also, the candidate should be referred to their departmental procedures and standards.

- 6) Dossier Blank:
- a. Provost has a detailed list of issues.
 - b. Should there be a space for the departmental committee report and it be required?
 - c. Should really ask for shared credit on grants and expenditures.
 - d. Why were some service activities blank? Did they forget – was there nothing?
 - e. Separate the qualifications of the external reviewers from the letters.
 - f. Which external reviewers have been chosen by candidate, chair, committee.
- 1) In II.A.6 – should -> shall?
After reaching his/her conclusions, 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 **should** offer to discuss with the candidate involved any decision regarding promotion or tenure.
- 8) Chairs should solicit external reviews that address 320.035 – Should Tenure prepare a draft letter for this?

Minor things:

- 9) Policy Memorandum II-10 may have a typo in it.
- a. Have a national reputation in teaching **or** research as demonstrated by a documented record and external evaluation by professional peers – inconsistent with 320.035 which discusses scholarly activity.
- 1) Documentation for P&T dossiers is out of date (mentions deans, etc)
<http://provost.mst.edu/faculty/documentation.html>
- 11) A question came up about a departmental rep voting again on their candidate at the campus level. Tenure debated this issue in 2006-07 and chose to allow all committee members to vote on all candidates.
- 12) Don Myers asked “does the Provost use extra information in decision making that is not in the dossier – are there any limits on this information” – may really be a U-wide tenure issue

- 13) From Bob Schwartz – we need to clarify what we mean by “insufficient number of full professors” in a department. RP&A view is that the Provost follows the 320.035 guidelines and asks for justification from the departmental P&T committee as to “why they viewed they have insufficient number of full professors”
- 14) The VPAA should preschedule all meetings of the Campus P&T review committee, including appeals (if any).