

PROMOTION AND TENURE GUIDELINES

Department of Human Development and Family Studies
College of Human Environmental Studies
University of Missouri

Revised: March, 2008

The Department of Human Development and Family Studies, University of Missouri, establishes the following procedures and criteria for awarding promotion and tenure to department faculty members. These procedures and criteria are consistent with guidelines established by the College and the University.

I. Promotion and Tenure Committee Membership

A. The Promotion and Tenure Committee for the Department of Human Development and Family Studies will consist of all tenured faculty except the department chairperson. The committee chairperson will be elected annually by the tenured faculty.

1. All Promotion and Tenure Committee members can vote on tenure recommendations.
2. Only those Promotion and Tenure Committee members who hold a higher rank than the candidate for promotion may vote for promotion recommendations.
3. The department chairperson is permitted to attend Promotion and Tenure Committee meetings at the request of the committee.

II. Department Review Process

A. Application for promotion and/or tenure will be initiated at the departmental level by the faculty candidate.

1. During winter semester (approximately March/April), the Dean of the College will request names of those faculty members who will be applying for tenure and/or promotion during the following academic year. Faculty members planning on going up for tenure and/or promotion should respond to the Dean's notice, as well as inform the chairperson of the department Promotion and Tenure Committee of their intentions.
2. On or around May 1, faculty members applying for tenure and/or promotion should submit the following materials to the department Promotion and Tenure Committee¹:
 - (a) A current curriculum vita;

¹ Those faculty members who are not required to apply for promotion and/or tenure at the current time are strongly encouraged to request the department committee to do a preliminary review of their materials, prior to letters from external reviewers being solicited. Based on this preliminary screening, the committee will provide the candidate(s) with their opinion of whether the candidate appears ready for making this promotion/tenure request at this time, or whether they recommend that the candidate consider postponing this process until a later date when the case for promotion/tenure would be stronger.

- (b) Copies of refereed publications and selected other publications (e.g., book chapters, invited papers);
- (c) A statement of research interests, and review of one's research program and plans;
- (d) Names, phone numbers, and email addresses of at least 7 faculty employed at comparable universities who have the ability to evaluate the quality and scope of the applicant's scholarly work and performance. Brief background information and/or C.V.s of the nominated referees should also be provided to the committee chairperson. These external reviewers should be:
 - at least Associate Professors, but preferably at the Professor rank
 - recognized experts in the candidate's area of study
 - persons who would not be viewed as biased (ie. the list should NOT include past mentors, collaborators, classmates, former students, or personal friends).

[When the faculty candidate has an Extension appointment, it is important to select some external reviewers who will be able to knowledgeably assess the merit of the candidate's extension work.]

3. The Promotion and Tenure Committee also will nominate up to 7 outside reviewers, using the criteria listed in II.A.2d above. From the combined lists of nominated outside reviewers, the Promotion and Tenure Committee will select at least 6 external reviewers, at least 3 of whom were identified solely by the department. These persons will be contacted prior to the end of the academic year by the department chairperson. Those who agree to review the candidate's credentials will be sent a packet containing:
 - the materials listed in II.A.2a-c
 - a cover letter explaining the University's review process
 - a copy of the department's current Promotion and Tenure Guidelines.
- B. The promotion and tenure dossier shall be prepared by the faculty candidate, in consultation with the department chairperson, and submitted to the department's Promotion and Tenure Committee on or about the starting date of Fall semester. The dossier shall be prepared in accordance with guidelines supplied by the Provost (usually by mid-semester of the preceding Winter semester). The dossier typically contains: a curriculum vita; a narrative record of residential and non-residential teaching, research, and service responsibilities; tabulated material summarizing teaching evaluations and publication information, as described in the Provost's guidelines; and letters from outside reviewers (which are added to the dossier by the department chairperson **after** the dossier has been submitted by the applicant).
- C. The dossier and supporting materials will be kept secure in the office of the committee chairperson and will be made available electronically (accessed through a secure password) for review by the committee and the department chairperson. Materials will be available at least one week in advance of the HDFS Promotion and Tenure Committee's meeting to discuss and vote on the candidate. To facilitate its review of the candidate, the department's committee can request additional

information from the department chairperson (e.g., annual review letters), and, where appropriate, any associate deans in the college. Prior to voting, the department's representative to the College Promotion and Tenure Committee must indicate whether s/he will cast her/his one vote in the Department or the College, and inform the committee of that decision. Upon completion of the vote by secret written ballot, the chairperson of the Promotion and Tenure Committee will write a recommendation letter to the department chairperson summarizing the outcome of the vote. The recommendation letter will highlight the committee's review, including both positive and negative features of the discussion. In cases of dissenting votes to the majority opinion, it is necessary to comment on and explain the reasons for those votes. The recommendation letter (which includes the actual vote count) shall be forwarded to the department chairperson on or about September 15 (the exact date may vary depending on the deadlines set for the University and College Promotion and Tenure Committees).

1. The faculty member seeking promotion and/or tenure will be forwarded a copy of the departmental committee's recommendation letter when it is sent to the department chairperson.
2. If the Promotion and Tenure Committee's letter and recommendation are not positive, the faculty candidate shall have a right to an appeal at the departmental level, in accordance with the University's guidelines.
3. The department chairperson shall forward the departmental committee's recommendation letter, along with her/his own letter of recommendation to the College Promotion and Tenure Committee. The department chairperson's recommendation letter shall include her/his recommendation regarding promotion and/or tenure of the candidate, along with comments supporting that decision.

III. Criteria for Evaluation

Faculty members are to be evaluated according to their assigned responsibilities. General responsibilities and goals for each faculty member will be determined by joint agreement between the faculty member and the department chairperson (and, for Extension faculty, the Associate Dean for Outreach and Extension). Faculty seeking promotion and/or tenure must demonstrate expertise in research/scholarship, teaching, and service.

- A. Research/Scholarship. All faculty are expected to be actively engaged in research/scholarly activities. A faculty member's research/scholarship should represent a clearly defined program of study. In some cases, a faculty member may be engaged in more than one program of scholarship. Documentation of scholarly/research activity should include a listing of:
 - scholarly outreach and extension publications,

- refereed publications, with acceptance rates and journal impact ratings for each journal where work is published (and samples of the published work),
- grant proposals, both funded and unfunded,
- refereed presentations at professional meetings,
- book chapters,
- books, along with published reviews of the book(s) if available,
- research awards received,
- membership on scientific review panels²,
- editorial activities²,
- invited presentations².

B. Teaching. Teaching is defined broadly as resident or non-resident instruction, research advising of undergraduate and graduate students, academic advising, and supervision of students in practica and field training experiences. Documentation required for each category includes:

1. (a) Resident Teaching

Effectiveness as a classroom teacher. More than one form of documentation must be included. Possible documentation includes:

- course evaluations by students or other participants,
- receipt of teaching awards,
- peer evaluations by other faculty members,
- evidence of field practica and training involvement.

(b) Non-resident Teaching

Ability to design, implement, and evaluate effective research-based educational programs; support educational program efforts of UO/E Regional Faculty and other qualified educators through consultation, in-service training, and resource development. Comparable to resident-teaching, effective evaluation of non-resident teaching includes multiple sources of documentation, such as:

- Evaluation of Educational Programs, In-service Education Seminars, and Invited Workshops and Presentations (including but not limited to: number of students, student numerical ratings and subjective comments, and peer reviews of program materials and direct teaching).
- Extension Publication Usage (including but not limited to: data reflecting print usage and internet access of Extension fact sheets, program curricula, and other research-based written materials, such as articles or newsletters, adoption of your program materials by other state Extension systems).
- Annual Performance Reviews (including UO/E regional faculty numerical ratings and subjective remarks).

² These activities are more important for those being evaluated for Professor rank

- Other Sources (including but not limited to peer-reviewed, published program evaluations, campus awards)

2. Advisement of Undergraduate and Graduate Research.

Direction of meaningful research and field experience projects. Possible documentation includes:

- number of departmental and non-departmental student committees,
- supervision of undergraduate research (e.g., McNair Scholars, departmental research fellows),
- number of masters and doctoral advisees,
- number of completed theses and dissertations,
- awards received by student advisees for their research,
- presentations and publications by student advisees.

3. Contributions to resident or non-resident curriculum

Involvement in the design, review, and/or modification of program curriculum. Possible documentation includes:

- course syllabi or program outlines,
- evidence of curricular development and/or revisions,
- development of practica and/or internships.

4. Academic advising of undergraduate/graduate students.

Possible documentation includes:

- number of academic advisees,
- advising/mentoring awards,
- awards received by student advisees for academic or professional accomplishments.

C. Service. Faculty can provide service to the university, the public, and to the profession. University service can be given at any level (e.g., department, college, university). The public can be local community, the citizens of the state and the nation, and citizens of other nations. Faculty also may provide service to their academic disciplines as well as to the profession of teaching. Service is one of the three missions of the University, and as such it is an important activity, but one that is secondary to teaching and research/scholarly activities. Evidence of service and a description of the faculty member's role in service activities should be summarized and dated. Evidence should include names, dates, location of presentations, and committee names. Examples of service activities:

1. Institutional service includes:

- departmental, college, campus, and university system-wide committee assignments,
- guest lecturing,
- advising student organizations,
- formal mentoring of colleagues.

2. Professional services includes:

- membership/participation/leadership in professional organizations and their functions (meetings, symposia, seminars, committees) at the local, state, regional, national, or international levels).

3. Public service (contributing professional expertise to community endeavors) includes:

- membership/participation/leadership in programs, meetings, committees at the local, state, regional, national, or international levels,
- assistance and consultation to organizations and individuals.

IV. Criteria for Promotion to Associate Professor and Professor Academic Ranks

A. Associate Professor

1. Demonstrates exemplary resident or non-resident teaching.
2. Has developed a clearly defined research program.
3. Contributes to the knowledge base of the field primarily through refereed scholarly publications and presentations.
4. Has demonstrated effort at securing external funding (private or public).
5. Is recognized by peers at other institutions for contributions to the field.
6. Contributes to the department/college/university and to professional and public service.

B. Professor

1. Fulfills the requirements for the Associate Professor rank.
2. Has made sustained scholarly contributions to the field, with publications in refereed, high-quality journals.
3. Has demonstrated success at securing external funding (private or public).
4. Is recognized nationally as an important and meaningful contributor to the profession.

VI. Teaching Portfolios & Evaluation of Teaching

All faculty who teach courses and/or who participate in Extension programming will maintain a teaching portfolio. For resident faculty, the teaching portfolio will include (for

each course taught) students' rating, peer reviews (see below), self-assessment of teaching, teaching goals, syllabi, exams, assignments, selected handouts, samples of graded papers, samples of graded exams, and other items deemed pertinent by the faculty member (e.g., solicited or unsolicited comments from students, nominations for teaching awards, letters of support or appreciation for teaching activities). For Extension faculty, the portfolio will contain participants' evaluations, peer reviews (if possible), instructional goals, self-assessment, and any other items deemed pertinent by the faculty member. **[Extension faculty should refer to III. B. 1. (b) for more specific documentation suggestions.]**

Each year the chairperson will review each faculty member's teaching portfolio as a part of the annual evaluation, with input from others who have pertinent information (e.g., the CDL Director will provide input into the evaluations of the Laboratory Instructors, Associate Dean for Outreach and Extension will provide information on Extension faculty).

Every three years, each faculty member's teaching portfolio will be evaluated by a department peer. As a part of the portfolio review, at least one course (or Extension program) will be observed by the peer evaluator. The specific course (or program) selected for evaluation and the peer evaluator will be chosen jointly by the faculty member and the department chairperson. At minimum, the peer evaluation will consist of:

- The Faculty member and peer evaluator will meet before any classes (or program) are observed. The purpose of this meeting will be for the faculty member to provide the evaluator with any pertinent information about the course, students, and class periods (or program) that will be observed, as well as about information contained in the portfolio.
- After meeting with the faculty member and reviewing the materials in the teaching portfolio, the peer evaluator will observe at least two class periods (or session of a program) so that flow from class to class (or session to session) can be evaluated. For University classes, it is recommended that evaluators observe one week of class sessions for courses that meet more than once a week and two class sessions for courses that meet once each week.
- The peer evaluator and the faculty member will meet after the classes (or sessions) have been observed. The purpose of this meeting will be for the faculty member to provide additional information about the observed classes (or programs) that may be relevant (e.g., impressions of student of participant behavior, reasons for teaching choices).
- The peer evaluator will write a narrative evaluation of the faculty member's teaching and course materials. Copies of the letter will be provided to the faculty member and will also be included in the faculty member's portfolio.
- The letter(s) will be included in the dossiers submitted for pre-tenure review and applications for promotion and/or tenure.

VII. Pre-Tenure Reviews

As a way of providing early and continued feedback and guidance to untenured, tenure-track faculty, the department's Promotion and Tenure Committee requires two pre-tenure reviews—one that evaluates the first three semesters on appointment, and the second that evaluates the first seven semesters on appointment. (These are the departments' equivalent of the University's required third-year review.) A mini-portfolio, which corresponds to the actual portfolio that will be prepared for promotion and tenure, will be prepared by the faculty member. Guidance for preparing these documents will be provided in writing by the department Promotion and Tenure Committee chairperson the semester before the portfolio is due. Note: for these reviews, external letters of support are not solicited.

The review materials are submitted to the department's Promotion and Tenure Committee chairperson. Mini portfolios for both the three-semester review and the seven-semester review are due the third Monday in February.

Following review and discussion by the Promotion and Tenure Committee, the committee chair will draft a letter from the committee to the faculty member. This letter will provide feedback on the faculty member's progress to date, noting both strengths and weaknesses in research, teaching, and service. In addition, it will provide specific recommendations to facilitate the faculty member's progress toward promotion to Associate Professor with tenure. A copy of the letter from both the three-semester and seven-semester evaluations will be included in the faculty members application for promotion to Associate professor with tenure. Additionally, copies of these letters are submitted to the department chair. After receipt of the letters, the faculty member will have the opportunity to discuss their contents with the committee chair, the entire committee, and/or the department chair.

Additional suggestions and guidance for un-tenured tenured-track faculty is also provided in a document (Model of Career Trajectory for New Assistant Professors) attached to these guidelines in Appendix A.

VIII. Post-tenure Review Procedures (see standards listed below in IX.)

IX. Minimal Standards for Overall Satisfactory Faculty Performance

Faculty in the Department of Human Development and Family Studies adopted the following minimum standards for overall satisfactory performance. These general standards coordinate with criteria used for annual reviews and raises.

- Faculty productivity is expected in all three areas: research/scholarship, teaching/extension/outreach, and service.
- In each area, performance should demonstrate quantity, quality, and relevance.

- The faculty member's record should demonstrate a specific and identifiable area(s) of expertise (i.e., special competence) in an area related to human development and family studies. The development of this area of expertise implies movement toward and the achievement of (inter)national stature.
- Faculty performance that demonstrates integration and relatedness of research, teaching/extension/outreach, and service is particularly valued.