

Chancellor's Memorandum #35

May 1977 (revised May 19, 1997, July 7, 2000, Dec 21, 2007, March 3, 2016)

*CURRENT DOCUMENT CONTAINS REVISIONS MADE BY THE CPTC THROUGH NOVEMBER 2022

Document initially introduced in the Faculty Senate meeting on 11/15/2022

Document resent to FSEC/Faculty Senate on 12/05/2022 for after incorporating comments provided by Faculty Senate members

Policies and Procedures for Promotion and Tenure University of Missouri - Kansas City

Introduction

The official policies and procedures for the Promotion and Tenure (P&T) processes for the University of Missouri system (UM System) are provided in the Collected Rules and Regulations chapters [320.035](#) (“Policies and Procedures for Promotion and Tenure”) and [320.020](#) (“Regulations Governing Application of Tenure”). Chancellor’s Memorandum #35 (CM35) outlines additional guidance for the P&T review process that is specific to UMKC. In any case in which CM35 conflicts with CRR320.020 or CRR320.035 or any other UM System policy, the UM System policies will take precedent.

Overview

This document is organized around the sequential order of events that occur during the tenure and promotion process each year. For the purposes of this document, “unit” refers to a UMKC School or the UMKC Conservatory. The list below summarizes the high-level steps that comprise the annual P&T process. The activities required in each step are explained in detail following the Overview.

1. The Dean submits to the Faculty Affairs Specialist the names of the unit’s Academic P&T Coordinator and Administrative P&T Coordinator for the upcoming year.
2. The Dean submits to the Faculty Affairs Specialist a confirmed list of the unit’s faculty scheduled for mandatory tenure review in the upcoming cycle along with the names of assistant professors intending to apply for early P&T review, and associate professors intending to apply for promotion in the upcoming cycle.
3. The unit Academic P&T coordinator facilitates the process of obtaining a list of potential external evaluators for each candidate and obtaining approval of the list from the Vice Provost for Faculty Affairs.
4. The candidate prepares a P&T application packet (dossier) following instructions communicated by the office of Faculty Affairs.
5. The unit Academic P&T coordinator obtains the required number of External Evaluator letters for each candidate.
6. Unit and campus-level reviews of the candidate are carried out following the policies and procedures outlined in [320.035](#).
7. The candidate receives notification of the P&T decision from the Chancellor.

1. Appointment of Unit P&T Coordinators

By January 1 each year, the unit Dean shall submit to the Faculty Affairs Specialist the names of one Academic P&T Coordinator and one Administrative P&T Coordinator who will facilitate the P&T process for the unit for the upcoming year. The Academic P&T Coordinator should be a tenured Associate or Vice Dean in the unit, typically a faculty member who holds tenure at the rank of Professor in the unit. If the Associate or Vice Dean is not tenured, then a faculty member who holds tenure at the rank of Professor should be the Academic P&T Coordinator. The Academic P&T Coordinator must not participate in any level of review for P&T cases within the unit while serving in the coordinator role. The administrative P&T coordinator will be a member of the Dean's staff who will assist the Academic P&T Coordinator in the management of the P&T procedural steps relating to file management within the myVITA and the Review Promotion and Tenure (RPT) system. Requests for exceptions to the requirements for these roles will be evaluated by the Vice Provost for Faculty Affairs on a case-by-case basis.

Unit Academic and Administrative P&T Coordinators serve three overarching functions: (1) to work closely with the Vice Provost for Faculty Affairs and the Faculty Affairs Specialist on all aspects of the P&T process; (2) to serve as liaisons between the unit faculty and Faculty Affairs to communicate University and campus-level P&T policies and procedures; and (3) to oversee the unit P&T process in compliance with unit, campus, and University policy.

The Academic P&T Coordinator will be responsible for coordinating the external evaluation process (details below) and overseeing of the unit-level review process, ensuring compliance with CRR320.035, CM35, and unit policies.

2. Confirmation of Tenure and/or Promotion Candidates for Upcoming Year

By September 1 each year the Faculty Affairs Specialist will instruct the unit Deans to (a) notify candidates whose mandatory tenure review will be initiated in the upcoming spring of their mandatory status and timeline for application, (b) obtain email confirmation from each mandatory tenure candidate of their acknowledgement of the mandatory review status, (c) request faculty planning to apply for non-mandatory promotion and/or tenure in the upcoming spring to notify the dean of their intention, and (d) submit to the Faculty Affairs Specialist by October 1, confirmation of mandatory tenure review candidates and names of unit faculty intending to apply for early tenure and/or promotion.

3. Obtaining List of Proposed External Evaluators

UMKC requires that external evaluators meet specific eligibility requirements. Requests for exceptions to these requirements are evaluated on a case-by-case basis. Each proposed evaluator must:

- hold tenure
- hold the rank at least one step higher than the rank held by the candidate (for assistant professors seeking promotion to associate professor, external evaluators must hold the rank of associate professor or professor; for associate professors seeking tenure and/or promotion, external evaluators must hold the rank of professor)

- be employed at a research peer (“High Research”) or higher than peer (“Very High Research”) institution based on the [Carnegie classification system](#)
- for proposed external evaluators from non-US institutions, documentation must be provided to verify that the proposed evaluator holds the equivalent of tenure, the equivalent of the required academic rank, and is employed at a doctoral-granting institution with a research profile at peer or higher level compared to UMKC
- for proposed external evaluators from non-academic institutions, documentation of their qualifications and a justification for their inclusion must be provided

The Academic P&T Coordinator is responsible for obtaining an approved External Evaluator list for each candidate following the steps below:

- The candidate enters the names of ten potential external evaluators onto the External Evaluator Form, completes the required information about each proposed name including disclosure of any past or current relationships, collaborations, or interactions that could create potential for a Conflict of Interest.
- The candidate submits the list of ten proposed names to the Academic P&T coordinator.
- The Academic P&T Coordinator reviews and addresses any concerns with eligibility of the names proposed and/or concerns with the COI disclosure.
- The Academic P&T Coordinator sends the list of candidate-provided names to the candidate’s department/division chair and the chair of the unit P&T committee who will work together to provide the names of an additional ten proposed evaluators. **In units with no department or division chair, the chair of the unit P&T committee will provide the additional ten proposed evaluators.**
- The Academic P&T Coordinator reviews the second ten names submitted and addresses any concerns with eligibility of the names proposed.
- The Academic P&T Coordinator reviews the final list of 20 names and addresses any concerns raised by the candidate and/or concerns with the COI disclosures for the second 10 names.
- The Academic P&T Coordinator forwards the list of 20 names to the Vice Provost for Faculty Affairs who reviews eligibility and COI disclosures and requests replacement names for any disapproved proposed evaluators in an iterative process until a final list of 20 approved names is obtained.
- The Academic P&T Coordinator notifies the candidate that their list of proposed evaluators has been approved, provides the official COI Assurance Form with the 20 names included, instructs the candidate to return a signed and dated copy of the form, and adds the form to the candidate’s P&T packet.
- **Requests for exceptions to the requirements above may be submitted to the Vice Provost for Faculty Affairs and will be evaluated on a case by case basis.**

4. Creating the P&T Application Packet

Instructions are provided to P&T candidates by the office of Faculty Affairs as to the format and content of the P&T application packet. The candidate’s packet must be finalized by May 1 of the application year.

5. Obtaining External Evaluator Letters

Once the final set of 20 proposed evaluator names has been provided, the Academic P&T Coordinator initiates the process of soliciting commitments for letters of review from the approved set of proposed evaluators with the following goals:

- Obtaining a minimum of four to six external letters
- Obtaining a balance in the number of letters secured from the candidate's list and the unit's list of names
- Obtaining letters from both peer "High Research" or higher than peer "Very High Research" institutions

As potential evaluators are being contacted and either accepting or declining the solicitation, the Academic P&T Coordinator enters the information into the External Evaluator Spreadsheet.

All letters received should be included in the portfolio

Once commitments have been secured for a sufficient number of letters, the Academic P&T Coordinator sends the candidate's packet and appropriate instructions to each external evaluator who has agreed to provide a review. The Academic P&T Coordinator handles all communication with the External Evaluators, answering any questions that arise, sending reminders of the timeline as needed, and securing the completed letters signed and provided on the evaluator's home institution's letterhead.

Prior to the first level of review, the Administrative P&T Coordinator adds the completed External Evaluator spreadsheet for each candidate into the candidate's RPT file, making it available to P&T reviewers at all levels.

6. P&T Review Process

CRR320.035, Section A.2 provides instructions for seven levels of P&T review:

- (1) Department/Division P&T Committee
- (2) Department/Division Chair
- (3) School P&T Committee
- (4) Dean
- (5) Campus P&T Committee
- (6) Provost
- (7) Chancellor

At UMKC, all academic units conduct P&T reviews at levels 3 through 7, but, due to their organizational structure or limited number of faculty, some units conduct only levels 2 and 3, or only level 3, prior to the Dean's review. Any unit variation from the full seven levels of review requires approval of the Provost.

Instructions by Level

Instructions for each level of P&T review are provided in CRR320.035 and restated below. Additional guidance specific to UMKC is indicated in italicized text.

- a. Review by department/division promotion and tenure committee
 - (1) The department/division promotion and tenure committee shall provide an independent written evaluation and recommendation on the candidate.
 - i. The critical question to be addressed during review is the following: Is the candidate qualified to be promoted or to be placed on continuous appointment, according to the criteria outlined in section B Policies.
 - ii. The department/division promotion and tenure committee shall review the candidate's dossier. The committee also may solicit additional information pertinent to answering the critical question stated in i above.
 - iii. The department/division promotion and tenure committee shall solicit input on the candidate from all of the members of the department at or above the promotion rank being sought.*
 - iv. The department/division promotion and tenure committee shall ensure adherence to the university-wide standards described in CRR320.035 section B Policies.
 - (2) The department/division promotion and tenure committee shall then provide its written recommendation on whether or not the candidate should be promoted, placed on continuous appointment or both. The department/division promotion and tenure committee shall provide a copy of that written recommendation to the candidate. The candidate may submit a written response within 14 calendar days. If the recommendation is against promotion, continuous appointment, or both, the response may also request reconsideration. In the event of a request for reconsideration, the department/division promotion and tenure committee will consider the response of the candidate, issue a written recommendation that addresses the request, and provide a copy to the candidate. The initial written recommendation, any response submitted by the candidate, and any additional written recommendation addressing a request for reconsideration will be forwarded to the next level of review.

**At UMKC, this process will be further defined as follows:*

- *The unit Administrative P&T Coordinator will manage the solicitation and collection of input on behalf of the department/division P&T committee.*
- *To ensure that no individual has input or influence at more than one level of review in the P&T process, this opportunity to provide input on a P&T candidate will be limited to those faculty who will not be participating at any other level of review for the candidate.*

- *When soliciting faculty input, the Administrative P&T Coordinator will send the candidate's P&T CV generated by the myVITA system to all faculty eligible to provide input.*
 - *The solicitation will stipulate that "input on the candidate" is restricted to information pertaining to the candidate's accomplishments relative to the CRR standards and the discipline, division, or school criteria, depending on the unit.*
 - *Faculty members who submit input will not be anonymous to members of the department/division P&T committee.*
 - *The department/division P&T committee will review input received for appropriateness, defined as pertaining to the candidate's accomplishments relative to the CRR standards and the discipline, division, or school criteria, depending on the unit. The committee may contact the author of submitted input for clarification or additional information if needed to evaluate the appropriateness of the input.*
 - *Faculty input deemed appropriate will be considered by the department/division P&T committee in their evaluation of the candidate and will be attached without author names to the recommendation letter generated by the committee. This is to ensure the candidate is aware of the input and has an opportunity to respond to it as part of the CRR320.035-defined request-for-reconsideration process.*
 - *Faculty input, with author names included, will be added to the candidate's packet and available for consideration by all subsequent levels of review (e.g., faculty input will not be anonymous to those participating at any level of review of the candidate)*
- b. Review by the department/division chair (In absence of departments/divisions, the first review is by the college/school promotion and tenure committee)
- (1) The department chair shall provide an independent written evaluation and recommendation on the candidate.
- (i) The critical question to be addressed during review is the following: Is the candidate qualified to be promoted or to be placed on continuous appointment, according to the criteria outlined in section B Policies.
- (ii) The department chair shall review the candidate's dossier. The chair also may solicit additional information pertinent to answering the critical question stated in i above.
- (iii) The department chair shall ensure adherence to the university-wide standards described in CRR320.035 section B Policies.
- (2) The department chair shall then provide the chair's written recommendation on whether or not the candidate should be promoted, placed on continuous appointment, or both. The department chair shall provide a copy of that written recommendation to the candidate. The candidate may submit a written response within 14 calendar days. If the

recommendation is against promotion, continuous appointment, or both, the response may also request reconsideration. In the event of a request for reconsideration, the department chair will consider the response of the candidate, issue a written recommendation that addresses the request, and provide a copy to the candidate. The initial written recommendation, any response submitted by the candidate, and any additional written recommendation addressing a request for reconsideration will be forwarded to the next level of review.

c. Review by the college/school promotion and tenure committee

(1) The college/school promotion and tenure committee shall provide an independent written evaluation and recommendation on the candidate.

(i) The critical question to be addressed during review is the following: Is the candidate qualified to be promoted or to be placed on continuous appointment, according to the criteria outlined in section B Policies.

(ii) The college/school promotion and tenure committee shall review the candidate's dossier. The committee also may solicit additional information pertinent to answering the critical question stated in i above.

(iii) The college/school promotion and tenure committee shall ensure adherence to the university-wide standards described in CRR320.035 section B Policies.

(2) The college/school promotion and tenure committee shall then provide its written recommendation on whether or not the candidate should be promoted, placed on continuous appointment, or both. The college/school promotion and tenure committee shall provide a copy of that written recommendation to the candidate. The candidate may submit a written response within 14 calendar days. If the recommendation is against promotion, continuous appointment, or both, the response may also request reconsideration. In the event of a request for reconsideration, the college/school promotion and tenure committee will consider the response of the candidate, issue a written recommendation that addresses the request, and provide a copy to the candidate. The initial written recommendation, any response submitted by the candidate, and any additional written recommendation addressing a request for reconsideration will be forwarded to the next level of review.

d. Review by the school or college dean or director

(1) The school or college dean shall provide an independent written evaluation and recommendation on the candidate.

(i) The critical question to be addressed during review is the following: Is the candidate qualified to be promoted or to be placed on continuous appointment, according to the criteria outlined in section B Policies.

(ii) The school or college dean shall review the candidate's dossier. The dean also may solicit additional information pertinent to answering the critical question stated in i above.

- (iii) The dean shall ensure adherence to the university- wide standards described in section B Policies.
 - (2) The school or college dean shall then provide the dean’s written recommendation on whether or not the candidate should be promoted, placed on continuous appointment, or both. The school or college dean shall provide a copy of that written recommendation to the candidate. The candidate may submit a written response within 14 calendar days. If the recommendation is against promotion, continuous appointment, or both, the response may also request reconsideration. In the event of a request for reconsideration, the school or college dean will consider the response of the candidate, issue a written recommendation that addresses the request, and provide a copy to the candidate. The initial written recommendation, any response submitted by the candidate, and any additional written recommendation addressing a request for reconsideration will be forwarded to the next level of review
- e. Review by the Campus Promotion and Tenure Committee (CPTC)
 - (1) The CPTC shall provide an independent written evaluation and recommendation on the candidate.
 - (i) The critical question to be addressed during review is the following: Is the candidate qualified to be promoted or to be placed on continuous appointment, according to the criteria outlined in section B Policies.
 - (ii) The campus promotion and tenure committee shall review the candidate’s dossier. The committee also may solicit additional information pertinent to answering the critical question stated in i above.
 - (iii) The campus promotion and tenure committee shall ensure adherence to the university-wide standards described in section B Policies.
 - (2) The campus promotion and tenure committee shall then provide its written recommendation on whether or not the candidate should be promoted, placed on continuous appointment, or both. The campus promotion and tenure committee shall provide a copy of that written recommendation to the candidate. The candidate may submit a written response within 14 calendar days. If the recommendation is against promotion, continuous appointment or both, the response may also request reconsideration. In the event of a request for reconsideration, the campus promotion and tenure committee will consider the response of the candidate, issue a written recommendation that addresses the request, and provide a copy to the candidate. The initial written recommendation, any response submitted by the candidate, and any additional written recommendation addressing a request for reconsideration will be forwarded to the next level of review.
- f. Review by the Provost
 - (1) The Provost shall provide an independent written evaluation and recommendation on the candidate.

- (i) The critical question to be addressed during review is the following: Is the candidate qualified to be promoted or to be placed on continuous appointment, according to the criteria outlined in CRR320.035 section B Policies.
 - (ii) The Provost shall review the candidate's dossier. The committee also may solicit additional information pertinent to answering the critical question stated in i above.
 - (iii) The Provost shall ensure adherence to the university-wide standards described in CRR320.035 section B Policies.
- (2) The Provost shall then provide the provost's written recommendation on whether or not the candidate should be promoted, placed on continuous appointment, or both. The provost shall provide a copy of that written recommendation to the candidate. The candidate may submit a written response within 14 calendar days. If the recommendation is against promotion, continuous appointment, or both, the response may also request reconsideration. In the event of a request for reconsideration, the provost will consider the response of the candidate, issue a written recommendation that addresses the request, and provide a copy to the candidate. The initial written recommendation, any response submitted by the candidate, and any additional written recommendation addressing a request for reconsideration will be forwarded to the next level of review.

g. Review by the Chancellor

- (1) The Chancellor is assisted in the review of recommendations for promotion and tenure by the preceding promotion and tenure committees, department chair, Dean and Provost. The campus committee reviews all recommendations for promotion and continuous appointment and advises the chancellor on the following matters:
 - (i) The adequacy of the criteria used at the department, school, and college level; and
 - (ii) The qualifications of the individuals recommended
- (2) An annual report of promotion and tenure actions approved by the chancellor shall be submitted by the chancellor to the president.
- (3) *CRR320.035 outlines the process by which a P&T candidate can request reconsideration of a recommendation at each level of review below the level of the Chancellor. At UMKC, candidates receiving a negative decision from the Chancellor will be provided the same opportunity to request reconsideration as is provided at the lower levels.*

At UMKC, additional guidelines for the Promotion and Tenure review process are as follows:

No individual may participate, vote, or otherwise have input or influence at more than one level of the P&T review process for any given candidate.

CRR320.035 describes the review at each level as concluding with an "independent written evaluation and recommendation" which "shall mean that the reviewers have considered the

information in the candidate's dossier and any additional information solicited and make their own assessment based on that information."

CRR320.035 states that the reviewer(s) at each level may solicit additional information pertinent to evaluating the candidate. Such additional information may consist of a request from the candidate, a request for additional university data (e.g., clarification of grant activity from ORS), or a request for clarification from the prior level of review.

At each level of review, clarification can be sought only from the level of review immediately below the requesting level. At the levels of the CPTC, Provost, and Chancellor, however, the communication can occur among the three levels because they all represent the full campus in their review process.

For the sake of transparency, requests for additional information at any level must be communicated by the reviewer(s) in writing. At levels up to the unit Dean, the written request for additional information must be sent to the unit Academic Coordinator. At the level of the CPTC, Provost, and Chancellor, the written request must be sent to the Faculty Affairs Specialist. Upon receipt of a request for additional information, the Academic P&T Coordinator or Faculty Affairs Specialist will convey the request in writing to the appropriate party, will obtain the requested information from that party in writing, and will convey the information in writing to the reviewer(s). These written communications will be included with the recommendation sent to the candidate from the reviewer(s) at the level initiating the request for additional information and will become part of the candidate's P&T packet moving to the next level of review.

Because levels of review are to be independent, communication from one level of review to the level prior should be restricted to requests for clarification or additional information regarding the reviewer(s)' rationale for the recommendation submitted.

The CPTC, Provost, and Chancellor operate as independent levels of review, reaching their conclusions through an independent review of the portfolio.

When the Chancellor's decision differs from the recommendation of the CPTC, the Chancellor shall meet with the CPTC to discuss the decision and the language that will be used in the letter provided to the candidate. The Chancellor's written decision must use the discipline, division, or school criteria, depending on the unit for promotion and tenure. This communication will occur before the Chancellor sends the letter communicating the final decision to the Candidate.

Decision and Notification Process.

It is to be clearly understood by all persons involved in the promotion and continuous appointment process that recommendations by faculty P&T Committees, Chairs, and Deans are only

recommendations and a final decision can be made only by the Chancellor. The Chancellor will provide written notification of the final decision to each candidate no later than July 31.

Periodic Faculty Review of P&T Criteria

Each discipline, division, or school (depending on the unit) shall define and publish its promotion and tenure criteria and ensure that faculty are advised on the criteria on a regular basis. Criteria must designate qualitative and, if applicable, quantitative performance expectations by rank in each of the areas of teaching, research/ scholarly/creative work, and service. Criteria must align with the UM System standards outlined in CRR 320.035 Section B.

The discipline, division, or school criteria are the means by which the system-wide standards are assessed in a promotion and tenure case. All levels of review must evaluate a promotion and/or tenure candidate's accomplishments against the standards outlined in CRR 320.035 Section B, using the discipline, division, or school criteria.

The discipline, division, or school criteria in place at the time of a hire onto the tenure track shall be the criteria used to assess tenure applications. If there is a change to the unit tenure criteria during a candidate's probationary period, the candidate may elect to be evaluated under the original or the new criteria. If there is a change to the discipline, division, or school criteria since a candidate's last promotion, new criteria will be used to assess a promotion application only if the new criteria have been in place for a minimum of three years, unless the candidate elects to be evaluated against the new criteria.

The tenured faculty of each academic unit shall review and revise the unit promotion and tenure criteria as needed, but at least every 5 years. This process, which will include an opportunity for feedback and endorsement of the revised criteria by the Campus Promotion and Tenure Committee, Provost, and the Chancellor, will be facilitated by the Provost's office.

The faculty-approved unit promotion and tenure criteria must be submitted to the Provost for publication on the UMKC promotion and tenure website by 1 July.