



2023-24 P&T TASK FORCE REPORT

Enhancing Promotion and Tenure Processes

APPRECIATION

The 2023-24 P&T Task Force co-chairs, **Jon Stemmler (School of Journalism)** and **Reginald Rogers (College of Engineering)**, want to thank the members of the Task Force who took on the responsibility and dedicated the time required to explore the issues related to promotion and tenure and without whom this report would not be possible.

We also want to recognize those who assisted this effort: data analyst **Jared Beasley** and Executive Director **Mardy Eimers (MU Analytics and Institutional Research)**, Interim Provost **Matt Martens** and Associate Provost for Academic Programs **Alexandra Socarides (Office of the Provost)**, and Faculty Council Chair **Tom Warhover (School of Journalism)**.

The committee was made up of four department chairs and four members of the faculty at large. The committee members were:



Stephen Ball
*Physical Therapy,
College of Health
Sciences*



Debora Bell
*Faculty Chair,
Psychological
Sciences, Arts &
Sciences*



Rabia Gregory
*Classics, Archaeology
& Religion, Arts &
Sciences*



Brian Houston
*Chair, Department of
Public Health, College
of Health Sciences*



Laura McCann
*Agricultural and
Applied Economics,
Past Chair, CAFNR P&T
Committee*



Reginald Rogers
*Chemical and
Biomedical
Engineering, College
of Engineering
(co-chair)*



Chris Slaten
*Department Chair,
Educational School
and Counseling
Psychology, College
of Education & Human
Development*



Jon Stemmler
*Faculty Chair,
Strategic
Communication,
School of Journalism
(co-chair)*

INTRODUCTION

In July 2023, the Office of the Provost, working with the Faculty Council, sought to establish an ad-hoc committee with the purpose of examining existing promotion and tenure processes for tenure track (TT) and non-tenure track (NTT) faculty and making recommendations to the Office of the Provost on how to improve the procedures. The committee was active during the 2023-24 academic year and was given the freedom to explore what issues to tackle, with some recommendations made by the Office of the Provost and others made by Faculty Council.

Upon receiving our charge, we began listening tours of our faculty groups as well as conducting information conversations with individuals and groups that deal with P&T issues in various colleges and schools. We also collected and analyzed current and past P&T reports from the Office of the Provost, Faculty Council and other groups on campus created in the last decade. Those reports included the 2017 Promotion & Tenure Process Evaluation report created by the Faculty Affairs Committee, the 2018-19 Chancellor's Committee on NTT Faculty, and the Faculty Affairs Report on 2022-23 Analysis of P&T Inconsistencies created in March 2023 along with the response document from the Provost and President.

We also reviewed data from the 2022 COACHE report as well as receiving data from the 2022 COACHE survey for 24 questions related to P&T issues. These questions were from three sections of the survey that asked respondents about tenure policies, tenure clarity and promotion. The data for these P&T questions were examined related to overall percentages, gender, race/ethnicity and faculty rank (assistant, associate, full). In reviewing the data, the task force determined there are significant concerns regarding transparency of the P&T process with respect to duties and expectations. Specifically, survey respondents indicated lack of clarity with the tenure process and whether tenure would be received; lack of clarity with expectations as a scholar, teacher, advisor, and campus citizen; and a lack of clarity related to reasonable expectations when considering promotion to full professor. In addition, respondents from populations underrepresented (i.e. women, faculty of color, and underrepresented minorities) indicated significant bias against their ability to successfully get through the P&T process.

Additionally, we conducted some primary research with peer institutions to learn more about how those outside of MU handled some of these issues. That research included:

- Nine interviews with Provost Office representatives from peer institutions related to their P&T policies and procedures related to early tenure.
- Four interviews with Provost Office representatives from peer institutions related to their P&T policies and procedures related to Academic Analytics.
- Five interviews with Provost Office representatives from peer institutions related to their P&T policies and procedures related to administrative service.
- A Qualtrics survey distributed via a listserv to faculty chairs/heads of departments of Psychology at peer institutions that received 19 responses related to the use of Academic Analytics in promotion and tenure.

More details on this research and findings are included as relevant in Section II: Topics and Recommendations.

SECTION I - APPRECIATION AND INTRODUCTION

As we completed our data gathering stage, several topics emerged that the Task Force believed were ones where we could enable change to help inform the 2024-2025 P&T call from the Office of the Provost. Before finalizing this list of topics, we sought input from the MU Chairs Council. Our scope of work and goals were presented to this group and, after that presentation, we asked them to complete a short Qualtrics survey to determine which of the seven topics we had identified were most important to them, as well as providing us with any topics we hadn't identified that they felt needed to be addressed.

That survey solidified the selection of the seven topics and did not identify any new topics of note.

Based on our internal discussions, review of past MU P&T reports, listening tours and research data, we finalized the following seven topics and actions steps. The topics are:

Streamlining P&T Process: Examine what can be done to streamline the P&T process for TT and NTT faculty related to links on the call from the Office of the Provost, as well as the RPT and MyVITA systems.

P&T “Minimum Standard”: Look at the “department is minimum” language in the P&T call and determine guidance about how to handle it when the guidelines change during the tenure process.

Early Tenure: Defining “rare and exceptional” as well as what “early” means.

Full Professor Guidelines: Examine how the parameters for going up for full professor can be clarified on the call from the Office of the Provost.

NTT Promotion: Examine the call from the Office of the Provost for NTT faculty and compare with TT faculty with a focus on clarity and fairness related to the typical NTT workload and responsibilities.

Academic Analytics: Explore if/how Academic Analytics should be used in the P&T process.

Administrative Service: Explore how administrative service, whether it's listed as part of a faculty member's FTE or not, should be treated for candidates going through the P&T process.

We also identified two topics that we deemed as very important, but the Task Force was in agreement that these were either too substantial to be completed in the time allotted or were viewed as topics that were specific to individual colleges/schools and therefore not within the purview of this Task Force. These two topics are:

1. Addressing equity issues related to female faculty and faculty of color. Includes elements such as the bias found with student evaluations, and how to handle those who have done service above and beyond the expectations of a given position (including invisible service that is time consuming).
2. Examining how to establish a consistent method of mentorship for new faculty - TT and NTT - throughout schools and colleges.

The next section of the report will deal with each of the seven topics with an explanation of the issue at hand and background, followed by our recommendations for each.

TOPICS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Topic #1 – Streamlining P&T Process

One area that was posed in the initial meeting with the Office of the Provost and Faculty Council leadership was about how to streamline the P&T process. Internal discussions about this issue unveiled many shared experiences, given that several members of the committee are currently or, in the past, served in the role of faculty chair and assisted faculty working toward tenure. After internal discussions, the Task Force sought out other chairs to explore their experiences, as well as examining the processes used by various schools and colleges, and past P&T report suggestions from Faculty Council and other groups.

As a result of these efforts, the Task Force has gone through and suggested several changes to the current TT P&T call.

Task Force Recommendations:

- Within the call documents from the Office of the Provost, add links to assist chairs and faculty where to go to find information, ranging from trusted sources for impact factors and acceptance rates of journals to where to find information for the Course Evaluation Table. Specifically, for the Course Evaluation table, links should be provided to:
 - Number of Students/Number Evaluating column should link to MyZou and to the Assessment Resource Center (ARC)
 - Course GPA column should link to the Registrar Office
 - Evaluation Average column should link to the ARC
- Taking the Teaching Philosophy document and adding that to be part of the Teaching Achievements document.
- Related to grants, provide clarity on how to best deal with information that is incorrect or missing in MyVita that's provided through Sponsored Programs Administration (SPA).
- Review the call documents to make sure what's requested matches up with the requests in the RPT system.
- Explore the possibility of MyVITA data being pulled into the RPT submission to avoid TT faculty having to duplicate effort with some of the documents.

Topic #2 – P&T “Minimum Standard”

We recognize that as disciplines and fields continue to develop, ways faculty can demonstrate productive and creative scholarship evolves. We further recognize that the University of Missouri's high standards for creative scholarship and inspired teaching will likewise evolve. These recommendations are intended to help reconcile the lack of clarity and implied tension and disagreement between the articulation and application of standards across multiple levels of the review process, as described in the CRRs and the P&T Call Letters.

Specifically, the Task Force noted a passage from the 2023 P&T Call Letter (“Importance of Packet Preparation” section) that states:

SECTION II - TOPICS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

*As one of the nation's leading teaching and research institutions, MU maintains high standards in recruiting, promoting, and awarding tenure and promotion to faculty. The campus goal is to ensure continuous quality improvement in teaching, research, and service. **Satisfaction of minimum criteria at the department, college, and university levels is not sufficient to ensure promotion or tenure.***

This same concept is addressed in CRR 320.025.B.1 https://www.umsystem.edu/ums/rules/collected_rules/personnel/ch320/320.035_policy_and_procedures_for_promotion_and_tenure

*“General Philosophy—As one of the nation's leading teaching and research institutions, the University of Missouri maintains high standards in recruiting, promoting, and awarding tenure to faculty members. Each unit shall define and publish its promotion and tenure criteria and ensure that faculty are advised on the criteria on a regular basis. The unit standards must meet the broader university-wide standards described in this section. While specific criteria for judging the merits of individual faculty may vary among units, there must be no variation in standards. The University will continue to strengthen its standards in all disciplines. **Satisfaction of minimum criteria at the college, school, or department levels is not sufficient to insure promotion or continuous appointment.** The University seeks faculty members who are genuinely creative scholars and inspired teachers and who are dedicated to the pursuit of knowledge and its transmission to others. These high standards are to be observed in the recruitment, promotion, and tenuring of faculty members. All persons and committees making recommendations regarding promotion and tenure will consider the candidate's demonstrated ability to meet these standards.”*

Despite the value of setting an expectation of continued evolution of MU's high standards, the Task Force finds the current CRR and P&T call letter language to be problematic in several ways. Specifically, the current language:

- Implies that there is a difference between standards and minimum criteria.
 - Standards and minimum criteria are synonyms that are not clearly defined in the current promotion guidelines. Implying that some level of performance that exceeds explicit standards is required, without defining what that level of performance entails or by how much it should exceed standards, is unclear and potentially misleading. It also creates an opportunity for bias and discrimination and may severely impair faculty success and campus recruiting and retention.
 - The current CRR language suggesting a difference may exist between departmental criteria and university standards should no longer exist at MU due to regular Provost review and approval of all unit (i.e., department) standards.
- Implies that there is, may be, or must be a difference in standards across levels. For example, the CRRs seem to require that unit standards be invariant (“there must be no variation in standards”) but that university standards will continue to strengthen (“University will continue to strengthen its standards in all disciplines”).
 - This language creates (or falsely assumes) a fundamental disconnect between department/unit standards and University standards and implies that unit standards are somehow less rigorous or current than university standards. Departments are in the best position to set standards that reflect the current and emerging expectations for important and impactful scholarship and teaching, but that these standards should reflect shared goals across units, schools, colleges, and campus.
- Implies that standards as applied to individual faculty may be changed at any time, without specifying any guidelines for extent, timing, or notice of such changes.
 - Although evolution and development of standards are desirable, drastic and rapid shifts can be detrimental to a candidate's success in the P&T process as well as to overall faculty morale and the University's reputation and ability to recruit and retain strong scholars.

Given this rationale, the Task Force has several recommendations, including a change to the language in CRR 320.035 and the call from the Office of the Provost related to the “minimum

SECTION II - TOPICS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

standards”. The recommendations below include several immediate and longer-term actions to address problematic aspects of the “minimum standards” language. Immediate actions involve adding clarifying language in the call letter from the Office of the Provost, as well as in instructions to all campus units and levels of P&T evaluation, to address interpretation and application of current CRRs. Longer-term actions involve considering changes to CRRs and developing or revising campus procedures.

Task Force Recommendations:

- Convene an intercampus committee to review this aspect of the CRRs. This committee should include legal counsel and representation of TT and NTT faculty from all campuses. The committee’s charge should include ensuring that the sections of the CRRs related to promotion for tenure track and non-tenure track faculty are clear, up to date, and in alignment with the campus policies across the UM System, and that mechanisms are in place to ensure transparency, fairness, and consistency in dissemination and application of policies.
- Ensure consistency and transparency in P&T standards across all campus units.
 - **Campus Procedures – Department Standards:** The Office of the Provost currently reviews and approves all department standards. Such approval should only be granted once standards are considered sufficient and well-aligned with campus standards and priorities. These department standards should be reviewed regularly, updated when necessary, and any changes must be approved by the Office of the Provost. By definition, the Provost-approved standards should be considered to meet standards for promotion and tenure at all levels. Clarify under what conditions minimum standards might be found insufficient (e.g., when a department’s updated standards have not yet been approved), and what standards will be used instead.
 - **Campus Procedures – Campus standards:** Clearly articulate any additional campus standards that are not (or may not be) described in department standards. Ideally, Provost-approved department standards will be comprehensive, but this may not be the case at present. If necessary, department standards should include addenda that address broader campus standards. Campus should ensure that any standards to be used in the P&T process are stated clearly, in writing, and distributed to all faculty well in advance of the review process.
 - **Campus Procedures – Transparent & timely dissemination:** Clarify how and when Provost-approved department (and campus) standards are communicated to candidates and all review committees. Information about how department and campus level standards are to be used and to whom they are available during the candidate’s evaluation process should be clearly stated for every level of the process. Information about this should be included in the call document, part of an annual workshop, or posted as information on the provost’s website.
- **Call Document Changes:**
 - Include a clear statement that, once approved by the Office of the Provost, the department-level P&T standards (and any additional documents regarding campus standards) are considered to meet standards for promotion and tenure.
 - Provide guidelines for how to establish standards for promotion and tenure if the department does not yet have Provost-approved P&T standards (if not all departments/units have Provost-approved standards).
 - Include a clear statement about how department and campus level standards are to be used and to whom they are available during the candidate’s evaluation process.
 - Remove the “minimum criteria” sentence (*“Satisfaction of minimum criteria at the department, college, and university levels is not sufficient to ensure promotion or tenure”*) and replace with a statement noting that the Provost-approved department and campus P&T standards reflect the shared expectations across all units. Clarify that the “minimum criteria” sentence in the CRR (*“Satisfaction of minimum criteria at the college, school, or department levels is not sufficient to ensure promotion or continuous appointment”*) should be interpreted as explaining that Campus P&T standards, as described and disseminated to faculty, are also considered in P&T decisions.

SECTION II - TOPICS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

- **CRR Changes:**
 - Revise the CRR to include a clear statement that, once approved by the Office of the Provost, the written department-level and any campus-level P&T standards are then considered to meet standards for promotion and tenure.
 - Remove the “minimum standard” sentence in the CRR (“*Satisfaction of minimum criteria at the college, school, or department levels is not sufficient to ensure promotion or continuous appointment*”) and replace with a statement noting that the Provost-approved department and campus P&T standards reflect the shared expectations across all units.
- Clarify the standards to be used in evaluating P&T cases.
 - **Campus Procedures:** If standards or the interpretation of ways to meet those standards has changed during the pre-tenure period, candidates should only be subjected to such changes if they have the time and support to meet them. Campus should develop written policies that articulate this, including the default standards (e.g., whether faculty are typically evaluated under the standards in effect at their hire date or those in effect at their mid-probationary review or at date of submission of promotion materials), conditions under which faculty may request to be evaluated using different standards, and how and by whom decisions about alternative standard use are made and documented. We recommend that such policies and their application be based on the extent to which meeting revised standards could be reasonably accomplished during the pre-tenure period. We further recommend that decisions regarding use of alternative standards be agreed upon by the candidate and department and that this agreement and rationale be documented and included with applications for promotion.
 - **Call Document Change:** Revise the call letter to include a section addressing which standards to use in the event that department standards have changed since the hire date.

Topic #3 – Early Tenure

There has been some confusion by faculty, chairs, and other administrators about the nature of what qualifies as “rare and exceptional” in the listed guidelines for promotion and tenure and what truly is classified as early tenure.

In order to create clear recommendations on this issue to the Office of the Provost, our Task Force reached out to Provost Office representatives from four different peer institutions to inquire about how they handle early tenure cases. The results from the peer institutions we communicated with suggest they are also struggling with identifying consistent university parameters around this issue. In addition, the Task Force reviewed the MU language around this topic and discussed our own suggestions based on our various roles and experiences here at Mizzou.

Task Force Recommendations:

- The bar is high for those wanting to go up for early tenure and the current language is clear and robust (“...rare and truly exceptional”). No change is recommended by this Task Force at the campus level. However, units (department/school/college) should be encouraged to develop their discipline specific standards for “rare and exceptional” and evaluate faculty that are going up for early tenure based on those standards and highlighting those standards and how they were met in review letters.
- If a candidate applies for early tenure and is unsuccessful, that individual should receive a one-year terminal contract, making this the same outcome as it is for faculty going up for tenure on-time that are unsuccessful.

Topic #4 – Full Professor Guidelines

It has been recognized that faculty seeking promotion to full professor do not have clear guidance on specific timelines on when to have their dossiers placed under review. Many units across campus

SECTION II - TOPICS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

provide conflicting information on perceived expectations regarding submission of materials for the promotion review process. Some of these misconceptions have led to some faculty not submitting their dossier when they would otherwise be eligible for review.

Task Force Recommendations:

- The Task Force proposes the following changes in the P&T call letter to align all colleges and units on timeline expectations for a candidate to begin the review process for promotion to full professor:
“Promotion to Professor will typically be considered after an individual has met the expectations related to academic productivity and impact as set by the unit/department/college standards and approved by the Office of the Provost. Understanding that timelines for promotion to full can vary based on discipline, there is no set timing as there is for promotion for tenure. Individuals should consult with their unit leaders to determine when their specific case should be reviewed.”
- The Office of the Provost should provide the average and median years for faculty members across the university to go up for promotion to full professor to give candidates a guide for the timing of such a promotion.
- It also should be noted that there is no such thing as early promotion to full and those who take a longer time to promotion to full should not be penalized, provided the standards mentioned above have been met and there is a history of sustained productivity during this time.
- This proposed language provides clear and reasonable expectations for faculty at the associate professor level to sustain a level of productivity that would encourage submission of dossiers for review by the P&T committees while also providing flexibility for others needing additional time before submitting their dossier for review.

Topic #5 – NTT Promotion

After discussions about issues members of the Task Force had experienced as faculty chairs or heard about related to NTT promotion, this topic was deemed as an important area to explore. One committee member was an NTT faculty and had first-hand experience with the process. From these internal discussions, the Task Force then sought out other chairs and NTT faculty to explore their experiences, as well as examining the processes used by various MU schools and colleges, and past P&T report suggestions from Faculty Council and other groups.

As a result of these efforts, the Task Force has gone through and suggested several changes to the current NTT P&T call.

Task Force Recommendations:

- Clarify how traditional research should be treated for NTT faculty who don't have a research appointment.
- Clarify how prior professional experience or prior university experience should be treated in the offer letter, much in the same way it is on the TT side related to years of service.
- Explore the possibility of MyVITA data being pulled into the RPT submission to avoid NTT faculty from having to do a CV. Seems duplicative currently.
- Remove passages from the NTT call that are unclear for NTT faculty and add some protections to make sure that their unit-level guidelines are followed whenever possible. For example, currently there is no language in the directions for Librarians or Extension faculty job appointments (or School of Medicine clinical faculty).
- Adapt the language used for the TT process describing committee members (from CRRs) to be used in the NTT call to provide an explicit procedure for constituting a promotion committee when there aren't enough NTT ranked faculty to form a committee. Specifically, the passage we are referring to is:

SECTION II - TOPICS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

“...in the discretion of the dean, a special promotion and tenure committee shall be formed by the addition of tenured professor(s) from a closely related department, and/or tenured professor(s) emeriti from the primary department in accordance with established procedures. The emeriti faculty serving on the committee shall have attained the rank of professor with tenure, and the number shall not be greater than 50% of the committee membership.”

- This could be adapted to specify that the committee should draw in ranked NTT faculty from other departments in the college and TT faculty should never be more than 50% of the committee. That level of precision is not in the CRRs for NTT faculty, but should be specified in the P&T call document. This would not contradict the CRR 310.035 K, which reads: *“Each campus shall adopt a promotion process that involves at least one faculty committee composed of one or more NTT faculty, at the promotable rank or above, and one or more tenured faculty, if such NTT faculty and tenured faculty exist. The committee or committees shall make recommendations to the Chancellor or designee who shall make the final decision.”*

Topic #6 – Academic Analytics

Academic Analytics can be a useful tool for programs and departments to evaluate research productivity and impact relative to peer benchmarks and support faculty development through identification of potential networks, collaborators, and awards. Although Academic Analytics developers advise against using Academic Analytics data for evaluation of individual faculty, especially for high-stakes decisions such as promotion and tenure, MU faculty are permitted to use these data to demonstrate their research impact and MU administrators have access to these data.

In preparing to make recommendations regarding the appropriate use of Academic Analytics or similar benchmarking data for P&T decisions, members of this Task Force sought two sources of informal input from colleagues at other institutions. First, Provost Office representatives from four peer institutions were contacted and asked if Academic Analytics were required or used at any point during the P&T process. Response themes indicated that they were not required, rarely discussed, and shied away from using. Second, chairs/heads of departments of Psychology responded to a Qualtrics survey asking about their campus’ use of Academic Analytics. Of 19 respondents, 15 were from institutions classified as Carnegie Very High Research Activity Doctoral universities (six of these are AAU members). Although many respondents’ institutions use the Academic Analytics tool to evaluate units (63%) and support faculty in non-evaluative ways (47%; e.g., identify potential awards, support retention), only one institution uses these data in P&T decisions if the candidate or department chooses to provide them.

Given this, MU’s use of Academic Analytics data as part of P&T portfolios is a minority approach. Both provosts and chairs described pros of using these data for aggregate benchmarking but noted several limitations of use in individual P&T cases. Using this input and additional input from our listening sessions, we suggest the following recommendations regarding the use of Academic Analytics or any similar benchmarking tool.

Task Force Recommendations:

- Departments, units, or colleges should make individual Academic Analytics data, along with basic training in how to understand and interpret the data, available to faculty. This step would allow promotion candidates to be aware of their Academic Analytics profiles, decide whether and how to use them in promotion materials, and be prepared to respond to any questions about these data during the promotion review process. These data should be made available on an annual basis, on a schedule that allows faculty sufficient time to consider whether and how to use them as they prepare their promotion materials.
- Units, departments, colleges, and the call letter from the Office of the Provost should make it

SECTION II - TOPICS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

clear to candidates, reviewers, and evaluators that including or discussing Academic Analytics data is optional and at the discretion of the candidate. The call letter and other materials related to promotion and tenure should make it clear that the Offices of the Provost, Chancellor and President are not using Academic Analytics to make decisions unless provided by the candidate.

- All P&T review committees, including department, college, and the Campus Promotion and Tenure Advisory Committee (CPTAC), should receive training in interpreting Academic Analytics data, appropriate and inappropriate use of the data, etc., so that they are prepared to utilize the information appropriately if it is provided by the candidate.
- CPTAC or any prior review committee or individual (e.g. chair, dean, Provost, Chancellor, President) should not discuss Academic Analytics unless these data are part of the dossier provided by the candidate in “Scholarly Accomplishments”.
- If the candidate decides not to include Academic Analytics data in their dossier, external reviewers should be notified not to include any mention or reference to Academic Analytics data in external review letters. In this circumstance, if these data are still included in an external letter in this case, the candidate should have the opportunity to respond in “Additional Information” before discussion/use at any level of review.
- Cautionary language regarding the use of Academic Analytics should be provided in the call letter from the Office of the Provost and any other materials related to promotion and tenure that reference Academic Analytics.
- The University may consider alternative approaches to quality evaluation and benchmarking, such as the Higher Education Leadership Initiative for Open Scholarship (heliosopen.org).

Topic #7 – Administrative Service

This topic addresses the way that administrative work is (or is not) evaluated as part of promotion and tenure. Currently, the P&T call letters from the Office of the Provost do not address administrative service. To learn more about this topic, the Task Force reached out to Provost Office representatives at five peer institutions to inquire about how they handle administrative service. The result of these conversations suggested that most of our peer institutions have not addressed this specifically, and when they have, they have asked faculty to include this in the Service portion of their dossier. In addition, the committee reviewed MU language around this and discussed our own suggestions based on our various roles and experiences here at MU.

Thus, we recommend that the Professional Service section of the call letters be updated and clarified to also include Administration. This change will help ensure that faculty applying for promotion include their administrative work in their dossier and that this work will be considered when evaluating promotion. An additional issue in this area is whether faculty working entirely in administrative roles could be promoted based on that work exclusively, without contributions in the areas of research or teaching. This would consist of some form of “Administrative Track” for promotion. The Task Force does not recommend an Administrative Track for promotion be developed now, though work to explore this track could be taken up in the future.

Task Force Recommendations:

- The “Professional Service Achievements” section of the Promotion and Tenure Call Letters (both Tenure Track and Non-Tenure Track) should be updated to include any administrative roles held by candidates. The section should be renamed “Professional Service/Administration Achievements.” This includes administrative roles appointed through formal university processes (e.g., department chair, associate dean) and more informal roles (e.g., director of research lab).
- Additionally, the “Service Evaluation Letters” included in the Call Letters should be updated to also address administrative roles (renamed “Service/Administration Letters”). These changes would help ensure that administrative work is described in promotion dossiers and considered by reviewers.

SECTION III - CONCLUSION

CONCLUSION

In conclusion, this report reviews seven primary topics that the Task Force saw as issues important to address and achievable before the launch of the 2024-25 call letters by the Office of the Provost. That said, these are merely recommendations and a starting point to some of the larger topics that the Task Force believes should be addressed moving forward.

Two additional items for the Office of the Provost and Faculty Council to consider are:

- **CRR Change:** This Task Force has recommended a change to the CRRs to address the need for removing ambiguity associated with “minimum standards” tied to promotion and tenure. We stress that this change should happen as soon as possible. However, we also recognize this change will require the approval of each of the campuses in the university system. Efforts to expediently initiate such conversations should be undertaken sooner rather than later.
- **New Task Forces/Subcommittees:** As mentioned at the beginning of this report, this Task Force did not focus on two areas that it felt required deeper attention than the time allotted for our work. We believe these two areas are linked in that female faculty and faculty of color should be helped in the P&T process through more transparency and consistent mentoring given that there is often informal mentoring that might exclude those groups, even inadvertently.
 - The first topic is associated with addressing equity issues related to female faculty and faculty of color. This is an ongoing issue that must be resolved for the university to see better retention of individuals from these groups. Specifically, a specific task force/subcommittee is needed to understand and make recommendations to address elements such as the bias found with student evaluations, and how to handle those who have done service above and beyond the expectations of a given position (including invisible service that is time consuming). There is plenty of data confirming these issues, and the university must make significant efforts to remove such barriers to allow individuals to successfully navigate the promotion and tenure process at both the assistant and associate professor levels.
 - The second topic that requires an in-depth analysis by a separate task force/subcommittee involves examining how to establish a consistent method of mentorship for new faculty - TT and NTT - throughout schools and colleges. Results from the COACHE survey clearly identified a major weakness when it comes to mentoring assistant and associate professors. This severe lack of formalized mentoring has led to unsuccessful promotion and tenure cases. Many of the issues stem from individuals not being provided relevant information as guidance to help navigate the promotion and tenure process. The Task Force notes that CAFNR has developed a system of mentoring for all TT and NTT junior faculty in the college that could serve as a model for other units within the university. Information on CAFNR’s efforts can be found here: <https://cafnr.missouri.edu/faculty-staff/faculty-development-for-promotion-and-tenure/>. The Task Force understands that this topic will be a long-term effort and will require key stakeholders to address the current issues.

We hope that our efforts on this Task Force can create positive change at the University of Missouri by helping administrators and faculty as they navigate the P&T process.

