

October 15, 2013

COE ATP Process for Promotion from Associate to Full Professor

This document is a set of procedures based upon the UMSL ATP Guidelines. It is intended to provide a roadmap of the steps involved. More detailed information is found in the ATP Guidelines themselves and these should be consulted at each step of the process. This document is not a substitute for the ATP Guidelines.

1. Each spring the Provost publishes the schedule for reviews to be conducted the forthcoming academic year (<http://www.umsl.edu/services/academic/About%20Us/atp.html>). Generally, the first step in the process is two-fold: establishment of the Ad Personam Committee and submission of the Factual Record by the candidate to the department chair. These two events are to be completed by early June at the latest.
2. Composition of the Ad Personam Committee: a minimum of 3 tenured, regular faculty members who are of Full Professor rank. The members can be from the candidate's department, other departments in the college, the campus, or from outside UMSL. The candidate has the right to select one member and the Unit Committee (all tenured faculty members at the rank of Full Professor) or its designee chooses the rest of the members, in consultation with the candidate. Having an Ad Personam Committee member from outside the department can be especially important when the candidate's research does not align with the research of faculty in the department. In addition, often Unit Committees are small when composed only of full professors in the department and having an outside member or two on the Ad Personam Committee may be necessary.
3. The Ad Personam Committee has several tasks:
 - a. Review the Factual Record and recommend revisions to the candidate (final version from candidate is typically due at the end of July)
 - b. Solicit external reviewers who will provide expert feedback on the candidate's scholarship activities (see below for more information on the external review process). These reviews should be obtained by the end of July.
 - c. Compile evidence related to the candidate's teaching activities and service
 - d. Write a factual report (not an advocacy document) summarizing the candidate's research, teaching, and service activities.
 - e. Each Ad Personam committee member signs the report in recognition that they believe that it is a factual document.
 - f. Typically the Ad Personam report is completed by mid-August.
 - g. The Ad Personam report is given to the Unit Committee.
4. The Unit Committee is composed of all tenured members of the department with the rank of Full Professor (the Unit Committee can include the department chair if he or she is a tenured Full Professor). If there are not at least three full professors in the applicant's department, then the Unit Committee will be composed of three full professors from the COE. The Unit Committee has several tasks:
 - a. review the Ad Personam report and the candidate's dossier to be sure that it is

October 15, 2013

- complete, factual, and unbiased.
 - b. Make a recommendation on the promotion of the candidate. This recommendation is made after a meeting of the Unit Committee to discuss the dossier. Voting is conducted by secret ballot. Anyone voting to abstain or voting negatively (against tenure and promotion) is required to provide a rationale for his or her vote. Typically voting is done by mid-September.
 - c. The Unit Committee Coordinator (elected by the Unit Committee; can be the chair of the Ad Personam Committee if from the candidate's department) writes a report based upon the dossier and includes the discussion that occurred before the voting and the rationales for the ballots cast. It must include a section listing reasons for any negative votes or abstentions. If the Unit Committee Coordinator disagrees with the majority vote of the Unit Committee, he or she is not permitted to write the Unit Committee report; another member of the committee should be elected to write the report. The preparer of the report should sign the report on behalf of the Unit Committee.
 - d. The Unit Committee informs the candidate, in writing, of the vote tally (for, against, abstaining) and provides the candidate with a copy of the Unit Committee report, including statements submitted by Unit Committee Members (with signatures removed).
 - e. The Unit Committee report is typically due to the candidate by the end of the third week of September.
 - f. The candidate can select a response option (see Response Options in the ATP Guidelines) or can choose not to respond to the Unit Committee report. When the deadline for the Response Option process has passed, the dossier is forwarded to the next level of review, the Dean level.
 - g. The dossier is typically due to the Dean by the 3rd or 4th week of October.
5. The department chair has the option of writing a letter sharing his or her perspective on the tenure and/or promotion application of the candidate. If the chair is tenured and has the rank of Full Professor, he or she may belong to the Unit Committee and vote. There is no formal mechanism by which a chair votes separately from the Unit Committee. If the chair is not tenured and a Full Professor, the chair may not be a member of the Unit Committee and he or she has no vote in the process.
6. The Dean reviews the dossier and writes a recommendation regarding promotion.
- a. The Dean may meet with an advisory committee, consult with the Unit Committee, meet with any faculty members individually, and/or confer with faculty from outside UMSL. Any new information solicited by the Dean must be made part of the candidate's dossier.
 - b. The candidate is given a copy of the Dean's recommendation and may choose a response option or to not respond. In addition, the Unit Committee Coordinator and Unit Chair get copies of the Dean's recommendation.
 - c. Typically the Dean's recommendation is conveyed to the candidate by the end of November.
 - d. The dossier is next forwarded (by mid-December) to the Provost in Academic Affairs, who will send it on to the Senate Committee on Appointments, Tenure,

October 15, 2013

and Promotion.

External Reviewers

An important part of the process for faculty going up for tenure and/or promotion is the evaluation of a candidate's scholarly work by external reviewers. These individuals should be known nationally and internationally for their own research achievements. Here are guidelines to follow in securing external reviews:

- Evaluations should be obtained from at least 6 external reviewers (these should not be former colleagues, students, research collaborators, or mentors of the candidate). These reviewers should all be from universities that are equal or above in status to UMSL.
- The candidate is asked to provide a list of names of potential reviewers to the Ad Personam Committee. In addition, the Ad Personam Committee creates a list of potential external reviewers. Of the total number of external reviewers who provide an evaluation of the candidate's work, no more than half may come from the candidate's list.
- The Ad Personam Committee is asked to use the COE standard letter templates to communicate with external reviewers:
 - An initial invitation to use when contacting external reviewers (typically via email)
 - An official letter (that will be included in the candidate's dossier) to be sent on department letterhead to individuals who have agreed to serve as external reviewers. The letter includes information about what we would like the external reviewer to focus on in his/her evaluation as well as material about confidentiality, etc. This letter also lists the documents to be sent to the external reviewer (candidate CV, research statement, selected publications).
 - A short thank you letter to be sent after receiving the external reviewer's evaluation letter.
- Use of standard letter templates ensures that all dossiers from the COE follow a consistent procedure in the external review process.