
University of Missouri-Kansas City

To: SCE Faculty
From: Deep Medhi,
Subject: Procedures and Criteria for Promotion and Tenure (v 1.41421)
Date: September 29, 2002; updated October 15, 2002; updated October 18, 2002;
updated Nov 8, 2002; updated February 1, 2008

This document (v 1.41421) updates the November 8, 2002 document by making the following minimal changes:

- SICE is replaced with SCE
- Interdisciplinary in SICE's full name is dropped
- Links for Chancellor's memorandum #35 and #77 are updated
- Changes due to recent full-time teaching faculty designation
- Change "Division Head" to "Department Chair"
- Provost's office guideline for P&T package is updated.

The updated document will be placed in the H: drive.

University of Missouri-Kansas City

To: SICE Faculty
From: Deep Medhi,
Chair, SICE Policy Committee
Subject: Procedures and Criteria for Promotion and Tenure (v 1.4142)
Date: September 29, 2002; updated October 15, 2002; updated October 18, 2002;
updated Nov 8, 2002

Thank you for your participation in the faculty meeting on November 8, 2002 in regard to P&T Criteria and procedure for SICE. As you know, our discussions in the SICE Policy Committee have been extremely good and have led to the development of an earlier draft which was distributed to you. Your involvement and inputs at the faculty meeting have made the document better and clearer.

Here's the final approved version (v 1.4142) of the SICE P&T Document, as approved by you on November 8, 2002 faculty meeting.

This document will be put in the internal shared drive:

`H:\Common\SICE\Faculty\Approved-Documents+Policies`

(alternate way to access:)

`\\myrtle\SICE\Common\SICE\Faculty\Approved-Documents+Policies`

All full-time faculty should be able to access the shared drive. If you've a problem, please contact Operations staff so that she can check and activate your access.

Thank you.

Criteria and Procedure for Promotion and Tenure

School of Computing & Engineering

University of Missouri - Kansas City

Criteria and Procedure for promotion and tenure are based on statements from the University of Missouri System and the University of Missouri-Kansas City. There are three documents and a form to note:

1. UM Systems *Policy and Procedures for Promotion and Tenure*¹, 320.035 [Doc-1]; see
<http://www.system.missouri.edu/uminfo/rules/personnel/320035.htm>
2. UMKC Chancellor's memorandum # 35: *Policies and Procedure for Promotion and/or Continuous Appointment at the University of Missouri - Kansas City*²
http://www.umkc.edu/provost/policies/promo_tenure/chanmemo35.htm [Doc-2]
3. UMKC Chancellor's memorandum #77: *Procedure for review of Regular Faculty on Tenure-Track or Tenured Appointments*³
http://www.umkc.edu/provost/policies/promo_tenure/chanmemo77.htm [Doc-3]
4. UM System Regulations Governing the Application of Tenure, 310.020[Doc-4]; see
<http://www.system.missouri.edu/uminfo/rules/bylaws/310020.htm>
5. UM System Academic Tenure Regulations, 310.015, [Doc-5]; see
<http://www.system.missouri.edu/uminfo/rules/bylaws/310015.htm>
6. Part-I of "Recommendation for Tenure and/or Promotion beyond Assistant Professor" form (to be completed by the candidate) [[Form-I](#)]

More specifically, we rely upon the following statements:

Outstanding intellectual qualities as reflected in teaching and scholarship are the primary criteria for recommendation for promotion and tenure. Additional criteria include professionally-oriented public service contributions and service to a faculty member's department, school, college and the University. ... The essential factors in consideration of candidates for promotion and tenure will be documented merit in the traditional areas of teaching, research and service and the degree to which contributions are comprehensively substantiated and represent sustained effort. (Doc-2)

Teaching includes, besides classroom and laboratory instruction, ... academic advising, supervision of junior staff, creative redesign of courses, including courses offered through telecommunications and the Internet; liaison with teachers outside the University, off-campus teaching, and preparation of teaching materials, including textbooks. (Doc-1)

¹ Based on last revised version of 7-31-1997.

² Based on last revised version of 7-7-2000.

³ Based on last revised version of 7-12-2000.

Scholarship gives evidence of the capacity of individuals to remain abreast of developments in their disciplines ... Quantity can be a consideration, but quality must be the primary one. ... Productivity in research is an important factor in judging scholarship. ... Documentation of research activities should include some evidence that the research had a reasonable or recognized impact upon the field. (Doc-2) A recommendation for promotion and/or tenure must include supporting evidence that the individual's contributions have had an impact on the discipline ... One common method of documenting such impact is through outside evaluations by authorities in the field. ... Evidence of favorable judgment by colleagues include publications in journals where expert evaluation is required for acceptance; favorable review of books, appointment or awards that require evaluation of professional competence; election to office in learned societies; and receipt of fellowships. Frequent citation by other scholars also provides evidence of good research. ... Research grants awarded, programs initiated, and other research in progress or research findings submitted for publication all represent activities that are expected of faculty members recommended for promotion and/or tenure. (Doc-1)

Service contributions shall be judged from a qualitative standpoint as opposed to quantitative. While service is important to provide balance in the academic experience, such contributions alone do not constitute grounds for promotion and/or tenure. (Doc-2)

[Comments that are less relevant have been omitted in these quotations.]

Before we proceed further, we state the mission of the School:

“Provide comprehensive educational opportunities and focused research in computing and engineering, generating the technical work force and research needed for economic development.”

As part of this mission, we need to consider promotion and/or tenure for three types of faculty: research-oriented tenured/tenure-track, teaching-oriented tenured/tenure-track, and non-regular full-time teaching faculty (In this document, *regular* faculty refer to tenure-track or tenured faculty; all other faculty are referred to as *non-regular* following definitions given in [Doc-4].) While research-oriented faculty address the research mission of the school in addition to teaching and service, teaching-oriented (both tenure-track and non-regular) address primarily the teaching mission of the school.

Following the above guidelines (including university and campus level), we have established the criteria below for measuring teaching, scholarship, and service. A candidate need not meet the highest standards in each category. Further, criteria/weights used depend on whether the candidate is in a research-oriented track or teaching-oriented track, or non-tenured full-time faculty position. In general, the criteria guide the discussion in the P&T committee, and we point to areas that require careful assessment. For example, if a candidate published only a few papers, we try to determine if the length, depth, importance, or impact of the candidate's publications would provide an alternative measure of “recognized impact upon the field.”

Teaching is an important mission of the university. We strive for excellence in teaching. High teaching ratings and reviews are usually important indicators of good teaching; but we do emphasize that student ratings are only part of the evaluation. We expect and evaluate such evidence for undergraduate and graduate teaching separately. Improving teaching ratings for an assistant professor (during the probationary period) are good evidence. A teaching award at the school level and/or the campus level is an example of exemplary teaching. Further, course and program development (for example, degree concentration) are considered strong contributions to the university. For teaching oriented faculty, this

is an important factor. Further, we expect teaching-oriented faculty to obtain external funding for development of such programs and laboratories to support them.

Evidence of **scholarship** includes, for example, refereed publications, citation of work, research grants (including research grant effort), application of discipline-based knowledge to the practice of the profession.

Publications are judged by their intrinsic merit (in part assessed indirectly from the comments in the external letters), as well as the reputation and acceptance rate of the specific publication. Here “publication” commonly refers to journals. However, in many areas of Computer Science as well as Engineering that fall under the purview of SCE, full-length paper publications in peer-reviewed conference proceedings is quite common. While, in general, such publications in conference proceedings aren’t quite at the level of publications in journals, certain exceptions should be noted. There are some highly reputable conferences where the acceptance rate is lower than similarly reputable journals. The acceptance rate is an especially important factor for publications in conference proceedings; an acceptance rate of 25% or less is desirable. Our guidelines give numerical targets for publications. The P&T committee is well aware that judging a candidate requires much more than simply counting. Research of particular depth, breadth, significance, or impact will be highly valued. Positive citations may also be used to indicate merit of publications. The guidelines provide a framework for the committee’s deliberations.

Our criteria make reference to publications, but we are willing to interpret this term more broadly. In some cases, software packages, inventions, or patents, IETF RFC (Internet Engineering Task Force – Request for Comments) might be considered as equivalent to more traditional publications. For teaching-oriented faculty, peer-reviewed publications related to new teaching technology/methodology are also applicable.

In many areas of engineering, the application of discipline knowledge to the practice of the profession is highly valued; this also has a place under the notion of scholarship.

For non-tenured faculty members on tenure-track appointment, a mid-tenure review will be performed, no later than the end of third year, along the same criteria as discussed here. Note that this doesn’t preclude the yearly performance review that should be conducted as per Chancellor’s memorandum No. 77 [Doc-3] and UM Rules and Regulations 310.015 [Doc-5].

Finally, we’ve listed two columns for Scholarship and Teaching: High Competence and Genuine excellence. Typically, “high competence” is to be interpreted as doing a good job, but without a lot of initiative or genius. “Genuine excellence” requires something beyond routine performance. We do point out that “genuine excellence” in one category but less than “high competence” in another may not lead to promotion and/or tenure.

The procedures for promotion and tenure are based on the above-mentioned documents as well as additional procedures established by the faculty in SCE. Further details (particularly on preparation of the candidate’s portfolio) can be found later in this document.

Criteria for Tenure and/or promotion (Assistant and Associate Level, regular faculty)

The *italicized* items are considered to be the most important, and a successful candidate should satisfy all of these items. Items underlined are primarily important for teaching-oriented faculty. Items in “quote” are primarily for research-oriented faculty.

Scholarship		Teaching		Service	
High Competence	Genuine Excellence	High Competence	Genuine Excellence	University	Professional
<i>“Clear program & objectives”</i>	<i>“Clear program & objectives”</i>	<i>Good teaching ratings & peer reviews</i>	<i>Excellent teaching ratings & peer reviews</i>	Attendance at faculty meetings	Journal / Conference Refereeing
<i>A significant publication record⁴</i>	<i>An exceptional publication record⁵</i>	Use of innovative/effective teaching techniques and technologies	Use of new teaching techniques and technologies	<i>Committee membership (school level)</i>	Organizing sessions at conferences
<i>Good external letters</i>	<i>Very good external letters</i>	Course development	<u>Program development</u>	<i>Student advising, and/or Student Chapter advising</i>	Professional society committee
<i>Emerging national reputation; Future Promise</i>	<i>National reputation; Future Promise</i>	Evidence of student mentoring ()	Evidence of student mentoring	Participation in UMKC activities (e.g., open house, Dean’s picnic)	Technical Program Committee member of conferences
<i>“External research funding^{6”}</i>	<i>“Significant external research funding”</i>	<u>External funding of instructional programs/labs</u>	<u>Significant External funding of instructional programs/labs</u>	Community Service (related to profession)	
Creativity – independence /interdisciplinary	Creativity – independence /interdisciplinary	“M.S. theses completed , or, Ph.D. students in progress”	“Multiple M.S. theses completed; or at least 1 Ph.D. student graduated”		

⁴ For research-oriented faculty, a typical publication total would be 5-10 *significant* refereed publications over a 5 year period, including at least 1 major journal publication.

⁵ For research-oriented faculty, a typical publication total would be 10-15 *significant* refereed publications over a 5 year period, including several major journal publications.

⁶ (a) An intramural UMRB grant, which is highly competitive, is the only exception that may be included in this category. (b) Being principal investigator of at least one grant is encouraged, (c) Usually, in-kind grant/gift (such as software license) will not be counted in this effort.

Criteria for Promotion to Full Professor (regular faculty)

The *italicized* items are considered to be the most important, and a successful candidate should satisfy all of these items. Items underlined are primarily important for teaching-oriented faculty. Items in “quote” are primarily for research-oriented faculty.

Scholarship		Teaching		Service	
High Competence	Genuine Excellence	High Competence	Genuine Excellence	University	Professional
<i>“Clear program & objectives”</i>	<i>“Clear program & objectives”</i>	<i>Good teaching ratings and reviews</i>	<i>Excellent teaching ratings and reviews</i>	Attendance at faculty meetings	Journal /Conference referring
<i>A significant publication record⁷</i>	<i>An exceptional publication record⁸</i>	Use of innovative/effective teaching techniques, technologies	Use of new teaching techniques, technologies	<i>Committee membership (division, school, and university level)</i>	Editorships
<i>Good external letters</i>	<i>Very good external letters</i>	<i>Course development</i>	<i>Program development</i>	<i>Committee chairmanship</i>	Consultancies
<i>National reputation</i>	<i>International reputation</i>	<i>Mentoring of students</i>	<i>Mentoring of students</i>	<i>Student advising, Graduate or Undergraduate Coordinator./Advisor</i>	Conference organization
<i>Leadership</i>	<i>Leadership</i>	<i>Leadership</i>	<i>Leadership</i>	<i>Participation in UMKC activities (e.g., graduation, open houses)</i>	Holding office in a professional society
<i>“External research funding”</i>	<i>“Significant external research funding”</i>	<u>External funding of instructional programs or labs</u>	<u>External funding of instructional programs or labs</u>	Junior Faculty Mentoring	
Creativity – Independence/ Interdisciplinary	Creativity – Independence/ Interdisciplinary	<i>“Multiple master’s theses completed ; 1 Ph.D. student graduated”</i>	<i>“Several Masters and/or Ph.D. students graduated”</i>	Community Service (related to profession)	
Senior membership in a professional society (where available)	Fellow-level membership in a professional society				

⁷ A typical publication rate would be an average of 1-2 *significant* refereed publications per year . The overall record should include several major journal publications.

⁸ A typical publication rate would be an average of 2-3 *significant* refereed publications per year . The overall record should include a number of major journal publications.

Criteria for promotion of Full-time Teaching Faculty

Full-time teaching faculty members are interpreted to mean full time academic personnel who are not tenure track/tenured. It is expected that this track will include several levels such as Assistant Teaching Professor, Associate Teaching Professor, and Teaching Professor. Faculty in these positions would be subject to yearly review. Promotion will be considered only on a multi-year basis; suggested duration at any rank is 3 to 5 years.

Teaching		Service		Other Significant Contributions
High Competence	Genuine Excellence	University	Professional	
Good Teaching Ratings	Excellent Teaching Ratings	Attend Faculty Meetings	Attend relevant conferences	Develop teaching materials (books, chapters, etc.)
Use of innovative/effective teaching techniques and technologies	Use of and introduction of innovative/effective techniques & technologies	Serve on Department committees	Present at conferences	Involvement with department or research projects
Course Maintenance	Course Development (for both live and net)	Advise students (is this service or teaching?)	Membership in professional societies	Additional credentials (technical certifications, PhD, etc.)
Evidence of student mentoring through advising	Mentoring – through advising and/or directed readings	Participate in department activities	Serve on society committees	Funding for educational or research projects
		Community involvement related to teaching		

Procedure

Format for Promotion and Tenure Portfolios for regular faculty

The UMKC Provost's office has recommended that the Promotion & Tenure portfolio for regular faculty contain the following materials, in the following order in a three-ring binder with tabs outlining the suggested format.

1. Dean's Recommendation
2. SCE Promotion and Tenure Committee's recommendation ("Part II")
3. Department Chair's recommendation
4. Department P&T Committee recommendation
5. External Evaluator letters
6. Part I: Recommendation for Tenure and/or Promotion beyond _____ Professor (to be completed by the candidate)
7. CV
8. Evidence of scholarship (e.g. selected publications)
9. Evidence of your teaching
10. Evidence of your service
11. Letters of support/recommendation or similar materials

Details on the Portfolio/Guideline to Candidate

The candidate works with the Unit Coordinator¹⁰ in preparation of the package. The candidate's role in preparing the package is to complete Part-I, CV, recommend names that may become external evaluators (see below), include publications, teaching evaluations and other relevant materials.

Letters of reference will be solicited from outstanding professionals¹¹. Initially, the candidate is asked to provide about eight/ten names to the Unit Coordinator. The P&T Committee, Department Chair and Dean may add and/or subtract as many as they may wish. Once a combined tentative list is derived, the Dean's office (or his/her designee) will check with potential evaluators whether they'll be able to serve and complete the review in the time window needed (this step usually avoids not having enough letters at the end). The Dean forwards the filtered list, after the informal checking process, containing about ten names ("the potential evaluators") to the Provost's office. The potential evaluator's list is expected to contain no more than 50% chosen by the candidate initially. The Provost's office may delete names from this list, and then, informs the Dean of the approved list ("final list"). Once the final list is determined, *no* more names can be added or deleted. Note that the candidate may also name a few individuals to exclude, but should not be shown the potential or the final list of reviewers.

No one of lower rank than the candidate should be chosen as an outside reviewer. It is highly recommended that a brief bio of each reviewer be included in the portfolio along with the letters. According to Chancellor's memorandum #35, all external reviewers must hold academic appointment at the university level. *On the other hand, in many areas of Engineering and Computer Science, there are outstanding, accomplished experts with many publications who work in industry or industrial*

¹⁰ The Unit Coordinator is usually the Department Chair of the candidate's division. For selection of the Unit Coordinator and the P&T Committee of the school, please refer to the School's by-laws/handbook.

¹¹ These reviewers must not be former professors, students, advisors, or classmates of the candidate who is being reviewed. Approval of the Vice-Provost is needed if a reviewer is from an institution from where the candidate: a) received a degree, b) served on the faculty, or, c) has a close personal association.

*research labs. Thus, such experts, who hold Ph.D. degrees and have ten years of work experience beyond Ph.D., may be included as external evaluators, as long as this group is not the majority of the evaluators and as long as they are approved by the Provost's Office.*¹²

Completing Part-I (by candidate):

- For section C.1.a (“Journal Articles”): the candidate may split this into two parts: (a-i) refereed journal publications, (a-ii) refereed conference publications. If the publications are from refereed conferences, report on the acceptance/rejection rates, or in some other way provide information on the significance of the publication (include this information as attachments).
- For section C.1.b (“Books”): may include book chapters. Please indicate whether refereed. Also, academic books you’ve edited may be listed in this section.
- List of conference abstracts may be included in section C.1.c (“Research monographs, etc”) by listing them under a sub-header.
- “Other publications accepted” (section C.1.d) is to be mainly interpreted as non-journal or non-conference publications accepted. Our recommendation is that accepted refereed journal papers and refereed conference papers be included in section C.1.a.
- Section C.2 (“significant citation”): list only non-self-citations, and the strongest ones. It’s not necessary to list all citations although the number is relevant. The candidate is not required to include the actual paper that cited the candidate’s paper. If in doubt, please consult with the Unit Coordinator.
- Section C.3 (“grant”): include the total award amounts for grants. The candidate is not required to include copies of any proposal. However, the candidate may wish to include as “additional material” external reviews of grant applications, especially ones not funded but highly-rated. You may list in-kind grants, however indicate it. Overall, we like to see the following information:
 - PI/co-PI, Proposal Title, Sponsor, Duration, Amount, (indicate only if it’s in-kind).
 - We suggest that the funded, pending and un-funded ones are grouped separately.
- Section E.3 (“List any other evidence …”): include a personal statement about teaching, scholarship and service, including future plans; usually, not to exceed 3 pages.

The candidate should include copies of publications that the candidate considers the most significant. The guideline is: for promotion and/or tenure of Assistant/Associate professor, three publications be included, while for promotion to full professor, five publications be included.

It may be noted that Part-I of the form requires the candidate to list courses taught in the past three years. It is however recommended that the candidate include course evaluations for the past five years along with the course syllabi for the same period.

Completed Part-I, CV, publication sets, teaching evaluations, teaching portfolio, any related material will be sent to the external evaluators along with a standard letter developed by the Dean’s office. The standard letter should include appropriate questions mentioned in Chancellor’s memorandum #35 (http://www.umkc.edu/provost/policies/promo_tenure/chanmemo35.htm).

¹² The Provost’s office has indicated that this deviation is acceptable in regard to non-academic evaluators.

Promotion of full-time teaching faculty

Promotion decisions for full-time teaching faculty are done within the School. The candidate is required to complete Part-I, and include appropriate documents. The Department Chair completes Part-II. An applicant is reviewed by the same P&T Committee unless a separate one is appointed by the Dean in consultation with the Department Chair. This committee forwards its recommendations to the Dean. The Dean, based on the input from this committee and the Department Chair, makes the final decision about promotion. Note that for the promotion of non-regular faculty, the UMKC level activity/procedure is not required.

Timetable

The promotion and tenure timetable may vary slightly from year to year. Each year, it is announced by the Provost's office, and hence is not included here. Typically, if a candidate is required to submit for tenure and/or promotion (as discussed in Chancellor's memorandum #77, http://www.umkc.edu/provost/policies/promo_tenure/chanmemo77.htm and related UM rules and regulations listed at the beginning of this document), or is informally recommended for promotion and/or tenure, then the determination of the external evaluators' list starts around mid April, and the candidate is required to complete Part-I (and associate material) by early part of summer. The faculty is requested to watch for the Provost's timetable and/or check with Dean's office.