
FACULTY SENATE

SOUTHEAST MISSOURI STATE UNIVERSITY

FACULTY SENATE BILL 26-A-16

Approved by the Faculty Senate
XXXXXX

BRIEF SUMMARY: This bill clarifies the process by which departments evaluate, revise, and approve their tenure and promotion (T&P) criteria, particularly in instances where the departmental T&P committee includes members from outside the discipline. It affirms that discipline specific criteria are developed and approved by faculty holding primary appointments within the department and possessing relevant disciplinary expertise.

In addition, this bill clarifies the approval process for both tenure and promotion criteria and RNTT merit criteria, including how governance functions when those criteria are maintained as separate documents or incorporated within a single combined document. It specifies voting authority, faculty input expectations, and procedural routing to ensure consistency, transparency, and compliance with university policy and procedures.

The purpose of these clarifications are to preserve disciplinary autonomy, ensure appropriate faculty governance, and provide clear procedural guidance during institutional restructuring, while maintaining alignment with established institutional approval processes.

ACTION OF BILL REVISING “Development of Criteria” in Chapter 2- Tenure and Promotion Procedures

WHEREAS: The Faculty Handbook establishes that departments are responsible for developing, maintaining, and recommending revisions to tenure and promotion (T&P) criteria that reflect the unique character and standards of each discipline;

WHEREAS: The Faculty Handbook further specifies that departmental T&P criteria shall be reviewed at least every five years to ensure alignment with current University policy and Faculty Handbook provisions;

WHEREAS: The Handbook provides for the development of Rank-Not-Tenure-Track (RNTT) merit criteria but does not clearly define the process for development, revision, and approval of RNTT merit criteria in relation to T&P criteria, particularly when such criteria are maintained as separate documents or incorporated within a single combined document;

WHEREAS: Current Faculty Handbook language does not clearly define the process to be followed when members of a Departmental Tenure and Promotion Advisory Committee are drawn from outside the

discipline, creating potential ambiguity regarding authority, participation, and voting in the development and revision of discipline-specific criteria;

WHEREAS: Clear procedural guidance is necessary to define faculty input, voting authority, and approval routing for both T&P and RNTT merit criteria to ensure transparency, consistency, and compliance with University policy and procedures;

THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED: That the Faculty Handbook be revised to clarify that discipline-specific tenure and promotion criteria are developed, revised, and approved by faculty holding primary appointments within the department and possessing relevant disciplinary expertise;

BE IT FUTHER RESOLVED:

That when a Departmental Tenure and Promotion Advisory Committee includes faculty whose primary appointment lies outside the department, those faculty members shall be excused from participation in the evaluation, development, revision, and approval recommendation of discipline-specific criteria;

BE IT FUTHER RESOLVED:

That when the number of tenured faculty within the department serving on the committee is limited, the review and development of discipline-specific criteria shall include all tenured faculty members within the department, including the department chairperson and may include tenure-track faculty for purposes of discussion and development, consistent with existing voting requirements;

BE IT FUTHER RESOLVED:

The approval process for both tenure and promotion criteria and RNTT merit criteria is clarified;

BE IT FUTHER RESOLVED:

That when a Departmental Tenure and Promotion Advisory Committee includes faculty whose primary appointment lies outside the department, those faculty members shall be excused from participation in the evaluation, development, revision, and approval recommendation of discipline-specific criteria;

TITLE OF BILL

1 Development of Criteria

2 Each department has the responsibility to develop, maintain, and, when necessary,
3 recommend changes to its tenure and promotion criteria ~~and RNTT merit criteria~~. Nothing in
4 those criteria may contradict other provisions of the Faculty Handbook. For example,
5 ~~departmental~~ criteria shall not require that a faculty member submit student evaluations if other
6 Handbook policy prohibits such a requirement.

7 Departmental criteria will be reviewed ~~by the Departmental Tenure and Promotion Advisory~~
8 ~~Committee~~ every 5 years and brought into compliance with current Faculty Handbook ~~policy and~~
9 ~~procedures~~.

10 Department criteria for tenure and promotion, promotion, and post-professorial merit should
11 be organized by the headings Teaching Effectiveness, Professional Growth, and Service and
12 contain within each heading those activities that the department-considers relevant accompanied
13 by the expectations for achieving promotion. ~~Each department may determine whether RNTT~~
14 ~~merit criteria are maintained as a separate document or incorporated within the same document~~
15 ~~as tenure and promotion criteria. If RNTT merit criteria are incorporated within the same~~
16 ~~document as tenure and promotion criteria, the document shall clearly distinguish the evaluation~~
17 ~~standards applicable to RNTT faculty. RNTT faculty shall not be required to submit evidence in~~
18 ~~the Professional Growth category. For RNTT merit criteria, all full-time faculty members within~~
19 ~~the department, including RNTT faculty, shall have opportunity for meaningful input into the~~
20 ~~development and revision of those criteria.~~

21
22 Once developed or modified, these criteria are subject to the approval of the College Tenure and
23 Promotion Advisory Committee, college dean, University Tenure and Promotion and Sabbatical
24 Leave Advisory Committee, and the Provost. ~~RNTT merit criteria, whether separate or~~
25 ~~incorporated within a combined document, shall follow the same institutional approval routing~~
26 ~~process.~~

27
28 Once approved, and until revised by the department, these criteria shall serve as the sole basis
29 upon which faculty members are evaluated for tenure and promotion. No committee or
30 individual evaluating a dossier may impose criteria upon a faculty member in excess of those
31 itemized in the departmental criteria. New sets of criteria or revisions to existing criteria shall be
32 approved through the process described below. Until such time as new or revised criteria are
33 approved, existing criteria remain in force.

34 1. The Departmental Tenure and Promotion Advisory Committee ~~develops draft criteria,~~
35 ~~which are then approved by a majority vote of the tenured and tenure-track faculty of the~~
36 ~~department.~~ shall be responsible for the ongoing review, development, and updating of
37 the department criteria. When the Department Tenure and Promotion Committee includes
38 members, whose primary appointment lies outside the discipline or department, those
39 members shall be excused from participation in the development, revision, and approval
40 of discipline-specific criteria. Authority for such criteria rests solely with faculty holding
41 primary appointments within the discipline and possessing relevant disciplinary
42 expertise. Where the committee includes a limited number of tenured faculty from within
43 the discipline, all tenured faculty members of the department, may participate in the
44 review and development process. Tenure-track faculty may be included in discussion and
45 development.

46 2. For tenure and promotion criteria, approval requires a majority vote of the tenure and
47 tenure-track faculty of the department. If RNTT merit criteria are incorporated within a
48 combined tenure and promotion document, voting on the tenure and promotion sections
49 shall remain limited to tenure and tenure-track faculty. Approval of RNTT merit
50 requirements requires a majority vote of all full-time faculty in the department. The
51 Chairperson for Department Tenure and Promotion will submit the approved criteria for
52 academic review. The approved departmental criteria will be routed sequentially to the

53 College Tenure and Promotion Advisory Committee, the Dean, the University Tenure
54 and Promotion and Sabbatical Leave Advisory Committee, and finally to the Provost for
55 review and approval.

56 ~~2. The criteria are transmitted to the dean for the dean to share with the College Tenure
57 and Promotion Advisory Committee. If both the dean and the college committee approve
58 the recommended departmental criteria, the criteria will be sent to the chairperson of the
59 University Tenure and Promotion and Sabbatical Leave Advisory Committee.~~

60 ~~3. If the recommendations of the College Tenure and Promotion Advisory Committee or
61 the dean differ from those of the department, the dean or college committee chairperson
62 will submit the suggested changes, along with supporting rationale, to the department
63 chairperson within 45 calendar days of receipt of the criteria during the academic year (or
64 within a mutually agreed upon time period during the summer). If this deadline is not
65 met, the department chairperson will contact the Provost for resolution. Following
66 deliberations in the department, the recommended departmental criteria will again be
67 submitted to the dean and college committee for review. If differences persist with either
68 the college committee or the dean, the recommendations of the department, college
69 committee, and the dean shall be submitted within 30 calendar days of receipt of the
70 criteria during the academic year (or within a mutually agreed upon time period during
71 the summer) to the chairperson of the University Tenure and Promotion and Sabbatical
72 Leave Advisory Committee. If this deadline is not met, the department chairperson will
73 contact the Provost for resolution. The University Tenure and Promotion and Sabbatical
74 Leave Advisory Committee shall either endorse the criteria or return them to the
75 department with suggested changes, along with supporting rationale (with a copy sent to
76 the dean), to repeat steps 1 through 3. If either the College T&P Committee or the Dean
77 does not approve the criteria, the document will be returned to the department with
78 written feedback and suggested revisions within forty-five (45) calendar days of receipt
79 during the academic year (or within a mutually agreed upon period during the summer).
80 The Department T&P Committee shall review the suggested revisions, deliberate, and if
81 necessary, modify the criteria. The approved revised document shall then be resubmitted
82 for review. If, after resubmission, differences persist with either the College Committee
83 or the Dean, the recommendations of the Department, College Committee, and Dean
84 shall be forwarded concurrently to the University Tenure and Promotion and Sabbatical
85 Leave Advisory Committee within thirty (30) calendar days of receipt during the
86 academic year (or within a mutually agreed upon period during the summer). The
87 University Committee shall review the recommendations and either: endorse the criteria
88 and forward to the Provost for final approval or return the criteria to the Department T&P
89 Committee with suggested revisions for further review with written feedback and
90 supporting rationale. The department shall then review the feedback, make necessary
91 revisions and submit the updated criteria.~~

92 ~~4. If the criteria are approved by the University Tenure and Promotion and Sabbatical
93 Leave Advisory Committee, they shall be transmitted to the Provost for final approval.
94 The Provost will review the final submission and either approve the criteria or return the
95 criteria to the University T&P Committee for clarification. If the Provost does not~~

96 approve the criteria, the Provost shall meet with the University T&P Committee to
97 discuss revisions. If no resolution is reached, the criteria shall be returned to the
98 department with recommendations for further modification.
99 ~~5. If the Provost approves the criteria, the Provost shall so inform the department, dean,~~
100 ~~and members of the University committee. If the Provost does not approve the criteria,~~
101 ~~the Provost shall meet with the University Tenure and Promotion and Sabbatical Leave~~
102 ~~Advisory Committee to resolve the disagreement. If the disagreement cannot be resolved,~~
103 ~~the University Tenure and Promotion and Sabbatical Leave Advisory Committee shall~~
104 ~~return the criteria, along with any suggested changes and supporting rationale, to the~~
105 ~~department for its consideration. Upon final approval, the Provost shall inform the~~
106 Department and Dean that the criteria are approved and effective.

107 For a period of three years following the final approval of a revision of departmental criteria,
108 a faculty member applying for tenure and promotion, promotion, or post-professorial merit may
109 elect to be evaluated by the previous criteria instead of the new ones.
110
111

<u>Action</u>	<u>Date</u>
Introduced to Senate	3-25-26
Second Senate Meeting	
Faculty Senate Vote	
President's Review	
15 Day Review	
Posted to Faculty Handbook	