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1. Non-Regular Faculty Titles and Positions

Non-regular full-time, ranked faculty position titles have the opening designation of (1) visiting or (2) one of the following: Teaching, Research, Clinical/Professional Practice, or Extension, combined with the rank designation of assistant professor, associate professor, or professor. General descriptions of faculty positions within each area are described below.

Visiting Faculty: A visiting faculty member may be appointed for two primary reasons: (1) to fill a specific and time-limited gap in coverage of department duties (e.g., to cover the normal teaching duties of a faculty member on leave), or (2) to take advantage of the availability of a colleague from another institution (e.g., a faculty member who is on sabbatical from his or her home institution). Job duties associated with a visiting line may be quite varied depending on the specific case. The major emphasis of this designation is the time-limited nature; the duties associated with the position are intended to be quite brief (e.g., a semester or an academic year) and should not last for more than 1-2 years, and in no case longer than 5 years. Visiting faculty can be appointed at any rank commensurate with their experience and, where applicable, with their rank at their home institution.

Teaching, Research, Clinical/Professional Practice, and Extension Faculty: The Department does not anticipate hiring in the final three categories, and therefore this document discusses only teaching faculty. Teaching faculty members have departmental undergraduate teaching as their primary responsibility. Duties include classroom teaching of undergraduate courses, undergraduate student advisement. Research activities will form no basis of evaluation for raises and promotions. Teaching faculty can be appointed at any rank commensurate with their experience in like positions elsewhere.

Departmental Restrictions: In order to preserve the integrity of the Department’s programs, and maintain the high level of face-to-face contact between faculty with national and international reputations and students, the Department restricts the number of non-regular faculty appointments. The FTE of teaching faculty appointments as a whole in the Department as a rule should not exceed
10% FTE of the regular faculty as a whole, and the FTE of non-regular faculty in total as a rule should not exceed 20% FTE. Only in extraordinary circumstances should exceptions be made.

2. Criteria for Appointing Non-Regular Faculty

2.1 Criteria for Appointing Visiting Faculty

Candidates for visiting lines should hold an earned doctoral degree in philosophy or a related field relevant to the specific focus targeted by the visiting line. The candidate should have demonstrated abilities in the area targeted by the visiting line (e.g., teaching or research in a particular subject area). The candidate’s qualifications should be documented in his or her resume, curriculum vita, portfolio/dossier, reference letters, and/or interviews. The candidate should have potential to contribute to the mission of the Department of Philosophy and to make significant contributions to the profession in the area of his or her expertise.

Note: Visiting faculty who do not have an earned doctoral degree in philosophy or a relevant related field are not covered by this document. They may, however, be hired as visiting instructors. Visiting faculty may also be hired on a part-time basis, but such appointments are not covered by this document.

*Visiting assistant professor* candidates should have:
- evidence of basic competence in the area targeted by the visiting line.
- potential for growth and excellence in that area.

*Visiting associate professor* candidates should in addition show:
- evidence of developing excellence in the area targeted by the visiting line.
- potential to make continuing contributions to the field.

(Candidates visiting from their home institution with the rank of associate professor should normally be appointed at this level.)

*Visiting professor* candidates should in addition show:
- evidence of sustained excellence in the area targeted by the visiting line.

(Candidates visiting from their home institutions with the rank of professor should normally be appointed at this level.)

2.2 Criteria for Appointing Teaching Faculty

Candidates for teaching faculty lines should hold an earned doctoral degree in philosophy. The candidate should have demonstrated the ability to teach effectively at the undergraduate level. The candidate should recognize the importance of being available to students outside of class time. The candidate should have experience in areas of student contact outside of the traditional classroom setting including academic advising, supervision of undergraduate research, and mentoring. At more senior ranks, the candidate should show evidence of distinctive contributions to the profession – at the local (i.e., department, campus, and community) level for associate professor and at the national or international level for professor. Such contributions may include service on department or national committees relevant to the profession of teaching (e.g., APA teaching committees), dissemination of scholarly work relevant to teaching (e.g., presentation at teaching conferences, development and dissemination of teaching materials), etc. The candidate’s qualifications should be documented in his or her curriculum vita, portfolio/dossier, reference letters, and/or interviews.
**Teaching Assistant Professor** candidates should have:
· demonstrated competence in all aspects of classroom teaching, advising, the ability to establish positive relationships with students, and making effective use of teaching evaluation data,
· potential to collaborate with the Department’s Director of Undergraduate Studies,
· demonstrated interest in teaching improvement activities.

**Teaching Associate Professor** candidates should in addition show, as appropriate to the case,
· excellence in all aspects of classroom teaching, advising, the ability to establish positive relationships with students, and making effective use of teaching evaluation data,
· a record of successful collaboration with the Department’s Director of Undergraduate Studies,
· evidence of distinctive professional contributions to the profession of teaching at the department, campus, and community levels (e.g., a record of presentations, guest lectures, etc. that demonstrate excellence in serving as a Department and campus resource on issues of teaching),
· participation in teaching improvement activities.

**Teaching Professor** candidates should in addition show, as appropriate to the case,
· evidence of sustained excellence in all aspects of classroom teaching with a wide range of course structures (large enrollment, writing intensive, etc.), supervision of undergraduate research, advising, establishing positive relationships with students, and making effective use of teaching evaluation data,
· ability to supervise graduate students in a teaching practicum,
· a record of excellence in collaboration with the Department’s professional advisors,
· evidence of competence in working collaboratively with professional colleagues in the community as well as on campus,
· demonstrated appropriate changes from participation in teaching improvement activities,
· evidence of distinctive professional contributions to the profession of teaching at the national or international level (e.g., a record of presentations, guest lectures, service on national committees, etc. that demonstrate excellence in serving as a national resource on issues of teaching)

3. Procedures for Initial Appointment and Evaluations in Rank

The process of procuring and filling a non-regular faculty line can be initiated from within the department or from without. If the process is initiated from without, that is, by a request from an office or unit in the University such as the Dean’s or Provost’s Office, the chair will ask for a formal letter of request from that office to be shared with the Department. The letter should state the nature of the position that is being requested, explain how the Department will further the mission of the University by making the appointment, what funding there will be for the position, including E & E support and office space. The Department will then meet in order to evaluate whether to approve the request and accept the line after receiving the candidate’s dossier.

**Initial Appointment**

Initial appointment contracts are written and negotiated by the department chair. Initial appointment letters should clearly specify whether the appointment is a visiting or teaching appointment, the primary area of appointment, and the length of initial appointment. For visiting lines, appointment length will typically be 1-2 years. Teaching appointments originating without the Department will normally be made for 1 year. Teaching appointments originating within the Department may be made for 1-3 years.

For a visiting appointment, the teaching load and weights of teaching, research and service should be negotiated by the department chair, and be determined by Departmental need and the strengths of the
For a teaching appointment, the initial appointment will be 80% teaching and 20% service. Currently, tenured and tenure-track faculty who are at 40% teaching teach 2 courses per semester. Accordingly, the teaching load for 80% teaching will normally be 4 courses per semester with no more than 3 preparations. If the teaching faculty member takes on substantial departmental service duties, such as duties associated with the Director of Undergraduate Studies, the percentages devoted to these areas can be adjusted, and the load can be reduced normally by one course, 3 courses in the Fall semester with no more than 2 preparations and 4 courses in the Spring with no more than 3 preparations.

Because teaching faculty do not have research activities as a part of their duties, they will not normally be assigned courses that serve the graduate program, that is, those numbered 7000 and above.

Evaluations
All non-regular faculty members should be evaluated each year, regardless of rank or promotion evaluation. Annual evaluation provides a good opportunity for the faculty member to meet with the department chair to discuss job duties and performance, areas for potential growth, future directions for the position, and so on. The evaluation should include a meeting between faculty member and chair to discuss these issues. Documentation, in a form that can range from a brief summary of the faculty member’s duties and accomplishments for the year to an Annual Report similar to that prepared by tenure-track faculty, is a useful accompaniment to this meeting. After the meeting, the chair will write a letter to the faculty member summarizing the faculty member’s accomplishments for the year and the results of the evaluation meeting. Information from evaluations in rank will be used to help guide any decisions regarding annual raises, to help determine whether and when the faculty member seeks promotion, and to incorporate into the promotion dossier.

Annual Raises
The Chair in consultation with the Raise Recommendation Advisory Committee will base raises for Resident Instructor positions on the annual evaluation of teaching and service, and for visiting positions, on the annual evaluation of research, teaching and service.

4. Criteria for Promotion and Termination of Non-Regular Faculty

This section describes considerations in promotion of teaching appointments to associate professor and professor levels and termination of non-regular faculty. Because of the time-limited nature of visiting appointments, visiting faculty are not eligible for promotion.

For teaching faculty, the promotion process is voluntary and not required for reappointment. Faculty members who believe that their accomplishments merit consideration for promotion may seek a promotion review. There is no set time (years in rank) at which promotion review must occur, nor is there a limit on the number of times a teaching faculty member can seek promotion review. However, faculty members seeking promotion review are encouraged to work closely with the department chair to assess the likelihood that their accomplishments will be considered sufficient for promotion, and it is expected that only those individuals with a reasonable chance for promotion will pursue the review. The faculty member’s annual and pre-promotion reviews will be useful in determining readiness for promotion.

Successful or unsuccessful promotion reviews of teaching faculty members are not associated with any automatic reward (other than change in title) or penalty from the department or university.
Evaluation of the teaching faculty member’s promotion application focuses on the faculty member’s primary area of appointment, with additional evaluation of any secondary duties as outlined in the appointment letters. Professional accomplishments, as outlined in Section II above, should be documented through the promotion candidate’s promotion portfolio or dossier (see Section V). Promotion candidates are expected to demonstrate excellence, at levels described in Section II, in their professional accomplishments and activities. Excellence will be defined by department faculty members within the promotion candidate’s area of focus, and based on established academic standards for each position and specific area of focus. In addition, the promotion candidate’s record of service to department and campus, while not sufficient for promotion, will be considered in the promotion review. In all promotion decisions, total contributions of the faculty member to the department and evidence of sustained activity and accomplishments described for the relevant academic rank will be considered.

Termination and Renewal of Contracts
Non-regular faculty members have the same academic protections regarding academic freedom as tenured and tenure track faculty. They enjoy the same level of academic freedom and free speech, both at the department and campus levels. Thus, adequate cause for dismissal during the contract period must be related directly and substantially to the faculty member’s fitness or performance in the professional capacity in teaching and service. (For details, see CR&R 310.020). Non-regular faculty members have the same rights of appeal that regular faculty members do, both at the departmental and campus level.

Teaching appointments do not carry any commitment by the department or university for renewal. Contract renewals are negotiated and written by the department chair, in consultation with the Department and relevant College and University administrators.

Nonregular faculty whose appointments end in August and who wish to be considered for renewal must submit a formal request for renewal to the department chair by April first of that year. (The request must be submitted at a comparable time for appointments that end at other points in the academic year.) The request should include a cover letter stating the request for reappointment and materials documenting the faculty member’s accomplishments in teaching and service, e.g., the results of teaching evaluations, letters of support from other faculty). If part of the basis for reappointment is that it will further the mission of the University, for instance, by helping with the recruitment and retention of other faculty outside the department, the department chair will request from the appropriate college or campus administrator a formal letter supporting renewal of the appointment and explaining how the Department will be furthering the mission of the University by doing so. If the appropriate administrators do not state in the letter that the mission of the University beyond the department will be significantly furthered by the non-regular faculty member’s reappointment in the Department, then the chair will have the option of not renewing the appointment. No nonregular faculty appointment shall be renewed unless, in addition to such considerations as performance and funding, the renewal serves the interests of the University or the department.

Upon receipt of a request for reappointment and the supporting documentation, the department chair shall present the question of reappointment to the department personnel committee (in this case, the regular faculty of the department) for its consideration and recommendation. The chair shall forward the committee’s recommendation, along with his or her own, to the Dean.

Standards and expectations for all Non-Regular Faculty may change as Departmental Policies regarding these appointments change over time. There is no presumption that the set of expectations included in any contract will carry over into subsequent contracts.
5. The Promotion Process & Timeline

The procedure for promotion begins with the assignment of responsibility at the time of the initial appointment. Faculty members should begin building a portfolio and/or dossier from the start of employment. It is critical that candidates maintain a record of all official letters, annual reviews, and other documents relevant to their position and responsibilities.

5.1 Change to Regular Tracks
Non-regular faculty may be hired into tenure track lines normally only if they are judged by the Department to be best qualified for the position. There will be no presumption in favor of or against non-regular faculty in any search for a tenure track position.

5.2 Pre-Promotion Review
A pre-promotion review is available to all teaching faculty members seeking promotion to either Associate Professor or Professor status. This review is recommended, though not required, for teaching appointees seeking promotion to the level of Associate Professor or for candidates for the position of Professor. It is an especially useful mechanism for candidates seeking promotion from the Assistant to Associate level. There is no required timing for the pre-promotion review; it is suggested that such reviews are most useful one to three years prior to the intended year of promotion application.

The review is intended to serve as an indicator of a candidate’s progress toward promotion and to identify potential areas for additional attention on the part of the applicant. A successful pre-promotion review does not guarantee approval in a formal promotion review. An applicant’s portfolio or dossier for pre-promotion review will be prepared using the same guidelines as those for promotion, except that no special outside evaluations or reviews should be initiated solely for the purpose of a pre-promotion review.

The pre-promotion review process consists of:

**Feb 1.** Any teaching faculty member who wishes to complete a pre-promotion review submits a portfolio/dossier to the Chair. The Chair appoints a pre-promotion review committee to evaluate the candidate's progress toward reaching the intended promotion level.

**April 1.** The pre-promotion review committee reviews the portfolio/dossier and writes a letter to the department personnel committee summarizing the candidate’s qualifications for promotion.

**May 1.** The department personnel committee reviews the portfolio/dossier and the pre-promotion review committee’s summary, and evaluates the candidate’s potential for obtaining promotion.

**June 1.** The Chair reviews pre-promotion portfolio/dossier, the review committee’s summary, and the personnel committee’s evaluation, and writes a letter to the candidate on the outcome of the pre-promotion review. Pre-promotion review letters are intended as diagnostic feedback to the teaching faculty and do not automatically become part of the faculty member’s dossier.

5.3 Promotion

5.3.1 Promotion Timeline

The promotion review process begins in the spring when a candidate requests consideration for promotion. Reviews occur at the department, the Dean’s office, and Provost’s office. Candidates shall be kept informed of the status of their candidacy during each step of the promotion process. In cases of a negative recommendation, the candidate has the right to a hearing before the body/authority that made the negative judgment. In cases of a continued negative judgment, the candidate has the right to appeal to the next higher authority or body in the promotion process.
Below is the timeline for each stage of the promotion review process. Note that the department’s portion of the timeline is the same as for department review of tenure-track faculty (i.e., April to October). However, once forwarded to the Dean’s office, the review will follow the campus timeline for non-regular reviews (i.e., review at Dean’s office in March, and submission to Provost’s office in April).

**April 1.** Candidates who wish to be reviewed for promotion during the next academic year submit a formal request to the Department’s personnel committee. This request should be based on conversations with the chair that indicate a reasonable chance of promotion. The candidate should submit a cover letter stating the request consideration for promotion to the next academic rank, along with supporting documents (e.g., annual evaluations, pre-promotion review; support letters from faculty and/or chair). At this time, the Chair also submits the names of a proposed promotion committee for the candidate. At its spring meetings (usually in April), the personnel committee reviews the candidate’s request and supporting materials and votes on formation of a promotion committee. If the vote is positive, the personnel committee then votes on the composition of the committee, using the slate recommended by the Chair or alternatives generated by the personnel committee.

**May 1.** The Department Chair submits names of teaching faculty to be considered for promotion to the Dean. The Department Chair also requests letters from peer reviewers (see section below for details on appropriate peer reviewers for teaching tracks). The candidate and his/her promotion committee begin working on the promotion portfolio/dossier.

**Sept 15.** The portfolio/dossier is completed and forwarded to Chair for distribution to the personnel committee.

**Sept.** During its fall meetings (usually in September), the Department’s personnel committee evaluates the portfolio/dossier and votes on the candidate’s case. The Chair writes a letter that summarizes items required by the guidelines and provides a recommendation concerning promotion. The letter will become part of the promotion file. The Chair informs the candidate of the recommendation in writing.

**Jan. 31** The complete dossier/portfolio and recommendations from the Chair are sent to the Dean’s Office. The Dean’s office reviews the promotion files and makes a decision communicated in a letter to the candidate and department.

**Feb. 15** The complete dossier/portfolio and recommendations from the Chair and the Dean are sent to the Provost’s Office. The Provost reviews the promotion files and makes a decision communicated in a letter to the candidate and department. The review process for promotion of teaching faculty appointments ends with the Provost’s review.

**September 1.** New appointments become effective.

5.3.2 Peer and External Reviews for Promotion

Peer and external evaluations of the candidate’s performance are essential components of the promotion process and a critical part of the dossier/portfolio.

**Teaching appointments.** It is imperative to document teaching performance and to provide evaluations (self, student, and peer) of teaching effectiveness. Other evidence might include awards, exceptional recognition from students, surveys or interviews with students and alumni of the
candidate’s classes, and evidence of students’ success.

For promotion considerations, the portfolios of applicants for the title of Teaching Associate Professor must include formal peer evaluations conducted by qualified individuals from the candidate’s department. Applicants for the title of Teaching Professor must include peer evaluations by qualified individuals external to the candidate’s department. Because effective peer evaluations require a long period of time for planning, implementation, and completion, it is suggested that the candidate initiate this process at least one year before the planned date for submitting the promotion application. At least four peer evaluations must be included in the promotion materials.

The goal of peer evaluations is to obtain qualified and comprehensive evaluations of the candidate’s teaching. Internal peer evaluations should, at a minimum, include visits to the candidate's classroom or place of instruction and assessment of teaching strategies, materials, and performance. It is often very useful to have visits by at least two faculty observers over several courses or presentations. External peer evaluations should represent an independent and objective assessment of the candidate’s accomplishments relative to instruction promotion criteria. Evaluations should be solicited from individuals who can assess the candidate's completed and active courses, materials, strategies, and related activities in an impartial, informed, and objective way. Evaluators should not represent any "conflict of interest" (e.g., former advisor, close friend) with the candidate. Please be careful that letters soliciting external evaluation be impartial in their requests and ask for an in-depth analysis of the candidate's performance. The qualifications of the teaching evaluators should be provided in the portfolio so that committees considering the candidate will have a basis from which to judge statements made in the evaluation.

5.3.3 The Promotion Portfolio

Those seeking promotion should prepare a dossier similar to the ones used for promotion requests for tenure track faculty. The portfolio/dossier should comprehensively review the candidate’s activities and accomplishments. It should contain evaluations of an individual’s performance in the appropriate area of emphasis as well as professional and service activities relevant to the individual’s assignment. The following information is expected in the dossier to provide adequate information to make a decision on promotion.

- Recommendation Signature Page, which includes a record of formal votes
- History and Recommendation Summary Form
- Dean’s summary letter and recommendation
- Chair’s summary letter and recommendation
- Department comments, summary of procedures used in review and appeals, and information on all formal votes
- Complete resume
- Letter of appointment
- Clear summary of accomplishments in area of appointment, evidence of excellence and potential for continued growth.
- Internal and external peer evaluations (maximum of 4)
- Copy of Departmental guidelines for non-regular faculty (criteria for each level/rank should be outlined).

Assembling the portfolio
The portfolio/dossier is assembled by the candidate with the advice of the Department Chair. In most cases teaching faculty will focus on compilation of a promotion portfolio. Candidates should develop
their teaching portfolios in consultation with the chair and other knowledgeable individuals. It is recommended that prospective candidates for appointment begin thinking about their portfolios as soon as they begin their positions at MU and that they accumulate portfolio materials over time. The components of individual portfolios will vary between individuals and appointments. Suggested guidelines are available from the MU Program for Excellence in teaching. Most portfolios typically contain variants of the sections listed below (with representative types of materials for each section):

1. Teaching/Instruction Responsibilities (including instruction activities, courses and titles, frequency of instruction, enrollment statistics, information about students, newly-designed instructions).

2. Teaching/Instruction Philosophy and Goals (including statements on learning and teaching).

3. Representative Instructional Materials (including syllabi, program outlines, curriculum, handouts, assignments, delivery methodologies, problem sets, study guides, written plans, visual aids, descriptions of non-print materials).

4. Evaluations of Teaching/Instruction (including summaries of standardized student or participant evaluations, unsolicited letters of evaluation, observation reports, peer evaluations).

5. Teaching/Instruction Scholarship (including materials development, improved instructional techniques, state-of-the-art delivery systems, applied research demonstrations, workbooks and guides, reports and publications on teaching/instruction/applied research/demonstrations).

6. Awards and Honors (including explanations of honors and awards, factors contributing to the candidate’s selection for the recognition, the sources of recognition, and the nature of competition for the recognition).

7. Advising, Service, and Professional Activities (supervising and advising, cooperative work with student groups and organizations, participation in associations, editorial or other responsibilities, organization of professional activities).

8. Improvement Activities Undertaken (including participation in workshops and meetings on instructional improvement, grants and support for delivery and instructional improvement).
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