

**REVIEW OF FACULTY PERFORMANCE
AND
GUIDELINES FOR PROMOTION AND TENURE RECOMMENDATIONS
(Revised and approved, 5/12/2015)**

Faculty members in the Department of Biomedical Sciences at the University of Missouri - Columbia (MU) are dedicated to achieving excellence in teaching, research/scholarly activity, and professional service to the university and their discipline. Tenure and promotion are awarded based upon significant contributions in all of these areas. Annual salary considerations are based on those same criteria. Continued contributions in all three areas are expected of all tenured faculty members.

The University of Missouri and the College of Veterinary Medicine have established minimum standards and procedures for the annual review of faculty performance and recommendations concerning promotion and/or tenure. The University of Missouri standards and procedures are defined in the UM System Collected Rules and Regulations (CRR):

http://www.umsystem.edu/ums/rules/collected_rules/faculty/ch320/320.035_policy_and_procedures_for_promotion_and_tenure; and on the website for the Office of the Provost: <http://provost.missouri.edu/faculty/tenure.html>. The College of Veterinary Medicine website contains current copies of both College and Departmental Guidelines and approximate timelines related to preparation and review of mid-tenure and promotion and tenure dossiers:

http://cvm.missouri.edu/cvm_pol_proc_guide.htm

Helpful tips on prior planning and preparation of promotion dossiers can be found on the Provost's website: <http://provost.missouri.edu/promotion-and-tenure/dossiers/tips.php>

These guidelines are considered to be an integral part of the Department of Biomedical Sciences policies and procedures described below. The Department of Biomedical Sciences guidelines amplify college, campus (Office of the Provost) and university policies. Voting during meetings requires a quorum (one half of the appropriate faculty group) and a majority vote (over half) is required to pass a motion. If not outlined in this document, meeting procedures will defer to Robert's Rules of Order.

SECTION I – DEPARTMENT OF BIOMEDICAL SCIENCES FACULTY MEMBERS

A. Duties and Responsibilities

1. It is the annual responsibility of every Department of Biomedical Sciences faculty member to provide *all* the materials necessary for a fair, impartial and complete review of that faculty member's

performance in research, teaching and service in the past year. This includes a current curriculum vitae (CV), a completed Annual Report according to department and College specifications and evaluations of teaching. Faculty members may at their option provide a description of their plans for the coming year.

2. It is the responsibility of any Department of Biomedical Sciences faculty member being considered for promotion and/or tenure to provide *all* the materials necessary for that evaluation as specified by the current Office of the Provost website and Call Letter in compliance with University of Missouri (UM), College of Veterinary Medicine, and Department of Biomedical Sciences published Guidelines. Prior to assembling a dossier, a faculty member wishing to be considered for promotion will provide the Department Chair with a complete CV (see example in Appendix 1), which includes detailed information regarding professional background, previous academic and professional experience, teaching and student/postdoctoral advising activities, scholarly contributions to the discipline and service to the scientific and local community and the discipline. This complete CV will be reviewed by the Department Chair. At his/her discretion, the Chair or the candidate may seek advice from the P&T Advisory Committee (see below). If the decision of the Chair and/or the P&T Advisory committee is to move forward, a complete updated CV provided by the candidate will be sent to external evaluators at the appropriate time. The faculty member may provide other professional materials that he/she considers relevant to the promotion and/or tenure decision.
 3. In cases of recommendations for promotion and/or tenure, at least one week prior to the vote, the appropriate tenured Department of Biomedical Sciences faculty members will be provided access to the complete dossier on each Department of Biomedical Sciences faculty member under consideration. It is the responsibility of each of those tenured faculty members to: (1) familiarize themselves with the dossier prior to the meeting of appropriate tenured faculty at which the Department P&T Advisory Committee formally presents the dossier for discussion; (2) solicit whatever information from within and outside the University deemed appropriate to aid an informed evaluation; (3) attend said faculty meeting; (4) vote on each recommendation by secret ballot.
- B. Criteria for voting faculty during consideration of promotion to Associate Professor and Professor on the tenure track.

In cases involving tenure and promotion to Associate Professor, the "appropriate faculty" includes all tenured regular faculty members holding the rank of Associate Professor or Professor in the Department of

Biomedical Sciences. In cases involving promotion to Professor, the "appropriate faculty" includes all tenured regular faculty members holding the rank of Professor in the Department of Biomedical Sciences. These faculty groups are defined as the Department P&T Committee.

SECTION II – DEPARTMENTAL PROMOTION & TENURE ADVISORY COMMITTEE

A. Composition

The Promotion & Tenure (P&T) Advisory Committee shall consist of four tenured regular faculty members in the Department of Biomedical Sciences. At least two members will hold the rank of Professor. Terms of service will be three years, with the exception of a possible one year extension to provide continuity on the committee should more than one member be completing his/her term in a given year. New members of the Committee will be elected in January and service on the committee begins immediately following election. Each year the P&T Advisory Committee will elect a full Professor on the Advisory Committee to serve as its Chair. No Department of Biomedical Sciences faculty member may serve more than two consecutive terms on the P&T Advisory Committee.

B. Duties and Responsibilities

1. The P&T Advisory Committee will coordinate with the Department Chair regarding timely preparation and review of the dossier for mid-term evaluation of Assistant Professors and faculty being considered for promotion and/or tenure.
 - a.) At the Department Chair's request, the P&T Advisory Committee will recommend potential external evaluators for a faculty member being considered for promotion and/or tenure.
 - b.) The P&T Advisory Committee shall review the dossier prepared by the faculty member under consideration for completeness and will communicate their assessment and any recommendations for revisions to the candidate and the Department Chair.
 - c.) Members of the P&T Advisory committee will present the dossier for discussion by the appropriate tenured faculty group (Department P&T Committee). The Chair of the P&T Advisory Committee will poll the P&T Committee by secret ballot and report the result of that ballot to the Committee.
 - d.) A draft letter explaining the evaluation of the faculty member under consideration, including the result of the secret ballot, will be written by

members of the Department P&T Advisory Committee. Members of the Department P&T committee who attended the meeting will have the opportunity to review, suggest revisions, and approve the final letter for inclusion in the dossier.

e.) The Department of Biomedical Sciences P&T evaluation letter is considered confidential to the extent such protection is afforded by University policies and state, local and federal laws for the following reasons (see UM Collected Rules & Regulations 320.035): (1) The Department P&T committee review is usually the most detailed level of review and the committee is expected to solicit whatever information deemed appropriate from within and outside the University, including documentation of impact on the discipline; (2) outside evaluators are informed that their letters to be included in the dossier are considered confidential to the extent allowed by University policies and state, local and federal laws; (3) the Department P&T letter must comment on any differences of opinion among external reviewers or among the members of the Department P&T committee with external evaluators; (4) the Department letter must include recommendations with a rationale, which could reveal the identity of external evaluators if shared directly with the candidate.

f.) The Chair of the P&T Advisory Committee will provide the candidate with a separate correspondence to inform the candidate of the status of the application, provide a brief summary of the P&T committee's evaluation, and outline major concerns (if any).

g.) In the case of discussion of a recommendation of promotion to Professor, only P&T Advisory Committee members holding that rank will take part in the discussion and only Professors in the department will vote on the recommendation.

SECTION III – DEPARTMENT CHAIR

A. Duties and Responsibilities

1. The Department Chair shall conduct an annual evaluation of the performance of each faculty member in the Department of Biomedical Sciences in the areas of research, teaching and service. The Chair's evaluation shall be used to aid improvement of the performance of the faculty member and for determination of the faculty member's salary for the next year.
2. The Department Chair shall: Ensure timely election of members of the P&T Advisory Committee; inform P&T candidates and members of the

appropriate departmental committees of important deadlines related to the process for mid-term and P&T review; and send written requests for external evaluator letters according to the guidelines outlined on the Office of the Provost website.

3. The Department Chair shall ensure that the candidate has access to information required in the dossier (e.g. departmental average teaching evaluation scores) and that the candidate is aware of his/her responsibilities regarding deadlines and content of the dossier.
4. In cases of mid-term evaluations or decisions on promotion and/or tenure, it is the responsibility of the Department Chair to request review by the P&T Advisory Committee and to assure that all appropriate faculty members have access to the complete dossier of each faculty member under consideration for at least one week prior to the scheduled meeting of the full P&T Committee and vote.
5. The Department Chair shall provide for the Dean a separate and independent written evaluation of the candidate and a separate recommendation in favor of, or opposed to, promotion and/or tenure. The Department Chair shall transmit to the Dean: (1) the letter of evaluation and the vote of the appropriate faculty body (Department P&T Committee), and (2) the Department Chair's independent evaluation and recommendation. For reasons outlined in Section II B.1, both the Department P&T Committee letter and the letter from the Department Chair are considered confidential. The candidate will be notified in separate correspondence from the Department Chair regarding his/her recommendation and a summary of major concerns (if any).

SECTION IV - GUIDELINES FOR REVIEW AND EVALUATION OF FACULTY PRODUCTIVITY

A. Annual Performance Evaluation

Department of Biomedical Sciences regular faculty members will be evaluated annually in three areas: (1) teaching, (2) research, and (3) service. While the first two areas are clearly most important, and thus will be weighed more heavily, the third area is an important complement to the first two. Department of Biomedical Sciences faculty members are expected to engage in teaching, research and service in a percentage of their total effort as described by their official contract or subsequent documented written revisions of percentage time allotments as approved by the Chair. Performance evaluation will be commensurate with percentage effort assignment.

In the evaluation of individual faculty members, the Department Chair will consider the diverse mission of the Department of Biomedical Sciences, understanding that different fields of biomedical sciences have different standards, expectations, and practices with respect to publication, presentation at national meetings, and availability of research grants. The Department Chair will consider the productivity of each faculty member in the current year and his/her record in the most recent three year period, thus diminishing the effect of year-to-year variability in teaching, advising, service, the communication of scholarly activity in publication, and the support of scholarly activity through grant preparation and award.

The following measures of performance in the Department of Biomedical Sciences serve as general guidelines within the constraints described above. The Department Chair will exercise judgment in applying these standards to individual faculty members.

1. **Teaching:** The Department of Biomedical Sciences has responsibilities in the veterinary professional curriculum, and in graduate and undergraduate education in Biomedical Sciences at MU and thus must provide a broad spectrum of formal instruction. It is equally important that faculty provide a stimulating learning environment outside the classroom, including time intensive one-on-one "state of the art" instruction with professional, graduate and undergraduate students in the research laboratory environment.

Department of Biomedical Sciences faculty members are expected to teach in courses in the professional and graduate curriculum and also contribute to informal instruction and advising. The evaluation of teaching contributions and performance will take into consideration all of a faculty member's teaching, not only in formal courses but also teaching activities that require extra time commitments such as undergraduate and graduate research mentorship, participation in courses with laboratory sections, journal clubs, and advising student professional organizations. Faculty members may also contribute to the teaching mission by designing courses and curricula and developing textbooks and innovative instructional materials.

Multiple evaluation methods and multiple sources of information for the evaluation of teaching quality will be considered. Methods of formal classroom assessment include student evaluation of teaching performance, classroom visitation and written evaluation by peers and/or instructional consultants, and peer evaluation of course content and teaching effectiveness through teaching portfolios that include a self-assessment component. The Department of Biomedical Sciences requires the use of student evaluation of teaching performance in every course and at least one additional form of formal classroom

teaching evaluation each year (e.g. peer review, teaching portfolio). Student evaluations should supplement and guide faculty teaching evaluation.

Recognizing that graduate student research is central to the Department's research mission, graduate research mentorship and advising is an important part of the teaching mission and thus must be included in the final overall assessment of teaching.

2. **Research/Scholarly Activity:** Department of Biomedical Sciences faculty members are expected to maintain a high quality, independent research program that makes continuing significant contributions to the scholarship of their discipline and leads to a national and international reputation for scholarship in their discipline.

The evaluation of scholarship is based largely on the communicated results of research, the most important forms of which are peer reviewed publication in respected journals, and books and monographs published by top presses. Also important are edited books, research reviews, and chapters in books. A third category includes invited seminars, symposium papers, meeting presentations and published abstracts of these presentations, and other non-peer reviewed publications. Some textbooks and innovative instructional materials have significance to the scholarship of the discipline and thus are considered contributions to scholarly activity, as are contributions to the scholarship of teaching. While we expect regular continued publication of quality papers in peer reviewed journals, the number of peer reviewed publications is less important than the recognition by peers that the work is of very high quality and has made an important contribution to the scholarship of the field.

An important aspect of research is obtaining funds to support the program and it is usually necessary to obtain regular funding in order to maintain a viable research program. It is recognized that funding opportunities and levels in some areas are greater than in others and that some areas of research require fewer funds to maintain a successful program. A part of the research evaluation will include grant and/or fellowship proposals submitted to federal and state agencies and private foundations and the result of peer review of those proposals by those agencies.

The research of graduate students and post-doctoral associates is also an important contribution to the overall research program in the Department of Biomedical Sciences. Thus successfully advising these researchers is an important component of a faculty member's total research effort. Mentoring students through completion of their degree

program, and placement of graduate students and post-doctoral fellows in subsequent positions is one criterion that can be used to judge the faculty members effectiveness in research teaching.

- 3. Service:** Department of Biomedical Sciences faculty members are expected to make professional contributions through service to the Department, the College, the University and their discipline. It is often difficult to separate service to a faculty member's profession from their scholarly activity. Reviewing manuscripts, editing journals, reviewing research proposals, and serving on research grant panels or study sections all fall both under service and research scholarship. Important service contributions include the organization of regional, national, or international meetings and service as regional or national officers of professional organizations. Important local contributions include administrative assistance to the Department of Biomedical Sciences and/or to the campus through service on committees, discipline-related community service, and paid or unpaid consulting work.

Each Department of Biomedical Sciences faculty member will receive an annual written performance evaluation from the Department Chair that will include individual ratings of exceeding, meeting, or below expectations in teaching, research and service. Based upon those individual assessments, each faculty member will receive an *overall* rating of satisfactory [either exceeding or meeting expectations] or unsatisfactory [below expectations]. These ratings and the attendant written evaluation will be communicated to each faculty member each year by the end of the winter semester. The full evaluation will be used by the Department Chair to: (1) develop a plan to improve the faculty member's performance [where applicable], and (2) to determine the faculty member's salary for the coming year. If the *overall* rating for a faculty member is considered unsatisfactory, the Department Chair and that faculty member must meet to discuss the evaluation and develop a written plan to address the deficiencies. That plan must include specific goals to be accomplished with attendant criteria for success and a specific timetable for completion. The faculty member and Department Chair will then meet with the Department P&T Advisory Committee to discuss and approve the plan, with modification if necessary. The final plan will be written, signed by the faculty member, Department Chair, and Department P&T Advisory Committee Chair. Copies will be provided to both the faculty member and Department Chair to be maintained with the faculty member's records. Annual evaluations and any related documents as described above will provide data for mid-term evaluations of tenure-track, but not yet tenured faculty. Annual evaluations for tenured faculty, along with any related documents described above, will provide data for the five year post-tenure review (UM System CRR 310.015 B; CVM website).

B. Third-year (mid-term or mid-probationary) Review of Tenure-track Assistant Professors

This required review must be completed at the end of the third full year of an appointment as a tenure-track Assistant Professor. The third-year review focuses on the individual's progress to date toward a positive promotion and tenure decision based on the candidate's research, teaching and service. The review is the same as that described below for the promotion and/or tenure decision with the exception that external letters of evaluation are not solicited. The review will result in an explicit statement of how well the candidate is meeting the Department of Biomedical Sciences expectations for progress toward tenure. This review of progress-to-date can result in the issuance of a terminal contract if the conclusion of the review is that the candidate cannot possibly meet the criteria for promotion and tenure by the end of the fifth year of their appointment (see CVM website). A copy of the departmental third-year (mid-probationary or mid-term) review letter is included in the promotion and tenure dossier (see Provost's call letter).

C. Guidelines for Tenure and Promotion to Associate Professor

The tenure decision is the most important decision made by the University faculty. A positive tenure recommendation requires that the faculty member: (1) has established a high quality, independent research program that is having an impact on the scientific field with the demonstrated potential for developing a national reputation for scholarship in the discipline; (2) has demonstrated that he/she has become an effective, quality teacher; and (3) has a record of service to MU, the local community and possibly the discipline at the national level appropriate for that faculty member's stage of development.

Teaching effectiveness will be judged on the variety of evidence described above. For a positive tenure recommendation, impact and the contribution of the faculty member to high quality publications in peer-reviewed journals is very important. Work performed at the rank of Assistant Professor at other institutions will be considered along with evidence of continued productivity related to work performed independently at the University of Missouri. Letters of evaluation of the scholarly contributions of the faculty member will be solicited from independent, unbiased individuals outside the University that are acknowledged to be among the leaders in the candidate's research area. The Office of the Provost website describes procedures and criteria for the selection of external reviewers. To aid in the process, the candidate will provide the Department Chair with names of mentors, collaborators, and close colleagues, who may be regarded as biased. In addition, it is possible that

other individuals may be considered in conflict of interest by the candidate. In this regard, the candidate has the opportunity to identify no more than three individuals as being in conflict.

The probationary period for tenure-track faculty is no more than six years unless an extension has been approved (see below). The tenure review process normally begins at the end of the fifth year of an appointment as a tenure-track Assistant Professor. An untenured Assistant Professor may however request review for tenure and promotion to Associate Professor in any year. Careful consideration of the Department, College, and University guidelines regarding expectations for promotion to Associate Professor with tenure is recommended prior to initiating a request for consideration prior to the end of the fifth year. Recommendations for promotion and/or tenure before the sixth year should be rare and restricted to truly exceptional cases (UM System CRR 320.035 B.2.a).

Early career faculty members may request an extension of the probationary period for tenure if they encounter circumstances that may substantially impede their progress toward tenure in specific ways. Possible reasons for requesting an extension include new parenthood (pregnancy and childbirth, adoption), serious illness, or care of an invalid or seriously ill spouse, partner, child, or other close dependent. Extensions must be approved by the Chair of the Department of Biomedical Sciences, the Dean of the College of Veterinary Medicine, and the Provost and can be for no longer than one year at a time with a maximum of two one-year extensions in the probationary period (UM CRR 310.025; CRR 340.070; and Office of the Provost website). If an extension is granted in the first three years of the probationary period then the formal third-year review will be delayed by the same period.

D. Guidelines for Promotion to Professor

Promotion to Professor recognizes sustained contributions during an academic career, including substantial and sustained contributions beyond promotion to Associate Professor. These types of contributions typically require six years beyond promotion to Associate Professor. As such, promotion before the sixth year should be restricted to exceptional cases.

A faculty member promoted to Professor will have demonstrated continued growth while an Associate Professor and a cumulative record of highest quality peer-reviewed publication, teaching and professional service. Demonstrated leadership and sustained participation at the department, the college and the university level is expected. Scholarship (beyond that completed at the time of promotion to Associate Professor) that has achieved national or international prominence is expected. A sustained publication record and recognition by peers that the work is of

very high quality and has made an important contribution to the scholarship of the field is very important. Letters of evaluation of the scholarly contributions will be solicited from independent, unbiased individuals outside the University that are acknowledged to be among the most outstanding individuals in the candidate's area. Procedures similar to those described in Section IV.C above will be used to identify appropriate external evaluations.

A tenured Associate Professor may request consideration for promotion to Professor in any year. However, careful consideration of the Department, College, and University guidelines regarding expectations for Professor status is recommended prior to initiating such a request. A faculty member wishing to be considered for promotion to Professor will provide the Department Chair with a complete CV (see Appendix 1) in which activity in the areas of research, teaching and service since promotion to Associate Professor have been clearly indicated. At his/her discretion, the Chair or the candidate may seek advice from the P&T Advisory Committee. If the decision of the Chair and/or the P&T Advisory committee is to move forward, a complete updated CV provided by the candidate will be sent to external evaluators at the appropriate time.

E. Negative Recommendations During Departmental Review

1. In the event of a negative recommendation by the Department P&T Committee, the Chair of the P&T Advisory Committee will inform the candidate in writing and will briefly outline the major concerns leading to a negative recommendation (see Section II B.1). The candidate will be provided the opportunity to submit a written rebuttal to include in the dossier (UM CRR 320.035 A.4.b). In such cases all documents, including the formal P&T Committee letter, the notification letter to the candidate, and the candidate's rebuttal to major concerns will be forwarded to the Department Chair for inclusion in the dossier.
2. If the recommendation of the Chair does not support promotion and/or tenure of the candidate, the Chair will inform the candidate in writing, outlining his/her major reasons for non-support (See Section III.A.3) and the candidate will be given the opportunity to provide a rebuttal letter to this correspondence. All documents, including the Chair's formal evaluation letter, the notification letter to the candidate, and the candidate's rebuttal will be included in the dossier and forwarded to the Dean of the College of Veterinary Medicine.
3. A candidate for promotion and/or tenure has the right to submit rebuttal and supplemental updates to be added to the dossier as it advances through each step of the review process. However, submission of a new dossier for consideration by the department

cannot occur until the process for a current dossier has advanced through all stages of review and the candidate has been formally notified of the final decision.

4. Candidates receiving a negative recommendation should familiarize themselves with current college, campus (Office of the Provost), and UM system guidelines regarding policies and procedures.

F. Periodic Post-Tenure Review of All Department of Biomedical Sciences Faculty Members

This is a summative review of performance over a five-year period. The expectation is that each faculty member will contribute fully to the institution throughout that individual's career: in particular that there will be evidence of sustained contributions over the previous five-year period. At five-year intervals every tenured Department of Biomedical Sciences faculty member will resubmit a five year report consisting of their annual reports for the past five years, along with a concise summary statement of research, teaching and service activities for that five-year period and a curriculum vita to the Department Chair.

The Department Chair will evaluate the faculty member's overall performance in the five-year period as either satisfactory or unsatisfactory using the standards described above for annual performance evaluation (Section IVA). If the overall performance is judged satisfactory the review is complete. If the Chair evaluates the performance as unsatisfactory, the five-year report will be sent to the Department P&T Advisory Committee for presentation to the appropriate department voting faculty (Department P&T Committee) and the College P&T Committee for independent evaluations. If two thirds of the members of each (the Department P&T Committee and the College P&T Committee) evaluates the performance as satisfactory the review is complete. If performance is deemed unsatisfactory by more than one-third of either the Department P&T Committee or the College P&T Committee, the report will be forwarded to the Dean. If the Dean deems the faculty member's performance as unsatisfactory, a plan for professional growth and subsequent evaluation will be developed as specified in College of Veterinary Medicine guidelines and UM CRR 310.015.B.1c-f, 310.015B.2a-g, and 310.015.B.3a-c.

The five-year post-tenure review of all Associate Professors will include a review of progress toward promotion to Professor. A statement of the performance expectations that would allow this faculty member to be *considered* for promotion at some point within the next five years will be included in the five-year review. The report will indicate that the faculty member understands the expectations and has had a chance to respond to them.

The first five-year Post-Tenure Review for a tenured faculty member will be initiated and completed five years after the tenure decision or promotion to Professor. Faculty hired with tenure will be reviewed five years after they are hired.

SECTION V -- GUIDELINES FOR ASSISTANT PROFESSOR MENTORING COMMITTEES

A. Composition of Mentoring Committee

Mentoring Committees for junior faculty shall be formed in the first six months of faculty appointment. Members, including the Committee Chair, shall be appointed by the Department Chair, in consultation with the junior faculty member. The committee will be composed of three to four senior faculty and shall include at least two full Professors. Typically it will include members in the junior faculty's discipline and may include an individual from outside the department.

B. Duties and Responsibilities of Advisee

1. Prior to the initial Mentoring Committee meeting (within one year of appointment), the Advisee should provide to his/her Mentoring Committee Chair:
 - a.) Copy of original appointment letter (private information, such as salary, redacted). This will give the committee a record of type of appointment, % effort allocation, and date of appointment. This is important in following progress, documenting that activity is appropriate for the type and effort allocation of appointment, and planning timeliness for mid-term review and promotion dossier preparation. If any changes in the original appointment occur (e.g. % effort allocation), the Advisee should provide a dated copy of the correspondence related to these changes to the Mentoring Committee Chair.
 - b.) Draft of 5-year plan
2. Each year the Advisee should provide the Mentoring Committee Chair with the following:
 - a.) Copy of Annual Report
 - b.) Copy of current C.V.
 - c.) Copy of student teaching evaluations from all courses taught.

d.) Copy of lecture schedule, course, time, and location

e.) Other materials as requested by the mentoring committee (e.g. critiques from recently reviewed grants, etc.)

C. Duties and Responsibilities of Mentoring Committee

1. The role of the mentoring committees will be to provide guidance and help junior colleagues stay on-track regarding their particular appointment.
2. The committee Chair, in consultation with the junior faculty member, will call meetings and coordinate with the faculty member to provide required documentation to the committee.
3. The mentoring committee will meet at a minimum once a year to discuss progress and plans for the next year. However, Advisees are encouraged to use members of their mentoring committee as a resource for information and advice at any time.
4. At least one member of the mentoring committee will attend at least one lecture, and write a peer evaluation of teaching each year. The mentoring committee will help the junior faculty member identify other potential peer evaluators for teaching, as deemed appropriate.
5. Advise the junior faculty member regarding planning for mid-tenure review and P&T dossier preparation.

D. The mentoring committees and Advisees should use for reference:

1. A copy of the Departmental Guidelines for Promotion and Tenure.
2. Appendix 1: Guideline of topic headings/ and information to be included in a complete curriculum vitae.
3. Resources for Information required during dossier preparation
 - a.) The departmental average for courses of similar level is required in dossiers.

Each Department within the College of Veterinary Medicine is responsible for documenting this information and making it available to departmental faculty. The Departmental Chair receives copies of all teaching evaluations. Information for overall average evaluation scores will be provided to the departmental office by CVM IT services, and will be on file in the Biomedical Sciences Departmental Office.

b.) P&T Dossiers require indices of quality of journals and scholarly activity. The rate of acceptance and the “impact factor” for a journal are recommended by the Department of Biomedical Sciences. A resource librarian in the College of Veterinary Medicine is available to help in obtaining these indices for various scholarly journals.

These guidelines were formulated by tenured and tenure track faculty in the Department of Biomedical Sciences in compliance with UM CRR 300.010. They were revised and approved by the Department of Biomedical Sciences tenured and tenure track faculty on May 10, 2006 (with minor revisions on May 27, 2008); and May 12, 2015. This document was created with significant input from a document entitled “The Annual Review of Faculty Performance and Recommendations Concerning Tenure and/or Promotion” from the Division of Biological Sciences, University of Missouri-Columbia and a document entitled “Appointments, Promotion, and Tenure” from the Department of Physiology and Cell Biology, Ohio State University.

APPENDIX 1: CURRICULUM VITAE SAMPLE TEMPLATE

Josephine P. Doe, Ph.D.

I. PERSONAL DATA

- A. Office Address:
- B. Home Address:
- C. Telephone:
- D. FAX
- E. e-mail
- F. Citizenship:

II. EDUCATION {Include names of Ph.D. advisor and post-doctoral mentors}

Year Degree Institution

III. ACADEMIC APPOINTMENTS AND OTHER EMPLOYMENT {most current first}

Year Position Institution

IV. PROFESSIONAL AFFILIATIONS/LICENSES

V. RESEARCH INTERESTS {Brief description}

VI. CURRENT PROJECTS {Provide 1 to 2 sentence summaries}

VII. TEACHING EXPERIENCE {Examples below}

- A. Participated in teaching the following courses:
{semester, year, course number, title, credit hrs., role, # of lectures, # students}.

1. Graduate and Professional

University of Missouri

WS 2003-06 VBmS 550: Veterinary Pharmacology, 4 cred. hr., Course Director and Instructor
5 lectures (Autocoids, Antihistamines, Ethics), 74 students

WS 2004 VBmS 400: Problems in Neural Control of the Circulation 3 cred. hr.- Co-Director
16 team lectures, 4 students

FS2003-14 V_BSCI 5051: Gastrointest, Physiology, 2 cred. hr., Course Director and Instructor
24 lectures and 8 laboratories, 117 professional students

The Ohio State University

WS 1996 PGY 911.27 Advanced Cardiovascular Physiology, 3 cred. hrs., Course Director & Instructor
9 lecture hours (Neural Control), 19 students

WS 1998 Neuroscience 297: Autonomic Nervous Sys. 3 cred. hr, Instructor
15 contact hrs, 12 students

2. Undergraduate

B. Mentoring/Advising- Undergraduate/High School

1. Supervisor - Honor/Minority/High School/ Undergraduate Students
{years, student name, program}

- a. 1989 XXXX XXXX, High School Summer Research Program (Univ. of Kentucky)
- b. 2011 XXXX XXXXX Undergraduate Research Project
- c. 2012 XXXX XXXXXXXXXXXX MU EXPRESS Summer Project

2. Undergraduate Honors Thesis Committee {years, student name, program}

- a. 05/91 XXXX XXXXXX (Dept. of Zoology, Ohio State University)

C. Mentoring/Advising- Graduate/Professional

1. Supervisor - Professional Student Research Projects {years, student name, program}

- a. 2004-05 XXXX XXXXXXXX – Veterinary Student, CVM and Merck Summer Fellowship, Univ. Missouri

2. Student Laboratory Rotations {years, student name, program}

- a. 2013 XXX XXXXXX (Medical Pharmacology & Physiology)
- b. 2014 XXXXXXXXXXXX XXXX (Biochemistry)

3. Master's Thesis Advisor {years, student name, program, outcome}

- a. 2011-14 XXXX XXXXXX (Biomedical Sciences), graduated, MS degree May 2014

4. Ph.D. Dissertation Advisor {years, student name, program, outcome}

- a. 2000-2005 XXXXX XXXXXX (Biomedical Sciences), graduated, PhD degree Dec. 2005

5. Master's Thesis Committees {years, student name, program, outcome, major advisor}

- a. 2000-03 XXXX XXXXXXXX (Biomedical Sciences), graduated, MS degree May 2003, Major advisor = Dr. Rudolph Flemming

6. Ph.D. Dissertation Committees {years, student name, program, major advisor}

- a. 2000-06 XXXXXX XXXXXXXX (Biochemistry) - XXXXXXXXXX XXX

D. Mentoring/Advising- Postgraduate/Resident

1. Supervisor - Post-doctoral Research Fellows {years, name, program, placement}

- a. 1999-2003 XXXX XXXXXX (Cystic Fibrosis Foundation Fellow), currently Assistant Professor, University of Colorado

VIII. PROFESSIONAL SERVICE

A. Department

Department of Biomedical Sciences, University of Missouri

- 2000-02 Seminar Director
- 2008-12 Graduate Policy Advisory Committee, Member

B. College

College of Veterinary Medicine, University of Missouri

- 2005-06 Phi Zeta, President

C. University

North Carolina State University

- 1995-96 Cardiovascular Day, Poster Judge

University of Missouri

- 2004-07 Faculty Grievance Committee, Chair
- 2000-01 Animal Care and Use Committee, Member

D. State

- 2001-06 American Heart Assoc., Heartland Affiliate, Research Committee, Regular Member

E. National/International

- 2003 APS Career Mentoring Program in Physiology, Mentor
- 2004-07 Research Committee, Cystic Fibrosis Foundation, Member

F. Editorial Boards

- 1999-2004 Editorial Board, American Journal of Physiology: Heart and Circulatory Physiology
2002 Guest Editor, Advances in Physiology Education, Dec. Issue 2002

G. Journal Reviews

- 2000 – 2004 American Journal of Physiology: Gastrointestinal and Liver Physiology
2010, 2014 Journal of Physiology (London), guest reviewer

H. Grant Reviews

- 2002-05 Regular Member, American Heart Association CV Regulation Peer Review Study Group
2002 Ad Hoc Member, NIH Skeletal Muscle Biology Study Section

IX. HONORS AND AWARDS {year, title, institution or organization}

- 1990 Moderator, Workshop: Ion transport of airway epithelia, moderator, FASEB
1997 Pfizer Award for Research Excellence

X. INVITED PRESENTATIONS {year, title, institution, date}

International

- 2005 Anion exchange activity of the duodenal villus epithelium in wild-type (WT) and cystic fibrosis (CF) mice. European Cystic Fibrosis Conference, Vienna, Austria, May 30-June, 3.

National

- 2002 Pathophysiology of intestinal obstruction in the CF mouse. Williamsburg Cystic Fibrosis Conference, Williamsburg, VA, May 31-June, 4.
2003 Lomucin™ (talniflumate) treatment increases survival in a CF mouse model of distal intestinal obstructive syndrome. 17th Annual North American Cystic Fibrosis Conference, Anaheim, CA. October 16.
2008 Acid-base transporters of the villous apical membrane. Dept. of Medicine, University of Illinois-Chicago, Chicago, IL., April 30.

Intramural/Local

- 1999 How the heart works, Cardiovascular Day, University of Missouri, March 30.

XI. FINANCIAL RESOURCES (GRANTS AND CONTRACTS)

{project number, role (Example: P.I. or Co-I (name of P.I.)), dates, granting agency, total direct costs, title}

A. Active Support {granting agency, role, title, dates, total direct costs}

5 R01 HL 00000-07 (P.I.)	4/1/2015 – 3/31/2019
NIH/NHLBI	\$1,000,000
Ion Transport in Lungs	

B. Submitted Applications

DCB 950000 (Co-I; Baker P.I.)	12/01/2002 – 11/30/2004
National Science Foundation	\$120,000
Liposome Membrane Composition and Function	

C. Past Support

02 R01 HL 00000-13 (P.I.)	3/1/1997 – 2/28/2002
NIH/NHLBI	\$1,250,000
Chloride and Sodium Transport in Airway Epithelial Cells	

XII. **BIBLIOGRAPHY** {use categories as appropriate; chronological with most recent first}

A. Presses

Name of press (publisher, for-profit or non-profit, refereed y/n, acceptance rate)

1. None

B. Professional Journals

Journal citation {contribution, refereed y/n, journal acceptance rate, journal impact factor}

1. **Doe, JP** and Buck, JL. Bananas are required for cAMP inhibition of intestinal Na⁺ absorption in a hypertensive mouse model. Am. J. Physiol. 271: G59-G67, 2014 (contribution 50%, YES, acceptance = 30%; impact factor = 3.6)

C. Papers in Conference Proceedings

Paper (publisher, refereed y/n, acceptance rate, impact factor)

1. **Doe, JP**. I like bananas. (Proceeding of the Fruit Society 2012, YES, information on acceptance rate & impact factor not available)

D. Published Abstracts

Abstract citation (refereed y/n, acceptance rate)

1. XXXXX,, XX, XXXXXX, SS, and **Doe, JP**. UTP stimulates electrogenic bicarbonate secretion across banana skins. Chives,114: A552, 1998. (YES, information on acceptance rates not available)

E. Major Creative Works, Exhibits, Juried Shows

(Name/Type, Indicators of Distinction*)

1. None

F. Other Types of Scholarly Dissemination**

Name/Type Indicators of Scholarly Stature

1. None

*Provide qualitative assessment if quantitative information is not available.

**Examples: invited book reviews, letters to editor, electronic publication, software, patents.

Example of required course information: Update yearly

Semester	Course Number	Credit Hours	Number of Students/ Number Evaluating	Course GPA	Evaluation Average+	Dept/Div Average for that Level of Course
WS03	VBmS 550	4	74	3.1	3.8/5.0	4.2/5.0
WS04	^ VBmS 5508	2 (4/32 lec)	78	3.4	4.3/5.0	4.3/5.0

^Team taught or team taught evaluation.

+If an evaluation instrument covers more than one dimension, e.g. the course as a whole, overall teaching effectiveness, indicate the one reported here.