

Promotion and Tenure Handbook

for Dossier Evaluators

Best Practices for Ethical, Equitable, and Rigorous Review
Academic Year 2026–2027

*For Use by Department, College, and Campus P&T Committee Members,
as well as others evaluating P&T dossiers*

Introduction

Service on a Promotion and Tenure (P&T) committee is among the most consequential forms of faculty governance at Missouri S&T. Committee members exercise professional judgment that shapes careers, advances the university's academic mission, and upholds the standards of scholarly integrity that define our institution. P&T evaluators make recommendations on both tenure and promotion, which are voted on separately at S&T. Tenure safeguards academic freedom and ensures the holder's job security; it is awarded based on the institutional value and long-term promise of the candidate. Promotion is awarded to recognize a candidate's academic achievements, disciplinary contributions, and professional growth.

This short handbook is designed to support evaluators at all three levels of P&T review—department, college, and campus—in carrying out that work with rigor, consistency, and fairness. It does not replace or supersede any applicable university policy, including the [Collected Rules and Regulations \(CRR\) on Promotion and Tenure](#) or departmental promotion and tenure criteria documents. Where this handbook and governing policy conflict, policy governs.

The practices described here reflect three core commitments:

- **Fidelity to published standards** — Candidates are entitled to be evaluated against the criteria their department has published, not against informal expectations or evolving norms applied retroactively.
- **Procedural integrity** — The deliberation process must be both rigorous and bounded: rigorous in the quality of analysis committee members bring, and bounded by the scope of information that is properly before the committee.
- **Equitable treatment** — Every candidate deserves a review that is free from bias, consistent in the application of standards, and attentive to the ways in which bias can enter even well-intentioned deliberations.

Committee members are encouraged to use this handbook in conjunction with a brief (optional) orientation Q&A session offered each year by the Office of Faculty Affairs.

Section 1: Roles, Responsibilities, and Committee Structure

1.1 The Three Levels of Committee Review

Missouri S&T employs a sequential review process that includes three levels of committee review (interspersed with individual reviews by the department chair, the dean, the provost, and the chancellor). Each level serves a distinct function, and understanding those distinctions helps committee members focus their work appropriately.

Department Committee

- Closest to the candidate's disciplinary context and daily work.
- Evaluates the full dossier against the department's published promotion criteria.
- Produces a vote and a written evaluation letter explaining the committee's reasoning.
- Sets the evidentiary record that higher committees rely upon.

College Committee

- Reviews the dossier, the department committee's letter, and the department chair's letter.
- Assesses whether the department committee's process and reasoning were sound and consistent with published standards.
- May identify issues the department committee did not address, but should exercise caution if substituting its own discipline-specific judgment for the department's.

Campus Committee

- Reviews for consistency of standards across colleges and disciplines.
- Evaluates the integrity and quality of the processes at lower levels.
- Is not a discipline-focused body; usually defers to documented departmental expertise on discipline-specific questions.

At each level, the committee's written evaluation should clearly explain its reasoning and, where it departs from or supplements the analysis of a lower committee, explain why.

1.2 Confidentiality

Committee deliberations are strictly confidential. Members must not:

- Discuss deliberations or individual candidates outside the committee.

- Share dossier materials with anyone not on the committee.
- Disclose vote tallies, specific comments, or the content of external review letters except as permitted by policy.

Breaches of confidentiality are serious violations of faculty governance and may constitute violations of university policy. Questions about what may be shared should be directed to the Office of Faculty Affairs before disclosing anything.

1.3 Conflicts of Interest

Committee members are responsible for identifying and disclosing any conflict of interest with a candidate under review. Missouri S&T is a relatively small institution, and it is both normal and expected that committee members will know many of the candidates they evaluate—as colleagues, collaborators, and professional acquaintances. Familiarity alone does not constitute a conflict of interest and does not require recusal.

A conflict of interest exists when a member has a relationship with the candidate that is so direct, personal, or financially entangled that the member cannot exercise independent professional judgment. The relevant question is not whether you know the candidate, but whether the nature of your relationship would make it impossible—or would appear to a reasonable outside observer to make it impossible—for you to evaluate the record fairly and independently.

Relationships that ordinarily require disclosure and likely recusal include:

- A familial relationship with the candidate (spouse, ex-spouse, domestic partner, parent, child, sibling, or equivalent).
- A financial relationship with the candidate, including shared business interests, joint grants in which the member's own compensation is affected by the candidate's continued employment, or other direct financial entanglements.
- A prior doctoral advisor/advisee relationship, particularly if it is recent or ongoing in a mentoring capacity.

By contrast, the following relationships do not ordinarily require recusal, though members should remain attentive to whether they are able to evaluate the candidate on the merits:

- Collegial friendship or professional acquaintance, even if longstanding.
- Co-authorship on past publications, even if recent or ongoing.
- Membership on the same research team or center, absent financial entanglement.
- A history of professional disagreement or differing scholarly viewpoints—which is not a basis for recusal, provided the member can evaluate the record on its merits.

Members who are uncertain whether a relationship constitutes a conflict should disclose it to the committee chair, who may consult the Office of Faculty Affairs. Disclosure does not automatically require recusal; its purpose is to surface potential issues so they can be assessed and, if necessary, addressed.

A member who concludes that a personal relationship—positive or negative—would prevent them from rendering a fair, evidence-based judgment should voluntarily recuse. Self-awareness in this regard is a mark of professional integrity, not a weakness.

Section 2: Reading the Dossier

2.1 The Obligation to Read Carefully

Thorough, independent reading of the dossier is a baseline obligation for every committee member. A committee member who has not read the dossier carefully cannot contribute meaningfully to deliberation, may anchor discussion on superficial or incorrect impressions, and undermines the fairness of the process for the candidate.

"Careful reading" means:

- Reading the entire dossier, not selected parts.
- Reading the departmental document on criteria for promotion and tenure.
- Reading the candidate's narrative statements and attending to how the candidate frames and contextualizes their work.
- Reading all external review letters in their entirety.
- Engaging with the evidence provided in each area under evaluation (research/scholarship, teaching, service) rather than relying on summary impressions.
- Noting questions or areas requiring clarification before the committee convenes.

Members are encouraged to take notes as they read, organizing observations under the categories established by the department's published criteria. This practice supports more structured and productive deliberation.

2.2 Understanding the Candidate's Narrative Statements

The narrative statements about teaching, research, and service are the candidate's opportunities to contextualize their record, explain choices, and connect their activities into coherent scholarly and professional narratives. Committee members should read them thoughtfully and analytically:

- Does the candidate's framing of their work hold up against the evidence in the dossier?
- Are there gaps between what the narrative statement claims and what the supporting materials show?
- Does the narrative statement help explain circumstances that affected the candidate's productivity (e.g., lab startup delays, shifts in federal funding priorities, etc.)?

The narrative statements should inform the committee's reading of the rest of the dossier. They are neither conclusive in themselves nor irrelevant.

2.3 External Review Letters

External reviewer letters provide expert disciplinary perspective that the committee may lack, particularly at the college and campus levels. When reading these letters, members should consider:

- The reviewer's apparent qualifications and standing in the field (typically indicated in the letter and accompanying CV).
- Whether the reviewer's evaluation is specific and grounded in the candidate's actual work, or general and impressionistic.
- Whether the reviewer identifies the candidate's work as making a genuine contribution to the field.
- Patterns across letters: where reviewers converge or diverge, and why.

Letters that are lukewarm, hedged, or short deserve attention but do not automatically constitute negative evaluations. Reviewers vary substantially in how they write letters. A letter that praises three specific and significant contributions in two paragraphs may carry more weight than a letter that enthusiastically praises a candidate in vague terms across three pages.

External reviewers may receive multiple invitations in any given cycle to evaluate promotion dossiers, so a declined invitation should not be interpreted as a reflection of the candidate's merit. Experts in various subdisciplines work at all kinds of institutions, so do not confuse one's institutional affiliation with one's standing in a particular field. The external reviewers' CVs are critical for confirming their credentials as legitimate peer reviewers. Finally, committee members should remember not to penalize a candidate for issues related to external reviewers over which the candidate has no control.

Section 3: Applying Published Standards

3.1 The Role of Departmental Criteria

Candidates have been given their department's published promotion and tenure criteria and have shaped their professional activities—sometimes over many years—in reliance on those criteria. Evaluating a candidate against unstated, informal, or elevated standards is fundamentally unfair and exposes the university to legal and reputational risk.

Each committee member should have reviewed the relevant department's criteria document before deliberating on a candidate from that department. Key questions to guide evaluation include:

- What does this department's criteria document identify as the indicators of distinction in research/scholarship at the rank under consideration?
- What teaching and service contributions does the criteria document require or expect?
- Does this dossier demonstrate that the candidate has met those indicators?

The committee's written evaluation should trace its conclusions back to specific criteria. Conclusions unsupported by reference to criteria are difficult to defend and may suggest that the evaluation was driven by factors other than the published standards.

3.2 Avoiding Unwritten Standards

Among the most common procedural problems in P&T review is the application of standards not found in the criteria document. These often arise unconsciously. Common examples include:

Unwritten Standards to Avoid

- "We expect candidates for associate professor to have a significant external grant before promotion" — unless the criteria document says this.
- "This journal isn't prestigious enough" — unless the criteria document specifies journal tier or impact factor requirements.
- "We usually expect more sole-authored work" — unless the criteria document addresses authorship patterns.
- "He should have more graduate students" — unless the criteria document addresses mentoring expectations.
- "He shouldn't be going up for full professor so early" -- unless the criteria document states a requirement for number of years in rank.
- Comparing the candidate to a specific prior colleague rather than to the published standard.
- "There should be more external review letters" -- unless required by policy or published criteria. The strength and substance of external evaluations are generally more important than the number of letters.

If a committee member believes published standards are ambiguous or outdated, that concern should be raised with the department chair or dean—not resolved by importing an informal standard into an individual case.

The UM System CRRs are clear that junior faculty are expected to apply for tenure and promotion during their mandatory tenure year. Those who do not receive tenure are offered a one-year terminal contract. If faculty choose to apply for tenure **before** their mandatory year and do not receive tenure, they are eligible to reapply in their mandatory year without prejudice. The CRRs also state "Candidates for promotion and tenure should demonstrate sustained merit and contributions over an extended period of time. Recommendations for promotion and/or tenure before the sixth year should be rare and restricted to truly exceptional cases." It is part of the committee member's responsibility to evaluate the merit of these rare and exceptional cases.

Also note that neither the UM System CRRs nor S&T policy make any statement about time in rank for associate professors applying for promotion to full professor. The CRRs state: "A person recommended for promotion to the rank of professor should have significant accomplishments, especially in the area of research and scholarly and creative contributions, beyond those justifying the rank of associate professor. Years of service alone do not justify advancement. Rather, sustained contributions during a career to research, scholarly and creative contributions and teaching are necessary. A person to be considered for promotion to professor should be a scholar who has achieved national distinction." Therefore, unless the department's published criteria dictate a minimum number of years in rank, committee members should consider the candidate's significant accomplishments without imposing an unwritten expectation related to their length of tenure as an associate professor.

3.3 Evaluating Across Disciplines (College and Campus Committees)

College and campus committees review candidates from multiple departments, each with distinct disciplinary norms. Members of these committees must be especially attentive to the risk of importing their own disciplinary expectations onto candidates from other fields.

Specific areas of cross-disciplinary variation include:

- Publication venues: journals, conference proceedings, books, and book chapters carry different weights in different fields.
- Authorship conventions: alphabetical authorship, large collaborative teams, single-authored work, and student-last authorship are all disciplinary norms, not indicators of effort or centrality.
- Publishing with one's former dissertation chair/advisor: some disciplines view this negatively, while for others it is normal practice
- Grant funding expectations: external grant funding is a primary indicator of scholarly productivity in some fields and less relevant in others.
- Teaching load and service expectations: these vary across departments and should be assessed relative to the candidate's context.

When uncertain about disciplinary norms, college and campus committee members should defer to the department committee's evaluation—and to the external review letters—rather than applying their own disciplinary assumptions. College and campus committee members do have an important obligation to verify that the department committee applied its own published criteria consistently.

Section 4: Deliberation and Discussion

4.1 Keeping Discussion Within Bounds

Effective deliberation is focused deliberation. The committee's discussion should be anchored in:

- The evidence in the dossier.
- The published departmental criteria.
- The external review letters.
- Written evaluations (department, chair, etc.) at previous levels of review (for committees at the college and campus level).

Information that is not in the dossier and not properly before the committee should not enter the discussion. This includes:

Information That Must Not Enter Deliberations

- Personal knowledge about the candidate not contained in the dossier (e.g., "I heard she's been having problems in the lab").
- Rumors, hallway conversations, or informal assessments from colleagues outside the committee.
- Information about the candidate's personal life, relationships, or family situation.
- Information about the candidate's salary or other income.
- The candidate's reputation for personality, collegiality, or interpersonal style unless those matters are directly addressed in the published criteria and supported by documented evidence.
- Political or ideological views expressed outside of professional activities under review.
- Social media content not submitted as part of the dossier.

It is not uncommon for committee members to have firsthand knowledge of a candidate's work (e.g. observing a class, collaborating on a campus initiative, serving on a university committee, etc.). Remember that evaluation should be based on the documented record in the dossier and not personal interactions. If a committee member raises information that is not properly before the committee, the chair should redirect the discussion. If a member repeatedly introduces improper information despite redirection, the chair should consult with the Office of Faculty Affairs.

4.2 Roles in Deliberation

Committee Chair

The committee chair is responsible for managing the discussion process, ensuring all members have the opportunity to speak, keeping the discussion within proper bounds, and moving toward a conclusion. The chair is not a tiebreaker, advocate, or final decision-maker, but a facilitator of rigorous process.

Committee Members

Each member is responsible for contributing their independent analysis. Members should:

- Be present and engaged during the deliberation of all cases considered. **Members are expected to clear their calendars of all other meetings, including their classes, during the scheduled meeting.**
- Share their own reading of the evidence, not merely react to others' characterizations.
- Distinguish between what the dossier shows and what they personally believe about the candidate or the field.
- Listen respectfully to colleagues with different readings and engage with the substance of their arguments.
- Not allow seniority, assertiveness, or social dynamics to substitute for evidence-based reasoning.

Minority Positions

Dissenting views are a healthy part of deliberation. A member who concludes differently from the majority should feel free to explain their reasoning. Minority views may be noted in the committee's written evaluation where doing so serves clarity and fairness.

4.3 Structuring Productive Discussion

Committees benefit from a structured approach to deliberation. A productive sequence often looks like:

- **Brief orientation:** Confirm the applicable criteria and the scope of information before the committee.
- **Area-by-area review:** Discuss research/scholarship, teaching, and service separately before integrating.
- **Integration:** Consider the record as a whole in light of the criteria for the rank under consideration.
- **Preliminary temperature check:** A non-binding indication of where members stand before formal vote, to surface disagreements while deliberation can still address them.
- **Formal vote and letter drafting:** The committee's written evaluation should reflect the rationale for the vote, describe the deliberations, and align conclusions with evidence from the dossier and criteria in the department's documents.

4.4 The Obligation to Vote

Every committee member is expected to cast a vote on each candidate. Abstention is not a neutral act. When a member abstains, the committee loses a voice that the candidate is entitled to have heard, the integrity of the deliberative record is weakened, and the burden of a consequential decision falls unevenly and unfairly on those who do vote.

The most common reason members abstain is relational discomfort: they are reluctant to vote against a colleague, a friend, or someone they like and respect personally. This discomfort is understandable, but it is not a sufficient reason to abstain. P&T committee service carries the responsibility of making difficult professional judgments—including, on occasion, negative ones. That is the nature of the role.

The antidote to relational discomfort is not abstention; it is the proper application of the evaluation framework. A negative vote is not a personal judgment about a colleague's worth or character. It is a professional finding that, on the basis of the evidence in the dossier and the department's published criteria, the record does not meet the standard for tenure/promotion at this time. The committee member's task is to make that finding honestly, not to avoid it.

Abstention is appropriate only in narrow circumstances:

- The member has a conflict of interest that requires recusal (see Section 1.3).
- The member was absent for a substantial portion of the deliberation and genuinely lacks sufficient basis to vote—a circumstance that should be extremely rare and should be reported to the committee chair.

A member who is inclined to abstain for reasons other than those above is encouraged to examine that inclination carefully. In some cases, what feels like uncertainty may actually be discomfort with a conclusion the evidence supports. Voting that conclusion is the more professionally responsible choice.

Section 5: Bias Mitigation

5.1 Why Bias Mitigation Matters

Research on faculty evaluation consistently shows that implicit bias—bias that operates below conscious awareness—affects how reviewers assess scholarly records. These effects are well-documented in studies of grant review, manuscript review, hiring, and promotion decisions. Committee members who believe they are objective are not exempt from these effects; research suggests that confidence in one's objectivity can actually reduce vigilance against bias.

Bias in P&T review causes concrete harm: it produces inequitable career outcomes, it undermines the legitimacy of the institution's promotion standards, and it creates legal exposure for the university. Bias mitigation is not a matter of political preference; it is a matter of professional integrity and procedural soundness.

5.2 Common Forms of Bias in P&T Review

Bias Based on Gender/Racial Stereotypes

Studies find that evaluators describe the same scholarly record differently depending on the perceived gender and/or race of a candidate. The accomplishments of women and members of racial minorities are more frequently attributed to collaboration, luck, or context than to individual talent or effort. Language in evaluation letters—"dedicated," "hardworking," "collaborative" versus "brilliant," "exceptional," "innovative"—often reflects these patterns.

Mitigation practices:

- Ask whether you would describe a candidate of a different gender or race the same way.
- Watch for language that attributes achievement to effort rather than ability when used disproportionately for candidates who are women or members of racial minorities.
- Evaluate the quality and impact of the scholarship itself, not the prestige of the doctoral institution or the demographic composition of the candidate's research subjects.
- Be alert to concerns about research "topic" or "significance" that may reflect unfamiliarity rather than genuine scholarly weakness.
- Check that you are applying the same scrutiny to work you find intuitively familiar as to work that addresses less familiar communities or questions.

In-Group Favoritism

Committee members tend to evaluate more favorably candidates who share their scholarly approach or professional network, or who are more visible in the department. This tendency can produce advantages for candidates who have been more active in departmental life and disadvantages for candidates who have invested heavily in external collaboration or interdisciplinary work.

Mitigation practices:

- Distinguish between "this candidate does work I find interesting or familiar" and "this candidate's record meets the published criteria."
- Give proportionate weight to external recognition and collaboration, which may look different from internal visibility.

Halo and Horn Effects

A strong performance in one area—or a significant weakness in one area—can color evaluations of unrelated areas. A candidate with a prominent publication may receive inflated teaching evaluations; a candidate with a controversial grant rejection may be read as weaker in service than the evidence supports.

Mitigation practices:

- Evaluate each criterion area separately and resist allowing assessments in one area to bleed into others.
- Return to the specific evidence in each area before offering a concluding assessment.

Presentation Bias

Candidates differ in how they write about their work. Some candidates are skilled self-advocates; others describe even significant accomplishments modestly. A candidate's ability to narrate their work compellingly is not the same as the quality of that work.

Mitigation practices:

- Supplement your reading of the narrative statements with independent examination of the underlying evidence (publications, citation metrics where available, course evaluations, letters).
- Do not mistake reticence for lack of accomplishment, or enthusiasm for significant accomplishment.

5.3 Committee Practices for Bias Mitigation

Individual vigilance, while necessary, is not sufficient. The following committee practices reduce the opportunity for bias to influence outcomes:

- Form independent impressions before the committee discussion, and write them down. This practice helps mitigate the tendency for the first speaker(s) in the meeting to disproportionately anchor subsequent discussion.
- Use the criteria document as an explicit checklist, not a general backdrop.
- If the committee's written evaluation uses descriptive language about the candidate, review that language before finalizing the letter: would the same language be used for a candidate of a different demographic background?
- If a committee member makes a claim about the candidate that is not supported by the dossier, ask for the evidence that supports it.

Key Self-Check Questions

- Am I evaluating this candidate's record, or my impression of this candidate as a person?
- Am I applying the department's published criteria, or criteria I would prefer the department to have?
- Would I describe this record the same way if the candidate belonged to a different demographic group?
- Is the concern I'm raising supported by specific evidence in the dossier?
- Am I treating information about this candidate's personal life or identity as relevant to a professional evaluation?

Section 6: The Committee Letter

6.1 Purpose and Audience

The committee's written evaluation serves multiple functions: it communicates the committee's conclusion and reasoning to the candidate, to higher-level reviewers, and, potentially, to external audiences in the event of a grievance or appeal. A well-written letter:

- States the committee's conclusion clearly.
- Explains the reasoning behind that conclusion, tied to specific evidence and published criteria.
- Identifies the candidate's strengths and, where a negative or split recommendation is made, the specific deficiencies that drove that conclusion.
- Is internally consistent: the analysis should support the conclusion.

Usually, the committee's letter is drafted by the committee chair or that person's designee. The draft should then be shared with and reviewed by all members of the committee, with ample opportunity for members to make suggestions. When the group agrees that the letter accurately reflects the committee's deliberations, all members should sign it before the chair submits it through RPT (the Interfolio digital system) to the next level of review.

6.2 What to Avoid

Evaluation letters that are vague, contradictory, or that attribute conclusions to unstated grounds create legal and procedural risk. Specifically, avoid:

- Conclusions that are not supported by the analysis in the letter.
- References to "potential" or "trajectory" as substitutes for documented achievement, unless the criteria specifically address trajectory.
- Descriptions of the candidate's personality, interpersonal relationships, or non-professional conduct, unless those matters are directly addressed in the published criteria and supported by documented evidence.

- Comparative language that implicitly compares the candidate to a specific prior colleague rather than to the published standard.
- Gendered, racialized, or otherwise identity-inflected language—even language that is intended as positive.

6.3 Tone and Completeness

The letter should be professional, measured, and complete. Brevity is not a virtue in evaluation letters; a one-paragraph letter for a five- or six-year dossier is almost certainly inadequate. At the same time, length is not a substitute for substance—the letter should cover what the criteria require, not exhaustively summarize the dossier. In the event that a committee’s vote is split, the letter must explain the reasons for the divided vote. A committee vote of, say, 8-4, that is accompanied by a letter including only positive assessments does not provide appropriate context for participants at the next level of review.

Recommendation letters in P&T review are formal documents of record. They should be written with the care appropriate to documents that will be read by multiple audiences over an extended period.

Section 7: Raising Procedural Concerns

Committee members who observe procedural problems in the review process—including improper information entering deliberations, evidence of bias, or departures from published criteria—have both the right and the responsibility to raise those concerns.

Appropriate channels include:

- Raising the concern directly with the committee chair during deliberations.
- Contacting the Office of Faculty Affairs if the concern involves the committee chair or is not resolved through in-committee discussion.
- Consulting the relevant dean's office at the college level.

Concerns should be raised as early in the process as possible. Procedural issues are more easily addressed before a final recommendation has been forwarded than after. A committee member who identifies a problem but does not raise it contemporaneously may find it more difficult to address later. Raising a procedural concern is not advocacy for or against the candidate; it is ensuring that the review process remains fair, consistent, and aligned with policy.

Retaliation against a committee member for raising a good-faith procedural concern is prohibited under university policy.

Section 8: Quick Reference Summary

Before You Read the Dossier

- Review the department's published P&T criteria for the relevant rank.
- Identify and disclose any conflicts of interest to the committee chair.
- Confirm your understanding of what information is properly before this committee.

While Reading the Dossier

- Read the entire dossier, not selected sections.
- Take notes organized around the criteria categories.
- Evaluate the candidate against the department's published criteria—not against unwritten expectations or comparisons to prior candidates.
- Carefully consider any rebuttals the candidate submitted in response to earlier levels of review.
- Form independent impressions before discussing with colleagues.
- Note questions and areas for further discussion.

During Deliberation

- Ground observations in specific evidence from the dossier.
- Apply only the published departmental criteria.
- Do not introduce information not properly before the committee.
- Check your reasoning for potential bias.
- Cast your vote — abstention is appropriate only when a genuine conflict of interest requires recusal.
- Raise procedural concerns as they arise.

In the Committee Letter

- State the conclusion clearly.
- Tie analysis to specific criteria and evidence.
- Ensure the analysis supports the conclusion.
- Review language for potential bias before finalizing.

Resources and Contacts

Questions about the P&T process, procedural concerns, or requests for additional guidance should be directed to:

Kate Drowne, Associate Provost for Faculty Affairs, kdrowne@mst.edu

Office of Faculty Affairs, Missouri S&T, facultyaffairs@mst.edu

Collected Rules and Regulations (CRR), Chapter [310.020](#) — Regulations Governing Application of Tenure

Departmental Promotion and Tenure Criteria Documents (on file with the Office of Faculty Affairs)

This handbook will be reviewed annually and updated as needed. Comments and suggestions for improvement are very welcome and may be submitted at any time to the Office of Faculty Affairs (facultyaffairs@mst.edu).
