Objective:

In keeping with University expectations for professional accountability, the Department of Molecular Microbiology and Immunology (MMI) endorses the concept of guidelines for post-tenure review of faculty scholarly activities and commitment to the missions of the institution. Tenured faculty members generally agree that standards for post-tenure review evaluations should be based on expectations of sustained activity in the areas of teaching, research, service, and in some cases, economic development. Therefore, the purpose of post-tenure review is to provide a mechanism for encouraging sustained, meaningful activity in these missions.

- The post-tenure review process is expected to affirm the contributions of the faculty member to the success of the Department, and should be a positive experience.
- The process is designed to assist, as needed, in identifying any concerns regarding a faculty member’s overall professional performance.

Each academic unit is expected to provide guidelines for the minimum standards of academic performance for post-tenure review. These guidelines should be consistent with the broad institutional standards of performance as mandated in the Collected Rules and Regulations, Section 310.015 (http://www.umsystem.edu/ums/departments/gc/rules/bylaws/310/015.shtml) of the University of Missouri and with the specific guidelines of the Department for achieving promotion and tenure.

Departmental Guidelines:

The evaluation process for post-tenure review requires the appraisal of a faculty member’s professional performance in meeting the expectations of the Department, School of Medicine (SOM), and University with regard to sustained scholarly and service activities.

- Each faculty member must demonstrate continuing/evolving excellence in teaching, research and service appropriate to the individual’s assignments, recognizing that the relative distribution of effort devoted to each area may differ among faculty colleagues and may change over time. Similar to the evolution of priorities of the institutional units, faculty priorities may change over time, necessitating flexibility in distribution of effort, which should be considered during the review process.
- Each tenured faculty member’s relative distribution of annual effort in the areas of teaching, research, service, and in some cases, economic development, will be established as part of the Chair’s annual evaluation process. A guiding principle in
any distribution of effort is that each faculty member will remain active as a scholar and educator.

Teaching:

The educational mission of MMI is focused on a broad range of students and trainees, including undergraduate, medical, and graduate students, as well as postdoctoral fellows. Exemplary teaching activities should exhibit elements such as, but not limited to:

- Effective teaching contributions in:
  - Undergraduate education and mentoring
  - Lectures and small group (e.g., PBL) interactions for medical students
  - Graduate student instruction through coursework, small group interactions, thesis and dissertation committee participation, laboratory/technical mentoring, journal clubs, works-in-progress, seminar presentations
  - Training of postdoctoral fellows to be independent investigators
  - Curriculum content should be current and appropriate to the course topic and level of student.

- Advising/mentoring relevant to outreach programs, undergraduate, graduate and postdoctoral trainees, student organizations, individuals, professional or civic outreach programs, all within the scope of the University’s missions.

- Creative development and use of information delivery systems to support the learning process, including new courses, innovative curricula, novel delivery systems and online courses.

- Sustained program of scholarship relevant to the demands of the discipline, which should include scholarly contributions to educational journals and commitment to securing funds for educational initiatives.

Research:

An integral element of the mission of MMI is the advancement and dissemination of knowledge in microbiology, immunology and related disciplines through basic and/or translational research. Exemplary research activities should exhibit elements such as, but not limited to:

- Evidence of excellence in research and promise of continued growth through:
  - Sustained publications in peer-reviewed journals, review articles and book chapters, or other media that are appropriate for dissemination of findings based on scholarly research.
  - Demonstrated commitment as Principal or Co-Principal Investigator to secure external funding resources to support an independent research program.

- Productive contributions to the research of colleagues through collaborative/cooperative interactions, which include:
Jointly authored publications
- Sharing of techniques and resources with members of other laboratories
- Contribution to development, efficient operation, and/or supervision of core laboratories
- Participation in training and multi-investigator grants
- Willingness to contribute to MMI, SOM, and University seminar/lecture series

- Evidence of recognition by investigators at the national level as a contributor to the research enterprise through such activities as:
  - Productive research interactions with international scientists and institutions
  - Co-authorship on publications and grants
  - Organization of/participation in international symposia and meetings
  - Hosting of visiting/sabbatical scientists seeking collaboration or technical training
  - Appointments to Editorial Boards and Scientific Review Panels

**Service:**

Service to the Department, SOM, and University through participation in a variety of activities is necessary to the efficient operation and function of these units. In addition, participation in service activities for scientific organizations, professional societies, and granting agencies is encouraged — such activities contribute to all academic missions. Thus, exemplary service activities should exhibit elements such as, but not limited to:

- Substantive contribution to the function of Departmental, School of Medicine, and/or University committees.

- Mentoring other faculty members, attendance and participation in Departmental activities (e.g., seminar program, faculty meetings, journal clubs, works-in-progress), and contributing to collegiality within the Department.

- Involvement with professional societies, scientific peer review (editorial boards, grant review panels), granting agency policy committees, and/or scientific/educational organizations.

- Dissemination of information to the public for the enhancement of the missions of the Department, SOM, and/or University.

**Economic Development:**

There is a growing interest and emphasis by faculty in the economic development mission of the University. The outcomes of scholarly and creative activity of MMI faculty may transfer to the private sector and enhance the lives of people in the state, nation, and the world.

- While it is not an expectation of the tenured faculty to contribute to the economic development mission, entrepreneurial activity may also drive the development of revenue streams that enhance the research or teaching missions of the Department and the University.
Faculty innovation and creativity may propel economic development through the commercialization of technological advances, medical devices, novel therapeutic interventions, and innovative instructional programs, teaching aids, and methods.

**Procedures for Meeting University Guidelines for Post Tenure Review:**

Section 310.015 of the *Collected Rules and Regulations* of the University of Missouri ([http://www.umsystem.edu/ums/departments/gc/rules/bylaws/310/015.shtml](http://www.umsystem.edu/ums/departments/gc/rules/bylaws/310/015.shtml)) outlines the general procedures on which the following are based.

1. Using the guidelines outlined above, the Department Chair will review each tenured faculty member’s performance over the previous five (5) years. The information used for this evaluation will be the annual reports/evaluations and any other materials required by the Collected Rules and Regulations of the University. It is anticipated that if all annual reviews are satisfactory, then only annual reports/evaluations will be used by the Chair for post tenure review. However, if one or more annual reviews are unsatisfactory during the five-year period, then all information specified in the Collected Rules, current curriculum vitae, and a summary of activities will be requested of the faculty member, along with any other information the faculty member may wish to provide. Using this information, the Chair will make a determination as to whether the performance during the five year period is satisfactory (meets minimum standards) or unsatisfactory. *If performance is judged satisfactory, the process is complete.*

2. If the Chair’s evaluation of the faculty member is unsatisfactory, then the case is referred to the Departmental Promotions and Tenure (P&T) Committee. The same information collected as part of step 1 above will be provided to this committee. *Should the committee determine that the faculty member’s performance is satisfactory, the process is complete.* Should the committee determine that the faculty member’s performance is unsatisfactory, the case, along with a report from the Chair and the committee, is referred to the Dean of the School of Medicine. A *two-thirds vote* by the members of the P&T committee is required for unsatisfactory recommendation.

3. The Dean will review the submitted materials and make a determination of the faculty member’s performance for the five-year period. The Dean may utilize a college-wide committee, such as the P&T Committee of the School of Medicine, to assist with a recommendation. *Should the Dean determine the faculty member’s performance is satisfactory, the review process is complete.* Should the Dean determine that the performance is unsatisfactory, a written plan for professional development will be designed and completed within three (3) months.

4. The Professional Development Plan (PDP) will be developed by the faculty member, the Department P&T Committee, a mutually agreed upon mediator from outside the Department, and the Department Chair. The PDP will follow guidelines outlined within the Collected Rules of the University. In accordance with that PDP, a faculty member
may not appeal the process of the PDP. However, the faculty member may appeal to
the next administrative level for assistance in the formulation of an acceptable PDP.

5. A faculty member with a PDP will submit an annual progress report to the
Department Chair for three (3) successive years after the plan has been initiated. The
Chair will review the report and provide a written annual evaluation on the progress of
the faculty member toward the objectives stated in the development plan. Should the
Department Chair find satisfactory progress for any two (2) of the three years, the
process will cease, and the faculty member will begin a new five-year cycle of post-
tenure review.

6. If the Department Chair fails to find satisfactory progress in two of the three years of
the development plan, the Chair will provide the annual reports and evaluations to the
Department P&T Committee and the mediator. If the Department P&T Committee that
includes the mediator finds satisfactory progress in two of the three years of the
development plan, the process ceases, and the faculty member will begin a new five-
year cycle.

7. If both the Department Chair and the Department P&T Committee including the
mediator do not find satisfactory progress in two of the three years of the development
plan, the Chair will provide annual reports and evaluations to the Dean of the School of
Medicine. If the Dean finds satisfactory progress in two of the three years of the
development plan, the process ceases, and the faculty member will begin a new five-
year cycle. If the Dean finds progress to be unsatisfactory, a report will be forwarded to
the campus Committee on Promotion and Tenure and to the Provost or Vice Chancellor
for appropriate action.

8. Any faculty member may request participation in a formal PDP (as described in #5)
after one or more consecutive unsatisfactory annual evaluations. In addition, the
Department Chair will strongly encourage faculty who have one unsatisfactory annual
evaluation to participate in a development plan.

9. At every level of review, the faculty member will be provided with a copy of any
written report that is part of the proceedings and will have the right of appeal of any
evaluations, decisions, or recommendations to the next level of the process.