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POST-TENURE REVIEW POLICY
DEPARTMENT OF MEDICAL PHARMACOLOGY AND PHYSIOLOGY

Objective: The post-tenure review process is expected to be an affirmation of the contributions of the faculty member to the success of the Department, and should be a positive experience. As tenured faculty members in the Department of Medical Pharmacology and Physiology (MPP), we recognize the value of professional accountability and subscribe to the view that standards for post-tenure review evaluations should be based on the appraisal of each faculty member’s contributions to the Department’s, School of Medicine’s and University’s expectations of sustained activity in the areas teaching, research, service, and in some cases, as an entrepreneur. It is understood that tenured faculty, by virtue of having successfully navigated the process of attaining tenure, have distinguished themselves in academic pursuits and hence are expected to continue to be self-motivated to excel in the three missions of the University. Therefore, we perceive that the purpose of post-tenure review is to provide a mechanism for encouraging sustained, meaningful activity in the aforementioned missions for tenured faculty members in MPP. Further, it is designed to assist, as needed, in identifying any concerns regarding a faculty member’s overall professional performance. Inasmuch as faculty members who have been awarded tenure were originally nominated for this distinction at the Departmental level, this 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 and will thereby provide the basis for the Post-Tenure Review process mandated by the University of Missouri System.

Guidelines: An essential component of the evaluative process for post-tenure review is 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 activity in the areas noted above. Each faculty member must demonstrate evolving excellence in these areas appropriate to the individual’s assignments, recognizing that the relative distribution of effort devoted to each area may change over time. Similar to the evolution of priorities of the Department, SOM, and University, faculty priorities may also change over time, necessitating a degree of flexibility in distribution of effort, which should also
be considered during the review process. Thus, each tenured faculty member’s relative distribution of effort to the areas of teaching, research, service, and in some cases, as an entrepreneur for each year 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

An essential part of the mission of the MPP is facilitation of learning among a broad range of students and trainees. These include undergraduate, medical, and graduate students, as well as postdoctoral trainees. Thus, exemplary teaching activities should exhibit elements such as, but not limited to, the following.

- Effective teaching contributions in undergraduate education, lectures and small group (e.g., problem-based learning) interactions for medical students, graduate student instruction through coursework, small group interactions, thesis and dissertation committee participation, laboratory meetings, journal clubs, and/or training of postdoctoral fellows. Class content should be current and appropriate to the course topic and level of student.

- Creative development and use of information delivery systems to support the learning process. These may include new courses, innovative curricula, or novel delivery systems. Problem-based learning case development, computer programs, Internet publications and web-based instructional activities, manuals, textbooks, and other media are additional examples of learning support materials.

- Development and use of high quality educational activities that address the needs of specific learners when appropriate.

- 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.

- Professional development in both discipline-specific and general education methodology.

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

Research

An integral element of the mission of MPP is the advancement and dissemination of knowledge in the pharmacological and physiological sciences through basic and/or translational research. Thus, exemplary research activities should exhibit elements such as, but not limited to, the following.

- Evidence of excellence in research and promise of continued growth.
- Evidence of sustained publication as demonstrated in a variety of forms that include: refereed articles, completed theses, review articles and book chapters, books, films, videotapes, audiotapes, computer programs, public presentations, or other delivery channels that are appropriate for dissemination of findings based on scholarly research.
- Demonstrated commitment to secure resources to support an independent research program.
- Productive contributions to the research of colleagues through collaborative/cooperative interactions. These 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, mentoring of graduate students and postdoctoral fellows, and willingness to contribute to MPP, SOM, and University seminar/lecture series particularly within MPP.
- Evidence of recognition by investigators at the national level as a contributor to the research enterprise.
- Productive research interactions with international scientists and institutions. Examples include co-authorship on publications, organization of international symposia and meetings, and hosting of visiting scientists on sabbatical or who are seeking technical training.

Service

Provision of service to the Department, SOM, and University through MPP faculty 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 by MPP faculty is encouraged because such activities may contribute to all three missions. Thus, exemplary service activities should exhibit elements such as, but not limited to, the following.

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

- Mentoring other faculty members, attendance and participation in Departmental activities (eg, seminar program, faculty meetings, retreats), and contributing to collegiality within the Department.

- Involvement with professional societies, scientific peer review (journals, funding agencies), 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

While it is not an expectation of the tenured faculty to contribute to entrepreneurial activity as part of the economic development mission of the University, the outcomes of scholarly and creative activity of MPP faculty may transfer into the realm of the private sector and enhance the lives of people in the state, nation, and the world. Entrepreneurial activity may also drive the development of revenue streams that enhance the research or teaching missions of the Department and University. Thus, contributions to the economic development mission of the University may play a significant role in the post-tenure review process for some tenured faculty. As examples, 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:

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 either 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, then 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 Tenure and Promotion 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.
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