POST-TENURE REVIEW STANDARDS

A Post-Tenure Review policy for the Department of Neurology will ensure professional accountability by evaluation of every tenured faculty member’s performance. The Post-Tenure Review will evaluate faculty performance in clinical service, teaching, scholarship, and service, the same areas of competence and achievement that are used in tenure and promotion reviews and in annual evaluations. It will be performed in accordance with the University of Missouri collected rules and regulations, faculty bylaws and tenure regulations, procedure for review of faculty performance (310. 015).

The Department of Neurology subscribes to the belief that standards for post tenure review evaluations should be similar to what is expected from faculty to earn tenure. Accordingly, the Department of Neurology Promotion and Tenure (P&T) guidelines for promotion to Associate Professor become the starting point for the Post Tenure Review process mandated by the UM System.

Recognizing that the mix of responsibilities of any given faculty member can change markedly through the various stages of his or her career, it is appropriate that the general principles articulated in the promotion guidelines (the minimum standard for overall satisfactory performance) be applied at the department level with focus on specific expectations from the faculty member.

Two levels of review may be performed: Regular or Comprehensive. A Regular Review will consist of a review of a faculty member’s CV by the Chair and will be performed every year. A Comprehensive Review will occur every 5 years following the awarding of tenure. Using the standards from the P&T Guidelines, the Chair will perform a Comprehensive review of the faculty member’s performance over the previous five years. This will include clinical service, education, service and academics/research. For a non-clinical basic neuroscience faculty member, clinical service will not be one of the criteria.

1. Clinical service: This can be quantified by the number of RV use generated in a year for the FTE assigned to the clinical service. In addition other measures would include number of clinic half days/year, number of procedures, number of procedure based lab half days, and other clinical service/on call coverage provided by the faculty member.
2. Education: This includes educational instruction of any level and type provided to medical students, residence, Fallows and appears. It may also include education to the public as well as the patients.
3. Service: This includes service to the department, to the medical school, to the institution and beyond. This also includes administration as Chairman, Division director, Fellowship director, Residency director, Center director and Program director.
4. Academics/research: This will include abstract presentations at regional, national and international meetings, peer-reviewed publications, book chapters and other publications. In order to have assigned laboratory space, individual should be funded through external resources. The level of funding that is acceptable will be jointly set by the faculty member and the department chair using guidelines from the Dean's office.

Claims of achievement in each of these categories should be buttressed with objective data.

The information used for this evaluation will be the annual evaluations and any other materials as required by the Collected Rules and Regulations. (Note: In practice, it is anticipated that if all annual reviews are satisfactory, then only the annual evaluations will be used by the Chair for the post-tenure review. However, if one or more of the annual reviews are unsatisfactory during the five-year period, then any additional information including current vitae and a summary of activities, will be requested from the faculty member, along with any other information the faculty member wishes to provide. On the basis of this information, the Chair will make a determination whether the performance during the five-year period is satisfactory (meets minimum standards) or unsatisfactory. If it is judged to be satisfactory, the process is complete.

If the Chair's evaluation is unsatisfactory, then the case is referred to the Department Promotion and Tenure (P&T) Committee (3 or more members). The committee is selected by the Chairman and may include faculty from other departments (with title of Associate Professor and above). The same information, as described above, will be provided to this committee, along with any further information the faculty member wishes to provide.

If the P&T committee determines that performance is satisfactory, the process is complete. If the P&T committee (by a majority vote) determines that performance is unsatisfactory, the Faculty member will be required to meet with the Chair to discuss the evaluation and to plan, develop and implement a Professional Development Plan to strengthen the faculty member’s performance and development.

PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT PLAN

The Professional Development processes are designed to improve faculty performance including the identification of resources and/or mentoring. The Professional Development Plan will be developed by the faculty member in consultation with the Chair. The Professional Development Plan will follow the guidelines outlined within the Collected Rules of the University and may include goals, timelines, resources, and benchmarks that measure progress at periodic intervals.

The faculty member with a plan for Professional Development will submit an annual progress report to the Chair for three successive years. 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.
If the Chair finds satisfactory progress for all three years, the process will cease, and
the faculty member will begin a new five-year cycle.
If the Chair finds satisfactory progress for any two of the three years, the faculty
member will begin a new three-year cycle.
If the Chair does not find satisfactory progress in two of the three years of the
development plan, the Chair will provide the annual reports and evaluations to the
Departmental P&T committee. If the Departmental P&T committee finds satisfactory
progress in all three years of the development plan, the process ceases, and the faculty
member will begin a new five-year cycle. If the Departmental P&T committee finds
satisfactory progress in two of the three years of the development plan, the faculty
member will begin a new three-year cycle.

If both the Chair and the Departmental P&T committee 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, School of Medicine for review.
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 and/or Vice Chancellor for
appropriate action. If the Dean finds satisfactory progress in all three years of the
development plan, the process ceases, and the faculty member will begin a new five-
year cycle. If the Dean finds satisfactory progress in two of the three years of the
development plan, the faculty member will begin a new three-year cycle.

Any faculty member may request participation in a formal development plan (as
described above) after two consecutive unsatisfactory annual evaluations. In addition,
the Chair may strongly encourage faculty who have had two unsatisfactory annual
evaluations to participate in a development plan.