General Guidelines: Post-Tenure Review

The Faculty of the University of Missouri, Department of Surgery awards tenure for the achievement of excellence. Whether a tenured member of the faculty emphasized service, education, or research, the continuation of tenure required the continued achievement of professional excellence. Through separate Promotion and Tenure guidelines, the specific criteria for the recognition of the achievement of excellence can be identified for each of these three arenas of professional activity: Service, Education, and Research.

Tenure represents a long-term commitment on the part of both the institution and the faculty member. Over this period, it is possible that both the faculty member and the institution will undergo change that can affect the faculty member’s performance. The faculty member must be responsive to the changing needs of the institution and the institution must be flexible to the evolving talents of the faculty member. Review of academic performance should reflect that both parties respect and respond to this dynamic.

In general:
- To be achieved, goals and expectations must be clearly enunciated, with reasonable resources (including time) provided to the faculty member.
- Claims of professional achievement should be buttressed with objective data.
- Claims of professional failure should be buttressed with comparative peer data.

When resources are provided and reasonable goals and expectations are set, it is expected that members of the faculty will make every effort to achieve those goals.

Post-Tenure Review Criteria

The annual review will form the basis for the post-tenure review process. This review will be conducted by the Division Chief and reviewed with the Chair of the Department. Annual reviews will be conducted with the knowledge of mission based (Research, Education, and Service – including Administration) effort agreed to by the faculty member and Divisional and Department leadership. Any change in a faculty member’s mission based focus required prior written approval of the Division Chief and Department Chair. A letter to that effect should be placed into the faculty member’s personnel file in the Department. In general, a faculty member with all annual satisfactory performances will be found to meet post-tenure review criteria.

Productivity will be measured in the three mission based areas using similar criteria to that in the School and Departmental Promotion and Tenure guidelines. Several important caveats in this group of faculty must be considered and are listed below.
Research (both PhD and M.D.)

1. In order to have assigned laboratory space, individuals should be funded through external sources. The level of funding that is acceptable will be jointly set by the faculty member and the Division Chief/Departmental Chair using guidelines from the Dean’s office.
2. If a tenured faculty member loses funding, the Division Chief, Chair and faculty member will agree to a plan for reestablishing funding for the laboratory. Commitment of additional bridge funding will be at the discretion of the Division Chief and Chair. The lack of grant submissions is unacceptable. Solely submitting research proposals does not secure an acceptable research rating.

Educational Standards

1. “Education” refers to the full spectrum of educational services offered by the Department of Surgery. These services range from undergraduate instruction through post-graduate instruction. These services also include extension services such as continuing medical education, public information, and service as an expert consultant.
2. For the purposes of satisfying post-tenure review, the educational services must be included in the official duties of the faculty member either through formal assignment or by approval of the academic supervisor. Unapproved educational services, as well as educational and consultative services provided for remuneration independent of the faculty member’s university salary, cannot be used to justify the continuation of tenure.

Service Standards

Service is construed to mean many different things in an academic environment. The easiest to quantify are patient care, committee work and administration.

A. Patient care can be quantified by the number of RVUs generated in a given period of time, indexed to national standards for academic medicine. Other acceptable measures would be the number of clinic half-days, months on consults, inpatient ward attending, directing a clinical lab, and other procedural based clinical activity expected to generate climate income.

B. Committee participation can be described and time spent clearly accounted. Some committees require more time for actual meetings and preparation than others (the Institutional Review Board or Medical School Admissions Committee may be the best examples.)

C. Administration (i.e. chairmanship, division chief), or leading of a program, division, center, etc. will be considered a major change in focus. These changes should be approved by the supervisor as appropriate and expectations altered since the time for administration may vary considerably with the activity type.
Post-Tenure Review Process

The post-tenure review process will be performed in accordance with

Collected Rules and Regulations, Faculty Bylaws and Tenure Regulations,
Procedures for Review of Faculty Performance (310.015_B)

B. Tenured Faculty Members. Tenured faculty have proven their ability to contribute significantly in their discipline and to work independently and productively in their field. In this document we affirm and strongly defend the importance of tenure at the University of Missouri. By fostering creativity and protecting academic freedom, tenure safeguards faculty from unfair dismissal based on arbitrary or discriminatory practices, thus encouraging the constant search for truth that is the hallmark of the University. Under this policy or any other university policy, academic tenure should be revoked only with just cause, and may only be done in accordance with the Collected Rules and Regulations of the University, section 310.020.C.1. However, tenure does not protect faculty from the consequences of not performing satisfactorily their duties to the University. It is in the best interest of the faculty as a whole to ensure that each faculty member contributes fully to the institution throughout that individual's career.

1. Performance Review of Tenured Faculty Not Holding Full-Time Administrative Positions

   a. The tenured faculty of each department or unit will develop and publish minimum standards for overall satisfactory performance.

   b. Every tenured faculty member, including those with part-time administrative positions, will submit a signed annual report describing her/his activities in research, teaching and service. The annual report will be reviewed by the chair. In this document the term chair will be used to mean the appropriate unit director (e.g., chair, unit administrator, area coordinator, etc.) or evaluation committee of the unit following normal unit practices. Chairs will be reviewed annually by the dean, or on campuses with no schools or colleges, the Provost according to the standards described in B.1.a. Using the standards described in B.1.a, the activities of the faculty member will be rated as satisfactory or unsatisfactory in research, teaching and service, and an overall evaluation of satisfactory or unsatisfactory will be provided. The faculty member will receive this information in a written evaluation.

      i. If the overall evaluation is unsatisfactory, there must be a face-to-face discussion of the evaluation between the faculty member and the chair. The faculty member will sign the written evaluation to acknowledge its receipt and may provide a written response to the evaluation. A copy of this signed evaluation will be provided to the
faculty member by the chair within a month after the faculty member has signed the evaluation.

c. **At five-year intervals** a tenured faculty member will resubmit the annual reports and evaluation statements for the past five years, with a concise summary statement of research, teaching, and service activities for the five-year period, and a current curriculum vita to the chair or evaluation committee of the unit.
   i. The first five-year review will be done five years after the tenure decision or the last formal review of the faculty member for promotion to associate professor/full professor. Faculty hired with tenure will be reviewed five years after they are hired.

d. Based on the five-year report, the chair will evaluate the faculty member's performance as satisfactory or unsatisfactory.
   i. The five-year evaluation process will be complete with a satisfactory evaluation.
   ii. If the evaluation is unsatisfactory, then the five-year report will be sent to the appropriate established committee of the department/unit, typically the one that reviews faculty for tenure and promotion. The departmental committee of faculty peers will perform its own full review of the performance of the faculty member over the five-year period and provide an independent assessment of the performance of the faculty member. The five-year evaluation process will be complete if the departmental committee judges the performance of the faculty member to be satisfactory.
   iii. In the event that both the chair and the departmental committee determine the performance of a faculty member to be unsatisfactory for the five-year period, the report will be forwarded to the appropriate dean, or on campuses with no schools or colleges, to the Vice Provost for Academic Affairs. The dean or Vice Provost for Academic Affairs will review the report and provide an assessment of the performance of the faculty member. The five-year evaluation process will be complete if the dean, or on campuses with no schools or colleges, the Vice Provost for Academic Affairs judges the performance of the faculty member to be satisfactory.
   iv. At every level of review, the faculty member will be provided with a copy of any written report that is part of these proceedings and will have the right of appeal of any evaluations, decisions, or recommendations to the next level of the process.
2. Formulation of Development Plan and Assessment of Progress
   
a. If a two-thirds majority of the members of the committee of the department/unit and the dean, or on campuses with no schools or colleges, the Vice Provost for Academic Affairs, consider the performance of the faculty member to be unsatisfactory, a plan for professional development will be written. This plan will be developed by the faculty member, the department/unit committee or a designated subcommittee, a mutually agreed upon mediator from outside the department, and the chair of the department/unit. This development plan will have clear and attainable objectives for the faculty member and may include a reallocation of the faculty member's effort and a commitment of institutional resources to the plan. This plan will be signed by the faculty member, the chair or unit administrator, the mediator, and the dean, or on campuses with no schools or colleges, the Vice Provost for Academic Affairs. The development phase will begin when the necessary resources as described in the development plan are provided.

b. A faculty member who has received an overall unsatisfactory five-year evaluation by the chair, the departmental committee, and the dean, or on campuses with no schools or colleges, the Vice Provost for Academic Affairs may not appeal the process of developing a professional plan. If the faculty member is not satisfied with the plan that has been developed, he/she may appeal to the next administrative level for help in the formulation of an acceptable development plan.

c. A faculty member with a plan for professional development will submit an annual progress report to the chair for three 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. If the chair finds satisfactory progress for any two of the three years, then the process will cease and the faculty member will begin a new five-year cycle.

d. 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 department/unit committee and the mediator. If the department/unit 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.

e. If both the chair and the department/unit committee that includes 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 or on campuses with no schools or colleges, the Vice Provost for
Academic Affairs. If the dean or Vice Provost for Academic Affairs 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.

f. If the chair, the department/unit committee that includes the mediator, and the dean, or on campuses with no schools or colleges, the Vice Provost for Academic Affairs do not find satisfactory progress in two of the three years, then the five-year evaluations plus the three years of progress reports and evaluations by the chair on the development plan will be forwarded to the campus committee on Tenure and Promotion and to the Provost or Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs. Each will review the reports and will recommend separately to the Chancellor that: 1) an additional two-year development plan be written and implemented in consultation with the faculty member and the originating departmental committee, or 2) the faculty member be considered for dismissal of cause proceedings (see section 3.)

g. Any faculty member may request participation in a formal development plan (as described in 2a) after two or more consecutive unsatisfactory annual evaluations. In addition, chairs will strongly encourage faculty who have had three consecutive unsatisfactory annual evaluations to participate in a development plan.

3. **Dismissal for Cause**

a. If it is deemed by the Chancellor that the performance of the faculty member during the periods covered in section 2 constitutes sufficient grounds for termination for cause, dismissal for cause may be initiated and if initiated will proceed in accordance with the procedures for dismissal for cause described in section 310.060.

b. This procedure for review and development of faculty performance does not substitute for the dismissal for cause procedures stated in section 310.060.

c. Notwithstanding the provisions of section 310.015 B.2.f above, this procedure does not impose additional requirements upon the University prior to initiating dismissal for cause procedures as stated in section 310.060.