Guidelines and Procedures for Post-Tenure Review

(Approved by the Faculty of the School of Dentistry 01/24/2006; revised 7/31/07; revised 4/27/11)

The Curators have mandated post-tenure review. They envision several benefits from this periodic formal review of tenured faculty.

- In establishing criteria, the faculty members of the unit clarify what is acceptable performance for a faculty member.
- Provides opportunity for review by department chair or supervisor and an unbiased group of colleagues (i.e. SP&TC).
- Fosters improved performance by all faculty members.
- Fosters a developmental process in the rare case of a serious performance issue on the part of a faculty member.

For more information on University of Missouri system-wide policies:


These pages contain the collected rules and regulations for post tenure review

http://www.umsystem.edu/ums/aa/faculty/faqs

Procedures

1. Once the School of Dentistry’s criteria and procedures have been established, post tenure review will be initiated. Reviews will be phased in, based on the year tenure was awarded. Twenty percent of the faculty will be reviewed annually. As post-tenure review is phased in, tenured faculty members will be reviewed every five years following the award of tenure.

2. Faculty to be reviewed during an academic year will submit their last five annual reports FAR (Faculty Activity Report) or FAS (Faculty Accomplishment System) reports, copies of their annual chairperson’s evaluations, and a current copy of their vita to the Office of Academic Affairs as requested by the Dean’s Office.

3. On behalf of the faculty member, the Office of Academic Affairs will compile a summary of student evaluations for the past five years.

4. Using these documents, the chair will conduct the post tenure review and a copy of the recommendation of acceptable progress or improvement-needed will be forwarded to the faculty member. In the event of a satisfactory evaluation (meeting the expectations of their current rank and their current assignment), the post tenure review will be complete. In the event of an unsatisfactory evaluation, the five-year report will be submitted to the SP&TC.

5. The SP&TC will perform a full review of the five-year report and provide an independent assessment. The five-year review will be complete if two-thirds of the SP&TC members present judge the performance of the faculty member to be satisfactory (Note: SP&TC rules require that a quorum be obtained for a formal vote.)

6. If the SP&TC renders an evaluation of improvement needed based on the five year report, the report will be forwarded to the dean.
7. The dean 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 judges the performance of the faculty member to be satisfactory.

8. 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 and decisions. All appeals must be provided within 10 business days of notification of decision and evaluation.

9. If a faculty member receives a rating of 1 or 2 in any category, they may appeal first to the Department Chair/Supervisor who generated their report. The faculty member may provide additional documentation for the review of the chair/supervisor and this must be provided within 10 business days of notification of the original decision. If the faculty member is unsatisfied with the outcome of that appeal, they may then appeal to the School of Dentistry SP&T Committee. This appeal must be initiated within 10 days of notification of the appeal decision. Upon receipt of an appeal from a faculty member, the SP&T Committee shall consider the appeal within 10 business days. If the faculty member is unsatisfied with the outcome of that appeal, they may then appeal to the Dean. If they are unsatisfied with the outcome of that appeal, they may then appeal to the UMKC Provost. In the case of a department chair, whose supervisor is the Dean, the appeal following a negative decision by the School of Dentistry SP&T Committee may be submitted directly to the Provost.

10. All reviews will be conducted by applying the guidelines specified below.

11. When it has been determined that performance has been unsatisfactory and improvement is needed, a plan for professional development will be written. This plan will be developed by the faculty member, the SP&TC, and the faculty member's chair. If requested by the faculty member, a mutually agreed upon mediator from outside the department will also participate in development of the plan. If the faculty member is not satisfied with the developmental plan that is developed, s/he may appeal to the dean for alteration of components of the plan. The faculty may not appeal the process of developing a professional development plan. The agreed upon plan will be signed by the faculty member, the department chair, and the dean.

12. A faculty member with a plan for professional development will submit an annual progress report to his/her chair or director 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. At the end of that three year period, the annual supervisor assessments will be forwarded to the SP&TC for its review. If the chair or the SP&TC find 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.

13. If satisfactory progress in two of the three years of the development plan has not been attained, the chair and the SP&TC will provide the annual reports and evaluations to the Dean and the mediator, if there is one. If those individuals find 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.
14. If the chair, the SP&TC, and the Dean (and if appropriate, the mediator) 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:
   a. an additional two-year development plan be written and implemented in consultation with the faculty member and the originating departmental committee, or
   b. the faculty member be considered for dismissal of cause proceedings (see section 3.)

15. Any faculty member may request participation in a formal development plan 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.

16. Dismissal for Cause
   a. If it is deemed by the Chancellor that the performance of the faculty member during the periods covered above 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. His 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.

17. Full-Time Tenured Administrators — In the event that a full-time administrator leaves her/his administrative position to become a full-time active tenured faculty member of a department, the normal annual departmental review process would be used to establish any discrepancy between the current abilities of the administrator and expectations concerning performance based on minimum departmental standards. If there is a discrepancy between current ability and departmental standards, a development plan funded by the administration should be considered for the administrator prior to her/his returning to the department.

Timeline
Post tenure review should be initiated in the Fall Semester to allow sufficient time for all levels of review that may be necessary during the academic year.
Guidelines for Post Tenure Review

Teaching Track
The individual will maintain a level of teaching excellence and responsibilities, a consistent level of research productivity and quality, and a level of service to his/her unit, campus, and profession minimally consistent with the pursuit of promotion to the most recent rank attained.

Research Track
The individual will maintain a level of teaching excellence and responsibilities, a level of research productivity and quality, and a level of service to his/her unit, campus, and profession minimally consistent with the pursuit of promotion to the most recent rank attained.

Expectations and responsibilities in teaching, research and service excellence in the two tracks listed above should be consistent with time/effort allocation as designated by the department Chair and/or Supervising Administrator.