PROCEDURES FOR REVIEW OF FACULTY PERFORMANCE  
(Post-Tenure Five Year Review Process)  
University of Missouri-Kansas City  
School of Education

The School of Education regards tenured faculty as an important intellectual resource. The unit desires excellence of its faculty in research, teaching and service. The purpose of outlining these post-tenure review procedures is to facilitate continued faculty development and to ensure accountability. These procedures are aligned with the University of Missouri’s Collected Rules and Regulations (310.015).

A. According to the Collected Rules and Regulations, the tenured faculty of each department or unit will develop and publish minimum standards for overall satisfactory performance. In the School of Education, these minimum standards have been identified in the annual review documents. For the annual review, a satisfactory evaluation on the faculty activity report is considered satisfactory in the areas of teaching, research, and service. The same standards used to evaluate faculty annually will be applied to the post-tenure review process. Accordingly, if a faculty member has received overall performance evaluations of “satisfactory” or better in three or more of the preceding five years, the faculty member will be presumed satisfactory for the purposes of the post-tenure review process.

B. Tenured faculty, 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. Chairs and Associate Deans will be reviewed annually by the Dean in the areas of teaching, research, service, and administrative responsibilities. The post-tenure review will take into consideration the administrative and faculty responsibilities of chairs and associate deans.

C. For the annual review, the faculty member will be rated as satisfactory or unsatisfactory in research, teaching, and service. The faculty member will receive this information in a written evaluation. If the evaluation is unsatisfactory in any of the areas, 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.

D. At five-year intervals, a tenured faculty member will resubmit the annual reports and chair evaluations 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 of the division. 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. Associate Deans and Chairs will submit their annual reports to the Dean.
E. Based on the five-year report, the chair will evaluate the faculty member's performance as satisfactory or unsatisfactory. The faculty member shall be considered satisfactory overall if they received an average or above average score in each of the three areas under review (teaching, research, and service) at least three times during the past five years.

F. If the chair concludes the faculty member’s overall performance for the preceding five years is satisfactory, the chair will forward that decision to the Dean and the five year evaluation process will be complete.

G. If the chair concludes the faculty member’s overall performance is unsatisfactory after review and face-to-face discussion, then the five-year report will be sent to the School of Education Promotion and Tenure Committee. The SOE Promotion and Tenure Committee 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 unless a majority of the SOE Promotion and Tenure Committee judge the performance of the faculty member to be unsatisfactory.

H. In the event that both the chair and the SOE Promotion and Tenure Committee through majority decision determine the performance of a faculty member to be unsatisfactory for the five-year period, the detailed evaluations will be forwarded to the Dean. 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.

I. 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.

In the event that the faculty member undergoing the five year review is facing catastrophic circumstances such as the death of a family member, serious illness, or other major life-changing event, the faculty member may submit a written request to the chairperson to extend the review process. If the chairperson approves the request, the evaluation process is complete. If the chairperson does not approve the request, it will be forwarded to the SOE Promotion and Tenure Committee for consideration. If a majority of the SOE Promotion and Tenure Committee approve the request, the evaluation process is complete. If a majority of the Committee do not approve, the request will be forwarded to the Dean. If the Dean approves the request, the evaluation process is complete. If the Dean does not approve the request, it will be forwarded to the Provost’s Office for review and final decision. The faculty member has the right to appeal any of the evaluations, decisions, or recommendations to the next level of the process.

**FORMULATION OF DEVELOPMENT PLAN AND ASSESSMENT OF PROGRESS**

A. If the chair, the SOE Promotion and Tenure Committee, and the Dean 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 SOE Promotion and Tenure Committee, a mutually agreed upon mediator from outside the
department, and the chair of the division. 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, the SOE Promotion and Tenure Committee, the mediator, and the Dean. 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 SOE Promotion and Tenure Committee and the Dean may not appeal the process of developing a professional development plan. If the faculty member is not satisfied with the plan, 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 SOE Promotion and Tenure Committee and the mediator. If the SOE Promotion and Tenure Committee and the mediator 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.

E. If the chair, the SOE Promotion and Tenure Committee, and 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. 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.

F. If the chair, the SOE Promotion and Tenure Committee, the mediator, and the Dean 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 for cause proceedings (see section 3 of the Collected Rules and Regulations.)

G. Any faculty member may request participation in a formal development plan (as described in 2a of the Collected Rules and Regulations) 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.