

# **PROMOTION AND TENURE GUIDELINES**

## **DEPARTMENT OF ARCHITECTURAL STUDIES**

Fall 2004 Revision—Approved 11/15/04

### **Introduction**

The Department of Architectural Studies (ARCH) at the University of Missouri-Columbia has established the following guidelines for determining professional rank and awarding tenure and promotion to members of the department. The policies and procedures for this department are consistent with the guidelines established by the College and the University. Unique departmental differences and individual achievements are considered in the following guidelines. It is very important for faculty members to understand and follow the criteria outlined in this document from the time of employment in order to collect appropriate data to document relevant achievements. Regardless of the percentages for teaching, research and service stated in the letter of appointment, it is critical that new faculty begin a research agenda immediately and that they show evidence of scholarship through publications in refereed journals by the end of the first three years of employment.

The departmental guidelines include the following sections: schedule for reviews, procedure, criteria for academic ranks, and expectation for evidence of faculty achievement in the areas of scholarship, teaching, and service.

### **Schedule for Reviews**

Faculty entering a tenure track position at the assistant professor level, and who remain on tenure track for the full probationary period, must be prepared to undergo at least two critical reviews during the initial probationary period, one at the end of the third year of employment, and one at the end of the fifth year of employment. All tenured faculty in the Department will evaluate the performance of the faculty member at the end of three years of service. After independent reviews of the candidate's materials by tenured faculty in the Department, the Department Chair, and the HES Promotion and Tenure Committee, the Department Chair will then meet with the candidate to discuss his/her strengths and areas needing improvement, and make a written recommendation regarding continuation of employment. The second review will be initiated at the end of the fifth year of employment. It is a more formal review process; the outcome of this review will determine whether the faculty member will be awarded continuous appointment at the University of Missouri, and promoted to the academic rank of associate professor. The procedure followed for these two reviews is presented in the following section. The time lines on the following pages are meant to serve as a guide, but may be subject to revision by the College, University, or by special circumstances. The following procedure is used for initiating and undergoing the review process at the end of the five-year probationary period:

Once a faculty member has achieved a continuous appointment by becoming tenured, and promoted to the academic rank of associate professor, performance evaluation will continue in the form of an annual review with the Department Chair. Each faculty member is expected to continue to achieve high levels of professional recognition for scholarship. The individual faculty member, in consultation with the Department Chair, will determine when to undergo the review process necessary to be promoted to the academic rank of professor. The procedure will be the same as for promotion to associate professor; however, the expectations regarding scholarship are much greater and are discussed in a later section of this document.

### **Procedure**

All faculty are reviewed annually. Faculty members on a tenure track should understand that they can be dismissed at any time up until the time they are awarded tenure.

## Pretenure Third-Year Review

### Purpose

As a helpful examination, the purpose of this progress review is to ascertain if an individual is making adequate progress toward tenure. Because faculty are mutually responsible in helping colleagues advance, this review gives faculty in the department an opportunity to assess progress. If adequate progress is not being made, messages of concern will be communicated and questions will be raised regarding the goodness of fit between the faculty member and the institution.

### Procedure

During the third year in a tenure track position, a faculty member's materials are submitted for review. Materials submitted by the candidate include the resume and other materials stating progress that are *criterion referenced* (documenting performance as outlined in department/college/campus promotion and tenure guidelines). The candidate's materials are submitted to the department's promotion and tenure representative no later than one week after returning from Spring Break to allow enough time for the review process.

Reviewers examine progress in teaching, research, and service as described in promotion and tenure guidelines. Reviewers also indicate what the candidate has contributed intellectually. Independent review letters will be written by the following:

- HES Associate Dean of Research and Graduate Studies
- Director of General Education Program. In addition, it is recommended although optional, to include a MU campus-recognized teaching scholar outside the department (i.e., recipient of a teaching award such as Provost award, Kemper, Burlington, etc.).
- Member of the college of HES promotion and tenure committee of the same academic rank or higher and who has had past experience on the college promotion and tenure committee.
- Tenured ARCH department faculty
- Department chair
- HES Associate Dean for Extension (if the candidate has an Extension appointment)
- (optional) Reviewer from campus of the same academic rank or higher and who has had past experience in serving on the campus tenure and promotion committee. The department chair and the department's promotion and tenure representative will accept recommendations on individual reviewers from the candidate before making the selection.

Independent letters are received by department chair and are submitted to the department's promotion and tenure representative. Tenured department faculty will review these independent letters and the department's promotion and tenure representative will write a letter summarizing the results of their review and submit it to the department chair. The candidate will receive copies of all review letters during the candidate's annual performance review with the department chair.

### Conclusions

Conclusions drawn at the time of the three-year review should not be considered as binding at the time of mandatory tenure review. Rather, they represent a "snapshot" for perceived progress at the time of the review.

### **Mandatory Fifth-Year Review for Promotion and Tenure**

Review and recommendations for tenure and promotion to rank of associate professor will be initiated at the departmental level. The University publishes guidelines for preparation of the dossier each year.

1. At the close of the Winter Semester of the fifth year of service to the University, the faculty member who is undergoing the review process will make an appointment with the Department Chair to discuss the University guidelines for preparing the dossier. At this time both the faculty member and the department chair will separately develop a list of possible outside reviewers of the dossier (preferably ranked at the professor level, but at least ranked at the associate professor level).
2. The faculty member will prepare the dossier in May, June and July according to University guidelines. The dossier will contain documentation of the faculty member's performance in each of three areas: teaching, research/creative endeavor, and service.
3. The completed dossier and selected research articles will be sent by the Department Chair to outside reviewers no later than July 15 requesting an evaluation from them by August 15. Outside reviewers will include equal representation of people suggested by the faculty member and those suggested by the Department Chair.
4. Early in the Fall Semester the Department Chair will assemble materials for the faculty review process including the dossier with letters from outside reviewers, samples of course materials, published articles, and manuscripts accepted for publication. These will be made available for tenured department faculty to review in a confidential manner.
5. Tenured faculty in the Department will review materials as soon as they are made available. After having sufficient time to review the materials, tenured faculty will meet to discuss and vote on whether the faculty member be tenured and promoted to associate professor.
6. The faculty member seeking tenure and promotion will be notified of the departmental recommendations immediately and in writing. If the decision is not positive, the faculty member will have a right to an appeal at the departmental level.
7. The Department Chair will carefully review the dossier and supporting materials, and make a written recommendation to the college committee concerning tenure and promotion of the candidate by the deadline set by that committee, typically in September.
8. The College Promotion and Tenure committee will evaluate the dossier including the recommendations made in letters from the faculty in the Department and the Department Chair. The College committee will vote on the candidate, and the dossier, including the written report of the results of the College Promotion and Tenure committee evaluation, will be sent to the Dean. If the decision is not positive, the candidate will have a right to an appeal at the college level.
9. The Dean of the College will review all of the materials in the dossier and make a recommendation to the Campus Promotion and Tenure committee by the committee's deadline.
10. The Campus Promotion and Tenure committee will review the dossier during the first half of the Winter semester. Members of the committee will vote on whether to recommend to the Provost that the candidate be tenured and promoted. If the vote is negative, the candidate will be informed of the decision and be given an opportunity to have a hearing before this committee. After a hearing is held, the committee will vote again.
11. The candidate as well as the Dean of the College and Department Chair will be informed of the decision. A written recommendation from the Campus Promotion and Tenure committee will be sent to the Provost during the Winter semester along with the candidate's dossier.

12. The Provost will evaluate the candidate's dossier and make a recommendation to the Chancellor as to whether the candidate should be tenured and promoted. The candidate will receive a letter from the Chancellor during the summer informing the faculty member that he/she has or has not been awarded tenure and promoted to associate professor. If tenure is granted, the faculty member will be on a continuous appointment at the University of Missouri-Columbia. If tenure is denied, the faculty member will be allowed to stay one year. The faculty member who is denied tenure may appeal the decision following guidelines in the Faculty Handbook of the University of Missouri-Columbia.

### **Criteria for Academic Ranks**

As a basis for appointment and promotion to academic rank in the Department of Architectural Studies, the academic preparation and achievements essential to the responsibilities and expectancies associated with each rank are designated.

A. Instructor

This rank is recommended for individuals who do not hold a terminal degree and who do not have other traditional scholarly or professional attainments. Except for special circumstances, this is generally a nontenure track position, requiring the following:

1. Minimum of a master's degree from a specialized academic program.
2. Evidence of professional promise.

B. Assistant Professor

Assistant professor is the usual entry-level rank for a candidate who has completed the appropriate doctorate, terminal degree, or possesses equivalent scholarly or professional attainments.

Candidates for assistant professor must show satisfactory competence or high promise as teachers and researchers appropriate to their level of experience.

C. Associate Professor

The awarding of tenure and promotion to the rank of associate professor must be based on convincing evidence that the faculty member has achieved an outstanding record as a teacher, as a scholar, and one who provides effective service, and can be expected to continue a program of high quality teaching, scholarship, and service relevant to the mission of the academic unit. When evaluating a candidate, the focus of the evaluation is the candidate's primary areas of responsibility. A mediocre performance in an area of primary responsibility cannot be offset by excellent performance in a secondary area of responsibility.

1. Candidates must demonstrate the quality, and effectiveness of their teaching. This must reflect growth and development over the probationary period and suggest a high likelihood that professional development with respect to teaching will continue. Examples of evidence of this are found in the Teaching section of this document
2. Candidates for promotion to associate professor with tenure must demonstrate a strong record in a program of sustained scholarship which contributes to a body of knowledge embraced in the department's mission. It is important that the candidate clearly demonstrate progress toward achieving excellence in scholarship. Examples of this scholarship are given in the Research section of this document.
3. Individuals must be recognized by peers at other institutions for contribution to the field and profession. This shall be determined through a formal review by faculty at peer institutions.

4. Candidates are held to a high standard of departmental citizenship. Departmental citizenship is defined as assuming individual and departmental responsibility, reliable, and carrying on responsibilities that might extend beyond the nine-month period of the appointment. Poor departmental citizenship at best imposes additional service burdens on other faculty and at worst may obstruct a department's ability to function and may damage its reputation. Poor departmental citizenship is basis for a negative recommendation.
5. Candidates are expected to provide convincing evidence of a sustained record of effective participation in professional, university, and community service. Effective participation is expected; however, service contributions may not be substituted for excellence in teaching and research. Examples of appropriate service contributions are given in the Service section of this document.

D. Professor

University of Missouri guidelines state:

A person recommended for promotion to the rank of professor should have significant accomplishments, especially in the area of research and scholarly activity, beyond those justifying the rank of associate professor. Years of service alone do not justify advancement. Rather, sustained contributions during a career to research, scholarship, and teaching are necessary. A person to be considered for promotion to professor should be a scholar who has achieved national distinction.

from: UM Executive Order 6A, Policy and Procedures for Promotion and Tenure, Sept. 1992.

1. The criteria applicable to appointment at the rank of professor are those already indicated as applicable to the rank of associate professor. Expectations for "effective" performance to merit promotion are considerably higher than for lower ranks. For appointment at this rank, candidates should have an established record of accomplishment, national visibility, and demonstrated the ability to direct research of graduate students.
2. Candidates must provide convincing evidence of a sustained record of excellence in areas central to their responsibilities. A mediocre performance in an area of primary responsibility is not counterbalanced by excellent performance in a secondary area of responsibility. Candidates for promotion to professor are to be role models for less senior faculty, for students, and for the profession.
3. Candidates must provide evidence of a sustained record of excellence in teaching. Evidence shall include student evaluations and peer evaluations. The teaching portfolio may be submitted for consideration but carries much less weight than the previous two forms of evaluation.
4. Candidates are expected to provide convincing evidence of a sustained record of excellence in scholarship. A sustained record of scholarship excellence is reflected through a significant body of scholarship which is recognized nationally.
5. Candidates are expected to provide convincing evidence of a sustained record of effective participation and leadership in professional, university, and community service.
6. Candidates are held to a high standard of sustained departmental citizenship. Poor departmental citizenship at best imposes additional service burdens on other faculty and at worst may obstruct a department's ability to function and may damage its reputation. Poor departmental citizenship is basis for a negative recommendation.

### Scholarship: Research and Creative Activities

The candidate should have **demonstrated** the ability to conduct research or creative activities that reflects (1) original scholarship, (2) a contribution to the knowledge base, and (3) the likelihood of continued quality performance. This ability and future promise may be demonstrated by accomplishments in one or more of the following categories:

- Conduct research/creative endeavor with appropriate methods and rigor.
- Conceptualize and theorize in an original way.
- Synthesize, criticize, and clarify extant knowledge and research.
- Innovate in the collection or analysis of data.
- Relate research/creative endeavor to the solution of practical problems of individuals, groups, organizations, or societies.
- Create design that appears in a national juried show.
- Develop an exhibit that is reviewed.

Refereed activities will be given greater weight than non-refereed activities.

Evidence of **scholarly activity** and of a candidate's standing in a discipline may include:

- Articles published, or accepted for publication, in scholarly or professional journals
- Scholarly books, monographs, chapters, bulletins, etc.
- Articles published in the proceedings of a conference or meeting
- Textbooks
- Abstracts, summaries, or brief reports published in a journal, professional newsletter, conference proceeding, or other similar format
- Scholarly presentations to a regional or national professional organization for which the papers or abstracts are refereed
- Proposals (for grants/projects); indicate whether funded or non-funded, your role, and status of proposal
- Work that leads to the development of public policies
- Funding for training, or professional development
- Testimony before governmental committees
- Consulting
- Professional honors and awards for research and creative scholarship
- Serving as an editor of a journal
- Serving on an editorial or review board of high caliber or of national stature
- Invited presentations
- Juried shows or exhibits; awards of competition
- Reviewed exhibits
- Presenting in invitational one-person shows of quality galleries

This listing identifies many of the important and typical activities that constitute scholarly activity. Other than articles published in professional journals, no particular order of importance is implied by the above listing, and other professional activities, not listed, may also provide supporting evidence of scholarly activity.

### Teaching

The ARCH department highly values effective classroom teaching for undergraduate and graduate students. Thus, a candidate should have demonstrated effective teaching abilities and should provide evidence of one's personal commitment to teaching, success in the communication of material, and stimulation of students' interest. Evidence of continual improvement should also be furnished. One's influence on the curricula and teaching strategies of other colleagues and programs, both within the department, on campus, nationally, and internationally, is also valued.

There is a wide range of legitimate approaches to teaching that are the result of the kind of material that is taught, the level of the student, the personality of the teacher, and the environment in which the teaching occurs. Distinctions among types of teaching situations may include lectures, discussions, studios, seminars, institutes, workshops, in-service training, teaching by correspondence and distance-learning, one-on-one tutorials, student advising, and consulting. In documenting teaching proficiency, the candidate should indicate how the teaching approach was appropriate to the learner constituency's needs and abilities. Of course, no teacher can be expected to be equally masterful in all teaching situations.

### **Evidence of Teaching Mastery**

Evidence must be presented that the candidate has engaged in a teaching program of substantial quality and impact. Because each type of evidence provides an incomplete picture, a balanced judgment of teaching ability and competence must rely on several kinds of evidence. Evidences described below under A, B, C, and D must be provided in the dossiers of resident instructional faculty. Both teaching and extension faculty are encouraged to consider parts E-J and provide documentation as available and appropriate. Extension faculty must document teaching mastery based on the guidelines in Part K.

#### **A. Statement of Teaching Philosophy**

Candidates should provide a statement describing his/her personal teaching philosophy, strategies, objectives, long term teaching goals, and expectations for continued improvement.

#### **B. Statement of Departmental Congruence**

The candidate should provide a statement describing his/her contribution to the teaching mission of the department and general contribution to curricular policy and innovation.

#### **C. History and Student Evaluations**

The candidate should provide a chronology of the candidate's teaching history at the University of Missouri since the previous review, or of teaching at other institutions where appropriate. All courses taught, by semester, should be listed and accompanied by enrollment numbers, and standardized quantitative evaluation summaries. Other teaching situations should be described in terms of clientele, situation, numbers of student participants, level of students, duration of instruction, method of teaching, method of student assessment, method of course/teacher, and results of course/teacher assessment.

#### **D. Colleague Evaluations**

Evaluations by colleagues are a dedicated form of teaching evaluation in the Department. It should be based on direct observation of teaching or extension program presentations and the examination of teaching or program materials, as described in the *Guidelines for Teaching Evaluation* and approved by the MU faculty.

#### **E. Graduate Student Teaching, Tutoring, Advising**

Recognizing that graduate student teaching is intense and time consuming, data regarding the numbers of graduate students taught in non-class room situations should be provided including: relationship to the student (advisor, committee member), level of student, and degree of involvement with the student. Information on effectiveness as a teacher from former students and evaluations by graduate students with whom the candidate worked closely may be included if their anonymity can be protected.

#### **F. New Course Development**

The candidate may indicate any new courses developed or major sections of a course completely revised. For each, a rationale for the development and explanation of the contribution it makes to the overall curriculum should be included. All materials for the new course or section should also be provided for review.

#### **G. Teaching Materials**

The candidate is encouraged to provide documentation of attempts at new or improved teaching methods

and materials and his/her evaluation of their effectiveness. Course outlines, syllabi, and other relevant teaching materials should be provided as an appendix to the dossier.

#### H. Individual Teaching/Supervision

Documentation of student advising, consultation, and research or laboratory supervision may be provided as appropriate.

#### I. Honors/Awards

Evidence of recognition related to the candidates teaching may be provided, such as teaching-related publications, honors and awards.

#### J. Other Indicators

Indicators of leadership in curriculum development, publications related to teaching, grants awarded for teaching enhancement, or service to a committee on teaching should be documented. Where appropriate, other kinds of evidences may be included, such as assessments by workshop participants, clients, trainees, teaching assistants, or others. Such evidence should summarize systematically, rather than simply quoting a few laudatory comments.

#### K. Extension Teaching Faculty

Extension faculty may indicate evidence of outstanding teaching by providing descriptions of up to five significant extension programs for which the candidate had primary responsibility. Such descriptions should include (a) the identification of the program goals, clientele, and the needs-assessment procedure; (b) outline of program objectives; (c) details on the method of instruction and delivery, innovative teaching methods, materials, aids or approaches, and client evaluation of the program's effectiveness; and (d) description of the significance of the program and its relevance to the issues in the state and nation, and its potential or demonstrated impact on public policy and citizen welfare.

### **Service**

For teaching and extension faculty, service activities fall into three general categories: university, professional, and public. However, while public service in the sense of *good citizenship* is encouraged for all faculty, it is not legitimate for P&T purposes. In instances in which a candidate is uncertain of how a service activity will be valued for promotion/tenure purposes, or when a service commitment is inordinately time demanding and consuming, the faculty member should ask the departmental P&T committee for clarification, in writing, prior to undertaking or continuing, that service activity.

University: The effective operation of the university requires a high degree of faculty participation and, at times, intensive activity in faculty government, departmental and university committees, administrative roles, advisory functions, and similar tasks. All faculty must share in this task, but that a heavier burden may and should fall on the shoulders of more senior (and already tenured) faculty members.

Professional: Service to one's profession or academic discipline may occur at local, state, national or international levels. Appropriate activities include service as an officer, member of a board, committee, or task force of a professional group, on-site visits, reviewing research proposals or manuscripts, and organizing and participating in professional and technical meetings such as training institutes, workshops, conferences, and continuing professional education.

Public Service for Teaching Faculty: Public service for teaching faculty is valued when it enhances the department's perception and value in the public arena and when the faculty member is engaged in it because of his/her university/professional affiliation. These may include such things as testifying at public hearings, consulting with public bodies, and the like.



Public Service for Extension Faculty: Public service for extension faculty is a critical part of their professional responsibilities. The documentation in such cases must clearly demonstrate either how the candidate is meeting the extension and outreach program needs of the public through the teaching, coordination and evaluation of outreach programs or how the candidate's work may have aided in shaping public policy. Evidence should be presented showing that a candidate with extension responsibilities has been able to identify program needs utilizing stakeholder input, design programs to address those needs, use a variety of information sources in program development, procure necessary resources, skillfully deliver programs including appropriate partners and evaluate those programs and their demonstrated impact. For extension faculty, the detailed documentation of service activities is critical in P&T evaluations.

### **Documentation of service**

Teaching Faculty: Documentation of service for teaching faculty should include the specific responsibilities of the faculty member, the nature of the service provided, some indication of the faculty member's time involved, a brief summary of contribution to the department, and letters of support or commendation.

Extension Faculty: In addition to the documentation of university and professional service indicated for teaching faculty, extension faculty should also provide detailed description of outreach program planning and development, and public appearances/presentation as a part of one's extension responsibilities.

#### Evidence of public service may include:

- \* Consultations to the community and significant advisory work with government, business, or industry.
  - \* Outreach program planning and development.
  - \* Membership on committees and boards.
  - \* Public lectures and presentations.
  - \* Participation in radio and television programs.
- \* Service in official positions of public organization or agencies related to the mission of the department.
  - \* Publications and other resources for general audiences.

#### Evidence of university service may include:

- A. Committee assignments in the department, college, or university.
- B. Participation in statewide outreach programs.
- C. Special administrative assignments in a department, college, or university.

#### Evidence of professional service may include:

- A. Membership on state, regional, national committees or councils, or review panels.
- B. Membership on editorial boards of professional journals or other reviewing or editing activities.
- C. Officer or board member of state, national or international scientific, professional, and educational organizations.
- D. Leadership in the development of continuing professional education for personnel in the field.

### **Post Tenure Review General Standards**

The University of Missouri emphasizes the research/creative endeavor at this Research I institution. Scholarly activity is interpreted as original intellectual work evaluated and validated by peer review and communicated to the scientific/academic community within the scope of the department's mission and goals.

Required minimum expectations for overall satisfactory performance of tenured faculty are established in the Post Tenure Review (approved by department faculty 8/27/01) and required by UM. These general standards coordinate with criteria used for annual reviews and raises.

- Faculty productivity is expected in all three areas of research/creative endeavor/scholarship; teaching; and service.
- In each area, performance should demonstrate quantity, quality, and relevance.
- The faculty member's record should demonstrate a specific and identifiable area(s) of expertise (i.e., special competence). The development of this area of expertise implies movement toward and the achievement of national stature.
- It is expected that the faculty member's performance in all three areas should demonstrate a relatedness to architectural studies. Relevance is assessed primarily from the perspective of demonstrated relatedness and/or application of the activity to practice.
- Faculty performance that demonstrates integration and relatedness of research/creative endeavor, service, and teaching is particularly valued.
- These department standards are provided to supplement the University of Missouri Collected Rules 310.015 as described. Updates of University regulations supersede those printed below.

#### **Procedure:**

The Post Tenure Review begins five years from the tenured date OR the date of this initial policy OR the hire date if hired with tenure. Post Tenure Reviews are done at five year intervals. The dossier will include a complete resume and supplementary evidence at the discretion of the Chair.

A committee comprised of tenured Departmental faculty, excluding the department Chair, will review the dossier addressing items above and make a written recommendation to the Chair and the faculty member under review. The Chair will write an independent review of performance and incorporate this review in the faculty member's annual review that year. The five-year evaluation process will be complete with a satisfactory evaluation.

If the evaluation is unsatisfactory, then the five-year report will be sent to the Dean. The Dean may request additional letters of evaluation to perform an independent full review of the performance of the faculty member over the five-year period. The five-year evaluation process will be complete if the Dean judges the performance of the faculty member to be satisfactory.

At every level of review, the faculty member will be provided with a copy of any written report regarding this process.

## ACADEMIC TENURE REGULATIONS

Bd. Min. 1-19-01.

### 310.015 PROCEDURES FOR REVIEW OF FACULTY PERFORMANCE

**A. Non-Regular and Untenured, Regular Faculty.** The performance of all non-regular and untenured regular faculty is to be reviewed annually by the appropriate unit supervisor (e.g., department chair, dean, director, etc.) The review should cover the performance for the past year and plans for the coming year. Written evaluations are expected and must be provided to non-regular faculty members where there are concerns about substantial shortcomings in performance. Annual evaluations of untenured faculty members during the probationary period must follow the faculty bylaws governing tenure for each campus (300.010 Faculty Bylaws of the University of Missouri-Columbia; 300.020 Faculty Bylaws of the University of Missouri-Kansas City; 300.030 Faculty Bylaws of the University of Missouri-Rolla; and 300.040 Faculty Bylaws of the University of Missouri-St. Louis.)

**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 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. 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. 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. The five-year evaluation process will be complete with a satisfactory evaluation. 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.
- e. 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. 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.

f. 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 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. 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 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. 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 department/unit committee that includes 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 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.

Department Guidelines Approved 11/15/04