

Proposed Changes to the UM Collected Rules and Regulations (CR&R)

Chapter 310: Academic Tenure Regulations

310.080 Regular Faculty Workload Policy Bd. Min. 12-3-92, revised Bd. Min. 4-1-04, Amended Bd. Min. 11-29-07.	Comments
A. Each department [1] will develop a faculty [2] workload standard for teaching, research, service, and administration[3]. The standard must specify the types of assignments and the distribution of the percent of effort in each function. The appropriate Dean on those campuses having schools or colleges and the Provost/Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs of the campus will review and approve the department workload standard according to the objectives of the department and the average instructional responsibility for the campus as defined in section D.	All campuses now have deans; this has been changed throughout the following documents.
B. The Provost/Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs will confer regularly with each Dean on campuses having schools or colleges or otherwise with each chair concerning implementation of departmental workload standards. Departmental workload standards will be reviewed as part of the five-year program review.	CRR for the five-year program review do not currently mention the workload policy – see suggested changes to CRR 20.035 below.
C. At the time of the annual review of the performance of the faculty member (see CR&R 310.015), the The Department Chair [34], in consultation with the individual faculty member, will determine a faculty member's assignments and distribution of effort in the areas of teaching, research, service and administration relative to the departmental workload standard. The faculty member's workload distribution will be recorded on the annual review document. The distribution may be assigned for the coming academic year or for multiple years up to the tenure review for untenured faculty, or the five-year post-tenure review for tenured faculty. At the time of the tenure review or the post-tenure review, the appropriateness of the workload distribution of the previous period will be assessed together with the faculty member's performance. Assignments among faculty members will vary to meet the objectives of the department.	Establishes the annual performance review as the point at which the workload should be discussed. Since CRR 310.015 states that the report will be signed by the faculty member, including the workload on the performance review requires a signature. Stipulates the tenure review or the five-year post-tenure review as the time for reassessing workload distribution.
D. The average instructional responsibility for all regular faculty members on each campus will be 9 section credits per semester. The Provost/Vice Chancellor for Academic	

<p>Affairs will establish instructional benchmarks for each college and school to attain the campus average instructional responsibility goal of 9 section credits per semester.</p>	
<p>E. The assigned teaching load for individual faculty should be (a) aligned with the department's workload standard; (b) consistent with the campus goal for average instructional responsibility; and (c) commensurate with research productivity, time devoted to individual instruction and advising, assignment of administrative duties, service assignments, and sabbaticals or faculty development leaves. Because of circumstances such as course cancellations, the Department Chair will modify teaching assignments; therefore, the actual teaching load of individual faculty will be calculated after any such modifications have been made. In calculating section credits or student credit hours, all forms of instruction will be included (such as off-campus, off-schedule, research supervision, clinical supervision, and independent study), although instruction for extra compensation will be excluded. Individual faculty effort in research and service will be calculated according to measures approved by the department. The distribution of effort for tenure-track faculty during the probationary period should be commensurate with departmental, college and campus standards for promotion and tenure. No regular faculty member can be assigned either fewer than 12 section credits or fewer than 180 student credit hours per academic year without an instructional waiver workload adjustment requested by the Department Chair and issued by the Dean or on campuses with no schools or colleges by the Provost/Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs.</p>	<p>The term “waiver” was misleading because it implied a reduction of teaching duties without an increase in other duties.</p>
<p>F. Using a faculty activity reporting system common to all campuses, each faculty member will submit an annual report of any faculty activities. The Department Chair will use the report, including the distribution of effort relative to the department's workload standard, to conduct an annual review of the performance of the faculty member (see CR&R 310.015). The dean or on campuses with no schools or colleges, the Provost/Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs will analyze departmental outcomes using data from the common faculty activity reporting system and work with the appropriate Department Chair to reconcile any disparities between a department workload standard and departmental outcomes.</p>	
<p>G. The Provost/Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs on each campus will supply an aggregate report of faculty workload to the Vice President for Academic Affairs.</p>	

<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The word "department" refers to an academic unit. 2. The term "faculty" refers to regular faculty throughout section 310.080. 3. Extension and continuing education activities represent an extension of the teaching and research functions of the institution. Faculty engaged in this mission will be evaluated by the same criteria applied to other faculty (see CR&R 320.035.B.2.b). 4. The term "department chair" refers to the leader of an academic unit. 	<p>Clarifies how faculty with duties in extension should be evaluated.</p>
---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	----------------------------------------------------------------------------

<p>20.035 Program Assessment and Audit Chapter 20: Organization</p> <p>Executive Guideline No. 25, 7-23-87; Revised 5-16-90; Revised 12-19-02; Revised 1-21-04; Revised 12-6-11.</p>	<p>Comments</p>
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Program Assessment -- Each department, center, and institute will undergo a cyclic process of assessment for the purpose of improving the quality of the educational opportunities provided by the academic unit. The assessment will include any degree programs offered by the department. The department faculty should assess the processes developed through its planning efforts to improve student learning, to enhance the impact of its research and scholarship on the discipline, and to link its service activities with the needs of the campus, discipline, and the community. The assessment should also determine if the planning at the academic unit is aligned with the campus strategic plan. <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The campus determines the procedures and format of the program assessment. 2. The departmental standards for workload and for the annual performance review of tenured faculty will be reviewed as part of the five-year program review of departments (see CR&R 310.080.B and 310.015.B.1.a). 3. The Office of the Vice President for Academic Affairs will provide 	<p>See CRR 310.080.B. above, which calls for the review of the workload standards as part of the five-year review. This revision now adds the</p>

<p>cooperation and coordination with the program review process of any applicable state agency or department. The Office of the Vice President for Academic Affairs will post short summary reports on the UM website available to any applicable state agency or department according to a mutually agreeable five-year cycle for each program. The summary report could contain the following summary information:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Name of the program and name of the department responsible for administering the program; 2. Statement concerning program mission; 3. Distinguishing characteristics of the program; 4. Trends in student enrollments and degree completions; 5. Scholarship activity and public service. 	<p>workload and performance standards as a component of the five-year review in this CRR.</p>
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

<h3>310.015 Procedures for Review of Faculty Performance</h3> <p>Bd. Min. 1-19-01; Amended 11-29-07; Amended 4-12-13.</p>	<h3>Comments</h3>
<p>A. Non-Regular Tenure-Track 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. For untenured regular faculty, it should also include the workload distribution for the coming year or for multiple years up to the tenure review (see CR&R 310.080.C). Written evaluations are expected and must be provided to non-regular (ranked, non tenure-track) faculty members as defined in CRR 310.035.B. 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</p>	<p>“Non-regular” is the phrase formerly used for Non-Tenure Track faculty which has not yet been removed from system documents.</p> <p>Since the Workload Policy was created later, this CRR did not mention it. The changes link CRR 310.015 with CRR 310.080 (the latter applies only to regular faculty).</p> <p>NTT faculty should also be reviewed annually.</p>

<p>Faculty Bylaws of the University of Missouri-St. Louis.)</p>	
<p>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.</p> <p>1. <i>Performance Review of Tenured Faculty Not Holding Full-Time Administrative Positions</i></p> <p>a. The tenured faculty of each department or unit will develop and publish minimum standards for overall satisfactory performance- which include minimum standards for teaching, research, and service as well as general principles for determining an overall satisfactory performance. They will be reviewed as part of the five-year program review. These standards are intended for use over the five-year time period covered by the post-tenure review (see B.1.c below).</p>	<p>The original wording did not require a separate evaluation of teaching, research and service, only an overall assessment. It is important that there are standards for each separate category so as to promote a clear process for responding to unsatisfactory evaluations, particularly teaching. Additional wording clarifies that the standards for the annual performance review are also the standards for the post-tenure review.</p> <p>IFC discussed whether there should be separate standards for associate and full professors, but decided that this would be unworkable and that there should be a single minimum standard. CRR 310.080 requires a review of the departmental workload standard in the 5-year program review; this revision requires the same level of oversight for annual performance review standards.</p>
<p>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 review should cover the performance for the past year and plans for the coming year, including the workload distribution for the coming year or for multiple years up to the five-year post-tenure review (see CR&R 310.080.C).</p>	<p>Links the annual review with the post-tenure review and workload policy.</p>

<p>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 unit standards for the annual performance review (described in B.1.a), and taking into consideration the faculty member's workload distribution (described in CR&R 310.080.C), 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.</p>	<p>Makes clear that the faculty member's workload allocation is taken into consideration in the assessment of annual performance.</p> <p>This sentence has been moved to the following section.</p>
<p>c. An unsatisfactory evaluation in any one category will not preclude a faculty member from receiving an overall satisfactory evaluation provided that the faculty member's overall performance attains the general principles laid out in the unit standards and fulfills the workload distribution assigned to the faculty member for that year. An unsatisfactory evaluation in both teaching and research will result in an unsatisfactory overall evaluation. If a faculty member receives an unsatisfactory evaluation in two different categories in a single year, or in the same category over two consecutive years, or an overall unsatisfactory evaluation in any year, there must be a face-to-face discussion of the evaluation between the faculty member and the chair to create a plan for achieving satisfactory evaluations. This may involve changing the faculty member's workload distribution (see</p>	<p>[new section]</p> <p>Provides specificity about what constitutes an overall unsatisfactory evaluation, incorporates mention of the workload, and stipulates the formation of a plan for remedying deficiencies. If teaching is unsatisfactory, it sends the faculty member to the campus unit for teaching excellence.</p>

<p>CR&R 310.080.C). If the unsatisfactory evaluations are in the teaching category, the chair will refer the faculty member to the campus unit responsible for fostering teaching excellence, which will work with the faculty member to improve pedagogical methods. The improvement plan will be attached to the signed annual performance evaluation. If the faculty member disputes an overall unsatisfactory evaluation, the dean will review the evaluation and decide whether to affirm the evaluation or return it to the department chair for revision.</p>	<p>Adds an appeal process.</p>
<p>d. 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 vitae. The review may be conducted either by the unit to the chair or by an evaluation committee of the unit, as decided by a vote of the tenured faculty (committee membership is described below in h.1.a). The first five-year post-tenure review will be done conducted five years after the tenure decision or the last formal review of the faculty member for promotion to associate professor/full or professor. Faculty hired with tenure will be reviewed five years after they are hired.</p>	<p>“Curriculum vitae” is the correct Latin.</p> <p>The “vote” may be accomplished by including this in the department’s by-laws, or it may be on an as-needed basis.</p> <p>Currently the review is never labeled the “post-tenure” review, which is confusing.</p> <p><u>NOTE:</u> IFC presents for discussion the question of whether the post-tenure review should be conducted by the chair alone or whether it should be mandatory to also include an evaluation committee. The current rules allow for either option and the following revisions have maintained that option.</p>
<p>e. Based on the five-year report, the chair or evaluation committee will evaluate the faculty member's performance as satisfactory or</p>	<p>The original section has been divided into two sections. The first</p>

<p>unsatisfactory. Satisfactory overall performance evaluations for each year will automatically be deemed sufficient for a satisfactory post-tenure review. The five-year evaluation process will be complete with a satisfactory evaluation. Faculty with a satisfactory evaluation may be further subdivided into Adequate, Good, and Outstanding. The chair may select a small number for the Outstanding designation whose names will be submitted to the evaluation committee of the unit for approval. The list of approved names will be forwarded to the Dean for consideration for a salary raise. The Provost/Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs will confer with each Dean to ensure that the proportion of faculty with an outstanding evaluation should be approximately 20 percent of the faculty undergoing the post-tenure review at the campus level in that year.</p>	<p>concerns satisfactory evaluations, and the second concerns unsatisfactory evaluations.</p> <p>Although the above rule (d.) permitted either the chair or a committee to conduct the review, this was not reflected in these sections; the language has been modified to reflect the two options.</p> <p><u>NOTE:</u> In the “Blue Section,” IFC presents the concept of merit raises for discussion by the UM faculty. Either the first or both sentences in blue could be inscribed in the CRR; or one or both could be included only in the White Paper as recommended operating procedures.</p>
<p>f. If an unsatisfactory overall performance review occurs in one or more years over the five year period, trends in the faculty member’s performance will be considered in the final determination of the five year post-tenure review. If the evaluation post-tenure review is deemed unsatisfactory by the chair and the initial review was conducted by the chair, then the chair will send the five-year report will be sent to the evaluation committee of the unit. 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</p>	<p>The IFC debated whether “one” is the appropriate number and felt that it gives maximum flexibility to the department.</p> <p>The previous rule permitting <i>either</i> a chair <i>or</i> the committee to conduct the review was contradicted by the wording in this section, which assumes that the chair conducts the review. The new wording allows for both options. The deleted sentence has been moved to the following</p>

<p>of the faculty member to be satisfactory.</p> <p>g. 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.</p> <p>h. 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.</p>	<p>section.</p> <p>These two sections have been deleted below and moved up to here.</p>
<p>(1) <i>Committee Membership</i></p> <p>(a) The evaluation committee is typically the one that reviews faculty for tenure and promotion may be appointed, elected, or otherwise designated in accordance with (CR&R 320.035.A.1.d). the established department, school, or college procedures as long as the procedures are in compliance with the Curators' rules and regulations. If other than tenured faculty members are included on the committee, o Only those who are tenured faculty members in the department may participate in the evaluation, except in circumstances described in Section 310.015.B.1.d (1)(b) below which permits others described therein to participate. Committee members may only evaluate faculty members who are at their current rank or below.</p> <p>(b) If there are not enough tenured faculty members within the primary department to comprise a committee of three, a special committee shall be formed in the same way as for a departmental tenure and promotion committee (CR&R 320.035A.1.d). by the dean, or on campuses with no schools or colleges, the provost/vice chancellor for academic affairs.</p>	<p>The original language was copied from the referenced CR&R 320.035; it seems simpler to refer to it here and in (b) below, rather than repeating it <i>in toto</i>.</p>

<p>The special committee should be formed by the addition of tenured faculty member(s) from a closely related department or field and/or tenured faculty member(s) from a closely related department or field on other UM campuses, or The committee may include faculty members(s) emeriti from the primary department in accordance with established procedures. In addition, it may include and/or retired faculty from the primary department who are part of an established recognition program according to Collected Rules and Regulations of the University, Section 310.075.B. The retired or emeriti faculty serving on the committee shall not be greater than 50% of the committee membership. The committee shall serve as the department-level committee.</p>	<p>Not relevant, since there are no other committees in this process.</p>
<p>i. 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.</p> <p>j. 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.</p>	<p>This section has been moved to above (g., h.). It properly belongs in the section about the performance review process and not in the section about the membership of the committee.</p>
<p>2. <i>Formulation of Development Plan and Assessment of Progress</i></p> <p>a. If a two-thirds majority of the members of the evaluation committee of the department/unit and the dean, or on campuses with no schools or colleges, the Vice Provost for Academic Affairs, consider the</p>	<p>These committees are typically small, and the 2/3 number can be problematic if one has to round up to</p>

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 workload distribution in accord with the department workload standards (see CR&R 310.080.C)** 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

whole numbers.

Currently, no process for constituting this *subcommittee* is spelled out. It was felt that the committee that conducted the evaluation should take part in crafting the developmental plan.

Links the development plan with the workload policy.

Note: IFC presents for discussion the question of whether the mediator should be maintained. Practice has shown that the involvement of a mediator was more of a hindrance than a help because it was difficult to find volunteers and recalcitrant reviewees repeatedly objected to proposed mediators. The revision creates a process that parallels the tried-and-true procedures used in the tenure and promotion process.

ceases and the faculty member will begin a new five-year cycle.

- e. If both the chair and the ~~department/unit~~ **evaluation** 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

<p>does not substitute for the dismissal for cause procedures stated in section 310.060.</p> <p>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.</p>	
<p>C. 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 the faculty member's workload distribution and to address any discrepancy between the current abilities of the administrator and expectations concerning performance based on minimum departmental standards for the annual performance review. 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. Faculty who return to the full-time active faculty after completing service as full-time administrators will be reviewed five years after leaving their administrative posts.</p>	<p>Adds mention of the workload distribution and clarifies which review is meant.</p> <p>Specifies the timeframe for the post-tenure review of returned administrators, allowing them five years in which to reestablish a research agenda if necessary.</p>