POST TENURE REVIEW STANDARDS

The Dermatology Department subscribes to the belief that standards for post tenure review evaluations should not fall below what is expected to earn tenure. Accordingly, the Dermatology Department Promotion and Tenure (P&T) guidelines for promotion to Associate Professor become the starting point for the Post Tenure Review process mandated by the UM System. (See attached sheet for Associate Professor guidelines.)

Recognizing that the mix of responsibilities of any given faculty member can change markedly through the various stages of his or her career, it is appropriate that the general principles articulated in the promotion guidelines (the minimum standards for overall satisfactory performance) be applied at the department level.

Procedurally each year the Chair will conduct an evaluation of all faculty members. For tenured faculty, the Chair will make a judgment whether minimum standards for performance are being met. While not required, the Dermatology Department supports a review by the department P&T committee (or a subset thereof) if the Chair determines that a tenured faculty member is not meeting minimum standards. The Dermatology Department will follow university regulations regarding an unsatisfactory evaluation. (Note: University regulations require a face-to-face discussion between the faculty member and the chair when there is an unsatisfactory evaluation.)
1. Using the standards from the P&T Guidelines, the Chair will review the faculty member’s performance over the previous five years. The information used for this evaluation will be the annual reports/evaluations and any other materials required by the Collected Rules and Regulations. (Note: In practice, it is anticipated that if all annual reviews are satisfactory, then only the annual reports/evaluations will be used by the Chair for the post-tenure review. However, if one or more of the annual reviews are unsatisfactory during the five-year period, then all information specified in the Collected Rules, current vitae and a summary of activities, will be requested from the faculty member, along with any other information the faculty member wishes to provide.) On the basis of this information, the Chair will make a determination whether the performance during the five-year period is satisfactory (meets minimum standards) or unsatisfactory. If it is judged to be satisfactory, the process is complete.

2. If the Chair’s evaluation is unsatisfactory, then the case is referred to the P&T Committee for review. The same information collected in #1 will be provided to this committee, along with any further information the faculty member wishes to provide. If the committee determines that performance is satisfactory, the process is complete. If the committee (by a two-thirds vote) determines that performance is unsatisfactory, the case, along with a report from the Chair and committee, is referred to the School of Medicine dean.

3. Note: 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.

4. The dean will review the report and make a determination of the faculty member’s performance for the five-year period. The dean may utilize a college-wide committee to assist with a recommendation. If the dean determines the faculty member’s performance is satisfactory, the review process is complete. If the dean determines the performance is unsatisfactory, a plan for professional development will be written.

5. The professional development plan will be developed by the faculty member, the Dermatology Department P & T committee, a mutually agreed upon mediator from outside the department, and the Chair. The plan will follow the guidelines outlined within the Collected Rules of the University. In accordance with that plan, a faculty member may not appeal the process of the plan. However, he or she may appeal to the next administrative level for help in the formulation of an acceptable development plan.
6. 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, the process will cease, and the faculty member will begin a new five-year cycle.

7. 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 Dermatology Department P & T committee and the mediator. If the Dermatology Department P & T 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.

8. If both the Chair and the Dermatology Department P & T 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. If the dean finds progress to be unsatisfactory, a report will be forwarded to the campus committee on Tenure and Promotion and to the Provost or Vice Chancellor for appropriate action.

9. Any faculty member may request participation in a formal development plan (as described in #5) 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.