The Department of Pathology and Anatomical Sciences subscribes to the belief that standards for post tenure review evaluations should not be substantially below what is expected to earn tenure. Accordingly, the P&T guidelines for promotion to Associate Professor are the starting point for the Post Tenure Review process.

Each year the Chair will conduct an evaluation of all faculty members, using the procedures and format currently applicable within the School of Medicine for making a recommendation to the Dean concerning appointment status, rolling appointments, and salary adjustments. For tenured faculty, the Chair will evaluate whether minimum standards for performance are being met (all performance levels as assessed by the Chair, except the lowest level of overall performance, are considered equivalent to “satisfactory” performance according to University policy, or “meets expectations” in the School of Medicine). Performance is also be considered “satisfactory” for post-tenure review if the workload “MBM” metrics show an overall productivity that exceeds 75% of the expectation of a full-time faculty member (or 75% of the expected effort for those with less than full-time appointments). Satisfactory performance for post-tenure review does not require performance in all areas of academic achievement (as required for attaining tenure); however, tenure does not protect faculty from the consequences of not performing their duties to the University satisfactorily.

If the Chair determines that a tenured faculty member is not meeting minimum standards, the faculty member will be notified in a face-to-face meeting by the Chair at the annual assessment. At 5 year intervals (either 5-years from initial tenure award, or 5 years after the implementation of this policy), the Chair determines whether the overall 5-year performance has been “satisfactory” or “unsatisfactory”. If “satisfactory”, the next 5-year review will occur in 5 years. If “unsatisfactory”, a review by the Departmental P&T committee will be initiated. (Note: The annual face-to-face meetings for post-tenure review are the same in this Department as the annual face-to-face evaluations. However, in this Department, the 5-year post-tenure review is a separate face-to-face evaluation of performance over a 5-year period, rather than simply an average of the prior evaluations.)

Procedure for Post Tenure Review in the Department of Pathology and Anatomical Sciences (starting with annual evaluations in 2007).
Using the faculty annual reports, annual evaluations will be conducted as above. All but the lowest level of performance, as evaluated by the Chair, is considered “satisfactory” in the annual review process. For the 5-year review, a summary faculty report is prepared by the faculty member, objective measures are obtained from the school or department as available, peer and student impressions (both formal or informal) are collected, and based on the standards from these guidelines and with consideration of the annual evaluations, the Chair will review the faculty member’s performance. (The first 5-year summary will occur 5 years after the initial approval of this policy by the tenured faculty of the department in March 2007, or 5 years after the initial awarding of tenure, or 5 years after hire for those faculty hired with tenure, for faculty that received tenure after March 2007). On the basis of this information, the Chair will make a determination whether the performance during the five-year period is satisfactory (meeting the minimum standards) or unsatisfactory (not meeting the minimum standards). A separate indication of “satisfactory” or “unsatisfactory” will be made for each faculty member at their 5-year review. (In all portions of this policy, “satisfactory” on annual evaluations is considered all but the lowest level of performance, and “unsatisfactory” refers to the lowest possible level of performance on annual evaluations.) If the performance is judged to be satisfactory by the Chair, the post-tenure review process is complete until the next 5-year period.

If the Chair’s evaluation is that the 5-year performance has been unsatisfactory, the case is referred to the Departmental P&T Committee for review (excepting the faculty member, if a member of the P&T Committee). The same information will be provided to the P&T committee, along with any further information the faculty member wishes to provide. If the committee determines that performance is satisfactory, this post-tenure review process is complete until the next 5-year period. If the committee determines that performance is unsatisfactory, the case, along with a report from the Chair and the P&T Committee, is referred to the Dean of the School of Medicine, and follows the further procedural guidelines within the School of Medicine and the University.

At every level of review within the Department, the faculty member will be provided with a copy of any written report that is part of this process and will have the right of appeal of any evaluations, decisions, or recommendations to the next level of the process. It is the responsibility of the faculty member to request a copy if he has not received a copy.

If a plan for professional development is required (after review at all levels, according to policy in the Collected Rules and Regulations of the University; http://www.umsystem.edu/ums/departments/gc/rules/bylaws/310/015.shtml), it will be developed by the faculty member, the Departmental P&T Committee (or working subcommittee assigned by the Departmental P&T Committee), the Chair, and a mediator from outside the department. The plan for professional developmental and subsequent procedures for review will follow the guidelines defined within the Collected Rules of the University (310.015).
Approved by a vote of the Faculty of Pathology and Anatomical Sciences (and by the tenured Faculty) on April 4, 2007.