Principles Applied to Post-Tenure Review

A PTR policy for the Department will ensure professional accountability by a regular, comprehensive evaluation of every tenured faculty member’s performance.

The policies and standards for PTR in the Department will be developed by a faculty committee of tenured faculty peers consistent with campus and School of Medicine policies. The policies and standards will be reviewed by the Coordinators and forwarded to all tenured faculty and voted on for adoption.

The Chair will appoint a three-person PTR Committee, and in case the three tenured faculty are not available within the Department, the Chair will recruit a tenured faculty member elsewhere in the Medical School, making effort to pick a member who has an appropriate background and expertise for this task.

Recommended Guidelines for Procedures to be Considered

PTR will evaluate faculty performances in teaching, scholarship, and service, the same areas of competence and achievement that are used in tenure and promotion reviews and in annual evaluations.

There should be two levels of review – Regular or Comprehensive. A Regular Review will consist of a review of a faculty member’s CV by the PTR Committee. A Comprehensive Review will include a review of the CV and a meeting with the faculty member to develop a plan for continued professional development and productivity, including goals and performance standards to be met.

A Comprehensive Review will occur five years following the awarding of tenure. This initial review may result in a Regular or Comprehensive Review again in one year, three years or five years. Additional reviews may be initiated based on the Chair’s annual review of faculty members. Because the annual Chair’s review and/or the PTR may trigger a Comprehensive Review, faculty who do not agree with their reviews may appeal the review through a plan for due process.

Following the initial review, subsequent Regular Reviews will occur no more often than every three years or less often than every five years. Faculty who has achieved summary evaluations
(Chair’s review and last PTR) as “meeting expectations” or better will undergo Regular Review at a designated interval.

Comprehensive Reviews may occur at intervals recommended by the PTR Committee and/or the Chair. Faculty who receive summary evaluations (Chair’s review and last PTR) of “below expectations” are required to meet with the PTR Committee to discuss the evaluation and to plan and implement a Performance Improvement Agreement (PIA) to strengthen the faculty member’s performance. The next PTR will be a Comprehensive Review.

Performance Improvement Agreement

Faculty who receive a “below expectations” PTR must participate in developing a Performance Improvement Contract (PIC) with consultation from the PTR Committee. The PTR and the PIC processes are designed to improve faculty performance, including the identification of resources and/or mentoring. Faculty may appeal the PTR or the PIC and no action will be required until the appeal is resolved.

A PIC should include goals, timelines, resources, and benchmarks that measure progress at periodic intervals. Usually, PICs will be reviewed at one-year intervals.

Consequences as Stated by the Campus

In cases where the PICs and Comprehensive Reviews haven not produced the desired results, the PRT Committee may recommend to the Chair that consequences be imposed on the faculty member including: reassignment of duties; loss of travel funds or ineligibility for merit salary increases. In extreme cases, a recommendation may be made for the removal of tenure consistent with campus policies.

Professional incompetence is defined to mean the failure to perform teaching, research/creative works, and service duties in a consistent and satisfactory professional manner. A judgment of professional incompetence is based upon peer review of the faculty member’s performance. The PTR process provides such peer review.