

# **A POLICY FOR POST-TENURE REVIEW**

## **THE SCHOOL OF MEDICINE**

### **UNIVERSITY OF NORTH CAROLINA AT CHAPEL HILL**

#### **INTRODUCTION**

This document defines in a formal manner the process of Post Tenure Review for the School of Medicine at UNC-Chapel Hill. The purpose of this Post Tenure Review process is to promote faculty development, to ensure faculty productivity, and to provide faculty accountability. It is the intent of the leadership of the School of Medicine to implement the Post Tenure Review process in a manner that is both constructive and fair. The goals of the Post Tenure Review are to enhance the quality of the school, to assist the professional development of each member of the faculty, and to assure that all students receive instruction that is of the highest quality. The process as set forth here conforms to the guidelines for Post-Tenure Review that have been defined by the Board of Trustees of the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill and by the Board of Governors of the University of North Carolina.

The School of Medicine "Post-Tenure Review" began conducting Post-Tenure reviews under this policy in the 1998-99 academic year. The first five years of this process was conducted in a manner designed to assure that all members of the School of Medicine faculty who have been granted permanent tenure prior to the 1998-99 academic year were reviewed no later than the spring of 2003. All subsequent reviews are then scheduled at regular, five-year intervals. While this process is intended to assure that all tenured members of the School of Medicine faculty will undergo a rigorous review once every five years, it is not meant to supersede the various reviews that are already mandated by existing School of Medicine policies. Indeed, the regular reviews that are in place for specific groups of individuals (e.g., Associate Professors, Department Chairs, Center Directors, and Endowed Professors) already fulfill the Post-Tenure Review requirements for these members of the medical school faculty. Therefore, to ensure a smooth transition into the new system for Post-Tenure Review, and to allow time for all involved individuals to familiarize themselves with this new process, the Post-Tenure Reviews carried out during the 1998-99 academic year, were only the reviews for the above-cited individuals (approximately 15% of the total tenured faculty) that had been previously scheduled to take place under existing School of Medicine policies. In this manner, we were able to adhere to the existing School of Medicine review protocols during the 1998-99 academic year. The Post-Tenure Review plan as described in this document, which will expand the process to encompass all tenured members of the School of Medicine faculty, was fully implemented in July, 1999. The Executive Associate Dean for Faculty Affairs, in consultation with the Chair of each department in the School of Medicine, selected slightly more than 20% of the tenured faculty annually to undergo review under the new policy for Post-Tenure Review. As a general principle, the faculty members selected for review each year were those with the longest accrued time from the last formal evaluation. As of 06/30/03 each faculty member with tenure as of 07/01/98 has undergone his/her Post-Tenure Review and is now on a regular five-year review cycle

#### **REVIEW POLICY**

All members of the faculty of the School of Medicine are expected to maintain throughout their careers the standards of excellence that are set forth in the School's existing tenure and promotion policy. Thus, the process of Post-Tenure Review should not be perceived as a threat to any member of the faculty. Rather, it represents a supplement and a logical extension to the various systems of review that are currently in place in the School of Medicine. These include the review of faculty members in the years prior to tenure, the review for tenure and promotion, the reviews that occur in connection with the appointment and re-appointment to such leadership positions as Department Chair, center director, and distinguished chairs, and the review of those individuals with long-term appointments to non-tenure-track positions.

As with all of the other reviews that are conducted in the School of Medicine, the specific areas that will be evaluated during the course of Post-Tenure Review include the following: 1) Research and scholarly work; 2) Teaching; 3) Administration; and 4) (when applicable) Clinical activities. In order to facilitate the process, all faculty members who are scheduled to undergo Post-Tenure Review will prepare a review portfolio. The material to be included in this portfolio is summarized below (see Attachment A).

## REVIEW PROCESS

The steps that comprise the Post-Tenure Review process include the following:

1. At the beginning of each academic year, the chair of each department in the School of Medicine will select one faculty member from his/her department to serve for one year on the School of Medicine Post-Tenure Review Committee. This committee will be comprised of full Professors who are not scheduled for review during that academic year. The Post-Tenure Review Committee will meet with the Executive Associate Dean for Faculty Affairs who will review the Post-Tenure Review policy. [Prior to this meeting members of the committee will review the digital training modules provided by the UNC GA that provide guidelines related to personnel and tenure; the essential elements of a useful and thoughtful review; how to prepare, conduct and manage a meaningful review process; and how to provide constructive criticism in a positive manner.](#) The committee will be divided into two separate subcommittees: a) a Basic Science Subcommittee; and b) a Clinical Subcommittee. These two subcommittees will perform the reviews for all faculty members scheduled for Post-Tenure Review during that academic year. This Post-Tenure Review Committee will not review those faculty members whose reviews are scheduled to take place by another process under the existing School of Medicine policy (e.g., Department Chairs, Center Directors, Associate Professors with Tenure, etc.).
2. Professors scheduled for review during the academic year will be notified at least one month in advance. This will provide the faculty member ample time to accumulate the various review materials. Note that all faculty members who are scheduled for review are responsible for compiling and submitting their own, individual Review Portfolio (see Attachment A).
3. The Post-Tenure Review Committee will provide a written summary of its conclusions and recommendations to the appropriate Department Chair and to the faculty member undergoing Post-Tenure Review. The chair will then meet with the faculty member to examine all aspects of his/her overall performance.
4. The faculty member being reviewed will be given an opportunity by the Department Chair to provide a written response to the report of the Post-Tenure Review Committee. The Department Chair will maintain, as a part of the faculty member's confidential personnel file within the department, a record of the Committee's report and any response to it. At the request of the faculty member, the Department Chair will arrange a second meeting that will include the faculty member being reviewed, representative(s) of the Post-Tenure Review Committee, and the Department Chair. Any substantial modifications of the review will be made in written form and will be included in the confidential personnel file of the faculty member.
5. The Post-Tenure Review Committee is expected to identify and recognize outstanding performance by faculty members. Recognition of excellence may include nominations for important School-wide or University awards, etc. The Post-Tenure Review Committee may also identify specific areas in which faculty members should be expected to exhibit improvement. In such cases, the review process will result in specific recommendations for improvement. For a faculty member whose overall performance reflects substantial deficiencies, a much more comprehensive plan for improvement (i.e., a development plan) will be prepared. Such development plans are to be prepared jointly by the Department Chair and the faculty member who was found to have the substantial deficiencies during his/her Post-Tenure Review. The development plan will reflect the evaluation and recommendations that were contained in the report submitted by the Post-Tenure Review Committee. Each development plan will be individualized and flexible, taking into account the intellectual interests, abilities, and career stage of the specific faculty member. It will also give consideration to the needs of the department, the School and the Institution. The development plan will establish clear goals,

specify steps designed to achieve those goals, define indicators of goal attainment, establish a clear and reasonable time frame for the completion of goals, identify resources available for implementation of the plan, and state the consequences of failure to attain the goals. Annual reviews will be used to assess the progress made toward the goals that were spelled out in the development plan. The Department Chair will acknowledge in writing a faculty member's clear improvement along with the successful completion of a development plan.

6. A faculty member whose overall performance has been found to show substantial deficiencies and for whom a development plan has been recommended has the right to appeal the findings of the Post-Tenure Review Committee and the recommendation for a development plan. The initial appeal is to be submitted in writing to the Executive Associate Dean for Faculty Affairs. Before making a decision regarding an appeal, the Associate Dean will meet individually with the faculty member, the Department Chair, and, if deemed necessary, one or more members of the Post-Tenure Review Committee as well. If the faculty member remains unsatisfied with the decision reached by the Associate Dean regarding his/her appeal, a final appeal may be submitted in writing to the Dean of the School of Medicine. Following this third comprehensive review, the Dean will prepare a written summary. The decision reached by the Dean will be final.
7. In the case of a faculty member who fails to complete successfully his/her development plan and whose performance continues to be deficient, the Department Chair will notify the Dean of the School of Medicine. The Dean will then consider whether grounds for disciplinary action up to and including dismissal exist under the *Trustee Policies and Regulations Governing Academic Tenure*. Dismissal or severe sanction may be imposed only in accordance with and on the grounds stated in the *Trustee Policies and Regulations Governing Academic Tenure*.

## RECORDS

Departments will maintain a list of the faculty members reviewed each year, a record of completed reviews and responses to the reviews, the names of all faulty members for whom a development plan was recommended and a copy of the development plan.

Departments will send to the Executive Associate Dean for Faculty Affairs a record of the names of faculty members reviewed during the previous year, the names of faculty members for whom a development plan was recommended and established, the names of faculty members to be reviewed in the coming year, and the names of faculty who are subject to review, but for whom a delay was approved along with the reason for the delay.

## AMENDMENT TO POLICY (2010)

In order to ensure that a Post-Tenure review occurs on a regular five-year schedule for all tenured faculty, the School is amending the Post-Tenure Review Policy. This amendment is being implemented for the Fall of 2010. Any Associate Professor who defers their promotion review without having undergone a departmental review [by full Professors or department promotion committee] will then undergo a Post-Tenure review conducted by the School's Post-Tenure Review Committee. The material to be submitted to the committee will be the same as that outlined in this Policy and used for the review of full Professors. Beginning in 2010, Chairs should ascertain by July 30<sup>th</sup> of the academic year prior to the scheduled review for an Associate Professor whether or not the faculty member is going to defer promotion review. For example, if an Associate Professor is due for promotion review in the Fall of 2010 or the Spring of 2011, then the Chair and the faculty member should determine by the end of July 2010, whether or not the faculty member will undergo departmental review. If the faculty member is deferring departmental promotion review, the Post-Tenure review will occur in between November 2010 through January 2011. This will then set a five-year Post-Tenure review schedule for that faculty member. Post-Tenure review will occur by this process until the faculty chooses to be fully reviewed by the department. Should promotion to full Professor occur, the faculty member's five-year Post-Tenure schedule will then be based

on the start of the full professorship. Should promotion not be awarded, the next Post-Tenure review will be five years after the promotion review or until promotion occurs. Should a faculty member not provide their promotion portfolio to the department on a timely basis, within a year of starting the process, then the faculty member must undergo the Associate Professor Post-Tenure Review described above in its next cycle.

In the case of departmental reviews, a written summary of the committee findings and recommendations should be given to the faculty member and included in the faculty member's personal file in the department, similar to the written reviews for the full Professors. The results of the departmental review can have one of three outcomes:

1. Recommendation for promotion,
2. Productive member of the department with a solid activity level, but not recommended for promotion,
3. Recommendation for a Development Plan.

If a Development Plan is recommended, the Chair and the faculty member are responsible for its development. As stated above these are individualized plans based on the faculty member's intellectual interests, abilities, and career stage. The outcome of departmental reviews will be reported to the Dean's Office in the annual May/June post-tenure reports.

**ATTACHMENT A****POST-TENURE REVIEW PORTFOLIO****THE SCHOOL OF MEDICINE - UNIVERSITY OF NORTH CAROLINA AT CHAPEL HILL*****Faculty from All School of Medicine Departments***

All faculty members who are about to undergo Post-Tenure Review will facilitate the review process by preparing a detailed **Review Portfolio**. The materials that are to be included in this **Review Portfolio** include the following:

- I. **AN INTRODUCTORY STATEMENT:** this **one** page self-assessment will be written by the faculty member undergoing Post-Tenure Review. This document is to summarize the faculty member's accomplishments during the preceding five years and his/her goals for the next five years. *The five year goals should include milestones that are aligned with annual performance evaluations conducted by the department. These plans can be modified annually by the faculty member, in consultation with the department chair.*
- II. **A CURRENT, UPDATED CURRICULUM VITAE:** This document should be prepared according to the standard UNC-Chapel Hill format for Curriculum Vitae. Both a paper and an electronic copy of this document are available from the office of the Executive Associate Dean for Faculty Affairs.
- III. **A REVIEW OF SCIENTIFIC/SCHOLARLY ACTIVITIES \***
  - A. A listing of all peer-reviewed and representative other publications during the past 5 years
  - B. A listing of representative scientific/research presentations made during the past 5 years
  - C. A listing of positions held on NIH Study Sections and/or comparable committees
  - D. A listing of Associate Editorships or positions on Editorial Boards
  - E. A listing of any other miscellaneous accomplishments
  - F. A listing of research support (please employ the format used for NIH Other Support)
    1. Active Support
    2. Pending Support
- IV. **ADMINISTRATIVE DUTIES \***
  - A. Administrative positions held: this should include a brief description of duties, responsibilities and time commitment.
  - B. Committee membership
    1. Departmental Committees
    2. School of Medicine Committees
    3. University Committees
    4. National/International Committees
  - C. Other administrative duties/responsibilities
- V. **AWARDS/HONORS/RECOGNITION \***
  - A. Please provide a listing of honors & awards received since the last review

**\* If this information is already available to the Post-Tenure Review Committee in the *Curriculum Vitae* of the faculty member, it is not necessary to reproduce it separately in the Portfolio.**

# POST-TENURE REVIEW PORTFOLIO

## THE SCHOOL OF MEDICINE – UNIVERSITY OF NORTH CAROLINA AT CHAPEL HILL

### *Faculty from Basic Science Departments*

In addition to the information listed on Page 1, faculty members from each of the Basic Science Departments must include the following material in their **Review Portfolios**:

#### V. TEACHING

- A. Courses (indicate course number, # of semesters)
  - 1. Course director (give course title)
  - 2. Course Instructor (give course title)
- B. Graduate students
  - 1. Students in lab for research rotations (past 5 years)
  - 2. Advisor for students in lab for thesis/dissertation (students' name & years in lab)
  - 3. Service on Thesis/Dissertation Committee (names of students)
  - 4. Other interaction with Graduate students
- C. Former Graduate students (Completed Graduate School during the past 5 years)
  - 1. Thesis/dissertation title for students who completed their research in the lab
- D. Post-doctoral trainees
  - 1. Post-doctoral trainees who are currently in your lab
  - 2. Post-doctoral trainees who completed their work in your lab in the past 5 years
- E. Training grants in which you are a participant (Title)

# POST-TENURE REVIEW PORTFOLIO

## THE SCHOOL OF MEDICINE – UNIVERSITY OF NORTH CAROLINA AT CHAPEL HILL

### *Faculty from Clinical Departments*

In addition to the information listed on Page 1, faculty members from each of the Clinical Science Departments must include the following material in their **Review Portfolios**:

#### VI. TEACHING

- A. Courses (include semesters/year, # of hours lectured, # of hours in lab, etc.)
  - 1. Course director (give course title)
  - 2. Course Instructor (give course title)
- B. Resident supervision (clinic) - days/wk
- C. Fellow supervision (clinic) - days/wk
- D. AHEC lectures
- E. Other teaching responsibilities

#### VII. CLINICAL ACTIVITIES

- A. Attending Physician (months/year)
- B. Consulting Physician (months/year)
- C. Clinic activities (days/week)

# POST-TENURE REVIEW PORTFOLIO

THE SCHOOL OF MEDICINE-UNIVERSITY OF NORTH CAROLINA AT CHAPEL HILL

## Faculty from All School of Medicine Departments

Once the faculty member has completed his/her portion of the portfolio it should be turned into the primary departmental chair's office.

Finally, the Chair of the primary department for each faculty member about to undergo the process of Post-Tenure Review is responsible for preparing a letter in which he/she delineates (and places in both quantitative and qualitative perspective) the contributions that that particular faculty member makes to the overall activities of the department. In addition to activities such as research, teaching, clinical responsibilities and service commitments, the Chair should address the faculty member's mentoring of other faculty and staff as part of his/her service to the departments or larger university community.

The departmental chair's office will deliver the portfolio to the Dean's Office for review.