

CHECK LIST FOR FACULTY POST TENURE REVIEW

Name: _____ **Degree:** _____
Faculty Rank: _____ **Secondary Department:** _____
Department: _____

A tenured faculty member will be subjected to post tenure review, every sixth year after obtaining tenure. (See Post Tenure Review 6.05 from Faculty Handbook below).

Materials should be sent to the Dean's Office, Faculty Affairs, College of Medicine, 601 CSB.

- _____1. Completed Checklist as coversheet to packet
- _____2. Letter from the Department Chair addressed to the Dean and APT Committee, stating that the faculty member's performance has been satisfactory;
or:
 - a) that faculty member has remedied previous unsatisfactory performance and is currently satisfactory; or,
 - b) that faculty member currently has unsatisfactory performance in one of more of the areas below.
- _____3. An Abbreviated MUSC CV
- _____4. An up-to-date curriculum vitae utilizing the College of Medicine standard format.

If Annual Performance Reviews **have not been "satisfactory" or better**, additional documentation will be required. If performance has responded to past improvement plans, note briefly and explain. **For current performance deficits relevant materials should be attached for unsatisfactory performance in one or more of the sectors below:**

Teaching. Provide a detailed assessment of the candidate's of accomplishments or non accomplishments as a teacher. Provide concrete examples of why the candidate's teaching accomplishments do not meet expectations.

Research. Provide a detailed assessment of the candidate's of accomplishments or non accomplishments in research. Provide concrete examples of why the candidate's research accomplishments do not meet expectations.

Scholarly publications. Provide a detailed assessment of the candidate's of accomplishments or non accomplishments in publications. Provide concrete examples of why the candidate's publications do not meet expectations.

Clinical Practice (Omit for non-clinical faculty). Describe the candidate's clinical practice. Provide concrete examples of why and how the candidate does not meet patient care expectations.

Professionalism Discuss the attributes of the candidate in light of the interests of the College and University. Consider professional judgment, wisdom, collegiality, citizenship in the academic community, the capacity to develop colleagues and students, contributions to the College's academic and societal mission, and the commitment to scholarly exchange and intellectual exploration. Provide concrete examples of why and how the candidate does not meet expectations for professionalism.

6.05 Post Tenure Review

Preamble: At every stage of a faculty member's career the Division Director and/or department Chair will review the faculty member's performance through the annual review process and reviews for promotion and tenure. A tenured faculty member will be additionally subjected to post tenure review, every sixth year after obtaining tenure. Post-tenure review serves to evaluate rigorously a faculty member's professional contributions and is guided by "Best Practices for Post-tenure Review" (see Appendix 6.05). During these reviews, efforts should be made to identify realistic long range goals for career enhancement, and evaluate the faculty member's strengths and weaknesses in performance, and through appropriate advice and action, provide opportunities to correct the weaknesses and realize her/his full professional development. The review should be used to ensure that all faculty members: (a) continue to perform at a level to achieve their long and short range career goals: (b) serve the needs of the students, and the institution; and that (c) outstanding faculty are rewarded.

(1) All tenured faculty members shall normally be subject to a review of professional performance and progress ("post tenure review") every 6 years. The process will be linked to annual faculty evaluations that are summarized on a five-point scale – (unsatisfactory, marginal, satisfactory, very good, outstanding) using the standard Faculty Performance Evaluation Form for all colleges and units of the University (See Appendix 6.05a). This review will be conducted by the Appointment, Promotions and Tenure (APT) Committee of the faculty member's college.

(2) The post-tenure review process will be initiated by the Chair/Director of the Department who will review the performance records of the faculty member and take action according to the following guidelines:

(a) If a faculty member has been rated as satisfactory or above in a majority of applicable performance categories in all annual performance evaluations in the preceding six years, the Departmental Chair/Director will send a letter to the Appointment, Promotions and Tenure (APT) Committee of the faculty member's college stating that the faculty member has received satisfactory or above in the majority of applicable categories relevant to her/his tenured appointment in the annual performance evaluations done during the preceding six years and, thus, is performing in accordance with standards of the university for a tenured faculty member. A copy of this letter will be sent to the faculty member under review.

(b) If a faculty member has been rated below satisfactory in a majority of applicable performance categories in one of the six preceding annual evaluations, and the deficiencies have subsequently been corrected, the Chair/Director shall send to the APT Committee of the faculty member's college a letter stating that the faculty member has received satisfactory or above in the majority of applicable categories on all but one of the annual performance evaluations in the preceding six years, that deficiencies have subsequently been corrected, and that the faculty member is performing at a level in accordance with standards of the university for a tenured faculty member. A copy of this letter will be sent to the faculty member under review.

(c) If a faculty member is rated below satisfactory in a majority of applicable performance categories in the sixth year of the cycle, the process will be extended for one additional year to allow the faculty member to correct identified deficiencies before further action is taken.

(d) Whenever a tenured faculty member has been rated below satisfactory in a majority of applicable performance categories on an annual evaluation, the Chair /Director shall meet with the faculty member to document the deficiencies, to outline the steps of improvement to be taken to correct the deficiencies and to indicate the source of the resources (funds) that will be provided to support the plan. The goal shall be to restore satisfactory performance. A written summary of the meeting, including a reasonable timetable for correcting deficiencies and a statement of the resources provided, shall be

prepared for the faculty member. If the Chair/Director finds that the tenured faculty member fails to make substantial progress toward meeting the performance goals that had been set and continues to be rated below satisfactory in a majority of applicable performance categories on two succeeding annual evaluations, a special review by the College APT Committee may be requested by the Chair or supervising administrator independent of the six year review cycle. The Chair/Director must submit a letter detailing the deficiencies of the faculty member under review with corroborating documentation as described under Section c to the College APT Committee. A copy of the letter detailing the deficiencies will also be sent to the faculty member under review.

(e) If a faculty member has been rated below satisfactory in a majority of applicable performance categories in more than one annual evaluation despite appropriate support and guidance from the Department Chair/Director in the preceding six years, the Chair/Director shall submit a letter to the College APT Committee detailing the deficiencies of the faculty member under review with corroborating documentation as described under Section c to the College APT Committee. A copy of the letter shall also be sent to the faculty under review.

(3) The College APT Committee will utilize the following materials for a post-tenure review.

(a) A full report on the faculty member from the Chair/Director, consisting of copies of the previous six years' annual performance evaluations conducted by the Chair/Director for the period in question using the standard Faculty Performance Evaluation Form for all colleges and units of the University (See Appendix 6.05c), and when applicable, written summaries that document deficiencies and plan(s) of remediation, (if any), plus the Chair's letter outlining his efforts to remedy the deficiencies, and supplemented by any other documents and information that the Chair/Director wishes to submit.

(b) The faculty member's curriculum vitae, plus a copy of the faculty member's annual reports for the period in question detailing her/his activity and progress, and including such aspects as the outcome of any sabbatical leave, professional development courses taken, etc. The faculty member under review shall be given the opportunity to appear before the committee and/or submit any documents that s/he wishes to be considered.

(c) Evaluations of teaching performance, in addition to those provided in the annual review by the Department Chair/Director will be included in this review. These would typically include such evaluations as student PACE evaluations, and comments by the directors of courses in which the faculty member has taught.

(d) Evaluation of research/scholarly activities by peers outside the department (although not necessarily outside the university). Refereed publications or other peer reviewed research/scholarly exercises will be considered as having been peer-reviewed outside the department.

(e) Any other documents or reports relating to the performance of the faculty member in any of the areas of professional activity that the Department Chair, the faculty member, or the members of the APT Committee wish to be considered.

(4) The College APT Committee will review the faculty member's performance based upon written standards and criteria which are developed by the College APT Committees, approved by the majority of faculty of the college or unit and be periodically reviewed by the faculty. These criteria will incorporate attention to "Best Practices for Post-Tenure Review", numbers 1 through 12 (See Appendix 6.05a). The criteria should reflect the specific missions of the individual Colleges and the University. Each College APT Committee shall publish and distribute these criteria to its faculty. **The basic standard for appraisal shall be whether the faculty member under review discharges conscientiously and with professional competence the duties appropriately associated with her or his position, not whether the faculty member continues to meet the standards for the award of tenure as those will have changed since initial granting of tenure to that faculty member.** The review must also be flexible

enough to acknowledge different expectations in different disciplines and changing expectations at different stages of faculty careers. In reviewing a faculty member's performance, the College APT Committee will recognize not only the diverse talents, activities and accomplishments of faculty within that College, but also that individual faculty are expected, in consultation with their Chair/Director, to focus their efforts in selected areas of endeavor. The College APT Committee will also verify that an adequate environment, as outlined in Section 6.05b, was provided by the Chair/Director to support the faculty members in performance of these directives.

(5) The College APT Committee shall, after completing their review, make a Report to the Department Chair/Director. The report, which shall be a permanent part of the faculty member's personnel file, will contain:

(a) An appraisal of the faculty member's performance and progress, including the perceived strengths and weaknesses. The performance shall be rated as superior, satisfactory or unsatisfactory. Any faculty member who receives a superior appraisal will be entitled to receive a permanent merit increase in base pay, in addition to any annual raise as determined by the Dean of the faculty member's college, or chair of the faculty member's department with approval of the Dean. The merit increase will be awarded by the Provost and will be funded for the first year by the Office of the Provost.

(b) An analysis of the faculty member's potential for further professional development. Opportunities for development should be identified (e.g.; encouragement of research initiatives, granting of sabbatical leave, potential mentorships in teaching and research, appropriate professional development courses that could be taken).

(6) The College APT Committee shall forward the Report to the Dean with a clear recommendation for retention of tenure when faculty, in the Committee's judgment, are rated superior or satisfactory. A rating of unsatisfactory by the College APT Committee shall result in a recommendation for remediation of the faculty member, or for removal of her/his. When removal of tenure is recommended by the College APT Committee, the Dean reviews the recommendation and, if in agreement, forwards the recommendation to the Vice President for Academic Affairs and Provost for review and action by the University Tenure Committee. The Dean shall provide to the faculty member Department Chair/Director and College APT Committee memoranda indicating her/his action.

(7) If the University APT Committee, after a full hearing of the case, supports the recommendation for removal of tenure, this recommendation will be forwarded to the Vice President for Academic Affairs and Provost and will activate the Grievance and Appeal Procedure for the faculty member as described in the Faculty Handbook (8.01).

(8) If the Grievance and Appeal Procedure results in an unfavorable decision for the tenured faculty member, the faculty member will then function under the guidelines for non-tenured faculty.

(9) The outcomes of evaluations shall be confidential, that is, confined to the appropriate college or university persons or bodies and faculty member being evaluated, and shall be released only with the written consent of the faculty member.

(10) Year one of the post-tenure review cycle will begin upon approval of this policy by the Board of Trustees and shall apply to all tenured faculty after the effective date.

(11) In accordance with the review process mandated by the Faculty Handbook, the above policy and standards and criteria developed to carry out this policy should be evaluated biannually with respect to the effectiveness in supporting faculty development and redressing problems of faculty performance.