

Bylaws of the University of Connecticut SOM
Appendix C
Post Tenure Review

All tenured faculty members may be subject to post tenure review.

A. What will initiate post-tenure review?

The performance of tenured faculty will be assessed annually as described in the school's Academic Merit Compensation Plan. The final overall rating from this assessment (after all appeals are completed) will initiate post-tenure review under either of the following conditions:

- 1) The faculty member receives at least two "marginal performance" ratings in a five year review period that commences when tenure is awarded and is reset after each 5 years. This trigger only occurs at the end of each 5-year cycle.

- 2) The faculty member receives one "not acceptable performance" rating. This trigger only occurs at the end of each 5-year cycle. EXCEPTION: during the period July 1, 2005 – June 30, 2010, two consecutive "not acceptable performance" ratings will be cause for post-tenure review, and in this time interval such review will begin immediately (i.e. doesn't wait for the end of the 5-year cycle).

B. Post-tenure Review

- 1) SAPC will assess the performance of the faculty member over the last 5 years and determine if this is "satisfactory performance" or "unsatisfactory performance" for this time period. Failure of a faculty member to participate in the post-tenure review process will be grounds for a rating of unsatisfactory performance. SAPC will transmit its assessment to the Dean, the Department Chair and to the faculty member. The rating issued by the SAPC may be appealed using the faculty grievance process described in the University's Laws and Bylaws (Article XIV.T).

- 2) The criteria for this review will be that the faculty member must make sufficient meaningful contributions to the School's academic mission while taking into account the assigned distribution of effort. Such criteria include, but are not limited to the following:

RESEARCH:

- Generation and publication of novel and significant research
- Award of external grants and contracts
- Service on NIH study sections or other grant reviewing bodies
- Service on editorial boards
- Reviewing manuscripts on a regular basis
- Invited talks at other educational institutions or national and international meetings
- Invited or elected participation in scientific society governance
- Invited review articles and book chapters

TEACHING:

- Evidence of effective teaching (e.g., Medical and Graduate School courses)
- Development of new courses, course sections, and teaching materials
- Offerings in the Continuing Medical Education Program
- Invited talks at other educational institutions or national and international meetings
- Teaching awards
- Evidence of willingness to teach when asked
- Continued entrance into the lab, and graduation, of graduate students
- Evidence of effective mentoring of learners and trainees

ADMINISTRATION/SERVICE

- Effective service on, or effective leadership of, institutional committees
- Administration of institutional academic programs, clinical and research resources, or regulatory bodies.
- Service on government or professional organization panels and committees
- Service on NIH study sections or other grant reviewing bodies
- Ad hoc reviews of grants and manuscripts
- Service on editorial boards

- 3) SAPC may request and/or obtain any information on performance it deems necessary to carry out the post tenure review, but, at a minimum, the following items will be included:
- a) Copies of the faculty member's annual performance ratings as assessed in the Academic Merit Compensation Plan over the past 5 years.
 - b) A letter from the faculty member's department chair summarizing the individual's activities over the past 5 years including any mitigating circumstances and an evaluation of future prospects for academic success.
 - c) A current curriculum vitae and any other materials the faculty member may choose to submit to assist in assessing past academic performance. Failure to submit such materials in a timely manner will not be cause to delay the final assessment of the faculty member.

These materials must be submitted within 45 days of the post-tenure review being triggered.

- 4) When the post-tenure review finds that a faculty member's performance has been unsatisfactory, a faculty development plan must be created to assist the faculty member to return to productivity.

Each department will have a defined procedure for developing "faculty development plans." This procedure will ordinarily include the participation of the Department Chair and/or Center Director, at least one other senior faculty member, and the faculty member for whom the plan is being prepared. Departmental plans should address conditions which could warrant recusal or exclusion of particular individuals from participation in the development of these "faculty development plans." If the faculty member declines to participate in the development of the plan, the plan may be developed and approved without the faculty member's input.

The faculty development plan must be prepared, and approved by the Department Chair, within 3 months of the transmission by SAPC of an assessment of “unsatisfactory performance”. Each department will also have a defined procedure by which these plans can be appealed to senior faculty in the department.

- a) The goal of the plan is to return the faculty member to a state of satisfactory performance by both the criteria of the Academic Merit Compensation Plan and the Post-tenure Review process.
 - b) The plan may include reassignment of duties and effort.
 - c) The plan should include specific expectations for academic productivity within a specific timeframe. Unlike criteria for promotion and tenure decisions, such criteria may be specified quantitatively since the overall standard is making sufficient meaningful contributions to the School’s academic mission rather than the promotional criteria described in Appendix B.
 - d) Interim metrics may be assigned for each year of the faculty development plan.
 - e) Within 10 working days of receiving the faculty development plan approved by the Department Chair, the faculty member may appeal its content unless the faculty member declined to participate in its preparation. In that case no appeal is allowed.
 - f) Any appeals must be completed within 30 days. The plan will not be implemented until any final appeal on the SAPC’s initial assessment of “unsatisfactory performance” is completed.
- 5) The faculty member will continue to undergo annual review with his/her Department Chair, and the results of this review will be made available to the SAPC. SAPC will monitor progress and performance towards the goals of the faculty development plan annually and will transmit its assessment to the dean, department head and faculty member using one of the following categories:
- a) The faculty member’s performance has reached the level of “sustained satisfactory performance”, in which case the post-tenure review and monitoring process will end and the faculty member will begin a new 5-year cycle of annual reviews. Subsequent post-tenure review would be triggered by the criteria described in paragraph A (“What will initiate post-tenure review”) above.
 - b) The faculty member’s performance in the preceding year adequately addressed the performance metrics in the faculty development plan for that year.
 - c) The faculty member’s performance in the preceding year did not adequately address the performance metrics in the faculty development plan for that year. This assessment may be appealed using the faculty grievance process described in the University’s Laws and Bylaws (Article XIV.T.)
- 6) A prolonged failure to contribute to the missions of the schools is deemed as adequate cause for loss of tenure and dismissal from the University for failure to perform one’s duties. In such cases the Dean may initiate dismissal procedures as described in the University Laws and Bylaws (Article XIV.H).

Approved by the UCONN Board of Trustees, April 12, 2005
Revised May 2007
Approved by the voting faculty of the School of Medicine on June 5, 2007
Approved by the UCHC Board of Directors on September 17, 2007.
Revised April 2010.
Approved by the voting faculty of the School of Medicine on November 15, 2010
Approved by the UCHC Board of Directors on February 14, 2011