

Revisions to School of Dental Medicine Guidelines
Approved Feb. 21, 2005

Article 3.3

Annual evaluation of faculty shall occur as described in the SDM Faculty Evaluation and Compensation Plan (dated no later than June 1, 2005) and may trigger post-tenure review of faculty as described in Appendix 3.3.A (SDM Post Tenure Review Plan: approved February 21, 2005). Revisions in either the SDM Faculty Evaluation and Compensation Plan or the SDM Post Tenure Review Plan shall be approved by the Dean's Advisory Committee (see Section 3, Article 3) and will be duly noted and dated in the Guidelines of the University of Connecticut School of Dental Medicine.

Appendix for Article 3.3

Appendix 3.3.A: SDM Post Tenure Review Plan

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 Faculty Evaluation and 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 "marginally meets expectation" 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 "fails to meet expectation" 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 "fails to meet expectations" 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 XV.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:

Teaching

- depth of knowledge, currency of information and mastery of the subject matter taught
- organized, lucid and challenging presentations of subject matter
- ability to interrelate material by showing applications and correlations as, for example, between basic science principles and their clinical applications
- development and presentation of electives in field(s) of expertise
- development of innovative teaching methods or materials
- creation of new, combined or integrated courses or other educational experiences
- mentoring relationships with other faculty and/or graduate students
- development and supervision of undergraduate, graduate or postgraduate laboratory-research or clinical rotations
- development and presentation of continuing education courses
- development of improved evaluation or grading mechanisms
- development of innovative and improved residency programs
- development of innovative mechanisms for the provision of care in an educational context as, for example, student instruction in a faculty practice context
- invited talks at other educational institutions or national and international meetings
- teaching awards

Research

- originality and importance of work
- steady, focused, continued productivity
- invitations to contribute (to) reviews, compilations or textbooks
- competitively awarded intra-and extramural grant and contract support
- impact of published work on the research field
- substantive collaborations
- participation in basic science or in clinical research centers
- development of innovative research programs, for example those transferring laboratory findings to the clinic, or employing clinical subjects or novel databases, or extending into the community at large

Health Care

- excellence and innovation in patient care
- development of continuing clinical education courses
- significant clinical consultancies (consistent with University of Connecticut School of Dental Medicine and Health Center Policy)
- development and implementation of improved health care programs for underserved patient groups
- skill in comprehensive patient management with medical integration
- election to the staff of external hospitals or other health-care delivery groups

Academically Related Professional Development Activities

- acquisition and application of new clinical, educational, research or health care skills, for example, as a mentee or significant collaborator in research

- preparation and submission of manuscripts
 - preparation and submission of grant and contract proposals
 - additional time spent in teaching, research or health care
 - participation and leadership roles in substantive University, local, regional, national and international committees
 - editorial or reviewer service for professional books or journals
 - service as an ad hoc reviewer study section or as a fixed-term member of a grant-review or contract-review
 - service as an examiner for specialty boards
 - service as a department section or division head
 - achievement of diplomat status in area of specialization
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 Faculty Evaluation and 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.
4. Within 3 months of the transmission by SAPC of an assessment of "unsatisfactory performance", a "faculty development plan" must be prepared by the department chair and approved by the Dean. Each department will define a procedure for developing such a plan that will in the least involve the chair and the faculty member. If the faculty member fails to cooperate in the development of the plan, the plan may be developed and approved without the faculty member's input.
- a. Within 10 working days of approval of the faculty development plan by the dean, the faculty member may appeal the content of the faculty development plan to the SAPC.
 - b. The goal of the plan is to return the faculty member to a state of satisfactory performance by both the criteria of the Faculty Evaluation and Compensation Plan and the Post-tenure Review process.
 - c. The plan may include reassignment of duties and effort.
 - d. The plan will not be implemented until any final appeal on the SAPC's initial assessment of "unsatisfactory performance" is completed.
 - e. The plan may include metrics. For example, the metrics might be that two NIH grant proposals of reasonable quality are submitted, or that two publications in peer-reviewed journals occur. 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.
 - f. Interim metrics may be assigned for each year of the faculty development plan. For example, while the requirement may only be to submit two reasonably sound NIH grant proposals by the end of year one, obtaining an R01 might be the criteria in year three.

5. 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 XV.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 XV.F).