

Post-Tenure Review Procedures in the School of Medicine

All faculty, in-residence, tenure-track and tenured, undergo annual merit reviews with their department chairs and center directors, if applicable. For tenured faculty, this process is linked to the post-tenure review process.

The post-tenure review process is described in Appendix C of the School of Medicine Bylaws, which may be found on the [Faculty Handbook](#).

This document contains the procedural rules for implementing the post-tenure review process. As outlined in Appendix C of the SOM Bylaws, the SAPC carries out the post-tenure review. The Chief Academic Officer for Faculty Affairs will serve as the liaison to the SAPC for the post-tenure review process.

Tenured faculty will be reviewed following the 5th, 10th, 15th, 20th, etc. anniversary of being awarded tenure if in the previous five years they received two “marginally acceptable” ratings or one “not acceptable” rating. This review will occur only after appeals regarding the performance ratings are exhausted.

The process will be as follows (see last page of this document for a graphic):


1. All faculty members have the option of appealing a merit rating. The first level of appeal is to the Academic Merit Plan Appeals Committee and must be submitted within 30 days of being informed of the final merit rating. The second level of appeal is to the Health Center Appeals Committee. The third and final level of appeal for the merit rating is to the Board of Directors. If an appeal of a merit rating is successful and upheld by the Dean or the Board of Directors, no post-tenure review will occur.
2. All faculty are routinely notified when the merit ratings are finalized and the 30 day window for submitting appeals has begun. In addition, when a faculty member receives a rating that will trigger a post-tenure review, then the Chief Academic Officer for Faculty Affairs will send a letter to the faculty member informing him/her of this fact. A copy of this letter will be sent to the department chair, the center director (if applicable), the chair of the SAPC, and the Dean. Ordinarily these letters will be sent after a second “marginally acceptable” rating or a first “not acceptable rating” is given within a faculty member’s five year review cycle.
3. If all appeals of the merit rating are exhausted or the faculty member chooses not to appeal, then the post-tenure review process begins. The Chief Academic Officer for Faculty Affairs will write to the faculty member, the faculty member’s department chair, the chair of the SAPC, and the Dean, formally triggering the review, and documenting the due date for submission of review materials (45 days from the date the review is triggered).
4. The faculty member and his or her department chair will be informed of the materials that must be submitted, as outlined in the post-tenure review policy and the SAPC guidelines for the post-tenure review process.
5. Failure of the faculty member to participate in this process will result in a finding of “unsatisfactory performance.”
6. The SAPC will transmit its findings to the Chief Academic Officer for Faculty Affairs who will in turn notify the faculty member, the department chair, and the Dean.
7. If the SAPC finds that the faculty member’s performance has been “satisfactory,” the review is at an end, and a new five year review cycle begins. If the finding of “satisfactory” occurs before September 1 of an academic year, then the first year of the new review cycle will be that academic year. If the finding of “satisfactory” occurs after Sept 1 of an academic year, then the first year of the new review cycle will be the following academic year.
8. If the SAPC finds that the faculty member’s performance has been “unsatisfactory”, then

- a. The faculty member may appeal the SAPC’s finding of “unsatisfactory performance.” The first level of appeal is to the Health Center Appeals Committee. The second and final level of appeal for the performance rating is to the Board of Directors. If an appeal is successful, the post-tenure review process is at an end and a new five-year review cycle begins.
 - b. A “faculty development plan” must be prepared for the faculty member, per that member’s department’s procedures ([see Appendix C of the SOM Bylaws.](#)) The department has 3 months from the time of the SAPC’s finding of “unsatisfactory performance” to complete the development of the plan and have it approved by the department chair. The plan will be sent by the department to the faculty member, the SAPC, and the Chief Academic Officer for Faculty Affairs.
 - c. The faculty member has 10 working days to appeal the content of the development plan per the department’s procedures, unless the faculty member declined to participate in the process, in which case no appeal can be filed. Any appeal must be completed within 30 days. If the appeal is successful, the department will have 45 days to revise the faculty development plan. This revised plan can also be appealed per the department’s procedures. If the second appeal is not successful, that is the end of the process and the (revised) faculty development plan is implemented.
 - d. The faculty development plan will not be implemented until any appeal of the SAPC’s finding of “unsatisfactory performance” is completed and any appeal of the faculty development plan is completed, or until the faculty member chooses not to appeal.
9. Once the appeals of the SAPC’s finding of “unsatisfactory performance” are exhausted or if the faculty member chooses not to appeal, then [the Tenured Faculty Minimum Guaranteed Academic Salary Policy 2004-03](#) will be implemented
 10. Once the faculty development plan is implemented, the SAPC will monitor progress and performance toward the goals of the plan. The SAPC will specify the materials it requires for this purpose, which will minimally include the faculty member’s annual review materials and rating, and copy of the faculty development plan. The SAPC will annually provide an evaluation, using one of the three categories defined in Appendix C of the Bylaws:
 - a. “sustained satisfactory performance” – leading to the end of monitoring and the post-tenure review process and returning the faculty member to the 5-year review cycle of all tenured faculty members (with the new review date starting with the year in which the “sustained satisfactory performance” rating was received);
 - b. “adequate performance” in the development plan for the year; or
 - c. “inadequate performance” in the development plan for the year.

The SAPC will transmit its assessment to the Chief Academic Officer for Faculty Affairs who will in turn send the evaluation to the faculty member, the department head, and the Dean.
 11. The faculty member may appeal the SAPC’s evaluation. The first level of appeal is to the Health Center Appeals Committee and must be initiated within 30 days of being notified of the SAPC’s evaluation. The second and final level of appeal is to the Health Center Board of Directors.
 12. If the SAPC gives an assessment of “sustained satisfactory performance,” then the faculty member’s salary will be restored to its original level as defined in the [Tenured Faculty Minimum Guaranteed Academic Salary Policy 2004-03](#) and a new five year review cycle begins.

This document dates from 2008. It was revised in February 2014 to reflect changes in the School of Medicine Bylaws, and other institutional changes since 2008. It was further revised in September 2015 to reflect changes in the title of the Dean responsible for post-tenure review.

Post-tenure Review Procedures



Footnotes:
¹If the appeal of the annual merit rating is successful, the new annual rating is considered with the previous four annual ratings to determine if post-tenure review should be pursued.
²Prolonged 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).
³If a second appeal is successful the revised development plan will be implemented.

Footnotes:
⁴Successful appeal-new rating is "adequately addressed plan"- will continue in annual review cycle.
⁵Successful appeal-new rating is "sustained satisfactory performance"- post tenure review ends and a new five year review cycle begins.