

**School of Medicine Senior Appointment and Promotion Committee (SAPC)
Procedures for Post-Tenure Review**

In a year during which there are faculty who may be at risk for post-tenure review, the Chief Academic Officer for Faculty Affairs (CAOFA) will inform the Chair of the SAPC for work flow planning purposes. The information shared will be the number of post-tenure reviews that might occur that year, and if the faculty members at risk are basic scientists or clinicians.

When a post-tenure review is initiated (see post-tenure review procedures posted on the [Faculty Handbook](#), the CAOFA will inform the faculty member, the department chair, the chair of the SAPC and the Dean, in writing. The letters to the faculty member and the department chair will include instructions.

Within 45 days of receiving the letter from the CAOFA, the department chair must provide to the CAOFA a letter summarizing the individual's activities over the 5 years under review, including any mitigating circumstances and an evaluation of future prospects for academic success. In addition, the SAPC request the chair provide information (if applicable) regarding (a) all clinical duties with the University of Connecticut Health Center programs, including number of weeks spent as an attending physician at John Dempsey Hospital, the Veterans Administration Hospital in Newington, and any affiliated hospitals or programs, (b) and information regarding productivity since the end of the official five years cycle under review.

Within 45 days of receiving the letter from the CAOFA, the faculty member must provide to the CAOFA any information he or she wishes to be considered.

The faculty member **MUST** submit a current curriculum vitae. The SAPC requests this include publications submitted and under review (with attached evidence that the publication is submitted, such as an acknowledgement email).

The SAPC also requests that the faculty member provide:

1. self-statement describing the faculty member's work and productivity in all CREATE domains over the five years under review,
2. a list of all grants submitted but not funded during the five years under review, including the funding agency, date submitted, percentile score, and pay line (if known), and
3. a completed "Post-tenure review checklist" form.

The faculty member **MAY** submit any additional information that might be helpful in clarifying his/her productivity over the 5 year period under review. This information could include:

1. a description in the self-statement of mitigating circumstances, and why he or she believes the SAPC should give a five-year rating of "satisfactory performance."
2. letters from colleagues testifying to specific areas of productivity during the five year period under review. (The SAPC will not solicit letters on behalf of the faculty member under review. Letters solicited by the faculty member must be submitted with the rest of the post-tenure review materials, within the allowed 45 day period).
3. documentation of productivity that could have been supplied during the annual review processes of the five years under review, but was not.
4. publications submitted during the five year period under review, but not accepted along with documentation of the submission & rejection, and/or
5. documentation of productivity since the end of the five year period under review.

In addition to the materials supplied by the faculty member and the department chair, the CAOFA will provide the SAPC:

1. annual merit reviews and forms for the five years under review, as well as any subsequent reviews, including the annual goals set by the faculty member with the department chair,
2. the academic merit criteria used by the faculty member's department, and
3. the faculty member's professional category.

Only primary reviewer members of the SAPC may participate in post-tenure reviews. As with all SAPC work, the quorum is 7 and the vote is a simple majority of the voting members present. The CAOFA will ask the faculty member under review if he or she wishes to ask any of the SAPC members to recuse themselves or be recused. If such requests are made, an explanation must be provided. The SAPC will then consider those requests, following its recusal rules.

All members of the SAPC, except those members who are recused, will, in advance of the meeting, be provided written copies of all submitted materials. Two members of the SAPC will serve as reviewers and present the materials to the SAPC.

The SAPC will assess the performance of the faculty member during the five years under review and determine if this is "satisfactory performance" or "unsatisfactory performance" for this time period. The SAPC may also consider performance in the time since the most recent annual review. Failure of a faculty member to participate in the post-tenure review process will be grounds for a rating of unsatisfactory performance.

Per the bylaws, "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." (SOM Bylaws, Appendix C, Section B.2.) Examples of criteria that can be considered may be found in the [SOM Bylaws, Appendix C, Section B.2.](#)

The SAPC will transmit its assessment to the CAOFA, who will in turn inform the faculty member, the Department Chair and the Dean. 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](#)).

In cases in which the SAPC finds "unsatisfactory performance," it will conduct an annual review to determine progress and performance toward the goals of the faculty member's development plan (see [School of Medicine Post-tenure Review Procedures](#)).

For this review the SAPC will use the faculty development plan, and the faculty member's most recent annual merit review materials. The SAPC's evaluation will use the following categories, drawn from the Bylaws:

1. *adequate performance* in the development plan for the year,
2. *inadequate performance* in the development plan for the year, or
3. *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).

The SAPC will transmit its assessment to the CAOFA who will in turn send the evaluation to the faculty member, the department chair, and the Dean.

The faculty member may appeal the SAPC's evaluation using the faculty grievance process described in the University's Laws and Bylaws ([article XIV.T](#)).

Originally confirmed on 2/28/2008, this document was revised on March 7, 2014 to reflect changes in the title of the Dean responsible for post-tenure review, a change in the University Bylaws section number for faculty grievances, to use the current "CREATE" terminology and to update SAPC requested information. The document was further revised in April 2014 to more accurately reflect what the faculty member "must" provide, per the bylaws, and what the SAPC "requests" be provided. It was further revised on September 15, 2015 to change the title of the Dean responsible for post-tenure review.