

Post-Tenure Review; Post-Promotion Review for all Faculty Tracks

Department of Obstetrics and Gynecology

Version dated 9/29/21; EC approved 10/8/21

Post-promotion review of Tenure, CHS and Clinician Teacher Track faculty occurs every five years. The Department is notified which faculty members are due for a Post-Promotion review by the School of Medicine and Public Health. ***A letter will be sent from the Chair's office to the faculty member notifying them of their upcoming Post-Promotion review and the review process.***

Post promotion review may incorporate the annual review in the post promotion review year. The review may be deferred, by approval of the provost, for unusual circumstances. See FPP.7.17.C.1 for further information on types of circumstances that may defer post-promotion review, and procedures for determining a new review schedule.

The post-promotion review panel will include the Department Chair, a reviewer chosen by the chair and a reviewer chosen by the candidate. The Chair shall designate an appropriately knowledgeable senior faculty to assist in the process (the Primary Designee). As in the Annual Review process, the Division Director may be the primary designee. For tenure track faculty, two or more tenured senior faculty shall be part of the five-year review process. If a non-tenure track faculty member is identified to participate as a third reviewer, this reviewer is included as part of the review team for expertise contributing to the review discussion, but will not be responsible for providing the overall evaluation summary report. A reviewer may be from outside the Department. For tenure track faculty, if the Division Director is not in the same track as the reviewee, another faculty inside or outside the Department may be more appropriate.

The Faculty Review will begin with the Chair notifying the faculty member of the identity of the Primary Designee. If the faculty member under review formally objects to a reviewer, procedures identified in FPP 7.17.C.1 will be followed. Formal objections should be kept confidential.

The faculty member shall identify for inclusion in the process an independent reviewer and shall notify the Chair and Primary Designee of that person's identity and contact information ***within 7 days***. The independent reviewer must be available to give timely input on the review to the Primary Designee.

A BOX will be created for sharing documents with reviewers for the post-promotion review. Documents for review include annual performance review reports, summary evaluations of teaching and a current curriculum vitae highlighting achievements over the period being reviewed. Key scholarship published in this period should also be available, either as copies, or provided with links to articles. The Promotion style CV will contain most needed material. Additional materials to provide qualitative and quantitative evidence of the faculty member's achievements and contributions can include other materials relevant to the faculty member's contributions, such as pending grants, publications in press and reports of service to professional societies or other academic units. The candidate should provide reviewers with a brief summary of major accomplishments during the review period, and career plans for the future (FP&P 7.17.C.2.a.). Outside letters of evaluation are not required, but they may be included if the faculty member chooses.

The Chair is responsible for convening the review panel. The reviewers' report should comment on these categories – Research, Teaching, Service/Leadership and Clinical – as appropriate by track. The Chair and the Primary Designee are responsible for creating the post-promotion report. The Post-

Promotion Review Report will be presented and discussed in person with the faculty member. The faculty member and reviewers will have the opportunity to add further written comments to the report.

Review process.

Using information provided by the reviewee, the review panel will prepare a summary report that presents the data as objectively as possible by category. The report concludes with a **summary statement** “**After all considerations, we believe that <reviewee’s name> <exceeds/meets/does not meet> expectations.**” The report will be signed by all members of the Post-Promotion Review Panel, including the Department Chair.

The summary report will be provided to the reviewee. The Department Chair meets with the candidate to discuss the summary. Review designees may, but are not required, to be included in this summary discussion. Reviewee may submit a written response within seven days of this meeting.

Following this review and response period, the Primary Designee will present the review to the Executive Committee, concluding with a brief overall summary of performance, which can address any information/mitigating issues relevant to performance in each area.

Expectations by category and track. Although it is not possible to precisely define departmental expectations given the diversity of research areas and contributions of faculty members, a rating rubric for expectations by track is available for additional guidance.

Rubric for overall expectations:

- Exceeds expectations – must exceed in at least two categories with no failure to meet expectations in any category
- Does not meet expectations – fails to meet expectations in at least two categories
- Meets expectations – generally meets expectations; may exceed expectations in one category, and/or may fail to meet expectations in one category

Executive Committee Review of the Post-Promotion Summary Report

Executive Committee are provided with the post-promotion summary report for review prior to meeting. Following discussion, the Executive Committee will submit votes by anonymous ballot for the stipulated 5-year period as follows:

- **Exceeds expectations – meets expectations – does not meet expectations** – in each track relevant category (Research, Teaching, Service/Leadership, Clinical) using the track appropriate rubric
- **Agree/disagree with the review summary statement: “After all considerations, we believe that <reviewee’s name> <Exceeds/Meets/Does not meet> expectations.”**

The complete review, including a short summary of the Executive Committee discussion and vote outcomes, will be sent to the reviewers and to the reviewee. The reviewee will respond in writing to accept, or to address any issues or factual errors in the review **within 2 weeks**. The summary, written response, and any other documentation evaluated and not readily available elsewhere will be sent to the department Chair.

The department chair completes the appropriate SMPH reporting form (post tenure or post promotion CHS/CT), indicating the results of the review: Exceeds/Meets/Does not meet expectations. A copy of these documents is placed in the faculty member's personnel file and sent to the department's SMPH HR business partner. In special circumstances, the departmental review may also be forwarded to the Provost (see FPP 7.17.C.6, 7).

Following the dean's sufficiency review and the dean's recommendation is "meets expectations", the post-promotion review process is concluded. If either the departmental review or the Dean's review indicate deficiencies, for tenure track faculty, procedures in FPP 7.17.C.6 are followed. Substantial deficiencies in the review are forwarded to the Provost. For CHS and CT track faculty, substantial deficiencies are reviewed using Academic Staff Policies and Procedures and any other school related policies.

If substantial deficiencies are confirmed, the department Chair and faculty member shall develop a written plan for mentoring and professional development to address all issues identified in the review in consultation with the Dean. The faculty member shall have the right to provide a written response regarding the manner in which any written development plan is formulated, its content and any resulting evaluation. The faculty member shall have three academic semesters to fully satisfy all elements of the remediation plan. If performance deficiencies are in research, an extension of one semester may be granted by the chancellor. Details of this process are outlined in FPP 7.17.C.7.b.

Steps toward successful completion of remediation include the following:

1. Faculty member submits documentation of activities that address the remediation plan to the department's Executive Committee no later than 4 weeks before the end of the remediation period.
2. Within 30 days, the Executive Committee will review submitted materials and make a determination regarding whether the remediation plan has been wholly satisfied. The Executive Committee's determination along with the faculty member's documentation is submitted to the Dean.
3. The Dean reviews and determines, in consultation with the faculty member, the department Chair and, for tenured faculty, the Chancellor, whether the remediation plan and criteria have been satisfied. Details of further action are beyond control of the department and are outlined in FPP 7.17.C.8.c-e, 9 & 10.

Table 1. Timeline for post-promotion review process. All steps are coordinated to complete process in time to submit final report to Dean's Office by March 1st.

Post-promotion Review Action	Responsible person	Date
Letter sent to reviewee informing of upcoming post-promotion review	Chair or chair's designee	mid August
Create BOX to share post promotion documents	Chair's designee	mid August
Primary designee (PD) selected; reviewee notified of this reviewer	Chair	mid August
Reviewee selects second reviewer and notifies Chair's office	Reviewee	late August
written notice to Chair's office accepting or objecting to Primary designee	Reviewee	late August
Reviewers notified; asked to confirm willingness to serve on review panel	Chair or chair's designee	early September
Reviewers notify willingness to serve	Reviewers	Early September
Send email to reviewers and reviewee to confirm review panel	Chair's designee	mid September
Documents for review are put into BOX	reviewee, chair's designee	by October 1
Meeting scheduled with reviewers	Chair's office	meet by Nov 15
Schedule 2nd meeting with reviewers if needed	Chair's office	meet by Dec 10
Write summary report; send to reviewee	Primary designee; chair's office	mid December
Reviewee meets with department chair; other reviewers may attend, but not required	Chair and reviewee	by late December
written response – accepting report or noting concerns - is sent to chair's office	reviewee	one week after meeting with Chair
Executive Committee reviews and responds to post-promotion document	Chair's designee adds pp report to EC BOX	prior to January Exec Committee meeting
EC members vote: agree/disagree with post promotion review summary statement	Executive Committee members	January Executive Committee meeting
EC members vote on each category of rubric: Exceeds/Meets/Does not meet expectations		
Tally of EC responses is added to Post promotion review report and sent to Chair for review	Chair's designee	within one week of Jan EC meeting
Chair reviews and approves full report	Chair	late January
Full report, now including EC summary is sent to reviewee and to reviewers	Chair's designee	late January
Written response – accepting full report, or noting objections – is sent to chair's office	reviewee	early February
All reports, faculty member responses and reporting forms put into personnel file and submitted to SMPH HR Business Partner	Chair's designee	by end of February