

University of South Carolina School of Medicine

Post-Tenure Review Procedures

2/18/99

University of South Carolina School of Medicine

Post-Tenure Review Procedures

I. General Procedures

The procedures given below are in compliance with the regulations on post-tenure review established in the University *Faculty Manual*. If any question should arise between the procedures given in this document and the regulations given in the *Faculty Manual*, the *Faculty Manual* will take precedence.

II. Faculty Eligibility for Post-Tenure Review

Each tenured faculty member, regardless of rank (other than the Dean and faculty members in administrative positions reporting directly to the Dean) will be reviewed every six years. However, post-tenure review will be waived for any faculty member who notifies his or her department chair in writing of retirement within three years of the next scheduled review; any faculty member who has received tenure or been successfully promoted to the rank of Professor or Associate Professor within the previous five years; and any faculty member who has been reviewed within the previous five years for appointment or reappointment to an endowed chair or named professorship. Specific faculty will be selected for review according to their date of tenure.

III. Post-Tenure Review Committees

The SOM Post-Tenure Review Committees (hereinafter referred to as the PTR Committees) will include subcommittees of SOM Tenure and Promotion Committee Clinical and Basic Science Units and the Library Unit. Membership of the PTR Committees will consist of a tenured faculty member elected by each department in the Clinical and Basic Science Units and up to five tenured Librarians elected by the Library Unit. Tenured faculty or Librarians who are having a post-tenure review conducted will be excluded from the membership of their PTR Committee. The Chairs of the PTR Committees will be the Chairs of the SOM Tenure and Promotion Unit Committees. If a Chair of a SOM Tenure and Promotion Unit Committee is being evaluated for post-tenure review, then the Tenure and Promotion Unit Committee will elect a new Chair for that year.

In the event that there are fewer than five SOM faculty members eligible to serve on a PTR Committee, the Dean will appoint a sufficient number of faculty members from

other tenure and promotion units within the SOM who do meet the eligibility requirements to make up a PTR Committee of five voting members.

IV. File Documentation

The faculty member who is being reviewed will submit a post-tenure review file to the appropriate PTR Committee. While the faculty member reviewed may include any documentation he or she believes to be pertinent, the faculty member must include at least the following material in the file:

A. *Teaching*

1. A listing of all teaching activities in the previous five years. Teaching activities are defined as those listed in the pertinent SOM Unit's Tenure and Promotion Procedures and Criteria.
2. Student course evaluations, a numerical and descriptive summary of the student course evaluations (to be prepared by the Office of Curricular Affairs and Faculty Support), and data from individual faculty evaluations for each of the courses listed (to be prepared by the Department Chair with data provided by the Office of Continuing Medical Education and Faculty Development).
3. A copy of a peer teaching review conducted in accordance with the SOM's policy on peer teaching review.

B. *Research/Scholarly Activity*

1. A listing, and relevant copies, of all research/scholarly activities conducted during the previous five years. Research/scholarly activities are defined as those listed in the pertinent SOM Unit's Tenure and Promotion Procedures and Criteria.
2. Publication of refereed scholarship and/or the award of competitive grants are considered as having fulfilled the peer review of research/scholarly activity requirement.

C. *Service/Patient Care*

1. A listing of all service/patient care activities conducted during the previous five years. Service/patient care activities are defined as those listed in the pertinent SOM Unit's Tenure and Promotion Procedures and Criteria.
2. An administrative evaluation of a faculty member's service/patient care by his or her Department Chair, other SOM administrator, and/or Committee Chair.

D. Annual Evaluations

1. A copy of all annual reviews accumulated in the last five years or since the last post-tenure review.

E. Sabbatical Reports

1. A copy of the official report of sabbatical activities (if one was taken during the review period).

F. Curriculum Vitae

V. PTR Committee Procedures

- A. The Chairs of the PTR Committees will ensure that peer reviews (from within the SOM) of the faculty member's teaching, peer reviews (from outside the SOM) of the faculty member's scholarly activity, and the administrative evaluation (by the Department Chair) of the faculty member's service/patient care are conducted in a timely manner. It should be noted that the publication of refereed scholarship and/or the award of competitive grants are considered as having fulfilled the peer review of research/scholarly activity requirement.
- B. After review of the faculty member's file, each member of a PTR Committee will complete a written evaluation form for the faculty member. The form will rate the faculty member's performance in four areas: teaching, research/scholarly activity, service/patient care, and overall performance. In each of the four areas, a PTR Committee member will rate the faculty member's performance as either: "superior," "satisfactory," or "unsatisfactory."
- C. For the purposes of post-tenure review, the following performance rating terms will be defined as:
 1. "Superior performance" means performance at the very highest level. Superior performance is performance that is "outstanding" for any given evaluation area in a SOM Unit's tenure and promotion guidelines.
 2. "Satisfactory performance" means performance that meets the expectations of the SOM. Satisfactory performance is performance that is "satisfactory," "adequate," or "substantial" for any given evaluation area in a SOM Unit's tenure and promotion guidelines.

3. “Unsatisfactory performance” means performance, taken as a whole, which fails to meet relevant SOM standards. Unsatisfactory performance is performance that is not “satisfactory” or “adequate” for any given evaluation area in a SOM Unit’s Tenure and Promotion Procedures and Criteria.

D. In making an assessment of the adequacy of a faculty member’s overall performance, PTR Committees must take into consideration possible approved changes in the job description of the reviewed faculty member over time (i.e., approved changes in the percentage of effort dedicated to teaching, research/scholarly activity, and/or service/patient care noted in the faculty member’s Annual Faculty Evaluation and Planning Documents).

E. In a meeting of a PTR Committee, the Chair will collect the performance evaluation forms from the PTR Committee members and tally the ratings in each evaluation area defined in section V. B. A majority evaluative rating is achieved when fifty-one percent of all eligible PTR Committee members have cast a ballot with the same rating. In the event that a majority of PTR Committee members do not rate the performance of a faculty member the same in a given performance evaluation area, the PTR Committee report will give a performance rating of “satisfactory, lacking majority opinion.”

A PTR Committee member on leave may vote only upon written notification to the Dean of a desire to do so before the beginning of the leave.

F. After the performance evaluation forms have been tallied and the results announced to the PTR Committee, the Chair of the PTR Committee will draft a report of the post-tenure review which will include at minimum the PTR Committee’s rating of the performance for each of the four evaluation areas defined in section V. B. and sufficient comments to aid the faculty member in his or her professional growth and development in each area.

G. A copy of the PTR Committee report must be sent to the faculty member, the Department Chair, and the Dean for inclusion in the faculty member’s personnel file. In the event of an “unsatisfactory” review, a copy of the PTR Committee report and Development Plan must also be sent to the Provost.

H. If the performance rating for each evaluation area defined in section V. B. of the faculty member is either “superior” or “satisfactory,” the evaluation of the faculty member is concluded with the distribution of the report. If the PTR Committee determines that the faculty member’s overall performance is “satisfactory,” but that his or her performance in either teaching, research/scholarship, or service/patient care areas is “unsatisfactory,” the PTR Committee must include recommendations in its report that could assist in restoring the faculty member’s performance to a “satisfactory” level in that area. A review that results in an overall performance rating of “satisfactory,” but includes an “unsatisfactory” rating in one of the other areas does not require a Development Plan.

I. An Unsatisfactory Review

1. If a PTR Committee determines that the overall performance evaluation rating of the faculty member is “unsatisfactory,” the PTR Committee must include recommendations in its report that could assist in restoring the faculty member’s performance to a “satisfactory” level. The appropriate PTR Committee Chair will appoint a Development Committee to prepare a Development Plan to assist the faculty member in improving his or her performance to a “satisfactory” level. A timetable for improvement will also be developed which is no less than one nor more than three years in duration. The Development Plan must be prepared in consultation with and receive the concurrence of the faculty member. Completed Development Plans must be approved by the PTR Committee and forwarded to the Dean for final approval.
2. Disagreements concerning the Development Plan or timetable between the faculty member and the Development Committee or between the Development Committee and the PTR Committee will be resolved by the Dean.
3. In accordance with the timetable established in the Development Plan, the Development Committee will review the faculty member’s updated file and will submit an evaluation of progress to the SOM’s Tenure and Promotion Unit Committee. The Development Plan will form the basis for the annual evaluation of the faculty member until satisfactory performance is restored. The SOM’s Tenure and Promotion Unit Committee will recommend in writing to the Dean whether it believes the goals of the Development Plan have been met, in general or in any particular.
4. The Dean will make the final determination on the progress, or lack thereof, of the faculty member in meeting the goals of the Development Plan and whether or not further measures may be necessary. The Dean will conform to the timetable established in the Development Plan and will file periodic progress reports with the Provost.

5. Failure to make substantial progress toward meeting the performance goals of a Development Plan established through the post-tenure review process may expose a faculty member to proceedings for termination.

VI. Appeal Procedures

- A. A faculty member who receives an unsatisfactory review and disagrees with the evaluation or any aspect of the recommendations may appeal to the SOM's Tenure and Promotion Unit Committee, in general or in any particular. The findings of the Tenure and Promotion Unit Committee, together with its recommendations for action and a statement by the faculty member will be forwarded to the Dean for final determination of the evaluation.