

MEDICAL COLLEGE OF OHIO

Subject: POST TENURE REVIEW

Policy No. 05-086

Introduction

The quality of education, research and service provided by an academic institution can be no better than the quality of the mind and expertise of the faculty of that institution. As a result it is in the best interests of the Medical College of Ohio to create an environment in which these academic pursuits can flourish, and to invest in faculty development activities that enhance the success of faculty vitally engaged in education, research and service. Tenure indicates that a faculty member has demonstrated over a period of years to peers and administration alike, a sufficiently high level of performance in education, scholarship and service to warrant a permanent position on the Medical College of Ohio faculty. Tenure protects the academic integrity of the institution, and it also protects academic freedom, the right of faculty members to pursue original research, or study ideas that may be new, unpopular, or misunderstood. This freedom of thought can only benefit society, and distinguishes education from training. The value of tenure in encouraging and protecting new generations of scholars, as well as sustaining the quest for knowledge, is not taken lightly by The Medical College of Ohio.

The performance of all tenured faculty members shall be reviewed annually by their department chair. The annual faculty review shall be directed at setting mutually agreed upon goals, planning for continued professional development and evaluating performance. The outcomes of the review should include continued improvement of faculty performance and continuous career growth. Tenure faculty members shall be evaluated on the basis of their contributions in education, scholarship activity, and service.

Performance Improvement Plan

A *Performance Improvement Plan* shall be prepared when a department chair determines at an annual review that a tenured faculty member's performance, based on the departmental standards, has been unsatisfactory. The *Performance Improvement Plan*, cooperatively developed by the chair and the faculty member, shall describe specific goals, measurable outcomes and strategies to improve performance. A copy of the *Performance Improvement Plan* shall be provided to the appropriate Dean and to the Executive Vice President/Provost. Successful completion of the plan shall result in the faculty member attaining the performance required by the departmental standards. The plan shall also describe sources of resources that will be provided to support the faculty member's improvement. While the individual faculty member is responsible ultimately for the successful outcome of the *Performance Improvement Plan*, the chair has an obligation to assist the faculty member who seeks guidance in developing a realistic plan to remedy identified areas of deficiency. If the chair and faculty member are unable to mutually agree to a reasonable *Performance Improvement Plan* either party may request facilitation by the Post Tenure Review Committee.

A *Performance Improvement Plan* for a tenured faculty member shall be twenty-four (24) months in length. The chair and faculty member shall meet at least twice every twelve (12) months to review progress toward the plan. If the faculty member has achieved the performance improvement goals described in the plan and satisfies the departmental performance standards at the conclusion of the plan, the faculty member shall subsequently be evaluated according to the regular annual review process. If the chair determines that the faculty member did not successfully attain the performance improvement goals described in the plan, a review by the Post Tenure Review Committee is mandatory.

Post-Tenure Review Committee

The purpose of the Post-Tenure Review Committee shall be to form Hearing Committees to conduct reviews as described in the following section entitled "Post-Tenure Review Process." The Post-Tenure Review Committee shall be a standing committee of the Medical College consisting of eleven (11) full-time faculty members holding tenured appointments. No department chair or administrative officer, as defined by the Administrative Rules and Regulations shall serve on the committee. Excluding the Graduate School, committee representation shall include five (5) faculty representatives from the School of Medicine and three (3) each from the Schools of Allied Health and Nursing. The faculty of each school shall elect the members for staggered terms of four (4) years with at least four (4) committee members being elected biennially. The Faculty Senate shall organize the elections. If a school is not able to field sufficient qualified tenured

representatives to complete its slate, it may elect non-tenured faculty members at the rank of Professor or Associate Professor.

The members of the committee shall annually elect a Chair and Vice Chair. Chairs and Vice-Chairs may serve up to two consecutive terms. The membership of the committee shall be communicated to the general faculty annually by the Executive Vice President/ Provost.

Any member of the committee who has been referred to the committee for review shall be removed from all committee activities until the matter is resolved. Committee members who cease to be full-time members of the faculty, whose duties become primarily administrative, or who are appointed as department chairs, will be ineligible to continue serving. The Faculty Senate Steering Committee shall appoint a new committee member to serve until the next scheduled election.

For each review, the Chair of the committee shall appoint four (4) committee members to a Hearing Committee. The Post-Tenure Review Committee Chair (or Vice Chair, at the Chair's designation), shall chair this five (5) member Hearing Committee. At least two (2) members of the Hearing Committee shall be from the same school as the faculty member being reviewed.

Post-Tenure Review Process

The department chair will request in writing a review by the Post Tenure Review Committee of a tenured faculty member who did not achieve the performance outcomes described in a *Performance Improvement Plan*. The Chair of the Post-Tenure Review Committee shall appoint a Hearing Committee to perform the review. A Hearing Committee shall be appointed and convened within twenty (20) calendar days from a written request.

The faculty member being reviewed may select one faculty member to serve as his/her advocate on the Hearing Committee. The selected advocate shall be invited to attend and participate in all meetings of the Hearing Committee as a non-voting member. Faculty members are ineligible to serve on a Hearing Committee if a conflict of interest exists with the faculty member being reviewed. The Conflict of Interest Guidelines for MCO Regulatory Affairs Committee's policy defines what constitutes a conflict of interest.

The Hearing Committee shall review the faculty member's performance based upon the written performance standards and criteria maintained by the department and the *Performance Improvement Plan*. The basic standard for appraisal shall be whether the faculty member under review discharges conscientiously and with professional competence the duties associated with his/her position. The review shall acknowledge the different expectations in different disciplines and changing expectations at different stages of faculty careers. The Hearing Committee shall:

1. Request the parties to provide all documents necessary.

The faculty member shall provide the Hearing Committee:

- A current curriculum vitae,
- Annual reports detailing activity and accomplishments for the prior three (3) years,
- Annual self evaluations for the prior three (3) years,
- The Department Standards of Performance, and
- Other documents, materials and statements that he/she wishes to be considered.

The faculty member may request, if there is disagreement about the faculty member's performance in scholarship/research, that the review also include evaluations from qualified persons external to the College.

The department chair shall provide the Hearing Committee:

- The annual performance review of the faculty member for the prior three (3) years,
- All materials that were considered in those performance reviews,

- Written summaries that document deficiencies and the *Performance Improvement Plan*, and
 - Any other documents and information that the chair wishes to submit.
2. Complete a qualitative and quantitative review of all the relevant evidence, submitted by the faculty member and department chair, of the faculty member's performance over the prior twenty-four (24) months.
 3. Interview both the faculty member and the department chair, and at its discretion interview other faculty members as the Committee deems necessary.
 4. Maintain accurate and confidential records of its findings and opinions.
 5. Complete its review within twenty (20) calendar days.
 6. Prepare a summary of its findings and conclusions and report to the appropriate Dean and the Executive Vice President/Provost. Copies of the report shall be simultaneously provided to the Chair and faculty member. The Hearing Committee's report will find one of the following:

(A) Certification of Satisfactory Performance

The Hearing Committee may conclude that the faculty member's performance and professional contributions are satisfactory to meet the standards set by the *Performance Improvement Plan*, thus failing to sustain the assessment of the department chair. The review is then complete. (Note: Should an unsatisfactory annual review occur in any subsequent year it shall be counted as the first in a new sequence.)

(B) Certification of Deficiencies

The Hearing Committee may sustain the department chair's evaluation that the faculty member's performance was unsatisfactory to meet the standards set by the *Performance Improvement Plan*. The Hearing Committee may conclude that: (i) The performance deficiencies identified have improved during the twenty-four (24) month plan, are not substantial or chronic, and may be remedied by extending the improvement plan for twelve (12) months, or (ii) The performance deficiencies identified are substantial, chronic and unlikely to be remedied by continuing the improvement plan. The case will be referred to the appropriate Dean and the Executive Vice President/Provost for further action including possible sanctions as described in the Faculty Rules and Regulations Article I, Section I.4 (Post-Tenure Review).

If at any point during the process faculty members believe they have not received due process or were treated unfairly, a grievance can be filed in accordance with policy 05-057, Faculty Grievance and Appeals.

Source: Executive Vice President and Provost

Effective Date: 7/01/00

Revisions/Review Date:

07/01/01 Revised
07/01/02 Reviewed
07/01/03 Reviewed