

UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA <hr/> <b>Medical School</b> <i>Office of Faculty Affairs</i>		Number: 2008.FR.002 Effective Date: 11/20/08
		No. of Pages: 3
Section: <b>FACULTY REVIEW</b>	Subject: <i>Optional Periodic Career Review</i>	

## PERIODIC CAREER REVIEW POLICY

### OPTIONAL PERIODIC CAREER REVIEW (Non Triggered Review)

#### 1. Timeline

A “Periodic Career Review” for Tenured [P] faculty at the Associate or Professor Rank usually occurs after every five years of service. Non Tenured Faculty may request a Periodic Career Review.

#### 2. Timeline Exceptions

- a. If there has been a promotion during that time, the clock restarts (ex: if an Associate Professor with 2 years to go before the next Periodic Career Review is promoted to Professor, the review clock resets to 5 years).
- b. When the review period ends in a sabbatical (or other leave) year, the Periodic Career Review shall be deferred until the next academic year.

#### 3. Criteria

The expectation is for *proficiency* in all areas included in the distribution of effort, as outlined in the goals for the period under review. The review process shall not extend beyond the office of the Dean of the Medical School.

#### 4. Review Levels

- a. Panel: a different panel is appointed for each review- composed of members at the same rank as the faculty member or above, with at least some members holding the same type of appointment (track).
  - i. Members are appointed (not elected).
  - ii. Members (n=5) are selected by the department head (2), the faculty member (1) and the Dean’s office (2).
  - iii. Members may be in the department or outside, if appropriate – case by case. If the faculty member has a secondary appointment in another department, that department should be represented on the panel.
  - iv. For smaller departments where a panel of 5 members cannot be assembled, composition of the panel may be discussed with the Associate Dean for Faculty Affairs. The panel may be composed of faculty from outside the department, or a smaller panel may be formed.  
*The Periodic Career Review panel is advisory to the Department.*
- b. Department Head: reviews the entire dossier, including the panels’ findings and recommendations, and formulates his/her own findings and recommendations.

- c. Associate Dean for Faculty Affairs: reviews the entire dossier, including the panel and Department Head's findings and recommendations, concurs or disagrees on the proposed rating and action (if applicable), and prepares a summary report.
- d. Dean: reviews the dossier and finalizes outcome and report. The report is sent to the faculty member and the Department Head for further action (if applicable).

**5. Portfolio materials include:**

- a. Personal Statement by faculty member.
- b. Current annotated curriculum vitae.
- c. All annual reviews with goals and effort distribution since the last review.
- d. Teaching evaluations since the last review.
- e. Reprints of papers published since the last review.
- f. Supporting documentation, including, but not limited to, letters of acceptance for articles in press, and acknowledgement by journal or funding agency of manuscript or proposal receipt.
- g. Separate recommendations by the panel and department head.
- h. Summary letter by the Associate Dean for Faculty Affairs, with Dean's comments/approval.

**6. Review Criteria and Methodology**

- a. A Periodic Career Review requires only *proficiency* in each area of involvement (as opposed to *excellence* in certain areas for Promotion and Tenure). Criteria to determine proficiency will be identified by each department, as part of their 7.12 Statement. In general, the faculty member should at a minimum continue to meet the standards set for that rank in the department's official statement (7.12 Statement).
- b. The only required area of involvement is teaching.
- c. All reviews originate in the faculty member's home department with notification to the dean's office that a review is scheduled. The Associate Dean for Faculty Affairs will assist in selecting a review panel.
- d. Faculty undergoing review may examine any substantive material in their file at any time.
- e. Faculty performance will be evaluated as either:
  - i. Outstanding: exceeding Department and/or Medical School criteria.
  - ii. Satisfactory: meeting Department and/or Medical School criteria.
  - iii. Unsatisfactory: not meeting Department and/or Medical School criteria.
- f. Departments should attempt to define the criteria necessary to meet these definitions (ex: what differentiates "satisfactory" from "outstanding")

**7. Outstanding Evaluation**

- a. Faculty members evaluated as outstanding will begin the next 5 year review cycle in the following academic year.
- b. Where evidence of outstanding performance over the entire review period is identified, recognition may be recommended in the form of salary increase, bonus or other method.

**8. Satisfactory Evaluation**

- a. Faculty members evaluated as satisfactory will begin the next 5 year review cycle in the following academic year.

**9. Unsatisfactory evaluation**

- a. Within the first thirty days after receiving the Periodic Review Report, the faculty member will prepare a development plan in collaboration with, and approved by, the Department or Division Head, which must ultimately be approved by the Associate Dean

for Faculty Affairs. The plan includes specific and measurable requirements to be met within one year, although in special cases a longer period may be approved by the Associate Dean and the Department Head.

- b. The plan should include:
  - i. Clearly stated objective goals to be met, related to the area of deficiency.
  - ii. Faculty member participation in appropriate and specified developmental activities.
  - iii. Institutional commitment to providing agreed-on resources and opportunities for the faculty member.
  - iv. The date (month) of the follow-up review (1 year later).
- c. Considerable effort should be made to provide agreed upon resources to the faculty member to meet the requirements of a successful review.

#### **10. Follow Up Review**

- a. After the year of enhanced faculty development, the faculty member undergoes a follow-up review. The same panel that provided the first review may be asked to serve for this purpose. The process is similar to the first Periodic Review, except that it will concentrate on the area(s) of deficiency identified during the previous review.
  - i. If the follow-up review is satisfactory, the next five-year review cycle begins with the following year.
  - ii. If the review is again evaluated as unsatisfactory, the faculty member will be referred for review by an elected Departmental Review Committee for possible initiation of a Special Review.