

## **IUSM Supplement to the IUPUI Faculty/Librarian Review and Enhancement Policy**

### **Academic Mission**

The mission of Indiana University School of Medicine, which is embraced by our entire faculty, is grounded in life-long learning, pursuit of knowledge and service to others. These are reflected in our devotion to education, research, clinical service and professional service.

### **Establishment of Policy in Accordance with Academic Mission**

The School of Medicine is a large and complex school within which there are significant variation in the particular missions of the subunits (i.e. the Departments, the Centers for Medical Education, the Medicals School Library, and the School of Allied Health Science). In considering a definition of 'unsatisfactory,' the school-level general definition is as follows:

In general, determination of unsatisfactory performance will entail consideration of total faculty activity in the four areas of teaching, research, clinical service and professional service, including changes in emphases over time. Evaluation should be based on, but not limited to, such factors as:

- 1) Failure to meet classes, to update course content or pedagogy, or to receive satisfactory evaluations by peers, students, residents, or fellows;
- 2) Failure to remain competent in the discipline or to contribute to its knowledge base;
- 3) Failure to serve patients effectively or to receive satisfactory peer evaluations;
- 4) Failure to apply disciplinary knowledge and professional expertise to society's needs and the profession;
- 5) Failure to contribute to a culture of effective academic citizenship through service on committees and in other organizational activities;
- 6) Failure to contribute to the mission and overall well being of the school, campus and university.

It is to be emphasized that a rating of unsatisfactory is inappropriate unless the performance of a faculty member clearly falls below accepted standards of professional competence, exhibits utter disregard for professional responsibilities, or violates the civility policy of the university. Unsatisfactory performance is constituted by inability or unwillingness to perform fundamental duties and/or by absence of intellectual growth and productivity. Given the standards a faculty member must satisfy to qualify for tenure, it is to be expected that such cases will be extremely rare.

Examples of performance areas that may be quantifiable in annual review may include (but are not limited to) the following:

#### Teaching

- Student, Resident, and Fellow evaluations
- Quantity and Quality
  - Staffing
  - Advisor
  - Curriculum design
- Awards
- Administrative Leadership

#### Research

- Extramural Support
- Attempts
- Successes
- Publications
- Awards
- Mentoring
- Program Development
- Administration

#### Clinical Service

- Patient Satisfaction
- Program Development
- Peer Satisfaction
  - Co-Workers
  - Referring Physicians
- Cost-Effectiveness
- Administration
- Leadership

#### Service

- Professionalism in interaction with learners and colleagues
- School or University Service Community Service
- Regional Service
- National Service
- International Service

Performance expectations in these areas may be similar to those that are held for salary determination, promotion, or tenure considerations (where applicable) with the understanding that a faculty member's roles and responsibilities within the department may change and mature with time. The implementation of the Faculty/Librarian Review and Enhancement Policy will require annual evaluation of **all** faculty members including full-rank, tenured faculty.

Each subunit may have a written policy that reflects what constitutes satisfactory and unsatisfactory performance. For many subunits, this policy may incorporate the subunit's mission statement, goals, objectives, purpose, and guidelines or other such reflection of values. **In the absence or conflict of a subunit policy, the IUSM Supplement policy will be used. Subunit policies that provide more specificity than the above guidelines are encouraged by IUSM and IUPUI.**

The procedures for dismissing faculty for misconduct or incompetence are separate from these policies and may be invoked, when appropriate, at any time. Dismissal policies supersede the Review and Enhancement Policy.

#### **Process for Electing and Replacing Members of a Faculty Review and Enhancement Committee**

Each year, the chair of the IUSM Promotion and Tenure Committee will select a standing Review and Enhancement Committee comprised of a minimum of three tenured faculty members who have been elected to serve on the IUSM Promotion and Tenure Committee and/or the IUSM Faculty Steering Committee, and excludes administrators at the level of department chair and above. In the interest of supporting the faculty member and his/her scholarly agenda, the committee may be augmented with tenured faculty members from multiple disciplines, in consultation with the faculty member, faculty

member's department chair, chair of the Promotion and Tenure Committee, and the IUSM Executive Associate Dean for Faculty Affairs (EAD).

Where there is a perceived conflict of interest, an alternative review committee member will instead be appointed by mutual agreement of the EAD or his/her designee, the chair of the Promotion and Tenure Committee and the faculty member undergoing review within 10 working days. If no agreement is reached, the Chair of the Promotion and Tenure Committee will appoint the committee member.

### **Process for Review and Enhancement Committee Proceedings**

In order to be maximally effective, the Review and Enhancement committee should be prompt in its work and provide clear benchmarks and timeline for faculty improvement. A timely Review and Enhancement process should be completed within three (3) months of constitution of the committee.

### **Two types of review (see IUPUI Policy for Faculty and Librarian Review and Enhancement):**

**Plan A:** Voluntary Review, initiated by faculty member

**Plan B:** Involuntary review, initiated by dean after two consecutive unsatisfactory reviews

### **IU School of Medicine Review and Enhancement Suggested Timeline for Plan B**

Upon the completion of the *second consecutive unsatisfactory review*, the following timeline should occur.

#### **Within first month:**

- 1) The chair notifies the dean that the involuntary R&E process should be initiated
- 2) The dean may grant an exemption if there are extenuating circumstances, such as health problems, which contributed to unsatisfactory performance, or in the event of impending retirement
- 3) The dean notifies the faculty member about the initiation of the process
- 4) The chair of the Promotion and Tenure Committee convenes the R&E committee based on the above guidelines. The R&E committee member list is reviewed by the faculty member. Per the IUPUI policy, the faculty member can reject a committee member in the case of a perceived conflict of interest.
- 5) Within ten (10) working days of receiving the list, the committee will be finalized and approved by the chair of the Promotion and Tenure Committee and the faculty member.

#### **Within first three months:**

- 1) The review committee meets and delivers one of three outcomes:
  - a. Some strengths, no deficiencies
    - i. Letter from committee is sent to faculty member and dean, and review process is terminated
  - b. Some strengths, some deficiencies, but deficiencies are not substantial or chronic
    - i. Letter from committee is generated, including specific deficiencies identified
    - ii. Letter is sent to faculty member and dean
    - iii. Faculty member is offered the opportunity to work with the committee to complete Plan A of the IUPUI Review and Enhancement process.
  - c. Substantial chronic deficiencies
    - i. Letter from committee is generated, including specific deficiencies identified
    - ii. Letter is sent to faculty member and dean

- iii. To ensure the feasibility and success of the plan, the faculty member, chair, and committee work together to draw up a development plan, per Plan B of the IUPUI Review and Enhancement process. The plan must include a timeline for improvement that is *no longer than three years* (in accordance with IUPUI policy).
- iv. The development plan is finalized with signatures from the faculty member, dean, and department chair (or designees). Per the IUPUI policy, the signatures indicate that the plan is complete and ready for implementation; faculty member has the right to appeal.

**Within the specified time period for improvement (as set forth by the R&E committee, unique to each case, per the IUPUI policy):**

- 1) The faculty member and review committee meet yearly to review the faculty member's progress
  - a. A letter from the review committee is sent to the faculty member and dean detailing the progress
    - i. If progress is not made based on the specified timelines and benchmarks, the dean may employ a variety of sanctions as appropriate, such as:
      1. Reduction in FTE
      2. Change in role, including assumption of additional responsibilities in teaching, clinical duties, service, or research.
      3. Reduction in allocated resources such as lab space and personnel
      4. Change in track
      5. Revocation of long-term contract
      6. Dismissal

Approved Faculty Steering Committee 11/27/01; approved IUSM Executive Committee 11/26/01.

Approved Faculty Steering Committee 07/21/11; Approved IUSM Executive Committee 12/19/11