

UNIVERSITY OF MASSACHUSETTS
PERIODIC MULTI YEAR REVIEW OF TENURED FACULTY (PMYR) POLICY

INTRODUCTION

The practice of regular annual reviews of faculty performance is well established at the University of Massachusetts Medical School. The review is based upon an annual faculty report (AFR) and incorporates an administrative review by the Department or Program Chair, the Vice Chancellor of Faculty Administration and the Dean. At the Medical School, Department and Program Chairs serve a unique and long term role in mentoring and fostering continued development of their faculty members. They therefore play the primary role in this annual review. The review serves as the primary basis for the award of merit monies, when they are available, and is intended to be a mandatory yearly review of faculty performance even when merit monies are not available. Because these annual reviews continue without interruption following the award of tenure, the AFR must be a principal ingredient of any process of post-tenure review.

Thorough multi-year reviews of faculty performance are conducted at the time of major personnel actions including promotions through the tenure decision year, the award of tenure and promotion to full professor. Performance of the faculty member is evaluated in the three mandatory categories of teaching, research, and service and is measured against established standards for each personnel action, including the expectation of continued professional development and performance.

A Periodic Multi Year Review (PMYR) of tenured faculty that is distinct from the annual and major personnel action reviews, is intended to serve a number of purposes. First, such a review expands the 12-month time window of the annual reviews into an overview of a faculty member's long term interests, achievements, professional activities and plans. Second, such an evaluation makes possible timely consultation, intervention, and assistance, where indicated, that should stimulate and encourage professional development, new initiatives or changes in direction that will benefit both the faculty member and the institution.

In adopting a PMYR policy, the University and the tenured faculty address the external concern for accountability, while upholding the integrity of tenure and academic freedom.

PURPOSE

The primary purpose of the PMYR policy is to foster the continued professional development of the tenured faculty. This is in the best interests of the faculty member and this institution and allows the demand for external accountability to be met. A faculty member who has been awarded tenure has already demonstrated excellent performance. The award of tenure represents a large investment on the part of the University and is made in the expectation that the faculty member will continue to develop professionally and will demonstrate a continued high level of performance. The PMYR process should optimize use of the talents of faculty members, throughout their careers, in furthering their career and in service to the University.

PRINCIPLES

1. The present AFR procedure encourages short-term assessment of individual accomplishments. PMYR should foster a longer-term view of an individual's performance and contributions to the University.
2. The PMYR must strengthen the faculty member's academic freedom and right to full and free inquiry, as prescribed in the understanding of tenure.
3. The PMYR is not a personnel actions as defined in the Academic Personnel Policy. In particular, it is not a reaffirmation of tenure.
4. The PMYR should follow the pattern established by the AFRs, including both self-assessment and administrative assessment by the Department Chair and Dean, should incorporate prior AFR's and should not involve the creation of additional unnecessary bureaucracy.
5. Standards of evaluation in each Department will be fair and consistent with departmental and school practice.
6. It is intended that the PMYR policy will recognize that individual interests and abilities of tenured faculty members may change over time, and that tenured faculty members may meet their professional responsibilities to their Department in varied and changing ways.

TIMING OF THE PMYR PROCESS

1. The PMYR is to be conducted every seven years for all tenured faculty member and will be conducted in lieu of that year's AFR. The PMYR will not normally take place less than seven years after a successful tenure review, promotion or previous PMYR and will normally take place two years prior to the next scheduled sabbatical.
2. The first formal consideration of an Associate Professor for promotion to Professor may be substituted for the initial PMYR unless such promotion consideration is delayed beyond seven years past the promotion to Associate Professor.
3. The year of the PMYR may be altered, upon written agreement between the individual and the Department or Program Chair, in the following circumstances:
 - a. When the faculty member is named to a full-time administrative appointment, the faculty member will have the option of delaying the PMYR for up to three years following the return to normal faculty assignments.
 - b. When the faculty member is granted a leave without pay for a full academic year. A leave of less than one academic year in duration shall not affect the time of the PMYR.
 - c. When the faculty member expresses in writing his or her intention to retire within three years of the time of the scheduled review, the review shall be cancelled. If the intention to retire is rescinded, the faculty member shall undergo PMYR in the next annual cycle or during the annual cycle in which the faculty member had originally been scheduled to undergo PMYR, whichever is later.
 - d. The PMYR may be advanced upon request initiated by the faculty member.

REVIEW MATERIALS

The faculty member will submit a current curriculum vitae and a brief statement, typically between 1000-2000 and not to exceed 2500 words, that summarizes and assesses

1. His/her principal activities during the period since then tenure review, the last promotion review or the last PMYR.
2. His/her goals, and approaches to achieving such goals, in the areas of teaching, research, creative and/or scholarly activity and service in the coming years. If the individual's statement calls for a major new initiative or change in the direction of her/his work, the statement may include a request for development support needed for that initiative or change in direction.

REVIEW PROCESS

The Department Chair will review the individual's curriculum vitae, statement, the AFRs for the prior six years, including any supplemental materials that normally accompany AFRs, and all evaluations of the faculty member's teaching performance carried out during the previous six years and the current year. After review of the materials, the Chair will recommend that the statement submitted by the faculty member be either accepted or revised. Academic reviews of chairs will be carried out by the Dean or his/her designee.

1. A recommendation to accept the submitted statement will be made when the individual's past performance and future goals, as documented in the materials submitted, indicates that no changes in the faculty member's work or plans are required in order to promote professional progress of the faculty member and continued contribution to the University.

The faculty member will acknowledge, by signature, receipt of any comments or suggestions appended by the Chair, and will have the opportunity to make appropriate responses.

2. A recommendation for revision of the submitted statement will be made when review of the individual's past performance and future goals, as documented in the materials submitted, suggests that a significant change in the faculty member's work or goals (substantially different from that proposed by the faculty member) is indicated in order to promote the faculty member's continued professional progress and effective contribution to the University.
3. In making either recommendation, the Chair will also recommend whether or not the resources requested for professional development, in the faculty member's statement or revised statement, should be provided. In deciding whether to recommend development support, the Chair would typically consider such factors as:
 - a. Whether the individual's past performance and future goals indicate that she/he is likely to be successful in achieving the goals;
 - b. Whether achievement of these goals requires the requested support;
 - c. The extent to which the individual's goals represents a contribution to goals of the department and the school.

Recommendations for development support will be submitted to the Dean who would consider the award of resources from a fund established for this purpose. The Dean will be aided in this decision by the Vice Chancellor for Faculty administration. Competing requests will be evaluated on the basis of merit and need.

FUNDING

The Medical School will allocate faculty development funds annually to implement recommendations resulting from individual PMYRs. These may include support for development programs sponsored by the Office of Medical Education or the Department of Faculty Administration and/or support for sabbaticals.

FURTHER ACTION

If the Chair recommends “statement accepted” and the Dean concurs, then no further action is taken, and the review is concluded.

If the Chair recommends revision, the Chair will meet with the individual to discuss ways of optimizing the faculty member’s proposed professional contribution through a revised statement. The faculty member may present any supplemental documentation of his or her performance at this time. The intent of the revision is to support and encourage the faculty member’s continued professional development and contribution to the department. It must in no way impinge on the faculty member’s academic freedom. Opportunities for professional development may include, but are not limited to, consultation with colleagues to assist in problem areas, a change in department assignments to facilitate improvement in teaching, research or service, the design of a sabbatical leave which is crafted to address the identified needs, and referral to the Office of Medical Education, if appropriate, for advice on teaching techniques.

If a revised statement is agreeable to the faculty member, the Chair and the Dean, the review is concluded. If the Chair recommends “statement accepted” but the Dean does not concur with the Chair’s recommendation, comments from the Dean explaining the nonconcurrence will be returned to the faculty member and Chair for revision of the statement. In these circumstances, a revised statement will be developed by the faculty member in consultation with the Chair, as described above. If the Dean accepts the revision, the review is concluded.

If the faculty member and the Chair or the faculty member and the Dean cannot agree on a revised statement, the faculty member can invoke a peer review of the PMYR statement by the tenured faculty of his/her department, if this comprises at least three additional faculty, or by the Tenure Committee. This group will review the revised statement and any further revisions suggested by the Chair or the Dean. They will recommend action on the further revisions to the Vice Chancellor for Faculty Administration or his/her designee.

If no agreement is reached, the Dean and Vice Chancellor for Faculty Administration will draft an appendix to the statement in consultation with the Chair and the faculty member. This appendix will address the issues identified, will include a timetable and criteria for a follow-up review to take place three years, and will be signed by the faculty member, the Department Chair and the Dean to signify that all parties have received copies. The appendix may include a reallocation of the faculty member’s effort, but such reallocation will not diminish the faculty member’s entitlement to merit funds nor impinge on his/her academic freedom. Any proposed reallocation of duties must not be designed, intended or used for the purposes of controlling, restriction or redirecting the nature of the faculty member’s research or

scholarship in his/her field. The revised statement will also indicate what resources or other support will be devoted to achieving the goals outlined in the revised statement.

During the three-year period after development of a revised statement, the Chair will consult as needed with the faculty member, and will comment in the AFRs on the faculty member's progress toward the goals set forth in the revised statement. The Dean will review these comments and may comment as well. At the end of this three-year period, the Chair and the Dean each will evaluate in writing the extent to which the goals of the revised statement have been achieved. If the parties concur that the goals have been achieved, the recommendation will be that a subsequent PMYR take place in four years, restoring the seven-year cycle. If they do not concur, the Dean may determine that no further efforts at faculty development are warranted and may refer the matter to the Vice Chancellor for Faculty Administration for disciplinary action or dismissal, consistent with the policies of the Medical School.

The fact of a faculty member's refusal to accept or to implement the revised statement shall not be a basis for discipline, and no aspect of the PMYR process, including but not limited to informal discussions, written recommendations, or the fact or details of any revised statements generated as part of the process shall be considered as an initial stage in any disciplinary process or be introduced as evidence or otherwise referred to in any later disciplinary procedure. This exclusion does not apply to any document or record originally intended for a use other than the PMYR, e.g. the AFR, nor to any aspect of a faculty member's performance which may have been considered in the PMYR process and may be separately considered in a subsequent disciplinary process. Nothing in this policy changes the "just cause" standard set forth in the Medical School policy under which a tenured faculty member may be considered for dismissal.

ASSESSMENT

The Vice Chancellor for Faculty Administration will prepare an annual report to the Dean on the PMYR process. This report, which will be reviewed by the Dean to ensure that the PMYR process is being appropriately and consistently carried out across departments. It will include a summary of the number of PMYRs conducted and their results and relevant details about all instances in which a revised plan was developed. This report will also be presented to the Faculty Council. In addition, every three years following implementation of the PMYR policy, the Vice Chancellor for Faculty Administration will provide an evaluation of implementation of the PMYR to the Faculty Council.