

Mercer University School of Medicine Post-Tenure Review Process

Section 1. Purpose

The purpose, process, and scope of post-tenure review is described in Section 2.5.2 - Post-tenure Review of the Mercer University Faculty Handbook (MUFH; revised July 2023). An overview of the process as specified in the MUFH is provided below as is the composition of the MUSM faculty advisory committee, the materials faculty undergoing post-tenure review are required to submit, and the assessment process. The domains evaluated per Section 2.4.2(2) of the MUFH (revised July 2023) are listed below (a-e) as well as additional domains that are MUSM specific (f-h). It is not expected that faculty will demonstrate contributions in every domain as contributions typically reflect a faculty member's distribution of professional effort and may be influenced by a change in promotion track. Note that administrative duties are not reviewed under post-tenure review.

- a. Quality of teaching and attention given to students as individuals.
- b. Breadth, depth, and variety of education and experience.
- c. Professional achievement and scholarship.
- d. Responsible participation in group deliberative processes.
- e. Professional responsibility and service to the school and community.
- f. Clinical practice.
- g. Service in the clinical realm.
- h. Professionalism and collegiality.

Section 2. Process (summarized from the MUFH)

1. Faculty due for a post-tenure review will receive at least six months' notice of the intent to review.
2. Per the MUFH: The review period starts with the first full academic year after hire into a tenured position or upon successful completion of a comprehensive review for tenure, promotion, or post-tenure review.
3. Faculty will review Section 2.5.2 - Post-tenure Review of the MUFH before assembling materials required for review.
4. Faculty will prepare and submit materials as PDFs via Watermark for review no later than the first business day/non-holiday of January. Post-tenure review materials will be simultaneously available to the faculty advisory committee, the faculty member's department chair, and the Dean.
5. In early January, the MUSM promotion and tenure committee will select the members of the faculty advisory committee (described below).
6. The faculty advisory committee will review materials and submit their report to the Dean no later than the 2nd Friday of February.
7. The Dean will provide a written evaluation to the faculty member and their department chair on or before April 1.
8. By April 1, the Dean will submit to the Provost a list of faculty deferred or reviewed along with the evaluation rankings and appropriate justifications for faculty who exceed expectations or do not meet expectations.

9. If necessary, for any identified domain in which the faculty member does not meet expectations, a Faculty Developmental Support Plan will be developed in accordance with Section 2.5.2 - Post-tenure Review of the MUFH.
10. If a Faculty Developmental Support Plan is issued, resubmission of materials for post-tenure review is required in accordance with the MUFH.

Section 3. Composition of the Faculty Advisory Committee

- A subset of the MUSM Promotion and Tenure Committee to include the deans of faculty affairs (*ex officio*, non-voting), the chair, and the chair elect.
- Three or more additional members of the faculty selected by Promotion and Tenure Committee who are tenured and represent diverse departments and disciplines with at least one member representing each campus. Eligible individuals include those serving on the P/T committee.

Section 4. Specific Expectations

Expectations for tenured faculty with primary responsibility for research (>50% DPE)

- 5-years post-tenure: Faculty are expected to have secured external funding in the 5-years following the award of tenure OR provide evidence that they have submitted grants for external funding that were scored, resubmitted, or in the process of revision for resubmission in the 5-years since the award of tenure.
- 10+ years post-tenure: Faculty are expected to have secured external funding in the 5 years following their last post-tenure review AND provide evidence that they have submitted grants for external funding that were scored, resubmitted, or in the process of revision for resubmission since their last post-tenure review.
- Demonstrate a record of involving MUSM students in research.
- Engagement in an existing internal grant peer review process at MUSM through submissions of their own grants and review of their colleagues' grants.
- Peer-review of research manuscripts by MUSM colleagues.
- Service as a role model and mentor for junior faculty on the tenure track.

Expectations for tenured faculty with primary responsibility for teaching (>50% DPE)

- Good or excellent student teaching evaluations.
- A teaching schedule consistent with their distribution of professional effort.
- A documented approach to and success in mentoring struggling MUSM students, service as a role model and mentor for junior faculty.
- A record of active participation in faculty development related to teaching, learner assessment, mentoring/advising/coaching, or curriculum development.

Section 5. Required materials

1. A letter addressed to the Dean, no longer than 3 single spaced pages, to include:
 - a. A statement/narrative addressing each of the applicable post-tenure review expectations described above in Section 4.

- b. A reflection on and remediation of any professionalism, civility, or collegiality issues over the most recent 5 years.
 - c. A reflection on some of the positive student evaluations/comments as well as areas identified for improvement and the steps taken towards improvement.
 - d. Distribution of professional effort for the most recent 5 years (download from the Rapid Reports menu in Watermark).
 - e. Goals for the next 5 years.
2. An up-to-date *curriculum vitae* in the MUSM CV format (download from the Rapid Reports menu in Watermark). Be sure that your faculty development activities are captured in the *curriculum vitae*. Faculty should clearly indicate activities and contributions made after the date they were awarded tenure, or after the date of their last promotion, or after the date of their most recent post-tenure review.
3. Letter from department chair (no longer than 2 pages) addressing your contributions to the school of medicine, any professionalism issues over the most recent 5 years, and your goals for the next 5 years.
4. Student evaluations (large group, patient-based learning, medical practice, clerkships, etc.). Evaluations should be downloaded from One45 or other software platform and provided as an appendix. In addition, a table summarizing the evaluations should be provided (faculty should create tables that best fit their needs). Faculty with a primary responsibility for teaching should include a list of students/trainees they have mentored over the most recent 5 years outside of the formal curriculum and must document their approach to and success in mentoring struggling students.
5. Optional materials
 - a. Peer-evaluations of teaching for the most recent 5 years.
 - b. Additional letters of support from colleagues/referees from or outside of Mercer University addressing all or some of the post-tenure domains or criteria (no more than two letters, each 2-pages or less).

Assessment of post-tenure review materials. Assessment of the domains below should be consistent with the faculty member’s distribution of professional effort over the most recent 5-year period and with any change in promotion track. The examples below are offered only as examples.

Domain	Exceeds Expectations	Meets Expectations	Does Not Meet Expectations	N/A
Quality of teaching and attention given to students as individuals (MUFH 2.4.2(2)) Students may include individuals enrolled in	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Outstanding student evaluations of teaching • Outstanding peer evaluations of teaching • Sustained record of student mentorship, advising, and/or coaching • Teaching, mentoring, advising, or coaching awards 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Satisfactory student evaluations of teaching • Satisfactory peer evaluations of teaching • Evidence of student mentorship, advising, and/or coaching • Satisfactory course/module/program evaluations 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Student evaluations of teaching consistently demonstrate need for improvement in one or more areas • Peer evaluations of teaching consistently demonstrate need for improvement in one or more areas 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Administrative role precludes an active role in student teaching, mentoring, advising, or coaching

<p>MUSM programs, interns, residents, fellows, junior faculty, and peers</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Outstanding course/module/program evaluations • Designs or develops novel learner assessments items or tools adopted by MUSM and/or other institutions or associations • Sustained commitment to enhancing educational skills by participating in activities related to professional development in teaching, mentoring, advising, or coaching • Invited to be a visiting professor at another institution • Develops a course, curricular component, software, or evaluation materials which are used regionally or nationally 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Revises learner assessments items or tools for quality improvement and designs or develops new items/tools when needed • Participates in activities related to professional development in teaching, mentoring, advising, or coaching • Develops a course, curricular component, software, or evaluation materials for the school 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Fails to improve in areas identified by student or peer evaluations of teaching and/or fails to engage in actively remediating areas identified by student or peer evaluations of teaching • No or limited record of student mentorship, advising, and/or coaching • Below average course/module/program evaluations • Does not contribute to the design or revision of learner assessments items or tools • Does not participate in activities related to professional development in teaching, mentoring, advising, or coaching 	
<p>Breadth, depth, and variety of education and experience (MUFH 2.4.2(2))</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Demonstrates lifelong learning skills and a growth mindset by actively seeking out and acquiring additional expertise or skills in areas outside of primary expertise and using newly acquired knowledge or skills with measurable impact to improve the learning environment, clinical practice, teaching, service, research/scholarship, etc. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Demonstrates lifelong learning skills and a growth mindset by actively seeking out and acquiring an additional expertise or skill in areas outside of primary expertise and applies the new knowledge or skill to improve an area of practice 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lacks a growth mindset: Does not seek and acquire additional expertise or skills in areas outside of primary expertise • Lacks lifelong learning skills: Does not expand or improve in area of primary expertise 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This domain requires evaluation and is an expectation for all faculty
<p>Professional achievement and scholarship (MUFH 2.4.2(2))</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Editor or associate editor of a professional journal • Multiple high impact peer-reviewed publications as first or last author • Multiple peer-reviewed or invited presentations 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reviewer for a professional journal(s) • Evidence of peer-reviewed publications as first, last, or middle author • Evidence of peer-reviewed presentations, including posters, at 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lacks peer-reviewed publications • Lacks peer-reviewed presentations • Lacks extramural funding as a principal investigator or co-investigator (for faculty with a primary 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This domain requires evaluation and is an expectation of all faculty

	<p>at regional, national, and international conferences</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Record of continuous extramural funding as a principal investigator demonstrating independence from intramural funding sources (for faculty with a primary responsibility for research) • Extensive record of engaging in the existing internal grant peer review process at MUSM (for faculty with a primary responsibility for research) • Extensive record of peer-review of research manuscripts by MUSM colleagues • Leadership role in multi-institutional collaborative research projects • Sustained commitment to enhancing professional achievement and scholarship by participating in multiple professional development activities • Leadership roles in state, regional, national, or international research societies or meetings • Participation as a consultant in regional or national research program reviews • Invited referee/reviewer of proposals for meetings of national or international associations • Awards for outstanding accomplishments in scholarship 	<p>regional or national conferences</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Record of extramural funding that may be supplemented with intramural funds as principal investigator or co-investigator (for faculty with a primary responsibility for research) • Record of engaging in the existing internal grant peer review process at MUSM (for faculty with a primary responsibility for research) • Record of peer-review of research manuscripts by MUSM colleagues • Co-investigator in multi-institutional collaborative research projects or clinical trials • Evidence of enhancing professional achievement and scholarship by participating in professional development activities • Participation in state, regional, national, or international research societies or meetings • Oversees training of health professions students, graduate students, or post-doctoral appointees 	<p>responsibility for research)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lack of involvement in collaborative research projects or clinical trials • Lack of participation in professional development activities to improve scholarship • No record of engaging in the existing internal grant peer review process at MUSM (for faculty with a primary responsibility for research) • No record of peer-review of research manuscripts by MUSM colleagues 	
--	---	---	--	--

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Director of scholarly activity of other faculty and/or graduate or post-doctoral appointees 			
Responsible participation in group deliberative processes (MUFH 2.4.2(2))	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Initiates and leads academic initiatives or projects involving multiple individuals • Proven leader able to build consensus among diverse groups or stakeholders • Proven leader able to manage difficult conversations and resolve conflict in group deliberative processes with diverse stakeholders • Actively includes and engages colleagues across campuses in collaborative processes 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Participates in academic initiatives or projects involving multiple individuals • Participates in efforts to build consensus among diverse groups or stakeholders • Participates in cross-campus collaborative processes 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Does not participate in academic initiatives or projects involving multiple individuals • Does not participate in efforts to achieve consensus among diverse groups or stakeholders • Does not participate in cross-campus collaborative processes • Fails to demonstrate willingness or ability to collaborate in group deliberative processes 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This domain requires evaluation and is an expectation for all faculty
Professional responsibility and service to the school and community (MUFH 2.4.2(2))	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sustained, excellent service as program director, co-director, block chair/co-chair, module coordinator, • Elected or appointed leader of a school, hospital, or community committee • Participates as a member of multiple and varied school, hospital, or community committees • Evidence of charitable work within the community • Initiates and leads service opportunities • Extensive record of service as a role model and mentor for junior faculty 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Service as a program director, block chair/co-chair, module/course coordinator for at least 2 years in the review period • Participates as a member of one or more school, hospital, or community committees • Participates in service opportunities within the school or community • Record of service as a role model and mentor for junior faculty 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lack of engagement on school or community committees • Frequent absences when serving on school or community committees • Attends but does not actively contribute to or participate in school or community committees • No record of service as a role model and mentor for junior faculty 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This domain requires evaluation and is an expectation for all faculty
Clinical Practice	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Elected fellow of a professional organization in the health professions 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Active member of one or more professional organizations in the health professions 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not a member of a professional organization or limited involvement over time 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not a practicing healthcare provider

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Active member of several professional organizations in the health professions • Appointed to an administrative or leadership role (DIO, department chair, vice-chair) • Elected or appointed to a leadership position within the governing structure of a national or international professional organization (e.g., AAMC, ACGME, COAMFTE, GAMFT) • Acknowledgement from accrediting bodies such as LCME, SACS, ACGME, COAMFTE as demonstrating “Best Practices” • Becoming a regional source of referral for expert opinion • Invitations to consult with government, insurance, or drug agencies • Recipient of awards for outstanding patient care delivery • Established consultant who attracts patients or clients on a regional or national level • Creatively revises and improves quality assurance and/or risk management procedures • Develops and implements clinical or professional program • Devises a new method or procedure which receives national or international recognition 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Demonstrates competence and promise of excellence in clinical, diagnostic, procedural, or other professional work • Considered a good clinician or professional by students, residents, fellows, and faculty • Consults at local level • Meets clinical benchmarks and productivity goals • Evidence for involvement in one or more of the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Revising and improving quality assurance and/or risk management procedures ○ Developing and implementing clinical or professional program ○ Devising a new method or procedure which receives national or international recognition ○ Developing new techniques, therapies, or health care delivery systems that have improved the health of the population served • Record of service as a role model and mentor for junior clinical faculty 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Does not demonstrate competence and promise of excellence in clinical, diagnostic, procedural, or other professional work • Does not consistently meet clinical benchmarks and productivity goals • No or limited evidence for involvement in one or more of the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Revising and improving quality assurance and/or risk management procedures ○ Developing and implementing clinical or professional program ○ Devising a new method or procedure which receives national or international recognition ○ Developing new techniques, therapies, or health care delivery systems that have improved the health of the population served • No record of service as a role model and mentor for junior clinical faculty 	
--	--	--	---	--

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Development of new techniques, therapies, or health care delivery systems that have improved the health of the population served • Recognized expertise in one's field at a regional, national, or international level • Source of referral for expert opinion • Extensive record of service as a role model and mentor for junior clinical faculty 			
Service in the Clinical Realm	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Leadership of a hospital/clinical committee, task force, or work group • Organizes a major national or international clinical meeting or symposium 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Membership on one or more hospital/clinical committee, task force, or work group • Participates in regional, national, or international clinical meetings or symposia 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not a member of a hospital/clinical committee, task force, or work group • No or minimal participation in regional, national, or international clinical meetings or symposia 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not a practicing healthcare provider
Professionalism, Civility, and Collegiality	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Respected by colleagues and students for consistently modeling all core values: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Civility, empathy, and transparency when working with others with differing points of views or beliefs ○ Collegiality through respectful communication, both written and spoken ○ Professionalism by actively listening to others and changing one's point of view when presented with new ways of thinking or understanding ○ Integrity by being accountable to the 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Frequently models several core values: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Civility, empathy, and transparency when working with others with differing points of views or beliefs ○ Collegiality through respectful communication, both written and spoken ○ Professionalism by actively listening to others and changing one's point of view when presented with new ways of thinking or understanding ○ Integrity by being accountable to the school and colleagues (three 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Does not model core values • Record of professionalism or collegiality issues that have not been remediated successfully • Fails to attend MUSM graduation, hooding, and white coat ceremonies and/or does not seek approval from the dean when unable to attend these events 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This domain requires evaluation and is an expectation of all faculty

	<p>school and colleagues (three campuses, one school community)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Embracing diversity by working towards an inclusive, welcoming, and fair working and learning environment • Attends all MUSM graduation, hooding, and white coat ceremonies 	<p>campuses, one school community)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Embracing diversity by working towards an inclusive, welcoming, and fair working and learning environment • Attends most MUSM graduation, hooding, and white coat ceremonies and seeks approval from the dean when unable to attend these events 		
--	--	--	--	--

Narrative

For domains assessed as “exceeds expectations” and “does not meet expectations” provide a detailed justification:

Exceeds expectations:

Does not meet expectations:

Five-Year Post-Tenure Review Timeline Example

Tenure notification: May 1, 2018					
Date tenure is effective: 7/1/2018	7/1/2018 - 6/30/2019	7/1/2019 - 6/30/2020	7/1/2020 - 6/30/2021	7/1/2021 - 6/30/2022	7/1/2022 - 6/30/2023
Years post-tenure:	1	2	3	4	5
					Application due first Monday of January 2024

Authors (January 2023)

Bonny Dickinson, Kimberly McElveen, Carolyn Klatt, Balint Kascoh, Elapulli Prakash, Richard Parrish, Andrea Meyer-Stinson, Christy Bridges, Eric Shaw, Anna Krامل, and Robert Visalli.

Approved by majority vote of the Executive Council on January 24, 2023.

Approved by majority vote of the MUSM Faculty on February 7, 2023.

Modified March 7, 2023 based on feedback from the Provost's office to clarify workflow of the faculty advisory committee, department chair, and Dean, to include submission of materials via Watermark, and to reference the University's Faculty Developmental Support plan.